

Chapter 1

THE MULTICULTURALISM-INTERCULTURALISM DEBATE: AN INTERVIEW WITH TARIQ MODOOD

Tariq Modood¹, Rina Manuela Contini² and Cinzia Pica-Smith^{3,}*

¹Department of Sociology and Politics, and Director of University of Bristol Research Centre for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship,
University of Bristol, UK

²Department of Management and Business Administration,
University of Chieti-Pescara, Italy

³Department of Human Services and Rehabilitation Studies,
Assumption College, Worcester, MA, US

ABSTRACT

This chapter presents an interview with seminal scholar, and sociologist, Tariq Modood. Modood delves into an in-depth analysis of interculturalism and multiculturalism discussing the theoretical underpinnings, the real differences in the frameworks, the shortcomings of the ways in which interculturalism has framed itself as an innovative framework, and the possibilities of complementarity in the frameworks. During the interview he engages in important discussions on the concepts of recognition, diversity, social cohesion, social justice, and ends the interview with reflections on intercultural education.

KEY THEMES IN THE DEBATE ABOUT MULTICULTURALISM VERSUS INTERCULTURALISM

A critical analysis of the theoretical framing of Intercultural Education and its policies and practices necessarily requires an in-depth study of the political framework of both multiculturalism and interculturalism and of the debate that exists between the two positions in order to adequately contextualize the educational extension of interculturalism.

*Corresponding Author's Emails: rm.contini@unich.it; cpicasmith@assumption.edu.

We would like to thank Professor Tariq Modood who kindly participated in this interview on July 17, 2019 via Skype.

Some of the key points of the debate are questions related to “intercultural dialogue and exchange” and “social cohesion”, the relation between “micro” and “macro” level interventions, the connection between “diversity,” “recognition,” and “identity,” and the nation state’s responsibilities to accommodate and balance the needs and rights of the “majority” and “minority.”

This interview with Professor Tariq Modood, one of the most prominent scholars in the debate between interculturalists and multiculturalists, goes to the core of these themes. The construct of *recognition* is foundational in the multicultural framework and in Taylor’s seminal work (Taylor, 1994a). Taylor links the demand for recognition to the concept *identity*, that he relates to *recognition, non-recognition, misrecognition*: “Our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the *misrecognition* of others [...] Non-recognition or *misrecognition* can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being” (Taylor, 1994a, p. 25).

Kymlicka (1995; 2007) defines multiculturalism as a political approach to manage culturally diverse societies based on the equal recognition granted to the cultures minority and majority groups. Modood (2007, p. 2) considers multiculturalism as “the recognition of group difference within the public sphere of laws, democratic discourses and the terms of a shared citizenship and national identity”. In the following interview Modood focuses on two dimension of identity: a sense of “one’s own group identity” and “how other people typecast us or stereotype us,” tying multicultural policies to the public sphere and, specifically, “political recognition” aimed at “empowering our own identity” in the field of institutional accommodation.

Another central theme dealt with in the interview is the new conceptualization of “diversity.” “Diversity,” key word at the basis of the intercultural framework (and foundational idea to interculturalism) considers the heterogeneity of national, ethnic and faith groups and it denotes a shift to the micro/individual level versus the macro/group level. Modood leads the debate on the delicate balance between the emphasis on individual rights and the concern with institutional adjustment per group accommodations.

In the interview Modood highlights that focusing on the concept of “super-diversity” (Vertovec, 2007) decontextualized from an analysis on macro politics (macro political level) and from the concept (idea) of “group accommodation within common institutions” can “gloss over” the disadvantages, asymmetries and inequalities that characterize our current societies.

In such a social reality the question remains about whether the fomenting of the interculturalism vs multiculturalism supports and advances the specific needs that policy makers and educators have to solve the issues linked to the increasingly diverse and inequitable societies, of societies informed by *governmentality* of promotion of social cohesion (Contini, 2017; Contini, Pica-Smith, 2017) and in line with civic integration policies (Joppke, 2007; 2016). Taylor (2016) notes that those who participate in this debate do, fundamentally, agree in some basic ways regardless of where they are situated on the multi/interculturalism continuum. He contends that all can agree on the goal of integration in increasingly diverse societies and that this goal cannot happen within assimilatory frameworks. Kymlicka (2016), criticizes an intercultural strategy that is based on building a new political narrative in which interculturalism emerges from the rhetoric of the failures of multiculturalism.

