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The concept of the nation has shaped the current geopolitical landscape in Europe and beyond. Not only have borders and territories of states shifted and new nation states been built, but in addition the influence of inter-governmental or supra-governmental agencies has increased particularly since the end of the cold war, while at the same time new patterns of economic and political processes on a global scale have developed. The formation of the European Union as a geopolitical and economic union plays an important role in debates about the accommodation of diversity within the union and its member states.

Key issues of these debates have been the construction of a common European identity against the background of the continuing shifts of Europe as a territorial entity. The controversial discussion about the potential membership of Turkey is a striking example of a European border regime which is closely linked to identity questions. In dominant political discourses Turkey is, despite its secular constitution, categorized as a Muslim country which is irreconcilable with Christian European identities. The controversies about the definitions of a common European heritage as a reference point for external borders are interlaced with immigration policies which constitute internal boundaries within Europe and its nation states.

Since the second half of the 20th century the concept of multiculturalism and its critique as well as the pattern in the discourse of "the failure of multiculturalism" indicate the ways in which diversity has been discussed within European nation states. Nevertheless, the nation states are linked to concepts of EU as a political and economic and even as a cultural unity in contrast to other cultures or civilisations. Yet, although EU institutions frame migration and immigration policies with the introduction of EU-citizenship, the Schengen-agreement and legislation like the non-discrimination law, the member states continue to follow their respective national integration policies. Accordingly, multicultural approaches mostly focus on the national settings and are concerned with the concept of the nation. In dominant public and political discourses diversity has been discussed in terms of cultural, religious or ethnic difference intertwined with drawing boundaries between sameness and similarity on the one hand and otherness on the other which even includes EU citizens.

Multiculturalisms Contested

The term "multiculturalism" emerged in the 1960s and 1970s in North America and Australia and only later entered European discussions. The American polit-

1 Shû José Casanova, "Religion, European Secular Identities, and European Integration" in Transit 27, http://migrationeducation.de/45.0.html 13.06.2014.
cal and legal theorist Sarah Song defines multiculturalism in her article in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy as an "umbrella term to characterize the moral and political claims of a wide range of disadvantaged groups, including African-Americans, women, gays and lesbians, and the disabled." Nevertheless, according to her "most theorists of multiculturalism tend to focus their arguments on immigrants who are ethnic and religious minorities [...], minority nations [...] and indigenous peoples" (Song 2010). Her definition is useful in the sense that it alludes to the different regional contexts in which the term has been developed and changed across time. "Like contemporary ethno-nationalisms", as the Australian scholar David Bennett stated at the end of the 1990s, "multiculturalism is in many ways an epiphenomenon of globalization, and since its coinage by the Canadian Royal Commission in 1965, the word itself has had a diasporic career, entering and inflecting numerous national debates about the politics of cultural difference, the 'limits of tolerance', and the future of the nation-state." In spite of common topics, there is no clear cut definition of multiculturalism in European contexts. It has been said that the various concepts share the appreciation of diversity, demand respect and recognition of different identities and above all foster attitudes that, as Alessandro Silj puts it, "the Other is not perceived as a threat to the identity, values and culture of the host society." However, the different epithets in academic discourse like "radical", "polycentric", "critical", "insurgent", "corporate", "conservative" or "left-liberal" multiculturalism indicate the variety of approaches which are linked to controversies on different levels and in different contexts.

The prominence of the term "culture" in political discourses, which multicultural theoretical concepts have also adapted, is closely linked to shifts on an international scale. Since the end of WW II the term "race", based on the construction of biological difference and hierarchies between human groups has become problematic against the background of the crimes of National Socialism, colonialism and apartheid. Instead, the terms "culture" and "ethnicity" were introduced as alternatives with the UNESCO "Statement on the nature of race differences" in 1951. Although the replacement of "race" was meant as anti-racist strategy, scholars have pointed out that the understanding of human difference in terms of "equal but different cultures" obscure the realities of inequalities interlocked with the production of superior and inferior groups by policies in national and international contexts. Moreover, categorising negative ascriptions to groups as individual prejudices and stereotypes misses the point that such practices have been produced by the institutions of nation states. To put it in a nutshell, "the language of culture rather than
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race does not ensure its innocence” as Anne Phillips notes and underscores with the following example: “When people speak of the dangers of their culture being swamped by the migration of too many people from another, or it being better to keep some distance between cultures because of natural human preference for living with one's own, this is not so different from the fear of miscegenation.”7

