

## MULTICULTURALISM AND EUROPE: A CRISIS OF POLICY?

**Rada Cristina IRIMIE, PhD Candidate, “Babeş-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca**

*Abstract: European societies have become increasingly diverse due to migration flows and the European Union is facing the challenge of addressing the issue of multiculturalism. In recent years, there has been increasing activity at European level, in the field of intercultural exchanges. The present research will study the phenomenon of multiculturalism with regards to its historical prevalence, the areas that traditionally challenge multicultural dialogue such as ethnicity, religion and social integration. The concepts of multiculturalism are presented in relation to recognized theories of multicultural diversity, such as communitarian, liberal egalitarian and postcolonial theories. Furthermore, the EU’s policy towards a multicultural society gives us the opportunity to examine and assess the success of the institutional model established. We would like to focus on the institutional record of initiatives taken and policies implemented in this direction, as EU constitutes a powerful model of cultural blend. To further enhance our understanding, we will attempt a case study of the Muslim population in Europe, identified as a shared European challenge by several member-states. The conclusions will bring us closer to the summary of current issues that need to be politically addressed and we hope to be able to make a valuable contribution related to the management of cultural diversity.*

*Keywords: European Union, multiculturalism, integration, dialogue, migration.*

### **Introduction**

The presence of more and more immigrants in Europe does not have only demographic consequences, but also forces social and cultural dynamics. Shaping a whole different type of society, quite different from the one imagined with the rise of the Nation-State, the social forces of multiculturalism affects both its citizens as well as the aspects of their life. Among other changes, one of the more visible is the battle of cultures that come together in one territory. The presence of immigrant population is not culturally neither religiously neutral. Indeed, the presence of immigrants of different cultural and religious background is one of the “engines” that push the society into a change that is bigger than their presence: in fact, it has important if not decisive effects also for the host society. The moving populations do not arrive naked: they bring with themselves, in their suitcases, among other things, also visions of the world, traditions, histories, faiths, practices, values, moral systems, images and symbols (Allievi, 2010). And they turn to them as indispensable identity references. More than this, they often turn to these references not only individually, but also collectively and as communities.

The article examines the social dynamics of multiculturalism not only from an historical perspective. Important attention is being paid in the aspects of ethnicity and national identity, education and minority issues. Other than generating a dialogue about multiculturalism in Europe, our main concern in this article is to examine the topic also from the European Union’s point of view. We are interested to see whether the EU has been proactive in their efforts to ensure an environment where cultural diversity is welcome, and where minorities coexist and grow without threatening each other’s development. The issue of religion could not be absent from such an analysis, but only in the context of cultural behavior in this case. The case of Islam is often considered the more problematic expression of this social process, even though not the only one. This is why we will revisit some of the rich intercultural discourse on

integration issues of the Muslim population in Europe. The increasing presence of Muslims in Europe remains controversial over the years, and since the terrorist attack of the 9/11, Islamophobic sentiments and politics draw back the attention to it. Thus, as a case study it represents a fundamental key for elaborating new theoretical and political answers and proposals to the growing cultural and religious differences in Europe.

The article is structured in four chapters that progressively study and analyze the evolution of multiculturalism, first as an evolving social phenomenon, secondly as a theoretical movement in social studies, thirdly as political discourse and strategic programming of the EU - and Europe, in general - and lastly as a societal reality and policy implementation. Using Islam as a case study, this article aims to identify key factors through which the EU has undermined its leverage in this policy area. The Muslim case study has particular comparative merits as Europe still faces the challenge of integrating a large Muslim minority. Finally, we hope not only to identify the discrepancies between political and social reality, but also to contribute to the dialogue of Europe's multicultural nature with constructive ideas.

