

UACES 47th Annual Conference

Krakow, 4-6 September 2017

Copyright of the papers remains with the author. Conference papers are works-in-progress - they should not be cited without the author's permission. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s).

www.uaces.org



MARITA BRCIC KULJIS

The new politics of cultural pluralism in EU

A prerequisite of stability and justice

Multiculturalism is a theoretical concept that promotes and advocates of cultural diversity in society. Cultural pluralism is a result of migration, but also the effect of the free mind under free institutions. Multiculturalism assumes that individuals of a different cultural backgrounds are able to live together in community without losing their cultural specificity. Besides it is the theoretical concept, multiculturalism is also a politics that seeks to manage and institutionalize existing differences. The failure of multiculturalism have confirmed the key players of the European political scene: Merkel, Sarkozy and Cameron. (We have seen that only A. Merkel has survived). The failure of multiculturalism is the failure of liberal democracy. The failure of multiculturalism in EU can be seen as a failure of European Union. Regardless the fact that the policy of multiculturalism has failed, multiculturalism is still, as a living experience of diversity, fact of our daily lives. The political approach to cultural diversity in EU is therefore necessary to change. Today it is not the main question how to live 'with' diversity but how to live 'in' diversity. In this article we will try to discuss more models and theoretical concepts dealing with issues of cultural pluralism, to see which of them is or could be an acceptable political model for the European Union.

Introduction

If we take the idea of A. Camus that "Democracy is not the rule of majority but the protection of minority", then all democratic states should have a policy for protecting the rights of minorities.

Who are the minorities? According to the Council of Europe we can define it as “a group of persons in a state who: a. reside on the territory of that state and are citizens thereof; b. maintain longstanding, firm and lasting ties with that State; c. display distinctive ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic characteristics; d. are sufficiently representative, although smaller in number than the rest of the population of that State or of a region of that State; e. are motivated by a concern to preserve together that which constitutes their common identity, including their culture, their traditions, their religion or their language”.¹

Sociologists define them as numerically subordinate groups in relation to the rest of the population of a nation, having specific ethnic, religious, linguistic, etc. characteristics in relation to the majority group. These are objective characteristics. On the other hand, there are subjective characteristics that are the result of self-consciousness about belonging to a specific group (Memisoglu, 2007: 4).

¹ <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=20772&lang=en>

European Union and the member states of European Union are multicultural societies. Member states of European Union have always been an extremely tempting destination for all kind of migrants from various parts of the world. Research shows that one in three international immigrants live in Europe, and that immigrants represent 8.7% of the total European population.² In the large urban centers such as Amsterdam, Brussels, Frankfurt, London, migrants represent nearly ¼ of the total population. There is a large number of illegal immigrants. The European Commission considers that in the period 2004-2007 there were about 1.4 million illegal immigrants in the EU. Which tells us that there are certainly more millions of them.³ In 2015, around 2.4 million immigrants from other countries entered the EU member states. Most of them moved to Germany, the UK and France.⁴

“On 1 January 2016, the number of people living in the EU-28 who were citizens of non-member countries was 20.7 million, while the number of people living in the EU-28 who had been born outside of the EU was 35.1 million.”⁵

Beside the migrations between the non-member states and EU states, migrations occur also within Member States. Despite ongoing migration processes, EU countries still claim to be homogeneous at 85%. However, such homogeneity is not natural but is the result of political processes (Kraus, 2003: 671). It is a result of the identification between culture and nation. That can be one of the reason why the European Union still does not have a unified policy of governing cultural pluralism. That kind of policy is still a part of state policy although immigrants develop a different kind of identification for example ethnicity more often than nationally (Riva 2009:3).

