

Producing Interculturality: Repertoires, Strategies and Spaces*

by NUNO OLIVEIRA (Lisbon University Institute)

Abstract

Issues of cultural diversity governance have been on the agenda with regard to urban paradigms that seek to accommodate diversity driven by a globalized world. These new *urbanscapes* feature particular conditions of interaction involving cross-cultural social competences and have lately been analysed according to an “ethics of encounter”. This text proposes three analytical axes to evaluate repertoires of cultural diversity in contemporary cities, particularly with regard to its inscription in public spaces and the underlying logic of their social organisation. Drawing on Foucault’s idea of the production of social realities, practices and subjectivities by means of the ways in which power circulates in social relations, I term this the *production of interculturality*. I argue that one can examine three logics of the production of interculturality at the urban space level: a political, an economic-competitive and an ethical-symbolic.

Keywords: interculturality, ethics of encounters, governance, diversity, repertoires

Introduction

Local space is becoming increasingly important in observing and understanding contemporary forms of cultural belonging and their social organization (Conradson and Latham 2005, Nathan 2011, Caglar and Schiller 2011). The overcoming of the nation-state as the paradigmatic unit for the integration of immigrants and the social accommodation of cultural diversity is clearly reflected in new notions such as *transnational-*

ism from below, conviviality and super-diversity (Smith and Guarnizo 1998, Gilroy 2005, Vertovec 2007). Such concepts highlight the fact that the nation-state has ceased to be the locus of cultural intersections, and instead a more complex space of diasporic contacts structured by globalized trends is emerging in cities (Sassen 1991). While similarly underscoring the growing complexity of migratory fluxes and their cultural intersections, other perspectives have shifted the focus of analysis to everyday practices. One such shift reflects the growing importance of local spaces in processes to accommodate cultural diversity.

The resulting research has viewed such spaces as sites of everyday encounters, which involve a certain “ethos” of relations between people (Wise 2009, Yuval-Davis 2011, Amin 2002, Wessendorf 2013). Accordingly, a dialogical and

* This text is based on work carried out within the project *Conviviality and Superdiversity* headed by Beatriz Padilla of whose team I was a member from 2010 to 2011. I would like to thank both the Lisbon and the Granada team with whom I was fortunate to work and discuss many of the problems arising from fieldwork and conceptual fine-tuning. My recognition goes to them. However, all the arguments and conceptual building expressed here are entirely my own.

relational process is said to unfold through an acceptance of the stranger – ultimately, a necessary sharing of common humanity – and is henceforth incorporated in our subjective spheres. But how are such spaces of sharing and commonality produced by urban governance discourses and what are the differential stakes involved in its definition? In this article I set out to discuss an apparent neglect of a more strategic and discursive dimension, at the same time integrating such spaces of encounters in inner city locations into a broader conceptual and political space of planning and governance. In order to do this, I look into intercultural/diversity festivals as social constructions of the intertwining of practiced diversity, planned interculturality and urban positioning strategies. I show that there is a link between the nature of the space, the strategic articulation of actors engaged and the expression of the intercultural festivals, which give significance to the circulation of power and its role in constructing subjectivities. This combination is part of the new urban governance of cultural diversity.

Following this idea, this article proposes three analytical axes to evaluate the governance of cultural diversity in contemporary cities, paying special attention to their incorporation of public spaces and the underlying logic of their social organisation, which I call the *production of interculturality*. This term directly evokes Foucault's idea of the production of social realities, practices and subjectivities by means of the ways in which power circulates in social relations (Foucault 1975, 1976). Of such modes, the article focuses on an economic aspect, a political aspect and a symbolic aspect that one can find in the discursive construction of the intercultural. It is clear that they maintain relations of dependence and can in no way be viewed as being mutually exclusive; however, for analytical purposes it is necessary to examine them in isolation.

The space of the cultural encounter

Wise (2009) proposed the expression “quotidian transversality” in the wake of the sociological appropriation of Deleuze & Guattari's concept

of transversality offered by Yuval-Davis (1997). This reprised the notion of ‘transversal’ as a ‘transversal transformation’ in the sense of anti-essentialism that refutes life being the result of pre-existing forms; it instead views it as ‘becoming’, which is modified with each new encounter, by means of which the beings involved undergo changes. In the same mould, expressions such as “ethos of mixing” (Wessendorf 2013), “habitual engagement” (Amin 2002) or “ethics of care” (Yuval-Davis 2011) highlight the relevance of everyday local practices and the specific nature of this ethos in encounters between people. In spite of slight conceptual and lexical differences, all these notions seem to place greater emphasis on the inter-subjective realm of meaningful relations and negotiated cultural codes. Considering these notions, it is possible to affirm that there is a certain implicit discourse on empathy and spontaneity associated with these interactions. Wise (2009: 36) suggests that owing to a social relationship of care, the relations in cross-cultural encounters sometimes produce a capacity for recognising “alterity” in particular situational conditions.

Many of these topics are also found in the images and discourses associated with intercultural festivals. As part of a larger social imaginary on diversity, the intercultural festivals seek to construct this image of spontaneity and interpenetration between people from different cultural and national origins. This is part of the wider discourse on diversity -- with its emphasis on communication and interrelation – that, for some, has become an ideological franchise (Lentin and Titley 2008: 12). For others, it is the reflex of ever-greater diversification of social differences that have culminated in superdiversity (Vertovec 2007).

I'm not delving into the issue of defining an intercultural festival, because this is exactly what from a Foucauldian viewpoint should be avoided. Following Foucault, it would be necessary to redeem the institutional dimension not as a centre for issuing norms, but as a space where strategies and behaviours of agents are

managed and mobilised. Hence, it is necessary to analyse this spontaneity by examining means of local forms of power and how they are negotiated by individuals and other agencies. With the same Foucauldian bent, Keith (2005) suggests an analytical framework that focuses on vocabularies, technologies of representation and spatiality. As Keith says, such an approach does not privilege the “heroic everyday tactics (...) of the ethnographical particular cultures of the urban” (ibid: 12); instead, it looks into the multiplicity of ways producing the visibility of the multiculture within the urban.

