ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Re-imagining a multicultural Europe: the experience of the R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:
Musarò, P., Cappi, V., Villani, L., Parmiggiani, P. (2025). Re-imagining a multicultural Europe: the experience of the R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet. Cheltenham : Edward Elgar Publishing [10.4337/9781035310036.00032].

Availability:
This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/1018395 since: 2025-06-25

Published:
DOI: http://doi.org/10.4337/9781035310036.00032

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

07 November 2026

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Musarò P., Cappi V., Villani L., and Parmiggiani P. (2025). *Re-imagining a multicultural Europe: the experience of the R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet*. In: Gunew S., Papastergiadis N., Rizvi F., and Muraca P. (ed. by), The Elgar Companion to the Arts and Global Multiculturalism, Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 326-340.

The final published version is available online at:
https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035310036.00032

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Re-imagining a multicultural Europe: The experience of the R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet[1]

Pierluigi Musarò, Valentina Cappi, Lorenza Villani, Paola Parmiggiani
(Department of Sociology and Business Law, University of Bologna)

Abstract:

This chapter examines the political and academic debate on multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism, going so far as to argue that a false dichotomy has been drawn between the two. By exploring the narratives through which migration processes - and the mixture of different cultures they promote - are framed in European mainstream media discourse, the authors highlight the ambiguous recognition of difference and respect for the 'other' emerging from a cosmopolitanism devoid of multicultural ethos. Taking the art installation 'R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet' - resulting from the collaboration between researchers, migrants, first-line practitioners and artists - as a case study, this chapters reflects on the role of art in challenging both the assimilationist logic and the processes of othering. Aesthetic practices show their potential as critical tools able to re-politicize the role of migration and diversity in the multicultural society while fostering the re-imagination of the political order that enables cosmopolitanism.

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism, Multiculturalism, Migration, Art, Solidarity, Symbolic bordering

The multiculturalism debate and its backlash

Migration has always been part of human life as it is an essential part of humanity's processes of adaptation to different social and physical environments. However, as a result of economic hardships, conflicts and globalization, the last decade has been globally marked by an obsession with immigration, even in the case of a reduction in migrants' arrivals to selected countries.
This obsession hinders the opportunity to consider the richness of cultural diversity and to portray it as a positive and fruitful phenomenon for the coexistence of human beings on the planet.
Migration has been high on the European Union's agenda, and a main cause of concern for European citizens alarmed by the levels of 'illegal' migration as well as by the humanitarian duty of safeguarding the rights of people who are attempting to cross the borders. The representation strategies and discursive practices enacted by a wide range of State and non-State actors have been presenting migrants, and particularly irregular migrants crossing borders, as an 'emergency' to be managed in terms of a wider social, cultural and political 'crisis'.
The public anxiety about migration and asylum-seeking in Europe is increasingly shaped by the political rhetoric that depicts Europe as an endangered continent besieged by people fleeing conflict or seeking economic opportunity to ensure a better life. Institutional and political actors have stoked public fears and security concerns, endorsing a range of emergency narratives, aggressive policing and militarized border control, which in turn has generated a fertile breeding ground for xenophobic, populist reactions. The same media discourse is often inclined to frame diversity in a stereotyped manner or, even worse, to endorse discrimination and offensive speech targeting minorities, thus contributing to a climate of public fear (Musarò, Papastergiadis, Peja 2022)
However, fear of migrants is not exclusive to modernity. While populist media commentators and politicians commonly confuse the identity of the migrant with an image of an external threat, and treat migration as the temporary disruption to the timeless feeling of national belonging, these images contradict historical reality. Historically, ninety-eight per cent of our time on Earth as anatomically

modern humans has been spent as nomads (Marquardt 2021)[2]. Far from being abnormal, the act of going in search of a better life is at the core of the human experience. Nevertheless, the mobility of selected people has been depicted as a deviation from residentialism, and migrants have been perceived as deviants that required careful inspection and surveillance.

In fact, the aspirations to mobility and the desire for freedom and a better life are not conceded to everyone: different regimes of mobility provide obstacles and criminalize them. Unveiling the residentialist perspective on culture, Papastergiadis (2012) observes that this negative view on migration 'is related to a deeper ambivalence towards mobility. Kinetophobia, the fear of mobility, takes many forms. It is most apparent in racist scapegoating, where the cause of social upheaval is projected onto the most vulnerable agents of movement' (p. 39).

The adoption of a residentialist conception of culture has led to a number of negative conclusions on hybridity and cultural transformation: we have taken identity rather than diversity, stasis rather than movement, the truth of our gaze on others - rather than theirs on us - as the norm. Accordingly, the migrant has been predominantly understood as a secondary political figure derived from the static bases of States (Nail 2020).

In the last thirty years the debate on multiculturalism has grown extensively and has tended to be polarized between those who are 'for' and those who are 'against' multiculturalism without critically considering both its negative and positive aspects. Multiculturalism is used widely and with several meanings: it refers to a normative ideal to aim for; it is a scientific way of analysing social reality and a common-sense description of contemporary societies; it refers to specific policies to regulate co-existence with ethnic diversity, and it also indicates a personal attitude/behaviour towards difference (Wieviorka 2001).

The debate on multiculturalism has developed due to significant historical events that occurred in the U.S. and Canada on one hand, and in Europe on the other. In the U.S., it is intertwined with post-slavery Afro-Americans' fight for civil rights, while in Canada with the recognition of French-speaking minority groups in Quebec and elsewhere. In Europe this debate has developed around the social, political and cultural consequences of migration flows.