The construction of "otherness" has been fluid across time and space. The continually shifting external and internal boundaries of the EU have been producing new societal formations which include former others, perpetuate exclusions of "old minorities" or produce new hierarchies between groups of "old immigrants" and "new immigrants". The geo-political enlargement of the EU has also led to redefinitions of the term "immigrant" and revisions of migration regimes. European countries which have been emigration nations in the first decades after WW II are now transit migration or immigration countries. At the same time the citizens of former emigration, now full member countries of the EU have been granted mobility and residence within the EU according to the introduction of EU citizenship since the Maastricht Treaty. They are no longer categorized as immigrants. Nevertheless, countries within the EU are emigration countries with diasporas in different parts of the world. Not only concepts of belonging but also remittances of diaspora members to relatives, investments, political or humanitarian support in the country of origin or imagined home show the multitude of current practices across state borderlines. Concurrently, the fortification of external borders has been intensified and Southern and Eastern countries at the EU borders are obliged to implement migration policies in order to become members of the European Union. In this vein, the metaphor "Fortress Europe" has often been used to signify European border and migration regimes.

Apart from these developments which play a crucial role in migration and integration policies, research found that the current migrant population in European countries is more diverse than those in post war decades. Steven Vertovec introduces the term "super-diversity" to categorize the complexities within and between presumed homogenous groups of immigrants along former categorizations according to the nationality, the ethnicity or the religious affiliations of immigrants. "Today", he argues, "newer, smaller, transient, less organised and more legally differentiated immigrant groups comprise global migration flows." The social and economic positions as well as migrants' self-concepts are influenced by multiple intersections of variables like gender, religious traditions, ethnicity, regional and local identities, language, cultural values and practices. Additionally, the respective immigration policies on national and communal levels, the employment strategies of companies or the attitude of locals towards immigrants shape the frames of their societal existences. The term "super-diversity" might be appropriate to indicate shifts, but one

---

should also take into account that its evolving could also be a result of changed interpretative models which neglect immigrants' diversity in previous periods of time insofar as other categorisations of difference have been at play in politics and research.

The political scientist Bhikhu Parekh argues: "Multiculturalism is best understood neither as a political doctrine with a programmatic content nor a philosophical school with a distinct theory of man's place in the world but as a perspective on or a way of viewing human life." According to Parekh "a multicultural perspective is composed of the creative interplay of ... the cultural embeddedness of human beings, the inescapability and desirability of cultural plurality, and the plural and multicultural constitution of each culture." Nevertheless, he emphasises that a multicultural society has to develop a "common sense of belonging among its citizens" which should not be "based on shared cultural, ethnic and other characteristics". Instead, the political community as a shared community should be the frame for the deliberation of common sense.

Parekh's approach which meets the paradigms of other multicultural approaches supports the idea of a civic nation and can be understood as a reconceptualisation of liberal democracies within nation or multi-national states. Two major concepts of the nation are being discussed at the moment. Social scientists distinguish between the concept of an ethnic nation and the concept of a civic nation. It is assumed that the concept of an ethnic nation emphasising common ancestors and culture demands the assimilation of newcomers, whereas the concept of a civic nation embraces all people who live in a particular territory "and show common allegiance to a political unit." Both concepts are often interlocked with perceptions of a national culture as homogenous. In other words, the distinctions between the concepts of an ethnic nation and civic nation may be useful on a theoretical level, though the actual outcome when states follow one or the other of the concepts may, in fact, be the same. If one compares, e.g., the integration policies of the ethnic nation state Germany with the civic nation state France one can see that both states demand the subjection to principles or values which are seen as core elements of the respective national culture. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the differentiation of populations on the basis of coherent and homogenous groups plays an important
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role in and between societies, has shaped particular social-political orders in such a way that it has become part of individual identity constructions and images of the nation as a natural unit. As the authors of the entry in the "Dictionary of Race, Ethnicity and Culture" point out the term "nation" is nowadays commonly understood as a "group of people united by culture, language, traditions and common interests", which indicates the uses in everyday language and how imaginations of a national community are part of the social unconscious.13