Nevertheless, in a conceptual move outside the established boundaries of the Foucauldian framework, the empirical research in this article brings in the cultural repertoires of the multiple agents involved in planning, producing and executing such events. I draw from Lamont’s (2000a, 2000b) notion of repertoire as the set of elements, symbols and codes that articulate and form a system of values and strategies that people use to evaluate social situations. Such strategies and representations of diversity and its expressions should be understood against the backdrop of spatial realities that, as Doreen Massey (1994) famously put, are the setting for geographies of power where material and ideological dimensions become mutually constitutive. Complementing the “ethnographic real” of local encounters entails relating these with urban planning processes, local cultural policies, strategies by political agents and, above all, the market (or markets) as a dimension – sometimes an overwhelming dimension – for the production of interculturality. One instance where such forces come together is precisely the intercultural festivals.

Interculturality is basically the equivalent for the southern countries of the “diversity” discourse in the northern ones. It has been for quite some time the preferred term to name policies targeting migrants’ integration both in Portugal and in Spain. Moreover, in both countries it has been defined as implementing a principle of positive inter-

action that allegedly would supersede multiculturalism closure¹. Thus, interculturality is not a complexified theoretical rendition of new patterns of diversification, but a tag name for a set of policies aiming at governing cultural and ethnic diversity, that seldom coalesce into a model (Oliveira 2014). Indeed, the terms multicultural and intercultural are so often interchangeably used, or in casting the intercultural as the beneficial phase of a multicultural society, that they do not specify any contending policy fields. The name resonates with other similar initiatives to celebrate diversity in its multiple expressions and images. It is necessary to frame such acceptance against the background of a debate where “real” differences between interculturalism and multiculturalism are ascertained, as the one we can see in the UK (Cantle 2012, Meer and Modood 2012).

In order to break out of this unproductive debate, because there was never a multicultural model neither in Spain nor in Portugal, we ask about the conditions for producing interculturality when this are explicitly required as part of the governance of urban city space.

This entails the qualification of the spontaneous vision of the cross-cultural space of encounters propounded by the “ethics of encounter approach”. In this sense, emphasising cultural policies means keeping in mind the structured set of social actions and practices of public bodies and other social or cultural agents – whether public or private – within the scope of culture. Cultural diversity appears as an important element in this process of aggregating synergies

¹ For Spain, see for instance Giménez (2003); for Portugal, the numerous publications from the High Commissioner for Intercultural Dialogue’s Office, in particular its definition as “accepting the cultural and social specificity of different communities and stressing the interactive and relational character between them, supported in mutual respect and in the compliance with the laws of the host country” (, Plano para a Integração dos Imigrantes (PII) [Plan for the Integration of Immigrants] – Council of Ministers Resolution n.º 63-A/2007, DR 85 SÉRIE I de 2007-05-03, p.6).

between the public and private sectors insofar as something like the governance of cultural diversity is playing an increasingly important role in socio-political orientations of local public agents. In this context, the accommodation of cultural diversity in a multi-scale space, encompassing not just a national element but also being part of a network involving local, regional and global elements, is gradually incorporated by means of strategies and policies that interpret this diversity. It does so not just through codes referring to the norms of the nation-state, but also according to the codes emerging from the intersection of these new spaces of local governance.

The data discussed in this article resulted from fieldwork carried out within the project *Convivial Cultures and Super-Diversity* from 2010 to 2011². Empirically, it was based on qualitative methodologies, namely a slightly modified version of what is generally understood to be a multi-situated ethnography, what can loosely be called a multi-situated ethnographic sociology (Nadai and Maeder 2009), encompassing ethnographic observation with interviews and discursive analysis. This approach continues to emphasise a gaze that is 'close up and from within' which observes and, as can be expected, understands the socio-cultural regularity produced by a web of meanings shared by the users of the space in question (Geertz 1973). Intercultural festivals emerge as the locus of the study but are not the object of the study. Consequently, our research topic consisted in comparing the main intercultural festivals in Lisbon and Granada as planned intercultural practices in different urban spaces to try to understand local variations of actors' repertoires and strategies and its link with the specific territories.

The project paid particular attention to planning meetings in strategic locales to observe actors and repertoires as well as conducting semi-directive interviews with a range of people

responsible both for organizing the events and for local policies. Accordingly, key-actors such as cultural entrepreneurs, grassroots organizations representatives, migrant associations' leaders, and public authorities were interviewed during this period; simultaneously, as support material, we used field notes and obtained visual material during our observation/participation while the events were being held. Specific interview guides and observation grids were utilized in both contexts to assure comparability. The analysis focused on the 'Festival of Interculturality' (*Fiesta de la interculturalidad*) held in the Realejo quarter in Granada and in the Festival Todos – *Walk of Cultures*, held in the Mouraria, in the historical centre of Lisbon. These two events and contexts have noteworthy similarities and specific features which directly impact the definitions and social organization of interculturality and its expressions.

Differences and similarities between the events: Space and organizational features

Centrality is a shared feature of both festivals, although they are nomadic in their intent; that is, they have been held in different parts of the city centre. In the year of observation of the *Fiesta de la Interculturalidad* (2011) this was celebrated in the very central quarter of Realejo in Granada. In Lisbon, that same year, the Festival Todos was held in Mouraria, a location within the historic centre. Common features should also be noted regarding the broader urban structure and its dynamics. The centre of Granada consists of a historical nucleus encompassing the quarters of Albaicín, Sacromonte and Realejo. Different from other urban nuclei that accumulate central functions, these are essentially residential quarters (Susino 2002). However, it is one of the most gentrified areas of the city (Calvache 2010), alluring for a new population because of its combination of centrality and alternative life styles. Similarly, Mouraria is part of the historical Lisbon, adjacent to the old medieval wall which has recently been in high demand by gentrifiers and tourists alike (Oliveira 2013). While the age structure of

² The project entitled "Convivial Cultures and Super-Diversity", coordinated by Beatriz Padilla, PTDC/CS-SOC/101693/2008

Mouraria is considerably biased, with 53% of the population aged over 65, research indicates that in the case of Realejo, the elderly have moved out and are gradually being replaced by younger gentrifiers (Calvache 2010: 210).

