

Sandžak Between Interculturalism and Multiculturalism

Harun Hadžić

Dr.Sc. Harun HADŽIĆ

Abstract

Building a multicultural society is one way of finding a Vivendi mode for resolving the national status of autochthonous peoples, minorities, minority communities or minority groups in the country, without conflict and war. In such a society, these peoples and groups exercise their right to resolve their political status, their economic, cultural and social development through constitutional possibilities, through international documents, all through various democratic mechanisms - referenda, agreements, etc. In that way they regulate their right to internal-internal, and sometimes external-external self-determination, and thus acquire certain elements of their international legal subjectivity. In this paper, we want to make some clarifications on the construction and functioning of a multicultural and / or intercultural society, using the research of the author Andrea Semprini and his book on Multiculturalism in the United States, with the intention that this may serve as an instructive practical-theoretical example of solving similar problems in our former Yugoslav - above all, the Sandžak area.

Key words: interculturalism; multiculturalism; liberalism; corporativism; models of multiculturalism; self-determination; peace and stability;

1. Interculturalism

Today, in the so-called modern state, multicultural education, and education of citizens, especially young people in a tolerant environment, leads to the emergence of the *philosophy of interculturalism*. Therefore, citizens should be obliged to provide experience of friendly and cooperative encounters with members of other cultures. When it comes to multiculturalism, it is important to emphasize that certain societies, such as the Bosnian society, are trying to find a solution for their inter-ethnic problems by resorting to the so- intercultural society that is, they use the ideology and the philosophy of interculturalism. They consider that interculturalism, as a theoretical and practical model, different from multiculturalism, is much more receptive to the existence of autochthonous, minority peoples, as well as national and ethnic groups in societies such as those in the former Yugoslav territories, in particular the Bosnian and Montenegrin societies, where no autochthonous, minority, or constitutive nation does not make a majority in the total population of the country in which it lives. By combining interculturalism in such societies, we would strive for a quality community in which the constitutive national-ethnic groupings would not be fully integrated or fully assimilated. Each national group would retain its specificity and its self-awareness, but the level of homogenization of society would be stronger than in multiculturalism.

Opponents of the intercultural model of society point out¹ that the revival of such a reality would mean the loss of national specificities of all groups. However, advocates of the intercultural model consider their opponents to be wrong. Precisely because of this, the minority, that is, the constitutive national, autochthonous, groups in the intercultural society, would not be fully integrated into the social environment, but would retain their specific identities, but at the same time they would be sufficiently incorporated in economic, cultural, political and every other life in country.

In the intercultural social model there would be interaction among the majority peoples, autochthonous, minority peoples and national and ethnic groups, unlike a multicultural society where, in their opinion, there is no interaction, whereby different values will be exchanged among themselves.

¹ For example, Serbian political leaders in Bosnia, unlike the Bosniak ones, point out that it is unacceptable to create an intercultural society in this country, because in this case, allegedly, the Serbian people were assimilated. Similar opinions can be heard from the Bosniak leaders in Sandzak.

There would be an exchange of features of lifestyle, style and quality of development. Interculturalists point out the fact that the multicultural model of society existed in many countries of the world² until the beginning of the 1990s, in order to overcome the intercultural model in the last decade of the second millennium, but within the national states. They say that the first decades of the third millennium are precisely the time frame for the invigoration and existence of an intercultural model of society, and Bosnia and Herzegovina should be a spatial reality in which its paradigmaticity is checked.

In an intercultural model would overcome divisions as each division into the basis of differences is the crime of uniqueness, that is, universalism and cosmopolitanism. The wealth formula in differences is a model for undivided societies. Different cultures and different people should not live side by side, but with one another because interculturalism accepts influences and permeations. That's what everyone gets in this process. When one culture influences the other, it makes it richer and does not assimilate it. This is the way of life that would be especially desirable in the Balkans and in this society the indigenous (minority) peoples would come to expression and have elements of international legal subjectivity (eg Bosnians in Sandzak, Serbs and Croats in Bosnia, etc.). It is a way in which they cannot go diversity without unity, nor unity without distinction. Through the model of intercultural society, universalism and diversity are being re-examined and discussed.

