

CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDING OF THE PARADIGMS OF MULTICULTURALISM

Lendrit Qell

State university UNIBIT, Sofia, Bulgaria, prosperiteti2006@gmail.com

"Don't ask me who I am and don't tell me anything about me.." Michel Foucault

Abstract: The concept of multicultural citizenship is increasingly the subject of philosophical reflections and political debates. No doubt it is the ubiquity of discourses of identity, otherness and difference—and the proliferation of legal claims. On this topic, it is interesting to note that postmodern authors have described the way in which the discourse on alterity dominates the new zeitgeist and thus confirms the dominant place occupied by the paradigm of difference in contemporary thinking about identity: "Ah the others!" That's all some loaded intellectuals have in their mouths! Diversity, otherness, multiculturalism, it grew into a hobby. According to one of the leading analysts in this domain, Jean-Francois Lyotard, in certain cases the topic of multiculturalism grew into cultural business, conferences, interviews, seminars. Today, three leading authorities in the field of multiculturalism are Charles Taylor, Michael Walzer and Will Kymlicka. Their opinion is of great importance for the theoretical directions of multiculturalism and therefore we will try to make some comparative analysis between their notions of this contemporary paradigm.

Keywords: multiculturalism, globalization, scales, nation-state, territory

1. INTRODUCTION

"Multiculturalism" is defined as the coexistence of several cultures in the same national (or local) space in order to create social bonds within the democratic regime. The debate is conducted between those who defend the liberal vision (respect for individual freedoms) against the communitarian and republican approach of "the pluralistic society in the field of social justice. Three political analysts who left a great mark in the analysis of the concept of multiculturalism and the politics of identity differences in modern democracies, Charles Taylor, Michael Walzer and Will Kymlicka, tried to answer these questions which are subject of debates in the modern world (Jean-Luc Gigna *Politique et Sociétés*, 1993, 18-24)

Charles Taylor believes that the recognition of identities in communities can advance civic participation and the exploration of the common good. According to Michael Walzer, "belonging to a community is a primary need that is as important as basic human rights." Finally, Kymlicka points out that "in some cases, the recognition of "differential rights" can enable the implementation of the spirit of the basic principles of liberalism, such as the right to autonomy and the freedom of individuals. By the way, the danger that multiculturalism contains certain pitfalls should not be avoided. For example, it can encourage certain particularist groups for pressure and ideologies of dissatisfaction.

2. TAYLOR'S MULTICULTURAL MODEL

The history of colonialism has shown that the multicultural model is opposed to the Jacobin model of assimilation and creation of a culturally unified population. This is also understandable since modern states are characterized more by identity pluralism than by homogenization of the population. Taylor believes that "if the model of the uniform citizen is more consistent with the classical image of Western liberalism ... the world needs a more humane political cohabitation ... where people will have complete freedom. (Charles Taylor, 1994, 61-84) Does this mean that the classical nation-state must be replaced by the multicultural state? However, the multicultural state can also manifest weaknesses because it recognizes only the "macro-diversity" i.e. the diversity of the larger groups but denies the "micro-diversity i.e. within the communities (dissidents, marginal, specific sexual orientations...). In that way, multiculturalism is reduced to a new strategy of uniformity and control over the intra-community in order to check the characteristics of the behavior of the real Muslim, the real woman, the real Turk, Albanian or Vlav. The multicultural model affirmed by Taylor seeks to fulfill justice towards citizenship in relation to the cultural diversification of societies. He seeks to understand what unites the demands of various minority groups, feminists and cultural communities within a single concept of modern liberal democracies. The fundamental dilemma is whether the satisfaction of claimed "differences" is compatible with the founding principles of modernity and universalism. He insists that "the modern must adapt to the variety". Taylor defines the policy of recognition of minorities in Canada as a democratic defense of cultural diversity in a universalist perspective. It finds political legitimacy in the constitutional multiculturalism of Canada, and finds its basis in the civil rights of "affirmative