It is exactly in parallel with the so-called migration crisis that, in the last decade, several European politicians and Prime Ministers, such as David Cameron, Angela Merkel or Nicolas Sarkozy, depicted multiculturalism in a negative light, and hark back to the days where the hegemonic status of privileged national subjects reigned. At the same time, many social scientists, including scholars of migration and cosmopolitanism, also attacked multiculturalism. Sometimes it is associated with methodological nationalism and argues the need to move beyond it, such us Beck arguing: 'Multiculturalism means plural monoculturalism. It refers to collective categories of difference and has a tendency to essentialize them… multiculturalism perceives cultural differences as – so to speak - "little nations" in one nation' (2011, p. 54). Other times, it is depicted in opposition to autonomy and justice, such as Delanty writing that: '[m]ulticulturalism often results in an increase in cultural differences as opposed to being a means to secure autonomy and justice' (Delanty 2011, p. 650).

The backlash against multiculturalism has been mainly twofold. First, multiculturalism came to be used as a convenient label when talking about the social exclusion, isolation and poverty of those living in subaltern neighbourhoods of Europe. Secondly, the negative attributions levied against communitarianism by liberal theorists came to be heavily directed against multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism became a 'bad word', partnered with particularism and separation. It was gradually associated with an image of Europe where ethno-religious communities live in cultural silos, leading parallel lives to that of the 'white mainstream' and refusing to mix with that mainstream. In other words, multiculturalism, which aimed to think through ways in which diverse societies can live together, accommodate diversity, tackle racism and exclusion and aid justice, came to be blamed for a host of evils, including the poverty, social exclusion and isolation which postcolonial 'immigrants' faced.

Interesting to note that precisely at the same time European policy-makers, politicians and social scientists abandoned multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism gained renewed attention in academia. The

rise and prevalence of cosmopolitanism in social science coincided with the increasing backlash against multiculturalism in wider political debates and European public policy and discourse.
Many scholars appealed to cosmopolitanism's Enlightenment and thus European origins, taking Kant's theories on cosmopolitanism as a basis. Yet, cosmopolitanism has appeared as an idea since ancient times. It has been expressed in forms that appeal to moral obligation, political responsibility, spiritual connectedness or aesthetic attitude. Also today we experience different competing visions of cosmopolitanism: as a cultural project of fusions of tastes and lifestyles, aspiring to establish a moral imagination of multicultural conviviality (Beck 2006); as a political project driven by global institutions of international law and human rights, aspiring to work towards a peaceful and fair international order (Held 2010); as a methodological project that goes beyond nation-bound knowledge production, encouraging scientific interpretations of the world as communities of fate linked by shared risk (Beck & Szneider 2006); and as aesthetic cosmopolitanism, that refers to a cosmopolitan worldview that is produced through aesthetics (Papastergiadis 2012).
Nowadays more than ever, globalization and the compression of space and time have heralded cosmopolitan perspectives. Appadurai (1990) noted the disjunction between subjectivity and territory as a result of globalization, whilst Beck (2006) emphasized that the global other is now in our midst. Cosmopolitanism, in Beck's reflections, allows the seeing of oneself – not only of others - in new ways, connecting individuals and groups in novel ways. Nevertheless, as Papastergiadis (2012) argues: 'Cosmopolitanism usually refers to the social transformation that arises from the mixture of different cultures. In the context of the political impact of migration, these signs of mixture are often interpreted through a kinetophobic prism' (p. 135).

Which narratives for cosmopolitanism as solidarity?

What Papastergiadis defines as the kinetophobic prism is evident in the clash between cosmopolitanism as solidarity towards the distant vulnerable others, which is typical of the humanitarian field (Fassin 2011), and the discourses traditionally associated with the operations of humanitarian aid in the context of border control.
On the one hand, as Chouliaraki (2017) argues, 'the most meaningful vision of cosmopolitanism relies on communicative acts that recognize the humanity of vulnerable others and engage with their vulnerability without demanding reciprocation' (p. 53). From here it follows that the stories of suffering become primers for the exercise of our 'citizenship of the world', for the sentimental cultivation of 'our moral community', and for the training of our sympathetic, moral imaginations (Rorty 1989, p. 75).
On the other hand, when the distant vulnerable others try to cross the border and get closer, automatically they become unwanted, uninvited, potential criminals, or illegal migrants thereby unveiling a remarkable paradox: humanitarianism is inscribed in systematic patterns of global inequality and in their hierarchies of place and human life. These hierarchies divide the world into zones of Western comfort and safety and zones of non-Western need and vulnerability showing that the politics of compassion is a politics of inequality (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013).
Indeed, humanitarianism can be intended as a historically specific articulation of cosmopolitan solidarity, 'which acts directly on the global South through specialized institutions, yet seeks legitimacy in the West through a communicative structure that disseminates moral discourses of care and responsibility' (Chouliaraki 2013, p. 27). Nevertheless, if we explore the multifaceted interaction between social inequality and humanitarianism in a globalized world within the framework of symbolic bordering[3], it becomes evident that the juxtaposition of humanitarian and securitarian narratives construct a moral geography of the world (Musarò & Parmiggiani 2022; Cappi & Musarò 2022) suitable for governing the 'borderlands' (Duffield 2001) while unifying Europe (against the 'Other'). Within this narrative, the 'European' values and protects the 'African' victim by positioning him/herself simultaneously as a donor and a controlling agent.
Instrumental humanitarian narratives, mainstream media, politicians and border control agencies

recurrently frame unwanted immigrants either as threats to European societies and values, or as victims of their own countries and cultures, and occasionally of European strict border control policies and practices, referred to as 'Fortress Europe'.

