LUISS ⫪

Department
of Political Science

Chair of Political Philosophy

THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES:

A comparative analysis of Liberalism and Multiculturalism.

Prof. Sebastiano Maffettone

SUPERVISOR

Alessandra Carpineti

Matricola: 083152

CANDIDATE

Academic Year 2018/20

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

By the end of 2017 the Republic of the Union of Myanmar has been subjected to accusations coming from many international organizations concerning the severe violations of human rights regarding the ethnic minority of Roinghya, a group of Muslims of Islamic origins in Myanmar, whose prevalent religion is Buddhism, is hold responsible for what has been defined an ethnic cleansing and genocide carried on by the army and Buddhist militants, started in 25th August 2017.

The members of Rohingya's religious minority are actively discriminated against, having been deprived of citizenship rights. They are not able to move freely, neither inside nor outside the country and are forced to live in a condition of apartheid, segregated in the ghetto of Aung Ming Lar, defined by the international press as an open-air prison. Furthermore, Roynghia's are filed as Islamic Bengalis, even though Bangladesh does not recognize them as its citizens. Roynghias cannot have more than two children, cannot be property owners and are often obliged to forced labor, making them the most persecuted ethnic minority in the planet. They are not recognized as an ethnic group, and of course, they have no political recognition, this has been proved by the reluctance of the foreign affairs minister Auun San Suu Kyi, to refer to them as Roinghya and instead to indicate them simply as Muslims.

This is one of the most extreme examples of how ethnic minorities can be denied the right of recognition and sometimes, in the worst-case scenario, even of the most fundamental rights.
In my research paper, I want to discuss the importance of the minorities' protection and how it is possible to ensure their safeguards from assimilation. In a historical overview of the recognition of group rights it is possible to see that the international approach to this issue has profoundly changed within the years, in fact for the first two decades of the twentieth century the main concern was the granting of individual universal human rights. For what it mattered in a relation with group rights, it was enough for each country to respect the minimum standards of the very gross violations of human rights such as genocide. The idea of minority rights in the post-war settlement was perceived as a potential threat to the stability of the states and the newly-created order, so the capacity of minorities to challenge the state power necessitated to be weakened imposing homogeneity upon the population. The new international approach was then based on the substitution of the group-oriented rights with some universal rights, in this way minority groups had no international standing as each member was protected as individual but not as a collective actor, neither their institutions were protected from discrimination and/or assimilation which probably was the very long-run purpose of the League of the Nations, securing the larger interest in making institutions stable. Some practical evidence of this is furnished

by the fact that there is no mention to minority rights both in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in the European Convention of Human Rights.

It was not until 1980 that things began to change, starting from the position of the indigenous people; the minorities commenced to have recognition within the United Nations and the international framework. In 1989 the ILO Convention of 1957, with explicit assimilationist purposes, was redrafted in order to "recognize the aspirations of these people to exercise control over their institutions." In the past, countries that recognized minority rights were seen as exceptions and every state aspired to act like France, which presented an undifferentiated conception of republican citizenship and only one official language. Countries who recognized pluralism, or allowed for different official languages were anachronistic for the first forty years after the II World War. But after the 80's the international perception has deeply changed as it is now recognized that the protection of the minorities is essential to prevent the outburst of ethnic or religious conflicts, and it is perceived that treating minorities as politically irrelevant is actually seen as a proof that a state is not ready to be a good standing member of the network of liberal democracies.

In this historical framework, a political philosophy debate is inserted, in fact during the '80s there was the rise of multiculturalism, which claimed to be the response to the excessive individualism brought by Liberalism and the answer to the crisis of citizenship model. In fact, members of certain groups have started to express the feeling of being more disadvantaged than others, notwithstanding having granted the same fundamental individual human rights. This context seems to lead into thinking that Liberalism is not the ideal political philosophical theory to grant the protection of the minorities. Critics point to the fact that Liberalism does not put enough emphasis on the concept of culture and the importance of being part of a group for the formation of the individual's personality and aspirations. What I aspire to do in my work is to analyze the concept of minorities' protection from the perspective of the two very distinctive theories of Liberalism and multiculturalism. The first focuses on individual rights and liberties in order to preserve and accommodate cultural differences and needs. According to Liberalism, this would sustain a wide range of social relationships and will then intrinsically protect all kinds of social activities and interactions, without the need for specific groups rights of the minorities to be protected while the second approach focuses on the overcoming of the main principles of Liberalism and its intrinsic individualism, in order to highlight the importance of the concept of culture, belongings and group membership as the starting point for all kinds of social activities, and ultimately for individual liberties. Apparently, both theories seem to be inconsistent with each other, differing particularly on their position on the necessity of specific group oriented rights. I will talk about each theory in a chapter solely dedicated to each one, but I will also explore the possibility of finding some middle ground of agreement, as it is believed by Will Kymlicka. In a world that is increasingly going toward a process of globalization, and that is characterized by the coexistence of different cultures and ethnicities, I want to analyze how different theories of political philosophy's approach to the accommodation of diversity and the protection

of everyone's rights. Because in a context with this greater viability, interconnection and a large number of state becoming "multi-national, it is no more possible to limit the concept of what is fair to what accommodate only the majority's needs, making sure that even the requests of the outvoted and those who do not constitute the majority will be heard.

CHAPTER ONE

LIBERALISM

1.1 The Liberal Virtues

The scope of analysis of this paper will be to evaluate how different political philosophical theories embrace the concept of the protection of minorities. In particular, the ongoing debate between the different approaches focuses on whether it is necessary to enforce group rights or individual human rights in order to accommodate all kinds of cultural diversities within the same nation. This question is what fuels the debate between Liberalism and Multiculturalism: the latter which supports the case in favor of the differentiated group rights accuses Liberalism to be too individualistic, and therefore not able to provide an adequate tool for the protection of minority groups. In this first chapter, I will evaluate how Liberalism assesses those critiques and how it thinks it could ensure satisfactory means to secure a peaceful coexistence of different cultural groups.

Liberalism has always had diversity at the center of its philosophical analysis, but this is assumed to be very limited since it takes in consideration only the differences in aspects of the same culture, without paying enough attention to the plurality of cultures of different communities that can happen to be coexisting in one single democratic state such as minorities do. The first author I will mention is Stephen Macedo, who defends liberal institutions against the critiques of multiculturalism and communitarians. In his book on the liberal values, he argues that liberal ideals, in its role of protecting individual rights, are capable as well of accommodating very different forms of identity and interpersonal commitment, indeed of groups in like manner, making sure that each individual can pursue its own plan of life. What Macedo stresses the most is the importance of the concept of "change", and as Liberalism embraces the idea of a self-determining individual, it also acknowledges the very importance that time has on shaping people's decisions and aspirations as well, regarding what they think the good life is for them. Indeed, the rule of individual rights, neutral state, and impersonal law encourages citizens to feel and to be part of a society that is intrinsically tolerant and pluralistic, in a kind that embraces any variety of useful life anyone can think of. This creates the conditions for an environment that leads people to engage in critical self-examination and to be in a position where, over time, they can revise their plans and purposes. This autonomy that is essential for Liberalism, guarantees space for people to be able to re-evaluate, change their projects, and examine other ideas of good life.