### **Multiculturalism as a Social Phenomenon**

It is important to put multiculturalism in an historical context. In one sense, it goes back to when different cultures have found ways of coexisting and respect for diversity was a familiar feature of many historic empires. But the sort of multiculturalism that we are discussing in this article is a more specific historic phenomenon, emerging first in the Western democracies in the late 1960s. More specifically, multiculturalism is part of a larger human-rights revolution involving ethnic and racial diversity. "Prior to World War II, ethno-cultural and religious diversity in the West was characterized by a range of illiberal and undemocratic relationships of hierarchy justified by racist ideologies that explicitly propounded the superiority of some peoples and cultures and their right to rule over others" (Kymlicka, 2012, p. 5). These ideologies were later widely accepted throughout the Western world and influenced both domestic laws and foreign policies.

From the 1970s to mid-1990s there was a clear tendency across western democracies towards the increased recognition and accommodation of diversity, through a range of multiculturalism policies and minority rights. These policies were endorsed both at the domestic level in various states and by international organisations, and involved the denunciation of the ideas of unitary and homogenous nationhood (Kymlicka, 2010, p. 97). Since the mid-1990s, however, we have evidenced a retreat from multiculturalism and a return to ideas of nation building, common values and identity, and unitary citizenship. This retreat is partly driven by fears among the majority group that the accommodation of diversity has "gone too far" and is threatening their way of life. But the retreat also reflects a belief among the center-left that multiculturalism has failed to help the intended beneficiaries - namely, minorities - because it has failed to address the underlying sources of their social, economic, and political exclusion and may have unintentionally contributed to their social isolation (Kymlicka, 2012). Thus, in brief, the challenge that current European societies are facing is the narrative of 'rise and fall' of multiculturalism.

In most of the post-multiculturalism literature, multiculturalism is characterized as a celebration of ethno-cultural diversity, encouraging citizens to acknowledge and embrace the panoply of customs, traditions, music and cuisine that exist in a multi-ethnic society (Alibai-

Brown, 2000). While multiculturalism for immigrant groups differs from that for indigenous peoples or national minorities, each policy has been defended as a means to overcome the legacies of earlier hierarchies and to help build fairer and more inclusive democratic societies. Therefore, “multiculturalism is first and foremost about developing new models of democratic citizenship, grounded in human-rights ideals, to replace earlier uncivil and undemocratic relations of hierarchy and exclusion” (Kymlicka, 2012, p. 8). Whether we look at local people, national minorities or immigrant groups, it is apparent that the phenomenon combines economic, political, social and cultural dimensions. While minorities are concerned with the historic legacy of their cultures, immigrant multiculturalism also includes policies that are concerned with access to political influence and economic prospects - for example, policies of affirmative action, mechanisms of political discussion, funding for ethnic self-organization, and facilitated access to citizenship (Kymlicka, 2007). In total, all three types of groups combine issues of cultural recognition, economic redistribution and political participation.

For most people, the term ‘multiculturalism’ is descriptive: it reflects the pluralist nature of a society. At the individual level, surveys indicate that multiculturalism provides a focus for the high-level of mutual identification among native-born citizens and immigrants. In most countries, native-born citizens with a strong sense of national identity or national pride tend to be distrusting of immigrants, who are seen as a threat (Citrin & Sides, 2007). Accordingly, most of the contemporary debate about multiculturalism centers on immigrants and their descendants. Typically, however, multiculturalism means more than demographic pluralism. It can also be a philosophy centered on recognizing, accepting and supporting cultural pluralism. The philosophy of multiculturalism is a general orientation than can be held by people, institutions and governments, but it also refers to a particular set of philosophical ideas developed by political theorists. Special analysis on the ideas of these theorists will be given in the next chapter.

Multiculturalism recognizes *de facto* pluralism in a society and rejoices that diversity. But it also requires governments and institutions to support pluralism through public policy, though the specifics across places and time can vary. “For example, schools might require teachers to adopt a more diverse set of literary texts or highlight the contributions of ethno-racial, cultural or religious minorities in history classes. In other cases, multicultural policies might make accommodations for the particular cultural or religious practices of minorities or they might provide public funding for separate schools for racial, ethnic, or religious minorities” (Broemraad, 2011). In other words, multiculturalism has many different faces. In the following chapter we will look at the most important theories of philosophical multiculturalism developed by theorists.