Given the intense form of legal and illegal immigration in the recent years in the EU caused by the wars in Syria and the Middle East and the conflicts in North Africa, the European Union has adopted certain provisions on migrant quotas and the Dublin Regulation.⁶ To stop a large number of migrants, EU has reached an agreement was reached (for visa regulation) with Turkey, which currently holds more than 10 million immigrants ready for the European Union. There is an obvious paradox. On the one hand, we have millions of people expressing the desire to come to the European Union, but they are confronted with limits, deportation and problems with seeking asylum and on the other hand, there is a constant need for new workforce in the EU member states. The European Commission calculates that in the EU,

² <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/2011/KYIV%20WEBSITE/Report%20on%20diversity.pdf>

³ <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/2011/KYIV%20WEBSITE/Report%20on%20diversity.pdf>

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics

⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics

⁶ <http://www.unhcr.org/4a9d13d59.pdf>

over the next 50 years, the workforce would decrease by nearly 100 million, even while the population as a whole continues to rise.⁷

European Union is very cautious with new immigrants. The biggest problem is with immigrants from Muslim states. The Chatham House Royal Institute of International Affairs has carried out the survey in 2016, asking online respondents to value the statement "all further migration from mainly Muslim countries should be stopped". Citizens in over the 10 European countries were surveyed, an average of 55% agreed with the statement, 25% neither agreed nor disagreed, while only one in five respondents felt Muslim immigration should continue. Poland was the country most in favor of a ban on Muslim immigration with 71% of respondents agreeing with the statement. Austria was close behind with 65%.⁸

The most important reason for the devastating survey results is intensified fear of terrorism. The citizens of the European Union fear that there is a great danger that terrorists will be hiding among migrants. Although it is unacceptable for religion or any group to be identified with terrorism, we cannot deny that terrorist attacks that have occurred in member states are closely related to Islam, or to people of Muslim religion. The second reason is in a way connected with the first one. The EU still does not have a unified policy for governing the cultural pluralism in the broadest sense.

Why is the policy for governing the cultural pluralism important? The best answer to this question we can find in John Rawls' *Political Liberalism*: How is it possible for there to exist over time a just and stable society of free and equal citizens, who remain profoundly divided by reasonable religious, philosophical and moral doctrines? (Rawls, 2005:4).

Death and failure of multiculturalism in the EU

In 2010/2011, when the leading EU politicians Angela Merkel, David Cameron and Nicolas Sarkozy almost unanimously declared that multiculturalism in the European Union was dead, the Western world was shocked.

The statements were not random, but rather synchronized and clearly targeted to certain groups. The then British Prime Minister Cameron in his speech accused the Muslim community for collapsing multiculturalism, while the German chancellor Merkel declared that multiculturalism in Germany failed because people from other cultures, such as the Turks or Arabs, were unable to integrate (Cantle 2012: 53-54). With a mitigated rhetoric, the French

⁷ <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/2011/KYIV%20WEBSITE/Report%20on%20diversity.pdf>

⁸ <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/02/08/europes-fear-of-muslim-immigration-revealed-in-widespread-survey.html>

President Sarkozy supported the statements by saying that French public policy has for a long time been too much focused on the cultures of those who immigrate to France, and too little on domestic culture. In its report *Living Together* from 2011, the Council of Europe explained its vision of the failure of multiculturalism in the European Union.

We are of course well aware of this debate, but find that the term “multiculturalism” is used in so many different ways, meaning different things to different people and in different countries – is it an ideology? A set of policies? A social reality? – That in the end it confuses more than it clarifies. We have therefore decided to avoid using this term and instead to concentrate on identifying policies and approaches that will enable European societies to combine diversity and freedom.⁹

According to Ted Cantle, the reference to the failure of multiculturalism is based on the perception that it was precisely the 'politics' of multiculturalism that failed to offer an adequate response to the 'composition' of the society (Cantle 2012: 53). The fact that 'politics' has failed to secure a just, stable and harmonious society also adds to such perception. This criticism has objective and subjective indicators. Objective indicators point to a significant level of inequality, racism and tensions within the community and subjective indicators are manifested in a low level of trust in diversity (Cantle 2012: 53). For example: racism and intolerance are undeniably widespread throughout Europe. Statistics can prove it. For example: anti-Semitic acts have decreased by 24% between 2011 and 2012, but violence against Muslims has increased by 47% during the same period of time.¹⁰