In his interview Modood steers the discussion on the necessity to overcome the contrast between inter and multi, because contraposition does not help the “cause of diversity.” Multiculturalism can contribute

by focusing on macro politics, national citizenship, and equality. In a complementary manner interculturalism can contribute by focusing on smaller scale dialogue and interaction at the micro level.

The hope is that this debate can contribute to the advancement of reflection and to research and practice on new solutions to face the challenges set by our complex contemporary societies.

THE INTERVIEW

Question: There is a timely and lively debate between interculturalists and multiculturalists, and you are at the epicenter of it. In your essay, “Must Interculturalists misrepresent Multiculturalism?” (Modood 2017, Comparative Migration Studies, 5:15), you assert that “it is intellectually mistaken to accept IC [Interculturalism] as new and superior to MC [Multiculturalism]” (p. 2). Interculturalists “do not really engage with the political theory of MC - or even its policies (Modood, 2016) - but with a stereotype of MC [...] [IC’s] negative characterizations of MC may resonate with stereotypes and ‘common perceptions’ (Bouchard, 2016; Zapata-Barrero, 2016) but are not true of the political theory of MC” (Modood, 2017, p. 2). Could you further explain your point about how interculturalism is not a new departure or a new theoretical framework from the framework of multiculturalism and how interculturalists misrepresent multiculturalism? This is particularly interesting to us as we (Pica-Smith, Contini, & Veloria, 2019; Contini, Pica-Smith, 2018; Contini, Pica-Smith, 2017; Contini, 2017) believe the same dynamic is at play when it comes to the debate in the context of education between proponents of intercultural education and critical multicultural education frameworks.

Tariq Modood (TM): I think that the main differences between interculturalism and multiculturalism, as interculturalists understand it, is that interculturalism emphasizes the importance of intercultural dialogue or more broadly, contact and interaction between different groups of people and that’s something that I think we find in the writings of a number of people. I think that the problem with that is that if we actually look at what multiculturalists have written, and unfortunately interculturalists are not very good at doing that, we see that there is an ignoring of the fact that multiculturalists have actually emphasized dialogue themselves. So if we think of someone like Charles Taylor, for instance, and he’s obviously one of the most seminal theorists of multiculturalism, he emphasized the importance of dialogue in his concept of recognition and he emphasized how – I mean even in his discussion of Master-Slave relationship, he emphasized the importance that the ‘master’ in a sense is not free because he’s not free of how he’s understood or perceived by the slave; that he is held by the understanding the slave has of him in their relationship and that the only way of moving forward is through a dialogical relationship (Taylor 1994 [1992]). His understanding of identity is very much a dialogical understanding of identity. If we take another important political theorist like Bhikhu Parekh, I mean he actually in his best known book *Rethinking Multiculturalism* (2006 [2000]), he actually devotes a chapter to intercultural dialogue and he, again, like Taylor emphasizes dialogue as a very central theme in his work.

If we add other multicultural theorists, James Tully (1995), Iris Marion Young (1990), it is clear that dialogue is really a foundational idea to multiculturalism and it’s a shame that this is not recognized by interculturalists (Modood 2019a, ch. 12). I think the key difference is that when multiculturalists have talked about dialogue, they’re really thinking about political controversy and political contestation, certainly very

much thinking about what we might call the ‘public sphere’ and the dialogue that they’re then talking about is what you might call dialogue at a fairly macro level, at a political, societal level. Here the interculturalists actually do add something additional, something different, because when they talk about dialogue they’re really talking about relatively small scale situations, sometimes very informal situations such as people just coming across each other in a shopping mall or even a bus queue or a bus line, and they’re just talking about very small encounters and sometimes they use expressions such as about people rubbing along together. It is true that the political theorists of multiculturalism have not much talked about that, but it’s not true to say that they haven’t talked about dialogue. So I think that we can learn something from interculturalists if we don’t take them at their face value, but look at what actually in their studies they focus on because the empirical focus on the small scale, on the micro, is a genuine complementary addition to the work of theorists of multiculturalism.

The other key difference I would mention that interculturalists’ emphasize, when they contrast their position with multiculturalism, is the idea of individual rights. I think that the sense is that multiculturalists are too concerned with group rights and hence these group rights can allow elites within a group - an elite within a minority, possibly an elderly male elite - to speak for and then control other people within the group. Their view is that the way to stop this happening is to emphasize the importance that everybody, regardless of their group membership, should enjoy individual rights protected in law. I’m not in disagreement with that, I think individual rights are fundamental. Certainly, in no place have I’ve talked about overriding individual rights.