### **Theories of multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism is a body of thought in political philosophy that provides theoretical responses to cultural and religious diversity. Mere toleration of group differences is said to fall short when treating members of minority groups as equal citizens; recognition and positive adjustment of group differences are quintessential to this process. Some group-differentiated rights are held by individual members of minority groups, while some other group-differentiated rights are held by the group *qua* group rather than by its members; such rights are properly called group rights, as in the case of indigenous groups and minority nations, who

claim the right of self-determination (Song, 2010). In this respect, multiculturalism is closely associated with nationalism. While multiculturalism has been used as a general term to characterize the claims of a wide range of disadvantaged groups, most theorists of multiculturalism tend to focus their arguments on immigrants who are ethnic and religious minorities, minority nations and indigenous peoples.

To understand multiculturalism as a political philosophy, we consider the British prime minister's appeal to liberalism in February 2011. In his speech, D. Cameron called in part on a vision of classical Western liberalism predicated on universalism and individual equality (Broemraad, 2011). Under classical liberalism, all people must be treated the same and governments should ignore particularities of ethnicity, religion or national origin. The multicultural critique of this position argues that cultural neutrality in public institutions is impossible. Since democracy is based on government by the majority, minorities face disadvantages in the public sphere despite laws guaranteeing certain rights and freedoms. Multicultural thinkers argue that social equality is reached when governments recognize cultural minorities, encourage pluralism and accommodate the cultural needs of groups.

One justification for multiculturalism comes from within liberalism. Will Kymlicka has developed the most influential theory of multiculturalism based on the liberal values of autonomy and equality (Kymlicka, 1995; 2001). Culture is said to be valuable to individuals, for two reasons: a) it enables individual autonomy. One important condition of autonomy is having an adequate range of options from which to choose and cultures provide contexts of such choices; b) Culture enables individual self-respect. Drawing on theorists of communitarianism and nationalism, Kymlicka argues that there is a deep and general connection between a person's self-respect and the respect accorded to the cultural group of which she is a part. It is not simply membership in any culture but one's own culture that must be secured.

Another justification for multiculturalism comes from the communitarian critique of liberalism. Liberals are ethical individualists; they insist that individuals should be free to choose and pursue their own conceptions of a good life. They give primacy to individual rights and liberties over community life and collective goods. The target of the communitarian critique of liberalism is not so much liberal ethics as liberal social ontology. Communitarians reject the idea that the individual is prior to the community, and that the value of social goods can be reduced to their contribution to individual well-being. They instead embrace ontological holism, which views social goods as "irreducibly social" (Taylor, 1994). The recognition of the equal worth of different cultures requires changing the traditional liberal regime of identical liberties and opportunities for all citizens with a system of special rights for minority cultural groups.

Lastly, some theorists regarded multiculturalism from a postcolonial perspective, looking through beyond liberalism. The case for tribal sovereignty is not based only on the value of tribal culture and membership, but also on what is owed to native peoples for the historical injustices perpetrated against them. Weighing history is crucial. Advocates of indigenous sovereignty emphasize the importance of understanding indigenous claims based on the historical background of equal sovereign status of indigenous groups, the dispossession of their lands and the destruction of their cultural practices (Moore, 2005; Song, 2010). This background calls into question the legitimacy of the state's authority over native peoples and provides a case for special rights and protections for indigenous groups, including the right of

self-government. A postcolonial perspective also searches for models of constitutional and political dialogue that recognize culturally distinct ways of speaking and acting.