The facts further point out that the European Union has never been systematically analyzed issues of cultural pluralism or problems of minority rights. During institutionalization and the organization of the European Union, there was no relevant discussion on minority rights as an important element of politics. Reasons are multiple. One of the reasons is certainly the assumption that the issues on minority rights are going to be solved with *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* that Europe Union has accepted and also with *the European Convention on Human Rights*¹¹ that EU has proposed. The protection of human rights from all forms of discrimination has been also incorporated into the *Rome Treaty* (Treaty establishing the European Community in 1957). It was considered that the rights guaranteed by the Declaration and the idea of liberal democracy are sufficiently universal, that it is not necessary to specify protection of minority rights. The idea of the liberal democracy advocates

⁹ <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/2011/KYIV%20WEBSITE/Report%20on%20diversity.pdf>

¹⁰ <http://wilpf.org/minorities-rights-in-france-many-challenges-yet-to-be-addressed/>

¹¹ http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf

impartiality and equality of all citizens as a core element for realizing justice in society. However, achieving citizenship in the EU member states was and is a major problem for certain groups.

Another reason was an assimilation model for migrants. By 1960, all immigrants had been expected to fully adopt the existing cultural norms, which was an Anglo-American model of immigration. Assimilation was considered essential for political stability (Kymlicka 1995:15). However, since 1970, the above-mentioned countries have rejected the assimilation model and adopted a more tolerant and pluralistic policy which was later defined as the policy of multiculturalism (Kymlicka 1995:17).

Assimilation was replaced by multiculturalism policy as a result of the series of social movements, the strengthening of civil society and the growing pressure and criticism of the inadequacy of the idea of liberalism as a universal value. Such an idea was increasingly interpreted as a biased model that corresponds only to one (dominant) group within Western societies. Multiculturalism was then shaped as a policy aimed at the institutionalization and management of diversity (Malik 2013: 8). As a policy, multiculturalism presupposes that individuals and culturally diverse groups can be fully involved in a (new) society without losing their cultural peculiarities. Such a type of integration, and hence full participation, assumed the transformation of state and social structures in the direction of ensuring equal access to the public space for all, at least in a formal legal sense.

In principle, multiculturalism has been from the beginning adopted in the member states of the European Union. That also was a reason why the core idea for unification of the Europe was *Unity in Diversity*. But, the reality was a bit differ. For migrants it was a very difficult to get citizenship in the EU member states and a process of assimilation have not got well as if it has for example in the USA. In the USA, there is a so-called hyphenated American identity that define someone as African-American or Italian-American. One African-American or one Italian-American have in common a political status they are an American citizen. Being a citizen in America it means in first place political rights and obligations. To be an American is largely a political identity, and everything else is upgrading. But the EU is not America. In the EU member states it is extremely problematic to separate citizenship and nationality because to have a civic status you must to have national affiliation. To be a Croat or to be a German is much more than just a legal status. Although politically speaking it is separate because citizenship refers to legal status and nationality to the feeling of belonging (Hermet, 234).

Minority rights began to be intensively discussed in the EU in the early 1990s, especially because of the situation in the Eastern and Southeastern Europe where intense and bloody

ethnic conflicts occurred during the process of separation. It all motivated the European Union to make some decision about legal regulation on minority rights. In accordance with these processes in 1993 was established Copenhagen Accession Criteria. These Criteria was a set of the requirements for the protection of minority rights. Later those Criteria became one of the key preconditions that accession countries should have to fulfill in their process of accession to the European Union. Meanwhile, other documents such as Amsterdam Treaty (1997), Human Rights and Democracy Committee and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000) have been adopted.