Symbolically, both territories share a history of intercultural continuity, or as of lately are codified as such. The Realejo was the erstwhile Jewish quarter in Granada, therefore symbolising a space of intersection between cultures – the Arab, Jewish and Catholic backgrounds mingled together within city life. Mouraria is inextricably intertwined with the narratives of the Portuguese empire. Linked to the symbolism of the Christian re-conquest of Lisbon and to the Moorish presence within city walls – significantly signalled by a plaque in Martim Moniz Square commemorating the year of the Reconquista – the narrative of its origins bestowed historical and mythical multiethnic contours to its image (Menezes 2012). It is also the locale traditionally associated to the cradle of Fado, the melancholic song invoking Arabic soundscapes. Thus, the two neighbourhoods share a symbolic central location in urban semiotics as part of a cultural frame buttressed on an original signifier of encounters, hybridism and mixing.

Finally, both neighbourhoods show significant shares of residing foreign population. Although the Realejo is not the neighbourhood with the highest concentration of foreign population (in fact, Zaidin is the one with the greatest share). It is home to 7% of the total according to 2011 data³, making it the second area with higher foreign concentration in Granada. The main backgrounds are from America and Europe, the latter composing middle and upper-middle class foreigners actively seeking to stay in the historic centre, especially in Realejo and Albaicín. These foreigners are often Erasmus students. The three parishes of Mouraria concentrate the

bulk of Lisbon's foreign population. According to the 2011 census, there are nearly 60 different nationalities residing in the three main parishes of Mouraria⁴. While people of Asian background remained overrepresented, reaching 56% of the foreign population, the gradual increase on European origins has attained 12%. The increase in the percentage of Europeans signals Mouraria's new role within the recent symbolic and economic dynamic of Lisbon inner city (Oliveira and Padilla 2012).

Conversely, the timing of discernible trends to make urban historic centres attractive for tourism and to gentrification are disparate. In Granada's case, such developments can be traced back to the end of the 1980s, while in Mouraria these urban modifications result from an urban and social rehabilitation plan dating from the first decade of the 21st century (Calvache 2010, Susino 2002, Menezes 2004).

As for the events' organisational features, specific characteristics can also be observed that distinguish their social intents. The *Fiesta de la interculturalidad* is entirely organised by associations of immigrants or associations defending their rights, more specifically by the Forum for the Defence of the Rights of Immigrants (*Foro por la Defensa de los Derechos de los Inmigrantes*), which, as the name indicates, is a collective of associations that came together around the *Fiesta* to draw attention to the problems immigrants face in Granada⁵. The *Fiesta de la interculturalidad* (2011) depends on voluntary efforts and modest resources, although efforts are being made to gain visibility in the public space by exhibiting cultural national traditions through street performances, dances and gastronomy, as well as seeking to engage spectators and passers-

⁴ The parishes are Socorro, São Cristovão e São Gonçalo.

⁵ The *Foro por la Defensa de los Derechos de los Inmigrantes* consists of a platform that brings together associations, NGOs and public and private entities with the intent of working together to promote the rights of immigrants on a local scale. The *Foro* has been in existence since 1993.

³ Data from the Empadronamento Municipal, Granada, available at <https://mail.granada.org/idegeogr.nsf/wwwtod/B80AFDFC3CF48C95C12578930031424D>.

by in a multitude of initiatives. It seeks to contrast with the *Fiesta de la Toma*⁶, in which the fall of Muslim Granada and the “Andaluz Reconquista” is celebrated through a nationalist and conservative narrative, with various nationalist groups flocking into town for the event, amidst ultra-right wing falangists (supporters of Franco) holding placards saying “Spain will never be Muslim” (Kottman 2011).

In the case of the *Todos* Festival, investment is higher and more diverse, with the event being backed and funded by the Socialist Party government in Lisbon Municipality. This initiative is part of the project to rehabilitate the Mouraria within the scope of the QREN programme. The rehabilitation project encompassed a material aspect, such as the restoration of buildings and infrastructure, and a social aspect, that of integrating its inhabitants and reviving life in the neighbourhood, recognizing the diverse cultural and social groups present in the area.

The 2011 *Todos* festival, the third (the last one in Mouraria) of a series of rotational festivals (to be held in different Lisbon quarters with a view to cultural marketing, improving images and promoting socioeconomic development and social cohesion), encompassed a wide range of performances and events. The core idea was to encourage intermingling between professional artists and the neighbourhood’s residents in a kind of integrating communion achieved by articulating the fringes with the dominant society. In the

⁶ Every year the *Fiesta de la Toma* is celebrated on January 2nd, commemorating the surrender of the Nasrid Granada to the Catholic Kings which, according to national historiography, marks the end of the Islamic rule in the Iberian Peninsula. It has been subject to polemics, namely and most recently, being classified as “fascist, anachronic and racist” by a collective of associations called Granada Abierta which alternatively suggests an intercultural celebration on another date (Open Granada) [<http://www.ideal.es/granada/201412/30/granada-abierta-pide-toma-20141230193913.html>]. However, it has been upheld by the Ayuntamiento (the municipality) which organizes a gathering in the Town Hall square in conjunction with the celebrations in the Cathedral on that same day.

words of one of the festival’s producers and artistic entrepreneur:

[This] publicises a series of nightlife establishments, from the margin, the fringe, but which are fashionable nowadays [...] it is through these dynamics of joy and integration [...] even for one night, they feel integrated [...] and I believe that the contact with others, having different ways of life and have the openness to carry out this encounter [...] it can positively impact those communities experiencing hardships there.

