Rethinking Liberal Multiculturalism: Foundations, Practices and Methodologies

François Boucher, Sophie Guérard de Latour et Esma Baycan-Herzog

(In Press *in Ethnicities*)

Abstract:

The article introduces a special issue on "Rethinking Liberal Multiculturalism: Foundations, Practices and Methodologies." The contributions presented in this special issue were discussed during the conference « Multicultural Citizenship 25 Years Later », held in Paris in November 2021. Their aim is to take stock of the legacy of Kymlicka's contribution and to highlight new developments in theories of liberal multiculturalism and minority rights. The contributions do not purport to challenge the legitimacy of theories of multiculturalism and minority rights, they rather aim at deepening our understanding of the foundations of liberal multiculturalism and of its practical implementation, sensitive to social scientific dynamics of diverse societies. Without abandoning the general idea that cultural minorities should be granted special minority rights, the essays presented raise new questions about three dimensions central to liberal multiculturalism: its normative foundations, its practical categories of minorities or groups, and its fact-sensitive methodology. Taken together they shed light on the renewed variety of theories of liberal multiculturalism highlighting their complexity and internal disagreements. To introduce these articles, the article first draws a brief historical overview of the debates on multiculturalism since the 1990s (section 1). It then highlights the distinctive aspects of Kymlicka's contribution (section 2) and identifies recent research trends (section 3). Doing so, it explains how the articles gathered here both expand on those distinctive aspects and explore those new research avenues. The section 4 summarizes the contributions.

Keywords: Will Kymlicka, multiculturalism, ethics of immigration, cultural diversity, citizenship, political theory methodology, nationalism.

Introduction

During the second half of the XXth century, many Western states began questioning false assumptions about their homogenous character and moving away from assimilationist nation-building practices. They recognized their own internal cultural and ethnic diversity, and adopted policies designed to respect their citizens' sense of attachment to minority cultures. In the 1990s, political philosophers and political theorists took stock of this transformation, which Will Kymlicka characterized as a 'revolution around the world in the relations between states and ethnocultural minorities' (2007a: 3). They elaborated theories explaining and justifying new models of multicultural citizenship.[i] In this context, Kymlicka published his pioneer work, *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, more than 25 years ago. The book still constitutes a key reference point in debates about the accommodation of cultural diversity in contemporary democratic societies.

Two decades and a half after the publication of Kymlicka's pioneer work, after an important migration crisis in Europe, the rise of far-right populism and well over a decade of alleged backlash against multiculturalism, what is the legacy and future of liberal multiculturalism? The articles presented in this special issue were discussed during the conference *Multicultural Citizenship 25 Years Later*, held in Paris in November 2021. Their aim is to assess the legacy of Kymlicka's contribution and to highlight new developments in theories of multiculturalism and minority rights. The contributions do not purport to challenge the legitimacy of liberal theories of multiculturalism and minority rights. Rather, they aim at deepening our understanding of the foundations of multiculturalism and of its practical implementation, sensitive to social scientific dynamics of diverse societies. Even though the volume focuses on 'liberal' multiculturalism, we do not mean to deny the importance of other strains of multicultural theorizing. Without abandoning the general idea that cultural minorities should be granted special minority rights, the essays presented here raise new questions about three dimensions central to liberal multiculturalism: its normative foundations, its practical categories of minorities or groups, and its fact-sensitive methodology. Taken together they shed light on the renewed variety of liberal theories of multiculturalism highlighting their complexity and internal disagreements.

To introduce these articles and situate them in the evolution of theories of multiculturalism, the first section draws a brief historical overview of the debates since the 1990s in order to position Kymlicka's views and arguments on a broader map of the field. The second section then highlights three distinctive aspects of Kymlicka's contribution that the articles of this issue further develop. The third section broadens the discussion on the future of liberal multiculturalism by identifying recent research trends. The last section presents the articles gathered here.

1. Multiculturalism and its Discontents: A Historical Overview:

From their very inception in the 1990s, theories of multiculturalism addressed ethnocultural pluralism on three levels. They understood multiculturalism as *a societal fact*, as *a set of public policies* designed to deal with the fact of ethnocultural diversity, and as *normative political theory* justifying the adoption of multicultural policies in societies marked by the fact of multiculturality (Guérard de Latour 2009, 1-3). As a fact, multiculturalism describes the demographic composition of a society and indicates that members have different ethnic origins or different cultural traits or practices (in terms of language, customs, sense of history, sense of

identification with a particular community). As observed at the scale of a society, the phenomenon of multiculturalism can have different sources. Early theories of multiculturalism focused on two of them. First, a society can contain different groups conceiving of themselves as distinct nations or peoples, that is, as cultural groups that can legitimately claim to form complete societies entitled to self-government, such is the case of minority nations and indigenous peoples. Second, the demographic fact of multiculturalism can also result from international migration so that host societies include individuals who were born and socialized in different countries with different cultures. Thus, whereas Charles Taylor calls the former kind of diversity 'deep-diversity' and the latter 'first order diversity' (Taylor 1991), Kymlicka distinguishes 'plurinational diversity', the fact that societies contain national minorities, from 'polyethnic diversity' resulting from immigration (1995, 2001, 2007a).

Theories of multiculturalism do not merely take into account the societal fact of ethnocultural pluralism, they also develop models of citizenship and public policies geared at meeting the specific needs of different ethnocultural groups. Those models and policies share a few characteristics. They first reject the requirements of cultural assimilation to the majority, enabling ethnocultural minorities to promote and maintain various aspects of their identities and practices in the public realm. Second, they move away from colour-blind or difference-blind policies that attempt to treat all as equals by ignoring their specific ethnic and cultural identities. Multicultural policies are thus 'differentiated' in the sense that they target specific groups and grant group-specific rights, rights and policies benefiting the members of certain groups *qua* members of those groups (Kymlicka 1995, 2007a; Modood 2007; Shorten 2022). Multicultural policies for immigrant groups mobilize a repertoire of measures including, for example, the official and symbolic recognition of cultural diversity, the adoption of a multicultural school curriculum, the representation of ethnocultural minorities in the media, exemptions from clothing codes or diet, the recognition of dual citizenship, the funding of organizations and events associated with ethnocultural minorities, the funding of mother tongue education for the children of immigrants, as well as affirmative action policies (Banting and Kymlicka 2013). On the other hand, multicultural policies aiming at securing the rights of indigenous peoples and substate national groups take the form of language rights, a federal division of powers or devolution enabling minorities to enjoy some level of territorial autonomy, as well as the recognition of the lands and legal codes of indigenous peoples (Kymlicka 2007a). For many theorists, the politics of multiculturalism can also refer to the 'politics of difference', or the 'politics of identity'. In this latter case, it then refers to forms of citizens' mobilization organized around cultural identities and through which cultural minorities challenge the hegemony of dominant cultural groups. These '*deliberative multiculturalists*' call for forms of public deliberation and democratic engagement that are more inclusive and recognize the distinctive voices of ethnocultural minorities (see Young 1990, Tully 1995, Benhabib 2002).