Today the Treaty on European Union advocate the value of respecting human dignity, equality, respect for human rights, including the minority rights. According to those documents, every person (not just citizens) living in the EU state member is under protection against all form of discrimination. Nevertheless, research shows that minorities in European countries are subject to discrimination in: employment, housing, education, health and social affairs, court and how police report about them.¹²

The establishment of additional criteria and preconditions for new EU members led to inconsistencies within the European Union itself, ie the legal frameworks of the Member States regarding the protection of minority rights between old members and new members (Memisoglu, 2007: 15). Thus, for example, Hungary, which, when joining the EU, has adopted a comprehensive minority policy that enables for 13 minority groups a broad group of rights, from cultural autonomy to political representation (Memisoglu, 2007: 15). Similarly, in the Republic of Croatia, which joined the European Union in 2013, which, by its Constitution (Source Basis), cites the national minority groups and guarantees them all rights including national rights. Minorities in Croatia, therefore, have their representatives in the Parliament elected in the elections on special lists, which further protects their rights and their specifics.

In the old member states, the issue of national minorities is extremely problematic. In France, for example, the law on separation of churches and states was adopted 100 years ago and the French had a different approach to multiculturalism (the so-called model of regressive assimilation (Cantle 2012: 72). France, for example, does not recognize the status of national minorities. Ethnic minorities who sought dual-citizenship were accused of fostering the “balkanization” of French society with their “communitarianism” and prompting the decline

¹² <https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/2011/KYIV%20WEBSITE/Report%20on%20diversity.pdf>

of social cohesion.¹³ But despite this “hyper diversity,” the French national identity remains more or less unchanged. In 2012 it is still expected that cultural identities will remain settled in the private sphere of life without the need for public or political recognition.¹⁴

According to Cantle, the mistake was made because there was no separation of multicultural society and multicultural policy (2015: 2). The decline of multiculturalism does not require a new 'brand' of cultural pluralism, but a concept which would reflect the reality of social differences in a different manner (Cantle, 2015: 3). Multicultural policies were very successful in promoting equal policies, developing positive actions and combating discrimination. However, being fully focused on the political aspect of multiculturalism has led to its failure. Society did not follow politics. Politics was not directed by society. The focus was entirely on rights and positive actions. On the other hand, the question of how and if people can learn to live with 'differences', in the societies in which these are constantly re-defined, was not examined (Cantle, 2015: 3). Cantle, therefore, advocates the so-called *contact theory* (Cantle, 2015: 5). Contact is necessary if we want to meet, reconcile, recognize differences, etc. In the European multiculturalism policy it was not recognized that contact is an important part of a successful multicultural policy, but it was rather believed that things would eventually solve by themselves.

The contact was avoided and the segregation advocated, either for the purpose of preserving cultural diversity or cultural features. Early forms of policy of multiculturalism were focused on the protection of minorities from racism and discrimination, and the development of positive action programmes with the aim of providing minority groups with equal opportunities. However, such policies have led to a certain degree of separation that was initially used as a means of avoiding both conflict and contacts (Cantle 2012: 54). The result was (so-called) parallel society or (so-called) ghetto (also marks the outskirts of the city where the poorer citizens are located - as a form of social exclusion). It is a part of an urban settlement where members of ethnic, religious, national and other minorities are accommodated. Ghetto is usually not mono-ethnic while parallel societies usually are. Ironically, for example, special programs for minority groups led to decreasing inequalities, but on the other hand they strengthened differences and separation. From a political point of

¹³ Patrick Simon, French National Identity and Integration: Who Belongs to the National Community? Institut national d'études démographiques (INED), 2012 <file:///C:/Users/Renata/Downloads/FrenchIdentity.pdf 02.kolovoza 2017>.

¹⁴ Patrick Simon, French National Identity and Integration: Who Belongs to the National Community? Institut national d'études démographiques (INED), 2012 <file:///C:/Users/Renata/Downloads/FrenchIdentity.pdf 02.kolovoza 2017>, p. 14

view, both left-wing and right-wing political parties agreed, for various reasons, of course, with such a kind of multicultural policy. The Right was opposed to integration and mixing, and the Left was afraid that the minority groups and their cultural specificities would drown and disappear with the process of integration and assimilation (Cantle, 2012: 56). The concept of state multiculturalism was developed in states such as the United Kingdom. This is also confirmed by Parekh's thesis that Great Britain is a community of communities (Parekh, 2000: ix). The EU's response to its own failure is presented as a failure of multiculturalism.