In both events, there is a shared discourse concerning the positive benefits of interculturality; i.e., the co-presence of diverse cultural traditions and expressions. The key word is coexistence and this is expected to happen in multicultural settings. However, as we shall see, the strategies conducing to such outcomes are fundamentally different. It is here that the *ethics of encounters* come into play, not just in terms of their spontaneous everyday displays, but also their practice of instrumentalised production and reproduction. In effect, the mechanisms to implement the ‘positive nature’ of the mixing as well as the social repertoires mobilised by the agents are different, in particular in the articulation between enhancing urban spaces and creating symbolic and material assets and the rhetoric and practice of hybridity. In the following paragraphs I shall try to characterise two social grammars expressed by the repertoires mobilised by actors in the sense of evaluating situations and formulating their strategies which frame differentiated understandings of the space of interculturality. I will start by addressing the Grenadian case.

Politics and collective action

Granada’s *Fiesta de la interculturalidad* aims to involve immigrants themselves as participants. This initiative demonstrates its political bent and collective thrust, far removed from official agendas and the gaze of the media. In effect, the organisational structure maintains diverse aspects. An example of this is the way in which the festival is publicised: by word of mouth and the distribution of pamphlets in the street by

members of the immigrant associations, often working voluntarily. Support and subsidies by the local authorities have vanished ever since the PP (*Partido Popular* or People's Party) came to power at the parish council level. This reveals a clash between two opposing political wills: the occupation of the public space by immigrant's claims and protests against a deliberate quenching of this presence pursued by the local authorities.

(...) Every year we have faced the problem of finding a place to hold the event. (...) We have been refused the use of the square outside the Palace of the Congress and we are still waiting for them to give us alternatives...if they give us any at all. However, this isn't the first year we have faced such a situation. We have been prohibited from holding the event anywhere for several years... [leader of an association in Granada]

Clearly, local authorities are pushing forward an attempt of depolitization, which is nevertheless counterbalanced by the marked political overtones of the *Fiesta*. The Granada festival is organised by a set of associations of and for immigrants, which ensures the festival has marked political overtones in terms of claiming rights. The festival and the fact that diverse associations made a joint effort to organise it resulted in the institutionalisation of a political entity henceforth known as the Forum (*Foro*). This consists of human rights associations, immigrant associations and other organisations from the Spanish Catholic Church milieu. From the outset the struggle for immigrants' voting rights played a key role in the contention repertoires of this platform. This markedly political connotation of claims making was driven by the need to disseminate a positive image of immigration; in the words of its proponents, "an image that breaks the cycle of illegality-criminality-immigration". Among other things, the event's organisers frequently cite topics such as the rights of immigrants, reformulating the public image of immigrants through positive aspects, rejecting a subaltern status.

Such political posture, more related with the logic of claims by social movements, is associated

with a distancing from public powers, above all, with the governments of the *Partido Popular* (PP). As one of the event's organisers explained, while in the past the PSOE (*Partido Socialista Obrero Espanol* or the Spanish Socialist Workers Party) did provide some (albeit limited) support, when the PP came to power this support was stopped entirely. Now, organisational responsibilities and obtaining necessary materials are solely dependent on the organisers' own resources.

We have been trying for a long time to integrate this population that is living in each of these places so that they bring more things to the festival...there are possibilities and that is why we do it, of course any individual can of their own initiative invite their contacts... shops, local residents, platforms... Currently it's being done like I told you, due to the goodwill of all the associations and people who participate in publicising the event [organiser of the event and leader of an association in Granada].

However, the disappearance of state support does not mean that the theme of interculturality has completely vanished from the PP's political agenda. In effect, among other initiatives, the Granada town hall promotes an *Intercultural Community Intervention Project*⁷ which largely emulates the guidelines of the Community Cohesion programmes that have been in vogue in the United Kingdom throughout the last decade⁸. Consequently, with an emphasis on community solidarity, like the Community Meetings promoted by this programme in 2013, the language of *community cohesion* is incorporated in the governance of diversity. Unlike its British counterpart, however, no attention is paid to problems such as segregation, discrimination, isolation, etc. In other words, no structural condition

⁷ <http://www.granada.org/inet/bsocial12.nsf/223466fbb745b87dc125740a002a8647/58b8f20e26d2b9abc1257abe0044cc09!OpenDocument> [accessed on 16-07-2013]

⁸ For a critical vision see McGhee, D. (2003) "Moving to 'our' common ground – A critical examination of community cohesion discourse in twenty-first century Britain" in *Sociological Review*, vol. 51 issue 3, pages 383-411. For an apologetic view of this discourse and methodology see Cantle, Ted (2005) *Community Cohesion. A New Framework for Race and Diversity*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

is reflected and incorporated into these concerns for community cohesion.

On the contrary, the association's activities demonstrate genuine political concerns, not just with regard to the policies for immigration and integration but also in the more practical and strategic sense of the term; the festival establishes alliances with political parties as it receives support and visibility, especially from the IU (*Izquierda Unida*)⁹. It is also important to note that the organisation of the event (but not just this event) reveals a hierarchy of relationships between national associations for human rights and the rights and associations of immigrants, properly speaking. In effect, it seems that the former controls most of the processes by means of political networks of influence. However, this does not mean that the associations of immigrants are redundant; i.e., associations that represent specific communities of immigrants, which play a role in showcasing their cultures – the difference that is to be protected and understood – as well as in defending the rights of their members and countrymen. In Granada, however, the umbrella organisations are native associations and this is perceptible in the relationships of prestige and power established between these native associations and the other immigrant organisations that are part of the Forum¹⁰.

The intervention of these organisations, most of which defend human rights and the integration of immigrants, occurs within the collective action frame of what Koopmans has identified as being political altruism (Koopmans et al. 2005, Giugni and Passy 2001). Two aspects characterise the repertoire of actions: on the one hand, their demands are placed in the public sphere in the sense of defending the rights of social and iden-

tity categories other than their own; on the other hand, these same repertoires suggest a universalism focused on particular categories, such as refugees, immigrant women, etc.