Within the first scenario, narratives of threats and security risks have been used to justify measures, policies and laws that were once considered to be extreme, unjustified and inhumane. It can be called a 'crimmigration approach' that not only frames migrants as symbolic threats but also extends to legal and illegal attempts to push migrants outside of the territories. Across and beyond countries of the Global North, a generalized 'atmosphere of hostility' has led to shrinking forms of social protection and increasing precariousness for all those classified as outsiders, with the passing of legislation that denies them access to work, housing, services, and education. This tendency has been only exacerbated by the global rise of nationalist and populist political forces, which has turned the scapegoating of migrants – not only those with a foreign passport, but anyone racialized as 'others' – into a distinctive target of public discourse and action.

Within the second scenario, migrants are framed as victims[4]: they are de-ethicized and de-individualized, being depicted into an indistinct mass of people worthy of humanitarian attention (Boltanski 1999). Undocumented migrants are thus presented as objects (of charity, criminalisation, or control), which means that they are treated as having no social or personal history and life: 'non-persons' (Dal Lago 1999). In addition, 'illegal' migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees are represented as outside the common history that binds countries of origin, transit, and arrival, while they are confused within a single story of illegitimate(d) mobility. In fact, no explanation is given about the multiple factors that brought them to where they are, or the political, environmental, economic or social context from which they come, or the different ways in which they participate in arrival countries in roles other than that of migrant (Barretta & Cappi 2021). Not only does this representation of migration processes as emergencies prevent disclosure on the causes of the disparities between the 'spectator' and the 'victim', but it also increases the distance between 'us' and 'them' (Musarò & Parmiggiani 2014).

Throughout these discursive strategies, such representations influence longer-term attention to migration policies, inequality, and justice: Europeans appear as heroes, elevated by the efficiency of their aid to help the poor, needy and passive Africans[5]. As a consequence, European identity construction moves paradoxically in the axis of humanitarianism and control.

Considering the symbolic dimension of the border and highlighting its deeply political nature allows us to clarify that the challenge for cosmopolitanism is to move away from benign visions of global togetherness and consider, instead, social justice as its central pillar, as a new sociality characterized by global connectivities that engender justice-oriented alliances and solidarities[6].

This means on the one hand that we can't look at Europe's (past and) future without taking into account the colonial relationships we have had with those thanks to whom our society became multicultural, and thus that it is fundamental to include the agency of migrants in the power relations of the border, their narrative and voice in news stories and more generally in a cosmopolitan social imaginary. On the other hand, a new social imaginary cannot disregard the decolonization of the gaze through which Europeans have constructed their 'elsewhere' (Chambers 2001; Cappi 2023) by producing moral geographies of the world, nor can it ignore taking into account of the way 'other' gazes have looked at 'us': 'gazes that have come from afar, but also familiar gazes, gazes that cross with our own on our own ground, within our own society' (Remotti 2010, pp. 3-4).

Cosmopolitanism includes 'both a way of being in the world that entails a universalist aspiration for moral connectedness and an emergent social order that extends political rights beyond exclusivist territorial boundaries. However, in order to feel an individual sense of moral connectedness and organize these collective modes of solidarity, there must be a mixture of aesthetic and deliberative modes for comprehending and evaluating the cultural similarities and differences' (Papastergiadis 2012, p. 136).

Yet, how can we step out of the hegemony performed by the gaze of the Global North? How can we recognize that migration is a constitutive feature in our world that provides an optic for experiencing

existence of the world and understanding being in the world? How social research can offer a new perspective for viewing the dynamics of multicultural and social change?
An exercise in cosmopolitan democracy would be fostering symbolic and physical spaces of hospitality (Silverstone 2009) by multiplying the opportunities, tools, channels, and places for individuals and communities to express themselves and interact with each other's gaze. Which is what we tried to experiment through the project we are going to describe in the following section.

The role of art in reimagining a cosmopolitan Europe: The experience of the R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet

Arts are recognized as tools that can challenge dominant narratives and open up alternative spaces of imagination, representation and action (Mazzara 2019). They can promote inclusive and collaborative spaces of expression that have on the one hand the capacity to deconstruct dominant rhetoric that portrays migrants as passive victims or potential threats, and on the other hand allow for the amplification and synchronization of diverse voices in the public space and give substance to the instances they bring (Moralli et al. 2021). Therefore, artistic creations 'meet the concept of "politicality"' as 'they become spaces of conviviality and positive hybridity, in which people can interact and perform both commonality and diversity, while perceiving themselves as part of the same symbolic, cognitive and physical universe without repressing diversity' (Paltrinieri & Parmiggiani 2020, p. 10). The use of artistic and creative methods for audience engagement has shown to be an effective way to overcome barriers to participation and to thereby stimulate individuals and communities to work together towards a common response to building confidence and self-expression (Seiger et al. 2022).
Creative methods are also increasingly used within social research, at different stages of the research - or action-research - process. Research that uses creative methods, in fact, can be defined as 'a dialogue with participants that can include a wide range of realizations (audiovisual, material, performative, even integrated with each other) as a form of elicitation and/or collection of information, experiences, representations, and/or communication of results that adapts, integrates, and applies methods and techniques from the social sciences and fields outside research, particularly the arts, for the purpose of generating unexpected results, revealing associations not otherwise apparent, and enabling the representation of complexity' (Giorgi et al. 2021, p. 19).
In the context of Horizon2020 project 'Perceptions'[7], we experimented creative methods while communicating the project's results, in order to promote intercultural encounter and cross-cultural recognition between local communities and newcomers in Italy. This was done through the co-creation of an artistic installation emerging from the collaboration between artists, researchers, migrants, and practitioners working in migrants' reception and border control fields: the R.E.D. (Reframing the European Dream) Carpet[8].
'Perceptions' project aimed at exploring the narratives and perceptions of Europe abroad and understanding through which information channels they are circulated and how they act in orienting the decision-making of those who intend to migrate to Europe or have migrated there since 2015. To this aim, at the beginning of 2021, several research partners conducted fieldwork research in 13 different EU and extra-EU countries[9]. Semi-structured interviews with migrants[10] who have arrived in Europe since 2015 and first-line practitioners working in migrant reception and border control fields[11] allowed us to explore different kinds of knowledges, understandings, imaginaries, and experiences of Europe and its national countries. Only if considered in the same breath, these different perceptions may let us reconstruct - always partially and temporarily - what Europe is, and to understand what it means to cross real borders or to encounter symbolic borders for people who have unequal rights or resources to cross them. Taking into account other gazes, and especially external gazes on Europe, can also represent a 'reality check': 'The EU's external images then become important indicators of how good intentions have been translated into observable actions (Rhodes,