In academic discourse, Benedict Anderson has presented the nation in his analysis which was published in 1983 as "imagined community". At the same time, Eric Hobsbawm pointed out that traditions "are often quite recent in origin and sometimes invented. ... [E]ntirely new symbols and devices came into existence as part of national movements and states, such as the national anthem ..., the national flag ..., or the personification of the nation' in symbol or image, either official, as with Marianne and Germany, or unofficial, as the cartoon stereotypes of John Bull, the lean Yankee Uncle Sam and the 'German Michel".14 These now classic approaches along with further (de)constructionist approaches have scrutinised in which ways nations are the result of historical social-political developments and how narratives of nationhood, concepts of national identity and a unified national culture have obscured internal divisions and differences along power structures within societies. The emphasis on the construction of nations offers space to reconfigure discourses on belongings and the accommodation of diversity. Critical theoretical and political debates about the constructions of homogenous national communities which go along with the drawing of boundaries are at the least crucial in view of the fact that divisions between "us" and "them" are inseparable from the past and present of war, conflict, violence and suppression.

Classical liberal approaches have emphasised that the implementation of equal rights for individuals, the neutrality of state institutions towards cultural, ethnic or religious affiliations, the division between the public space as a secular space for political rational deliberations and the private space as a space for expressing different ethnic, religious or cultural identities are important and sufficient elements to pursue social coherence and justice within societies. In contrast, multicultural approaches have pointed out on what levels classical liberal social political orders are biased by the cultural concepts of majority groups as a result of continuous power struggles based on hierarchical structures which exclude or marginalise groups with different concepts of culture. This includes also critiques on the claim that dominant cultural groups declare their core values and norms as universal ones. Such multicultural critiques have partly picked up political issues and demands of social movements that have addressed racism.15

The British scholar Tariq Modood, who is a key figure in research about multiculturalism in European nation states, argues that "the primary interest of multicultur-
turalism is not culture per se but in the political uses of non-European origin ethnic and related identities, especially in turning their negative and stigmatic status into a positive feature of the societies that they are now part of. This means that multiculturalism is characterized by the challenging, the dismantling and the remaking of public identities. In other words, his emphasis, which he shares with other multicultural theorists, is on "the politics of recognition of difference or respect for identities that are important to people, as identified in minority assertiveness, and should not be disregarded in the name of integration or citizenship."16. Such concepts of multiculturalism differ from concepts of assimilation which support a one-way process demanding the subjectivation of immigrants to the dominant values, norms and national identity constructions. In contrast, concepts of integration are seen as two way processes which emphasise social interactions between immigrants and different actors within a society. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that mainly in current political discourses and policies the term integration is understood as a one way process that means immigrants are made responsible for their integration process. As, e.g., newly introduced citizenship tests illustrate the applicants have not only to provide language skills but also to demonstrate their knowledge about the host country and their acceptance of assumed core values and norms. In contrast, members of the majority are not questioned about their knowledge and loyalty to the nation state. According to Modood the concept of multiculturalism differs from integration insofar as multiculturalism's demand for the accommodation of difference is intertwined with the recognition of "groups, not just individuals, at the level of: identities, associations, belonging, including diasporic connections; behaviour, culture, religious practice, etc.; and political mobilisation."19. Concerning the variety of groups and multiple forms of inequality as obstacles for a full citizenship including social, political and economic dimensions from Modood's point of view integration policies have to apply different ways and to include minority identities in political deliberations about the constructions of national identities instead of presuming that the hegemonic definition should be accepted. Policies which allow a wide range of groups to participate actively would offer possibilities to renegotiate the essentials of shared cultural meanings. Taking into account existing inequalities, multicultural policies should implement anti-discrimination instruments addressing individuals and groups to meet the principles of equality, see for his categorisation of currently discussed/practised modes of integration. However, Modood's "political multiculturalism", which Maleiha Malik categorises as an example of "progressive multiculturalism" representing a form of "liberal pluralism", varies from other approaches according to different national settings.
and/or different understandings about the applied basic terms and their interconnectedness which frame the analyses and assessments of integration policies. Accordingly, the various concepts have not only been criticised by classical liberal theorists or those who support concepts of assimilation. Particularly, the focus on collective identities, the required or already implemented rights for groups has been debated in academic discourses. The main controversial issues turn around essentialist and anti-essentialist notions of culture, identity or ethnicity. Furthermore, it has been questioned whether multicultural approaches address power structures within states and groups sufficiently in order to achieve social justice.