From a critical point of viewing multiculturalism, some theorists argue that the multicultural argument for the preservation of cultures is premised on a problematic view of culture and of the individual's relationship to culture. Cultures are not distinct, self-contained wholes; they have long interacted and influenced one another through war, imperialism, trade, and migration. People in many parts of the world live within cultures that are already cosmopolitan, characterized by cultural hybridity. As Jeremy Waldron argues, "We live in a world formed by technology and trade; by economic, religious, and political imperialism and their offspring; by mass migration and the dispersion of cultural influences. In this context, to immerse oneself in the traditional practices of, say, an aboriginal culture might be a fascinating anthropological experiment, but it involves an artificial dislocation from what actually is going on in the world" (Waldron, 1995, p. 100).

The greatest challenge to multiculturalism, however, may not be philosophical, but political. The political backlash against multiculturalism has created new challenges for the supporters of multiculturalism. What is the relationship between multiculturalism and the integration of immigrants? What is the role of the European Union in protecting the diverse cultures that live inside its borders? This is a question that will occupy us in the next chapter.

### **Multiculturalism and EU Policy**

Western European states have been countries of immigration for a long time. Most Member-States of the European Union are multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multicultural even though sometimes reluctant to accept this diversity. Immigration policy and the management of ethno-cultural diversity have become key issues both nationally and in the process of European Union integration. The EU as a whole advances a positive approach to integrating immigrants which draws on the European idea of 'unity in diversity' and covers the full range of issues relating to economic, social, cultural and political integration of immigrants. Yet, of the three theories outlined above, the EU's shared approach is still close to some kind of multiculturalism in which the emphasis is on immigrants being able to preserve and practice their cultures and faiths (Aggestam & Hill, 2008).

However, we argue that with regards to their place in European integration, cultural policies collect a rather insignificant interest. Without formal legislative presence until the Treaty on European Union in 1992, culture has been a non-priority for the European Union. But also later with fairly unimportant budget provisions ever since, it has received little attention in the key political or economic decisions. However, we would like to attempt an overview of the EU's multiculturalism aspects, from a policy point of view. This is very important, as the evolution of EC/EU decision-making processes, policy objectives and governance structure, can lead us to understand the political choices behind the marginalization of multiculturalism.

### **After the Maastricht Treaty**

A major turning point for culture and citizenship came with the Treaty on European Union in 1993. The Treaty has effectively created a new political unit with noticeable constitutional features. Entering into force in November 1993, the Treaty eventually introduced both the legal concept of Union citizenship and a mandate for the Community to act in the area

of culture (Treaty of European Union, Art. 151). Four core rights are introduced: the freedom of movement and residence; the right to stand and vote in local and in the European Parliament elections in place of residence; to petition a new Ombudsman and the European Parliament, as well as diplomatic protection by another member state. It also provided that citizens were to enjoy all rights concerned by the Treaty, thus establishing a link with the non-discrimination principle.

Additionally, article 151 allowed the Community to contribute to the “flowering of the cultures of the Member-States while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore” (Treaty of European Union, Art. 151). With a number of provisions calling for taking culture into account, it authorized cultural cooperation with third countries and international organizations. However, novelty was not unconditional. While Union citizenship was settled exclusively on the basis of prior nationality in a Member-State, the culture article ensured that the EU could only supplement national action, required that votes in the Council are unanimous, and limited the legislative tools for this purpose. This granted new powers to the European Parliament and established a new consultative body, the Committee of the Regions. Some scholars wonder whether the direction taken to this EU cultural policy born in Maastricht was addressing the issue of migration enough - especially for non-European countries into Europe - with sufficient recognition of the major impact it has on European cultural identity (Xuereb, 2011, p. 28).

Therefore, the assumption is that if the European culture is sufficiently promoted and protected, a European perception must have naturally emerged. “This emphasis on the role of culture in the construction of community makes more obvious the contradiction that affects all cultural policies: promoting the spontaneous flowering of culture, using culture as a legitimizing tool while claiming that culture deserves to be safeguarded as the highest product of human activity, thus as an end in itself” (Sassatelli, 2002, p. 441). Before struggling to define the elements of a European identity, we should consider the type of policies employed in creating such an identity, not only because we want to evaluate their effects, but more importantly because they are clues to the type of identity they are addressing. Especially when considering an emerging social identity, it is crucial to address the means deployed to build it.