1999). They also serve as sources of knowledge about European identity and the effectiveness of European common foreign policy' (Chaban & Holland 2014, p. 1).
The development of creative outreach materials addressed to the project's stakeholders and civil society was part of the project's objectives from the outset, precisely for the purpose of creating community engagement, bringing situated knowledge about and of Europe and migration into dialogue, facilitating the expression of often marginalized individuals or groups, and producing cross-cultural understanding while fostering social interaction.
In order to enable a different representation of intercultural complexity, to counter stereotypes and avoid 'the danger of a single story'[12], we decided to resort to art-based methods, which aim to evoke meanings rather than impose them, to mobilize audiences' knowledge toward decoding rather than offering a preferential top-down reading. Realizing a partnership between the Department of Sociology and Business Law at the University of Bologna and artists Sara Pour and Pietro Floridia, together with Cantieri Meticci[13], a collective of artists from more than 20 countries around the world based in Bologna (Italy), we created an artifact, a 13-meter-long and 1.5-meter-wide plastic carpet, with layered content: illustrations, audio, and video that can be accessed through QR codes redirecting to a digital platform mirroring the physical version of the carpet[14].
As first, together with the artists, we reread interviews and selected literary excerpts that would later be performed in video clips by actors with migrant backgrounds from the Cantieri Meticci collective. Verbatim reporting of the excerpts from the interviews let the research participants' perceptions emerge directly, allowing us to construct a knowledge 'with' rather than a knowledge 'of' the participants. By decentering ourselves as researchers, we became participants in artistic research and co-creation. The interpretive work of the artists and actors of Cantieri Meticci also allowed us to find new meanings across the interviews, and to identify the carpet as an artifact able to open up new space within the public space, to create a common playground for local people and newcomers and to invite them to cross it as passengers. Choosing a carpet as the center piece of this installation elicits a gesture of welcome: the red carpet is reminiscent of success, as it is usually laid out for very important people. This choice was made to symbolize the imaginings of opportunities and success projected onto Europe from afar, by people intending to migrate. But when the carpet is approached and inspected, its illustrations reveal more complicated and unpleasant details.
The R.E.D. carpet gets its name not only from its signature red color, but more importantly from the operation in which it would like to engage its audiences, that is inviting the audiences to re-frame their imaginaries about multicultural Europe, grasp the polyphony of perceptions and narratives, and evaluate the discrepancy between the ideal vision that often characterizes migrants' expectations prior to departure and the reality experienced after arrival in Europe.
The Iranian artist Sara Pour increased the symbolic value of the red carpet by recovering the original meanings that derive from Persian ancestry, where the carpet was born as a symbol of the garden, in turn the embodiment of paradise on earth. The buds, the branches full of fruits and flowers transformed into eyes, to represent perceptions – but also digital surveillance -, contribute to the symbolic construction of a Europe that many, before leaving, imagined as paradise, where access to the 'fruits' (work, home, school, etc.) will be easily grasped. Heavenly imaginaries are soon deconstructed and re-framed by the encounter with a more disappointing, complicated and at times repellent reality. What emerges from 'Perceptions' interviews, in fact, is a predominantly positive view of Europe before migrants' departure, especially as a place of democracy, respect for human rights, and the possibility of leading a protected life that offers opportunities for growth. This ideal vision, in some cases idealized, is soon scaled down from the first contact and then also from the subsequent contacts with the concrete realities of individual countries, whose cost of living had been underestimated, as well as the possibilities, given also by the time and space remaining from work, to participate in political life.
Highlighting other visions, the carpet solicits the passer-by to play a game of deciphering and re-interpreting the central themes concerning Europe and the migration processes towards it. The R.E.D. Carpet, in fact, features 12 illustrated rosettes which are composed of metaphorical and polysemic