action", i.e. positive discrimination. (["Evaluation of the Multiculturalism Program". 2019](#)). Taylor also believes that "democracy ushered in the politics of recognition of equality which took various forms over time such as the culture of gender equality". Taylor's project focuses on overcoming the liberalism of neutrality. This kind of neutral liberal state, as is the case in North Macedonia, favors coexistence more than meetings and interactive living. Such a situation can lead to atomization and fear of the disintegration of society. He fears that "multinational societies are constantly at risk of disintegration, because one group lacks recognition by another. . . and he refers to the case of Canada and Quebec." the fragmentation provoked by bureaucratic liberalism. Citizens could better recognize themselves in a state that respects differences. In other words, the majority should be more receptive to minorities. Modern liberalism, which defines civil status only through the paradigm of rights, leads to a negative conception of freedom. The rights written in the charters impose limits on the state's actions. Taylor believes that the citizen should be given his political and participatory dimension, which legal individualism does not approve. (Tremblay, Arjun (2019, 23).

3. WALZER'S AMERICAN PLURALISM

Walzer distinguishes pluralism in America from that in Europe. Pluralism in the Old Continent is characterized by a majority of nations, while in the New World it is only the result of the immigration of individual volunteers who settled over the entire territory of America. Such a difference is also reflected in the claims. In Europe, national communities consider it a new legitimate right to demand autonomy of the territory they live on. In America they are not able to reclaim autonomy because they are scattered everywhere. That's why in the ethnic affirmations they found the equivalence of the battles for national liberation. BIRNBAUM Pierre, 2009, 91-102) Walzer defends the policy that recognizes differences, but does not defend the policy of quotas (positive discrimination) because he considers that they serve more for differentiation and assimilation. He believes that such a policy is a violation of individual rights (for example, whites) and advocates the moral dimension. (Jones, Seth G.; Doxsee, Catrina; Harrington, Nicholas, 2020, 70)

If individuals have historically been excluded (women, blacks, Albanians, Roma, Egyptians, immigrants) it is legitimate, in accordance with the principle of legal distribution, to adopt measures that will enable the integration of everyone in society. The principle of the moral dimension leads society to take more substantial measures towards minorities in the celebration of iconographies, holidays, customs, folklore, historical heritage, bicultural education, bringing ethnic groups into history... (Michael Walzer, 1983, 24) Walzer points out that the individual belongs to a culture, to a community and within that community he should form his own conceptions of justice and morality and not through an abstract rationalist identity or liberal atomization. Cultural, religious and political community are part of our needs, so everyone should fight for the social recognition of these three types of communities. Like Taylor, he believes that civic participation is inseparable from community identification and belonging. Kimlicka on the ethics of liberal society Elaboration of multiculturalism presupposes clarification of the term "cultural groups". Caravantes, Ernesto (30 June 2020, 55).

The Canadian philosopher Will Kymlicka, when discussing cultures, defines it through "groups of individuals who are mutually united through a 'common culture', into a 'cultural group.' Kymlicka believes that it is necessary to accept the thesis of the existence of multiple cultures as entities that can be defined separately from each other. (Will Kymlicka, Liberalism...1998, p.78) In his theoretical works, he interprets the ethics of the liberal political project within the modern pluralistic context and follows the logic of democratic individualism. He points out that identity pluralism and diverse group rights correspond to liberal logic. Otherwise, liberal thought is against differences, considering that the nation-state is presented as a model of a homogeneous state. Precisely because of the incompatibility of individual rights with cultural rights, Kymlicka proposes to revise the liberal theory. According to Kymlicka, "if cultural rights are not complemented by differential measures of individual rights, they can become discriminatory, given that individuals who do not belong to the dominant culture can suffer unfair treatment." Liberals hardly recognize the existence of collective rights because cultures exist through the individual. Writing about the meaning of societal cultures, Kymlicka believes that they contribute to the autonomy of individuals and at the same time people feel deeply connected to their culture. Therefore, belonging to a culture plays a significant role in assuming individual autonomy. Thus, the liberal state is obliged to recognize certain "differential rights" in order to realize the basic principles of liberalism. In order to avoid a wrong debate, Kymlicka proposes to change the concept of "collective rights" with "group differentiated rights" or "minority rights" (Kymlicka, Ibid. 1998, 110) Kymlicka also introduces two specific expressions: "internal restrictions" and "external protections". This is explained by the fact that "collective rights are acceptable and allow the smaller community to fight against the dominant culture." This is external protection. At the same time, given the democratic principles, the expression of dissent within the community cannot be prevented, and this is marked as internal restrictions. Kymlicka justifies the differentialist multicultural citizenship status. He distinguishes two types of multicultural rights: a) rights of national