It is important to note that the phenomenon of the universalization of diversity in the world takes place through two parallel processes:

- On the one hand, there is a process of globalization and European integration, in which, for example, Germany renounced its monetary units - DM, the French denounce the sovereignty that moves into EU institutions in Brussels, and the United Kingdom slowly renounces the pound.³

² The Soviet Union, the SFRY and Czechoslovakia can serve as an example, but due to the lack of interaction between different national identities in such societies, they have collapsed.

³ The Kingdom is June 23, 2016. held a referendum on the way out of the EU. The referendum managed 51.9% to 48.1%, however, during the preparation of this press book, the process of Britain's withdrawal from the EU has not yet been completed, even the resistance to Brexit and the British public in 2018 and 2019 is demanding a referendum - about the cancellation of BREXIT. (See about Brexit: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>).

- On the other side, in parallel with these processes and processes of regionalization. Developing the regional cooperation initiative leads to the transformation of national, religious, cultural and other differences into the comparative advantages of the region based on entrepreneurship and business.

Diversity in contemporary societies and their universalization should and should become a symbol of civilization progress and cooperation in the 21st century. The quality of the social environment will be measured by the degree of integration into a wider society of regional dimensions. The universalism of a multicultural, or intercultural society, does not determine the simple sum of different cultures, nations and religions in one space, but creative integration, and not a fatal assimilation, as part of a larger constitutive diversity. The division of the social environment into conditionally "our" and conditionally "their" reality shows that it is not about interculturalism. In such distancing of diversity it is a practice of simulation of permeation. We are witnessing such "integration" in almost all the countries that emerged on the territory of the former Yugoslavia. With such integration, various international factors offer and place their "knowledge and skills" that are not compatible with internal values and specificities within specific countries in transition.

Certainly, the intercultural model of society requires knowledge and frames based on supreme moral values, which are created within the society itself, and not to those imposed on the part of the society. Imposed and insufficiently studied integration contents will not constitute the universality of differences. The cultural and civilization values that are an organic segment of coexistence within the societies themselves are key features of interculturalism. Awareness of differences and diversity must be derived from the framework of academic debate and themes and carried out in the reality of everyday life. Therefore, the awareness of the values of multiculturalism and ethnic tolerance as a lasting commitment should be encouraged.

It is precisely on these ideas and bases that the affirmation of multiculturalism, interculturalism and multiethnic tolerance in modern societies and each state should be conceived and presented as values of general interest.

2. Multiculturalism

A significant number of theorists claim, and what we consider to be correct is that

"... multiculturalism appears as a powerful indicator of the crisis of modernity. In fact, the basic categories of this modern project - philosophical, political, social - are in doubt, sometimes rough, by seeking multicultural identity, and especially through the requirement to include the right to diversity in the very heart of the project. Setting up the modernity of the question of the right to differentiation, multiculturalism transcends the specifics of each individual national context and presents to all modern societies a magnificent civilization challenge" (Semprini, 2004, p.6).

Modern law theorists also find that it is clear that, in democratic societies, universalism and belonging to civil society, or unity and diversity, by their interweaving; they constitute a very compact dynamic social entity. The particular achievement of unity and diversity, that is, universal and special, represents multiculturalism. They say that the multicultural model of the "unity of diversity" in its social being contains multiethnicity and multiracialism. In its generic essence there is the existence of diversity of people, cultures and religions. The peoples, living side by side with each other, pursued one another alongside one another, and by practicing one another along the other, they formed the universality of diversity. Neither the people, nor culture, nor religion were threatened. They never changed or transformed to the detriment of one, the other, or the third.

So, "one of the great questions posed by multiculturalism is the issue of diversity. How to observe diversity? What place does it have to allocate within a single social system? Is diversity enriching or impoverishing? Trump or threat?" (Semprini, 2004, p.9).

Observing the very essence of things, practice has shown that the unity of diversity is manifested in multiculturalism, multiethnicity, multiracialism and multireligism, does not constrain any dimension of universalism. On the contrary, it enables constant articulation and affirmation of cultural values and elements of the quality of life of all entities living in such a multicultural society. The social environment of the existence of universalism and belonging, as unity and diversity, provides equal opportunities for development of all the specialties.