This vision has often been misinterpreted by communitarian as an excessive individualism, that will lead to no other result than a society of "radically detached people" (Macedo 1990): a set of individuals who

live their lives separately, isolated and fated to struggle against one another. This is not the real end of the liberal theory as the pivotal theme is the liberty to change, it does not reject any kind of cultural association, it should only ensure that every individual in the group is there for specific choice and that he can change his ideas as well as his personality as the environment around him is constantly changing. Liberalism only assures to create a neutral surrounding that makes those choices possible since, no lifestyle is encouraged in any way over another, making possible for each individual to have access to a wide variety of goals, project or end any member of a society may wish, and this includes indeed interpersonal relations and the feeling of membership to a certain group that shares your ideas. The role of a government should be to ensure these rights, with a policy of non-intervention, making sure that no government interferes with their free exercise of them. This idea of liberal autonomy invites people to be interpretative, committed to their own life but to respect of the autonomy of others as well, a character that is prone to participate and be pleased by the constant change of a pluralist society based on diversity and in continuous progress. This last part is important to stress, as it highlights how Liberalism is conceived by Macedo not just as an individualistic theory that would help people just to serve their mere interest, but as a powerful tool that can propagate a liberal ideal, a moral commitment that would lead people not just to obey to liberal institutions but to see the justice in it, to embrace diversity and respect and recognize the liberal justice as the best way of affirming the protection of diversity and of liberty.

1.2 The Liberal Concept of State Neutrality

I wanted to start this chapter with Stephen Macedo as I believe that it would make possible to understand the commitment that stands behind such individualistic principles, but it is of course a very idealistic premise, very prone to the explanation of the intrinsic values and beliefs of Liberalism, but less efficient in addressing the practical problems that this theory finds in facing the accuses of multiculturalism. One of the most debated issues is the whole idea of the state neutrality, as it is considered not feasible and an unrealistic goal, multiculturalism's experts believe that it could only end up favoring the majority. According to Will Kymlicka and Charles Taylor, in the contemporary liberal states, benign neglect is nothing more than a myth. That is because all government decisions on languages, public holidays or state symbols unavoidably involve recognizing the needs of the majority's national groups, Indeed the fact that in most countries there is a national language that should seem to confirm that. The author Peter Balint replies to that, as he strongly believes that tolerance is justified trough freedom, he defends the liberal neutrality and presents it as the solution instead of the problem. For what it concerns the state neutrality, what has been criticized most is the concept of benign neglect. According to this, the state should not prefer or favor a particular way of life that citizens should follow, and this is reflected in the institutions, laws, and policies that do ignore citizens fundamental beliefs or interests concerning lifestyle.

The first theoretical concept is that neutrality is *ideal*, and as such, it will never be completely achieved, neither in practice nor in theory. This is very important as it is the basis of the whole theory of liberal neutrality, the fact that complete neutrality has not been fulfilled yet in any liberal democracy, should not mean that it is failing or that it should not be implemented in favor of some difference sensitivity. It must remain an action-guiding principle because it is a political ideal. A clear example of that is the meaning of democracy: at the present time, there is no state which, on the basis of democratic measures indices, or theory in political science, completely corresponds to a perfectly democratic state. But this does not mean we should abandon the idea of achieving a perfect democratic state if we believe in its principles and if we think that the ideals that stand behind it are right. Neutrality has a lot of weight in the liberal theory for it should furnish to liberal states guidance, and as such, it should lead liberal states to be critical and to attempt to get closer to that ideal. It is for this reason that it does not make sense to make a reasonable critique on the basis of the fact that it could never be realized. Liberal neutrality, like any other ideal, must be balanced with other things that are considered equally important. An official language, for example, can be justified neutrally, as it may serve for social cohesion or as a prerequisite for social mobility (Barry 2001). People feel more connected, and most importantly, people may be more likely to avoid being victims of their birth, when there is a core language. It is necessary to implement a non-neutral policy only on the degree necessary to achieve a determinant goal, as in this case, a common language provides social cohesion. Of course, the norm would not provide any deliberative way to eliminate other languages or dialects by punishing who speaks them, as in the case of the French type of nation-building policies.

What is fundamental, more than the neutrality of the policy, is the justification of it on a neutral basis. It is in this sense that liberal neutrality is said to be balanced so that the interest of the whole society can be served and not only those of the majority or various minority groups. Neutrality furthermore cannot fail in accommodating every difference because "it does create the space for people to live their lives as they see fit more than the alternatives do" (Balint 2003). By not favoring any legitimate lifestyle, every citizen is treated fairly regardless of his life choices. Balin, as well as Macedo, puts the emphasis on the role of change. People mute their tastes, fashions, and opinions. Furthermore, nations are subject to migration flows as well, which will eventually bring new ideas and beliefs to the population. What is fundamental for the liberal thought is to create a system that is capable of being sensitive to this, the existing regulations may become much less neutral than it was initially intended.

If neutrality has to deal with everyone in the same way, then it needs to be responsive to changing circumstances and modify policies accordingly, in order to be as neutral as possible, conforming with the mutations of its population. In response to the multicultural critiques, it is possible to say that the liberal neutrality, as perceived by Balint, is very difference sensitive, since it is conceived to be as functional as to accommodate all the differences and interests of each individual of the population. It is true that there is no

reference to minority group, but it is safe to say that there is no mention of the majority either. The individual, belonging to any social group, of any ethnicity, or religious beliefs is at the center of the liberal theory of politics, and we could affirm that there is indeed a strong individualism at the basis, but it is an effort to lead everyone to what is best for them, in a society that is intrinsically free and respectful of diversities. Neutrality only serves to this scope, it is an ideal, and as such it must be responsive to a broad range of concepts, but it is a difference accommodating concept, it acknowledges differences and adapts to them.

Difference-sensitive neutrality, is consistent with various forms of Liberalism, and it can be realized by the state creating some extra support to categories which were previously excluded, instead of just being in the back and be neutral; this would not mean privileging a particular way of life, it means that the state is capable of acknowledging the differences in its own population and in order not to privilege anyone, it grants some special effort to bring the categories of people that are most worse off at the same level of those who seem to be more advantaged. If neutrality means that the state cannot show in any way to be more favorable towards a certain lifestyle, on the same theoretical line, it cannot even let imply that there exists a lifestyle that is the least preferred one above all, or that it is deserving to be worse off than others. If the state realizes that it is acting in a non-neutral way it should expand its range of neutrality and publicly declare that the previously excluded way of life is to be of equal worth (Galeotti 2002). Those who were previously rejected should now receive special treatment, not on the basis of the membership to a minority group, but as a form of balancing out. There is not even the concept of minority, because even allowing this terminology would lead to some kind of differentiation, which is exactly what the liberal neutrality is attempting to eradicate. People do not receive special treatment concerning the fact that they are indeed a minority; they do receive a differential treatment that is only instrumental to the purpose of balancing out all the differences. In this way, everyone can enjoy same rights, equal opportunities and quality of life independently of what they choose to believe in, and this does not have anything to do with the number of people who belong to a particular group or not, it responds to the principle of individual freedom.

