

Tariq Modood
Multiculturalism



SECOND EDITION

Multiculturalism

— **Multiculturalism** —

A Civic Idea

Second Edition

———— Tariq Modood —————

polity

Copyright © Tariq Modood 2007, 2013

The right of Tariq Modood to be identified as Author of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 2007 by Polity Press; second revised edition with new material 2013

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Polity Press
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN-13: 97807456-6286-2

ISBN-13: 97807456-6287-9 (pb)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in 11 on 13 pt Sabon
by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited
Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

The publisher has used its best endeavours to ensure that the URLs for external websites referred to in this book are correct and active at the time of going to press. However, the publisher has no responsibility for the websites and can make no guarantee that a site will remain live or that the content is or will remain appropriate.

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to include any necessary credits in any subsequent reprint or edition.

For further information on Polity, visit our website: www.politybooks.com

For Glynthea, Ghizala and Yasmin

About the Author

Tariq Modood is Professor of Sociology, Politics and Public Policy, and the founding Director of the Centre for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship at the University of Bristol, UK. He is a leading authority on post-immigration ethnicity, racial equality and the theory and politics of multiculturalism. He has written over thirty (co-)authored and (co-)edited books and reports and over 150 articles or chapters in political philosophy, sociology and public policy. He was the principal investigator of the PSI Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities (UK) and has participated in and led numerous research projects, including as co-Director of the Bristol–UCL Leverhulme Programme on Migration and Citizenship. He is a co-founding editor of the international journal *Ethnicities*. His latest books include *Still Not Easy Being British* (2010), and, as co-editor, *Secularism, Religion and Multicultural Citizenship* (2009), *Global Migration, Ethnicity and Britishness* (2011) and *European Multiculturalisms* (2012). He is a regular contributor to the media and to policy discussions in Britain and was a member of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain (the Parekh Report, 2000) and the National Equalities Panel. He was awarded an MBE for services to social science and ethnic relations in 2001 and elected to the UK Academy of Social Sciences in 2004. His website is <tariqmodood.com>.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>Second Edition Acknowledgements</i>	x
1 Is Multiculturalism Appropriate for the Twenty-first Century?	1
2 A Liberal's Bias	20
3 Difference, Multi and Equality	34
4 Liberal Citizenship and Secularism	58
5 Multiculturalism and Essentialism	80
6 Multicultural Citizenship	108
7 The Strange Non-Death of Multiculturalism	144
8 Multiculturalism and the 'Crisis of Secularism'	168
<i>Notes</i>	188
<i>References</i>	204
<i>Index</i>	230

Acknowledgements

This book does not aspire to be a comprehensive theory, detailed comparative study or a policy blueprint. It is written to help us see the wood and not just a bunch of trees; to better identify what multiculturalism might mean as a political project that we might be for or against. The argument is that there is an understanding of civic equality that offers a core vision of multiculturalism that is not only coherent and relevant to the twenty-first century but is also attractive and ought to be a basis for civility, political reform and social research.

The arguments presented in this book have benefited from the opportunities I have had to do a number of presentations and engage with diverse gatherings. The people who have been helpful in these ways are too many to acknowledge individually and I offer them a collective thanks. I would like expressly to thank those who offered comments in writing. Thanks to Yahya Birt, Geoffrey Levey, Nasar Meer, Bhikhu Parekh, Andy Pilkington and Varun Uberoi for reading and commenting on a draft of the book (and also to two anonymous readers). I am also grateful to Veit Bader, Rainer Baubock, Adrian Favell and Jon Fox for the same in relation to Chapter 5. It is a

privilege to have so many expert friends and colleagues to be able to call on for constructive feedback; I hope they will forgive me for not always acting on their comments.

I would also like to thank the Leverhulme Trust. Co-directing the Bristol–UCL Leverhulme Programme on Migration and Citizenship perhaps competed for my attention with the writing of this book rather than flowed from it but I am conscious that the Trust’s generous funding created a level of activity which provided me with a stimulating context to think about social research in relation to the development of multicultural societies.

As is perhaps true of many university books today, much of the writing was done outside formal work time. Many people could complain that they have a time-IOU from me in their hands but I am most conscious of the diminution of companionship and family life that it has entailed for my wife, Glynthea, and daughters, Ghizala and Yasmin. It is small recompense but I dedicate this book to them, the most important loves of my life.

Second Edition

Acknowledgements

I am pleased that there is a demand for a second edition of this book when its topic is supposed to have intellectually and politically died some years ago. I have made some minor corrections and amendments and added two new chapters, each of which try to take the argument of the book further. Chapter 7 develops the view that integration will remain incomplete without multicultural citizenship. Chapter 8 gives further substance to the view that political secularism is the new, major site for multiculturalism, and while this does not amount to a crisis it means that the current controversies around political secularism are structured by pro- and anti-multiculturalism.