We consider it important to point out that it is not possible to fully understand today's demands of some indigenous or indigenous peoples in the world (in Serbia and Montenegro, minority peoples), for identity, if we do not look at the historical context. As a good example, author Semprini takes the United States and their relationship with Indigenous Indian people on their territory. Namely, for the Americans, or for Western conquerors, the territory of the United States was terra-incognita (unknown land), that is, terra nullius (no man's land), and therefore it was free to occupy and exterminate its inhabitants. "The number of indigenous Americans (Native Americans) is believed to have been somewhere between three and four million inhabitants at the time of colonization (17th century)" (Semprini, 2004, p.10), while immigrant Americans will reach that figure only in the early 19th century (Ibidem p.10, 11). "During the 20th century, the physical massacre was extended through a systematic policy of forced assimilation and cultural eradication: the transfer of people, the mixing of different tribes, the ban on the promotion of traditional cultures and the teaching of tribal languages. Only in the early 1930s, thanks to the new generation of anthropologists (Loves, Kreber, Hersković), this identity destruction policy was gradually abandoned. Still, it was only necessary to wait until the sixties to raise awareness in the political public and public opinion about the necessity of compensating for such cruelty and to invite the Indian Nations (Indian Native) was recognized as official status and special rights." (Ibidem, p.10,11)

Also, it should be noted that "Multiple geographic, cultural, ethnic, and family imposition by slaves can be considered the root of the identity problem that is obsessed with the black minority in America today. For example: In 1790, the United States settled 4 million people, of which 700,000 were slaves. On the eve of the Secessionist War (1861-1865), the slave was 3,500,000, of about 36 million of the total population, or about 40 percent of the population in 11 secessionist states. See: Philip Curtin, *The Atlantic Slave Trade. A census*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1969. (Semperini, Ibidem, p.12).

This feeling of injustice is all the more so that, in the Declaration of Independence, a document that identifies the essential values of a particular American civilization and whose spirit continues to permeate modern society, is not at all touched by the problem of slavery. How can one country, which declares that each person is born equal and has the same fundamental rights, be able to satisfy the legislation that agrees with

black slavery? This is one of the controversies that Western civilization keeps as a secret, which, however, does not cease to obscure the minds of those who were either forgotten through these twists or were openly victims of this forgery." (Ibidem, p.13). Here we should mention the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen of 1793, which also tolerates the exploitation of slaves, so that slavery in French colonies was abolished only in 1848. (Ibidem).

How America was undemocratic and non-cultural is seen from the facts that show that only Anglo-Saxons in this country had full rights. "Despite the successive immigration waves, despite the rhetoric of the melting pot, despite the existence of a significant black minority and indigenous peoples, the soul of America remained white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant (WASP). For the sake of illustration, we give an example that in 1960, 94 percent of Protestant and non-Protestant student populations at American universities were whites." (Todd Gitlin, cited according to Semprini, 2004, footnote 10, p. 17).

America, therefore, was always in reality something different from the rhetoric of its political representatives and in relation to its constitutional determinations. This gap between the American Constitution and its application makes one of the fundamental reasons for polemics and multicultural misunderstanding, especially today, when Donald Trampe's administration surprises the world with some of its attitudes and attitudes towards immigrants, foreigners, members of Islam, and so on. (<https://www.theguardian.com/usnews/2018/jun/26/trump-supreme-court-upholds-travel-ban>).

Thus, the American "liberal thought defended a free civil society, but it did not come to life in reality..." while the "mono-cultural liberal position defended itself by referring to principles of general significance. The advocates of multiculturalism, however, publicly announce the ideological character of these principles and criticize the absence of realism in liberal theory. Claiming a multitude of inequalities, they challenge the operational tendency of an American society that only serves to mask the continuation of the project of a positivistic society, and whose goal is to maintain a system of controlled power, which is held by white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant elites in its hands." (Semprini, Ibidem, p.19).

These are just some of the elements that point to controversies in American society, which indicate the reasons for today's demands of American indigenous groups for self-determination and the American

multicultural society, in which each group can express its particularity. This also points to the difficulties in establishing a complete multicultural society. Because, "Multicultural conflicts should not be reduced to the bipolar issue of the majority / minority, or the integration / separation dialectics. This should be a good management of diversity and a variety of modalities of distribution of a polycentric space that poses multiculturalism as a challenge to modern society." (Ibidem, p.28).