Finally, theorists of multiculturalism have also developed a range of normative arguments and conceptual frameworks that purport to explain why societies marked by the societal fact of multiculturalism should embrace multicultural policies. They thus reject assimilationist policies on the ground that cultural belonging is morally salient. They also base their rejection of difference-blind approaches to citizenship on the claim that the mainstream liberal hands-off approach to neutrality is impossible and\or undesirable.

Some theories of multiculturalism assert that the value of cultural membership and the need for group-specific rights and policies follow from the core principles of liberalism. On that regard, Kymlicka is one of the founding fathers of liberal multiculturalism. Drawing on theories of liberal nationalism, he claims that cultural membership is relevant because the core values of liberalism, such as individual autonomy, equality of opportunity and deliberative

democracy, are all best achieved within national cultures (2001). This means, first, that national minorities are entitled to maintain and develop their own national cultures and, second, that since national majorities are also entitled to promote their own culture, immigrants who join them should benefit from special rights aiming at mitigating the burden imposed onto them through the ethnocultural partiality of the state. This differentiated approach to minority rights is one of Kymlicka's key contributions to these debates (1995; 2001; 2007a). Similarly, Taylor claims that the politics of difference is a logical extension of the politics of universal equal dignity and that liberalism can be interpreted in a way that is hospitable to diversity by giving up the requirement of difference blindness (1992). More recently, other liberal political philosophers have revisited liberal egalitarian arguments for minority rights by showing how a 'ressourcist' liberal theory of justice requires the state to grant group-specific rights to minorities on the ground that such differentiated treatment is demanded by a fair allocation of public recognition (Patten 2014).

Although all forms of multiculturalism criticize cultural imperialism and aggressive majoritarian nation-building, some give more importance to the critique of cultural imperialism than liberal accounts of multiculturalism do. For them, imposing liberal values is in itself a form of cultural imperialism. Thus, different strands of multicultural theory, such as the 'Bristol School of Multiculturalism' (Brahm-Levey 2019), starts from a critique of the pretensions to universality of liberalism. According to Bhikhu Parekh, to give another example, the universal values that should underpin democracies should not come from a liberal theory of justice. They should rather result from an intercultural dialogue (2000). In a similar vein, James Tully roots his theory in a critique of modern (liberal) constitutionalism, which tends to rely on a centralized authority responsible for enforcing a rationally designed enlightened constitution. By contrast, he proposes rediscovering ancient forms of constitutionalism, which are based on an open dialogue between equal groups who have developed their own cultural understandings of legal and political forms (1995). These theories share with liberal multiculturalism the rejection of assimilationism, the recognition of the moral salience of cultural membership and an openness to seeking equality through differentiated treatment. However, they favor open-ended and agonistic processes of democratic deliberation over the granting of liberal group-specific rights, which they tend to view as rigid, top-down and undemocratic.

Most of those theories have emerged in the 1990s and early 2000s, in the era of liberal democratic triumphalism that followed the fall of the Soviet Union. At that time, liberal optimism and the promise of tolerance and openness were such that one commentator said that 'we are all multiculturalists now' (Glazer 2003). However, in the following decade several political theorists have developed a wide range of criticisms directed at the three levels of theories of multiculturalism.

First, critiques targeted the conceptual and descriptive elements of multicultural theories. They claimed that multiculturalists often misrepresent the phenomenon of ethnocultural diversity in various ways. One variant argues that by requiring the public recognition of cultural identities, multiculturalism relies on an essentialist view of cultures representing those as fixed, atomised and hermetic wholes deprived of internal tensions and contradictions, whereas cultures, in reality, are porous and continually changing as a result of mutual influence and internal contestation (see for instance Benhabib 2002; Appiah 2005; Phillips 2007).[ii] Another variant focuses on the way multiculturalism understands the fact of diversity. It claims that the categories of minority groups shaping theories of multiculturalism tend to reflect the shape of diversity in a specific country, namely Canada. While some question the emphasis on culture as the most salient aspect of diversity, as opposed to race (Hooker 2009), or religion (Maclure 2015), others question the possibility of exporting the categories

of polyethnic and national groups, which are built from the experience of one particular society, to other political contexts and geographical areas. They cast doubts on the suitability of special rights for polyethnic ethnic groups resulting from immigration given the specific needs of racialized minorities, such as Afro-Americans (Appiah 2005), or religious minorities, such as Muslims in Europe (Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2007). Others doubt that the category of territorially self-governing minority nations suits the needs and situations of national minorities in Eastern-Europe (Kymlicka and Opalski, 2002), of ethnic groups in Africa (Fessha 2012), and of indigenous peoples in Asia (Kingsburry 1992) and Latin America (Van Coot 2005). Theorists of multiculturalism have explored those criticisms, acknowledging the limits of their models and proposing new forms of multicultural policies. For instance, Tariq Modood has explored the idea of multiculturalism in order to address the specific situation of religious minorities in Western European countries (2005; 2019). Kymlicka has been particularly active in exploring the applicability of liberal multiculturalism in non-Western contexts. He published a book (2007a) and co-edited several volumes critically scrutinizing the potential for the international diffusion of legal norms of multicultural citizenship to areas such as Eastern Europe (Kymlicka and Opalski 2002), Africa (Berman, Eyoh and Kymlicka 2004), Asia (Kymlicka and He 2005), and the Middle-East (Pföstl and Kymlicka 2015).