The difference is that unlike liberals and interculturalists, multiculturalists argue that individual rights are by themselves not enough to bring about, to ensure, equality in the context of groups, in the context of multicultural heterogeneity, so sometimes groups need to be given various exemptions from laws. A simple one case is that of male Sikhs in Britain and Canada who may wear a turban, believing their religion requires them to do so. They are allowed to wear a turban, when others have to wear something else on their head because of, say a work uniform - a police uniform, for instance – requires it. So that’s an exemption. Sometimes minorities need additional provision that the majority does not need for itself. This may be that Jewish schoolchildren in a common school might require a kosher diet, even though we don’t have anything called a Christian diet because on the whole Christians eat most things or everything. The majority’s needs are actually always taken care of because they are what shape standard provision. So, a multiculturalist accommodation is an adjustment of institutional or societal rules to meet the needs of minorities. That’s what I understand by ‘group rights’ and as you can see from my examples, they are not a denial of or in opposition to individual rights.

Interviewer: Yes, I see.

TM: So, I think we need some idea of group accommodation or what one might call ‘group rights’. I prefer not to talk about group right; I prefer to talk about group accommodation within common institutions. We need those in addition to individual rights. They are not a substitute for individual rights, nor do they trump individual rights.

So, I think on these are two differences with multiculturalism that interculturalists emphasize. Firstly, they emphasize the micro but fail to note that it is an addition not a substitute for the macro. Secondly, they emphasize individual rights and give up on the idea of group accommodation (Modood 2017, 2018).

Question: Ted Cantle states that “interculturalism is based upon an entirely different conceptual and policy framework and offers a new and progressive approach to how we learn to live with diversity” (Cantle, 2016, p. 133). How would you respond to Cantle’s assertion?

TM: I think this question complements the previous question. Ted Cantle is emphasizing certain things which perhaps have not been sufficiently emphasized in multiculturalism so there is some novelty in his perspective, I don’t want to deny that. I would say that there are two aspects to this novelty. Firstly, he wants to emphasize that in countries like Britain and the United States, Canada and so on, we’re living in a time of what Steve Vertovec has called ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec 2007). ‘Super-diversity’ means that we’re not just talking about a few limited groups, a few minorities that we could you know list on our hand - or at least two hands - and that policy can be shaped around accommodating in the way that multiculturalists have been arguing for. He said, no, there are too many different groups of people and some of the groups can be very small; and moreover, many individuals don’t necessarily identify with just one group. They may feel -- especially of course if one of their own parents is of mixed heritage, they identify with more than one group. Add to that the fact that the sources of recent migration are quite diverse - from so many different continents and becoming more diverse. This leads Cantle to say, look, let us not get stuck to the idea that we have to recognize groups, because actually what we’ve got is an enormous super diversity of individuals, not just of groups.

The other thing he wants to emphasize is that most multiculturalists, including myself, have tended to focus on national citizenship because we think citizenship is a strong, normative concept from which strong arguments from equality are made and so we have grounded our multiculturalism in the idea of national citizenship. This is true of Will Kymlicka (1995), it’s true of Parekh, it’s true of myself (Modood 2019b). Whereas Cantle says that the time that we’re living in now is one where so many of our lives and relationships, including economic and cultural relationships, are shaped by globalization and that this is something that multiculturalists do not take this into account.

Having said what are the two things that I think are novel in Cantle’s approach, my response to each would be as follows. Firstly, I would say that actually there are groups, there are significantly visible groups, they are significantly stigmatized and disadvantaged, and we can identify them. They’re not hidden in a morass of super diversity. So African Americans, Hispanics, Muslims...these are all groups of people that we can name and identify. What is of course true is that within any of that category, there will be internal differences. For example, with Muslims you have conservative Muslims and liberal Muslims, you have middle class Muslims and working class Muslims, you have Muslims of Middle Eastern origin and Black Muslim and you have men and women and so on. So of course, to talk about any group of people is not to say that they are reduced, to as it were, ‘one variable’ or ‘one dimension’. But that’s true of everything, that’s not a particular critique of multiculturalism. In sociology we always have to have some way of identifying groups of populations so that we can talk about them, so that we can do research about them, so we can theorize about them. The internal differentiation don’t have to be hidden; they come into play but they come into play whilst, say, we talk about “the working class” or “Muslims”. If, however, we were to throw off the general category “working class” or “middle class” or “Muslim” or “Black” then we would be hiding from ourselves the ways in which class disadvantage or racism and stereotyping operate (Modood, 2013 [2007]: ch. 5). So we need general concepts and categories. Super diversity may be a fact, but groups

also exist and super diversity can gloss over the real asymmetries and disadvantages, the inequalities, including inequalities of esteem, inequalities of power that are the feature of our societies.