minorities and b) rights of ethnic minorities (immigration). He believes that migrant groups cannot reclaim the same rights as national minorities. France represents an ideal type of the universal model, while Canada represents the multicultural model. France is inspired by the legal-political Jacobin paradigm and integrates neutral individuals into the nation-state, which it considers a civil state. The nation is understood as a civil society that shares the "Universal Man". That society is a political community of citizens. The Canadian model is inspired by the cultural paradigm. He does not seek to integrate abstract civilians into a Unitary State, but concrete citizens who possess a certain cultural identity within a multicultural state. The Jacobin model defines the citizen from strictly legal-political dimensions, while the multicultural model tries to integrate the psycho-sociological identity with the definition of the citizen. According to this model, which has its roots in the Enlightenment, "cultural identity is only a secondary characteristic of the Universal Man."

In the multicultural model, the cultural identity is inseparable from the political identity of the individuals and it is the equal dignity of the state to recognize them and support their identity. Common to both conceptions and that both seek to protect the identity of the state.

4. INDIVIDUALISTIC MULTICULTURALISM

Kimilka's multiculturalism is individualistic and aimed at freedom and greater equality among citizens. Waltzer's communitarian multiculturalism is motivated by redefining politics in terms of the moral dimensions and meaning of community. Considering the cultural diversification, Kimilka believes that the state must remain neutral when it comes to the promotion of positive ideas. He opposes Walzer's thesis on communitarianism and believes that the best option for pluralism is the principle of neutral pluralism. Therefore, he places the multicultural citizen within the paradigm of rights instead of the community tradition. (Kymlicka, "Individual and Community Rights", 1994, 17-34) Kimilka's multiculturalism rejects the communitarian solution. From the point of view of the individual, collective rights are legitimate. An individual whose identity is subjugated by a dominant group will not be able to enjoy full equality and autonomy except through differential rights. Kymlicka believes that the expression of multiculturalism is contained in the logic of the individual. The politics of identity differentiation, which will be reduced only to the language of rights, imposes several problems. Especially that of the triumph of procedural hegemony within the domain of identity conflicts. This will make identity groups convert into pressure groups and play their play in democracy. This opens the door to ideologies of pity. Along with such ideologies that the palace among the population tends to deal with all. Various political theories that take into account the multiculturalism of societies propose solutions aimed at the cohabitation of peoples and cultures. They are engaged in promoting a climate of peace and a stable society.

Will Kymlicka suggests using the differentiated citizen as a tool to realize these ideals. His project is primarily of a legal nature and privileges the legal mechanism. It is evident that the politics of identity differentiation and multiculturalism contain certain pitfalls that can be harmful when facing the alternative. However, communitarian multiculturalism and liberal multiculturalism present different risks. Let's not forget that each of these two models seeks to preserve the fundamental rights and legacies of modernism while simultaneously acknowledging differences in identity. For communitarians, the common good is also as important as fundamental rights, which should be modulated according to the common good. Communities must therefore be recognized to avoid the fragmentation and atomization that undermine the common good (*le bien commune*). The pitfalls of this model are not to enable the alternative unless it contributes to defining the common good. The alternative that fragments and escapes the control of the political community is rejected. The liberal idea, for its part, takes seriously the threats arising from communitarianism that weigh on the possibilities of dissenters and therefore rejects the common good. However, it tends towards another danger. To petrify identities through addressing rights and transforming the politics of identity differentiation into a politics of interests. At the same time, she tends to affirm the politics of pity. At the same time, the differential rights of the groups can harm the political dialogue by bureaucratizing and placing social relations in a legal framework. (Kymlicka, 2020, 101)

Identity pluralism This does not mean that when there is more and more talk about identity pluralism and multiculturalism that identity emancipation automatically occurs. Debates about identity can also contribute to monitoring, controlling and disciplining social relations. Talking about the other, defining and giving him rights is also a way of neutralizing and limiting his power and strength. Michel Foucault expresses this through the normative identity of the prisoner. It can be made an object of control especially through the judicial procedure. In that way, his soul (identity) is bought in order to realize the legal oppression. However, according to the opinion of Seyla Benhabib who criticizes Kymlik, it is not possible to effect a fair and objective differentiation of cultural groups.