Another important point to be spelled out is the concept of identity: the whole argument against Liberalism spins around the fact that it is said not to taking into account the importance of being part of a group for the formation of the individual identity, and to put too much emphasis on the individual without paying enough attention to the ethnical group of pertinence which indeed shapes individual personality. The issue is faced with particular attention by liberals, as a lot of emphases is put on the role of change, it is just not possible for a liberal theory to confine the whole concept of identity just to group affinity. Identity is something that is subjected to continuous mutations, and it is something very personal; it does not remain the same for the whole life, and we cannot compare identities defining them the same: the identity of a person who categorizes himself as a Jew may be kin to another person who identifies himself as such, but it is not the same identity. People's identities are multifaceted and indeed, they consist of many different identifications

and we cannot catalog people and limit them to just one category. Religious beliefs are a crucial aspect of the identity of each individual, but it is not the only thing that categorizes them, perhaps religion may weight very differently in the life of people even pertaining to the same creed. This leads us to the problem of the recognition that, according to this optic, becomes something very unrealistic to happen, especially in an equitable fashion. As the state has to recognize different groups it is very easy to see how it could fall in the mistake of unequal recognition: how is it possible to recognize a group identity if their members can identify with many other things at the same time? There might even exist different subgroups inside one single group. If we agree to this concept of identity that is not static and keeps mutating, then we can agree to the fact that states could cause real harm by the very act of recognition, with the possibility of creating deep divisions and inequalities. This leads to the completeness of the neutrality approach, as removing acts of recognition would only end even more with the accommodation of diversities. The recognition approach is very likely to fail in the acceptance of what has been called "the minorities within minorities," a policy that favors a certain group granting some facilitation perhaps may create disadvantage if not even prejudice within the same minority group, due to the impossibility of the state to perceive the differences within. The example that the author suggests is the place of women in some kind of traditional groups, who might believe men to be superior and to have the right to enjoy more freedom. In this case, granting recognition to such a group would mean to deprive another group of the recognition it deserves, making instantly more difficult the lives of the people who might partially disagree with the general direction that society takes, or those who have interests that might enter in collision with those of the general group. A woman, due to its cultural heritage might decide to agree to be subordinated to men, and actually believe this is the right order of things because that is the weight that culture has on the perception of self-identities, but it would be wrong to recognize it at a state level. The whole point of Liberalism is that each individual has to make this choice on his own if a woman makes the choice of ascribing to the status quo that her particular group imposes her, she is free to do so if it matches with her life aspirations. The whole point of the liberal neutrality is that the state should not suggest whether this is right or wrong, of course, unless it violates the most basic human rights. What is more important is that state should secure an environment where this choice can be taken in the absolute freedom of the individual, without any suggestion of what ought to be done, of what is good or wrong, the individual is free if he can make choices in a context where there is a full range of other options available. By not recognizing any particular minority group, the state is creating exactly this kind of context, in this sense, the difference-sensitive neutrality can be seen as multicultural, it does not believe in the setting of group-differentiated rights, but it is not in favor of assimilation, it does accept diversity. The point of liberal neutrality is a pluralistic society eluding the chances that some differences might matter more than others.

1.3 Liberalism and Equality in Practice: The Case of the United States

Neutrality as an ideal is indeed unrealistic to fulfill but, to show how these are not just theoretical concepts and can also have a realistic application I want to analyze the case of the United States, a liberal country that had a very successful integration of different ethnocultural groups and has reached the peaceful coexistence of each of them. Of course, it would be very superficial to assert that profound inequalities based on ethnicity and religion do not find their place in society. These, in fact, remains until today, but they are progressively being fought, and the aim of these case study is to show how the theoretical approach of the superiority of individual rights against group rights might have helped and continued helping to fix this condition. In the United States, there has always been a tradition of liberal individualism since the creation of its constitution. It is possible to see that law is conceived as to protect mainly individual rights, with no mention to group rights, providing a unitary national language in order to inspire cohesion and to avoid group prejudices.

The most important trace of this tradition in the case law history is Brown v. Board Education. The Supreme Court pronounced itself in May 1954, marking the end of the racial segregation. Since then, during all the '60s, there was a great effort in overcoming discrimination against blacks, and this was done through the protection of individual rights, consequently enhancing the rights and protection of entire groups. The multicultural suggestion of group-specific policies, such as the assignment of jobs in public institutions to make sure that every group or minority has adequate representation in each institution, has never received a significant consensus, and the results are uniform. According to the Gallup poll, a vast majority of whites and a substantial majority of blacks are against preferential treatments of any kind, even on the basis of race aimed at reducing racial discriminations. Since the moment Brown entered into force, group rights were gradually starting to be off the table, individual rights were granted to each citizen independently of ethnicity or national origins, making sure that each person could claim those rights as discrimination would because of harm mainly to individuals instead of to the group.

On a certain optic, we could state that highlighting the importance of group-sensitive rights would in a certain sense undermine what the American society has been building in many years, stating that each individual derives its own rights from a specific group membership, perhaps we could state that another kind of citizenship in respect to the general one, it would go against the American tradition weakening their very concept of identity. Since in almost all multiethnic situations groups tend to rank each other, avoiding the creation of hierarchies would be then unrealistic, perhaps impossible to maintain the liberal individualism that characterizes the importance of rights that are said to be universal, something that each individual has had since his birth independently of race or ethnicity. In this situation, discrimination would be provided by state law, since having group-specific rights would charge it to create regulations determining who is a citizen of a

minority group and who as such can exercise the specific rights ensured to such citizenship. Sometimes there is some grievance between different ethnic groups as well; moreover, those could reflect economic differences and political inferiority. The United States presented extreme evidence of this situation, with the racial segregation, it is perfectly reasonable for the state to aspire to take as much distance as possible from that dark political era. There is another defense argument in favor of group rights, which states that this type of provision would only be temporary, useful to the purpose of making inequalities disappear. On this topic, the American sociologist Nathan Glazer argues that once benefits are given it is really hard to be withdrawn, that is because it will strengthen groups the members of which would be very unlikely to give up to their new privileged status; eventually this would end up dividing the population and reinforce inequalities. Furthermore, he believes that the social costs of group-oriented rights would be too high, undermining the very essence of the American society, each citizen can claim all the same rights, regardless of race, origin or ethnicity and the consideration of group affiliation would end up for harming the very core of the society, which is the claim to be considered as an individual.

The United States is good evidence of how liberal individualism can be implemented and be valid safeguarding individual rights, as well as minorities. It is undoubtedly an exceptional country because it is the only one, so far, that has succeeded in accomplishing a national identity despite all the ethnical diversities and the different origins of the groups composing the American population, and has brilliantly succeeded in their cohesion. It is also true that all this has a cost, which was indeed the prominence of the white culture at the expense of all the remaining cultural groups. This has had repercussions mostly on African Americans, who have been stigmatized, received differential treatment, and sadly continue to be subjects of episodes of racism. But the whole point of this case study is that on the view of Nathan Glazer, given the United States history and tradition, it is very unlikely that things could have gone into another direction, and he presents some shreds of evidence of changes that have hit the country since the development of Brown. Many signs of progress have been made through the protection of minority rights, and minorities were vindicated by the raid progresses, the gaps between black and whites are reducing at an incredible speed, as well as the gaps with other minorities. The black proportion in medical schools has increased substantially without the need for a policy setting a fixed numerical quota, they were given exactly the same opportunity by means of the regular admission process, as the constitution and civil rights forbid discrimination against any person on account of race. So, this could be evidence of how particular attention in granting the same individual rights, instead of creating a preferential treatment for specific targeted groups, could help to raise the conditions of minorities. The pace at which the differences in education, income, and political representation are being progressively eliminated is a confirmation that the system is operating in a more than satisfactory way, and that the American society is definitely going toward a path where, besides common ideals and national common sense, identities are protected and respected as private individual choices.