In relationship to globalization I think Cantle and others do have a point, but my response would be that citizenship is still one of our most powerful normative concepts, one of our most powerful political concepts. We shouldn't give up on that. We can't just say that everybody in the world is equally related to everyone else in the world. The way that we're related to our citizens, co-citizens, has extra responsibilities, extra obligations -- you know we pay taxes on the basis that we are co-citizens and the money will be spent in certain kinds of ways, you know through elected governments deciding and so on. We make laws for ourselves in a country where we can't make laws about what's happening in another country. So yes, we should be mindful of our relations with other countries, though a certain amount to international cooperation around issues to do with, for instance, human rights, regulating migration, eradicating poverty, climate change and so on. All these things are very important but they don't, and they shouldn't, undermine the fact that citizenship is an important political concept and that equal citizenship cannot be realized if we're blind to the ways in which our racialized identities and our own sense of membership in a group and identity make a difference to how citizenship operates...i.e., it can create second and third class citizenships. So that's why we must focus on the context of citizenship, on the resources that citizenship has and its biggest resource is the idea of equal membership and common belonging. So we really need that in order to make equal citizenship work and that's exactly what multiculturalism tries to do in relation to issues around majority and minority identities.

Question: I find myself nodding as you speak and noting all so many parallels in the intercultural/multicultural education frameworks. I see the same dynamics of which you speak between the perspectives on interculturalism and multiculturalism and those on intercultural education and multicultural education. But before we get to education, I would like to hear more about the bigger picture in which your thinking is located. Could you say how you understand both the concepts of "recognition" and "social cohesion" as they are understood in the frameworks of multiculturalism and interculturalism? Maybe you could say a bit about how you understand the connection (or lack thereof) between social cohesion, social order and social justice?

TM: I think recognition has made a very big difference to our political understanding by emphasizing the importance of identity or identities and of bringing out how identity has two dimensions. Firstly, we all have a sense of our own group identity (here of course I'm not talking about private, personal identity). We have a sense of belonging to a certain group, especially if that group is a minority or a group that's recently settled in the country because it stands out and you know we're taught certain stories from our family and so on about who we are - that's one dimension.

The other dimension of identity is how other people perceive and treat us, because they say things like 'you're Black, so actually you can't do this' or 'you're very good at sports' or you know 'you've got rhythm, that's great, that's cool'. Our identities are an interaction between these two things, between our own sense of identity and how other people typecast us or stereotype us. Multiculturalism is about empowering our own identity so as to resist the dominant identities that are imposed upon us, imposed upon minorities through racism and stereotypes and stigmatization of groups. This is part of what is meant by political 'recognition' (Modood, 2013 [2007]: ch. 3).

Recognition is not just about identities at a discursive level, though I think that's obviously very important because that shapes our public sphere. Recognition also involves institutional accommodation. Not just recognizing that people belong to groups, but how those groups might not be getting fair treatment because of the way that institutions are designed to serve the cultural needs of majorities and often to also marginalize or oppress minorities. Examples of institutional accommodation I gave minutes ago were of the Sikh turban and kosher food at school. I think interculturalism sacrifices or demotes equality, because it just wants to emphasize that we are all diverse. And it brings in the concept of social cohesion. I don't want to deny that diversity can create problems, and we must work to overcome the problems. But the multiculturalist concept of equality absolutely is central to defining the problem and to defining the solutions and people who talk about social cohesion don't do that.