My membership of the two European Union FP7 projects, A European Approach to Multicultural Citizenship: Legal Political and Educational Challenges (EMILIE, 2006–9) and Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion (ACCEPT PLURALISM, 2010–13), nine and sixteen countries projects respectively, enabled me to continue to explore the nature of diversity and how it was changing across Europe, and I would like to express thanks both for the funding and the stimulating collaboration. The work

for chapter 8 was done during an AHRC Fellowship (2010–11) and I am grateful to the AHRC for the award.

I would like to renew the thanks of the original Acknowledgements, in particular to Nasar Meer and Varun Uberoi, who have in this period become co-authors even when not employed to be so, and to Jan Dobbernack for his research assistantship.

I am also pleased to renew the original dedication.

Is Multiculturalism Appropriate for the Twenty-first Century?

The 1960s were a time for asserting the singular character of the human race. Nazism had asserted the irreducible difference between Aryan, Jew, Slav and so on but it had been defeated and anti-racism was on the march. Martin Luther King Jr and his followers proclaimed humanity's essential sameness, that nothing differentiated whites and blacks other than skin colour and few outside the besieged laager of *apartheid* were willing to defend separate development. The imperial idea of 'the White Man's burden' of ruling 'the lesser breeds without the Law' was regarded as an embarrassing anachronism if not a matter of shame amongst white youth. Yet it was also the time for the celebration of difference. A time when people were not only encouraged to 'do their own thing' but when African-Americans started to assert a new black historical pride and the need for a specifically black political mobilization. Some women focused on their sexual differences from men and postulated that women were naturally more caring, consensual and empathetic. For gays the company of co-sexuals became a necessity in order for them to explore the nature of homosexuality and to allow it to be

its own thing in its own space without shame or copying heterosexuality.

At the very same moment that the related ideas of humanism, human rights and equal citizenship had reached a new ascendancy, claims of group difference as embodied in the ideas of Afrocentricity, ethnicity, femaleness, gay rights and so on became central to a new progressive politics. It was a politics of identity: being true to one's nature or heritage and seeking with others of the same kind public recognition for one's collectivity. One term which came to describe this politics, especially in the United States, is 'multiculturalism'.

Multiculturalism also has a more restricted meaning, especially in Britain and other parts of Europe. Here we are said to have become a multicultural society not so much by the emergence of a political movement but by a more fundamental movement of peoples. By immigration – specifically, the immigration from outside Europe, of non-white peoples into predominantly white countries. Here, then, the political idea of multiculturalism – the recognition of group difference within the public sphere of laws, policies, democratic discourses and the terms of a shared citizenship and national identity – while sharing something in common with the political movements described above has a much narrower focus. Perhaps the narrower and the broader meanings of multiculturalism – focusing on the consequences of immigration and on the struggles of a range of marginalized groups or on group differences per se – cannot be entirely separated from each other. The narrower meaning might reasonably be construed as a part, a strand, of the larger current. Nevertheless, post-immigration multiculturalism has its own distinctive concerns and sensibilities which can be distorted or obscured if we see it in generic multicultural terms. It may have connections with racism, which may be quite different when the right to settle is not an issue; or, it may have connections with sexism which can only be attended to when there is sensitivity to culturally

differentiated sexual norms or gender roles. Moreover, even within the narrower post-immigration phenomenon, the issues can vary between countries. In some countries, racism and the legacy of colonialism may be central; in others, the concern may be how to convert a condition of guest worker into citizen when the former condition offers no opportunity to exercise democratic power. Beginning with a larger idea of multiculturalism tends, as I will illustrate in the next chapter in the case of the philosopher, Will Kymlicka, to distort, even marginalize, some of the specific contemporary issues in relation to the politics of post-immigration, especially in western Europe.

The first countries to speak of themselves as having become multicultural societies were, perhaps not surprisingly, countries which have a long, historical experience of immigration and indeed which have been built up out of immigration, namely, Canada, Australia and the United States. Their previous histories of migration and settlement meant that migrants were more readily seen as prospective co-citizens and the nation was seen as multiethnic in its source, even if till the 1960s and 1970s, assimilation (anglo-conformity) was what was expected from migrants and certainly their children. Most of these historical migrants were of European descent but, as migration policies were loosened to allow non-whites, there was a sense both that the new migrants were more culturally different than many of their predecessors and that assimilation was not acceptable as a policy. As part of, or because of, the wider political acceptance of 'difference' mentioned above, it was felt that the migrants should be able to retain their distinct cultures while they adapted to working and living in their new countries. No doubt some assimilation would take place but it should not be required.¹