images that reflect some of the main themes emerging from the interviews realized in Italy within the 'Perceptions' project[15], namely: Europe through screens, the European dream, border crossings, integrations, relations with community of origin, security, human rights, bureaucracy, training, home, job, prospects.
All around, QR codes stimulate the viewer to explore migrants' perceptions of Europe, before and after their arrival, as well as the related perceptions of first-line practitioners operating in Italy.
The order of the illustrations along the carpet is not random: the spectator, as well as the migrant, accesses Europe through 'a magical object that transfigures reality', the smartphone, which in the illustration is transfigured into the Lampedusa gateway created by artist Mimmo Paladino. The journey continues amid expectations of the 'European dream', a 'dream of life flourishing again' after the dead season, the dry earth, the material necessities of living, to crash against the physical and bureaucratic walls of border crossing. Those who overcome this obstacle, carrying with them the hole of 'not being fully there, not being fully here', continue the journey, in a way that cannot be taken for granted, through the everyday world: study, work, home, up to future prospects.
However, the passenger can choose to start his or her journey across the carpet at any point, looking at the border from the other side (Khosravi 2019). The polysemy of the images also derives its meaning from the fact that 'everybody sees and hears from a different position' (Arendt 1958, p. 57). Laid out as a sign of welcome in public squares and streets in the cities of Bologna and Forlì (Italy)[16], the R.E.D. Carpet is meant to stimulate a 'game of mirrors' inviting viewers to a confrontation with an 'other' perspective on the self, one that invokes a repositioning and rescaling of one's own knowledge and point of view on the 'other' and the 'elsewhere'.
The 'game of mirrors' is also given by the fact that it is through the smartphone screen that spectators are able to access stories about Europe, through the QR codes stuck on the frame of the carpet, just as it is through smartphone screens, rather than television screens - we found during the fieldwork research - that Europe is narrated to those about to begin their journey, by friends and relatives who are already here.
The kind of interaction that the R.E.D. Carpet seeks to promote confronts us with the humanity of others and the otherness of ourselves, as Chouliaraki argued when speaking of 'agonistic solidarity' (2014, p. 35):

> agonistic solidarity makes explicit the social values that permeate its calls to action and posits human vulnerability as a problem concerning global injustice, collective responsibility, and social change. […] It is thus by recovering with effort the communicative space in which the radical plurality of these viewpoints becomes the object of politics - that is, the object of public deliberation and collective judgment - that agonistic solidarity might succeed in stimulating Western publics through expressions of solidarity oriented to others, rather than to themselves.

To the co-creation of the R.E.D. Carpet, this has meant first and foremost 'taking seriously the voices of the Other and considering it as a constructor and agent of knowledge' (Colombo 1999, p. 192), stepping out of the logic of a 'them' as opposed to a 'us talking about them' (Kilani 2015), and placing the imagination of the 'other' about ourselves at the center of collective responsibility (Chouliaraki 2013). The simultaneity of voices and instances emerging from the videos accessed from the carpet, which presents no sorting or classifying attempt, allows the different stories, of migrants, and practitioners, to be heard on the same stage. In this new space of simultaneity, the interviews, which were obviously conducted individually, are in dialogue with each other. The viewpoints of a first-line practitioner and a migrant on the topic of housing are emblematic:

> Many leave to look for and find a new life. Those who are already here and would like to rejoin their families naturally say "come here, it's better here", certainly much better than there. But then, when they arrive here, they don't find what they wanted, they don't orient themselves, they don't find a life suitable for human beings. For example, I used to check houses where 15 or 16 people

slept in the same room. Of course they have food, they have something to wash themselves with, but I would not want people to have such a life situation' (Police inspector, from Italy).

Home, home sweet home. When I was in Africa, I imagined that here, as soon as they arrived, they would put you inside a house with all the nice things: the sofa, the chair. Instead, here in Bologna, it is not like that. Here, it is very difficult for an African, a foreigner, to find a home. Even when your paperwork is all in order, you never find a house, because I have done a lot of tours: sometimes I write on Facebook, I write on websites, I go to the real estate agent to find a house, but as soon as I arrive, I say that I am working and that all my paperwork is in order, they ask you: "What kind of contract do you have?" "Two/three months" "Okay, that is fine, we will call you back". They never call you back. Even if you have a permanent contract they don't call you back. So, the house here is very difficult, that's why we always find many people in one house. If you find a house and the other one doesn't, you try to take the other one in, because if the other one is in the middle of the street, how can we do that? This is why they always say that Africans are always many in one house, because we cannot find a house here. This is a big problem (Migrant, from the Gambia).

The R.E.D. Carpet, as an artistic installation, becomes a mean to challenge assimilationist logic and othering processes (Musarò, Papastergiadis, Peja 2022) by entrusting audiences, migrants and reception and border control workers with the narrative of the 'we others' who build multicultural Europe every day.

The R.E.D. Carpet we took in this chapter as a case study represents in some way an embodied example of the fundamental difference in which the cosmopolitan sentiment is articulated in the political sphere and the way it manifests in an artistic context, which according to Papastergiadis (2012) are two polarities that can be expressed as 'normative' and 'aesthetic' cosmopolitanism: in politics, cosmopolitanism was represented as a moral duty – it directs the secondary social order that humans ought to pursue. In art, cosmopolitanism is the primal condition of creation – it is manifest through the world making activity of art.

The creative engagement of local communities in Bologna allowed by the R.E.D. Carpet experience seems to have helped diverse individuals to question their own idea of Europe, their knowledge about migrants' instances and their own individual positioning with respect to the same.

Initial feedback data collected through a questionnaire in public places where the carpet was displayed, in fact, tells us that compared to the information about migration and migrant people that our audiences get from news and news programs and social media, the R.E.D. Carpet allowed them to discover something they were not aware of before by identifying it as 'a different point of view than usual', 'new ways of giving voice to protagonists of the situations narrated', 'different points of view from those told by the media'. The publics who encountered the R.E.D. Carpet interpreted it as 'an invitation to empathic reflection, which rejects pietism but focuses on a denunciation', as something that 'counteracts mainstream communication on migration in Italy' and that 'allows one to know the different in order to know oneself'.