Going beyond that, I should add that social cohesion, nor social order, nor social justice are my framing concepts. As I was explaining a moment ago, I work with the idea of citizenship, and from it I derive a concept of multicultural citizenship. So, to your question, what do I think about social cohesion, social order and social justice, my answer is that I am not for or against any of them as long as each is multiculturalised. In each context, what we need to do is to ensure that equality and recognition are included. Now you might say, well but isn't social justice really the frame that multiculturalists and others are working with? And I would say yes and no. Yes, in the sense that of course in one form or another we all want social justice but no, in the sense that I don't think that most concepts of social justice adequately take multiculturalist concern into account. I think that often, I think this is true for instance of Nancy Fraser's understanding of social justice (Fraser and Honneth 2003). When she talks about the cultural dimension of equality she call it 'status'; while it is true that society assigns us differential status and there can be inequality and injustice in that, Fraser doesn't take into account of how our own self-understanding is important to us. So, it's not enough for society to give Sikhs, for instance to use my previous example, a certain status, it actually needs to allow Sikhs to express themselves in terms of their own self-understanding. So only Sikhs can tell us what it is to be a Sikh. And I don't see that happening in most concepts of social justice. They tend to assume a certain objective ideal of justice that is independent of a plurality of subjectivities or positionalities, or assume certain majority conceptions and then say, oh, these majority conceptions are unequally realized, they create differential status i.e., unequal status, they give lower status to some. For instance, they give lower status to Sikhs. The issue, however, isn't simply lower and higher status, the issue is what is it to be a Sikh and what does society need to do in order to accommodate Sikhs as full members of our society? Now if there's a concept of social justice doing that, then good, I'm on the side of that concept. But I don't personally have a theory of social justice so I'm not offering one. All I'm saying is whichever theory of social justice is being discussed I want to make sure that it includes a multiculturalist understanding.

Question: I see. Thank you. Moving on, in your conceptual essay titled "Interculturalism: Not a new policy paradigm" (2018) that reflects back on a symposium of contributions by both interculturalists and multiculturalists, you write about a spirited analysis and debate during the symposium involving many scholars in the field of social policy. You cite yourself (Modood, 2018) disagreeing with the assertion that IC is a new theory, Joppke (2018) stating IC is "shallow and dangerous," and de Waal (2018) noting that IC is both "ambivalent and dangerous". Moreover, you note that "Levrau and Loobuyck (2018), Boucher and Maclure (2018), Oosterlynck (2018), Levrau (2018) and Kastoryano (2018) identify how IC can add

to and complement MC without replacing it.” (Modood, 2018, p. 1). Could you talk more about how you understand the framework to be potentially harmful or dangerous? What do you and your colleagues mean by this?

TM: Thank you for picking up that symposium in *Comparative Migration Studies*. I think that it brought out rather well some limitations in interculturalism, but I think I would like to go beyond it and I do try to do that. I want to build on that to say how can interculturalism and multiculturalism be brought together. I don't want to see them as an either/or or pitted against each other in a competitive relationship. I really don't think that helps the cause of diversity or multicultural equality because to be quite honest it's divisive.

Having said that, of course I appreciate that it all depends on how we bring them together because interculturalists may well say that they're already doing this though I say they're not. So I think that the best way of bringing them together is by recognizing that multiculturalists have focused on macro politics, or what should our national citizenship look like, what does equality mean when we think of the country as a whole and the different groups within the country, and of political controversies at a national level? So many of the controversies that for example Muslims today are involved in, whether it is to do with dress or whether Muslims are sufficiently liberal, whether their ways of thinking are compatible with what are called 'western values' and so on, those are all big macro debates and that's what multiculturalism focuses on and has always done so. Interculturalism tends to focus on looking at how people come to work together, to live together, to study together and that tends to be looking at a much smaller scale, for example, how did it happen in this neighborhood? And I think that's the complementarity. Multiculturalism should carry on working at a macro political level and interculturalism can contribute by considering how these larger ideas of multiculturalism are or are not being lived out at an everyday level...that's how I think we need to now go beyond this, what you might call this 'fight' between multiculturalists and interculturalists. We need to have this complementarity through a certain kind of macro/micro division of labor. And if we don't have that—well “united we stand, divided we fall” we are letting down the minorities that we say we care about and whose equality we want to champion.

Question: I very much agree with you that interculturalists and those who are proponents of intercultural education must talk about asymmetries of power, group membership, dimensions of identity, group identity, belonging to groups that have been historically marginalized, and that regardless of intersectionality, regardless of being a woman or a man or young or old and belonging to – you know having different dimensions to one's identity, yet still being Black or Hispanic or Muslim or you know those very important dimensions of belonging to a group that's been historically and presently you know significantly discriminated against. For example in the United States being African American, being Black, today means a great deal whether or not you're middle class or affluent or young or old or female or male, so how is it possible for interculturalists to still do that work on a small scale (micro) without committing to really important aspects of a multiculturalist framework (macro)?