Second, critics have also pointed to the allegedly perverse effects of multicultural policies and forms of citizenship. The most common and well-know critique highlighting the undesirable consequences of multiculturalism claims that it leads to social fragmentation, which undermines solidarity and stability. The objection is that once cultural groups are officially recognized, the bases of a common national identity are weakened. Different groups then live 'parallel lives' and form 'ghettos' (Schnapper 1998; Barry 2001; Bissondath 2002). To avoid these pitfalls, critics have proposed alternative ways of dealing with ethnocultural diversity. While some called for a shift towards policies of civic integration emphasizing the duties of immigrants to adapt to their host society (Joopke 2007), others argued for the adoption of a model of interculturalism emphasizing the promotion of daily cross-cultural interactions at the local level (Cantle 2005; Meer and Modood 2016a; Zapata-Barrero 2017). Proponents of multiculturalism tended to view the impact of multicultural policy on social cohesion as an empirical question (Baycan-Herzog 2021; Holtug 2021). They argued that many empirical studies rather show that multicultural policies have a positive impact on minorities' civic engagement (Bloemrad 2006), on social capital (Kesler and Bloemraad 2010) and on solidarity (Banting and Kymlicka 2006; Kymlicka 2015). Commentators have also pointed to the potentially adverse consequences of granting groups more power over their members by stressing the risks of oppression of 'minorities within minorities' (Eisenberg and Spinner-Halev 2004), whether those are individual dissenters, smaller cultural minorities within a larger group, or vulnerable persons such as children. Feminists have been especially preoccupied that granting special minority rights could reinforce patriarchal norms and undermine the equal standing of women (Okin 1999). Nonetheless, 'feminist multiculturalists' have built models of multiculturalism that purport to provide strong protection for women by separating the identity aspects of cultural accommodation from their distributive aspects (Shachar 2001; 2008) or by empowering women to play a significant role in the deliberative processes leading to an internal reshaping of gender norms of both cultural minorities' and majorities' (Deveaux 2006; Song 2007).

Third, focusing on normative ideals, critiques of multiculturalism claimed that multicultural theories misinterpret certain fundamental principles of justice, such as neutrality and equality. For instance, critics argued that the best way to achieve neutrality is by means of a hand-off or color-blind approach instead of the 'even-ended' approach favored by multiculturalism. They asserted that when the state is in fact not neutral and favors the culture

of the majority, it should withdraw such privileges rather than extending its active support to minority cultures (Barry 2001; Balint 2017). Another normative critique claimed that multicultural accommodation is detrimental to the liberal ideal of equality. When people's cultural commitments conflict with otherwise justified general laws, those people should bear the costs of adjusting their way of life. In other words, states should not subsidize their expensive life choices, and the neutrality of the state does not require mitigating the uneven impacts of just laws on people (Barry 2001). Finally, other normative critiques denounced multiculturalism for its alleged commitment to a preservationist ethics purporting to ensure the survival of cultures independently of the wishes of individuals (Scheffler 2007). Recently, multiculturalist accounts responded to these critiques by showing how neutrality and fairness require allocating recognition equally. This means that although cultures themselves should not be protected from change, multicultural states should grant each group its pro-rated share of recognition so as to provide its members with the opportunity to shape their own culture (Patten 2014).

2. Kymlicka's Liberal Multiculturalism: Three Distinctive Features

As suggested in the previous section, liberal multiculturalism found its full expression in Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship*. In this groundbreaking publication, Kymlicka offered a convincing alternative to the assimilationnist view of political integration by combining communitarian and liberal influences. He agreed with communitarians like Taylor that cultural membership was morally indispensable to give meaning and value to individuals' life, but he explored the normative consequences of such a view in the Rawlsian perspective of justice as fairness. He accordingly argued that cultural membership was a social primary good that should be fairly distributed among citizens, which entails granting cultural rights to ethnocultural minorities in order to protect them against social and political assimmilationnist pressures. Articulated as such, the defense of cultural rights grounded multicultural recognition in liberal and democratic principles. For national minorities and indigenous peoples, those ethnocultural groups who still possess an institutionalized and viable collective form of life (what Kymlicka names 'a societal culture '), it would be unfair to require of them to renounce the cultural context which makes their individual freedom meaningful. They should thus enjoy 'self-government rights' enabling them to promote their societal culture. By contrast, ethnocultural groups resulting from recent immigration, should benefit from 'polyethnic rights' enabling them to fully participate in the economic, political and social life of the host society without having to give up all aspects of their cultural identity.

In general, Kymlicka has answered the types of critiques of multiculturalism mentioned in the previous section by emphasizing three distinctive aspects of his theory and by developing them further. First, he opposed the view that multiculturalism could reinforce oppression and undermine liberal values by highlighting that his theory was a liberal theory in the sense that it is both based on and limited by liberal values such as individual freedom and equality (2007a). Second, he privileged a political form based on special rights designed to protect certain minorities from the assimilationist pressures of nation-building policies that specifically target them (2001; 2007a), thereby challenging the claims that multiculturalism was an ill-guided policy founded on an essentialist view of culture and designed to preserve the continuity and authenticity of cultures. Finally, faced with empirical objections claiming that multiculturalism undermines social cohesion and social solidarity, he developed an interdisciplinary research agenda aiming at empirically assessing the impact of multiculturalism on solidarity (Banting and Kymlicka 2006; Kymlicka 2010; 2015).

The essays presented here raise questions about those three distinctive dimensions

central to Kymlicka's project: its normative foundations, its practical categories of group-specific rights, and its fact-sensitive methodology. As they each propose to depart from some aspect central to Kymlicka's theory, taken together they shed light on the great variety of liberal theories of multiculturalism and reveal their complexity and internal disagreements. In that regard, they are also pointing towards new trends of research.

First, as highlighted above, Kymlicka's theory is resolutely liberal. It formulates a principled justification of minority rights grounded in the normative logics of modern liberal citizenship. It asserts that multiculturalism is a matter of justice: it is not merely compatible with, but also required by, the fundamental liberal values of freedom and equality. This aspect of Kymlicka's work has always attracted criticism by scholars less enthusiastic about the liberalism of autonomy such as pluralist liberals (Kukathas 1995), or critics of cultural imperialism (Tully1995; Parekh 2000). Recent discussions focused on whether alternatives to Kymlicka's theory were still liberal variants of multiculturalism or whether they were non-liberal alternatives (Brahm-Levey 2019). The essays in this collection expand this debate on the variety of normative foundations of liberal multiculturalism by identifying and further articulating what equality and liberty entail without hesitating to discuss whether there might be alternative foundational principles irreducible to liberal autonomy or equality of opportunity. For example, De Schutter argues that dignity must complement the principle of liberal autonomy. Lambrecht, in turn, explores the role of the principle of reparation of historical wrongs in the justification of multicultural policies.

