Culture, Multiculturalism and Welfare State Citizenship

Sheila Shaver

Paper presented at the Australian Social Policy Conference, *Social Policy through the Life Course, Building Community Capacity and Social Resilience*, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney, 11-13 July 2007

Sheila Shaver
Visiting Professor
Social Policy Research Centre
University of New South Wales
Email: sshaver@bigpond.net.au

Postal address:
526/8 Point Street
Pyrmont, NSW 2009
Australia

Culture, Multiculturalism and Welfare State Citizenship

Culture, in its broadest sense of the 'design for living' that a people share, pervades the rights and expectations of citizenship. It supplies the framework of language, symbols, customs and expectations by which people order and give meaning to the actions of daily life, and through which they interpret their common history and purpose. The political framework that defines their shared citizenship is an expression of this common culture. This cultural dimension has, however, had little direct attention in studies of citizenship and social policy. This paper attempts to open a conversation about how to remedy this neglect.

Historically, nation states have generally instituted frameworks of citizenship on behalf of the populations of citizens who reside within their borders. Culture and nation do not necessarily coincide, and nation states have always had to engage with cultural difference within their domains. Recent decades have seen cultural diversity increase, through the migration of labour, resettlement of refugees and asylum-seekers, movements of rural peoples into cities, and vocal indigenous group claims for territorial and cultural autonomy. As national boundaries grow more permeable, cultural diversity among citizens has become salient for nations of both north and south. While some cultural differences are transitional, diminishing over a generation or less, others are persistent through time. Modern communications enable immigrants to maintain connections in their societies of origin as well as residence, making cultural difference a permanent rather than temporary condition of national life.

The multicultural condition of nation states raises significant questions about the coherence of the cultural foundations that underpin their national social policy arrangements and the capacity of welfare state citizenship to mediate the local effects of global development. As Banting and Kymlicka (2006: 1) observe, recent decades have seen many nations attempt to find political accommodations to the reality of it through multiculturalist policies. In reaction to these, it is argued that by giving legitimacy to cultural diversity,

multiculturalist policies are weakening the national solidarities that underlie welfare state citizenship. Their important collection explores cross-national comparative evidence and country case studies addressing this hypothesis.

The objects of this paper are more modest. Culture has had little presence in the discussion of citizenship in the tradition of T. H. Marshall (1963) that informs much of the current comparative literature on welfare state formation and restructuring. These debates have treated citizenship as bundles of rights and duties associated with particular types of institutions and politics, giving only cursory attention to the potentially varying meanings that these have for their citizens. In increasingly multicultural societies these meanings are perhaps more at issue than in the past.

The paper looks at three well known theoretical accounts of the relation between multiculturalism and citizenship, drawing out the way that each would inform the Marshallian conception of citizenship that underlies much discussion of the welfare state. The aim of the discussion is to identify understandings of culture and multiculturalism that may contribute to a more elaborated perspective on welfare citizenship with respect to culture and the cultural diversity.

The paper first sets out the key terms of this citizenship perspective in the identity of the citizen, the rights and duties of citizenship, and the community of the nation that these belong to and share. After a brief discussion of culture and globalization, the paper then turns to analysis of three theories of citizenship and multiculturalism. These are Will Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995), Bhikhu Parekh's *Rethinking Multiculturalism* (2006), and Néstor García Canclini's *Consumers and Citizens* (2001). The paper concludes with a discussion of the insights these theoretical approaches offer for elaborating the cultural dimensions of welfare state citizenship.

Welfare state citizenship and its elements

Theories of citizenship such as Marshall's (1963) portray modern democratic capitalism as the ongoing product of the opposed forces of capitalist economic development and democratic nation-building. The state develops

as it manages the inherent tensions between these forces in economic inequality and social division on one side and political equality and social equalization on the other. Citizenship and the rights it entails play an important role in fostering social integration, mitigating the effects of inequality and affirming the common cause of diverse members of society. Marshall's account has been faulted for its Anglo-centrism and the evolutionism of its history (Turner, 1986; 1990; Barbalet 1988), but nevertheless remains the seminal version. Hindess (1993) reminds us that its heuristic value is more reliable than its description of postwar Britain as a substantially equal society. Turner (1986; 1990) sees theories of citizenship as a version of modernization theory, and suggests a four-fold typology of historical development according to whether citizenship is framed as active and public or passive and private, and whether it has been developed from above, by the state, or from below, by social movements. The perspective has been given both liberal and social democratic inflections. Citizenship is the core idea of 'states vs. markets' perspectives on the growth, development and limitations of the welfare state (Esping-Andersen 1990; Pierson 1994; O'Connor, Orloff and Shaver 1999; Huber and Stephens 2001).

The central argument of citizenship theory is that the development of universal or near-universal extension of citizenship in modern nations has been important in reshaping the structures of solidarity in these societies to attenuate division and conflict. The particular form this reshaping has taken has been historically contingent, driven by both capitalist development and the character of social struggle. At the most general level it has entailed displacement of local and particularistic solidarities by weaker and more abstract attachments on a national basis. Under democracy and the welfare state, class division was transformed from the opposition of labour and capital to graded inequalities of social status and the ladder of opportunity. This was part of a more general pattern of individuation under the bureaucratic authority of education and social policy institutions. This universalisation and individuation of personhood have been less complete for women, whose citizenship has continued to be mediated by the

interdependencies of marriage and family responsibility (Marshall, 1963; Barbalet 1988; Turner 1986; Pateman 1989; Esping-Andersen 1990).

The key elements of theories of citizenship in the Marshall tradition are the social identity of the citizen, the nation as a political community, and the shared set of rights and obligations that bind them together. Each of these terms has multiple layers of meanings and implications, not least because each is part of a set of dualities in respect of the collective processes of policy making and institutional development and the individualised enjoyment of rights and obligations on the part of its citizens. The discussion aims to draw out the cultural dimensions of each of these elements.

Citizen identity

Citizenship itself refers to membership in the nation community, and is both a legal status and a social and political relation. As a status, citizenship confers legal and social recognition on the citizen as a member of the collective body of citizens entitled to the rights and obligated to the duties that citizenship entails. As a relation, citizenship connotes membership on terms fundamentally equal with other members, including individual freedom and participation in its political affairs. Correspondingly, citizenship carries a presumption of citizen loyalty to society and nation, in exchange for liberty and protection.