### **Emilie: A European Commission project**

The Emilie project came in 2006 as a response to what was considered to be a “crisis of multiculturalism” and the lack of a common EU intellectual framework to discuss the relevant challenges. Funded by the European Commission Research DG, under the Sixth Framework Programme, the project aims to outline the challenges faced in nine major EU countries in the fields of migration and integration. Nine partners were selected from nine countries (Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Poland, Spain, United Kingdom), in order to represent different experiences of migration and integration, including those still in transition with regard to migration. There were five main research phases for this purpose. Firstly, a level of migration in these countries needs to be outlined. Secondly, a critical review of current public debates on integration and multiculturalism has to take place. Then, three case studies are conducted in each country: (i) educational challenges posed by migration related diversity, including multicultural education and faith schools; (ii) legal challenges with special reference

to discrimination protection in the workplace; and (iii) political challenges with special reference to voting rights and civic participation (European Commission, 2011, p. 44).

The case studies are ethnographic, but integrate different kinds of qualitative and quantitative data (previous studies, policy papers, etc.). Knowledge dissemination activities and interaction with users are incorporated in the research process. Lastly, the fourth phase includes the integration of the national case studies, critically evaluating the different types of challenges and how they are accommodated in each country. Each partner considers to what extent their country offers a distinctive ‘model’ of immigrant incorporation and on what value discourses this model is based (European Commission, 2011, p. 46). The last phase compares the main value discourses and value conflicts among the countries studied and attempts to identify the European dimensions of integrating diversity (value discourses, best practices, etc.) and elaborate an empirically grounded European theoretical model of multiculturalism, appropriate to the European experience as a basis for a rational resolution of the current panic about multiculturalism (Eliamep, 2006). Though promising, the initiative is too recent to represent any definite results on the actual conditions in the countries studied.

### **The MIPEX tool**

MIPEX is a fully interactive tool and reference guide, launched in 2011 as a cooperation initiative between the European Fund for Integration of Third-Party Nationals and the Migration Policy Group, and gives the opportunity to the EU to assess, compare and improve integration policy. MIPEX measures integration policies in all EU Member-States plus Norway, Switzerland, Canada and the USA. Using 148 policy indicators, MIPEX creates a rich, multi-dimensional picture of migrants’ opportunities to participate in civil society by assessing the government’s commitment to integration. The tool measures the implementation of policies exposing whether all residents are guaranteed equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities. Additionally, it collects further evidence of how legal integration can work to promote societal integration in practice. “It answers questions on enforcement mechanisms, such as sanctions, the existence of equality bodies and their mandate, the role of non-governmental organisations and dialogue with social partners. Where such mechanisms do not exist, integration actors can call for their creation. Where they do exist, actors can use them effectively” (MIPI, 2013). The tool generates results on the volume of policies in Member-States examined, which are announced every year in the country results. The following map illustrates an example of policies representation based on the country.

### **Source: Migrant Integration Policy Index, [www.mipex.eu](http://www.mipex.eu)**

Some could easily conclude that in Europe, a low level of multicultural policies is evident, and certainly significantly lower than many of the new world countries, such as Canada, the US or Australia. Professor Ward explains that EU policies constitute nothing more than national policies of the EU Member-States in combination. “When you ask the question ‘Do these countries in Europe have multicultural policies? Do they include ethnic representation in government, are there exemptions for public dress codes based on ethnic background, is their acceptance of dual citizenship? The countries in Europe that are decrying multiculturalism and saying it has failed have never tested it, because they don’t bring to the table both traditional ‘cultural maintenance’ and this ‘equitable participation’.” (Liu & Ward, 2012).