Second, Kymlicka did not merely argue for the validity of an abstract ideal of cultural recognition. He took great care of specifying the institutional shape of his preferred regime of liberal minority rights. In this regime, different groups have different group-differentiated rights because of their distinctive needs, historical relationship to the state and specific vulnerabilities to assimilationist pressures imposed by cultural majorities (2001). This is why he claims that his theory follows 'three silos' of minority rights, each corresponding to a specific pattern of diversity (polyethnic groups, national minorities and indigenous peoples) (2007b). Many critics have questioned Kymlicka's sharp dichotomy between groups resulting from immigration and groups based on peoplehood and some essays in this special issue join them (see Lambrecht and Gianni). In addition, other contributions deepen our understanding of the institutional implementation of multiculturalist ideals and principles in two different ways. First, they expand the typology of minority groups deserving to be protected via specific group-differentiated rights (see Guérard de Latour's discussion of the Roma minority as a 'transnational minority'). Second, they emphasize the need to go beyond theories of group-specific rights in order to think about the political conditions that enable the active forms of citizenship required under conditions of ethnocultural diversity (see Gianni's analysis of the 'performative dimension of citizenship')

Third, Kymlicka's theory is characterized by its high degree of sensitivity to empirical considerations. His recent work took an interdisciplinary methodological turn and incorporated contributions from the social sciences to assess the extent to which multicultural policies (a) impact the welfare state (Banting and Kymlicka 2006, 2017); (b) have proliferated in the last decades despite the alleged 'retreat of multiculturalism' (Joppke 2004; Banting and Kymlicka 2013); and (c) have been successful at building more cohesive societies (Kymlicka 2010). This engagement with the social sciences led Kymlicka to develop an increasingly more empirically grounded account of inclusive national identities and to articulate the specific role of multicultural policies in nurturing such identities (Harrell *et al.* 2021). Following these footsteps, some essays collected here engage into empirically grounded political theory. They explore the legitimate ways in which multicultural policies help rethinking and reforming the

boundaries of national membership (see Triandafillydou's analysis on plural and neo-tribal forms of nationalism in pandemic times; and Savidan's analysis on the crisis of social solidarity).

3. Theories of Multiculturalism: New Research Avenues

While they deepen our understanding of the three dimensions of Kymlicka's project mentioned above, the essays of the special issue also explore three recent trends in the scientific literature on multiculturalism. First, some highlight the importance for liberal multiculturalism of postcolonial contexts and of arguments based on the critique of cultural imperialism. Second, many essays here draw our attention on new ways of conceiving inclusive national identities that both reject liberal ideas of purely civic or postnational identities as well as conservative views on the necessity of exclusionist and thick national identities. Third, some contributions try to fill a gap between liberal theories of multiculturalism and the ethics and politics of migration.

1. Liberal Multiculturalism and Post-/De-Colonial Theory

The principled defence of cultural rights now has to face the vibrant development of postcolonial and decolonial studies. These approaches to multiculturalism tend to question the liberal starting assumption about the nation-state being the legitimate unit of normative political theory, as the neutral arbiter that should fairly distribute social primary goods to its citizens. One of their main claims is that many demands made by cultural minorities are not demands to be fairly treated by a truly benevolent liberal state, but are rather claims to legitimate authority, to govern themselves according to their own normativities (Tully 1995; Eisenberg forthcoming). Many highlight, for instance, that indigenous do not demand liberal cultural rights within settler states, they want to be freed from colonial relations with those settler states and from the Western ideological frameworks (Turner 2006). As Glenn Coulthard argues, drawing on the works of Fanon, even when they are accommodating and prone to recognize cultural differences, those settler states end-up imposing ideological colonial frameworks and reproducing patterns of domination (Coulthard 2014). Against the anhistorical view of the liberal state, critics from postcolonial studies recall that Western democracies have once been powerful empires which colonial crimes, predatory economy and racialized imaginaries still weight on their citizens' social and political relations with non-Western migrant minorities (Sharma 2020; Bhambra 2017). This critical perspective raises a two-fold challenge to the liberal foundations of multicultural citizenship. First, it questions the legitimacy of the normative framework within which liberal egalitarianism justifies cultural rights. These critics contest the Rawlsian paradigm of distributive justice's ability to take seriously the harm of historical injustices and their enduring effects on minorities. Some of them plead instead for a new normative framework based on corrective and reparative justice (Lu 2017, Rudas forthcoming, see also Lambrecht's contribution to this special issue). Second, critical approaches inspired by postcolonial studies question the ability of liberal political theory to make sense of the structural injustices faced by indigenous peoples and postcolonial migrants. Some draw on anti-racists theorists denouncing the essentializing and domesticating effects of a culturalist justification of rights, they call for a better critical understanding of the legacy of colonial Empires on interethnic relations (Amer Meziane 2022). Others reject Western colonial ways of thinking that are structurally embedded in dominant liberal theories of justice and democracy in order to include indigenous political theories and highlight how those carry greater emancipatory potential (Allard-Tremblay 2022).