Defining the place of the citizen in the public order, the social identity of the citizen gives the boundaries of personal life. These boundaries have cultural content in the individualization of the citizen in relation to kinship, marriage and family, and in divisions between secular and religious authority. The expression of affect and loyalty is also culturally governed. Differences of attitude and expectation concerning what it means to be a citizen can be both subtle and significant in a multicultural society.

Rights and duties of citizenship

Citizens enjoy rights from and owe duties to the community of its citizens. Marshall famously grouped these rights and duties in the categories of civil,

political and social rights, and others have noted further types such as industrial rights. Civil and political rights and obligations refer to modern institutions such as laws of property, marriage, and privacy, habeas corpus, freedom of speech, assembly and association, and political suffrage. The social rights associated with the welfare state extend beyond these liberal rights to involve the citizenry in mutual exchanges of support and assistance across the life cycle and in the event of adversity. Hindess (1993: 28; see also Dean 1998) reminds us that social rights include a republican obligation on citizens, as officers of the community, to uphold normative standards and develop required personal qualities and attributes. Importantly, citizens enjoy relative equality with others in the enjoyment of the rights and obligations of citizenship.

Even in highly secular societies, the rights and duties of citizenship are typically rooted in religious traditions and moral discourses. Where they are the fruit of political contest, social rights may be further legitimated in historical narrative of struggle and just reward. Encoded in the rules defining them are ethical beliefs and expected behaviours with which claimants must comply. In a culturally diverse society the cultural assumptions underlying rights and duties of citizenship may be less well suited to some groups than to others.

Nation as community
The nation is in turn the community of its citizens, and refers to both the democratic polity and the common history and values upon which it rests. Marshall (1963: 96) referred to this as 'a civilization which is a common possession'. This nation community – an imagined unity extending beyond the others one knows and meets (Anderson, 1983) – is the foundation on which solidarity among its citizens and the stability of its social institutions are enabled to develop. It is this solidarity that founds the exchange of rights and obligations through which its citizens share risks and burdens with one another. The nation community of citizens has been equated with the nation state, a problem to which we shall return below.

The nation is a cultural vision as much as a political one, with the solidarity attached to it based on the recognition of its members as having a shared history, territory, and usually language. The affective dimensions of citizenship in belonging, loyalty, fellowship – the dark as well as the light side of citizenship – take their meaning from this sense of shared cultural identity. The vision of nation as community includes culturally based interpretations of divisions and inequalities within it, and the rights and duties of citizens in relation to these. The idea of nation as community is particularly uncomfortable in multicultural societies, where the romance of community sits uncomfortably with an evident plurality of cultural subgroups.

Citizenship, culture and globalization

Globalization has raised major questions for citizenship perspectives. Self-evidently, the increased social and economic interdependence of nations challenges not only the economic authority of their governments but also the cultural integrity of their societies. The greatly increased movement of income, capital and people has been accompanied by greatly increased communications, including new forms of electronic media with ever extending penetration. These media especially circulate symbols of American popular culture, including underlying tenets of individualism and consumerism. The cultural effects of globalization are varied and dynamic, including not only cultural homogenisation, but also religious and ethno-nationalist resurgence in response, and new forms of cultural mix and interaction (Steger 2003).

Welfare state studies abound with examples of historically sustained differences in political culture, policy institutions and the behavioural responses of citizens between nations or groups of nations (Esping-Andersen 1990, 1996). That such differences are at least partly attributable to cultural dimensions such as language, religion and urbanism has long been recognised (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965; Flora and Heidenhemer, 1981; Huber and Stephens, 2001).These dimensions need to be better recognised in the terms that frame the analysis of social welfare citizenship. Issues stemming from the cultural foundations of welfare state citizenship

arise in their sharpest form in societies whose populations are culturally diverse in language, religion and ethnic origin.

For the purpose here, culture needs to be understood in two main senses. The first is culture in its most general meaning as the underlying set of shared understandings, beliefs, customs and rules of behaviour that constitute a framework for the daily life of a people. It is often characterised as 'a design for living' or 'the way we do things around here'. This is culture as it is learned in the course of everyday life. Experienced from birth, culture shapes an individual's understanding of who she is, what she may expect, and how to treat others and behave in her own right. As a collective body of beliefs and lifeways, culture is generated from social interaction through time. Cultures build up distinctive institutions of patterned behaviour and expectation that are generally stable and long lasting, but the foundations of culture in social interaction also give rise to variations within cultures and to ongoing development and change. Significant differences between cultures stem from differences in language, religion and historical experiences of people in different parts of the world. Slavery, colonisation, and struggles for national independence have had important effects on the cultures developed in different regions and countries.

The second sense refers to culture as communicative arts, embodied in art, literature, performance, media and popular entertainment, traditional and folk arts and like forms of expression. Communicative arts have mimetic relations to the culture of daily living, in that communicative art forms draw from and play on culture as lived experience, while in turn reflecting back to their consumers ideological visions of life as it might be lived. The various art forms reflect social division and stratification, into 'elite culture', 'folk arts' and 'popular entertainment', and are increasingly produced and distributed under commercial auspices.

With globalization, communicative arts and especially popular entertainment have become the stuff of international media industries. In market competition with local cultural products on markedly uneven playing fields, these open audiences to wider ranges of ideas and cultural possibilities and

moreover to the cultural hegemony of western, largely American popular culture. In the circulation of images of society and culture, the cultural symbols of western, largely American media, are incorporated in mimetic relations with the world of everyday life, although not necessarily without being reinterpreted in the process (Steger 2003).

Citizenship and multiculturalism

In the next section of this paper I review three extended treatments of multiculturalism as it bears on citizenship and the issues that surround rights and equality in multicultural societies. These have been chosen as substantial accounts that develop contrasting theoretical perspectives and which draw their inspiration from different multicultural societies. For each of these authors, multiculturalism is a primary concern. Examining the models of welfare state citizenship – citizen identity, rights and duties of citizenship, and nation as community – that inform their consideration of multiculturalism, the discussion aims to identify ways in which the citizenship perspective can be developed to give fuller and more informative place to culture and multiculturalism.