### **The Muslim integration as a case study**

We take the Muslim population as a case study, as recent concerns around the topic of multiculturalism in the public sphere are mainly driven by the populous migration of Muslims to Western democratic countries. At the moment, Muslims represent about 5% of the population of the EU27. However, it is estimated that by 2050, Muslims will account for 20 percent of the European Union's populace (Ghosh, 2011). The failure of these newest immigrants to integrate effectively is said to demonstrate a failure of multiculturalism (Ciobotaru, 2012). The pressure under which most Muslims find themselves under, it is likely a result of the hostility expressed towards them by the populations that surround them rather than as a failure of purposeful multicultural policies, originally planned to encourage their inclusion in the public sphere. "This hostility is expressed in significant part by increasing the demands placed on migrants to secure their own integration, and in significant part by increasing the requirements that must be met in order to 'prove' that they have successfully integrated" (Lenard, 2012, p.191).

The alertness of this challenge began to become evident and manifest itself even before events such as 9/11. "Nor is it due to the fact that some Muslims, unlike other post-immigration groups, may have been involved in rowdy demonstrations and riots, because others (such as African-Caribbeans in Britain) are associated with these without raising such profound normative questions. Nor is it due to conservative values, especially in relation to gender and sexuality, though it is related to it. The core element of the challenge is the primacy given to religion as the basis of identity, organization, political representation, normative justification and so on" (Modood, 2013). The difficulties that Muslim population comes across with every day is summarized below.

To start with, Muslims are frequently expected to demonstrate loyalty to the countries in which they reside. Then, they are asked to condemn acts of terrorism committed in the name of Islam, even when these acts are in no way connected to them (Van Den Brink, 2007). Thus, they often 'take responsibility' for their global community, despite the fact that they often share very little in common with them. The worry that Muslim migrants may not be democratic, and most importantly that their loyalty is usually towards an illiberal Muslim community, is frequently expressed. This concern has enabled public discourse to associate Muslims with terrorism, multicultural policies to producing Muslim extremism, and therefore to equate multiculturalism with terrorism.

David Cameron has recently claimed that defeating the threat of terrorism in the UK requires 'turn(ing) the page on the failed policies of the past' (Reuters, 2011). Yet, while many Muslims certainly identify with a larger, global, religious community, just as Christians and Jews identify with a larger, global, religious community, those residing in Western countries display loyalty and commitment to their host states. There is remarkably little evidence that Muslim immigrants desire anything beyond what immigrants desire in general, which is to live as productive and loyal citizens of the states in which they resided and hold citizenship status (Nyiri, 2007).

Secondly, the volume of citizenship and linguistic tests and requirements indicates that in order to adopt the new norms and values, migrants will find moral and political adaptation difficult. The Dutch case is an obvious example; although recently declared to be both illegal and discriminatory, the Netherlands had for several years required that migrants from non-Western countries pass a 'citizenship test abroad' before even being granted entrance visas



(Lenard, 2012). It is, of course, arguable that such requirements are one way in which host states ensure that newcomers are able to live as productive and loyal citizens. Linguistic and cultural skills are no doubt essential to success in the socio-cultural and economic environments of host countries. The observation here is not that citizenship tests are disagreeable but that the rhetoric that surrounds the implementation of these tests and the importance of their recognizing and adopting the shared values that purportedly characterize receiving states. The adoption of 'citizenship codes' or the proposal that new migrants take 'loyalty oaths', which outline the values allegedly held by specific communities, illustrate a similar hostility and discrimination towards Muslim migrants (Lenard, 2012).

Lastly, we have witnessed a subject of serious public debate, the question of what women who cover their faces should be permitted to do in the public sphere. France, for instance, has rejected citizenship applications from women who cover their faces on the grounds of insufficient assimilation to French norms (Chrisafis, 2008). The question of face cover is a controversial one around which public opinion gathers against Muslims, since the requirement to show the face can be justified in terms of gender equality, a principle accepted by the entire Western democratic world. The result is an emphasis by Muslims on treating practices as religious rather than cultural, and therefore as non-negotiable. In other words, the inflexibility displayed by the host community translates into a kind of strategic obduracy on the part of Muslim populations. The attention on a question of Islamic practice has created an environment in which the choice to cover or not must be presented, in a unified way, as a religious requirement rather than a cultural choice.

