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SECTION 1 – BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

For more than thirty years across a range of countries, numerous policies have had as their overall goal the promotion of tolerance and respect for collective identities, particularly among immigrants and ethnic minorities. Collective called multiculturalism, these policies have been pursued through measures such as supporting community associations and their cultural activities, monitoring diversity in the workplace, encouraging positive images in the media and other public spaces, and modifying public services in order to accommodate culture-based differences of value, language and social practice.

By the early part of the 21st century multiculturalism has been seriously challenged from a number of directions. The changing nature of global migration, new social formations spanning nation-states, and the persistently poor socio-economic standing of immigrant and ethnic minority groups are among the foremost developments that seem to render obsolete aspect of the older models of multiculturalism. In light of and added to these, there has emerged in numerous settings a broader backlash against multiculturalism in public discourse, policies and public opinion: many critics now see multiculturalism as a foremost contributor to social breakdown, ethnic tension, the demise of the welfare state, failure of public services and the growth of extremism and terrorism.

For all of these reasons there are widespread calls to rethink multiculturalism. This background paper describes such patterns, and discusses the question as to whether we are shifting into a ‘post-multiculturalist’ world. It also addresses, in passing, several other pertinent questions today including: What are the changing public discourses surrounding multiculturality? What are the characteristics of new forms of immigration? How have these new forms of immigration impacted on multicultural theories? What are the relationships of immigrants with sending countries? How do all of these patterns contribute to what might be called post-multiculturalism?

Following an initial section outlining some key aspects of conventional multiculturalism and its critiques, the report includes sections describing emergent migration trends leading toward
conditions of ‘super-diversity,’ patterns of diasporic identification and transnationalism, recent public debates that are critical of multiculturalism, and various policy measures taken in response. It concludes by way of speculation regarding the emergence of ‘post-multicultural’ perspectives which seek to foster both the recognition of diversity and the maintenance of collective national identities.

**MULTICULTURALISM**

Looking back historically and considering cases within contexts such as the colonial period, Ottoman Empire and Roman Empire, we can observe that in populations comprised of linguistically, culturally and religiously heterogeneous groups there have always been questions of multi-group governance and the need to negotiate everyday practices and interactions. Just as today, aspects of diversity had to be ‘managed’ in order to ensure: the non-alienation of specific groups (at least to ensure rule or policy delivery), the limitation of conflict (at least in ways that didn’t hurt the dominant group), and the generally smooth functioning of society (or at least the economy). The great ‘age of migration’ in the latter half of the nineteenth century brought some relatively new issues of diversity management to immigrant-receiving countries, but expectations of ‘assimilation’ – or the public discarding of social and cultural difference – largely held sway. In the last half of the twentieth century, social, political and public service challenges stemming from yet newer waves of large scale immigration and the settlement of sizable communities prompted many nation-states (and their local government institutions, alongside many business, other public sector and voluntary sector organizations) to adopt policies, structures and programmes designed to manage the emergent new modes of diversity and their accommodation within wider society.

*The paradigm of multiculturalism*

Collectively described as multiculturalism, these late 20th century institutional initiatives had a number of broad, common objectives. These included: providing opportunities for group representation to local and national government authorities; restructuring institutions towards pluralistic public service provision; measures to promote equality, respect or tolerance particularly among the dominant population towards minorities; and provision of resources to support the continuity of traditions and identities among immigrant groups (as opposed to assimilation). Further, in many countries multiculturalism differentially entailed actions in the following fields:

- *Public ‘recognition’*: support for ethnic minority organizations, facilities, activities; creation of public consultative bodies incorporating such organizations;
• **Education:** often addressing dress, gender and other issues sensitive to the values of specific ethnic and religious minorities; creation of curricula reflecting the backgrounds of ethnic minority pupils; mother tongue teaching & language support; the establishment of own schools (publically financed or not);

• **Culturally sensitive** practices, training and information established within social services, among healthcare providers, police and courts;

• **Public materials** (such as health promotion campaigns) provided in multiple languages;

• **Law:** cultural exceptions to laws (such as Sikh turbans instead of motorcycle helmets); oaths on sacred books other than the Bible; recognition of other marriage, divorce and inheritance traditions; protection from discrimination & incitement to hatred;

• **Religious accommodation:** permission and support for the establishment of places of worship, cemeteries and funerary rites; allowance of time off work for worship;

• **Food:** allowance of ritual slaughter; provision of proscribed foods (halal, kosher, vegetarian) in public institutions;

• **Broadcasting & media:** monitoring of group images to ensure non-discrimination or to avoid stereotypes; provision of own media facilities for minority groups.

To be sure, the policy and programmatic elements of multiculturalism have not been the same in its primary countries of general implementation (particularly Australia, Canada, the United States, Great Britain, Sweden and the Netherlands). Even within the same country, policies relevant to an overall multiculturalist agenda have not taken the same perspectives, aims and approaches. Similarly, public discourse (as found in political debates, media treatment and public opinion polls) has comprised a variety of takes on the topic. Hence, as Stuart Hall (2001: 3) observes,

> Over the years the term ‘multiculturalism’ has come to reference a diffuse, indeed maddeningly spongy and imprecise, discursive field: a train of false trails and misleading universals. Its references are a wild variety of political strategies. Thus conservative multiculturalism assimilates difference into the customs of the majority. Liberal multiculturalism subordinates difference to the claims of a universal citizenship. Pluralist multiculturalism corrals difference within a communally segmented social order. Commercial multiculturalism exploits and consumes difference in the spectacle of the exotic ‘other. Corporate multiculturalism manages difference in the interests of the centre.

The creation and implementation of multicultural policies, structures and programmes have – according to a range of critics within academia, politics and the media – entailed a number of problems. Some commentators have pointed to the ways multiculturalism contributes to the marginalization of minorities by keeping them off ‘serious’ government policy agendas; others suggest multiculturalism comprises a ‘divide-and-rule’ strategy by government in relation to ethnic minorities, wrought by ethnic minority associations’ competition for funding or political influence. Still others point to the misleading and reifying view of ‘communities’, as never-changing, socially bounded entities, inherent in multicultural ideology. And there are many who have criticized multiculturalism’s over-emphasis on the maintenance of ‘culture’ at the cost of less policy attention paid to socio-economic inequalities.