The British Ghanaian philosopher Anthony Appiah criticises the notion of authenticity which is crucial for the multicultural approach of the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor with his demand for the recognition of different identities regarding individuals and collectives. Appiah emphasises that what we assume as collective identities of marginalised groups is not only the result of self-description but also an effect of the social ascriptions, societal practices and governance. In contrast to the Western philosophical understanding that individuals have a true self which he or she should be empowered to discover as a guidance for his or her life, Appiah states "We make up selves from a tool kit of options made available by our culture and society. We do make choices, but we do not determine the options among those we choose". In a similar vein, Anne Phillips objects to approaches "with reified notions of culture" which tend to perceive groups as homogenous and assume collective identities instead of addressing power relations and the wide range of multiple identities within groups. Particularly, the political structures of representative democracies that negotiate with spokesmen or sometimes spokeswomen of minority groups would exclude the marginalised voices. She promotes the notion of "human agency" as a core element of multicultural concepts without neglecting that "people are cultural beings", shaped by diverse ascriptions, beliefs, values, norms, practices etc. Deconstructionist concepts of culture would also provide space to overcome the ongoing binary production of modern/liberal and traditional/illiberal groups with the tendency to perceive women in non-Western cultural groups as victims without agency. Yet, as Pnina Werbner notes, on local levels, drawing on British examples, multi-ethnic networks are already active to negotiate with government agencies. Thus, what Werbner calls "multiculturalism from below" indicates new democratic forms of representation, participation and ways of fairer distributions of resources. Last but not least Vertovec argues that the multilayered diversity of the new immigrant populations requires revisions of concepts in social science and policies in order to grasp and create appropriate measures to cope with the new developments.
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patterns, structures and multiple identity formations and their interconnectedness with cross-border practices.  

Research findings about the discourses and policies on "migration and integration" across Europe emphasise essential shifts in the last two decades. According to the French political scientist Christophe Bertossi the dominant discourse patterns of "immigration and diversity" do no longer meet understandings of the "EU as a laboratory for the invention of a post-national and multicultural form of common belonging and citizenship". In contrast, "nationalism and national identity are the key frames in which multiculturalism is being discussed, disputed and challenged today." The claim that "multiculturalism has failed" has not only been publicly announced by right-wing political movements but has also become part of the dominant political discourses in European nation states and has been officially declared by leading national politicians. Moreover, the claim has found approval across the various political perspectives.

Steven Vertovec and Susanne Wessendorf consider the following elements central in public discourses against multiculturalism across Europe since 2000: the portrayal of multiculturalism as "a singular, fixed ideology or dogma" pursued by liberal politics in line with claims of minority groups, multiculturalism's suppression of critical debates about societal problems, the prevention of social cohesion and common values, fostering of practices in minority groups, which violate principles of equality and democracy, and finally its responsibility for security threats caused by terrorism. Particularly, the condemnation of multicultural policies by the German chancellor Angela Merkel makes obvious that the political rhetoric has to be seen in a wider context, because multicultural principles have not been an objective of official integration policies so far. It even took decades before it was accepted in political discourse that Germany is an immigration country. The unanimous condemnation of multicultural policies in the media makes no effort to consider the complex social conditions and the effects of the various applied integration policies. In fact, research has analysed the descriptions of multiculturalism are "demonstrably partial, erroneous or false" in this context.

Nevertheless, Vertovec and Wessendorf argue, current policies maintain multicultural principles within the presently promoted policies which prefer "diversity" as a key term (Vertovec et al. 2010b). Thus, the discourse of the "failure of multiculturalism" cannot simply be categorized as an anti-immigration policy. Indeed, the discursive strategy indicates a shift of migration regimes and integration policies, which introduce new hierarchies within immigrant populations and new regulations for legal access to Europe along the construction of "bad diversity" and "good diversity"30. Along this differentiation, new borderlines between cultures have been drawn and indicate, as Alana Lentin and Galvan Titley have analysed, revised forms of racism under neoliberal conditions. European nations represent themselves as societies which enable citizens to live their lives according to the principles of "equality, freedom, justice and democracy". In this vein, the established social-political orders are only threatened by cultures ascribed as alien to Western cultures. Currently, the most important contradiction between cultures is expressed in cultural religious tropes. At the same time, the drawing of new internal borderlines also perpetuates older ones. A striking example for the reproduction of otherness is the infringement of the mobility and resident rights of Roma from Bulgaria and Romania as EU citizens. The debates in Western European nations about the societal threads, they would cause revived old ascriptions. Particularly, the French eviction and expulsion policy towards Roma is a striking example for the convergence of old and new forms of racism31.