Conclusions

The overview of the debate on multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism undertaken in the first paragraphs of this chapter allowed us to focus on the suggestion that as with multiculturalism, the debate on cosmopolitanism seems to have a normative vein, with the aim of formulating a theory of justice capable of ensuring the rights of the largest possible number of minority groups. In other words, rather than attempting to represent the concrete, everyday co-existence with difference by investigating the dynamics, conflicts, tensions, negotiations and interactions with difference, the debate on multiculturalism seems more focussed on how we would ideally like things to be, as in the case of those approaches inspired by political philosophy and social policy (Kymlicka 1995).

Indeed, the accent on the normative dimension of co-existing with diversity – namely the attempt to outline a theory of justice capable of fulfilling the claims and rights of all members of a society – actually tends to obfuscate the concrete dynamics between cultural differences. As pointed out, the attempt to reconstruct the ideal conditions for an equal society and respectful co-existence with difference assumes that cultural difference is something stable, immutable and clearly definable. In this way, multiculturalism ends up viewing cultural difference as fixed.

If cosmopolitanism is to be politically and theoretically rewarding, it must not only engage with multiculturalism seriously, but also recognize the openness, tolerance and justice-oriented solidarities migrants, refugees and diasporic communities bring to - and demand from - Europe.
Therefore, the recognition of that difference and respect, which multiculturalism defended, is essential for a non-hierarchical relationship with the 'other', and thus essential for a cosmopolitan order. Consequently, a false dichotomy is increasingly drawn between multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. Recognition of difference and respect for the 'other' are crucial for the questioning of previously established social and cultural hierarchies between the West and its 'others' and any possible learning from the other which cosmopolitanism promotes (Moyn 2010). Multiculturalism, in its aspiration to allow minoritized groups to participate as equals in civic and political life, and to enhance their claim-making capacities is essential for a cosmopolitan order. We suggest that cosmopolitanism without a multicultural ethos is nothing but a monologue; one where openness and dialogue are redundant if not impossible.
Insofar as cosmopolitan morality is communicated through specific stories and images of human suffering, then the possibility is always there both for a re-thinking of what the human is and for re-formulating what the global order is and which interests it should serve. Notwithstanding its legacies with history and power, cosmopolitanism as a communicative project has the potential to act as a critical tool, problematizing and re-imagining the very political order that enabled it to emerge in the first place. And one key precondition for this potentiality lies in the capacity of sociological studies to produce sensitive accounts of two properties of cosmopolitanism: its historicity and its performativity.
The performativity of cosmopolitanism refers to its enfoldedness in practices of meaning-making, such as language, image, or the body, which regulate the communication of the sufferer as human and invite particular forms of action upon her/him as legitimate, at the moment that they claim to simply 'report' on them. What are the aesthetic properties of communicating suffering, and in which ways do differences between them produce different claims to cosmopolitan care? Why and how does this matter? These questions have motivated intense debates among professionals, in humanitarianism or journalism, and scholars alike. While some argue that the political economy of the media, far from making a difference, end ups commodifying spectacles of distant suffering, others blame the colonial legacy for the continuing dehumanization of the sufferer, in contemporary humanitarian campaigns or the daily news. Although they may ultimately be unresolvable, given these fields' complicity with enduring histories of de-humanization and othering (Said 1978), they also sustain important conversations about how aesthetic form and narrative content may contribute to encouraging affective dispositions of humanity and care.
As shown through the experience of the R.E.D. Carpet, an experience of artistic co-creation between artists, researchers, migrant people, and the audiences, the role of art appears crucial in fostering such kind of cosmopolitanism for its ability to suggest new meanings without imposing them, to question rather than answer, to empower the spectator in finding his or her own role within the 'borderwork' (Rumford 2008) or 'de-borderwork' between self and other. Within the R.E.D. Carpet, there is neither a homogeneous narrative of Europe nor an attempt to recompose individual stories within a collective history that could mitigate the power differentials or social injustices through which everyone experiences borders, nation states and social identities. The R.E.D. Carpet opens up a new listening ground, a new space of visibility for the specificity of each individual perspective and experience while allowing for the exploration of resonances and disjunctures between each specific position. In

this sense, it invites a reflection on a cosmopolitan and multicultural Europe starting with the expression of different points of view as statements of public interest and social justice, instead of a private morality or the promotion of universal values.

Bibliography

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7(2–3), 295–310.

Arendt, H. (1998 [1958]). *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Barretta, P., & Cappi, V. (2021). Rappresentazioni. La migrazione nel discorso mediatico. In E. Miletto, & S. Tallia (Eds.). *Vite sospese. Profughi, rifugiati e richiedenti asilo dal Novecento a oggi* (pp. 288-301). FrancoAngeli.

Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Polity.

Beck, U. (2011). Multiculturalism or Cosmopolitanism: How can we Describe and Understand the Diversity of the World?'. *Social Sciences in China*, 32(4), 52-58.

Beck, U. & Szneider, N. (2006). Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 1-23.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.

Boltanski, L. (1999). *Distant Suffering: Morality, Media and Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Cappi, V. (2023). *Immaginare l'altrove nell'epoca dell'Antropocene. Media, confini, cambiamenti climatici*. FrancoAngeli.

Cappi, V., & Musarò, P. (2022). Awareness campaigns to deter migrants: a neoliberal industry for symbolic bordering. In A. Dastyari, A. Nethery, & A. Hirsch (Eds.). *Refugee Externalisation Policies. Responsibility, Legitimacy and Accountability* (pp. 171-188). Routledge.