Despite these criticisms (and more recent ones, see below), in most places multiculturalism has been successfully ‘mainstreamed’ in the public sphere such that pluralistic provisions and some acceptance of the need to be culturally sensitive (ridiculed as ‘politically correct’) have become widespread and commonplace. The following book titles from the 1980s-90s – when multiculturalism, by this name, reached its peak – attest to the variety of public domains reached by the concept: Medical Practice in a Multicultural Society (1988), Counselling and Psychotherapy: A Multicultural Perspective (1993), Managing Substance Abuse in a Multicultural Society (1994), Marketing in a Multicultural World (1995), Multiculturalism: Criminal Law (1991), and Multicultural Public Relations (1995). Directly following and drawing upon this multicultural mainstreaming, by the early 2000s ‘diversity management’ in the corporate world has become a major function of human resource departments.

**The turning of the multicultural tide**

Although since the 1960s there have always been critical views of multiculturalism – seen in various ways as ‘pandering’ to immigrants and ethnic minorities – by late 1990s/early 2000s very serious questions arose as to the effectiveness and worth of multicultural policies. These questions stemmed from numerous developments of high public concern.

Despite mainstreaming, the growth of respect and tolerance seemed limited: evidence of the persistence of discrimination and racism was rife, and Europe, Australia, Canada and elsewhere witnessed a seeming rise of right-wing extremism and success among populist, anti-immigrant political parties. Census and other social surveys in numerous countries indicated deep and enduring patterns of inequality among ethnic minorities (by now in their second or third generation after the original immigrants): low educational attainment, high unemployment, poor jobs, low income, bad quality housing, ill health, and little social mobility. In Britain, Germany and elsewhere, reports suggested ‘natives’ and immigrants/ethnic minorities were living ‘parallel lives’
marked by residential segregation, effectively separate schools, different places of worship, divergent community associations, discrete social networks, and disparate places of leisure.

The terrorist actions in America in 2001, Spain in 2004 and Britain in 2005 drew attention to ethnic minority communities as potential harbours for extremists; the fact that the British terrorists were ‘home grown’ – or born and raised in the UK – made matters worse. By 2005/6 the riots in England, France and Australia, alongside the discovery of terrorist cells in the UK, Germany and Canada, suggested to many that not only were many ethnic minorities remaining geographically and socio-economically excluded, but that they posed a significant problem for overall social cohesion, public order and national security.

In many if not all Western countries of immigration, a remarkably common public discourse emerged: there had been a ‘failure of integration’, and multiculturalism was largely to blame. Surely multicultural policies should have delivered something different? From the political right most of the pre-existing criticisms were re-voiced: multiculturalism keeps ethnic minorities distinct and breaks down common values and national identity. Yet new criticisms began to be heard from the political left: multiculturalism, some said, broke down people’s sense of mutual obligations and willingness to contribute to the welfare state. Linking all such discourse was the assumed logic that (a) multiculturalism fosters accentuated or preserved cultural differences; (b) such differences lead to communal separateness; (c) separateness, in turn, entails lack of socio-economic mobility, breakdown of social relations, grounds for conflict and potential for extremism (even terrorism). Also present in such discourse or logic, the blame on multiculturalism also entails blame on immigrants/ethnic minorities themselves: as the thinking goes, it is their own desire to maintain cultural traditions and distinct identities – a desire that multiculturalism supports – which leads to all these negative consequences. Meanwhile, structural conditions, institutional obstacles or policy failures are rarely being taken into consideration by way of explaining immigrants’ and ethnic minorities’ poor socio-economic standing.

In these ways across several different national sites, emergent social conditions, prominent events and reactive public discourses have combined to paint a rather disapproving, if not outright damaging (albeit fairly caricatured) picture of multiculturalism. Added to this important trend, recent patterns of global migration and certain developing practices among migrants themselves also present factors contributing to the need to rethink certain aspects of multiculturalism as well.
In the twentieth century, post-war migration primarily comprised substantial numbers moving from one place to another, predominantly by way of specific recruitment or other regulated schemes: for instance, from particular sites in Turkey to Germany, Algeria to France, Chinese to Canada, Greeks to Australia, Mexico to the USA, Pakistan to the UK. Explicit or implicit multicultural policies and structures accordingly arose to engage these kinds of large, increasingly well organized and settled communities. For the most part, these significant, regionally particular immigrant flows decreased in the 1970s.

Today the scene is considerably different. World-wide there has been a rise in migrant (including refugee) numbers over the past two decades: up to some 190 million at present. Furthermore – and significantly – more people are now moving from more places, through more places, to more places.

In comparison to the large immigrant groups representative of the 1950-70s, today newer, smaller, transient, more socially stratified, less organized, and more legally differentiated immigrant groups comprise global migration flows. Such complex social formations have hardly gained attention or a place on the public agenda, which is still largely based on models of previous migration flows. Yet it is the growth of exactly these new variety of migrants that has in recent years radically transformed the social landscape of migrant-receiving countries. The time has come to re-evaluate – in social scientific study as well as policy – the nature of contemporary diversity. With a reworked understanding of new complexities of diversity, the structures and policies meant to deal with diversity – that is, multiculturalism – need to be reworked too.

**The emergence of super-diversity**

In order to better understand and more fully address the complex nature of contemporary, migration-driven diversity, additional variables need to be taken into account by social scientists, policy-makers, practitioners and the public. These include differential immigration statuses and their concomitant entitlements and restrictions of rights, divergent labour market experiences, discrete gender and age profiles characterizing immigrant flows, patterns of spatial distribution in receiving contexts, and mixed local area responses by service providers and residents. The interplay of these factors is what is meant by the notion of ‘super-diversity’.

‘Super-diversity’ is a term intended to underline a level and kind of complexity surpassing anything many migrant-receiving countries have previously experienced. ‘Super-diversity’ among immigrants is distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables, including: country of origin (comprising a variety of possible subset traits such as ethnicity, language[s], religious tradition, regional and local identities, cultural values and practices), migration channel (often related to highly gendered flows, specific social networks and particular labour market niches), and legal status (including myriad categories determining a hierarchy of entitlements and restrictions).
These variables co-condition integration outcomes along with factors surrounding migrants’ human capital (particularly educational background), access to employment (which may or may not be in immigrants’ hands), locality (related especially to material conditions, but also to other immigrant and ethnic minority presence), and the usually chequered responses by local authorities, services providers and local residents (which often tend to function by way of assumptions based on previous experiences with migrants and ethnic minorities).