In the decades that followed, some western European societies, especially Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden, began to follow suit. Western Europe had been importing labour, particularly between the late 1940s and the oil crisis of 1973, to rebuild its postwar economies, and the

inward flow carried on as dependants and other kin, legally and illegally, joined the migrants, as the economic cycle created new labour demand and refugees sought shelter. Most European countries do not collect data on non-white citizens and residents, only on foreigners, so all figures are guess estimates, but it seems that more than 5 per cent and possibly up to 10 per cent of citizens and residents of EU15 are of non-European descent. Currently most of the largest, especially the capital, cities of northwest Europe are about 15–30 per cent non-white (i.e., people of non-European descent). Even without further large-scale immigration, being a young, fertile population, these proportions will grow for at least one generation more before they stabilize, reaching or exceeding 50 per cent of some cities in the next decade or so. The trend will include some of the larger urban centres of southern Europe. A high degree of racial/ethnic/religious mix in its principal cities will be the norm in twenty-first century Europe, and will characterize its national economic, cultural and political life, as it has done in twentieth (and will do so in the twenty-first) century US. Of course there will be important differences too between western Europe and the US. Amongst these is that the majority of non-whites in the countries of Europe are Muslims; the UK, where Muslims form about a third of non-whites or ethnic minorities, is an exception. With an estimated over 15 million Muslims in western Europe today, about four per cent of the population (Savage 2004), they are larger than the combined populations of Finland, Denmark and Ireland. For this, if for no other reason, Muslims have become central to the merits and demerits of multiculturalism as a public policy in western Europe, though it is to state the obvious that, at least since the attacks of 11 September 2001, Muslim migrants and settlers have come under new political and security scrutiny even in countries in which Muslims form a relatively small proportion of recent settlers, such as the US, Canada and Australia.

The recognition that a society had become multiethnic or multicultural was not simply about demographics or economics. It was an understanding that a new set of challenges were being posed for which a new political agenda was necessary (or alternatively, had to be resisted: the view of certain conservatives, nationalists and French republicans). While this politics was connected with the wider meanings of multiculturalism mentioned above, and was entwined with issues of racial equality, I shall here mean by multiculturalism the political accommodation of minorities formed by immigration to western countries from outside the prosperous West.

A New Idea but not a Comprehensive Political Philosophy

There have been many multicultural societies in the past, especially outside European nation-states, for example, in the Ottoman Empire, where the levels of religious tolerance and accommodation (shown by Muslim rulers towards Jews and Christians) were much greater than those found in western Europe till recent times. Some contemporary societies are much more deeply multicultural than the societies that are the focus of this book. The former include countries like India, which has many millions of followers of most of the major world religions, as well as being the home of many smaller-sized religions, dozens of ethnic groups, over twenty official languages and so on.

The deep communal cultural diversity that characterizes countries like India, no less than the territorial nationalisms of the Quebecois, for instance, or claims of indigenous peoples, is beyond the scope of my theme. The concern here is with the relatively limited diversity caused by large-scale immigration of people perceived to be 'different', who do not simply melt away into the populations they have settled amongst but are ethnically visible and

so various multicultural, multiethnic, multifaith urban dynamics come to be and do not seem to be short term only. The ‘difference’ in question is typically marked by various forms of racism and similar forms of ideologies as the migrants come from societies or groups that have been historically ruled and/or perceived as inferior by the societies into which they have settled. Yet the latter are typically also liberal democracies. That is to say they are places in which – compared to the norm in the world, past and present – an ethical primacy is given to the individual and individual rights are politically fundamental. Relatedly, embedded institutionally are ideas of equality of participation in national self-determination, in democratic processes and public participation, which make up the practice of citizenship and debates – including serious contestations – about how equal citizenship is to be extended.

This is what makes contemporary multiculturalism a new political idea, a new ‘-ism’. It arises in the context of liberal or social democratic egalitarianism and citizenship whereas earlier manifestations of similar political ideas were in the absence of political citizenship, where the minorities and majorities alike were subjects of the crown/emperor. Hence it is not right to look at the pioneering policy developments in Canada as a ‘return to an ancient pattern. . . . Specifically, Canada is finding space for the classical, Islamicate model that existed into the modern era only to be eradicated, not by colonialism, but the triumphalism of the West’ (Sardar 2004: 29).² This does not mean that multiculturalism is simply a liberal idea, an outgrowth of liberalism. But nor is it a political philosophy in its own right, if by that is meant a comprehensive theory of politics. The closest it has come to that, in my opinion, is in Bhikhu Parekh’s *tour de force*, *Rethinking Multiculturalism* (2000). Yet even though Parekh does seem to treat multiculturalism as a philosophy and argues, for example, that all the functions of the state have to be reconceived in the light of it, for they are currently conceived within the ideas that the state represents national