Will Kymlicka's liberal multiculturalism:
Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995) presents a liberal theory of minority rights in multicultural society. His central concern is to reconcile the liberal commitment to equality of rights of individuals with the claims of cultural minorities for public policy recognition of valued aspects of their cultures where these put them at a disadvantage in the mainstream society of the majority culture. Kymlicka is challenging the postwar liberal view that the concern of the state and public sphere with ethnic and cultural identity should be limited to protecting the freedoms of individuals, enabling them to make free choices about cultural matters. This view sees the expression of cultural values as a private rather than a public matter and insists that all rights be rights of individuals, treated equally and on the same basis. Kymlicka argues that this stance fails to recognise that the ostensibly universalist institutions of law and public life effectively privilege the majority culture, and that this privileging may preclude members of minority cultures from full equality in the exercise of liberty and choice. His aim is to

supplement traditional human rights principles with a theory of minority rights*:* 'a comprehensive theory of justice in a multicultural state will include both universal rights, assigned to individuals regardless of group membership, and certain group-differentiated rights or "special status" for minority cultures' (1995: 6).

Kymlicka (1995: 18-19) understands 'culture' and 'multicultural' as referring to the framework of customs or 'civilization' which marks a national or ethnic group as 'a people' and distinguishes them from others. He means to set a high threshold for the kind of distinctive cultural groups for whom special rights might be considered. In his meaning, a culture thus has the essential features of a nation, viz. intergenerational coherence and continuity, its own social institutions, a territory or homeland, and a distinct language and history. Although allowing for many variations and certain exceptions, he finds two kinds of distinctive cultural group, 'national'[1] minorities and ethnic groups. 'National' minorities are distinct, territorially concentrated and potentially self-governing societies located within a larger state and society, in most cases as an outcome of national historical developments. The examples of 'national' minorities at the forefront of his analysis are indigenous peoples of the settler societies such as Australia, Canada and the United States, and historically, linguistically and territorially distinctive groups such as the Québécois in Canada. By ethnic groups he refers to immigrants who have left their national community, voluntarily or otherwise, to enter another society and who take their place there as individuals or family groups. He means his theory to be general, but recognises difficulty in applying it to all minority groups and circumstances. He notes the special case of African-Americans, who fit neither model, as representing a unique legacy of the history of slavery and the civil rights movement (24-25).

Citizen identity. Culture is inherently important for Kymlicka's citizens, for it supplies the structure of meaning that supports their capacity to exercise freedom of choice and action (1995: 1995: 82-84). Kymlicka argues that culture is a basic underpinning of people's sense of self and social

---

[1] I shall use quotation marks to distinguish Kymlicka's usage of nation and national from more general uses such as in referring to the nation state.

belonging, and that even when thinned by modernization it remains highly valued as a point of anchorage in a past and future that is shared with others. Given the depth of attachment that many feel to it, commitment to culture is a reality of social life, and one that has to be acknowledged as a potentially significant dimension of the political identity of the citizen. This culture is 'national' in Kymlicka's sense, and is likely to be maintained and reinforced more powerfully for 'national' than for ethnic minorities.

Although Kymlicka believes that culture shapes people's choices, and that justice may require special treatment to accommodate cultural requirements, he does not see culture as finally determinative. His is an avowedly liberal theory. He regards individuals as ultimately capable of making their own choices about the conception of the good, and as capable of re-evaluating culturally received views and choices. The state must therefore safeguard the liberal freedoms of members of minorities as well as of the majority. In accommodating the cultural needs of minorities, it must not authorise groups to limit the liberty of their members from dissent or departure from the norms of minority culture, i.e. to operate 'internal restrictions' on their actions. It must also limit the accommodation of minority interests to measures that operate at the 'national' level. Distinguishing his position from communitarianism, he disapproves of accommodations of minorities that might work through sub-national institutions such as churches, neighbourhoods, unions or families. Institutions of this kind, he believes, form around shared conceptions of the good, and policies operating at this level would be likely to reinforce these shared conceptions. He is concerned not to inhibit the capacity of citizens to question their cultural inheritance and affirms the importance of a liberal education that might enhance their capacity to do so (1995: 89-93). Sen (2006: 18-39) makes a similar argument.

Beyond their particular cultural identity, citizens of a multicultural society potentially share an identity as members of common national society. This may, but will not necessarily, rest on shared political values and/or pride in a commonly recognised history, culture or national achievements (1995: 187-191).

Rights and duties of citizenship. Kymlicka's primary concern is with the just basis for group rights, and he focuses more directly on civil and political than on social rights. Such collective rights may be required as 'external protections' safeguarding the members of minority groups from cultural dominance by the majority, and might take such forms as territorial autonomy, veto powers in certain areas of law, guaranteed representation in central institutions, land claims, and language rights. He identifies three forms of group-differentiated rights: self-government rights, 'polyethnic' rights, and special representation rights. Self-government rights are claimed by 'national' minorities seeking to maintain at least a semblance of past cultural and territorial integrity. Such rights typically take the form of devolution of powers to a local authority under minority group control, directly or within a federalist system, and may cover a broad spectrum of civil, political and social rights. Polyethnic rights are a much more limited form of accommodation claimed by ethnic groups to support and preserve valued aspects of ethnic culture, or to exempt members of ethnic groups from laws and regulations that conflict with ethnic cultural and religious requirements and thereby cause them economic or social disadvantage. Special representation rights refer to forms of guarantee of minority group representation in parties, parliaments and public administrations.