**British super-diversity as exemplar**

The British case, presented below, is not unique to processes, trends and characteristics arising in many immigrant receiving countries.

**Countries of origin.** One of the most noteworthy features of ‘the new migration’ is the multiplicity of immigrants’ countries of origin. Moreover, most of this new and diverse range of origins relates to places which have no specific historical – particularly, colonial – links with Britain. In London alone there are people from some 179 countries. Many represent just a handful of people, but there are populations numbering over 10,000 respectively from each of no less than 42 countries; there are populations of over 5,000 from a further 12 countries. While pointing to important indicators of diversity, country of origin data itself, however, may mask more significant forms of differentiation than it reveals. Within any particular population from a given country, there will be important distinctions with reference to ethnicity, religious affiliation and practice, regional and local identities in places of origin, kinship, clan or tribal affiliation, political parties and movements, and other criteria of collective belonging.

**Languages.** The growth of multilingualism in the UK has been recognized and engaged in various ways by both social scientists and policymakers, although the latter have often arguably failed to respond in positive or adequate ways. Still, it is now often proclaimed with pride (for instance in the city’s successful 2012 Olympic bid) that 300 languages are spoken in London.

**Religions.** On the whole we can say that among immigrants to Britain, Christianity is the main religion for people born in all continents except Asia; Asia-born people in the UK are more likely to be Muslim than any other religion, although of course Indians include a majority of Hindus and a significant number of Sikhs. For many, religions tend to be broadly equitable with countries of origin – Irish and Jamaicans are mostly Christian, Bangladeshis mostly Muslim and so forth – but even so these categories often miss important variations in devotional traditions within each of the world religions. Taking Islam as example, it is often pointed out that there are several traditions within the faith as practiced by South Asians in the UK (Deobandi, Tablighi, Barelvi, Sufi orders and more). Such variations are multiplied many times when we consider the breadth of origins among Muslims from around the world who now live in Britain (such as Nigerians, Somalis, Bosnians, Afghans, Iraqis and Malaysians). In London Muslims are the most heterogeneous body
of believers in terms of ethnicity and country of origin, with the largest group (Bangladeshis) making up only 23.5%. ‘London’s Muslim population of 607,083 people is probably the most diverse anywhere in the world, besides Mecca’ (The Guardian 21 January 2005).

Migration channels and immigration statuses. Socio-cultural axes of differentiation such as country of origin, ethnicity, language and religion are of course significant in conditioning immigrants’ identities, patterns of interaction and – often through social networks determined by such axes – their access to jobs, housing, services and more. However, immigrants’ channels of migration and the myriad legal statuses which arise from them are often just as, or even more, crucial to: how people group themselves and where people live, how long they can stay, how much autonomy they have (versus control by an employer, for instance), whether their families can join them, what kind of livelihood they can undertake and maintain, and to what extent they can make use of public services and resources (including schools, health, training, benefits and other ‘recourse to public funds’). Therefore such channels and statuses, along with the rights and restrictions attached to them, comprise an additional – indeed, fundamental – dimension of today’s patterns and dynamics of super-diversity.

Coinciding with the increasing influx of immigrants to the UK in the 1990s, there has been an expansion in the number and kind of migration channels and immigration statuses. Each carries quite specific and legally enforceable entitlements, controls, conditions and limitations. Most prominent are the following channels and statuses:

- **Workers** - Between 1993 and 2003 the number of foreign workers in the UK rose no less than 62% to 1,396,000. This large-scale increase in workers includes people who have come under numerous categories and quota systems;

- **Students** - The number of foreign students entering the UK recently peaked at 369,000 in 2002 before reducing to 319,000 in 2003. Non-EU students accounted for some 38% of all full-time higher degree students in 2003;

- **Spouses and family members** - The number of migrating spouses and family members coming to the UK more than doubled between 1993-2003. Furthermore this is a particularly feminised channel of migration compared with others;

- **Asylum-seekers and Refugees** - Throughout the 1990s the number of asylum applications rose considerably in the UK and indeed throughout Europe. Applications (including dependents) in Britain rose from 28,000 in 1993 to a peak of 103,100 in 2002. This too is a highly gendered channel of migration: in 2003 some 69% were male. The provenance of asylum-seekers represents a broad range: again in 2003 applications were received from persons spanning over 50 nationalities;

- **Irregular, illegal or undocumented migrants** - This category, variously termed, pertains to people whose presence is marked by clandestine entry, entry by deceit, overstaying or
breaking the terms of a visa. In 2005 the Home Office offered a ‘best guess’ number between 310,000 and 570,000 irregular migrants in the UK;

- **New citizens** - A great many migrants become full citizens. During the 1990s around 40,000 people became citizens each year. This number has risen dramatically since 2000, with 2004 seeing a record number of 140,795 granted British citizenship. In attempting to understand the nature and dynamics of diversity in Britain, close attention must be paid to the stratified system of rights, opportunities, constraints and partial-to-full memberships that coincide with these and other immigrant categories.

Moreover – and denoting a key feature of super-diversity – there may be widely differing statuses *within* groups of the same ethnic or national origin.

These facts underscore the point that simple ethnicity-focused approaches to understanding and engaging various minority ‘communities’ in Britain, as taken in many models and policies within conventional multiculturalism, is inadequate and often inappropriate for dealing with individual immigrants’ needs or understanding their dynamics of inclusion or exclusion.

**Gender.** Over the past thirty years, more females than males migrated to the UK; since about 1998, males have come to predominate in new flows. The reason for this may be due to a general shift away from more female oriented family migration to more male dominated work-based migration schemes since 1995. It is likely also related to the inflow of asylum-seekers, most of whom have been male.

**Age.** The new immigrant population has a higher concentration of 25-44 year olds and a lower proportion of under-16s than a decade ago, also perhaps reflecting a shift away from family migration. Variance in age structure among various ethnic groups reflects different patterns of fertility and mortality as well as migration. The mean age of new immigrants is 28 – averaging eleven years younger than the mean age of 39 for the British Isles born population.