Across the EU member states the debates on the core values and norms of national culture and identity are framed by the perception of Islam as incompatible with European political orders understood as heritage of the "Enlightenment" and moreover a threat, nourishing global terror against Western countries. In this setting the religious-cultural denoted term "Muslim migrant" has substituted the former mostly ethnic-national denoted term "guest worker" or "immigrant worker"32 and signifies the changed patterns of othering within European nations which revive the discourses and practices of orientalism. Again, the multilayered social practices of so called "Muslim migrants" with various religious concepts, ethnicities and regional origins are not an object of public discourse33. Yet, the debate about Islam is also linked to the question of "good" and "bad diversity" insofar as it produces a binary classification of bad "extremist"/ "fundamentalist"/ "pious" and good "moderate"/"secular" Mus-
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lims which is nevertheless fluid and allows ascriptions of all Muslims as a potential enemies of liberal political orders.\textsuperscript{34}

**Conclusions**

Multiculturalism has played an important role in the discourses on migration and diversity in European nation states. The various approaches can be best understood as revised concepts of liberal representative democracies. Despite the different theoretical frames and national settings, these concepts share the objective of recognising marginalised diverse collective cultural identities to achieve equality and social justice for all residents and to negotiate a common sense of belonging within nations. Accordingly, multiculturalism delineates modes of integration in opposition to those which demand the subjection to assumed unchangeable core principles of national identity. Nevertheless, constructions of difference in terms of "equal but different cultures" tend to neglect the heterogeneity within and across groups of old and new residents and are not sufficient to address the power relations, class inequalities and further systems of oppression which are at play. Moreover, the pluralist forms of social existences cannot be grasped in terms of group differentiation and concepts of authentic identities.

The case studies of integration and minority policies in European countries show a wide variety of policies which have only partially followed multicultural principles. Thus, the condemnation of multiculturalism in dominant political discourses across Europe indicates a shift in the debate about the accommodation of diversity. At the forefront are constructions of national identities and European identity which are usually based on ascriptions of sameness and recently also on similarity. Differentiating between "good" and "bad" diversity migration, immigration and minority policies have been revised and produced new boundaries between "we and the others" which generate new and revive old forms of racism along cultural and religious tropes.

Against this background it is crucial to discuss and develop further critical perspectives on diversity and belonging which take into account that individual and collective identity constructions intersect with multiple social categories and practices and their entanglements with systems of power and oppression (see as a reference point, e.g., the approach "critical diversity literacy\textsuperscript{35}"). Lastly, in migration contexts it is important to pay attention to the effects of the different legal status of immigrants which shape their social existences and the modes of (im)possible political representation and participation in national settings.
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КАТАРИНА ХОФМАН – Кто входит в нацию? Дискурс относительно миграции и разнообразия в Европе. – Длительные десятилетия дискуссии о легальной социальной и политической интеграции мигрантов касаются таких фундаментальных вопросов, как национальность и конституция Европы как культурной единицы, и проясняют структуру коллективной идентичности. Различные концепции мультикультурализма рассматривают его как альтернативу ассимиляции. Однако в академических и политических кругах идея альтернативы всё чаще подвергается критике, что свидетельствует о важных сдвигах во взглядах на идентичность. Как показывают исследования, всё большее распространение получает мысль о том, что мигранты обязаны усвоить нормативные принципы доминантных групп, видящих себя гарантированными национального и социального сплочения. В результате появляются новые виды миграционной политики, основанные на дифференциации разнообразия по принципу “хорошо” и “плохо”.

Ключевые слова: принадлежность, культура, разнообразие, миграция, мультикультурализм, нация, расизм