As much as civil, political and social rights, the special rights that Kymlicka supports are cultural rights (Turner: 2001; Stevenson: 2001). In his conception, the cultural rights of 'national' minorities are properly greater than those of ethnic minorities. Rights with respect to language are a touchstone for this difference.[2] Kymlicka supports the protection and perpetuation of the languages of 'national' minorities in public affairs including language education in public schools, on the grounds that all 'national' groups should have the opportunity to maintain themselves as a distinct culture if they choose, and a member of such a group should have the opportunity to live and work in one's culture. It is only with such protections in place that individuals can have the freedom and responsibility

---

[2] Kymlicka affirms the rights of 'national' minorities to territorial integrity on same ground.

to decide for themselves what parts of their culture they wish to maintain. For ethnic groups, however, rights centre on the need for equal access to the mainstream culture, and language rights concern opportunities to learn the language of the majority society and protection from prejudice and discrimination. The difference in the basis of right stems from immigrants' different 'context of choice', i.e. the inevitable necessity of their integration in mainstream society. (1995: 110-113)

<u>Community as nation</u>. Kymlicka regards the modern nation state as resting on a limited pluralism of citizens joined to it both as individuals and through certain group memberships. He sees modern societies as increasingly taking the form of 'multination' or 'polyethnic' states, or a combination of these. The multination state is the product of history, just or unjust, in which the territory and peoples of previously separate nations has been incorporated. The polyethnic state is the legacy of individual and familial immigration. Kymlicka views 'national' minorities as typically wishing to maintain themselves as distinct societies, and as demanding accommodations that would support their continued integrity. He sees ethnic minorities as typically (though not always) wishing to integrate into the larger society, but seeking recognition of their ethnic identity and accommodation of cultural difference. He does not see the creation of special rights for ethnic groups as problematic for such unity, noting that in most cases the demand for such rights reflects a desire for social integration. To the extent that they sustain capacities for self-government, the creation of special rights recognising 'national' minorities is more problematic for national unity, since these reflect and may engender separatist impulses. However, to deny or suppress the political identity of a 'national' minority may equally have harmful consequences for the unity of the larger state, since it may encourage secession. The final reality, Kymlicka argues, is that, 'People from different national groups will only share an allegiance to the larger polity if they see it as the context within which their national identity is nurtured, rather than subordinated' (1995: 189). To bridge such diversity, a liberal state must establish a shared civic identity. Beyond shared civic values, which are not in themselves sufficient, there is no guaranteed source of national unity in multinational states.

In the ten years since its publication Kymlicka's account has been widely debated. He (2001) has since reaffirmed most of his basic positions. His remains the most fully developed treatment of multiculturalism and citizenship within the strict parameters of liberalism. Parekh's largely parallel treatment was originally written at much the same time.[3] It breaks with liberalism in search of a more dynamic, pluralistic resolution of the tensions between equality and minority rights that gives greater parity to contending cultural groups.

Bhikhu Parekh's dialogical pluralism
In *Rethinking Multiculturalism* (2006), Parekh challenges the unitary liberal foundations of approaches such as Kymlicka's. His point of departure is a critique of the 'moral monism' of much western political theory including liberalism. Such monism privileges one view of human nature and human society over any other (2006: 16-18). He grounds his alternative vision of multiculturalism in recognition of differences in the moral values, traditions and structures of different societies, and the search for higher levels of moral universality through dialogue between them. Diversity is inherently valuable because each culture is limited, and thereby limited in the range of human capacities that it nurtures. A society where diverse cultures are in critically sympathetic dialogue with each other enables individuals to appreciate the distinctive features of their own culture and the contrasting potentials of others. Like Kymlicka, Parekh rejects a mode of accommodation that confines the expression of cultural difference to private life. Rather, a society of this kind requires a pluralistic public realm in which difference is recognised as the positive basis of creative dialogue. Parekh argues that in multicultural societies at least the modern state has outlived the assumptions of unity of territory, sovereignty and culture on which it has relied to date. His project aims to find ways of pluralizing the state without undermining its unity.

---

[3] See Barry (2001) for a hostile commentary on the arguments of both Kymlicka and Parekh.

For Parekh, human nature is mediated by culture, a 'system of beliefs and practices in which a group of human beings understand, regulate and structure their individual and collective lives (2006: 143). Culture is historically created, shared in interaction with others through language, religion and/or ethnicity, and deeply rooted in the human personality. Moral values are culturally embedded, and as for Kymlicka, culture defines the meanings and significance of human actions. Cultures themselves, majority and minority, are changed by actions and influences emanating from both within and without. Parekh acknowledges multiple forms of diversity including gender, sexual orientation and bodily capacities, but restricts his argument to communal diversity (2006: 3-4). Contemporary multicultural societies differ from those of past periods in that colonialism, slavery, the Holocaust and communist tyrannies have undermined the legitimacy of the old ethno-racial hierarchies while economic and cultural globalization have brought cultural difference more directly into view. Cultural groups thus now live in awareness of, proximity to, and contention with one another (2006: 167-8).

Citizen identity. Like Kymlicka, Parekh sees human identity as culturally embedded. Observing that membership of a cultural community not only shapes options but also entails loyalty and demands conformity, he sees culture as institutionalizing, exercising and distributing power (2006: 157). However, its role is not determinative. Parekh is critical of Kymlicka's liberal view because it sees autonomy as ultimately a feature of human nature, only contingently and externally related to culture (2006: 109-10). Parekh reformulates the basis on which he sees individuals as able to stand apart from their constitutive beliefs as including the influences of economic, political and technological factors intertwined with culture, the internal inconsistencies characteristic of all living cultures, and innate human capacities for thought and reflection. He argues that the ability to question and compare is greater in a diverse society (2006: 157-8).

Parekh also sees the members of a multicultural society as sharing a common national identity. This common national identity stems from a common culture. This common culture is interculturally created and

multiculturally constituted and sustained by a multiculturally oriented system of education. To support unity, this identity, he argues, must be politico-institutional rather than ethno-cultural in nature, it must be inclusive, and culturally and symbolically egalitarian (2006: 219-236).

Rights and duties of citizenship. Parekh acknowledges the significance of equality of civil and political rights including a constitutionally enshrined framework of fundamental rights. Like Kymlicka, Parekh sees it as just for the state to recognise the cultural identities of its citizens in its treatment of them under certain conditions. These include cultures that are vitally important to their members and whose continued existence is endangered by majority power, such as at least some indigenous and other 'national' minorities. He makes the case both for negatively equal treatment through measures such as anti-discrimination provisions, and positive equality measures. Such positive measures include cultural rights, viz. the rights that an individual or community requires to express, maintain and transmit their cultural identity (2006: 211). He and Kymlicka differ little in the particular kinds of collective rights they would recognise. He is, however, critical of Kymlicka's differential valuation of 'national' and ethnic cultural rights as insufficiently cognisant of the rights and claims of immigrant minorities (2006, 102-3).