At both national and local levels, policy-makers and public service practitioners continuously face the task of refashioning their tools in order to be most effective in light of changing circumstances (whether these are socio-economic, budgetary, or set by government strategy). This is equally the case surrounding policies for community cohesion, integration, managed migration and ‘managed settlement’. Structures and modes of government support for, and liaison with, ethnic minority organizations have for decades formed the backbone of the British model of multiculturalism. Especially on local levels, these have indeed often provided important forums for sharing experiences and needs, establishing good practices and providing access to services. However, in light of the numerous dimensions of super-diversity, such structures and modes are inadequate for effective representation. Most local authorities have been used to liaising with a limited number of large and well-organized associations; now there are far more
numbers in smaller, less (or not at all) organized groups. In any case, just how many groups could such structures support? And how should local authorities account for the internal diversity of various groups, not least in terms of legal status?

Already, existing minority ethnic agencies often cannot respond to the needs of the various newcomers. None of this is to say that community organizations no longer have a place in bridging migrant groups and local authorities or service providers. Such bodies remain crucial to the process, but should be recognized as only partially relevant with regard to their representativeness and scope.

The growing size and complexity of the immigrant population carries with it a range of significant public service implications. Executives in local authorities around Britain have voiced concerns about the ability of transport systems, schools and health services to manage new needs. Such concerns flag up a substantial shift in strategies across a range of service sectors concerning the assessment of needs, planning, budgeting, commissioning of services, identification of partners for collaboration and gaining a broader appreciation of diverse experiences in order generally to inform debate. Such a shift must begin with gathering basic information on the new diversity.

---

**TRANSNATIONALISM**

It is now widely recognized among academics and policy-makers alike that transnationalism, or the cross-border and homeland links maintained by migrants, is an inescapable fact of migration under contemporary conditions of globalization. Advanced technologies and lower costs surrounding travel and mobility, telephone calls, internet connectivity and satellite television have meant that dispersed groups can, with relative ease, stay in everyday, close contact with each other or with events in homelands and other diasporic locations. Regular and routine transnational practices of exchange (of people, money, resources and information) and mobilization (for business, religious, social or political purposes) within diasporic networks often ensure that common collective identities are maintained and enhanced. Also, over twenty-five years of multicultural policies in Western, migrant-receiving countries have meant that it has been widely acceptable for immigrants and their descendants to sustain culturally distinct practices and diasporic identities.

What are the implications of sustained transnational connections for migrants’ integration? There are various answers to this question, various modes of transnationalism and integration that can be examined, and various studies that have attempted to measure or interrogate related processes and phenomena.
Perhaps throughout history, and certainly over the last hundred years or more, immigrants have stayed in contact with families, organizations and communities in their places of origin and elsewhere in the diaspora. In recent years, the extent and degree of transnational engagement has intensified among immigrants, due in large part to changing technologies and reduced telecommunication and travel costs. Enhanced transnationalism is substantially transforming several social, political and economic structures and practices among migrant communities worldwide in both places of migrant origin and reception.

Of course, not all migrants maintain the same level or kinds of transnational engagement, socially, culturally, economically or politically. Much of this will be largely conditioned by a range of factors including migration channel and legal status (e.g. refugees or undocumented persons may find it harder to maintain certain ties abroad), migration and settlement history, community structure and gendered patterns of contact, political circumstances in the homeland, economic means and more. That is, transnational practices among immigrants are highly diverse between and within groups (whether defined by country of origin, ethnicity, immigration category or any other criteria), adding yet another significant layer of super-diversity to all those outlined above.

Many migrants develop and maintain strong modes of community cohesion – but not necessarily with others in their locality of settlement. The strongest senses of cohesion or belonging may remain with others in a homeland or elsewhere. However, this needn’t mean they are not becoming integrated in their new setting. Belonging, loyalty and sense of attachment are not parts of a zero–sum game based on a single place. That is, the ‘more transnational’ a person is does not automatically mean the ‘less integrated’ he or she is, and the ‘less integrated’ one is does not necessarily prompt or strengthen ‘more transnational’ patterns of association.

Empirical research has demonstrated the complex relationships between modes of transnationalism and integration. Numerous findings, analyzed and published by a variety of academics, demonstrate that across a range of variables and correlations, modes of transnational participation have complex and generally positive interplays with processes of integration.

The incontestable fact is that with regard to either processes of transnationalism or integration, migrants adapt. Sustained and intensive patterns of transnational communication, affiliation and exchanges can profoundly affect manners of migrant adaptation – including practices associated with positive or limited integration – through the maintenance of a particularly strong sense of connection or orientation to the people, places and senses of belonging associated with the place of origin. Such increasing incidence among contemporary migrants (afforded especially by cheap telephone calls and transportation) arguably contributes to a more widespread process of transformation affecting many Western societies, namely the public recognition of multiple identities. As in earlier eras, migrants feel powerfully bound to homelands and communities elsewhere – and now they can variously express and enhance this attachment.
At the same time, new immigrants clearly are getting on with developing a new life, livelihood, social ties and political interests in their places of settlement. Quite clearly, in the security-gripped era since 9/11 diasporic identities and transnational relations have come to be regarded by many with suspicion. There have been growing fears of ideological fifth columns, terrorist sleeper-cells, and other enemies within. And regardless of the social scientific findings that migrant transnationalism does not impede integration, politicians and the wider public perceive that the maintenance of ties with homelands means that migrants and ethnic minorities have not – and do not want to – become part of their societies of settlement. Such a view, combined with the anti-multiculturalism trends and the new challenges broad about by immigrant super-diversity, have arguably propelled into an era of post-multiculturalism.

POST-MULTICULTURALISM

As we have seen, for a variety of reasons multiculturalism has come to be seen by many as a concept or set of policies that legitimized a retreat into culturally and physically separate minority communities. It has become associated with socially disintegrative effects. It has been perceived as supporting an assumed unwillingness of migrants to integrate. In response to these issues and as a kind of corrective set of measures, policies to foster ‘community cohesion’, stronger national identity and mandatory immigrant integration are being rolled out in countries around the world. In places such as France, Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Singapore and Australia, the government has established policies and programmes implementing citizenship courses and tests for immigrants. These require the acquisition of knowledge of national civics, dominant cultural norms and values. Eligible immigrants who pass these courses and tests are rewarded with citizenship ceremonies, which themselves are meant to symbolically serve as emblems of national belonging.

