1. Interculturalism: main hypothesis, theories and strands

Ricard Zapata-Barrero

SOME PRELIMINARIES: THE CURRENT ACADEMIC AND POLICY CONTEXT

Despite the many conferences and policy meetings devoted to intercultural policies, there are still small internal disputes among those who share this policy approach. In my view, we need to take a direct step forward in the emerging debate to open a wide path for a promising internal discussion among interculturalists. It is time to put aside the discussion in justifying and defining interculturalism’s place in (and distance from) the diversity discourse among the other traditional proposals, such as assimilation and multiculturalism. It is time to enter into a foundational debate on interculturalism.

Taking into account the recent literature, we encounter a policy strategy that understands that we are in the process of building a ‘living together context’, given increasing diversity in Western contemporary societies. We are also in a context that lacks convincing public policies to deal with the reality of super-diversity (Vertovec, 2007, 2014). It is assumed that current Western societies are fragile, since most of the answers to the challenges presented by diversity management involve a process of change (Zapata-Barrero, 2013b). This process of change necessitates variation in social and institutional behaviours and even poses the threat of straining most current traditions, systems of rights/duties, and liberal democratic ways of legitimating Western societies. Dilemmas as to how to manage religious questions, language diversity, and the cultural practices of immigrants always arise socially and provoke social discussions and political cleavages. From this perspective, the intercultural strategy founded on interaction promotion in public spaces is interpreted as fostering a new civic culture based on a ‘culture of diversity’. That is, it should be assumed that diversity is itself a culture which should be promoted through an intercultural strategy, influencing knowledge construction and prejudice reduction (Zapata-Barrero, 2014, p. 8) and even serving as a
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tool to reduce the space of xenophobic discourses (Zapata-Barrero, 2011). From this initial framework, those participating in the debate share certain basic premises, though they also diverge at some important foundational points. In this chapter, I wish to claim that though there is one core concept of interculturalism, there are, however, at least three basic normative strands that, as I will argue, need not be interpreted as being at odds, but rather can be read as complementary angles of the same intercultural concern: a contractual, a cohesion and a constructivist strand. Each one has its own policy driver and has to be considered as a reaction to a particular empirical hypothesis and theory. I will elaborate on the first two strands with the help of the arguments put forward by two recent books from 2012: Bouchard’s *L’interculturalisme: un point de vue québécois* and Cantle’s *Interculturalism: The New Era of Cohesion and Diversity*, respectively. The third strand is the result of my own reading of the existing diversity advantage literature, drawn primarily from urban and management studies.

Before going into further detail, let me present the stages of my argument. The first is to consider that the first two concepts (contractual and cohesion strands) share a rights-based approach toward individuals and a concern for ensuring a common public sphere and culture. I will attempt to contrast this with a capability-based approach, which is directly concerned with individual and social development in applying this technique of positive interaction in diverse societies. I will call this approach the *constructivist strand*. The second part will attempt to defend a comprehensive view, grounded on the argument that no one can have sole authority to define intercultural policy, since the three can be applied at different moments, according to different purposes and needs. To frame this two-step argument, let me first ask the most obvious question: What do ‘we’ interculturalists share?

WHAT IS THE COMMON CORE OF THE INTERCULTURAL APPROACH? TWO SHARED PREMISES

The *first premise* is undoubtedly the liberal critique of multiculturalism. Its point of departure is the diagnosis that multicultural policies in the past have missed an important point: interaction between people from different cultures and national backgrounds. This is a fact that even the liberal multicultural scholar Kymlicka recognizes, when he says ‘we have multicultural states populated by citizens who have only minimal levels of intercultural interaction or knowledge’ (2003b p. 155). The core meaning is
etymologically related – namely, it means to act together with a common purpose. This collaborative action can only be accomplished if people feel free to act as human beings, without being categorized in terms of diversity by whatever administration or policy that encapsulates them. I would first say that interculturalism fundamentally proposes a change of focus: we move the policy lens from a centred and static fixed point to a much more dynamic and multi-directional process, one that results from interpersonal contact.