Parekh attempts to define principles for intercultural evaluation of the limits to be set to tolerance of divergent minority values and practices on the basis of what he terms 'operative public values'. These are a loosely-knit corpus of values, at least some of which are embodied in constitutional, legal and civic institutions, that are generally observed and which constitute a lived social and moral reality in the society. These operative public values form the basis of an intercultural dialogue within and between minority and majority cultures (2006: 268-273).

Nation as community. Parekh sees economic and cultural globalization as having undermined the cultural integrity of societies, compounding the homogenizing effects of modernizing nation states on political culture (2006: 8). 'In short the old unity of territory, sovereignty and culture (or identity) that

has hitherto propelled the development and consolidation of the modern state and provided its historical rationale is fast disintegrating' (2006: 194). His focus is thus on the kind of state required to support a multicultural society. He advocates a multicultural pluralism, dialogically constituted, that balances liberalism with multiculturalism – 'at once a community of citizens and a community of communities' (2006: 340). In such a state, the basis of unity is not cultural but political, based on shared commitment to the political community. This entails a commitment to its integrity and continuing existence, but this might reflect different forms and bases of attachment for different groups. He argues that equal citizenship may be essential to nurture a common sense of belonging, but equality is not in and of itself sufficient. Recognition and acceptance of diversity is additionally required to foster achieve full community (2006: 341-2).

Parekh's book was first published in 2000. In the same year the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain sponsored by the Runnymede Trust (2000; 2004) published the report from an inquiry which he chaired. Known as 'The Parekh Report', the report addressed policy responses to racial discrimination and disadvantage in 'multi-ethnic Britain' with a range of social policy recommendations in areas such as policing, education, the arts and education. Its publication prompted four weeks of intense debate in the British press over the suggestion in the report that Britain was not already multicultural and expressions of a new multicultural nationalism (Fortier 2005). Three years later, in a report on the progress made on its recommendations, Parekh (2004) attributed its 'difficult birth' to its break from the dominant conservative, liberal and Marxist conceptualisations and to the resistance of many on the right to its interventionist strategy.

Néstor García Canclini's citizenship as consumption:
Néstor García Canclini (2001) approaches the issues of multiculturalism and citizenship very differently from the two writers just considered. He draws his ideas not from political philosophy but from anthropology and cultural studies. He situates his perspective not in the dominant capitalist nations of the North Atlantic, but in the developing countries and especially the cities of

Latin America. He too supports political recognition of the cultural needs and interests of the members of minority groups, but wishes to join this with wider reform pursuing equality among groups and classes in access to the fruits of globalization (2001: 21). García Canclini sees citizenship and politics, broadly understood, as being reshaped through changes in the modes of consumption, including cultural consumption. These changes locate citizenship itself on the social terrain of consumption:

> The exercise of citizenship has always been associated with the capacity to appropriate commodities and with ways of using them. It has also been commonplace to assume that the difference in modes of consuming and using commodities is cancelled out by equality of abstract rights…Men and women increasingly feel that many of the questions proper to citizenship—where do I belong, what rights accrue to me, how can I get information, who represents my interests?—are being answered in the private realm of commodity consumption and the mass media more than in the abstract rules of democracy or collective participation in public spaces (2001:15).

While Kymlicka and Parekh understand multiculturalism on the basis of group differences, García Canclini interprets it theoretically as 'hybridization' generated from the history and diversity of the region and its peoples. The colonization of Latin America by Spain and Portugal stretched a common cultural template over the diverse indigenous civilizations of the region, but did little to bind the colonies or the nation states that succeeded them together as a region. Nation and ethnicity never neatly coincided in Latin America, and modernization has not dissolved the marked ethnic regional and national differences, or the indigenous, ethnic and national minorities, that have resulted (2001: 122-24). Globalization and an international liberal order have had further effects. As a way of conceiving of this multiculturality, hybridization recognises not only diverse cultures and social heterogeneity, but the social and political effects of this historical layering and cultural intersection. These effects are at play in the production and consumption of culture, and in the cultural policies of the state. García Canclini argues that an institutional division of labour has been established in which the cultural

policies of states tend to focus on the preservation of monuments and folkloric heritages and the promotion of high culture while trans-national corporations distribute international, and largely American, popular culture through mass markets and popular entertainment. In the result, multiculturalism entails not only cultural difference and heterogeneity, but also cultural stratification (2001: 128-30). One of García Canclini's concerns is the scope for democratisation of these cultural forces through equal access and participation in sophisticated communication technologies (2001: 131; see also Turner 2001).

Citizen identity. As the social relation at the heart of politics, citizenship refers not only to the rights attached to territorial jurisdiction but further to the social and cultural practices that confer belonging, define difference, and enable the satisfaction of needs. García Canclini sees Identity ("with a capital I") as constructed in group narrative, which in the Latin American case almost always entails territorial appropriation and struggles for independence. Ethnic and national identities are hybrid constructions in which groups are asymmetrically interdependent, contending with one another in relations infused with their diverse and intersecting pasts. With the passage from the modern to the postmodern age has come a transformation in social identity. In this transformation, identities once understood as an imagined community secured by bonds of blood and territory are being replaced by identities that are trans-territorial and multi-linguistic. The cultural conditions of the present entail a rearticulation of public and private in which the popular classes are incorporated through popular culture and mass media, while the underlying order of cultural authority of the elite classes continues unremarked (2001: 11-27).

Rights and duties of citizenship. García Canclini does not argue in the language of rights but rather of struggles for recognition, not only of difference but of the valid subjectivities, interests and claims of all citizens. He sees a place for development policies that recognise diverse modes of economic organization and political representation as self-determination. More generally, however, he sees demands for juridical forms of cultural rights to accommodate the needs of particular groups as leading to a

splintering of citizenship at a time when political participation itself is being redefined as entertainment and consumption. In an environment where activities critical to citizens' needs are steeped in consumption and its cultural referents, the state finds itself obliged to relate to its constituents in way that respond to their tastes as consumers. As he puts it, 'Disillusioned with state, party, and union bureaucracies, the publics turn to radio and television to receive what citizen institutions could not deliver: services, justice, reparations, or just attention' (2001: 21-23). This may entail individualisation and diversification, whether substantive or otherwise, of what is on offer in the manner of the market.