Living together in the European Union

When the European Union adopted the paradigm Unity in diversity, this paradigm primarily concerned the differences existing between the EU members states, all other differences will be compensated by national decrees. Today, the European Union faces with the problem - the European Union needs migrants, but not all kind of migrants. Every state has its own criteria for offering possibility that someone became citizen. Given the need for labour force, is EU in position to choose? UN statistics state that the EU, considering population aging, by 2050, will have about 40% of the European population is going to be immigrants or first generations. (Iov, Mera, Marian, 2013: 309).

From history it is well-known that America has built its powerful economy thanks to the mechanical inflow of population or immigrants. The European Union does not have too many choices if it wants to survive. The financial crisis has struck the very foundations of the European Union, and as it always happens, after the economic crisis comes the order of detecting the enemy (whether external or internal). The first victim is multiculturalism (opening up space for rising intolerance and discrimination); the second: abandonment of the European Union (Great Britain); and the third: strengthening of extreme political options in member states.

Given the diversity is destiny of the European Union, the European Union needs to find a unique plan on this issue. In accordance with that goal, the Group of Eminent Persons of the Council of Europe presented a report in 2011 titled Living together. Combining diversity and freedom in 21st-century Europe. The Report is divided into two parts: "The threat" and "The response". It is a document which confirming the failure of multiculturalism, point to an increase of discrimination and intolerance towards certain groups (sexual minorities, both national and religious minorities, especially Roma and Sinti, Muslims, Jews and Christians) in the EU members but also in other member states of the Council of Europe. Report also

presents the prejudices against minorities (increase the rate of crime, Islamic extremism, bring diseases, take our jobs, lower our wages, exploit the welfare state, behave like this place belongs to them, build parallel societies, lower standards in education, immigrant women live as a minority). It is considered that minority representation in the media in a negative way and through stereotypes raises discrimination (eg. migrants are accused for exploiting the system by using all rights and privileges). Other problems are: crisis of leadership, insecurity, possible clash between “religious freedom” and freedom of expression, parallel societies ect.

The report also offers ‘the responses’. The Report offers 17 fundamental principles around which all Council of Europe members should agree that should ensure coexistence among people of different races, religions and cultures. The basic principle underpinning this document is the obligation to comply with the law, meaning that no person or group can be excluded from compliance with the law. It is also envisaged that every person with the EU citizenship or residence in the EU is entitled to participate in the law-making process. Migrants are required to learn the language, respect the law, and bring benefits to society. According to the Report, coercion should be minimal, and the persuasion, which is carried out through the education process, should be maximized.

At the end of the document, we can find 59 proposals for actions that are divided into strategic recommendations and specific recommendations (some of which relate exclusively to EU members - integration of migrants and people of recent migrant origin, citizenship and voting rights, asylum and humanitarian issues, and some to all members of the Council of Europe: education, youth and intercultural dialogue, media, Roma inclusion, support for action at local and regional level, political extremism, racism, xenophobia, working with neighbours, implementing our proposals).

In this paper, we will focus on the guidelines to the European Union members in addressing the problem with cultural pluralism and migrants. Report advocates developing a comprehensive EU migration policy that will be aligned with the constitutional and legal framework that respects the promotion of the fundamental rights and requirements outlined in the Europe 2020 Strategy. According to the Report, the EU has to admit to its members states need for immigrants. Report suggests that EU members have to accept citizenship requirements for individuals who are permanently resident in their states. They have to encourage active participation at the local level of all legally registered residents and allow these members to vote in the local elections. This can be extended to all immigrants with long-term status and this can be considered as a transitional process until citizenship is acknowledged. Report also call on member states that have not yet done so to sign and ratify

the Council of Europe Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local level (so far signed by 13 member states but ratified by only 8 of them).

All states should therefore strive to extend the full rights and obligations of citizenship, including the right to vote. And as a step towards this, non-citizens of whatever origin should be allowed to vote in local elections in any city or region where they have established residence – as is already the case for citizens of the European Union residing in a member state other than their own. (Living together 2011: 33)

Migrants are required to learn the language, respect the law, and bring benefits to society. The coercion should be minimal, and the persuasion that would be accomplished through the education process is maximized.