8

2. Towards an Inclusive Nationalism

Debates have also focused on the issues of cultural belonging and of the importance of national cultures, thus questioning the relation between liberal multiculturalism and nationalism. As noted earlier, multiculturalism has been criticized for undermining social cohesion and leading to the fragmentation of society. Yet, since their original formulation, theories of multiculturalism have been concerned with social cohesion and national identity. Both Taylor (1998) and Kymlicka (2001) reject primordialist theories of the nation and embrace the modernist view developed, for instance, by Gellner (1983) an Anderson (1993). They do not view nations as intrinsically ethnic and exclusive in a morally problematic way, but rather as the result of the emergence of mass modern democracies in the last few centuries. From a normative point of view, multiculturalists tend to embrace the liberal nationalist view (Tamir 1995, Miller 1995) according to which states have legitimate reasons to promote a common national identity and culture since such a shared identity and culture is a precondition of exercising autonomy, facilitates democratic deliberation and nurtures social solidarity (see for instance, Kymlicka 2001).[iii]

While liberal theories of multiculturalism have always acknowledged this sympathy towards a shared national identity, the recent surge of xenophobic anti-immigrant far-right nationalism across the world forces multiculturalists to clarify their relation to nationalism. Some commentators go as far as claiming that multiculturalism entails granting nations majority rights that authorize them to control immigration for the sake of protecting the culture of the majority (Orgad 2015).[iv] Taking a different road, proponents of multiculturalism have instead, in the last decade, attempted to explain how national identities could be inclusive and developed, to this end, notions such as 'plural nationalism' (Triandafyllidou 2013, 2020), 'multicultural nationalism' (Modood 2019) and the 'ethics of shared membership' (Banting *et al.* 2019). By doing so, they explained how multiculturalism could be inclusive not by rejecting the legitimacy of nations or by emptying the content of national identity until only a civic core remains. Rather, they sought ways to foster inclusivity by pluralizing the content of national identities and recognizing the contributions of various ethnocultural components of the nations (see Triandafyllidou's and Savidan's articles)

The discussions on the relation between multiculturalism and nationalism also call for a deeper understanding of the theoretical, conceptual and normative connections between liberal multiculturalism and neo-republicanism (Lovett 2010, Bachvarova 2014). Indeed, Kymlicka's recent shift towards inclusive identities and a robust ethics of membership acknowledges the crucial value he grants to national cultures for citizens (Kymlicka forthcoming), putting forward the constitutive relation between individual rights and national solidarity. With their holistic underpinnings, these new developments are very close to the republican tradition where individual freedom is understood as a collective freedom. Those similarities invite political theorists and philosophers to clarify the position of multicultural citizenship regarding the liberal and neo-republican approaches (Pettit 1997, Maynor 2003). Following Kymlicka's suggestion that liberal egalitarianism and civic republicanism should be allies instead of enemies (Kymlicka 2001), it would be worthwhile to explore the potential of the neo-republican normative approach to justify the ideal of a multicultural sense of national belonging in more robust terms than liberal egalitarianism (Laborde 2008, Guérard de Latour 2013)

Finally, one emerging methodological debate concerns the relation between liberal multiculturalism and the ethics of migration. Many contemporary philosophers and political theorists so far produced separate works on liberal multiculturalism and migration (see for instance Carens 2000, 2013; Shachar 2001, 2009; Song 2009, 2018). Yet one can wonder whether these theories should remain separate or be discussed together. Multiculturalists notice the two-fold causal and conceptual link between multicultural theory and ethics of migration. First, immigration is one source of diversity in multicultural societies, in the demographic sense. Second, to the extent that the chosen traits qualifying a society as 'multicultural' in the demographic sense are those linked to immigration, there is also a conceptual link between these debates (Lægaard 2017: 246; Meer and Modood 2016b). These connections might suggest that, methodologically it would be more fruitful to reconnect these debates and discuss them together. On this point, there is an emerging debate regarding whether or not these two literatures should remain 'separate' or be discussed 'together'.

Separatists think that safeguarding equality of multicultural citizenship requires isolating it from the exclusive influences that are methodologically embedded in ethics of immigration debate (Lægaard 2007; 2017; Modood 2019: 242). To explain, one should focus on the methodological sources of the analytical tension between the logics of multicultural citizenship and the ethics of migration. These debates have different methodological points of departure. While multiculturalism takes membership for granted, the ethics of immigration is all about investigating the state's practices of excluding outsiders. Traditionally, multicultural theories start with the presupposition that ethnic minorities (including those with a migration background) are already 'members' of the society, hence their presence in the state's territory or their entitlement to various citizenship rights and duties of membership should not be questioned (for an interesting exception to this, see the essays in Triandafyllidou 2017). The challenge for such theories is to articulate ways of enhancing an inclusive and egalitarian citizenship alongside cultural differences, by taking these latter into account explicitly. By contrast, the ethics of migration starts with a prior set of membership-related questions such as: Who should be admitted to the territory? Who should eventually be granted citizenship? Under what conditions? Several contributions to debates on immigration reject the view that states have obligations to admit newcomers and to offer pathways to citizenship to those they admit. While many scholars provide good reasons for immigrants' inclusion to enhance equality of the domestic sphere, others justify differential rights or territorial exclusion. Therefore, separatists defend that it is counterproductive for multiculturalism to view the fundamental question of membership as an open one. If multiculturalism mainly aims at enhancing meaningful belonging beyond the legal boundaries of universal and undifferentiated citizenship, then considering challenges to the very idea of citizenship is at best a *detour* from this aim.

Togetherness approaches, in turn, defend that fulfilling the normative requirements of the egalitarian ethos that multicultural theory promotes cannot be achieved without paying attention to immigrants in theorizing. They agree that there is a conceptual link between multiculturalism and migration. Togetherness approaches defend that this connection should be addressed explicitly. They claim that the separatist paradigmatic decision to leave out the membership question is misleading, because state institutions and legal rules do not settle the issues of citizenship and borders once and for all (Baycan-Herzog 2021; 2022). In this context, presupposing otherwise would lead to oddly conclude, for example, that some very salient cases, such as the 'withdrawal of citizenship for ethnic minorities' (Gibney, 2020), are beyond the reach of multicultural theory. In addition, togetherness approaches argue that it is morally arbitrary to exclude an essential dimension of citizenship, namely the deservingness to become

a member (Teo 2021). In other words, if multicultural theory wants to remain relevant in a political context in which immigrants and ethnic minorities suffer from the same xenophobic tendencies, then togetherness approaches defend that multiculturalism should think about the cultural rights of migrant persons that are not yet citizens.