Nation as community. García Canclini sees the nation as declining in significance with the globalization of finance, industry and culture. In the same vein metropolitan centres become more closely connected to one another than to the localities of their own regions. Citizen identities have their bases in local cultures, but as people migrate to urban centres these centres become points of intersection of multiple national traditions. García Canclini sees transnationalization and regional integration as restructuring national cultures, with differential effects in four 'circuits'. The *historico-territorial* circuit concerns knowledges, habits and experiences of ethnic, regional and national groups, periods and territories; the *culture of elites* comprises cultural forms primarily representative of the upper and middle classes, and while historically defining the nation as collective self, is now becoming integrated in international markets.[4] *Mass communications* refer to the symbols of the entertainment industries. *Restricted systems of information and communication* are the communication systems reserved to decision makers. Here, García Canclini is thinking of advanced technologies such as computer, cellphone and satellite communications (2001: 30-31).[5] The social meaning of nation, local community, class and ethnic group, to the extent that they remain relevant, function as the 'interpretive community

---

[4] One thinks of Frida Kahlo.
[5] García Canclini published the original Spanish edition of *Consumers and Citizens* in 1995. This last category of his schema appears to have been overtaken by the convergence and democratisation of communication technologies. Internet and satellite connected mobile phones are now widespread and have been extensively colonised by entertainment industries.

of consumers' that frames the experience of wider cultural messages (2001: 43, 159).

In political action there is a shift from 'the people' to 'civil society', but civil society is subject to cooption by international agencies with shallow local roots. Hence he is equally wary of a heterogeneous civil society of groups, non-government organisations and social movement bodies. His focus is on cultural policy, and he sees greatest promise in strategies bringing political parties critical of neoliberalism together with social movements, and which work with rather than against popular tastes and cultural interests to democratise communication (155-158).

García Canclini is primarily interested in the city, and he does not address the problem of national unity. More concerned with Latin American regional integration in the face neoliberal globalization, he sees regional trade and economic agreements such as NAFTA and MERCOSUR as disregarding the possibilities and obstacles posed in national contexts.

Lessons for theorising culture in welfare state citizenship
While all three of these writers favour cultural diversity and pluralism, multiculturalism means something different to each of them. Their political agendas are also different, in a manner connected to what they take multiculturalism to be. Kymlicka and Parekh offer theories of cultural rights addressed to liberal democracies, implicitly those in developed western nations. Kymlicka's account clearly has a strong concern with Canadian experiences and the claims of its Francophone and indigenous minorities. He argues that the 'national' and ethnic minorities that serve as archetypes in his analysis represent the most difficult challenges for liberal democracy, and that the Canadian approach may have lessons for other countries (2001). The preservation of 'national' cultures is a clear value in his theory. Territory and territorial concentration, whether in actuality or memory, are accorded legitimacy, as is a wish on the part of 'national' minorities to live with others of the same culture.

Parekh's arguments have been developed in the British context, and its dialogical basis reflects his aim to bridge the mix of eastern and western cultures of immigrants from Britain's former colonies. Less defensive than Kymlicka's in its justification of cultural rights, his argument is also less interested in the right to preserve cultural heritage and maintain cultural difference. Its key concern seems to be with the role of cultural recognition in securing racial and cultural harmony. More than Kymlicka's, Parekh's theory is addressed to the situation of diverse cultures living side by side and subject to the same institutional structures of employment, education, health, welfare and criminal justice.

García Canclini sets his discussion in Latin America. Modelled on the experience of that region, his version of multiculturalism refers not only to regional diversity of indigenous peoples, histories of conquest and slavery, and postcolonial immigration, but to cultural difference grounded in modernization, economic development and the urbanization of rural peasants and indigenous peoples in fringe settlements and the cities themselves.. He views culture and cultural difference not as fixed but changing, even in social institutions devoted to its preservation. The hybridization of cultural identity is shaped in contexts of cultural commodification and Foucauldian circuits of power. He is an urban theorist, and addresses multiculturalism as describing the urban environment. Importantly, for García Canclini multiculturalism, although deeply valued, is not a policy objective in its own right but simply the objective social condition of postmodern life. Primarily interested in social and economic struggles for social equality in conditions of globalization and neoliberal politics, he sees a multiculturalist politics of cultural rights as counterproductive.

Multiculturalism is clearly different things for different theorists, and for different reasons. Moreover these three accounts, even taken together, refer to only some of the diverse forms of multiculturalism to be found in the world. The differences of value and purpose raise doubts about the viability of any one-size-fits-all approach to theorising multiculturalism for policy purposes. This is not a new observation (see Turner, 2005). Despite their aims for a general theory, both Kymlicka and Parekh present visions that are

finally Eurocentric. García Canclini's approach, in contrast, has its point of view rooted in societies that send more than they receive immigrants from other parts of the world. There are undoubtedly other visions of citizenship and multiculturalism to be written, from the perspectives of other societies and regions. All these books were written before September 11, and the advent of home-grown terrorism in London and elsewhere. None of them grapples with the dark side of multiculturalism, or the fears of it, that these events represent.

As Miller (2006: 326-7) suggests, it is necessary to distinguish between multiculturalism, or perhaps more usefully cultural diversity, as social condition, multiculturalism as an ideology shaping politics and policy, and multiculturalism as enacted in policy instruments such as language and cultural rights. Concepts of welfare state citizenship need to engage with multicultural societies at all these levels, and to give theoretical place to the parts that culture and cultural difference play in citizenship in each.

Whatever the limitations of these three theories of citizenship and multiculturalism, they offer insights for how the study of welfare state citizenship might be made more responsive to the issues raised by cultural diversity.

The cultural identity of citizen
Both Kymlicka's liberal and Parekh's dialogical approaches to multiculturalism take the cultural identity of the citizen as a given. Seeking to honour minority culture, they assume its authenticity. In the result, they treat culture as a static system of values, traditions and lifeways into which individuals are born, which they share with communities of others of like cultural heritage, and whose norms and values they are obliged to honour in their behaviour. Cultural identity is thus a matter of belonging to one or other of majority or minority cultures, these existing separately side by side. Both accounts also see culture and its requirements as effectively fixed in their most important respects. Although Kymlicka's liberal theory insists that the individual is also able to reflect on and make choices about attachment to cultural values, there is little or no consideration of the cultural resources

that an individual would require to be able to do so[6]. In fine, both approaches leave culture and the social processes surrounding the development, reproduction and change of the cultural identity of the citizen out of view and out of consideration. This is, of course, not the task their authors have set themselves. Nevertheless, in societies of increasing cultural complexity, how citizen identity is formed and maintained is the question that most needs to be asked.