Thus even the best laws are of little use if mainstream opinion is not convinced that they are right. For this reason, we believe that a better common life in 21st-century Europe depends relatively little on compulsion, and much more on convincing people of different cultures and beliefs that they actually need to live together, and on finding ways to make that easier (Living together 2011: 35).

The entire document is in line with the European Convention on Human Rights. The document stands for the fundamental principle of multiculturalism as a living experience of diversity.

But they are not expected to renounce their faith, culture or identity. Neither Islam nor any other religion should be considered a priori incompatible with European values. None of us has only one identity – we identify differently according to context (Living together 2011: 34).

With the aforementioned document, the Council of Europe in a certain way makes a step forward in dealing with the decline of multiculturalism policy, because it clearly defines the rights and obligations of minority groups, but also opens up to different cultures and immigrants by accepting their reality in the European Union. It was not the case before. Report *Living together* thus advocates ideas of a well-known concept of interculturalism.

While all the above measures are necessary, they may not be sufficient to ensure that people of different cultural, religious or geographical background will live together in genuine harmony and friendship in all the different countries and cities of Europe. Only when we know each other as individual fellow-citizens, colleagues and friends, rather than at second hand through images and stereotypes, can we truly be said to “live together”. (Living together 2011: 35-36).

It is important to point out that report *Living together. Combining diversity and freedom in 21st-century Europe* is just a set of guidelines and that the Report emphasize the autonomy of the state regard to the specific legal provisions.

“We recognise that there are contexts in which the application of these principles is not self-evident. There is still the question of how far, in making the law, states should take account of the particular views, beliefs or traditions of minority groups. On such matters the citizens of each democracy must decide where to draw the line. Opinions may legitimately differ, and on at least one such issue – whether women (or men for that matter) should be allowed to appear in public with their face fully covered – even the members of our Group were unable to agree.” (Living together 2011: 36)

Is the EU ready to live together?

The above-mentioned Report of the Council of Europe is a valuable contribution that can be useful for the EU in struggling with the problems of cultural pluralism.

However, since the European Union is still struggling with itself, the above proposal have to be carefully analysed for a number of reasons. To consider the objective possibilities of the potential solution and potential pitfalls. The first step on this journey is to accept the fact that some things in the European Union have to change. The major changes will relate to the current understanding of the national identity that served as we-they model.

National identities will certainly have to be more open to new cultures and different immigration policy. The proposal of report *Living together* aims to accelerate the process of obtaining the status of citizenship for all members of minority groups that have resident in the one of member state for a long time.

We can agree with some report suggestions, but some suggestions are confusing. For example attitudes about the concept of human rights and civil rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was an important and core document during the process of modelling the concept and the idea of the European Union. Accordingly, the European Declaration on Human Rights has also been adopted. However, there is a difference between human and civil rights. Simple explanation shows that human rights are general rights that has to be always applied to all, while civil rights are specific and they are valuable within state borders. For the European Union, this is even more specific because there are civil rights within member states and civil rights as citizens of the European Union. In the report *Living together* different terms

are used: resident, non-citizens, immigrants, members of minorities, people of recent migrant origin and citizens. But it is not clear when and why in the Report is used one term, and not the other, leading to certain ambiguities with the messages of the document. For example instructions that are addressed only to the citizens but should refer to everyone „All citizens should be ready to condemn verbal abuse and correct distorted images of any group, wherever they encounter them“ (Living together 2011: 55). Also, the Report suggests political equalization of citizens and non-citizens. „Since residents on the territory of a state are required to obey its laws, we believe, as a matter of fundamental democratic principle, that they should have a say in the making of those laws. All states should therefore strive to extend the full rights and obligations of citizenship, including the right to vote, to as many of their resident population as possible“ (Living together 2011: 55). „As a step towards this, non-citizens of whatever origin should be allowed to vote in local elections in any city or region where they have established residence (as is already the case for citizens of the European Union residing in a member state other than their own).“ (Living together 2011: 55).