4. The Contributions of this Issue

The first two articles question the normative foundations of liberal multiculturalism, either to propose an alternative account or to refine them. **Helder de Schutter** argues that dignity provides an alternative moral foundation for cultural rights that is irreducible to autonomy. He contrasts the autonomy and the dignity case for multiculturalism in terms of (1) their intellectual history; (2) their contemporary justificatory potential; and (3) the kinds of rights and policies they end up justifying. He starts by arguing that the autonomy grounding stands in the Herderian-romantic tradition, whereas the dignity case is older and hearkens back to the humanist claim for vernacular development. Then, he shows that, while autonomy and dignity can independently justify group-differentiated rights, a theory that includes both justificatory grounds is stronger because they can strengthen each other: firstly, dignitarian multiculturalism can help the autonomy-based theory in withstanding the assimilationist claim that *any* cultural context – and not only people's *own* culture – may foster autonomy; while, secondly, the autonomy case strengthens the dignity case by providing absolute ammunition to ward off the objection that dignity claims are normatively weak because they rely on subjective feelings.

Felix Lambrecht refines the normative foundations of liberal multiculturalism by rethinking Kymlicka's dichotomy between national minorities and ethnic minorities within a theory of reparative multiculturalism. Lambrecht recalls how the 'national/ethnic dichotomy' combines a distributive logic that allocates cultural rights to achieve equal individual autonomy with empirical considerations about the ways minorities were incorporated into the state, which entail different claims. He turns to the main objections addressed to this dichotomy, which is blamed for not capturing adequately differences between kinds of minority groups and their respective entitlements. He then defends the dichotomy by offering a supplementary principle to liberal egalitarian multiculturalism: the reparative multicultural principle. This principle allocates cultural rights as part of reparative entitlements for historical and ongoing injustices committed against minority groups. Supplementing multiculturalism in this way captures more accurately the historical mode of incorporation that inspires the dichotomy and can help resolve some of the objections to multiculturalism.

The two following articles shift from normative foundations to practices by dealing with the question of how liberal multiculturalism is and should be implemented in laws, institutions and political actions. **Matteo Gianni** proposes to enrich the liberal account of multicultural citizenship by granting more importance to the process of civic participation than Kymlicka does. He regrets that Kymlicka's principled approach has loaded his justification with metaphysical assumptions, such as the conditional relation between societal culture and individual autonomy, that produce disadvantaging and exclusionary effects on ethnic minorities. He argues, moreover, that such a justificatory focus has diverted attention from the reality and value of civic practices. Drawing on a conception of performative citizenship, Gianni pleads for a re-politicization of citizenship that specifies the political modalities supporting multicultural accommodations, beyond their legal modalities. He complements the multiculturalist project with a political dimension, capable of providing individuals the resources and spaces to be politically empowered and to have equal standing.

Sophie Guérard de Latour investigates the practical dimension of liberal multiculturalism through the case study of the Roma minority protection in Europe. This case study gives the opportunity to test Kymlicka's targeted approach to multiculturalism, according to which cultural rights should be suited to the specific needs of the type of ethnocultural minority they target, and the following idea that Roma should be protected as a 'transnational' type of minority. Guérard de Latour confronts this position with the results of an empirical study, designed to identify how the Roma minority is represented in the institutional discourse of the Council of Europe, one of the main agents in charge of Roma issues. She thus analyses the ambiguities of the concept of 'transnational minority', as well as the heterogeneity of discourses aimed at justifying the ethnic targeting in this case. She concludes that the model of liberal multiculturalism is not the best suited to make sense of the institutional practices and categorizations regarding Roma groups. Instead, she claims that Iris M. Young's "politics of the difference" offers an alternative that better grasps their specific situation and claims.

The last two articles draw more explicitly on social sciences and attempt to bridge the gap between theories of multiculturalism and the ethics of immigration as they conceptualize ways in which national identities can either include or exclude migrant persons and their experiences. In her article **Anna Triandafyllidou** examines how the pandemic emergency has activated what she calls a 'pandemic nationalism'. She explains that this kind of nationalism was simultaneously inclusionary and exclusionary. On the one hand, the national community was redefined in relation to the common fate of all persons residing on the territory (since they faced the pandemic together), thus extending the boundaries of membership to temporary residents and those with precarious status. On the other hand, national communities became increasingly closed with the rise of what has been labeled 'vaccine nationalism' and of competition between states over access to vaccines and cures. Closures and exclusions also arose internally against those minorities that were associated with the 'external threat', notably people of east Asian origin. In the face of these contradictory developments, Triandafyllidou asks whether we could consider the Covid-19 pandemic as a turning point that signals a new phase of development of nationalism. Such nationalism is meant to respond to the increasing challenges of globalization by incorporating those who serve the community while 'othering' those who are perceived to threaten its well-being.

In his contribution, **Patrick Savidan** focuses on the dilemma of multicultural diversity and support to welfare state policies in France by critically engaging with Kymlicka's account of ethics of membership. First, he shows that for Kymlicka, majorities hesitate to extend rights and benefits to ethnic minorities because they have prejudices *vis-à-vis* the merits of minority membership. Majorities are prejudiced in that they evaluate minority groups according to their resemblance or prototypicality to those who are perceived as members of the majority and penalize minorities for their deviances. Second, Savidan shows that when it comes to the French case, the changes in the attitudes towards the welfare state are a result of neoliberal policies being enacted since 1980s. The scarcity rhetoric induced by neoliberal policies obliges French citizens to prioritize members of the cultural majority and such a reinforcement of 'elective solidarities' indirectly results in exclusive effects for ethnic minorities. Third, Savidan defends that this lack of support can be resolved by an 'ethics of provenance' based on its moral potential to emphasize shared experiences between immigrants and native citizens.

Endnotes:

---

i   Since then, political theorists have published a few encompassing introduction to that literature. See for instance Murphy 2006; Crowder 2012; Shorten 2022.
ii   For replies to such criticisms see Kymlicka 2014, Patten 2014, 38-68, Eisenberg 2009.

iii See Parekh (2001) and Modood (2007) who also claimed that multiculturalism in Britain was a way to pluralize British national identity, not to negate it.

iv For some recent criticisms of this view, see Eisenberg 2020, Patten 2021 and the essays in Orgad and Koopmans 2022.

References

Allard-Tremblay Y (2022) The Two Row Wampum: Decolonizing and Indigenizing Democratic Autonomy. *Polity* 54(2): 225-249.

Amer Meziane M (2021) *Des empires sous la terre. Histoire écologique et raciale de la sécularisation.* Paris: La Découverte. English version forthcoming.