García Canclini's approach to culture and multiculturalism supplies starting points for a more rounded and especially a more processual account of cultural citizenship. His notion of hybridization and his dual concern with culture as way of life and as marketed commodity offer key resources for such a project. Cultural hybridization presents multiculturalism as entailing a complex mix of contending groups with different histories as indigenous, historical, immigrant and other minorities. Moreover, hybridization draws attention to these groups as related through their differences in origins, settlement history and territorial possession and in national and group ideologies. Thus García Canclini's account suggests both between-group differences in power and cultural legitimacy and cross-group interaction in social, economic and urban life. Perhaps most interestingly, it suggests the basis of cultural citizenship in the narratives that contending cultural groups construct explaining their place in national history and culture. Mexico has seen, for example, the post-independence nationalist narrative of *mestizaje* representing the nation as the fusion of European and indigenous peoples challenged by groups such as the Zapatistas in Chiapas with new narratives of indigenous identity. For García Canclini the meaning of these narratives is also the subject of wider contestation in cultural arenas, where they become the fodder of politics and commerce – the stuff of heritage protection and telenovelas – under auspices that may be local or global.[7]

García Canclini's way of seeing multiculturalism stems from his anthropological and ethnographic approach. It nevertheless has parallels

---

[6] It is unclear, for example, what cultural rights, support or protections might be appropriate for the member of a 'national' minority living away from the homeland of the 'national' group.
[7] This contrasts sharply with Kymlicka's and Parekh's respectful assumptions of the authenticity of minority culture.

with Sen's (2006: 18-39) more philosophically grounded critique of the reductionist fallacy of 'singular affiliation' that he sees as at the heart of problematic identity politics. Sen notes that individuals have multiple social identities reflecting their backgrounds and histories, social roles, interests and affiliations. The fallacy of singular affiliation refers to the claim that among the various groups to which they belong, there is one which confers on the individual an identity of pre-eminent importance. This claim is often attached to ethnic or cultural identity and the discovery of a true self. Sen considers this fallacy mistaken and potentially oppressive. 'The same person can, for example, be a British citizen, of Malaysian origin, with Chinese racial characteristics, a stockbroker, a nonvegetarian, an asthmatic, a linguist, a body builder, a poet, an opponent of abortion, a bird-watcher, an astrologer, and one who believes that God created Darwin to test the gullible' (p. 24). He argues that individuals, while constrained by context to varying degrees, nevertheless have scope for choice in the priority they accord to these multiple identities in the actual circumstances of social life. These choices give freedom and entail responsibility. Sen, in turn, too easily assumes the circumstances of cosmopolitanism, giving little consideration to the importance of education, experience and social power in empowering individuals to see and use such freedom.

It follows from this discussion that arguments about multiculturalism and citizen identity need to give closer attention to cultural diversity as it is lived in multicultural society, in the structures of social relations within and between cultural groups and their members: in residence, employment, marriage and kinship, religion, and civil society and political activity. Identity, including cultural identity, is a social construction, and the networks and interactions in which individuals meet (or do not meet) in daily life are key resources for its development. If culture forms a thread in the narratives of identity that explain who citizens are, this social context will be foundational to it.

Culture and the rights and duties of citizenship
All three of these accounts of citizenship and multiculturalism concern themselves more directly with civil and cultural than with political and social

rights. In a general sense, Kymlicka's and Parekh's arguments about the justifications for special rights for cultural minorities apply also to social rights, but the authors do not concern themselves with the frameworks of risk and redistribution entailed in the support of special rights to social rights of citizenship, or the political effects of redistribution between cultural groups. Perhaps surprisingly, neither has much to say about cultural bonds as a foundation for political mobilisation, directly or through participation in mainstream political parties. This is the central issue for a theory of multiculturalism and citizenship. As the papers in Banting and Kymlicka's (2006) show, these issues are live in many countries and the political outcomes presently unclear.

In suggesting that we think of citizenship as consumption, García Canclini offers a rather different way of framing questions about the cultural basis of social rights. The most usual imagery for social rights has been in terms of their use values or cash equivalence. This is an apt comparison for income support provisions such as pensions and employment benefits, but perhaps is less so for other forms of provision, such as health, education and personal care, where social rights take the form of services. An analysis working through the imagery of consumption may capture important aspects of social provision in popular experience, such as hierarchies of public and private provision, the symbolic importance of choice, and individualised care. In putting public services on the same plane as advertised commodities, it may also prove an interesting way to explore the cultural dimensions of public support for welfare state provision.

Nation as community
Both Kymlicka and Parekh seek to persuade nation states to give justice to the cultural minorities living within their borders. Perhaps for this reason, they do not attend to the permeability of national states and national boundaries for the processes that shape cultural identities or the cultural dimensions of social citizenship. It is nevertheless clear that an understanding of multiculturalism and multicultural citizenship must be set in the context of economic and cultural globalization.

In this dimension too, García Canclini's discussion of multiculturalism and citizenship offers potentially fruitful directions. He draws attention especially to the spread and power of electronic communications, and the capacity these give for people to maintain cultural connection across distance and beyond national borders. Modern telecommunications, the internet and satellite dishes enable immigrants to keep up not only personal relationships with family and friends in their country of origin, but also to follow political events there through radio, television and the electronic versions of newspapers. The democratisation of international travel allows these connections to be refreshed more readily than in the past. Dual citizenship is no longer rare. Cultural connection is thus more likely to be maintained as a force in immigrants' lives, and to grow and change, in a way different than in the past, when immigrants' interpretation of knowledge and cultural expectations tended to become outdated as compared with contemporary practice in their homelands.

García Canclini's focus on global communication industries and the interplay of cultural influences they foster are also significant. The effects these have in stratifying cultural markets and symbols have implications for the shaping of solidarities within and between groups, and in the creation of group and national loyalties. This suggests a relevance for social citizenship of cultural policies such as those governing museums and cultural heritage, media access and control, and support for local and national media production and distribution.