This liberal criticism of multiculturalism is carried out with two foundational ‘weapons’: that the individual prevails over group, and that culture cannot be an ‘iron cage’ – for either the freedom of people who do not want to be typified by origin, or for institutions that cannot ensure the system of rights/duties, distribute goods and services, or incorporate origin/nationality as a criterion. In spite of some multiculturalist academics, such as N. Meer and T. Modood (2011), who argue that there are many more similarities than differences between the two paradigms, the two essential differences between interculturalism and multiculturalism, in my view, remain. In both cases, interculturalism presents itself as a framework that tries to challenge the way multiculturalism has always tended to categorize people through origin and nationality, which predetermine certain behaviours and beliefs. In this way, interculturalists will dispute the multicultural assumption that diversity must be interpreted only in terms of origin, nationality and culture. The recently edited book by M. Barrett (2013) moves in the same direction, by examining the similarities and differences between these two policy approaches to managing the cultural diversity of contemporary societies. Interculturalists seek to break this essentialist view of diversity. Individual preferences and practices, rather than national origin adscriptions, prevail as a framework for beginning to plan the design of a diversity policy. Let me cite an example: being of Moroccan origin does not entail being Muslim and following Islamic beliefs. It would be the same if I refused to be described as a ‘Christian’ in Morocco, but was nonetheless subjected to certain policies rather than others because of this institutional prejudgement. In other words, we cannot ‘assume’ people belong to a certain religious practice because of their origin. It is this assumed link made by multiculturalism that interculturalism tries to avoid precisely by criticizing this group-based and closed-cultural approach. We must let people decide their own cultural practices, their religions and their languages, independent of the national circumstances into which they were born. We then endorse this detachment from any attempt to align culture with genetics, as though it were hereditary like skin colour (J. Bloomfield and F. Bianchi, 2001 p. 104), or even with the presumption that culture is rooted in territory, in the sense
already signalled by the liberal W. Kymlicka (1995 p. 84) in his seminal book when he argued that, according to the communitarian view, ‘one cannot choose to belong’.

The second premise rests on the view that interculturalism is mainly a policy intervention in diversity dynamics. The key question for us is how to justify intervention rather than leaving the deployment of diversity to be carried out socially. The answer to this foundational concern rests on three empirical hypotheses, emerging from the literature that focuses on the potential impacts of diversity:

1. The social hypothesis says that, at the beginning of the process, diversity tends to provoke segregation and exclusion and reduces social capital and the sense of belonging in society, either through social inequality or through the interference of information and knowledge among immigrants and citizens (see, for instance Putnam, 2007). Interculturalism, as a strategic policy of intervention, seeks to restore social cohesion, trust, and feelings of belonging (Cantle, 2012), through social equality policies, in addition to policies that try to promote knowledge formation and prejudice reduction.

2. The political hypothesis argues that diversity tends to alter the traditional expression of national identities, threatening traditional values and the system of relations of rights and duties, which ensure a common sense of loyalty and stability between citizens and the basic structures of society. In this case, the technique of interaction seeks to maintain control of any justified change in national traditional values, protecting equilibrium between the loyalty of citizens and the rights of immigrants (see, for instance, Bouchard, 2012).

3. The cultural hypothesis rests on the view that citizens’ and immigrants’ cultural capabilities are not fully developed in a diverse society. Here, I mean not only nationality-based culture, but also artistic culture in keeping with the broad three senses in the seminal distinction made by R. Williams (1976).3 Left alone, diversity tends to close off the cultural opportunities of diverse people. Interculturalism, as a technique of positive interaction, seeks to promote the development of cultural creativity and innovation in diverse societies (see, for instance, Bennett, ed. 2001).

Nonetheless, beyond these two shared premises there are three basic conceptions with quite different dividing lines.
THREE POLICY DRIVERS OF INTERCULTURALISM

If we consider the three basic hypotheses justifying intercultural intervention, we have indeed three kinds of potential interactions. First, there is a horizontal one among all the members of society, understood multidirectionally – that is, among immigrants, among citizens, and among immigrants and citizens (the basis of the social hypothesis). Second, there is a vertical one between immigrants and the basic institutional structure of the society (the basis of the political hypothesis). The third is a deepening of interpersonal development and personal cultural abilities (the basis of the cultural hypothesis). In this section, we argue that each hypothesis develops a theory that informs a different normative strand.