We always seek to go beyond in terms of human rights, because we believe that this shouldn't just be limited to a festival (...) we think that the element of denouncement, the element of claiming rights should be more present in the festival (...) our association is one that denounces wrongs, we raise political and social awareness in the area of human rights, this festival includes some elements that are compatible, [leader of an association in Granada]

Moreover, the forum for the rights of immigrants and its umbrella of national organisations foregrounds a social and political preoccupation, not just with the rights of immigrants and refugees, but more specifically with the expression of their identities. Once again it is possible to integrate this pattern into what Koopmans has assessed as political altruism oriented towards identity, as opposed to an orientation towards interests. The former corresponds to collective actions structured around solidarity and group identifications that make definitions of citizenship and nationality by the host society more complex. Reflecting the systematic allusions to interculturality as a form of accommodating the most diverse cultural expressions in the national sphere and the insistence on reciprocal knowledge and consequent acceptance, the slogan of the festival in the year of the fieldwork was, "We build citizenship by bringing people together", encompassing the activities of these groups in this type of political altruism.

"(...) we believe that only intercultural solidarity provides a possibility of finding a way out of the current situation. Curtailing the rights we already have cannot be allowed and we believe that it is essential to establish ties and networks among people irrespective of their origin"¹¹.

⁹ The United Left is a Spanish political coalition set up in 1986 which brings together several left wing parties, where the Spanish Communist Party leads at the national level.

¹⁰ The organisations that comprise what can be called the apex of the Forum are *Granada Acoge*, the organisation that coordinates the forum, *ADPHA* (*Asociación pro derechos humanos*) and *Acción en red*, none of which are associations of immigrants.

¹¹ With reference to the XVII *Fiesta de la interculturalidad* held in May 2012, statement made at a press conference and cited from <http://www.parainmigrantes.info/xvii-fiesta-por-la-interculturalidad-y-la-convivencia-en-granada-697/> [accessed on 29-08-2013].

This emphasis on the theme of rights and the universalisation of citizenship is accompanied by a generic demand to incorporate diverse identities in the wider national narrative; incorporation of their histories, traditions and memories that go beyond the local level and that are intended to be part of a composite national narrative that can henceforth build into the representations of the nation and their belonging. The universal dimension of the struggle for citizenship rights is consequently based on a policy of cultural recognition reflected in the building of self-esteem at an individual level and incorporating difference at an institutional level, foregrounding asymmetries and injustices of which migrants constitute particular targets. In short, it develops a politicisation of cultural difference.

Territorial competitiveness and the aesthetics of everyday sociability.

In the case of the festival held in the Mouraria, the situation is rather different. Not only does the Municipality support and manage the initiative, it also mobilises it as a symbolic element typifying its actions. In other words, *Todos* Festival is a vital part of the project to renovate the city centre as an aspect of the wider urban process of “returning to the centre” (Rojas 2004). Making this territory attractive and appealing to new dwellers and visitors is a strategy explicitly held by many of the actors involved in its renewal, both regarding its material and social aspects. The processes of what has recently been designated as “culturalization of urban planning” play a major role in the renovation, rehabilitation and transformation of the inner city. Culture is no longer synonymous with “urban culture(s)”; it gains autonomy as part of an urban development strategy. This culturalization falls into the growth dynamics of the symbolic economy and the role it has played in the promotion and competitiveness of urban areas (Zukin 1995, Florida 2005). Its association with art, the aesthetisation of spaces and urban interventions has been interpreted both as standardization of urban cultures diversity (Zukin 2010) and as part of a competitive process of

“city branding”, entailing the search for a market niche in which a city can stand out in a range of cities competing in a globalized economy (Dinnie 2011). As Michael Keith argues, multicultural mediates such articulation in which social and economic urban form is the cultural quarter (2005: 116). In Lisbon, the articulation between interculturality and territorial competitiveness is made apparent both in its wider strategy as well as in the particular case of Mouraria and its festival. On the one hand, references to the significance of interculturality as a specific trait of Lisbon abound in the strategic “Vision” of the city¹². On the other hand, zooming in the *Festival Todos*, actors’ strategies to produce images and give visibility to cultural diversity are consistent with this branding strategy. The idea of a cosmopolitan capital, where diversity inheres, making the most of the comparative advantages it offers, is clearly delineated therein. This trend reveals that the urban strategy of the Lisbon municipal authorities is increasingly considering the trio of artistic-cultural activities, interculturality and the symbolic economy (Oliveira and Padilla 2012). It is, in a sense, a modality of the governance of cultural diversity in the city. Producing interculturality as part of governance entails a certain type of visibility. In this context, how to legitimize the rendition of some symbols in the public space is part of contemporaneous urban governance, especially whenever given territories are adjusted to the discursive and imagistic mobilization of cultural diversity. The Festival *Todos* epitomizes such logic. Part of a combination of numerous initiatives arising from the urban renewal of the city centre, it was explicitly commissioned by the Lisbon municipality “to assert the visibility of interculturality in the city” (interview with the founder of the Festival). Among these initiatives,

¹² There is a very pronounced emphasis on cultural diversity in three axes, viz. economic (Lisbon, city of entrepreneurs), cultural (Lisbon, city of culture) and community (Lisbon, city of neighborhoods). *Visão Estratégica, Lisboa 2002-2012. Eixos de desenvolvimento urbano*, Lisbon: CML, 2007, p.75 [cited from <http://ulisses.cm-lisboa.pt/data/002/009>; accessed on 21-03-2012].

those traditionally clustering within the cultural quarter suggest its planned emergence. Without being exhaustive, the renewal plan entailed, directly or indirectly, a Centre for Innovation at the heart of Mouraria that would lodge creative industry workshops, an Lx Factory (according to the model of the factory in Manchester) in one of the contiguous hills, an university residence, studios/lofts for 140 artists, a creative market in the adjacencies and a “fusion” market already set up by a cultural events entrepreneur. Additionally, the myriad of commerce and night-time economies that foregrounded Mouraria as the “Hipster Lisbon”, as one fashionable magazine put it, are the visible expression of the tenants of a cultural quarter in the making. What is, then, the role of the Festival, and how has interculturality been defined and functionally recreated according to consumption patterns?