Anderson B (1993). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Appiah K A (2005) *The Ethics of Identity.* New York: Princeton University Press.

Bachvarova M (2014) Multicultural Accommodation and the Ideal of Non-Domination. *Critical Review of Social and Political Philosophy* 17(6): 652-673.

Balint P (2017) *Respecting Toleration. Traditional Liberalism and Contemporary Diversity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Banting K and Kymlicka W (2013) Is there really a retreat from multiculturalism policies? New evidence from the multiculturalism policy index. *Comparative European Politics* 11: 577-598.

Banting K and Kymlicka W (eds) (2006) *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Banting K, Harell A, Kymlicka W, and Wallace R (2019) Beyond National Identity Liberal Nationalism, Shared Membership, and Solidarity. In: in Gustavsson G and Miller M (eds.), *Liberal Nationalism and its Critics: Normative and Empirical Questions.* New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 205-225.

Barry B (2001) *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism.* New York: Harvard University Press.

Baycan-Herzog, E (2021) Immigration, and Common Identities: A Social Cohesion-based Argument for Open Borders. In: Mieth C and Cremer W (eds) *Migration, Stability and Solidarity*. Nomos, pp. 155–186. DOI: 10.5771/9783748924890-155.

Baycan-Herzog, E (2022) Inclusive Membership as Fairness? A Rawlsian Argument for Provisional Immigrants. *Danish Yearbook of Philosophy*, Vol:55 (2), pp. 134–153. DOI: 10.1163/24689300-20221058

Benhabib S (2002) *The Claims of Culture. Equality and Diversity in the Global Era.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Berman B, Dickson E, and Kymlicka W (eds) (2004) *Ethnicity and Diversity in Africa.* Ohio University Press.

Bissondath N (2002) *Selling Illusions Revised Edition: The Cult Of Multi Culturalism In Canada*. Toronto: Penguin Books.

Bloemraad I (2006) *Becoming a Citizen. Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bouchard G (2017) *L'interculturalisme. Un point de vue québécois.* Montréal: Boréal.

Brahm-Levey G (2019) The Bristol School of Multiculturalism. *Ethnicities* 19(1): 200-226:

Cantle T (2016) The case for interculturalism, plural identities and cohesion. In: Meer N, Modood T and Zapata-Barrero R (eds) *Multiculturalism and interculturalism: Debating the dividing lines*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 133–157.

Carens J (2013) *The Ethics of Immigration.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Carens JH (2000) *Culture, Citizenship, and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard G (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Crowder G (2013) *Theories of Multiculturalism. An Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Deveaux M (2006) *Gender and Justice in Multicultural Liberal States.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Eisenberg A (2009) *Reasons of Identity: A Normative Guide to the Political and Legal Assessment of Identity Claims.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Eisenberg A and Spinner-Halev J (eds.) (2004) *Minorities Within Minorities: Equality, Rights and Diversity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenberg A. (forthcoming) Multiculturalism and Decolonization: Two Tensions. In: Boucher F and Caron JF (eds) *Multicultural Citizenship: Legacies and Critiques*, London**:** Palgrave MacMillan.

Fessha Y T (2012), Federalism, Territorial Autonomy and the Management of Ethnic Diversity in Africa: Reading the Balance Sheet. *L'Europe en Formation* 363: 265-285.

Fukuyama F (2018) *Identity. The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*. New York: Farar, Straus and Giroux.

Gellner E (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Gibney, M (2020), Denationalisation and Discrimination. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46(12): 2551–68.

Glazer N (2003) *We are all Multiculturalists Now*. Harvard University Press.

Guérard de Latour S (2009) *Vers la république des différences***.** Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

Guérard de Latour S (forthcoming) Is Feminism Good for Multiculturalism? From Multicultural Citizenship to Multicultural Feminism. In: Boucher F and Caron J F(eds) *Multicultural Citizenship: Legacies and Critics.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harell A, Banting K, Kymlicka W (2021) Shared Membership Beyond National Identity: Deservingness and Solidarity in Diverse Societies. *Political Studies*: 003232172199693. DOI: 10.1177/0032321721996939.

Holtug N (2021) *The Politics of Social Cohesion: Immigration, Community, and Justice*. Oxford, United Kingdom; New York: Oxford University Press.

Hooker J (2009). *Race and the Politics of Solidarity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Joppke C (2007) Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics* 30(1): 1-22.

Kesler C and Bloemraad I (2010) Does Immigration Erode Social Capital? The Conditional Effects of Immigration-Generated Diversity on Trust, Membership, and Participation across 19 Countries, 1981-2000. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43(2): 319-347.

Kingsbury B (1992) The Applicability of the International Legal Concept of "Indigenous Peoples" in Asia. In: Bauer J R and Bell D A. *The East Asian Challenge for Human Rights.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 336-377.

Kukathas, Chandran (1992) Are there any Cultural Rights? *Political Theory* 20 (1): 105-139.

Kymlicka W (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka W (2001) *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka W (2007a) *Multicultural Odysseys. Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W (2007b) Ethnocultural Diversity in a Liberal State: Making Sense of the Canadian Model(s). In: Banting K, Thomas Courchene J. and Leslie Seidle F (eds.). *Belonging?: Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada. The Art of the State, Vol. 3*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy, pp. 39-86.

Kymlicka W (2010) Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence. *Canadian Journal of Political Science.* 43: 257-271.

Kymlicka W (2014)The essentialist critique of multiculturalism : theories, policies, ethos. EUI Working Paper, RSCAS, 2014/59, Global Governance Programme-108, Cultural Pluralism - http://hdl.handle.net/1814/31451

Kymlicka W (2015) Solidarity in diverse societies: beyond neoliberal multiculturalism and welfare chauvinism. *Comparative Migration Studies*. 3 (17).

Kymlicka W (2019) Deschooling Multiculturalism. Ethnicities.19(6): 971-982.

Kymlicka W (2022) The Ethics of Membership in Multicultural Societies. *Public Reason*. https://raison-publique.fr/3034/. *Raison Publique*. Available at: https://raison-publique.fr/3034/#r+3034+1+25 (accessed 25 July 2022).