1.4 Liberal Conception of Group Rights

Although the current results of Liberalism may be considered sufficient or not, the contemporary discussion on these topics is not as focused as they were before, and enough liberal theorists tend to fall into the trap of the oversimplification with the concept of benign neglect. However, the traditional liberal thought has not always been wholly opposed to group rights. For most of the 19th century, up to the first half of the twentieth, at the core of the thought of many liberal statesmen there was the concern for the rights of national minorities, that were constantly debated as they were a very important concept of liberal thought, even the idea of group specific rights was not completely off the table, especially in between the two World Wars. On this topic, it is considerably hard to define the liberal thought, as there were quite a few different positions and ideas, but what is clear is that due to the historical events characterizing that period it would not have been possible not to consider some sort of group rights to be guaranteed. In fact, the minority problem was central in the liberal thought as there where some groups, in the Habsburg empire, for example, that had denied their rights, one above all the right to self-government. This was common in many multi-nation empires in Europe, and it was something that could not go along with the liberal thought, as restraining the liberty of one particular group would undermine their most fundamental principle, free society for free men. According to Wilhelm von Humboldt, there could be no such thing as the promotion of individualism without recognizing an essential role to group's membership, partly because of the fundamental role played in the personality development by language.

Of course, at this point, we are not yet to the same page of the Liberal Multiculturalism, as it was intended by Will Kymlicka, but there was for sure an essential linkage between Liberalism and the support of national minorities during the period in between of the two World Wars. This was a very shared idea between liberal political leaders. One among them, the politician Leonard Hobhouse, firmly believed in the necessity of recognizing minority rights in order to ensure cultural equality. The group-specific rights as they were conceived by the liberal tradition between the 19th and 20th century, were oriented toward a situation in which minorities would be capable of sustaining a life of its own. This is not a distortion of Liberalism as it was discussed early in this chapter, it is a reaffirmation of the same principles, which takes on a different connotation due to the historical events of the period. The core is that, since the individual capability of making choice is incredibly interconnected with associations, ethnical groups and cultures, the recognition of the importance of these ties brings us to think, as the most natural conclusion, that for the individual to be free there must not be differences among different groups, so that each individual that makes part of them will be recognized worthy of the same exact universal rights and freedoms as anybody else. This last concept is therefore intrinsically liberal, and it was widely shared between liberals, perhaps it would take very different connotations as there were disagreements on which was the best-suited way to realize this conceptual equality between different groups in a practical way.

As there were no doubts on the importance of the self-governing rights, seen as fundamental for the realization of the individual, it was questioned whether this should take the semblances of group-specific rights, regarding this liberal like Mill thought that it should not. Mill strongly believed that what was more important above all, for the maintenance of the free liberal institution, was the coincidence of the government boundaries with those of the main nationalities. This concept does not outrun what has been previously said, it still confirms the importance that liberals attributed to culture as the starting point for the establishment of individual liberal liberties, but according to this point of view the pacific coexistence of different cultural groups within the same government is impossible, and it could only lead to one group being discriminated and denied of the self-governing rights in favor of the majority. Group-specific rights are then not even an option; nationalities should coincide with state boundaries; if democracy is the government by the people, then they must share some sense of values and political allegiance.

In regard to this, we could add the opinion of T.H Green who saw liberal democracy as only be possible in a context where people feel allegiance among themselves, that could only derive from ties between the population members, who share the same values of conduct and customs and beliefs. This comes from a stream of liberal thought that identified state as the nation-state, according to which the existence of multi-nation states could only end up favoring the majority and restrain the liberties of some individuals with respect to others in the same states. Perhaps, as I stated before, this traditional Liberalism has been very much influenced by the historical context, and the Habsburg empire would furnish outstanding evidence of that. It is precisely for this reason that I said that during this period, we are still very far from multicultural Liberalism that I will discuss in the next chapter. It is true that it is acknowledged the importance of group membership, but this is so in a very delicate historical context and has nothing to do with multiculturalism, as for many liberals it was not even an option since the coexistence of different groups was seen as unrealistic. When the geographical boundaries happened to be reshaped following World War I, some groups belonging to a state found themselves in a kin state with a majority of people exercising a very different culture, and this was a source of turmoil that involved the whole international society. That is precisely why liberals started to pay attention to national minorities, only to protect the interest of individuals and to ensure the fulfillment of the liberal individualism in a context were some groups of people were receiving differential treatment. This leads to the point to which it is a necessary condition to maintain stability, to have a society made by nation states instead of the multi-nation empires. There is no trace of multiculturalism here because the possibility of coexistence is not contemplated, as in that period the historical events seemed to suggest that it was a very unrealistic ideal. Multi-nation states are perceived to be incapable of promoting national identity, there should be only one culture in each nation-state, and this is the only way to grant the same rights to each individual.

So, in the end the issue of the minority rights was raised before the breakout of World War II, yet this disappeared after it, leaving space to the debates characterized more by the topic of the ideology than the

matters of nationalism. As I previously said, this has not been controversial if compared to the more modern or classical visions of Liberalism, it was a rational response to the continuous conflicts that raged Europe, and that urged to be addressed for a matter of international security, moreover European liberals confronting with another reality faced another reason to change their liberal attitudes towards minority protection slightly. During the colonization era, English liberals who went to administer the British colonies found themselves in front of the unavoidable truth that Liberalism, as it was studied and conceived in their universities was not working in the colonies, more specifically, could not work in multi-nation states. Liberalism, as it was tested in a nation-state such as England simply did not contemplate issues of cultural diversity, and the essentials of the liberal theory did not know how to address it. The deeper the cultural divisions were inside the nation, the more unrealistic were the aims of establishing a successful working institution, stable over time. In the period of time that goes from the 19th and early 20th century the debate around Liberalism is very different for American liberals, they were never confronted with such reality being far from Europe and its conflicts and not having colonies under their administration, this has resulted in much less attention on their part to matters of subject regarding multi-nation states and to a neglect of the topic of national minorities. This partly explains why there are not so many discussions concerning these topics in modern and contemporary Liberalism, because the American theories have been undoubtedly dominant in that field right after the end of World War II. This approach went even further in 1954 when group-specific rights started to be seen as a form of racial segregation with the case of Brown v. Board of Education. The new model of racial justice was then one of "color-blind laws," and this overstepping the whole concept of a separate state but equal treatment norms. On this view providing exceptional rights institutions, or in general any kind of differential treatment even if in light of an equality purpose, became seen as a form racial segregation which the United States wanted to keep at a distance from as much as possible, justice then was a matter of nondiscrimination and equality of opportunities. The reasons why the end of the conflict somehow marks the end of the liberal interest toward the national minority can be various. Will Kymlicka, an author that will be discussed in the next chapter, tried to identify it in an attempt to rethink the liberal tradition. The features of the post-war context lead liberals not only to neglect minority rights but to find them unjustified and perhaps dangerous. Multi-nation states during the war period were often made up by different cultural groups who had been forced to coexist due to the redrawing of geographical boundaries; what this implies is that usually those groups had culturally similar groups in a kin state and this in the past had been a very great cause of turmoil, furthermore if a minority group is culturally belonging to the said kin state, the chances to have a territorial aggression from the "mother country" are much higher. Indeed, the aggression of Nazi Germany towards Polish and Czech governments was justified on the ground of the necessity to protect the German minority that was living in those territories, whose needs were thought to be neglected. This kind of manipulation, of easy implementation due to the weakness of the League of the Nations had the effect of creating a very negative reaction to any kind of protection of the national minorities, in favor of an approach inclined towards individual human rights, easier to handle and prone to a more stability of the international system. Consequently, to the devastation brought