Taking the descriptions of the cultural entrepreneurs engaged in designing and staging the Festival, the resulting narrative is structured by the twin topics of creating synergies through artistic performances and recognition through interaction between cultures. Building trust and understanding by knowing the other is the key objective. In the invitation to participate in the Festival, people were summoned “to visit, know and interact with the inhabitants in this area of the city” fighting the fear of the unknown “by knowing each other”. This experiential dimension, the construction of empathy, is apparent in the declarations of one public responsible.

(...) we have started to create the local conditions so that interculturality can work (...) No idea how many people living in Lisbon – starting by myself – have visit that space before. Why? It is the other, the stranger, the fear – lets try!

The Festival is thus rendered as the guarantee of Lisbon’s practical recognition of interculturality. In the words of the Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage Department of the Council of Europe, Robert Palmer, on the accession of Lisbon to the network of intercultural cities that coincided with the 2001 edition of the Fes-

tival, the city was “an example for the rest of Europe concerning the healthy coexistence of immigrants”¹³.

Henceforth, a number of initiatives highlighting the intercultural potential of Mouraria were carried out. From the onset, the Festival announced as its main aim to promote the “historical and cultural universes of Mouraria and to show the diverse cultural manifestations of the people of the world, by showing the various artistic fields, cultural and gastronomic, through the commitment of the community in the programming and functioning of the festival”¹⁴. The organisation of the event entailed hiring artists and exhibitions, as well as smaller parallel performances involving the residents. Among such noteworthy examples were the photography exhibition held in the Municipal archives and the display of posters in the public space rendering Mouraria’s inhabitants in cultural and ethnic mixed situations. Thus, interculturality is constructed while an integral element to the city imaginary and narrative, and it is with such goal in mind that the various actors are engaged in reformulating the image of Mouraria – previously seen as a marginal space within that imaginary – into an appealing space both for tourists and gentrifiers alike. In this frame, interculturality becomes instrumental for urban renewal and the construction of the cultural quarter. While attempting to assure social cohesion within the quarter by improving material living conditions, planning seeks to articulate the cultural and historical heritage with diversity as a representation for the tourist gaze.¹⁵

¹³ http://www.rtp.pt/noticias/cultura/festival-todos-caminhada-de-culturas-muda-se-em-2012-para-o-poco-dos-negros_n477118

¹⁴ CML (Lisbon Municipality) site *Há Mundos na Mouraria*, <http://www.aimouraria.cm-lisboa.pt/valorizacao-socio-cultural-e-turistica/festival.html>.

¹⁵ In the CML (Lisbon Municipality) website, the page dedicated to the QREN Action Programme, Mouraria, reads that “the appreciation of the historical and architectural heritage of the buildings and the pub-

Here, interculturality is a factor for attraction bereft of political content. In essence, there are similarities between the repertoires of the collective actors in Lisbon and Granada, such as the aforementioned positive benefits of a coexistence of cultures as the leitmotif (manifest) for carrying out such initiatives, although in Lisbon this appears without the politico-national component that seems to characterise the repertoires of associations in Granada. In effect, in the context of the *Todos* festival, part of the plan to rehabilitate the Mouraria quarter, questions of identity (when they surface) are above all limited to a local scale, a community element in which the quest for a *Gemeinschaft*, in which ties are structured by relationships of solidarity, is evident both in the initiatives as well as the discourses.

What we want is to create happiness and self-esteem among this population. In order to create self-esteem among this population it is necessary to develop the neighbourhood in urban terms and on the other hand implement a Community Development Plan, a plan involving people, prepared above all in collaboration with the people and which is not a “prêt-à-porter” for the people. The people are the ones who must be the local actors. [Association leader in Mouraria].

The universalist dimension of the expansion of rights, with the corresponding implications on citizenship conceptions and claims, is not marked in the agents discourses involved in planning and conceiving the event in Mouraria. The repertoire is organised around questions that are important for revitalising the neighbourhood and protecting Mouraria’s historical and architectural heritage. Some examples include initiatives such as the *intercultural walk*, with its traditional component of revisiting the history of *fado* music or Moorish style architecture intertwine with the multicultural of the neighbourhood.

lic space in the Mouraria quarter (...) as well as its manifested intercultural characteristics in downtown Mouraria, will allow the insertion of the quarter in the tourist routes of the city.” With a view to that objective, the Tourism Association of Lisbon (ATL) was contacted that, as a partner of this application, is available to include Mouraria in its Cultural Routes, posted on the website: <http://www.visitlisboa.com/>.

It is in this sense that the intercultural initiatives in the Mouraria are part of a kind of field homology in the marketed production of the urban territory that it encompasses. In the logic of territorial competitiveness, the creation of a particularity associated with an urban space creates an urban scene with its comparative advantages in relation to other urban scenes “made” according to the same principles. Thus, the universalist repertoire that characterises forms of action in the public sphere by the associations in Granada is adjusted and translated into a language of consumption and marketability. This does not mean that the same preoccupations with the ethics of encounters are not present, i.e. the same code of the accommodation of cultural difference as mutual knowledge and openness to the subjectivity of the other. This is a definition that does not need to be proved and is assumed by associative and administrative actors and cultural industries entrepreneurs in any scenario.

Modalities of the production of interculturality

It is thus possible to consider various types of logics for the production of interculturality, which are not limited to daily practices, as suggested by the “ethics of encounters”, but are instead mediated by power configurations, different cultural repertoires and social grammars which in turn translate into various forms of its expression in the public space.

It is also in this sense that it is possible to establish a distinction between the political repertoire of the *Fiesta* in Granada, without it being incorporated in planning or the revitalisation of the city centre with its more universalist languages, against the backdrop of a process of building a ‘glocal’ mechanism, in Lisbon. This mechanism combines global cultural trends with their ensuing local economic benefits – basically adjusting itself to the demands of the symbolic economy.