We are witnessing that at the beginning of the third millennium in many countries of the world there is a large number of national and ethnic groups. Such a fact in itself indicates that these are actually multicultural societies in which one lives and interacts one another besides the other many nations, peoples and minorities. However, as Semprini notes, there is no interaction between groups in existing contemporary social models. There is no exchange of life experience, lifestyle and other social values. The very act of the existence of various national and ethnic groups is not controversial, as it is not controversial and that the former Yugoslav society was multicultural. But, at the astonishment of the democratic world, precisely in this multicultural society, the great crimes of one nation towards others have been made. The answer is clear - there was no interaction between different national groups, nations, peoples, and that's why this society was broken down by national seams. In order to succeed a multicultural society, differences between groups must develop as top values that make up the unity of society. The fact is that nationally homogeneous societies, which are societies in which national and ethnic minorities do not have a significant share in the population structure, more easily resolve numerous issues related to the preservation of the national and ethnic identity of national minorities, that is, minority / indigenous peoples. By contrast, societies in which these national groups play a significant role in the overall demographic structure, and especially in societies where they do not make up the majority of the population, as is the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina or Montenegro, it is much more difficult to solve problems of national and ethnic identity. The problems of such societies go beyond the scope of the regulations of international conventions and other documents, and they exceed the state's own experience. Many of these groups do not forget in their national and ethnic consciousness that through the history of others, geostrategic interests have been shattered to their detriment.

Multiculturalists point out that one of the most important issues of the future of each state, especially the complex countries, is the affirmation of multiculturalism and multinational tolerance. They say that multicultural society is something that represents an ideal society. The term of this society is multiculturalism as a cultural policy which primarily aims at equal coexistence - the "coexistence" of different cultures. That is why it is the task of every modern state and the international community itself to define the national strategy of multiculturalism, that is, the strategy of coexistence of all minorities, autochthonous, constituent and so on. peoples and national minorities within states, in accordance with international standards.

Modern societies know the phenomenon of institutionalization, that is, legal shaping compulsory measures to facilitate and ensure equality and equality of all citizens in different areas of social life. Such measures are in they define the broadest sense as "affirmative action", but other terms are also used: positive discrimination, preferential treatment, quota system, and so on.

Affirmative action, unlike the neutrality of the ordinary non-discriminatory approach towards minorities, is characterized by taking positive measures aimed at improving the position of all peoples, minorities and other ethnic communities in the society and political system of the country. For example, representation of all actors of society, all peoples and minorities in the authorities - in the legislative body, in executive and administrative bodies, in the judiciary and in the public services, as well as in educational, cultural and informational institutions, etc. Therefore, affirmative action can encompass a whole range of different activities and benefits in favor of minority rights. Measures of affirmative action, above all, strive to correct past injustices in the past. According to international standards for national-national groups, as well as for national minorities discriminated in the past, it is not enough to provide protection guaranteed by a general human rights system with regard to non-discrimination, but certain historically neglected minorities must also be guaranteed certain special rights to create equality respect for differences and the preservation of minority identity. Affirmative action is not in conflict with the concept of a civil state. On the contrary, they are very compatible. In Western political philosophy, in various European documents, and even in national legislation, minority self-rule is gaining importance for more and more Western democracies.

The essence of minority self-government is that on issues concerning identity, culture, education, information of minority communities, local self-government, etc. decide (or participate in deciding) the minority / minority peoples themselves, or their elected representatives and bodies. On these premises, the idea of forming minority, national councils (national councils), which functions somewhat in the territories of Serbia and Montenegro, rests.

National groups, national minorities, and certainly the so-called European, minority, autochthonous, peoples, some of them in a certain state framework and constituent peoples (Unlike Indigenous / Indigenous peoples of America, Australia, Canada, and so on), are a historical fact. In the past, but still today, one of the basic paths for their emergence was the territorial changes that took place - either by changing the sovereignty over the respective territory, most often by conquest - by the disintegration of a larger state into several smaller ones, such as the situation with the breakup of the SFRY and the Soviet Union. Of course, there are other forms of the emergence of minorities and indigenous peoples, such as the nation's migrations and the like.