Answering the social hypothesis requires the development of a social theory of diversity, grounded in Allport’s (1954) well-known contact theory (which states, roughly speaking, that contact reduces prejudice and promotes knowledge formation), and based on Cantle’s (2008) view of interculturalism as community cohesion. Supporting positive interaction involves transforming initial conflict zones into areas of positive contact in order to ensure an optimal living situation and social inclusion. Its basic aim is social conflict reduction, as diversity becomes an explanatory factor of social inequality. Moreover, conflict does not only refer to social disturbances; it is a broader notion encompassing racism, poverty and social exclusion (Cantle, 2012 p. 102). The promotion of social participation and the incorporation of immigrants into the main social networks of the city are also main priorities in fostering cohesion.

To react to the political hypothesis we need to develop a political theory of diversity, developed, in my view, by G. Bouchard (2012) and basically centred on managing immigrant/city as the basic structure of society. It seeks to provide appropriate spaces for motivating agreements between national tradition, which accepts unavoidable changes, and the context of diversity through participative policy channels and other means of vertical communication. Its purposes are to manage the potential impact that changes can have on tradition, to regulate the behaviour of nationals, and to minimize impacts on the loyalty of citizens and the rights/duties of immigrants (especially equal opportunities). The idea of equilibrium between national majority and diversity-minorities appears constantly as a guiding thread of this approach.

Lastly, if we want to formulate policy reactions to the cultural hypothesis, we need to frame a cultural theory of diversity, based on promoting the capabilities of people and fostering a principle of fairness, which is to be understood not in terms of property or rights, but as the cultural goods and resources needed to develop creative and innovative capacities.
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What all these views assume is that interculturalism as a policy is a technique of positive interaction that seeks to promote open spaces of interpersonal relations, to generate socialization effects in the short term, and – in the medium and long term – to generate a common public culture with stability, cohesion, and a developing sense of loyalty and belonging (Zapata-Barrero, 2011).

Graphically speaking, we can represent each theory as channelling a logical strand and each has its own fear of what happens when diversity is left alone without intervention. The social theory of diversity shapes a cohesion strand of interculturalism, and takes cohesion (of social inclusion and trust) as its normative policy driver, with social conflict as its basic fear. The political theory of diversity seeks to legitimate a contractual strand, taking stability (of tradition and rights/duties) as its normative policy driver and the loss of national identity as its basic fear. Finally, the cultural theory of diversity is grounded in a constructivist strand of interculturalism. It takes development (the development of capabilities, innovation and creativity) as its normative policy driver and its basic fear is the lack of development (personal and social).

In this debate on the foundation of interculturalism, we then have three angles within the same intercultural triangle, which have this technique of positive interaction as a conceptual core (see Figure 1.1). It is this comprehensive view of interculturalism that I will try to defend in this chapter.

Let us look at each of these angles (a more detailed account can be found in Zapata-Barrero, 2013a).

**Tradition/Stability/Diversity Nexus**

The contractual strand understands interculturalism as a tool for managing the national tradition/dynamics of diversity nexus. It sees intercultural policies as a function for enhancing stability in a diverse society. The basic category of tradition is its main driving policy. By tradition, we mean what Weber (1964 p. 29) conceptualized with the suggestive expression, ‘what has always existed’, ‘what is here forever’. It also requires no rational justification, since it is better transmitted through (national) emotions. It designates a set of established values and beliefs transmitted from generation to generation (Friedrich, 1972 p. 18), which is jeopardized by
immigration-related diversity. The word ‘tradition’ derives from the Latin *tradere* which means to transfer or to deliver. Tradition is a defence of the chain of the self and his or her history. It has, then, a vital function in the political body as the purpose of maintaining social stability. In politics, tradition is also a framework for the unity of a community of citizens, and it is a tool for promoting a sense of loyalty. Tradition thus has an obvious social and political function, which plays an important role in the feedback loop of tradition, ensuring its preservation. It is imperative to consolidate territorial routines and institutions, behaviour patterns and social action logics. Tradition expresses itself through collective routines and socially acceptable behaviour. This variant of the contractual approach is most associated with G. Bouchard (2012).