It would thus be of interest to consider another profile of intermediaries which Wise does not contemplate. Take the distinction suggested by Evans and Foord (2003) between culture as a cultural landscape, a connection to a

place and the intensified exchanges of those living there, and culture as an asset, in the forms of production-consumption promoted by cultural industries, cultural neighbourhoods and tourist bubbles. While Wise examines intermediaries of cultural landscapes, other intermediaries also exist, related with the second sense of culture underscored herein, constituted by professionals who “act as interfaces between cultural activities and the system for urban regeneration” (such as intervention departments, local authorities, real estate entrepreneurs).

Of such logics of the production of interculturality, I underscore a *politico-universalist*, an *economic-competitive* and an *ethical-symbolical*. Here, I make no attempt to examine how they mutually reinforce or demobilise each other. We can specify them as follows:

Politico-universalist: the frames of action that establish intrinsic links between identity claims and the grant of citizenship rights. The issue of the equality of rights is directly related to a normative categorical imperative language where the expansion of the space of political engagement is equated with the expression of new identities in the public sphere and therefore the opening-up of restricted national conceptions of belonging.

Economic-competitive: the discourse is patently organized around the core ideas of territorial competitiveness, urban branding and the incorporation of the local in global cultural and economic dynamics. The gist of this strategy is to combine the reinvention of a communitarian localism with the heterogeneity of transnational flows capitalizing on the economic gains arising from the commodification of ethnic traits, which do not limit themselves to ethnic markets and products, but are caught in mechanisms of aesthetization of a more global and postmodern bent, such as the importance of ethnicized images to tourist campaigns and city branding.

Ethical-symbolic: everyday practices are seen as potential transformative encounters. These are underpinned by a structure of a dialogical ethics of relations between different cultural

backgrounds. To a transcendental principle of human communion – such as an ‘ethic of care’ – given by the nurturing nature of personal interrelations is added a concern with collective boundaries intersections and its global social locations.

While these three dimensions are not mutually exclusive, some have more elective affinities than others. This is the case of the strategic proximity between the economic-competitive and ethical-symbolic logics. The harnessing of local autogenic forces and their subsequent use by markets, where symbolic reinforcement is attributed by expressions such as “tolerance” and “mutual understanding”, have practical effects in a commodified multicultural. Culture as an asset benefits from the interstitial connections between differentially cultured bodies without being undermined by the strangeness of alterity. This relationship not only institutes new identities-identifications but also new patterns of consumption. These new patterns of consumption, pragmatically related to identity (insofar as they incorporate an identity and differentiate it) particularly adjust to the consumable aspects of the ‘ethnic’.

On the other hand, if the politico-universalist dimension is easily given form by ethics and a symbolisation of the encounter, the distance between the former and the economic dimension becomes greater. In effect, if the logics of production-consumption of the cultural industries are adjusted to the *ethics of encounters*, there is an almost unsurpassable irreducibility with regard to the rhetoric of political claims. This is not so much because it appeals to a universal language based on rights, but rather because it uses a code that is fundamentally oppositional. In this sense, it is a language of antagonisms that establishes the radical difference between the social horizontalisation, resulting from a reduction of social relations to cultural sharing, and a rhetoric that contemplates socially differentiated positions and their reflections in an unequal structure for the distribution of social, economic and symbolic resources, as the following testimony indicates:

The daily grind, the system, sometimes their work situation does not allow it, sometimes ... specifically this weekend they will not leave the house where they work; (...) it's a pity that people who were already dancing and already practising the dance that we will present... will not be able to participate because they can't have this weekend off. It's a shame. Their labour situation is now further compounded by the crisis: "Either you work or I will hire someone else", it's that clear and sometimes weeks and months pass by without them going out. Where are our rights to be able to socialise a bit? [Head of a Columbian association in Granada].

Only when viewed from a merely symbolic-ethical perspective does it become saturated with this dimension of human, spontaneous sharing, subordinate to emotional aspects, such as "care" as an expression of an ethical relationship negotiated in encounters where cultural boundaries intersect. Moreover, space becomes crucial not only because its associate meaning affects social processes, but more significantly, as Berland (2009: 133) says, the process of producing publics is inseparable from the process of producing spaces where they live or frequent.

Consequently, the processes of cultural production oscillate between "advantageous" options according to the greater or lesser degree at which they are aimed at specific audiences. Thus, the visibility of "cultural encounters" in public spaces can result from a combination of cultural policies and the requalification of territories, a combination that is organised by a certain ideology for urban areas in which planning and urban marketing (a specific city *branding*) come together (Oliveira and Padilla 2012). Space mediates the regimes of visibility differently. Whenever a specific territory fits appropriately with the logic of culture as asset, interculturality can become commodified and integrate global flows of images in the form of an ethnoscape. Thus, the way interculturality features in the social imaginary is mediated by the "visual ordering of the spatial", to paraphrase Keith (2005: 125) However, as has been seen, this is not the only way of producing interculturality: such processes of cultural production and social organisation

can be supported by strategies of a more political nature. The latter will become even more prominent when their claims contradict mere 'culturalisation' dominated by aesthetic strategies for the occupation of public spaces.