Could I ask you to consider these matters in relation to interculturalism's pedagogical extension, Intercultural Education, and how it is being proposed by some intercultural education scholars and proponents as a conceptually new model and most the appropriate answer to globalization. For example, Agostino Portera (2008, p. 485) has called it a “truly Copernican revolution”. How do you respond to such a claim?

TM: I agree with the spirit of your question, namely that we can't overlook issues around group exclusion, group disadvantage, stigmatization. In relation to Professor Portera's suggestion that intercultural education marks a Copernican Revolution, I think he's not drawing the line in the right place. The Copernican Revolution, meaning a paradigm shift, is really the shift from what we might call assimilation to respect for difference, because if we look at immigration-based societies, and obviously the United States is a leading example, but including Canada and Britain and Australia and France and so on, we see that equality has gone hand-in-hand with the idea of assimilation; that if you want to be treated the same you have to assimilate, you have to become the same as the majority. We now critique that idea because we'd say you are imposing an unfair demand, you are making the price of equality much higher for minorities than for everybody else. No one else has been asked to give up their identity, why should minorities be asked to give up theirs? I think that the Copernican Revolution, the shift from assimilative equality to respect for difference and that's not peculiar to intercultural education. I don't actually find that there is a proper account of the difference between multicultural, intercultural and transcultural education in the Portera article you have quoted from. The article promises something like that but it doesn't deliver it. It just asserts that intercultural education is now solving the problems that multicultural education couldn't solve, but it doesn't show that in any detail at all so I don't see why Professor Portera comes to the conclusion that he does. Moreover, the article uses multiculturalism or multicultural education by reference to programs of education and language training in the 1970's. That is a very limited understanding of multiculturalism and it's certainly not the one I've been talking about. It is true that some governments in the 1970s - Germany is a very good example - where they had guest workers who were coming on fixed contracts after which they had to leave the country (that's why they were called 'guest workers'), it is true that they were given some education or training for themselves and their children in their home languages, so Turkish workers, for instance, were given the opportunity to keep Turkish language and culture and their Islamic religion alive and this was all done through very formal segregation. They weren't really allowed to mix with the German population.

But this was not done on the basis of a political theory of multiculturalism. Portera makes no reference to the political theory of multiculturalism, which really only got going in the 1990's and well after the period that he's talking about when he refers to multicultural education in the 1970's. The political theory I'm talking about really gets going with the feminist Iris Young (1990), Charles Taylor 1994[1992]), Will Kymlicka (1995) and Bhikhu Parekh (2006 [2000]). Those are four authors that I would cite as the core theorists of political multiculturalism and I just don't understand something being called multiculturalism without reference to their ideas. So, what Portera is talking about is something entirely different. I think what he's talking about I would probably call kind of mother tongue or home culture maintenance.

What I'm talking about is education into a shared multicultural citizenship and sense of belonging to the country in which you are now a citizen or on a pathway to becoming a citizen. Those are two opposite things. Professor Portera isn't the only one to talk like this. I think when, in her famous speech, Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany said that multiculturalism had utterly failed and was not wanted back (ESO 2010), She also was thinking of the home culture maintenance program that Germany put on in the 1970's and 1980's. I don't call that multiculturalism so actually I can agree with Chancellor Merkel that what she calls multiculturalism has utterly failed, because I know that what she's talking about is not what I'm talking about and which I agree has absolutely failed. We certainly don't want that kind of segregation.

So in relation to how we're to emphasize issues around kind of culture and issues around power and social justice, I think we should avoid seeking them as alternatives, as either/or, because I think whatever the social order, social cohesion or social justice that we want to advocate, I want to make sure that it includes what I've been referring to as multicultural equality or recognition. So I don't particularly want to take sides between social cohesion and social justice, because I think they can both be lacking what I want to emphasize and if they do include what I want to emphasize, well in that case they've met my primary concern.

Question: A central so-called "innovation" of migratory politics/theory and policies is the framing of the term and concept of "diversity." Several scholars have commented on the fact that this framing has caused a shift from immigrants being understood as ethnic "group" to "individuals" (Faist, 2009; Ambrosini, 2014; Contini, 2017). Hence, this move towards a "diversity" narrative (a neoliberal narrative) has coincided with a shift towards a disaffection from multiculturalism in Europe (Joppke, 2004; 2007). Ambrosini (2016, p. 1) suggests that "diversity could be the new framework within which multiculturalist stances can be reshaped"....."In the present European political landscape, diversity policies could recover and even enhance several multiculturalist stances, shaping them into a new cultural framework" (p. 15). How do you understand this shifting dynamic?