When this tradition becomes ideology, it can ground the liberal nationalist political discourse, in the sense of seeking to preserve tradition against processes of change due to new dynamics of diversity (Zapata-Barrero, 2009). This does not mean that Bouchard is against any change of traditional identity, but he contends rather that this change cannot suppose a loss of power and authority in managing the dynamics of tradition in the majority/minority nexus. There are, then, two constant concerns in the contractual intercultural view: the survival of the national identity and respect for the rights of minorities. The basic pillar of Bouchard’s contractual view as equilibrium rests on this point. When tradition becomes social action, it defines the minimum unity necessary
for structuring a stable society. In this sense, I think we can rightly say that the contractual view is much more concerned with stability than with cohesion. What this view fears is that leaving diversity alone can be an element of cultural division and instability in society.

Social Inclusion/Cohesion/Diversity Nexus

The cohesion strand understands interculturalism as a tool for managing the social inclusion/dynamics of diversity nexus. It sees intercultural policies as a way to promote cohesion in a diverse society. When speaking of ‘social cohesion’, or as Cantle categorizes it as ‘community cohesion’, the basic idea is to perceive intercultural strategy not as a policy tool to equilibrate the tradition/diversity nexus – as is the case with the contractual strand. The idea, rather, is to interpret intercultural strategy as a technique for promoting interpersonal contact, community building, or – as Cantle (2012 p. 102) also insists – as a policy mechanism for generating trust and mutual understanding, and for breaking down prejudices, stereotypes, and the misconceptions of others. We might say that it is a technique of bridging differences, bonding, and social capital. That is, it promotes relations between people who share certain characteristics (bonds), as well as relations between individuals from different backgrounds (such as promoting interaction between people across different religions, languages, etc.) (Gruescu and Menne, 2010 p. 10). It is a way, then, to avoid the confinement and segregation of people, which as a last resort become explanatory variables of social exclusion and social inequalities. Social cohesion is also the horizon in the sense of encouraging interaction to overcome social and cultural barriers among people, especially in neighbourhoods and cities (Cantle, 2012, p. 103). Cantle also draws a link between programmes of interaction and of belonging that cannot be dismissed, in the sense that to ensure the permanence of cohesion, there is a need to promote a minimal sense of belonging.

The cohesion strand leaves aside power relations among nationalities and minorities. However, it also addresses power relations, particularly in terms of tackling inequalities both in opportunities and in outcomes, in order for the pre-conditions of mutual respect to be established prior to intercultural dialogue such that ‘contact’ is more likely to be effective (Allport, 1954; Hewstone et al., 2007).

Therefore, in contrast to the contractual strand, it promotes better face-to-face relations, step by step, in a proximal context. Cantle explicitly speaks about local identity and belonging campaigns to garner a sense of solidarity. We might say that, whereas feelings of common values were the cement of past periods, Cantle highlights (quoting Kymlicka,
2003a, p.195) that it is now necessary to focus on a common space of interaction and common citizenship. From the perspective of the cohesion view, interculturalism tends to bridge the tension between ‘too diverse’ (Goodhart, 2004) and cohesive.

Both strands coincide, however, as good liberal tradition representatives, in their prioritization of the individual rights of people in contrast to group rights, which both see as the major constraint inherited by the multicultural focus. However, there may be another approach dismissed by both views, directly addressing the cultural hypothesis. This approach need not be considered at odds with the two previous ones, but simply as another angle of the intercultural strategy.

The Innovation/Development/Diversity Nexus

The constructivist view understands interculturalism as a tool for managing the innovation/dynamics of diversity nexus. It sees intercultural policies as an instrument for promoting development in a diverse society. It is basically a pro-active policy, in the sense that it is not a policy thought to react against any particular negative outcome of diversity (as a therapeutic policy), but is instead concentrated on producing an innovative outcome from the interaction. It is, then, creativity-based. This view highlights the fact that, through interaction, something new is potentially generated, which can drive individual and social development. This idea of development is its distinguishing characteristic. Both the former contractual and cohesion strands miss this added value of diversity. Expressing itself in the form of innovation and creativity, this constructivist approach also has a different view of diversity. Diversity is basically considered an asset and an opportunity for promoting individual and social development. From this point of view, interculturalism can then be considered a strategy that promotes a context of mutual development. It follows a bonding/bridging strategy, in the sense that it tries to promote interaction between people with common interests but with different backgrounds. In this sense, it can campaign for the cohesion and sense of belonging of the cohesion strand. But this constructivist strand, in my opinion, takes a step forward, in the sense that it promotes the capabilities of people. This capability approach of diversity obviously has a direct impact on some categories from the other two interpretative frameworks. First of all, it sees persons not only as nationalities (as in the contractual strand), or simply as common human beings (as in the cohesion strand), but as capable agents. Following Faist’s (2009) suggestive analysis of the diversity category, this involves people not only being considered in terms of their rights, but in terms of what they can do and are able to achieve. As such, we take into consideration
individual skills (what an individual knows how to do) and competences (what an individual is capable of doing). In fact, this view deserves a special new section, since, as I will argue, it has the feature of giving answers to a question that has not even been posed by the contractual and cohesion strands, and which seems to me to be common sense. This question is not focused on the normative function of interculturalism – such as why positive interaction matters – but rather it concerns the incentives of people to interact. Namely, how are people motivated to interact?