Increasing language requirements for immigrants are being rolled out in many places too. Newcomers must demonstrate acceptable standards or levels of competency in the official language, again through compulsory courses and tests – sometimes even prior to entry. Failure to engage or pass such language requirements is being met by a variety of penalties.

In these ways and more, the onus and obligation is being placed on immigrants and ethnic minorities to take up ‘host’ country values and cultural practices and to actively demonstrate their desire to ‘belong’. Such measures are seen by policy-makers as crucial steps to ensure immigrants’ and ethnic minorities’ own socio-economic mobility, to avoid unrest and to guarantee security of all.
These measures comprise key elements of what might be called post-multiculturalism. But this does not simply mean the return to ‘assimilation’ (at least as it was practiced in the first half of the twentieth century). That is, despite a strong emphasis on conformity, cohesion, national identity and dominant cultural values, in practically all the contexts in which such new policies are being implemented there remains importantly voiced and institutionally embedded an acceptance of the significance and value of diversity. In this way post-multiculturalist policies and discourse seek ‘to have it both ways’: strong common identity and values coupled with the recognition of cultural differences.

As Desmond King (2005: 122) has described it in the USA,

Modern American nationhood is an ideology of ‘post-multiculturalism’: a wide acknowledgment of group distinctions combined with a state struggle to ensure that government policies do not accentuate hierarchical divisions between groups based on race, ethnicity and national background... It is post- in that the demands commonly advanced under a multiculturalist agenda are now quite modest ones.

Accordingly, governments in several countries are currently challenged by a search for post-multiculturalist models that somehow fuse agendas of the left (‘celebrating’ diversity, fostering social capital, reducing socio-economic inequality) and the right (promoting national identity, marginalizing or eliminating competing values, limiting new immigration as a presumed inherently divisive process). As King (2005: 123) puts it, the challenge is to construct a state ideology, structures and programmes that are ‘broad enough to permit strong group identities to endure within a legal framework upholding the rights and obligations of citizenship.’

Once more, the United Kingdom can serve as example of post-multiculturalist policies. Recent policy documents such as Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society (issued by the Home Office in 2005) shows that the government is seeking simultaneously to be devoted to: improving life chances and reduce inequalities among ethnic minorities (regarding education, jobs, health, housing and policing), promoting ‘a cohesive society’ by bolstering a sense of common belonging and participation in civil society, and fostering a greater understanding of the ‘range of cultures that contribute to our strength as a country.’ It seeks to better integrate immigrants through: citizenship in school curricula, classes for immigrants on British history, customs and public services, a stress on English language acquisition, citizenship tests, ceremonies for new citizens and the possible celebration of a Citizenship Day.

**CONCLUSION**

In diverse contexts around the world where some form of multiculturalism obtained over the past two or three decades, there are observers who put the blame for a supposed ‘failure of integration’
directly on multicultural policies and ethnic minorities’ persistent cultural practices and homeland orientations. They argue that too much cultural preservation and too many maintained links to places of origin are responsible for the poor conditions surrounding immigrants and their descendents. They suggest that the size and diversity of current migration patterns is leading to further social breakdown, particularly if supported by multicultural policies.

However multiculturalism has never been comprised of a single type or piece of policy, institutional framework or programme. Moreover, most multicultural policies were not intended to produce economic outcomes, nor a sense of separateness among minority communities, but rather a broad social acceptance and recognized inclusion in dominant public spheres.

Migration and cultural diversity will certainly remain high on the public agenda for many years to come. Meanwhile patterns and processes of global migration are creating ever more contexts of ‘super-diversity’, and migrants are maintaining strong diasporic identities and direct transnational ties with their homelands. The need for explicit policies and structures to engage these issues is acute. If multiculturalism has been damaged, surely something else must replace it.

Recent ‘post-multicultural’ agendas certainly do not mean that multiculturalism is ‘dead’. Just the world, or ‘-ism’, seems to be. No politician – except perhaps in Canada, where multiculturalism still enjoys prominence as part of the national identity – wants to be associated with ‘the M-word’. The gains of decades of multiculturalism, particularly a broad, everyday (or institutionally mainstreamed) acknowledgement of the gains and value of ethnic diversity, are still evident. This is to be seen in, among other sites, schools, organizations and workplaces. Further, in many places and despite anti-multicultural rhetoric, public opinion polls still tend to show high levels of respect for diversity. For instance, Eurobarometer recently demonstrated that ‘Almost three-quarters of EU citizens believe that people with a different background (ethnic, religious or national) enrich the cultural life of their country’ (European Commission 2007: 4).

It can be said that the turn from explicit ‘multicultural’ discourse and policies has largely been based on a misreading of their purposes and effects. Nevertheless, the measures put in their place need not mean an emphasis on assimilation, intolerance and a resurgence of jingoistic nationalism. Social cohesion and national identity can coexist with a valuing of diversity in the public sphere, programmes to recognize and support cultural traditions, and institutional structures to provide ethnic minority community representation – all without reference to ‘the M-word’. In this way it is hoped that whatever a ‘post-multicultural’ condition looks like, it might still entail the fashioning a greater sense of cosmopolitanism, respect for others, and social justice for migrants and their descendents.
‘Toward post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity’

Steven Vertovec
Max-Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity

SECTION 2 – CASE STUDIES / BEST PRACTICES

The following represent a variety of cases intended to show highly diverse practices and programmes that positively promote cultural diversity across a range of sectors. Descriptions are drawn from websites, media reports and information provided by local observers (including Ricard Zapata, Nancy Foner, Dan Hiebert, Susanne Wessendorf, Ayse Caglar and Gergo Pulay).

1. Network of Public Libraries, Catalonia, Spain

   Catalonia's Department of Culture and Media has supported a variety of measures to establish social integration programmes within the region's 330 public libraries. In addition to the acquisition of 7,228 documents in 2006-2007 – mainly in Punjabi, Portuguese, Russian, Urdu, Arabic, German and English – the Library Service has also implemented the 'Diaris del Món' (World Press) programme, a service that offers through satellite technology over 180 newspapers from sixty different countries in twenty languages.