Benhabib denies the existence of "social or societal cultures". In this way, he opposes the reasoning of Kymlicka who sees in "social or societal cultures" a key element in the justification of his thesis. Finally, how and with what political instrument can the sense of belonging of a nation be fostered, when its population is composed of citizens

as different as they can be from several nations located at opposite ends of the globe? According to Kymlicka, such a social situation requires a rereading of the concept of civil status - citizenship, which is a basic instrument that connects citizens with the rule of law. This function of citizenship makes it a major component of civic life. Kymlicka defends the idea of "multicultural citizenship" against the concept of citizenship based on the foundations of liberal individualism. They are often defined by the term diaspora or by the expression community x or y. In general, these groups do not seek to oppose the integration of the host country. They strive to integrate without assimilating with the majority: "If groups of immigrant origin assert themselves with increasing power towards the right to express their ethnic particularities, they still strive to effectuate that right within the public bodies of society." That is why social mechanisms that are different from those available to "national minorities" are of great importance. It is about a new type of minority cultural community which is a novelty and with which the political institutions must find new ways of development. Social or societal culture" is defined as culture that is offered to all members of the group "[...], it is ways of living, bearers of meanings, which modulates all human activities, at the level of society, of education, religion, leisure and economic life, in the public and private spheres. "Social or societal culture" is experienced from within, through the participation of its members in social, family, and even personal life. Thus, social culture is not merely a "common vocabulary of tradition and convention" (Dworkin 1985, p. 231), suspended in time like works of art preserved in a museum, but a continuous system of traditions, habits, institutions, and beliefs in which its members evolve. and which constantly change with the activity of its members. Kymlicka's main goal is to find a theoretical way to create a political system that offers a better opportunity for coexistence between cultural groups. It therefore seeks to establish the foundations of a liberal system of tolerance. It is through "differentiated citizenship" that Kymlicka claims to be able to achieve this, and within the confines of a liberal philosophical framework. It is possible to identify two types of special rights that these groups are fighting for: He believes that it is necessary to fully understand the difference between these two terms because Kymlicka's liberal strategy is mainly based on the thesis that minority communities have the right to maintain and preserve their "social culture" in relation to the majority, for the sake of individuals. Cultural minorities must be protected from the excessive influence of the majority; That is why priority is given to "protective external measures". At the same time, the principle of tolerance is a significant element within multicultural states. Tolerance should be manifested in the mechanism of liberal minority rights. Internal barrier measures are collective rights that apply within the community. They are most often articulated with the aim of reducing the individual freedoms of the community in the name of solidarity and the preservation of the culture of the group. It is evident that for some authors these measures can represent a threat to liberal and democratic societies. In that way, it limits the social mobility of the members of the group.' (external protection of the Anglophone culture of Quebec in Canada; the Quebec Language Convention, an internal barrier against the English language, which is contrary to individual rights) All minorities strive to demand protective measures, These measures can take various forms: laws to protect the language, special rights in democratic institutions, or a demand for greater territorial autonomy. In theory and practice, it is possible to differentiate "cultural groups" especially through the identification of "social/societal cultures" and to reclaim political, economic and social positions for the preservation of their societal cultures. At the same time, liberal democracies must practice a policy of tolerance towards cultural minorities. The concept of tolerance is interpreted differently and it is operated from the majority to the minority. The majority must accept the measures of emergency protection. Michael Walzer calls it a "mode of tolerance".

The communitarian multiculturalism and liberal multiculturalism however, pose different risks. Note that each of these two thoughts is concerned with preserving the fundamental rights and the heritage of modernity while wanting to recognize the difference identity. It is at the level of the modes of recognition that these two thoughts differ.