**HOW ARE PEOPLE MOTIVATED TO INTERACT? WHAT ARE THE BASIC PRECONDITIONS FOR INTERACTION? THE CONSTRUCTIVIST VIEW**

One of the basic distinctive features of the constructivist view is that it provides visibility to an assumption of the contractual and cohesion strands: the question of motivation. That is, it offers answers to the assumed idea that people will be motivated to interact. This assumption cannot be taken for granted. The constructivist view seeks to encourage a link between persons of different backgrounds who have common capabilities (skills and competences), and then sees that both agents can better develop their own capabilities and even bring about a creative outcome because of the interaction. It is this innovative outcome and this creative atmosphere that motivate people to interact. At the foundation, there is a common interest in developing one's own capabilities.

How can we offer incentives and motivate people to interact? Even Cantle, with his *cohesion strand* that centres his focus on the common humanity of people, assumes that persons will interact when they are asked to do so only because they share specific concerns. In my view, at this point Cantle misses the opportunity to theorize on people's impetus to interact, at least minimally. The constructivist view seeks to engender the interests of people to interact by motivating them to meet because they will have the opportunity to develop their capacities. It is then clearly in their best own interest to develop their capabilities first and to see that, potentially, both parties will not only benefit through interactions, but will even create something new. It is here that the category of innovation – which is, in my view, absent in both previous approaches – can play a prominent shaping role.

The argument for considering people as not only agents of rights but as agents of development is also, from the *constructivist strand* I intend to shape, related to a new category of equality. Equality here is not understood in material and instrumental terms (‘if I have two and you have three,
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then we are unequal’), but rather in terms of capabilities. I owe this con-
ception to Sen’s (1992) seminal approach to equality. Here we focus not on
a view of the universal person or of the person as a holder of national iden-
tity; we focus instead on personal capabilities. The definition of capability
is directly linked to the equality of opportunities. This approach is built as
a reaction against the utilitarian perspective that defines equality in terms
of material possessions and applies to primary goods and resources which
people need to perform their particular worldviews.

The capability approach tells us that the important matter is to encour-
age the creation of conditions for people to have real opportunities to
judge the kind of life they would like to have and the type of people they
would like to be. In this sense, enhancing the autonomy of individuals
to choose the life they want in terms of their capabilities can rightly be
considered as a new normative driver of intercultural policy. But what
does ‘capability’ mean? It is defined as anything that a person can do or
be. If a person has the ability to read and cannot perform this action,
then there is a problem of inequality, whereas others with similar skills
can develop this ability and exercise it (that is, they can read). Applied to
everyday life, we might say that to bringing people into contact who want
to develop cooking skills, cultural skills or language learning capacities is
what this constructivist view of interculturalism is about. The interaction
technique can only be successful, in my view, if it seeks to create a context
of motivation to interact. From this constructivist strand, intercultural
policies cannot force people to interact if they do not see sufficient reasons
to do so. What this interaction technique establishes is an institutional
framework, a societal scenario (be it national or urban) and a social space
that motivate people to interact, even if they may not do so ultimately.
Establishing this motivational system is essential because it also prevents
people from creating their own spaces of action, provoking segregation
and separation. For this reason, this motivational technique of interaction
is crucial for allowing people to develop their capabilities and construct
their own ways of life and particular worldviews. In my view, this added
value of interaction is what the other two views fail to address.