   Libraries in the network have specialised collections, press and activities on cultural diversity. They also offer: a Welcome service for migrants (electronic information guides on administrative and legal procedures, health care, social assistance, useful addresses and private associations in Catalonia); Tales from other countries (told in Catalan or bilingually); Exhibitions (on migrants coming to Catalonia from all over the world); Easy reading clubs (to improve knowledge of Catalan); School visits (especially for recently arrived pupils to introduce the library and its services in order to facilitate their integration); and special Projects (such as ‘Youth Area’ intended to create a cultural meeting point within the library, specifically devoted to them ‘Trapeze’ aimed at integrating young Arabs, and ‘Bibsons’, a live radio programme from the library aiming to foster the relation between migrant and non-migrant youth).

2. Radio Multikulti, Berlin, Germany

   Radio Multikulti was established in 1994 as an experiment to provide information about the cultural diversity of everyday Berlin. The radio station's strategy involves providing 'information' in two senses: one is to convey basic information about the various groups and cultural backgrounds now found in the city in order to fashion a general climate of acceptance and integration; another is to supply practical assistance to the public – often specifically immigrants and ethnic minorities – by way of information on developments concerning legal conditions and social programs. Alongside news and public information, the station produces diverse forms of entertainment. The total effect is to foster different understandings of cosmopolitanism, directed at both German and 'non-Germans' in Berlin.

   The daily structure of programming reflects other important aspects of Radio Multikulti's strategy. This includes: reports on developments in world politics, European news, and events in Berlin and elsewhere in Germany; ‘World music’; interviews with guests from a range of backgrounds to discuss and criticize new activities and initiatives surrounding cultural diversity; and for five hours...
each day, a succession of programs in ‘the languages of the world-city’: Turkish, Albanian, Arabic, Kurdish, Persian, Polish, Russian, Vietnamese, Italian, Spanish, Greek and separate programs for Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, Bosnians and Macedonians.

Radio Multikulti has received numerous awards for promoting diversity issues, such as the CIVIS prize from the Federal Commissioner for Foreigners’ Affairs, UNESCO recognition as the German partner for the World Decade for Cultural Development, and Internationale Medienhilfe’s radio station of the year.

3. Collingwood Neighbourhood House, Vancouver, Canada

Part community centre, part settlement house for immigrants, part recreation club, Collingwood Neighbourhood House (CNH) began twenty years ago as a local community initiative serving the Renfrew-Collingwood area of eastern Vancouver. As an area of considerable socio-economic deprivation (some 30% living in ‘conditions of poverty’), the Renfrew-Collingwood is home to 50% Chinese residents, 9% Filipino, 8% South Asian and the rest a mix of other ethnic origins. CNH presents a single facility for a wide range of integrative functions for the entire neighbourhood.

It provides educational, cultural, recreational, and social programs in addition to child care programs, day camps, and a Family Place with activities for preschoolers and social time for caregivers. Settlement services for new immigrants include English language classes for adults (child care provided for some classes), Chinese and Korean settlement workers and information in English, Hindi, Punjabi, Cantonese, Spanish and Tagalog. Services for seniors include information and referral, social activities, and fitness programs. Youth services include the Buddy Program which matches elementary school age newcomers to Canada with peer hosts. Also provides proposal writing, event promotion, and conflict management training to increase community leadership skills. Offers various recreation and sport activities and computer training.

CNH was the subject of the documentary film ‘Where Strangers Become Neighbours: The Story of Collingwood Neighbourhood House and the Integration of Immigrants in Vancouver,’ which has been popular at several film festivals and which won first prize in BMW Group’s prestigious Intercultural Learning Awards.

4. Multicultural Center, Prague, Czech Republic

Founded in 1999, the Center presents a remarkable range of educational, cultural and information initiatives. These include workshops, courses, international seminars, debates, film screenings and book readings for children, students, teachers and librarians. Its overall aims are to promote a tolerant society in the Czech Republic while promoting the values of social integration and cohesion.

Examples of the Center’s programmes include: the Dialogue of Cultures (focusing on the interaction and blending of different cultures, languages and religions in the Czech Republic through film screenings, readings, exhibitions, a multicultural afternoon for children and soup competitions), Women between Cultures (a series of debates focusing on the position and role of women in different cultures), and Readings about Minorities and for Minorities (presenting poetry and prose of minorities living in the Czech Republic and elsewhere). Its educational projects entail diversity management (courses designed for company management and teams working in intercultural environment), programs for teachers, pedagogues and librarians, and intercultural workshops for children and students.

Since 2002, the Center has uniquely implemented Diversity in Libraries, a project designed for Czech public libraries and aimed at turning them into a unique space where diverse cultures can meet. It has also distributed, free of charge, a number of books for children, students, experts as well as the general reading public to 500 libraries all over the Czech Republic. In 2004 the Centre carried out a survey among 500 libraries in order to find out how Czech libraries work with minorities.
and foreigners and what services are available to these new users. Stemming from this, it has also
initiated the project Libraries as gateways to the integration of immigrants in the EU.

5. The Media Diversity Institute, London, United Kingdom

The Media Diversity Institute (MDI) is a charity devoted to enhancing the role of media to lessen
inter-group conflict, advance human rights – especially minority rights – and to support deeper
public understanding of all types of social diversity. It focuses on regions where news media have
previously played a destructive role in exacerbating ethnic and religious conflicts and violations of
human and minority rights, such as in Serbia, Israel, Nigeria and Rwanda.

MDI works with media organisations, journalists, journalism educators, NGOs and governments to
prevent and reconcile conflict, promote tolerance of vulnerable groups, and stimulate balanced and
non-partisan journalism. It develops and employs a range of tools, training methods and practical
reporting initiatives to that end. MDI works with local organizations comprising the Reporting
Diversity Network. Together they provide local cross-ethnic reporting projects, media training for
minority NGO groups, and special curricula on reporting diversity for journalism schools.