The enemy is no longer outside the nation, but threatens the nation-state from within and is deceptively constructed through nationalism, racism and xenophobia (Uberoi, 2008). In Europe today, "Muslims are becoming particularly targeted as being invaders with alien cultures, worshipping other gods and threatening the majority community's ways of life. In the face of such perceptions and in line with a discourse on terror, European governments have often opted for restrictions on migration and for particular measures of surveillance of Muslim communities" (Kinwall & Linden, 2010, p. 597). Hence, we observe here that cultural features are regarded as fixed and inflexible attributes that are not disputed, constructed or reconstructed over time by educational and social factors. Identity is seen as something you are born into, thus implying that it is a static and natural category, where the social process has no impact on.

## **Conclusions**

This article developed an overview of migration waves, after 1945 in Western Europe, stressing the main trends, theories and debates on multiculturalism. Due to the limited extent of this article, we could not provide a detailed explanation of all aspects but we hope we have achieved a representative summary of developments in the field. We have examined cultural regulation and policies in Europe towards immigration policy and the management of ethno-cultural diversity. Reference was made here to the role of the Member-States of the EU. Crucial to the process of inclusion are nationality and citizenship policies. We also examined the European debate over Muslim migration and development. Widespread practice here suggests that Muslims are often being judged on the basis of their religious rather than their cultural identity.

Our arguments lead to two conclusions that policymakers must observe. At first, any proposed policy that targets minority communities in a particular political community must be considered in relation to that state's particular political context. It is also because governments may not want their policy of multiculturalism to change their national identity. Second, a serious discussion of what should be demanded of new immigrants, to secure their own integration, has to take place. In sum, the declaration that multicultural policies have produced segregated and marginalized minority communities is too fast. Although multiculturalism is under fire, the trends that inform the analysis here do not suggest its death (Lenard, 2012). The article concludes with a consideration of the future of the European Union as a post-ethnic Europe based on a multicultural citizenship. In our opinion, it is of great importance that European communities realize that societies and cultures constantly evolve; being oppressed into denying multiculturalism, because of our fear that an acceptance of ethnic minorities will lead them not to change, is an oversight. They will change anyway. As political conditions with respect to immigrant groups are fairly complex, future studies on the state of multiculturalism should take into meticulous account each country's historical and social background before assessing the impact of policies.

### **Bibliography**

- Aggestam, L. & Hill, C. (2008) "The challenge of multiculturalism in European foreign policy", *International Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 1, pp. 97-114.
- Alibai-Brown, Y. (2000) *After multiculturalism*, Foreign Policy Centre, London.
- Allievi, S. (2010) "Multiculturalism in Europe", Paper on St Antony's Princeton Conference with the subject 'Muslims in Europe post 9/11'. Available from <[http://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/ext/princeton/pap\\_allievi.shtml](http://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/ext/princeton/pap_allievi.shtml)> [Accessed on 8 November 2013].
- Broemraad, I. (2011) "The Debate Over Multiculturalism: Philosophy, Politics and Policy", MPI, University of California, Berkeley.
- Ciobotaru, A. (2012), "Understanding Multiculturalism and its Importance to the EU. Part I, Definition and Consequences of its 'Failure'", *idebate.org*, 25 October. Available from: <<http://europe.idebate.org/blog-post/understanding-multiculturalism-and-its-importance-eu-part-i-definition-and-consequences-it>> [Accessed 11 November 2013]
- Citrin, J. & Sides, J. (2007) "European Opinion about Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information", *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 37, pp. 477-505.
- Chrisafis, A. (2008) "France rejects Muslim woman over radical practice of Islam", *The Guardian*, 12 July. Available from: <<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/jul/12/france.islam>> [Accessed on 10 November 2013].
- ELIAMEP (2006) *EMILIE - A European approach to multicultural citizenship: Legal, political and educational challenges*. Available from: <<http://www.eliamep.gr/en/category/migration/emilie-a-european-approach-to-multicultural-citizenship/>> [Accessed on 9 November 2013].