by two great conflicts, the stability of the system became a matter of extreme importance, even at the expense of justice, because what was more important was avoiding the outbreak of another war. For this reason, the fairness of such principles was not questioned, as it would serve a superior and more important cause, due to the most recent experience the fear of the disloyalty of national minorities was very real made impossible to face any discussion on their protection both nationally and internationally. The belief that minority rights were unjust and furthermore divisive was then reaffirmed in the liberal theories in the years between the 1960s and 1970s with the ethnic revival. As it became easier to get to know information regarding income distribution, education or even occupation between the different groups, this has been the beginning in the United States of a new wave of consciousness pervading the different ethnical groups who were suddenly more aware of the deep gaps in the society. This has been manifested through a stronger expression of ethnical identity, and a perfect example of that is that the academic concept of cultural appropriation has originated in no other country than in the United States. It shows how strong now it is the feeling of ethnical identification pervading the country and how important it is in defining the individual personality. However as initially most liberals accepted the basic group-based ameliorative actions, such as including the emblems of different ethnical groups in the government symbols, in order to have a more equalitarian representation of all the different people making part of the population. The Anglo-conformity model was gradually abandoned, giving up to the purpose of assimilation in favor of a more polytehnic society, but when demands started to escalate, suggesting a direction going toward a more multi-nation system, the liberal backing ended. The ethnical revival brought requests such as the state recognition of the mother tongue of each minority group. Furthermore, those groups started to define the social push for integration as oppression. The too demanding requests were starting to harm the most fundamental liberal beliefs and assumptions of the American political culture, it is undeniable indeed that the path of the US has been quite unique in history, and a so complete polyethnic integration would not have been possible and sure enough, or it could not guarantee long-term stability and longevity, if each ethnic group obtained the right to self-governing, creating a multi-nation state with so many diverse ethnical groups.

In conclusion, having emphasized the role of the American thought as the leading one in the field of Liberalism and political philosophy, it does not come as a surprise that the debate on minority protection and group-specific rights has remained quite unstressed, given the importance that immigration covers in a country made up almost entirely by immigrants' groups that virtually form any linguistic and cultural group around the world, it makes sense that all the efforts should be focused on emphasizing those traits that unite the population rather than those who divide it. Otherwise, the fragmentation would be so dispersive that it could hardly be a long-term situation for any stable government. The United States claims to be a country that, in spite of having a very rooted national identity, leaves each citizen free to develop its own tradition, to be in harmony both with their ethnicity and culture and with their identity of American as well. As a matter of fact, the United States is the country of what we could call the hyphenated identity, where people define themselves

as Latin-American, Italo-American and so on according to their ethnicity and this should be an evidence of how only guaranteeing the liberal individual rights it is possible to converge the same feeling of a common identity with a diverse ethnical identification, leaving citizens free to exercise whatever worship or idiom without being subjected to any kind of discrimination or being disadvantaged in respect to another group. In theory, this should be enough to demonstrate that it is possible to respect minorities and cultural diversities without the need to recur to multiculturalism, but it is not safe to say that disparities have been completely eliminated from the country. At this point, the author I have analyzed will probably agree upon the fact that perfect state neutrality is a utopian ideal since it could never be fully implemented, but this should not stop statesmen looking forward to it and try to get as close as possible. Perhaps some authors like Nathan Glazer believe that the gaps between ethnical groups are indeed closing through the amelioration of individual rights. According to this view the liberal theory has great chances to survive and to be implemented, let us intend that today the main obstacle for the pacific coexistence of different cultures and minority groups without any disadvantage is not the excessive individualism as this, if successfully implemented, can lead to a society where it prevails the respect for the diverse and where all the forces are successfully focused on fighting racism which today represents the largest challenge.

CHAPTER TWO

LIBERAL-MULTICULTURALISM

2.1 Internal restrictions and external protections

The idea of group-differentiated rights seems to be unavoidably irreconcilable with the main purposes of a liberal democracy, that is ensuring individual freedom and substantial equality of all of its citizens. The idea seems to rest on a philosophy that places considerably more value on the concept of the group and group's identity rather than on the individual's one. The latter, according to liberals would ultimately end up losing all of its capacity to decide for its own goals and to make choices to shape its own identity. In this theory individuals seems to be only mere vehicles for group identity, but according to the famous political philosopher Will Kymlicka this is not to be considered the case. He is a Canadian author that despite being liberal, advocates the importance of multiculturalism, his Canadians origins have probably had a big impact in the shaping of his theory, being Canada one of the first country to adopt multiculturalism. For this reason, he is able to support his theory by first hand's observations on the results that multiculturalism has achieved in liberal democracies, which would be analyzed later in this chapter.

According to him the principle of the group-differentiated rights should not be relegated to be only part of the communitarian theory, as it can be consistent with both principle of freedom and equality mentioned above, and in some cases, it might even be necessary to ensure the cited values. In order to fully understand what he calls his 'liberal multiculturalism hypothesis' it is necessary to make some important assumptions about the categorization of collective rights. Since the said category of group rights is very vast and heterogeneous, it is very important to make a distinction in the use of the terminology regarding it. In particular Kymlicka drives the attention towards the difference between "internal restrictions" and "external protection". To make confusion between the two means to create false assumptions and ideas in respect to the relation of individual rights and collective ones. Under the category of internal restrictions, they do fall all the claims involving all the issues regarding the internal ethnical group as a whole, where members, in order to comply with religious or cultural precepts are subjected to impositions, perhaps even restrictions, of their own individual identities. To make a claim against a group's own members means protecting such group from internal dissent, in order to make sure that the rules laid down by a specific religious or cultural thought will not be destabilized. Of course, the larger the group is, the less the probability of having unanimous consensus is a realistic one, meaning that those claims will probably involve some restrictions of the individual freedoms in the name of group solidarity. It is for this reason that collective rights usually tend to be very criticized, as they are associated to settings in which those rights are a tool, used to make interventions in the intra-group relations, with purpose of restrict the role of individual free choice. A very good example of that might be given by the perpetuation of patriarchal precepts that comes at the expenses of the female's role in societies

belonging to some ethnical and religious groups, where women tend often to be oppressed or considered to be inferior to men. In regard to this, there is an important specific to be made which is that every government restrict citizen's liberties. This is part of a government's role. It does that trough various types of obligations such as taxes duties or even the imposition to taking part to the military service, as it happens in some countries. Those kinds of restrictions regularly happen in all those that are considered advanced liberal democracies and to some extent are widely accepted. But some groups seek to impose greater restrictions and it is important to distinct between limitations whose purpose is to uphold liberal rights and democratic institutions, from those who seek to restrict the said rights under obligation of cultural traditions or religious orthodoxy.