However more permeable national boundaries may be to cultural difference, nation states remain the primary reference for social citizenship frameworks. Kymlicka and Parekh address the basis of national solidarity in conditions of social diversity, but in both cases this discussion is rather thin. Suggesting shared civic values and operative public values respectively, their arguments say little about how such a common culture is generated or sustained. Kymlicka (1995: 187-191) acknowledges that shared civic values cannot be guaranteed to be strong enough to withstand the forces of cultural separatism.

This question of national integrity is important. It might be addressed through more robust appreciation of culture as socially constructed through processes rooted in everyday social interaction and the representations of public culture. Such an approach would direct attention to the social structures and processes shaping social interaction and the cultural conditions under which citizens understand themselves and each other. This might bring citizens themselves to life as social and cultural beings. Barbalet (1988) and Kymlicka (1995: 180) argue that social rights of citizenship do not have the same integrative function for cultural minorities as for the social integration of the working class. As they see it, it is culture itself that is at stake, and only cultural rights will give the feeling of inclusion that is required. Kymlicka's argument for cultural rights is intended to fill this gap. Social rights are, however, read through cultural frames. How social rights may contribute to a common civic culture, or strengthen a framework of operative public values, is ultimately an empirical question about the cultural dimensions of welfare state citizenship.

References

Anderson, Benedict (1983), *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London, New Left Books.

Banting, K. and Kymlicka, W., eds. (2006), *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State, Recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Barbalet, J. M. (1988), *Citizenship*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Barry, B. (2001), *Culture and Equality*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Dean, M. (1998), 'Administering asceticism: reworking the ethical life of the unemployed citizen', pp. 87-107 in M. Dean and B. Hindess, eds., *Governing Australia, Studies in contemporary rationalities of government*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Esping-Andersen, G., ed. (1996), *Welfare States in Transition, National adaptations in global economies*, London, Sage.

Flora, P. and Heidenheimer, A. J., eds. (1981), *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America*, New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Books.

Fortier, A-M (2005), 'Pride politics and multiculturalist citizenship', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(3): 559-578.

García Canclini, N. (2001), *Consumers and Citizens, Globalization and multicultural conflicts*, trans. G. Yúdice, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Hindess, B. (1993) 'Citizenship in the modern west', pp. 19-35 in B. Turner (ed.), *Citizenship and Social Theory*, London, Sage.

Huber, E. and Stephens, J. D. (2001), *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State, Parties and policies in global markets*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship, A liberal theory of minority rights*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2001), *Politics in the Vernacular*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Marshall, T. H. (1963), 'Citizenship and social class', pp. 67-127 in T. H. Marshall, *Sociology at the Crossroads and other essays,* London, Heinemann.

Miller, D. (2006), 'Multiculturalism and the welfare state: theoretical reflections', pp. 323-338 in K. Banting and W. Kymlicka (eds.), *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State, Recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

O'Connor, J. S., Orloff, A. S., Shaver, S. (1999), *States, Markets, Families, Gender, liberalism and social policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Parekh, B. (2006), *Rethinking Multiculturalism, Cultural diversity and political theory*, 2nd edn, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Pateman, C. (1989),'The patriarchal welfare state', pp. ?? in C. Pateman, *The Disorder of Women,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

Pierson, P. (1994), *Dismantling the Welfare State? Reagan, Thatcher and the politics of retrenchment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Runnymede Trust, Lord Bhikhu Parekh Chair (2000), *The Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, Runnymede Trust, www.runnymedetrust.org.

Runnymede Trust (2004), *Realising the Vision Progress and further challenges*, Briefing Paper April 2004, Runnymede Trust, www.runnymedetrust.org.

Sen, A. (2006), *Identity and Violence, The illusion of destiny*, London, Allen Lane.

Steger, M. B. (2003), *Globalization, A very short introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Stevenson, N. (2001), 'Culture and citizenship: an introduction', pp. 1-10 in N. Stevenson (ed), *Culture and Citizenship*, London, Sage.

Turner, B. S. (1986), *Citizenship and Capitalism, The debate over reformism*, London, Allen and Unwin.

Turner, B. S. (1990), 'Outline of a theory of citizenship', *Sociology* 24(2): 189-214.

Turner, B. S. (1994) 'Postmodern culture/modern citizens', pp. 153-168 in B. van Steenbergen (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*, London, Sage.

Turner, B. S. (2001) 'Outline of a general theory of cultural citizenship', pp. 11-32 in N. Stevenson (ed.), *Culture and Citizenship*, London, Sage.

Wilensky, H.L and Lebeaux, C. N. (1965), *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*, New York, The Free Press.

Theoretical discussion of welfare state citizenship has focused too narrowly on bundles of rights and duties, with too little concern for the cultures of institutions, relationships and meanings that define them. It has been convenient, especially for comparative research, to reduce citizenship to measurable quantities and qualities of obligations and entitlements. The price of such convenience is to abstract these rights from the political culture and social action that make them meaningful for the citizenry concerned. Culture, in its broadest sense of the 'design for living' that a people ma Public Opinion on Multiculturalism, Trust and the Welfare State," in Banting and Kymlicka, eds., Multiculturalism and the Welfare State; and Markus Crepaz, Trust Without Borders: Immigration, the Welfare State and Identity in Modern Societies (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming). 27 More recently, this conclusion has been tested in multivariate analysis, with the same result. See Banting, Johnston, Kymlicka, and Soroka, "Do Multiculturalism Policies Erode the Welfare State?" 28 Banting and Kymlicka, "Do Multiculturalism Policies Erode the Welfare State?" 29 See van Par...Â 32 Barry, Culture and Equality, p. 8. 33 See Yasemin Soysal, The Limits of Citizenship (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994). Modern states are organized around the language and cultural norms of the dominant groups that have historically constituted them. Members of minority cultural groups face barriers in pursuing their social practices in ways that members of dominant groups do not. Some theorists argue for tolerating minority groups by leaving them free of state interference (Kukathas 1995, 2003).Â Multiculturalism involves not only claims of identity and culture as some critics of multiculturalism suggest. It is also a matter of economic interests and political power: it includes demands for remedying economic and political disadvantages that people suffer as a result of their marginalized group identities.