Kymlicka W (forthcoming) Nationhood, Multiculturalism and the Ethics of Membership. In: Orgad L and Koopmans R (eds) *Majorities, Minorities, and the Future of Nationhood.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kymlicka W and Opalski M (eds) (2002). *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported? Western Liberal Political Theory and ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W and He B (eds) (2005) *Multiculturalism in Asia.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lægaard S (2007) Liberal nationalism and the nationalisation of liberal values. *Nations and Nationalism* 13(1): 37–55. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2007.00269.x.

Laegaard S (2017) On the Reciprocal Subordination of Multiculturalism and Migration Policies. In: Triandafyllidou A (ed) *Multicultural Governance in a Mobile World*. Edingburgh: Edingburgh University Press, pp. 245-264

Lilla M (2017) *The Once and Future Liberal: After Identity Politics*. New York: Harper Collins.

Lovett F (2010) Cultural Accommodation and Domination. *Political Theory* (38)2:243-267.

Maclure J (2015) Multiculturalism on the Back Seat? Culture, Religion, and Justice. *Les ateliers de l'éthique/The Ethics Forum*. 10 (2): 141-146.

Maynor J (2003) *Republicanism in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Meer N and Modood T (2016a) Interculturalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship. In Meer N, Modood, T and Zapata-Barrero R (eds.), *Multiculturalism and Interculturalism: Debating the Dividing Lines*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 27-52.

Meer N and Modood T (2016b) Migration and cultural diversity. Challenges in the twenty first century. In: Triandafyllidou A (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Immigration and Refugee Studies*, pp. 180–9. Available at: http://site.ebrary.com/id/11122100 (accessed 4 November 2017).

Miller D (1995) *On Nationality.* New York: Oxford University Press

Modood T (2005) *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Modood T (2007) *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Polity Press.

Modood T (2018) Remaking the nation: Immigration, integration and multicultural nationalism. *ABC Religion and Ethics*, 25 July. Available at: https://www.abc.net.au/religion/remaking-the-nation-immigration-integration-and-multicultural-na/10214338 (accessed 8 September 2018).

Modood T (2019) *Essays on Secularism and Multiculturalism*. London: ECPR Press.

Modood T A (2019) Multicultural Nationalism? *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 25(2): 233-246.

Mounk Y (2022) My Resolution for 2022. In: *Persuasion*. Available at: https://www.persuasion.community/p/my-resolutions-for-2022 (accessed 26 July 2022).

Murphy M (2012), *Multiculturalism. A Critical Introduction.* Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Okin S M (1999) Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?. In: Cohen J and al. (eds) *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 7-24.

Orgad L (2015) *The Cultural Defense of Nations. A Liberal Theory of Majority Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press

Orgad L and Koopmans R (eds) (forthcoming 2022) *Majorities, Minorities, and the Future of Nationhood.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parekh B (2000) *Rethinking Muticulturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. 2nd Edition, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patten A (2014) *Equal Recognition: The Moral Foundations of Minority Rights*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Patten A (2020) Populist multiculturalism: Are there majority cultural rights? *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 46(5): 539–552.

Pettit P (1997) *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Governement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pföstl E and Kymlicka W (eds) (2015) Minority politics in the Middle East and North Africa: the prospects for transformative change. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38(14): 2489-2498.

Phillips A (2007) *Multiculturalism Without Culture.* Princeton. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rudas S (forthcoming)   Cultural imperialism and indigenous self- determination. In: Boucher F and Caron JF (eds) *Will Kymlicka's Multicultural Citizenship: Critics and Legacy.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Sachar A (2001) *Multicultural Jurisdictions: Cultural Diversity and Women's Rights*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sachar A (2009) *The Birthright Lottery: Citizenship and Global Inequality*, Harvard University Press.

Savidan P (2015) *Voulons-nous vraiment l'égalité?* Paris: Albin Michel.

Scheffler S (2007) Immigration and the Significance of Culture. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 35(2): 93-125.

Schnapper D (1998) *Community of Citizens. On the Modern Idea of Nationality*. Routlegde.

Shachar A (2001) *Multicultural Jurisdictions: Cultural Differences and Women's Rights*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shachar A (2009) *The Birthright Lottery: Citizenship and Global Inequality*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Shachar A   (2008) Faith in Law. Defusing Tensions Between Diversity and Equality. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*. 36(3-4): 395-411.

Sharma N (2020) *Home Rule. National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Shorten A (2022). *Multiculturalism. The Political Theory of Diversity Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sniderman P M and Hagendoorn L(2007) *When Ways of Life Collide. Multiculturalism and its Discontents in the Netherlands.* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Song S (2007) *Justice, Gender and the Politics of Multiculturalism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Song S (2009) The subject of multiculturalism: culture, religion, language, ethnicity, nationality, and race? In: Bruin B de and Zurn CF (eds) *New Waves in Political Philosophy.* Basingstoke [England] ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 177–97.

Song S (2018) *Immigration and Democracy.* New York: Oxford University Press

Tamir Y (1995) *Liberal Nationalism*. New York: Princeton University Press

Taylor C (1991) Shared and Divergent Values. In: Watts R and Brown D M (eds.) *Options for a New Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 53-76.

Taylor C (1992) The Politics of Recognition. In: Gutmann A (ed.) *Multiculturalism and the 'Politics of Recognition'.* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 25-73.

Taylor C (1998) Nationalism and Modernity. In: Hall J A (ed.) *The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-218.

Teo T-A (2021) Multiculturalism beyond citizenship: The inclusion of non-citizens. Ethnicities 21(1): 165–191. DOI: 10.1177/1468796820984939.

Triandafyllidou A (2013) National Identity and Diversity: Towards Plural Nationalism. In: Dobbernack J and Modood T (eds) Tolerance, Intolerance and Respect. London: Palgrave MacMillan: 159-185.

Traindafyllidou A, ed. (2017), *Multicultural Governance in a Mobile World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Triandafyllidou A (2020) Nationalism in the 21st Century: Neo-Tribal or Plural? *Nations and Nationalism* 26(4): 792-806.

Tully J (1995) *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity.* Cambridge University Press.

Van Cott D L (2005) Building inclusive democracies: Indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in Latin America. *Democratization.* 12 (5): 820-837.

Young I M (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zapata-Barrero R (2017) Interculturalism in the post-multicultural debate: a defence. *Comparative Migration Studies*. 5(14).