The second category of group differentiated rights is the one defined as 'external protection', a class of rights that are requested by ethnocultural groups trying to limit the influence of a larger external group, namely a national majority. This is done so to preserve an ethnical minority from assimilation, or from the external influence over their culture and traditions. So, at this point, the most reasonable question that comes next is: if a group demands self-government or polytehnic rights, is it seeking to impose internal restrictions or gain external protections? The answer is that, it depends by the circumstances, as they can serve both purposes. The line that separates them seems subtle but this is exactly the important difference and the fundamental point that Kymlicka tries to highlight. External protection tries to rule inter-group relations, protecting distinct identities and limiting the impact of majority's decisions on groups who might be numerical inferior and consequentially more prone to the risk of assimilation. This brings into the discussion another kind of menace, because as it has been said in the first chapter, groups tend to rank each other, and such approach could bring the risk of unfairness between groups. In a polytehnic society there is not only one minority group to be protected from the majority, but there can be the coexistence of many different ethnical groups and even sub-groups. Sometimes a minority's demand for special protection, in order to protect their identity character, can lead to the marginalization of another group, the main detractors of specific-rights approach often mention the case of South Africa and its apartheid system. If we stick by Kymlicka view we would yet see that there is no need to create social injustices granting special claims, such as special representation or language rights, because minority claim does not seek to reach a dominant position as a group. They just need to have their rights secured from the majority, escaping the risk of assimilation, it is only a matter or reducing the vulnerability of one group in respect to another rather than reaching a position of advantage over others. It is safe to say that the desire to defend cultural practices from desegregating is very common in pretty much every culture, in homogenous states as well. But the concept of external protection is quite different as it is related only to minority groups that, as they might wish to fit in the society, they might also want as well to preserve what connect them to their ethnical differences, even if they are outnumbered by a majority with a different cultural origin. "This kind of group-differentiated rights protect a particular ethnic group from the destabilizing impact of the decisions of the larger society" (Kymlicka 1995). It is very important to get to know the intrinsic differences between this very diverse group-specific rights, as their interactions determine very distinct

conceptions of minority rights. As external protection and internal restrictions do not need to go together, it is possible to experience very different minority's claims, there might be some groups who insist on having recognized both kind of demands, there might be group who might be aspiring as well only to the right to impose restrictions to their own ethnical group's member. The variations of these demands lead to very different conformations, which can perhaps change deeply the organizational structure of a government. Kymlicka in his advocacy for the liberal multiculturalism, indicates that liberals should endorse certain external protections, in order to promote fairness and equality between groups, and it should reject internal restrictions in the name of the same said principles, as they can restrict the group's member rights to question and revise traditional authorities and practices. This would make them in a position in which they would be limited not by their own choice, as it is expected by Liberalism, but by birthright in to a specific cultural group.

2.2 Liberal Multiculturalism

The public discussion on the possible relation between multiculturalism and liberalism has initiated in pluralistic contexts such as Australia or Canada, that gradually changed their attitudes toward the whole idea of assimilation, as they sought it to be the only option possible in order to have a stable liberal democracy. In the academic field the philosophic thought on multiculturalism has initiated by the end of the 80s, after being particularly neglected between the 60s and the 70s. This was a period in which scholars were starting to question on the relation that could exist between liberalism and diversity. In the previous chapter, we have seen as classical liberal views will reject the multicultural approach because of the role that could have in the distortion of the true liberal values. Classic Liberalism's main purpose is the one of defending the individualistic approach as the only mean to ensure the protection and the flourishment of personal identities. In spite of these that could be defined, quite radical opinions, softer assumptions have emerged assessing the importance of embracing some liberal concepts in order not only to guarantee the individual rights and liberal values but also to strengthen them. This view does not over-emphasize the importance attributed to the concept of group, at the expenses of the individuals, as it was perceived by many detractors of multiculturalism. The principal aim is to embrace what is considered to be necessary to strengthen individual freedoms, making sure that the individual and its own needs, would still be the ultimate ends of this research. There are different positions regarding the relationship between Liberalism and Multiculturalism, but the most famous approach is definitely Kymlicka's one. He has been the first one by the end of the 80s, to elaborate a systematic version of the cultural liberalism and more generally to introduce multiculturalism in the philosophical debate. He sees the recognition of the cultural diversity as an essential precondition for the formation of the personal identity in strictly liberal terms, in this sense his contribution to the discussion is essential in giving us the means to make a connection between two irreconcilables theories such as liberalism and multiculturalism. Instead of focusing on what is wrong with multiculturalism, he elaborates, probably as it was said early, also due to being

born in a country with an established institutional multicultural tradition, a theory that aspires to be enriched by the benefits brought by the latter to a theory that ultimately stays true to the ultimate liberal ends.

Liberal principles can be, then, very compatible with multiculturalism. In regard to the first one, Kymlicka believes that it is by focusing too much on its individualistic traits that it has lost sight of the great weight that culture and the sense of belonging have in the life of an individual, and on the shaping of his purposes in life as well. Classic liberalism happens to consider the issue of group rights as something negligible but also dangerous for its possible illiberal implications (Melidoro 2015). In a certain sense, it almost seemed that those ideals were driven by the fear that group representation would be a distraction in respect to the primacy of the individual in the political moral and philosophical consideration. Kymlicka has a different idea regarding this approach, he values the concept of culture and find it essential in the debate of the liberal virtues. The cultural background is fundamental for the individual as it is only in a context that is essentially free from the patterns imposed by the majority, where all ethnic and cultural groups have equal recognition, that is possible to find a vast range of options allowing the individual to choose, to give meaning to his life and, above all, exercise is free will as it thinks it is best for him. This concept can be partly explicated by the view he has in regard to the liberal notion of benign neglect, for Kymlicka such thing does not exist, according to him "the benign neglect" is a myth. Government decisions on languages, internal boundaries, public holidays, and state symbols unavoidably involve recognizing, accommodating, and supporting the needs and identities of particular ethnic and national groups. Nor is there any reason to regret this fact … The only question is how to ensure these unavoidable forms of support for particular ethnic and national groups are provided fairly – that is, how to ensure that they do not privilege some groups and disadvantage others (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 115)". Following this reasoning it is possible to comprehend that without recognition of minority culture there will never be a neutral context suited to freedom as liberals would like to guarantee, it will be always biased by the ideas and values of the majority. Autonomy, indeed can only be exercised in a background where there is a full and vast range of choices, and this is feasible only giving space to the role of culture in the shaping of the individual. When culture is restricted then individuals' freedoms and possibilities of choice are also restricted.