This is in line with the requirement that Iris Marion Young put forward in his book *Justice and the Politics of Difference*.

"For a norm to be just, everyone who follows it must in principle have an effective voice in its consideration and be able to agree to it without coercion. For a social condition to be just it must enable all to meet their needs and exercise their freedom; thus justice requires that all be able to express their needs" (Young, 1990:34).

Authors of the report *Living together* advocate the right to vote for non-citizens or migrants who have residence in the EU member state for a long-term. This is cited as one of the incentives for states to accelerate the recognition of civil status for immigrants. This is in a way justified. But, if the right of vote is given to non-citizens, the question arises as what is the difference between being citizen and being a non-citizen? Authors give an example that the citizen from the EU member state can vote in the EU elections in any EU member state (Maastricht Contracts link national citizenship and citizenship of the Union). But the difference is that you can vote in the EU election only after your state become the EU member. Your status of nation citizenship provides your status of the EU citizenship.

Such a proposal raises the problem relations of rights and 'rights' ? With this proposal, the right to vote for non-citizens is ensured only in local elections, not in the state election or elections for the European Parliament. It is clear that we can encourage the idea of subsidiarity in this way, but there is a danger of creating a hybrid-citizen who has the right

and does not have the right. If he has the right to vote, has he right to run on election? Only in local or in all elections?

The proposal that also creates some problems because it does not belong to the European tradition and the spirit of the EU is the idea of forming a hyphenated European identity similar to the American model African-American or Italian-American. Applying such a model in the EU would have, for example, Turkish-German or Serb-Croat identity.

The assumption for such identity is a residence for a long time in the EU member and recognition all rights and obligations as other citizens have. It is about legal-political identity, not just subjective feeling of identity. We have already stated, in the United States, the meaning of being an American is primarily a mark of political identity, in Europe it is somewhat different. In that sense, for someone who defines themselves as Turkish-German, there is a possibility to accept an attitude: „Turkey means home, while Germany is opportunity.“ (Iov, Mera, Marion, 2013: 312). Of course this is not always the case, but it is clear that, for example, a large number of Turks came to Germany only temporarily and then without plans they remained and did not adequately assimilate. However, such a proposal may somehow encourage members of the minorities to adopt the identity of the country they are moving into, along with their own identity, and gradually develop a European identity. This is a necessary prerequisite for building a stable and just society built on the idea of solidarity. Solidarity is the key link for European society. Solidarity is based on trust, feelings of belonging, common identity (the third pillar of liberal democracy in Europe with freedom and equality) between member states and citizens, but also between citizens.

The report *Living together* is the document that combines diversity and freedom in the 21st century, as the subtitle says. Specifically, the Council of Europe, ie by 47 members, and not only the EU member states propose the Report. The Report can serve as a set of guidelines and instructions, good desires and great hopes that this part of the universe where we live can be more stable and fairer, but that we need the common effort of all of us. What is even more important is to point out that the European Union, no matter how tolerant and democratic it is, has its serious demons with which it has to face it openly and boldly.

Conclusion

The culture of multiculturalism is not holistic, but it includes subcultures, cultural fragments, mega-culture, meta-culture, emerging cultures, and all other cultural elements that are not cultures per se but make a plurality of culture (lifestyles, ideologies, etc.) (Eller, 1997: 251). Culture is articulated at several levels (Parekh 2000: 143). Moreover, cultures are never a

community's achievement, but are always a result of various communities that provide context, shape beliefs and practices (Parekh 2000: 163). "In this sense, almost all cultures are multiculturally constituted" (Parekh 2000: 163).

Although the failure or the death of multiculturalism in the EU has sounded extremely threatening, especially since it came from countries that have built the idea of the European Union, the consequences can be positive, depending on perspective.

We have mentioned that there is a huge differentiate between the policy of multiculturalism and multiculturalism as a living experience of diversity. So, we can assume that the EU policy of multiculturalism has failed, but the diversity still is the fate of the European Union, and it will rise, given the intensity and the need for immigration that EU has. Multiculturalism as a living experience of diversity will continue to exist as it has until now.