Examples of MDI’s work include: work in Bosnia with the Sarajevo Media Center to develop a soap
opera that will promote understanding and acceptance of ‘others’; collaboration with the Beta News
Agency in Serbia to produce and distribute more than 70 Reporting Diversity-based articles by 15
correspondents based throughout southeastern Europe while persuading the Ministry for Ethnic and
National Minorities to support a special Web site dedicated to minority issues; and assisting in the
development of Reporting Diversity courses within journalism faculties and schools at Zagreb
University; Tirana University, Sarajevo University, Sofia University, Bucharest University, and the
Novi Sad School of Journalism, Serbia.

6. International Gardens, Dietzenbach, Germany

International Gardens Dietzenbach is one of almost 100 gardening projects under the patronage of
the Stiftung Interkultur (Foundation Interculture). Following the example of ‘International Gardens
Göttingen’, in many German Cities intercultural gardening projects were initiated. However, the
organisation of each gardening project is undertaken by the members, who are mainly families with
a migratory background alongside German families.

The objectives of the gardening project are: to foster the integration and participation of families with
a migratory background in the city’s life; to establish and improve German as the language of
communication (also directly through offering German language courses); and to support the
independency of migrants themselves. Of particular note, the scheme offers female Muslims with a
migratory background access to so-called semi-public spaces.

In addition to its integrative function, the project makes use of the idea of using the idle space for
gardening. Involved families from Dietzenbach come from seven different countries of origin
(Afghanistan, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, the Czech Republic, Turkey and Germany). Together they
have planted vegetables, trees and bushes while they have also built tool sheds, playgrounds and
other facilities. Future plans include the establishment of a community house, while fruit trees have
been donated so that an orchard can be planted.

7. France Télévisions, Paris, France

Since 2004 France Télévision has implemented an Affirmative Action Plan for Integration (Plan
d’Action Positive pour l’Intégration or PAPI). This programme entails measures to improve the
presence, representation and promotion of cultural diversity within the organisation. It also provides
a unit with representatives from all television genres and ensures both the presence and positive
representation of cultural diversity on programmes, at the level of programme participants (e.g.
presenters, chroniclers and hosts) as well as at the level of the choice of the programmes broadcast. Regular studies, meetings and seminars are held to stimulate reflections regarding the necessity to take into account France’s diversity.

Further, following the crisis in certain districts of Paris in November 2005, members of France Télévisions reflected on the gap between the way in which diversity was contentious portrayed in fictional programmes and in the news on French television channels and the way in which it was being perceived in ‘sensitive’ neighbourhoods. Subsequently France Télévisions set up two regular activities: Citizenship-Media Forums in which journalists meet with college and school students from the ‘priority educational zones’ (zone d’éducations prioritaires or ZEP), to discuss and exchange views on their news reports; and Diversity Fiction Screenings when TV films about underprivileged districts are shown and the team involved talk with local inhabitants about the film in question.

France Télévisions has also led many European initiatives and debates about the presentation of diversity in public programming.

8. Fondation ECAP, Institute for Vocational Training, Continuing Education and Research Zürich, Switzerland

Significantly founded in 1984 as a ‘bottom-up’ initiative by Italian migrants themselves, ECAP’s Institute for Vocational Training, Continuing Education and Research has been opened up to all new migrants. The institute provides: general education, language and occupational training for foreign workers living in Switzerland; training of adult education instructors as well as language and cultural mediators; research on the need for education and on the social effects of education; planning, implementation and evaluation of new educational models; organization of conferences and student seminars; and publication of research, essays and didactic materials.

The institute’s training programs are accessible in fourteen cantons around Switzerland. It is comprised of over four hundred employees. Funded by a variety of sources (Swiss public institutions, institutions from migrants’ countries of origin, course fees and sale of books), ECAP works closely with: Swiss institutions at federal and cantonal levels; migrants’ countries of origin and their representations in Switzerland; migration organizations; trade unions; and numerous public and private companies.

9. Immigrant History Week, New York City, United States

Established by Mayor Bloomberg in 2004, Immigrant History Week is comprised of numerous functions meant to foster communication, understanding and respect among all inhabitants of New York City. Its stated goals are ‘to create an environment of inclusiveness that embraces and celebrates all New Yorkers,’ ‘to celebrate New Yorkers’ immigrant histories and contributions,’ ‘to connect New Yorkers of different origins,’ and ‘to inspire New Yorkers to reclaim and take pride in their immigrant roots and history.’

The weeklong cultural celebration features more than 50 free or low-cost events throughout the city’s five boroughs. The events include family programs, cultural celebrations and multi-day workshops hosted by community organizations, museums, public libraries and CUNY. The Mayor’s Office for Immigrant Affairs issues a call for projects and events for Immigrant History Week, to which organization can submit proposals for dance or music performances, panel discussions, art and photo exhibitions and workshops. Venues include libraries, museums, community centers and other public spaces. Examples of events are: ‘Many Hands, Many Places,’ an exhibit featuring the works crafted by immigrant artisans; ‘Silent Film Series: Hungry Hearts and The Immigrant,’ a recently restored dramatic film based on the short stories of a Polish immigrant; and ‘The Immigrant
Experience – Crossing the Boulevard,' a multi-media performance that traces the lives of recent immigrants to Queens.

As part of Immigrant History Week, the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs also has launched a comprehensive guide of community based organizations that provide services for New York City’s immigrants. The guide gives information about the types of services available in the five boroughs and languages spoken at the provider locations. For example, guide describes adult literacy programs, immigration and legal services, and health and nutrition counseling. It also contains information in English, Spanish, Chinese and Russian about key City laws and policies that affect immigrants.

During Immigrant History Week the Mayor also give awards to individuals and groups for their work in immigrant communities.

10. Athe Sam Roma Festival, Budapest, Hungary

The Athe Sam Roma festival took place in Budapest in June 2007. It brought several well-known Roma artists and performers together with a mixed audience of Roma and non-Roma Hungarians. Roma music entailed a broad spectrum of genres ranging from the traditional to rap, jazz and classical music. There were also theater performances, including a ‘self-ironic display’ about ‘the Roma life’, film-screenings, and exhibitions. Although there were roundtables about ‘Roma in the educational system’, or ‘Roma in the media’, it was the music and performances, which were central to the festival program and to its success.