- European Commission (2011) *Pluralism and religious diversity, social cohesion and integration in Europe: Insights from European Research*, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Brussels, 4 March.
- Ghosh, P. (2011) Muslim population in Western Europe rising, IBTimes.com, April 08. Available from: <<http://www.ibtimes.com/muslim-population-western-europe-rising-551572>> [Accessed on 12 November 2013].
- Kinnvall, C. & Lindén, J. (2010) “Dialogical Selves between Security and Insecurity: Migration, Multiculturalism, and the Challenge of the Global”, *Theory Psychology*, Vol. 20, pp. 595-619.
- Lenard, P.T. (2012) “Reports of Multiculturalism’s Death are greatly Exaggerated”, *Politics*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 186-196.
- Liu, J. & Ward, C. (2012) “Has Multiculturalism Failed?”, Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Research, 21 October. Available from: <<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/conversations-about-multiculturalism/multiculturalism-in-europe-and-new-zealand>> [Accessed on 11 November 2013].
- Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001) *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007) *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kymlicka, W. (2010) *The Rise and fall of Multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies*, UNESCO, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford.
- Kymlicka, W. (2012) *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC.
- MIPI: Migration Integration Policy Index (2011). Available from: <[www.mipex.eu](http://www.mipex.eu)> [Accessed on 11 November 2013].
- Modood, T. (2013) “Multiculturalism and Muslims in Britain and France”, *Public Spirit*, 9 May. Available from: <<http://www.publicspirit.org.uk/multiculturalism-and-muslims-in-britain-and-france/>> [Accessed on 12 November 2013].
- Moore, M. (2005) “Internal Minorities and Indigenous Self-Determination,” in *Minorities within Minorities: Equality, Rights and Diversity*, A. Eisenberg E J. Spinner-Halev (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Nyiri, Z. (2007) “European Muslims Show No Conflict between Religious and National Identities”, Gallup [online], 26 April. Available from: <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/27325/european-muslims-showcon%EF%AC%82%20ict-between-religious-national-identities.aspx>> [Accessed 11 November 2013].
- Reuters (2011) “Multiculturalism has ‘failed in UK’”, *Aljazeera*, 5 February. Available from: <<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/europe/2011/02/2011255620810460.html>> [Accessed on 12 November 2013].
- Sassatelli, M. (2002) “Imagined Europe: The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy”, *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 5, pp. 435-451.
- Song, S. (2010) "Multiculturalism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* in Edward N. Zalta (Eds.). Available from:

<<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2010/entries/multiculturalism/>> [Accessed 7 November 2013].

Taylor, C. (1994) "The Politics of Recognition" in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Gutmann, A. (Eds), Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Treaty on European Union and of the Treaty establishing the European Community (1992), Art. 151. Available from:

<<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/ce321/ce32120061229en00010331.pdf>> [Accessed on 8th November 2013].

Uberoi, V. (2008) "Do Policies of Multiculturalism Change National Identities?", *Political Quarterly*, Vol. 79, No. 3, pp. 404-417.

Van Den Brink, B. (2007) "Imagining Civic Relations in the Moment of Their Breakdown: A Crisis of Civic Integrity in the Netherlands" in *Multiculturalism and Political Theory*, A.S. Laden & D. Owen (Eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 350-372.

Waldron, J. (1995) "Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative," in *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, Kymlicka, W. (Eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Xuereb, K. (2011) "European Cultural Policy and Migration: Why Should Cultural Policy in the European Union Address the Impact of Migration on Identity and Social Integration?", *International Migration*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 28-53.