2.3 The Three Major Categories of Liberal Multiculturalism

There is not a widely accepted definition of liberal multiculturalism, it may be stated that it is a form of liberalism that besides granting the classic set of civil and political rights also adopts group-specific rights with the purpose of ensuring equality. Kymlicka believes in the adoption of three major categories when it comes to this particular version of liberalism. Indigenous people make part of the first category, they are peculiar of countries such as United States and Canada, historically they have all gone through numerous attempts of assimilation carried out by their government. The point was that all of these countries,

characterized by indigenous groups like the Maori in New Zealand or the Sami in Scandinavia, had in common the expectation that sooner or later indigenous groups would have disappeared as distinct communities, through intermarriage or assimilation. Government also adopted a number of policies in this regard. Examples of these are policy intended to restrict the practice of traditional culture, the imposition of a national language or religion or even actions taken in order to throw out the indigenous out of their land. Since the approach to this phenomenon has slightly changed from the 70s, all the mentioned countries have now shifted toward a more multicultural approach, renouncing to the concept of assimilation and accepting that indigenous group will continue to exist as societies itself. This change of attitudes is possible to see by the fact that within those countries, indigenous groups have now self-government rights and they are able to make land claims. In 1982 Canada allowed for the constitutional affirmation of indigenous rights and established a land claims commission. In the same year Australia has started legal proceeding for a very significant case regarding indigenous land claims, the Mabo case indeed recognized the land rights of the Meriam people who were the traditional owners of the Murray islands in the Torres Strait. This might indicate that in those countries a decolonization process is underway. What stems from the work of Will Kymlicka is his concern in finding a space for the protection of the minorities inside a liberal framework, reason why he is particularly interested in the shift that liberal countries make toward a more multiculturalist approach. Particularly for this reason in 2006, he developed with his colleague a "Multiculturalism Policy Index" precisely in the attempt to measure this shift and its extent, creating a list of specific policies which can be taken as emblematic or representative of a new multicultural approach (Banting and Kymlicka, 2006). They then attempted to identify which of these policies were actually in force and in which Western democracies in the period between 1980 and 2000. The research showed an ongoing trend toward a more multicultural approach, even if it is not evenly widespread. The second minority's category that Kymlicka takes under analysis is the one of the substate/minority nationalism which concern regionally concentered minority groups that consider themselves a separate nation within a larger state. This would be the case of the Quebecois in Canada, the Catalans in Spain or the German-speaking minority of South Tyrol. Subs-states as well as indigenous groups were perceived as a threat to the national unity, and in the past the same type of tools that were used to dominate the first group mentioned, where also used against this kind of minority. One of them was encouraging people being part of the majority to settle in the minority's group homeland, in an attempt to outnumber them. At the beginning of the 20th century, only Switzerland and Canada allowed for the creation of a federal unity, guaranteeing a territory where the sub-group could have the majority and exercise its self-determination rights. But since then almost all Western countries grant this type of recognition to its sub-states. The third category identified by Kymlicka is the one of the immigrant group, a trend that involved the already mentioned countries of Australia, Canada, New Zealand and United States. Again, they had an approach focused on assimilation, with much less consequences then for the first two categories, perhaps according to Kymlicka it is in the interest of the immigrant group to fit in the society, indeed to be assimilated by the hosting country. In his words: "Immigrants were encouraged and expected to assimilate to the pre-existing society, with the hope that over

time they would become indistinguishable for native-born citizens in their speech, dress, recreation, voting patterns and way of life generally" (Kymlicka 2007).

2.4 Liberal Multiculturalism in Western Countries

So, until now it has been clear that the liberal multiculturalism hypothesis endorses that multiculturalism can exist inside a liberal framework, it is claimed that group-specific rights are not only consistent with liberalism, but very pertinent as well. It might appear very unlikely that such different approaches of political philosophy could be actually read together to complement each other and perhaps move toward the same direction. It is also clear, from what stems from his work that according Kymlicka's hypothesis states can adopt policies that recognize the identity of minorities and the importance of their culture, without crushing the core of liberal democratic values. But if in the theory this has been stressed up to a point that it is almost an obvious concept, is it truly possible to make that happen in practice? And if that is so, are its effects on liberal societies truly that beneficial as the theorists of this political philosophy's concept seems to believe? Kymlicka provides a practical example: in the following figures, he provides on the left side a list of multiculturalism policies that have been adopted by the Western countries, while on the right side there is a list of the three-traditional liberal democratic values: freedom, equality and solidarity, as defined by the French Revolution and reformulated in Rawls's canonical formulation (Kymlicka 2010). The point of this hypothesis of course is to demonstrate that it is possible to successfully implement a number of policies on the left without jeopardizing the values on the right side. According to the theorists of liberal multiculturalism the differences between liberalism and multiculturalism are not that harsh and clear as to say that to implement one it is necessary to renounce the other. Liberal multiculturalism "simply" accommodates the legitimate interests of different ethnocultural groups regarding their language and culture, justice for minorities can be achieved without having to compromise neither the liberal democratic values or the society's commitment to individual freedom.

Multiculturalism policies (MCPs)	Core liberal-democratic values
(1) Re: Immigrants - religious accommodations - funding of ethnic organizations - ethnic representation in media - multicultural/mother-tongue education - affirmative action	(1) Civil and political liberties - freedom of speech, conscience, assembly - right to effective political participation
(2) Re: national minorities - official language rights - regional autonomy - consociational power-sharing	(2) Equality of opportunity - to acquire skills - to gain employment
(3) Re: indigenous peoples - land claims - self-government rights - customary law - treaty rights	(3) Solidarity: - mutual respect - redistribution [1]

[1] "Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence", *Will Kymlicka,* June 2010, https://www.jstor.org/stable/20743149 (accessed April 29, 2019).

Kymlicka further explains this concept in his book "Multicultural Odysseys", where he presents the key features of Liberal Multiculturalism not only in theory but in practice. Specifically, how it is present in the Western democracies. The Western liberal multiculturalism is defined by the author as highly group-differentiated, this is so because beside the granting of some basic and generic kind of rights extended to all the different ethnical and cultural groups in the society, they typically tend to develop also particular set of special rights that are targeted to specific groups. The degree of this of course varies from country to country, but we could say that virtually all the Western liberal democracies are highly 'targeted'.