Chaban, N., & Holland, M. (2014). Introduction: The Evolution of EU Perceptions: from Single Studies to Systematic Research. In N. Chaban, & M. Holland (Eds.). *Communicating Europe in Times of Crisis. External Perceptions of the European Union* (pp. 1-23). Palgrave Macmillan.

Chambers, I. (2001). *Culture after humanism*. Routledge.

Chouliaraki, L. (2013). *The Ironic Spectator. Solidarity in the Age of Post-humanitarianism*. Polity.

Chouliaraki, L. (2014). "La distanza inadeguata": per una riflessione critica sulla solidarietà come ironia. In Musarò, P., & Parmiggiani, P. (Eds.). *Media e migrazioni: etica, estetica e politica della narrazione umanitaria* (pp. 17-42). FrancoAngeli.

Chouliaraki, L. (2017). Cosmopolitanism, In L. Ouellette, & J. Gray (Eds.). *Keywords for Media Studies* (pp. 52-54). New York University Press.

Colombo, E. (1999). *Rappresentazioni dell'Altro. Lo straniero nella riflessione sociale occidentale*. Edizioni Guerini.

Cuttitta, P. (2006). Points and Lines: A Topography of Borders in the Global Space Ephemera. *Theory & Politics in Organization*, 6(1), 27-39.

Dal Lago, A. (1999). *Non-persone. L'esclusione dei migranti in una società globale*. Feltrinelli.

Dal Lago, A., & Palidda, S. (2010). *Conflict, Security and the Reshaping of Society. The Civilization of War*. Routledge.

de Haas, H. (2007). *The myth of invasion. Irregular migration from West Africa to the Maghreb and the European Union*. IMI research report. International Migration Institute.

Debord, G. (1995). *The Society of the Spectacle*. Zone Books.

Delanty, G. (2011). Cultural Diversity, Democracy and the Prospects of Cosmopolitanism: A Theory of Cultural Encounters. *British Journal of Sociology*, 62(4), 633-656.

Duffield, M. (2001). *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*. Zed Books.

Fassin, D. (2011). *Humanitarian Reason. A moral history of the present*. University of California Press.

Giorgi, A., Pizzolati, M., Vacchelli, E. (2021). *Metodi creativi per la ricerca sociale. Contesto, pratiche, strumenti*. Il Mulino.

Guiraudon, V., & Joppke, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Controlling a New Migration World*. Routledge.

Held, D. (2010). The Cosmopolitan Order. In D. Held, & C. Brown (Eds.). *The Cosmopolitanism Reader* (pp.

229-247). Polity.
Khosravi, S. (2019). What do we see if we look at the border from the other side?. *Social Anthropology*, 27(3), 409-424.
Khosravi, S., & Keshavarz, M. (2020) The Magic of Borders. *Architecture e-flux*, 1-7.
Kilani, M. (2015). *L'invenzione dell'altro. Saggi sul discorso antropologico*. Edizioni Dedalo.
Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford University Press.
Marquardt, F. (2021). *The New Nomads. How the Migration Revolution is Making the World a Better Place*. Simon & Schuster.
Mazzara, F. (2019). *Reframing Migration*: *Lampedusa, Border Spectacle and the Aesthetics of Subversion*. Peter Lang.
Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Duke University Press.
Moyn S. (2010). *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History*. Harvard University Press.
Moralli, M., Musarò, P., Paltrinieri, R., & Parmiggiani, P. (2021). Creative resistance. Cultural practices, artistic activism and counter-hegemonic narratives on diversity. *Studi Culturali*, 2, 163-180.
Musarò, P., & Parmiggiani, P. (2022). *Ospitalità mediatica. Le migrazioni nel discorso pubblico*. Franco Angeli.
Musarò, P., & Parmiggiani, P. (Eds.). (2014). *Media e migrazioni: etica, estetica e politica della narrazione umanitaria*. FrancoAngeli.
Musarò, P., Papastergiadis, N., & Peja, L. (2022). Reimagining Narratives on Migration. The Role of Media, Arts, and Culture in Promoting Transcultural Dialogue. *Comunicazioni Sociali*, 1, 3-16.
Nail, T. (2020). Migrant images. In K.G. Lynes, T. Morgenstern, & I.A. Paul (Eds.). *Moving Images: Mediating Migration as Crisis* (pp. 147-163). Transcript.
Paasi, A. (1996). *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border*. Wiley.
Paltrinieri, R., & Parmiggiani, P. (2020). Introduction: Right to the City, Performing Arts and Migration. In R., Paltrinieri, P. Parmiggiani, P. Musarò, & M. Moralli (Eds.), *Right to the City, Performing Arts and Migration* (pp. 7-22). FrancoAngeli.
Papastergiadis, N. (2012). *Cosmopolitanism and Culture*. Polity.
Popescu, G. (2011). *Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-first Century: Understanding Borders*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Remotti, F. (2010). *L'ossessione identitaria*. Laterza.
Rorty, R. (1989), *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge University Press.
Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
Seiger, F., LeLouvier, K., Jinkang, A., Granger, S.C., Villani, L., Sbaa M.Y., Cappi, V., Bermejo, R., Puzzo, G., Shubin, S., & Bratskas, R. (2022). The PERCETPIONS Handbook. A guide to understand migration narratives & addressing migration challenges. https://www.perceptions.eu/handbook/.
Simmel, G. (1972 [1908]). The Stranger. In G. Simmel, & D.N. Levine (Eds.). *On Individuality and Social Forms. Selected Writings* (pp. 184-189). Chicago University Press.
Wieviorka, M. (2001). *La difference*. Les Éditions Balland.