References

- AMIN, A. 2002. "Ethnicity and the Multicultural City". *Environment and Planning, A*, 34(6): 959-80.
- BERLAND, J. 2009. *North of Empire. Essays on the cultural technologies of space*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- ÇAGLAR, A. and N. GLICK SCHILLER. 2011. "Introduction: migrants and cities". In: A. Çaglar, N. Glick Schiller, eds., *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*, 1-22. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- CALVACHE, R. Duque. 2010. *Procesos de gentrificación de cascos antiguos en España: el Albaicín de Granada*. Granada: Editorial de la Universidad de Granada.
- CANTLE, T. 2005. *Community Cohesion. A new framework for race and diversity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- — —. (2012) *Interculturalism. The New Era of Cohesion and Diversity*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- CONRADSON, D. and A. LATHAM. 2005. "Transnational urbanism: attending to everyday practices and mobilities". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(2): 227-233.
- DINNIE, K. 2011. *City branding. Theory and Cases*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- EVANS, G. and JO FOORD. 2003. "Shaping the cultural landscape: local regeneration effects". In: De Malcolm Miles and Tim Hall, eds., *Urban Future: Critical commentaries on shaping cities*, 167-181. London: Routledge.
- FLORIDA, R. 2005. *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1975. *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- — —. 1976. *Histoire de la Sexualité, vol. 1: La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- GEERTZ, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.

- GILROY, P. 2005. *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- GIMÉNEZ, R. C. 2003. "Pluralismo, Multiculturalismo e Interculturalidad. Propuesta de clarificación y apuntes educativos". *Educación y Futuro: Revista de Investigación Aplicada y Experiencias Educativas* nº8, Editorial CES Don Bosco-EDEBÉ, abril 2003, págs. 9-26.
- GIUGNI, M. and F. PASSY (eds.). 2001. *Political Altruism?* Boulder: CO: Rowan and Littlefield.
- KEITH, M. 2005. *After the cosmopolitan? Multicultural cities and the future of racism*. London and New York: Routledge
- KOOPMANS, R., P. STATHAM, M. GUIGNI and F. PASSEY. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- KOTTMAN, S. L. 2011. "Mocking and Mimicking the 'Moor': Staging of the self and other on Spain's borders with Morocco". *Journal of Mediterranean Studies, Vol. 20, Issue 1*: 107-136.
- LAMONT, M. 2000a. "The rhetoric of racism and anti-racism in France and the United States". In Michelle Lamont and Laurent Thévenot (eds.), *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology. Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 25-55.
- . 2000b. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Citizenship*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LENTIN, A. and G. TITLEY. 2008. "More Benetton than barricades? The politics of diversity in Europe". In: Gavin Titley and Alana Lentin, eds., *The politics of diversity in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe: 9-30.
- MASSEY, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,.
- MCGHEE, D. 2003. "Moving to 'our' common ground - a critical examination of community cohesion discourse in twenty-first century Britain". *Sociological Review, vol 51 issue 3*: 338-441.
- MEER, N. and T. MODOOD. 2012. "How does Interculturalism contrast with Multiculturalism?" *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 33 (2)*: 175-197.
- MENEZES, M. 2004. *Mouraria, Retalhos de um Imaginário: significados urbanos de um bairro de Lisboa*. Oeiras, Celta Editora.
- . 2012. "Debatendo mitos, representações e convicções acerca da invenção de um bairro lisboeta". *Revista Sociologia, número temático: Imigração, Diversidade e Convivência Cultural*: 69-95.
- NADAI, E. and C. MAEDER. 2009. "Contours of the field(s): Multi-sited ethnography as a theory-driven research strategy for sociology". In: Mark Falzon, ed., *Multi-sited Ethnography. Theory, practice and locality in contemporary research*, 233-50. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- NATHAN, M. 2011. "The economics of super-diversity: Findings from British cities, 2001-2006". *SERC Discussion Paper 68*.
- OLIVEIRA, N. 2013. "Lisboa redescobre-se. A governança da diversidade cultural na cidade pós-colonial". In: Elsa Peralta and Nuno Domingos, eds., *Cidades e Império. Dinâmicas coloniais e reconfigurações pós-coloniais*. Lisboa: Edições 70: 558-602.
- . 2014. "Interculturalidade ou interculturalismo? O terceiro 'ismo' das políticas de integração de imigrantes". In: *40 anos de democracia(s): progressos, contradições e prospetivas*. Atas do VIII Congresso Português de Sociologia, Associação Portuguesa de Sociologia (org.) Associação Portuguesa de Sociologia ISBN: 978-989-97981-2-0.
- OLIVEIRA, N. and B. PADILLA. 2012. "A diversidade como elemento de desenvolvimento/atração nas políticas locais urbanas: contrastes e semelhanças nos eventos de celebração intercultural". *Revista Sociologia, thematic number: Imigração, Diversidade e Convivência Cultural*: 129-62.
- ROJAS, E. 2004. *Volver al centro: la recuperación de áreas urbanas centrales*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- SASSEN, S. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- SMITH, M.P. and L.E. GUARNIZO, eds. 1998. *Transnationalism from Below*. Piscataway: New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- SUSINO, J. 2002. "La sociedad ubana en Andalucía". In: Moyano Estrada, E. and Péres Yruela, M., eds., *La sociedad Andaluza*, 361-391. Córdoba: Instituto de Estudios Sociales de Andalucía.
- VERTOVEC, S. 2007. "Super-diversity and its implications". *Ethnic and Racial Studies Vol.30, N°6, November*: 1024-1054.
- WESSENDORF, S. 2013 "Commonplace diversity and the 'ethos of mixing': perceptions of difference in a London neighbourhood". *Identities, 20(4)*: 407-422.

- WISE, A. 2009. "Everyday Multiculturalism: Transversal Crossings and Working Class Cosmopolitans". In: Amanda Wise and Selvaraj Velayutham, eds., *Everyday multiculturalism*, 21-45. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- YUVAL-DAVIS, N. 1997. *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage.
- . 2011. *The Politics of Belonging. Intersectional Contestations*. London: Sage.
- ZUKIN, S. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- . 2010. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Note on the Author

NUNO OLIVEIRA is post-doctoral researcher at the Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology (CIES) at ISCTE – Lisbon University Institute. Currently developing work on the meaning of governance of diversity, both in Europe and Latin America, with a special focus on the Portuguese intercultural model. Holds a Phd in Sociology from the Lisbon University Institute and among other things he worked for the Fundamental Rights Agency of the EU as a detached national expert and was the coordinator of the Portuguese National Focal Point of the European Racism and Xenophobia network (Raxen).