2.1. Models of multicultural space

When it comes to multiculturalism, it is necessary to explain the issue of multicultural space, that is, the environment in which multiculturalism is realized. The multicultural space, in essence, contains the question of the cohesion and stability of one society, but this social cohesion must be explained in greater detail, and it cannot be reduced to the very binary logic behind which, against *cohesion*, is *balkanization*, that is, against *unity - chaos*. Namely, the question is how much multiculturalism with its differences weakens social cohesion, how much it threatens, and how much it threatens the disintegration of the society itself and the state.

Of course, there are several models of multicultural space, each in its own way offering a different view of the problem of the cohesion of society, but for the needs of this paper, accepting the classification of Andrea Semprinia (Semprini, 2004), we will summarize four main models of multicultural space: The classic political liberal model, Multicultural Liberal Model, Maximal Multicultural Model, and, Model Corporate Multiculturalism.

2.1.1. The Classic Political Liberal Model

This model is based on classical liberal theory and it has had an impact on many modern democratic constitutions of various states, and in particular the American Constitution. According to this model, there is a fundamental difference between the public and private spheres of life. It has "established civil and political rights and obligations of individuals such as - respect for the law, paying taxes, voting rights, freedom of expression and association. If an individual adjusts to this set of rights and obligations, he acquires the status of a citizen, which is a condition for his access to the public space, understood by Habermasovski. As a citizen, he is in the field of absolute equality with all fellow citizens, because the public space, by definition, is neutral and homogenous. As Taylor would say, he is blind to diversity" (Semprini, *Ibidem*, p.113).

It should be noted that the differences in this model are not canceled, they are only limited within the individual's private space. This private space is naturally an addition to the public space and is subordinate to it. What is inherent in the private life of an individual, it is placed in the private sphere of his life, and thus forms a private sphere of social life. Only those private behaviours that violate obligations imposed upon an individual as a citizen may be subject to sanctioning. So, diversity is widely tolerated, but they are concentrated within the private sphere.

Some advocates of multiculturalism criticize this model and say that he has never been really open to all and that real equality has never ruled in him. They point out that "the traditional political liberal model is absolutely incapable of responding satisfactorily to their demands for recognition and acceptance of diversity" (*Ibidem*, 114).

2.1.2. Multicultural Liberal Model

This model is based on Kimley's understanding of "multicultural citizenship" (Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship*, 1995), which points out that the traditional political model, has never been really applied in America. He says some groups have received some special rights, such as the Amish who have been granted the right not to send their children to public schools, but they have been provided with their traditional education. Similarly, it is allowed to the Indians in the United States. According to this understanding, "The multicultural liberal model proposes recognition of the central role of ethnic and cultural dimensions in building an individual as a moral and civic being" (*Ibidem*). According to this

model, the relationship between the private and the public sphere is modified in relation to the traditional model. While in the classical model it encompasses every individual, separating his civilian from private life, he is moved to the level of the group's boundaries.

In the classical model, there was no mediation between the private and public spheres of life, between the individual and the citizen. However, the multicultural liberal model introduces *the group* as the mediation term. "Although some forms of autonomy and recognition have been approved by some groups, however, there is a single distribution zone through which groups participate in the common sphere. It is this zone that ensures system maintenance. Instead of being divided into two spheres that intercept each individual, the social space is divided into a single central mono-cultural zone, in which all groups participate in varying levels, and in the many peripheral zones in which each group has its own autonomy" (Ibidem, p.115).

The difference between the classic political liberal model, on the one hand, and the multicultural liberal model, on the other hand, is visible precisely when considering the question of social cohesion. Namely, in the classic model of cohesion is secured, so to speak, only *ex officio*. The homogeneity of the public space guarantees this cohesion, but also blocks the conditions for its existence. Because of the inability to ensure integration with some other means, apart from the sterilization of diversity, this model is a poor response to recognition requests and endangers the danger of radicalizing rather than resolving multicultural conflicts. In contrast, in a multicultural liberal model, two outcomes - *cohesion* and *fragmentation* - are also predicted and theoretically possible ... Kimlika recalls that the goal of a large number of multicultural demands is a much greater participation, i.e. he thinks that a multicultural political liberal model can cause stronger cohesion. The strength of the central space should ensure real neutrality and break down the pitfalls of monoculturalism that will ease the dynamics of cohesion. On the contrary, as the centre is more tolerant, it is more exposed to the risk of conflict and centrifugal dynamics" (Ibidem).