[1] This chapter was conceived jointly by the authors. However, for the purposes of acknowledging authorship, paragraphs 1 and 2 should be attributed to Pierluigi Musarò and Paola Parmiggiani; paragraph 3 to Valentina Cappi and Lorenza Villani; paragraph 4 to the four authors. This work was supported by PERCEPTIONS project, which has received funding from the European Union's H2020 Research & Innovation Action under Grant Agreement No 833870. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Pierluigi Musarò, Valentina Cappi, Lorenza Villani, and Paola Parmiggiani and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.

[2] Accordingly, residentialism started with the beginnings of the Neolithic Revolution about 12,000 years ago, when agricultural practices were first developed.

[3] Borders are not treated here as fixed physical boundaries but rather as a process of 'bordering' involving both imaginary and concrete making and unmaking of borders (Mezzandra & Neilson 2013; Khosravi & Keshavarz 2020). If we take into account the way in which Simmel (1908) considered the 'not a spatial fact with sociological effects, but a sociological fact that takes a spatial form' (p. 467), and the way Debord (1995) focused on the spectacle as 'a social relationship

between people that is mediated by images' (p. 19), we can imagine the border not just as mirror-like reflections of the divisions existing in the physical-cultural landscape, but as symbolic and political barriers enacted and performed as 'discursive or emotional landscapes of social power' as well as 'technical landscapes of control and surveillance' (Paasi 1996, p. 63).

[4] Women and children are more often than men represented as victimized public figures.

[5] The social production of the African and the European continents as binary opposites is the product of a symbolic bordering process (Guiraudon & Joppke 2001; de Haas 2007; Dal Lago & Palidda 2010). The cultural construction of the North as a wealthy, ordered, and compassionate entity, and as a natural performer of a civilizing mission towards the underdeveloped, dangerous, voiceless and helpless South is embedded in mediated representations of the 'other' and the 'we' based on asymmetry of power (in terms of both agency and dignity). As argued by Popescu (2011): 'Borders are first and foremost about power. Border making is a power strategy that uses difference to assert control over spaces by inscribing difference in space [...] Borders have traditionally served the role of ordering society' (p. 8). Therefore, process of bordering is essentially political, and this political dimension permeates border making at all scales, from the daily life of individuals to international relations (Cuttitta 2006).

[6] Together with the willingness 'to foreignize' and to be 'foreignized' via translation or encounter – as postcolonial scholars such as Bhabha (1994) underline -, the 'urge to support other struggles' and the 'urge to make justice-oriented alliances and solidarities' can then be seen as central pillars of cosmopolitanism.

[7] The full name of the project is: 'Perceptions: Understanding the Impact of Narratives and Perceptions of Europe on Migration and Providing Practices, Tools and Guides for Practitioners'. The project has an informative website (https://project.perceptions.eu) and a web platform hosting all the materials produced as outputs within the project (https://www.perceptions.eu).

[8] https://www.perceptions.eu/red-carpet/

[9] Interviews were conducted in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Italy, Kosovo, Spain, the United Kingdom, Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia, and involved a total of 100 migrants and 71 first-line practitioners. For a comprehensive description of the fieldwork carried out at the project consortium level (including detailed methodology and sample of respondents), please see: https://www.perceptions.eu/handbook/

[10] In the project, it was decided to make use of an inclusive definition of the term 'migrant', to refer to people 'experienced by direct experience' of migration. The term 'migrant' is an umbrella term that has no legal definition at the international level and refers to a person who crosses an international border and changes, or plans to change, his or her usual residence for a variable period of time. The term 'migrant' does not elaborate on the legal status, causes, or duration of displacement. In this sense, where not otherwise specified, the term 'migrant' has also been used in reference to refugees, asylum seekers and holders of other forms of international protection, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons who have moved for other purposes, including family reunification. The use of this 'factual' definition is not meant to diminish or misrepresent, but rather to reaffirm, the right to mobility of all people. In this sense, we make our own the terminology also used by Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) to describe 'subjects who cross or negotiate the world's borderscapes, avoiding where possible the recourse to categories such as refugee, asylum seeker or "illegal" migrant invented by state bureaucracies or their international counterparts' (p. 142).

[11] 'First-line practitioners' refers to people who have direct professional contact with migrants as part of their daily work activities: police and other law enforcement officers in charge of border control, medical and health workers, intercultural mediators, workers of nongovernmental organizations, cooperatives, and service-providing agencies in the migrant reception field.

[12] https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story/c

[13] https://www.cantierimeticci.it

[14] To view the art installation in its digital version, please visit: https://www.perceptions.eu/red-carpet/

[15] A total of twenty-one semi-structured interviews were conducted by the researchers of the University of Bologna and of the University of Rome La Sapienza, between February 1st and March 15th 2021, in the cities of Bologna, Rome, Naples, Palermo and Viterbo, including nine with first-line practitioners, two with law enforcement agents, six with asylum-seekers/refugees from Armenia, Afghanistan, Ivory Coast, Gambia, Nigeria, and Senegal, and four with migrants from Brazil, Gambia, Ghana, and Senegal.

[16] The R.E.D. Carpet entered not so much a generic public space, but rather the places of everyday life by incentivizing public engagement with the aim of acting on the social imaginary and the ways through which we shape the spaces we inhabit, whose meanings, uses and purposes are mobile over time.