TM: We all know that the term 'diversity' is sometimes used as a diversionary term, to soften the political demands of multiculturalism and this relates to the stuff about super-diversity that I was talking about earlier to say well, we're all different, so why are African Americans or Muslims making a big fuss about their difference, we're all different. I think that is very superficial. So I guess I would suggest we use the term 'diversity' as a kind of generic term so that we can create an umbrella or a coalitional grouping of those positions that can be called 'pro diversity' and they may not all be the same, in fact I know they're not the same. I think liberal individualism has something to contribute to diversity within a nation's state and I think this is what some people who emphasize super diversity or even interculturalism, they are actually emphasizing a certain kind of liberal individualism and trying to take it beyond the nation-state, what we might call 'cosmopolitanism' namely that you want to have a kind of liberal or civic relationship with everybody in the world. We sometimes express that idea by saying we are citizens of the world. Well yes, but as I was saying before that is not the same as being citizens of our own country and of being equal citizens of our own country.

While there's nothing wrong with being citizens of the world but that's a different meaning of citizen, that's more like a kind of – a human rights discourse rather than a citizenship discourse. And I think we can make the same distinction between multiculturalism within our nation-state, which is by and large what most political theorists in multiculturalism have argued for so far and maybe we need to find ways of going beyond that and to think about multiculturalism within transnational perspectives -- this can be perhaps a new way of thinking about globalization as well – and consider if multiculturalism something to contribute to cosmopolitanism or transnationalism? Can multiculturalism be given some force in relation to global connections as opposed to simply national ones?

I suppose I would say the jury is out. Most political theorists of multiculturalism, including myself, have not really grappled with those issues. We have thought that the task of multiculturalizing our national

citizenship is a big enough task and we've all focused on that, but maybe we do need to be now thinking about multiculturalizing the processes of globalization.

I haven't done much thinking on that, but I'll offer one thought just to bring out more clearly how there can be different levels of governance and multiculturalism doesn't always transfer well from one level to another.

My thought has to do with Britain's current predicament at the moment in relation to the European Union. Though the country voted in a referendum to leave the European Union and people say to me 'oh what implications do you think this has on multiculturalism?'- and just so there's no misunderstanding I'm a very strong "remainer", I don't want us to leave - I do say when asked that question, that Britain is the most multiculturalist country out of the 28 countries in the European Union. Maybe Sweden is somewhere in the same space but most of the other countries certainly aren't. The big countries like France and Germany are not. So even though the European Union tries to go beyond the idea of national borders and strong nationalism, which we know it can be the enemy of multiculturalism, it nevertheless has not really embraced multiculturalism. Yet Britain, which may not be sufficiently European, is actually more multiculturalist than most of the other countries.

It is something of a paradox but it does bring out a point that I'm trying to make, which is that the project of wanting a multiculturalist national citizenship doesn't hang on a kind of global or in this case 'European' multiculturalism, because global and European multiculturalism may not even exist. You may be able to make some progress in relation to your own country and if you can do that you've probably got a better chance of influencing, partly through example, influencing other, especially neighboring countries or international organizations you belong to. So I think that there is no need to apologize for focusing on the national citizenship, but I also accept that multiculturalists do need to also think beyond national citizenship.

Question: Well, that's quite a profound statement and good to end on. Indeed, this whole conversation resonates deeply for me and it feels like it just captured so many of the themes in your work and in your writing. I would really like to thank you for taking the time to talk to me today and for being part of this project. Thank you for contextualizing our conversation about intercultural education and situating it in within its political origin and helping us to see how it is relevant to the interculutralism/multiculturalism debate.

TM: Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to introduce this European debate about multiculturalism and interculturalism to a US readership of educationalists.

REFERENCES

- Ambrosini, M. (2014). *Non passa lo straniero? Le politiche migratorie tra sovranità nazionale e diritti umani* [Does the foreigner not pass? Migration policies between national sovereignty and human rights]. Assisi: Cittadella Editrice.
- Ambrosini, M. (2016). Superdiversity, multiculturalism and local policies: a study on European cities. *Policy & Politics*, doi: 10.1332/030557316X14745534309609.