- When it comes to socialist regimes, there is no philosophical option of multiculturalism, although some socialist countries adopted measures to protect cultural minorities, everything was done for the promotion of the socialist cause and through the prism of class struggle - The political definition of the individual corresponds to the liberal position which implies that the individual is a free and moral and autonomous individual. Liberalism is a philosophy that promotes the individual freedom of citizens. Finally, one more solution Audi alteram partem (to hear the other). According to Tuli this problem is to accept and listen and understand the other side. This maxim should be a framework that will be accepted in order to hear the other, without many ceremonies. According to Tuli, the new form that must be taken into account by a pluralist Constitution is based on three great principles: a) mutual recognition, b) agreement and continuity. If the constitutional negotiations are conducted according to these principles, the negotiations and the constitutional results will establish a balance acceptable to all.«

5. CONCLUSION

The communitarian multiculturalism and liberal multiculturalism, however, pose different risks. Note that each of these two thoughts is concerned with preserving the fundamental rights and the heritage of modernity while wanting

to recognize the difference identity. It is at the level of the modes of recognition that these two thoughts differ. To conclude: just as the three great principles of liberalism must guide the definition of laws within liberal societies to respect the dignity and values of each individual, Tully's three conventions must guide intercultural relations to respect the demands of all minority groups. . Tully's first condition is to accept by all, the maxim - audi alter partem. How can an "ethnic group" be distinguished from a "national minority"? Kymlicka offers an analytical network for the classification of minority populations according to these two terms.. National minorities represent more or less homogeneous populations that have been annexed to another state, usually involuntarily: "Comparisons of different cultures within a state can be unintentional. So it is when A cultural community is attacked and conquered by another, that it is ceded by the imperial power of another or that its homeland is occupied by settlers" The model of differentiation in the liberal theory of minority rights rests, among other things, on the assumption that cultural groups can be properly defined and identified as "social/societal cultures". Canada, for example, would be composed of several "minorities nationally". Whether it is Quebec or the various aboriginal peoples, these peoples perfectly correspond to the previous minorities. (Corsicans, Alsatians, Bretons), but also Italy and Spain, the United States (natives) The case of "ethnic groups" is more ambiguous. They are a direct consequence of waves of immigration. Moreover, the multiculturalism resulting from this mass immigration is, according to Kymlicka, characteristic of our time. It is essential to mention the difference between "ethnic group" and "national minority". If "national minorities" tend to form groups geographically located and often attached to their territory, immigrant groups do not constitute "nations" and do not live in their country of origin. (Kymlicka 2001, p. 29). Moreover, immigrant groups are dispersed in their territory of immigration, so that one cannot speak of groups that will tend to formulate territorial claims in the name of natural right or traditionally occupy a certain region.

REFERENCES

- Birnbaum, P. (Year). [Book Title]. p. 98. [Reference found in the book].
- Caravantes, E. (2020, June 30). From Melting Pot to Witch's Cauldron: How Multiculturalism Failed America. Government Institutes. ISBN 978-0-7618-5056-4.
- Gigna, J.-L. (1993). Sur le multiculturalisme et la politique de la différence identitaire. Politique et Sociétés.
- Jones, S. G., Doxsee, C., & Harrington, N. (2020, June 17). The Escalating Terrorism Problem in the United States. Center for Strategic & International Studies. [Reference found online].
- Kymlicka, W. (1994). Individual and Community Rights. In J. Baker (Ed.), Group Rights (pp. 17-34). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2020). Liberalism, Community, and Culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Department of Philosophy.
- Taylor, C. (1994). Multiculturalism: Difference and Democracy. Paris: Aubier.
- Taylor, C. (1995, November 21). Le pluralisme... [Article in La Presse newspaper, p. B-3].
- Taylor, C. (1992). Multiculturalism and "the Politics of Recognition". Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tremblay, A. (2019). Diversity in Decline: The Rise of the Political Right and the Fate of Multiculturalism. Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-3-030-02299-0.
- Walzer, M. (1983). Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality. New York: Basic.