From this perspective, interaction is a technique that can help to
develop capabilities through joint actions among people from differ-
ent cultural backgrounds and from different dynamics of diversity. This
includes personal opportunities to develop physical abilities, to nurture
skills related to art, entertainment, or linguistics, to explore cultural or
religious concerns and capabilities, etc. These are basic, yet vital, skills that
are closely related to the way people project their personal life plans in a
diverse society.

This constructivist strand of interculturalism holds innovation as a
basic category, as different to tradition and social cohesion. We take this category in the most literal sense as involving creativity, transformation, change, alteration, modification, renovation, modernization, and even performance and improvement. As different from tradition – to modify the previous Weberian expression – it promotes ‘what never existed’ but can be generated through interaction processes. In contrast to cohesion, it tries to motivate people to interact because they see that the relationship will benefit them directly and can help them develop some of their capabilities. That is what the different dynamics of diversity produce through interaction: something new for all agents. Moreover, like any new component in society, it transforms the context for everyone involved; it accommodates diversity, creates new spaces for action, and alters the existing logic of action. What matters regarding innovation is therefore, primarily, the transformative effect it produces, which is absent in both the contractual and cohesion strands.

I would even go so far as to state that diversity has a subversive component here, in any context where it occurs, because it challenges existing social conventions. It necessitates a structural change to modify behavioural patterns, to transform public space, and to change institutional routines to be transformed back into tradition.

This raises issues such as whether to give each culture continuity and reproduction within its own public social space, or whether we must promote interaction among them as the basis of creativity and innovation, which evolve through all cultural types, and which are continually developed and redefined. It is assumed, therefore, that all expressions of diversity have something to learn (or to contribute, depending on where we build the argument) from other expressions of diversity. Diversity expresses its own specific social meaning only through every day practices of social interaction.5

Although, as a result, it promotes social inclusion and prevents cultural and socioeconomic segregation, following the cohesion lines of Cantle, it is a mistake to concentrate only on this goal, not because it is not important, but because it is not enough to motivate people to interact. The ultimate goal is not social inclusion but rather to promote creativity and innovation, along with personal and collective development. However, as I have argued, the constructivist view is just a third angle of intercultural policies, since it insists on different concerns regarding diversity dynamics. What is most important is that these views are only complementary angles that can be used to categorize existing local practices dealing with diversity management. Indeed, it is this comprehensive view that I will defend as the final step in my argumentation.
INTERCULTURALISM: A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

The comprehensive conception is the main basis for the foundations of intercultural policies; this conception holds that interculturalism is a way to manage the contractual, cohesion and constructivist strands. To understand this comprehensive view appropriately, we must keep in mind that interculturalism should be performance oriented. I propose widening the focus to see all three views at the same time as interconnected. Indeed, my argument is that intercultural policy should not rely on the contractual, cohesion or constructivist view alone, but on the three practices altogether, applied at different moments in the city according to different purposes and needs.

This interplay between tradition, cohesion and innovation is the framework within which we should ground intercultural policies. The three strands become a new paradigm. They bring together policies, behaviours, cultural practices, institutional routines and management programmes that can help create bridges between ‘what has always existed’, ‘what generates social conflicts’ (in broader terms), and ‘what it is now’. It ultimately involves applying the equilibrium logic so rightly defended by Bouchard, and the anti-exclusion logic orienting Cantle’s cohesion strand, but with the added value of innovation, creativity and human and social development. Without this added value, interculturalism could become, in the last resort, just a phase in the historical trajectory of diversity in society, but it will not reach the level of becoming a new historical paradigm for our democratic societies. The real challenge of interculturalism is not in deciding which of these three views is right or wrong, but in balancing them into a comprehensive interpretive framework – one which considers that the technique of interaction, presupposed by intercultural policy strategy, must create a context where tradition, social inclusion and innovation drive local governments’ intercultural policies. The challenge now is that our policy managers, acting chiefly at the local level, should be able to take on a comprehensive view and to achieve a balance between the three driving forces in a context of global implementation.

NOTES

2. See, among others, Blommaert and Verschueren (1998), Zachary (2003), Sze and Powell
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3. R. Williams (1976) rightly distinguishes three concepts of ‘culture’: (i) culture as personal development: the independent and abstract noun which describes a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development; (ii) culture as a way of life: the independent noun, whether used generally or specifically, which indicates a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group, or of humanity in general, (iii) culture as artistic activity: the independent and abstract noun which describes the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity.
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