- Bouchard, G. (2016). Quebec Interculturalism and Canadian multiculturalism. In N. Meer, T. Modood, & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.) (2016), *Multiculturalism and interculturalism: debating the dividing lines*. (pp. 77-103). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Boucher, F. & Maclure, J. (2018). Moving the debate forward: interculturalism's contribution to multiculturalism. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6.
- Cantle, T. (2016). The case for Interculturalism, plural identities and cohesion. In N. Meer, T. Modood, & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and interculturalism: debating the dividing lines*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Contini, R. M. (2017). *Il paradigma interculturale. Questioni teoriche e declinazioni educative [The intercultural paradigm. Theoretical questions and educational issues]*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Contini, R. M. & Pica-Smith, C. (2017). Problematizing the Conceptual Framework of Interculturalism and its Pedagogical Extension of Intercultural Education: Theoretical Perspectives and their Implications. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 9(3), 236-255.
- Contini, R. M. & Pica-Smith, C. (2018). Education and Diversity: Theoretical and Practical Issues. *Studi di Sociologia*, 3, 239-256.
- De Waal, T. (2018). Is the post-multicultural era pro-diversity? *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6.
- ESO (European Sources Online). (2010) 'Multicultural attempts 'failed', claims Merkel', 18 October, <https://www.europeansources.info/record/multicultural-attempts-failed-claims-merkel/>.
- Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition?: a political-philosophical exchange*. Verso.
- Faist, T. (2009). Diversity – a new mode of incorporation? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32, 1, 171–90.
- Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 237-257.
- Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants. Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Joppke, C. (2016). After Multiculturalism: Neo-Assimilationist Policies in Europe? In Ambrosini M. (Ed.), *Europe: No Migrant's Land?* Edizioni Epoké - ISPI: Milano.
- Joppke, C. (2018). War of words: interculturalism v. multiculturalism. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0079-1>.
- Kastoryano, R. (2018). Multiculturalism and Interculturalism: Redefining nationhood and solidarity. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0082-6>.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). *Multicultural Odysseys*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Kymlicka, W. (2016). Defending Diversity in an Era of Populism: Multiculturalism and Interculturalism Compared. In N. Meer, T. Modood & R. Zapata-Barrero (2016), *Multiculturalism and Interculturalism. Debating the Dividing Lines*, (pp. 158-177). Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Levrau, F. (2018). Towards a new way of interacting? Pondering the role of an interpersonal ethos. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6.
- Levrau, F. & Loobuyck, P. (2018). Introduction: mapping the multiculturalism-interculturalism debate. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0080-8>.
- Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Modood, T. (2013 [2007]). *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*, 2nd Ed., Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Modood, T. (2016). What is Multiculturalism and what can it learn from Interculturalism. In M. Antonsich, Interculturalism versus Multiculturalism—The Cantle-Modood Debate, *Ethnicities*, 16 (3), 480-489.
- Modood, T. (2017). Must Interculturalists misrepresent multiculturalism?. *Comparative migration studies*, 5(1), 15.
- Modood, T. (2018). Interculturalism: Not a new policy paradigm. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(1), 22.
- Modood, T. (2019a). *Essays on Secularism and Multiculturalism*. London: Rowman and Littlefield and European Consortium of Political Science Press.
- Modood, T. (2019b). 'A Multicultural Nationalism', *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 25(2).
- Oosterlynck, O. (2018). Moving beyond normative philosophies and policy concerns: a sociological account of place-based solidarities in diversity. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0083-5>.
- Parekh, B. (2006 [2000]). *Rethinking multiculturalism: cultural diversity and political theory*, 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pica-Smith, C., Contini, R. M. & Veloria, C. (2019). *Social Justice Education in European Multi-ethnic Schools*. Addressing the Goals of Intercultural Education. London & New York: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Group.
- Portera, A. (2008). Intercultural education in Europe: epistemological and semantic aspects. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 481-491, DOI: 10.1080/14675980802568277.
- Taylor, C. (1994 [1992]). *Multiculturalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1994a). The Politics of Recognition. In C. Taylor, K.A. Appias, J. Habermas, S. C. Rockefeller, M. Walzer & S. Wolf (Edited and Introduced A. Gutmann), *Multiculturalism. Examining the Politics of Recognition*, (pp. 25-73), Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Taylor, C. (2016). Foreword. In Meer N., Modood T. & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and Interculturalism. Debating the Dividing Lines*, (pp. vii-ix), Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Tully, J. (1995). *Strange multiplicity: constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30 (6), 1024–1054.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zapata-Barrero, R. (2016). Theorising intercultural citizenship. In N. Meer, T. Modood, & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.) (2016), *Multiculturalism and interculturalism: Debating the dividing lines*, (pp. 53-76). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.