The conclusion is clear, in this model - that the autonomy of the group is stronger, it is their subjectivity and participation in their own management, the stronger, and therefore the cohesion of society is firmer, as the separatist tendencies of social groups are reduced, because they are satisfied with their guaranteed autonomy.

2.1.3. Maximal Multicultural Model

This model is fully accepted by those groups that require various forms of separation from the state and society and which seek political autonomy. He denies the merits of separation between the private and the public sphere, and denies any possibility of the existence of a common sphere. So, as we have seen, while in the previous two models cultural and ethnic factors are either neglected or subordinated to the elements of citizenship, in this third model the scale of values is reversed. Here, the cultural, religious and identity factors are more determined by the individual and his belonging to a group. This model is indifferent to the problem of *the state - the people*, which was founded only if it is placed above the boundaries of the group. From this point of view, this model proposes a *postmodern* or *post national* multicultural space. He not only expresses social separation, but also presumes.

It should be said that neither this model, nor the first two, offers a true solution to the call for diversity. "The diversity is resolved in it before the segmentation of the collective space into subspecies which, if they look globally, offer only one collection of diversity, and in reality they are all built on the basis of strong internal homogeneity. Thus, the problem of diversity is not solved by this model; it has been *demultiplied* beforehand by creating as many mono-cultural spaces as the groups that demand a distinct identity" (Ibidem, p.117), thereby achieving autonomy, and ultimately external self-determination, that is, its full international legal subjectivity" (illustrative example of the so-called constituent peoples in Bosnia).

2.1.4. Corporate or joint multiculturalism

This model puts emphasis on "managing" the given diversity. He views ethnic groups and social movements as objective facts, "created through social change, which need to be adapted as successful as possible" (Ibidem).

The corporate model is equally far from both political and maximalist models in which multicultural pressure comes from "bottom" as a potentially destabilizing form of monoculture order. The field of action of this model is *the economy*, its system of functioning is *pragmatism*, and its development framework is an international scene. So this model, like the previous two, goes beyond the boundary of the state-people, as the natural framework of social space. This means that the common space of the Corporate Multiculturalism is of economic type. "The groups that inhabit it

are viewed as target groups, in changing and individual forms of social acceptance (fashion, consumption, entertainment, mass culture)" (Ibidem).

We conclude that Corporate Multiculturalism has made arguments for the placement of its products from diversity. "Cosmopolitanism, diversity, and ethnic groups - become so market values, culturally compatible with the capitalist economy in its process of actual mondialization" (Ibidem). The main factors of this governance model, through media representation of diversity, are, in fact, large multinational companies, such as Benetton, Coca Cola, CNN, and others. as well as world sports events, such as the Olympic Games, football championships and the like. which represent images of a joyful multicultural coexistence.

It should be said that many critics of this model, especially some multiculturalists, point out that this model has an ideological character. Because this model only directs scenarios of supposedly successful management of diversity, as did *the policy of melting pot*, in the US, and in fact it involves the integration (assimilation) of minorities by conventional monoculture norms. He proposes the implementation of the policy of "diversity and coexistence, injected into the socio-cultural space *from above*, not required *from the very bottom* by the minorities themselves" (Ibidem, p.118).

Of course, it is not difficult for us to conclude that Corporate Multiculturalism does not at all call into question the cohesion of society, because it is in fact based on a mono-cultural core, which, according to its restrictive rules, implements cultural changes. In other words, this model represents a "real, concrete, postpolitical, economic and transnational version of the traditional multicultural liberal model, which would offer one political and liberal diversity management, easier to imagine, but completely abstract" (Ibidem, p.119).

In this model, like in classical models, minorities, peoples and ethnic groups cannot achieve significant elements of their international legal subjectivity.

3. Conclusion

Looking at the presented models, we conclude that there are enormous difficulties to look at an authentic multicultural space in which different groups could meet the satisfaction of their demands: 1.) requests for recognition and identity, 2.) require that they preserve the possibility of

having their collective dimension, which goes beyond frameworks of ethnicity, and 3.) demands for the preservation of their civic and democratic institutions.

We can easily conclude that none of the four models offered offer a global solution for these three conditions. The classic liberal model is "blind to diversity", and it varies this diversity into the private sphere and accepts it only if it is expressed on the individual plane. A pure multicultural model proposes in reality the juke position of monocultures and considers the obsolete utility of a broader social framework. The corporate model, in turn, offers recognition of diversity that is simplified and implemented "from above".