The failure of multiculturalism can and should be seen as an opportunity for the European Union. We have abandoned the imposed policy of multiculturalism, so it is now time to create our own policy that will respond to the specifics of the European Union. Does the European Union want to be a supranational model (as one that empowers the role of the state in the design of political Europe) or post-national (as one that goes beyond national state modality) (J.M. Ferry)? We have seen that the policy of multiculturalism was shaped precisely for the national state, ie for the territorial, linguistic and cultural community, as the policy of involving the minorities into a unified political community (Riva, 2009: 4). We also saw that the national state of the European model was not able to realize it. In the European Union, the political community still means a national community irrespective of the existence of a political community of citizens of the European Union. It is therefore necessary to learn to think of Europe simultaneously as a plural and one (Hersant in Riva 2009:19). Europe can therefore be perceived as a place of citizenship, involvement, participation, as a place of belonging, regional, national, even ethnic and religious, and this can be supplemented by a new element, which is an individual choice on identity. Think of yourself as a Europeans. (Riva 2009:20). This does not mean extinction or collapse of a national state, this means overcoming the systems that in a certain way stuck in the past, in ideology and mythology.

"What does all this mean for European polity-building? Firstly, it means that the appeal of the 'mainstream' nation-state model of political integration is highly questionable from a normative perspective, if one wants to take issues of 'cultural justice' seriously. Secondly, and this is perhaps the more relevant point for my concerns here, it implies that the cultural dynamics of European integration will differ sharply from the dominant nation-state pattern" (Kraus; 2003: 672).

Can we preserve what cannot be preserved? The European national state has lost a certain part of its sovereignty when it became the EU member state. The national state has lost part of its sovereignty, partly because of the global economic fluctuations on which it cannot influence, and who strongly influence on its economy (if it is its economy) but for sure on its financial system. In addition, the very idea of subsidiarity is the rival idea of sovereignty in the political sense. (Kraus, 2003: 683).

When did Merkel, Sarkozy and Cameron declare the failure of multiculturalism have they done so in order to rescue the national state, or there was some kind of the different background message ?

„Hence, whatever the EU will look like in future, it will certainly differ from the dominant nation-state pattern.“ (Kraus, 2003: 672).

The future of the EU is uncertain. If we want to preserve the EU, we all will have to accept some terms and condition, and some changes that are not going to be very easy.

To find solution for the cultural pluralism issue, the EU will have to accept concepts that advocates cooperation, communication, contact (Cantle), interculturalism, transculturalism and the concept of living together.

To develop such an environment, it is necessary to cooperate with all interested parties and to respect all existing agreements and laws adopted by the European Union. It all starts from the assumption that peaceful coexistence between people of different races, religions and cultures is possible only if an agreement is reached on the underlying principles.

In the report Living together, authors have identified particular sectors of society and institutions, which they believe have the capacity to change the way people in Europe think about each other, and so enable them to live together better: educators, mass media; employers and trade unions; civil society; churches and religious groups; celebrities and “role models”; towns and cities (the principle of subsidiarity); member states; European and international institutions.

They all should be working together and try to restore trust among citizens, with their examples of avoiding prejudices. Given that the EU is still in some form of a pre-eminent situation, despite Maastricht, it is precisely the right time, as Habermas said, to develop the political virtues of solidarity and fraternity, which will enable us to develop a European identity. Maybe we need a new model of social contract for EU or new French revolution. You never know.

“If it is born, the sovereign people of Europe will not be multicultural for one precise reason: it will not define itself primarily as a function of the policies to integrate the extra-European immigrants coming to join it. It will be pluricultural: linguistically, culturally, and politically composite, without becoming mixed or crossbred, fashioned less by the widespread but unpredictable internal migratory movements than by the persistence of its “ethnic” borders in the weak sense” (Hermet in Riva (ed); 2009:235).

Given all the facts and circumstances, the European Union has an optimistic future only if all its members are ready for the changes that the future will require. If the member states are going to be persistent in saving the form that has no future, there is also no future for the European Union.