The festival was not framed within the usual terminology of politics related to Roma in Hungary – such as poverty, discrimination, exclusion and citizenship rights – but as a cultural festival of high-quality music and arts which brought different Roma groups and non-Roma together. The relations among the organizers, performers (which also included artists from Brazil and Spain) and the audience were mediated through arts, not in the terms of ethnic majority/minority. Despite the exclusionary divisions between these groups in the daily life, at the festival, they were artists and a public who came together through art and culture.

Instead of aiming to preserve the existing divisions, i.e. bringing Roma and non-Roma Hungarians’ ‘own’ music and art into the encounter (as it is the case in most multicultural events), it was built on crossbreeding of cultural forms and genres. Such events have the potential to foster cultural diversity as a sustainable diversity without leading to ethnic and/or cultural closures. If cultural diversity is a project of democratic inclusion which will create a more inclusive public space for communication and exchange and enable the access of the excluded to this public space by changing the terms of participation, then the ‘Athe Sam Roma festival’ was such a good practice.
SECTION 3 – SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

1) While pointing to important indicators of diversity, country of origin data may mask significant forms of differentiation. Within any particular population from a given country, there will be important distinctions with reference to ethnicity, religious affiliation and practice, regional and local identities in places of origin, class and social status, kinship, clan or tribal affiliation, political parties and movements, and other criteria of collective belonging. Surveys, policies and reports should take greater account of a range of variables when describing migrant or ethnic minority populations.

2) Immigrants’ channels of migration and the myriad legal statuses which arise from them are often just as, or even more, crucial than shared ethnicity or country of origin with reference to: how people group themselves and where people live, how long they can stay, how much autonomy they have (versus control by an employer, for instance), whether their families can join them, what kind of livelihood they can undertake and maintain, and to what extent they can make use of public services and resources (including schools, health, training, benefits and other ‘recourse to public funds’). Immigration status is not just a crucial factor in determining an individual’s relation to the state, its resources and legal system, the labour market and other structures; it is an important catalyst in the formation of social capital and a potential barrier to the formation of cross-cutting socio-economic and ethnic ties. Legal status should be recognized more as a key variable of social differentiation.

3) It is increasingly recognized that migrants engage in a variety of transnational practices such as sending remittances. However, not all migrants maintain the same level or kinds of transnational engagement, socially, culturally, economically or politically. Much of this will be largely conditioned by a range of factors including migration channel and legal status (e.g. refugees or undocumented persons may find it harder to maintain certain ties abroad), migration and settlement history, community structure and gendered patterns of contact, political circumstances in the homeland, economic means and more. Hence, transnational practices among immigrants in Britain are highly diverse between and within groups (whether defined by country of origin, ethnicity, immigration category or any other criteria). Policy-makers should pay greater attention to such differentiation.

4) Belonging, loyalty and sense of attachment are not parts of a zero-sum game based on a single nation-state or society. That is, the ‘more transnational’ a person is does not automatically mean the ‘less integrated’ they are, and the ‘less integrated’ does not necessarily prompt or strengthen the ‘more transnational’ patterns of association. While migrants continue to feel powerfully bound to homelands and communities elsewhere, they are now more able to maintain and enhance these feelings while at the same time are quite capable of developing a new life, livelihood, social ties and political interests in their places of settlement. Politicians, policy-shapers, the media and other public actors should take these facts into account.

5) It is often clear in various studies that group inter-relations are closely dependent on the existence or absence of competition for local resources and services (whether of state, voluntary or public sector). Lack of conflict between ethnic groups is often due to a separation of communities by way of economic niches, and or differential demands on public resources. Policy-makers should reflect on
whether their measures might actually make matters worse for minorities by creating conditions of competition.

6) In order to be successful as a strategy for breaking down prejudices and encouraging interaction, individuals should be made aware of each others’ **multiple category memberships** under conditions that promote inclusiveness. People should be able to represent themselves by way of voicing their many identities, not simply a presumed ‘ethnic’ one.

7) Given the overwhelming fact that **most new migrants move into places populated by previous cohorts of immigrants or ethnic minorities**, a wide variety of interactions and integration processes occur among these groups – not just with regard to longstanding White communities. Indeed, many immigrants often only meet, live in the same building with, socialize or work with other immigrants or British ethnic minorities. These kinds of encounters and processes have hardly been addressed in social scientific research or policy development. Support should be given to previous migrant and ethnic minority groups in terms of assistance in integrating newcomers.

8) Structures and modes of government support for, and liaison with, **ethnic minority organizations** have for decades formed the core of models of multiculturalism. Especially on local levels, these have indeed often provided important forums for sharing experiences and needs, establishing good practices and providing access to services. However, in light of the numerous dimensions of contemporary super-diversity, such structures and modes are inadequate for effective representation. Most local authorities have been used to liaising with a limited number of large and well-organized associations; now there are far more numbers in smaller, less (or not at all) organized groups. Now given new numbers and complexities of migration, just how many groups could such structures support? Existing minority ethnic agencies often cannot respond to the needs of the various newcomers. None of this is to say that community organizations no longer have a place in bridging migrant groups and local authorities or service providers. Such bodies remain crucial to the process, but should be recognized as only partially relevant with regard to their representativeness and scope.

9) The growing complexity of the population carries with it a range of significant **public service** implications. Among these is no less than a fundamental shift in strategies across a range of service sectors concerning the assessment of needs, planning, budgeting, commissioning of services, identification of partners for collaboration and gaining a broader appreciation of diverse experiences in order generally to inform debate. Such a shift must begin with gathering basic information on the new diversity. Existing measures are inadequate and may even impair service delivery. Moreover, no simple ‘knowledge based’ training – in which service providers are taught the customs and values of particular ethnic minority cultures – can prepare professionals for all the issues that ever increasing diversity creates. Learning generic skills to respond flexibly to a wide range of cultural encounters is more appropriate.

10) In order to avoid the conventional trap of addressing newcomers just in terms of some presumably fixed ethnic identity, an awareness of the new super-diversity suggests that policy-makers and practitioners should take account of new immigrants’ **plurality of affiliations** (recognizing multiple identifications and axes of differentiation, only some of which concern ethnicity). Recognition of the range of affiliations and engagements – such as with their localities of residence – will likely demonstrate that ethnic minorities are far better ‘integrated’ than is often presumed.
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