Thus, the conclusion is that the Liberal Multicultural Model proposed by Kimlicka best suits all three of these conditions, because it strongly recognizes the different subjectivities of all groups. But the objection highlighted in this model is that it does not take sufficient account of the individualistic and socio-cultural factors that underlie the demands of today's recognition of identity. This means that no current model is able to predict the features of the future multicultural space. Therefore, as Semprini correctly states, the question arises: is it possible at all to have an authentic multicultural space that enables the normal functioning of society and the preservation of its cohesion, with full satisfaction of the specific identities of all groups?

Modern practice in the United States shows that there are historical, demographic and institutional specifics in this country that support the creation of a multicultural space. But it is clear that the issue of multiculturalism is being set up in almost all countries of the modern democratic world. There are countries in which there has long been discrimination against national groups, that is, indigenous peoples and minorities, such as Canada, Brazil, Mexico or Australia, but it was not much better than in some socialist countries.

In some countries, there were bloody events when minorities within a majority tried to define their identity and subjectivity, such as in Chechnya, the former Yugoslavia, Kashmir, Sri Lanka. Even in Europe, a national and ethnic group, that is, peoples like the Catalans and Basques in Spain, Catholics in Northern Ireland, the Corsicans of France, seek the right to an international recognition of their subjectivity both on autonomy, self-rule and even autonomous state.

"There has been a time for affirmation of particularism everywhere, because universalism, as a driving myth and political project, loses its power" (Ibidem, p.123). That is why, as the opposite example, paradigmatically mentioned France, as a country in which diversity has not been given the opportunity for its development and preservation. Francaise concept of social space corresponds to the first, ie, the classic model of multicultural space presented in this paper. In this model, "Diversity, namely, they are neither deflated nor suppressed, they are rejected in the private sphere of individual life. They cannot be accepted in the civic space, because it should remain neutral and the individual receiving it does not bring it - its identity of the citizen. Cultural factors, individualist instances, demands for the recognition of subjectivity and identity, if not political, are excluded from the intact and perfectly homogeneous territory of citizenship" (Ibidem, 125).

Perhaps the example of France best illustrates that its rigid model of civil society is, however, overcome, or at least forced to adapt to the emerging socio-cultural changes. Because the "directed" and centralized French "civic" monocultures, *from the top*, leads to a lack of feeling for the demands emerging *from the bottom*, from the broad layers of society, and to a poor understanding of the tendencies contained in these demands. Or, perhaps, the French system considers these requirements to be worthless because they do not contribute to the integration and cohesion of society, so they are dismissed on the charge that they want to destabilize the nation. An illustrative example of this case is the so-called a crisis with an Islamic scarf (hijab), carried by Muslim women, which was banned in French schools. Forgetting that they are, I mean, even the so-called hijab, were an integral part of European culture (See: <https://youtu.be/9G1bn-XS5eM>). There was a paradox that in a modern, democratic France, Muslim students could not continue their education. This example shows that French society was not able to understand that Muslim scarves were no threat to the French nation, but they expressed a demand for the recognition of the identity and subjectivity of five million Muslims in this country. Therefore, it was more symbolic than the religious act of one group, which, in the name of the principle of integration, was excluded from a republican school. Perhaps such cases show that there are frustrations, and then the conflicts between the state and the social and national groups that exist in it.

As the author Andrea Semprini rightly observes, "The American example shows that multicultural conflicts often arise from the

accumulation of frustrated requests for the recognition of unresolved mini crisis" (Semprini, *Ibidem*, p. 128), which leads us to conclude that solutions to the problems that are at their basis need to be addressed in a timely manner.

Therefore, we consider that this work can be a teaching tool for the issue of human and minority rights in Sandžak.

List of References

Semprini, A. (2004), *Multikulturalizam*, CLIO, Beograd.

Curtin, P. (1969), *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*, University of Wisconsin Press.

Louis S. M.. (1987), *Le Code noir*, Paris, PUF.

Gitlin, T. (1955), *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America is Wracked by Culture Wars*, New York, Holt.

Kymlicka, Will, (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford University Press.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jun/26/trump-supreme-court-upholds-travel-ban>

<https://youtu.be/9G1bn-XS5eM>