A distinction between types of minorities is commonly made. The "old minorities", which concern groups such as the indigenous ones, are groups who settled in the territory prior to the creation of the liberal country itself, while other historic minorities are often called "national minorities". The "new" minorities instead, usually concern groups of immigrants. The north European cross-border minority called Sami is the only indigenous population that is officially recognized by the European Union, and it does provide a good example of this described "targeted" liberal multiculturalism. In Sweden, the Sami has special rights granted by the government that differs by those which normally are guaranteed to the Swedes that are as well a national minority. In turn, the rights granted to this two different groups as old minorities are different as well from those acknowledged to the new minorities established through migration. The government of Denmark grants different rights to the German national minority and to the indigenous Inuit in Greenland, those set of special rights are in turn differentiated by those of the new immigrants. This is a generic path that of course changes from country to country, and it may be possible that a state does not present all the three categories. Countries like Spain or Britain for example, do not have to deal with indigenous groups. But in all these cases it is still possible to see the differentiated and targeted approach of the liberal multiculturalism. This differential treatment is justified by Kymlicka as it is necessary to promote equality. As much as this might not seem a very liberal concept, the key feature of Kymlicka work is that he evaluates his sense of justice and look at what is right and what is wrong throughout a liberal lens. Granting special rights to a single group, acknowledging his difference form the rest of the population can be explained in a liberal sense if, in the end, the purpose is to ensure that each citizen will be granted of the same freedom as anybody else, without any obstacle that might be posed by the membership to a certain group. If a norm that addresses only the members of a special ethnocultural group is created with the purpose of helping such group's member to get out of a condition where they are stigmatized, then it is a multicultural policy evaluated from a liberal perspective. Special rights are gained by different groups not merely because of the group's identity as such, not at least in the sense that seems to be attributed to the multiculturalist theorists, who seems to 'privilege group identity over individual identity' (whether this is actually the case or not we will discuss it in the following chapter). Special rights are conferred because, to achieve the very liberal purposes, formal equality can be overridden by a differential treatment if the very end of this is a factual equality. Differentiated rights are always justified

from a liberal perspective, not every right is granted to each group only on the base that they deserve their self-governing rights. The point is that they cannot harm the individual liberty of those who belongs to such group, internal restrictions based on ethnical and cultural claims that restrict a person's autonomy are not allowed by Kymlicka, such as accepting the inferiority of women in some religious culture or the apartheid in South Africa could never be justified as a cultural norm to respect ethnocultural diversity. We can then assert that to understand the theory and practice of liberal multiculturalism it is indeed necessary to abandon any attempt to articulate this stream of political philosophy's thought as a purely matter of generic minority rights.

Another important point to focus on is the material distribution, as many commentators simply limits themselves to discuss this topic as a mere debate on issues of symbolic recognition, reflecting an interest toward a policy of identity often opposed to a politics of redistribution. As this distinction between the politics of recognition and the politics of redistribution might seem helpful for an analytical purpose, it must be pointed out that this does not necessarily hold true. Despite the importance of identity and cultural character is undisputed "liberal multiculturalism in the West addresses issues of power and resources" (Kymlicka 2006). As the Western democracies took distance from the old models of unitary state this departure from older ideologies are reflected by a range of rights that guarantee inclusions to national minorities, and this has to do not only with symbols, it has to do mostly with rights regarding the official language and regional autonomy, usually manifested through devolution or federalization. It is very important to point at the differences between what is purely symbolic and what not because changes like the example cited produce an actual redistribution of economic power as well as political one. In this way, liberal multiculturalism seeks to transform the economic and political opportunities, this is done in order to make them more accessible and ensure a factual equality of opportunities, eliminating the barriers that can be created by belonging to a particular disadvantaged ethnic group.

A peculiar feature of the liberal multicultural democracies in the West, is that on the targeted element rests the entire infrastructure of the liberal multiculturalism, the ethnic and cultural diversities are administered by different pieces of legislation and in turn are administered by different departments following their own "policy tracks". Due to the organization of this system a striking feature that is possible to be observed throughout all the West is that each country moves to a different speed along the different policy tracks, meaning that in some respect they can be very multiculturalist while retreating along another. In this sense, a state can be both a pioneer of multiculturalism and having a more classical liberal approach at the same time, depending on the ethnocultural groups. To remain consistent with the case of Sweden for example and the indigenous group of the Sami, we could mention that while it has been a trail-blazer country toward a more multicultural approach concerning the immigrants' status, it has been very resistant in to the allowing of special land claims by the Sami. This is an important point to focus on, because quite often there is no spillover effect between the different policy track in the same countries, and this might have important consequences

on the interactions between the different groups. In fact, while each of an ethnocultural group has in common with one another the urgency to claim the rights that are due to them or, to challenge the historical subordination to which they feel to be forced, they are not connected by a unitary character and they might not support one another. As more the country presents a targeted approach the less likely is that the ethnocultural group will move in the same direction making a united front in the name of diversity, and the more likely is that when the various struggles for multiculturalism do interact, they will conflict more than to cooperate. This might lead us to think that the liberal multiculturalist hypothesis, however advanced it may seem at a theoretical level, is unworkable in practice, but keeping analyzing Kymlicka's work this seems not to be the case. In an article in 2010, he suggests the presence of evidences that seems to indicate that, despite the diffused skepticism that has been spreading from the 90s, multiculturalism policies actually foster liberal values, especially solidarity, cohesion and a more equal wealth distribution. The author analyses the Canadian case which has been the first country in the West to officially declare in its constitution to be a multiculturalist state and to adopt public policies intended to foster multiculturalism. The scope of the case study is limited to evidences in relations to immigration rather than national minorities, but it is very useful in showing the consequential effects on the domains of freedom, solidarity and equal opportunity, that actually do coincide with the goals set by Liberalism. The findings on this research shows that compared to other Western democracies, Canadian immigrants are more likely to become citizens and they have great chances, as well as inputs, to actively participate in the political field of the state not only as voters, because by the composition of the Canadian Parliament is possible to see that there a great incentive also to take part of important role in the government and to candidate for political offices. In fact, in the Parliament are present more foreign-born citizens and Canadian-born minorities than in any other Wester country. What is also striking in the multicultural policy in Canada is that a clear effect on the equality of opportunity can be observed. It is true that the country tends to select highly skilled immigrant, which is a fact that should not be underestimated, but it is also true that data seems to suggest that immigrant children from lower socio-economic backgrounds also do better in Canada than in other countries. According to a research conducted by the OECD in 2006 second-generation immigrants in Canada actually outperform children of non-immigrant parents. The same study seems to confirm that a big part of this success is not due the fact that Canada tends to favor highly skilled immigrants in comparison to other countries, because it seems that it is mostly due to the specific policies that are actuated in order to address issues of cultural and linguistic diversity, especially in the educational field and in the school population. This model of multiculturalism has proved to be effective in demonstrating that not always what the effects described by Kymlicka as a result of different policy tracks must occur. Perhaps the opposite might occur, as the Canadian case shows, multicultural policy had the effect to promote a strong feeling of mutual identification, not only contributing to normalize diversity but also making the coexistence of different cultures to be perceived as country's strength by its citizens. Canadians view immigrants and demographic diversity as key parts of their own national identity and compared to every other Western democracy, citizens are more prone to say that immigration is beneficial than to believe that immigrants are

prone to crime (Focus Canada 2006) Immigrants as well feel very connected with their Canadian-born counterparts and they have very high levels of national pride. This confirm the hypothesis that liberal multiculturalism could actually contribute to foster the liberal values, in particular equality and solidarity, because it has been demonstrated that in the absence of policies addressed to multiculturalism immigrants tend to be perceived as a threat to the national identity. Multiculturalism provides a link by which immigrants and minorities come to identify with, and feel pride of. In the absence of this this links are more difficult to establish, and national identity is more likely to lead to intolerance and xenophobia (Esses et al,.2006). Also, a study conducted by John Berry within 13 countries showed evidences that children are better adapted in countries with multiculturalism policies (Berry et al., 2006).

CHAPTER THREE

MULTICULTURALISM

3.1 Equality as a Differential Treatment

A problem posed by the scholars of multiculturalism is that many philosophers limit themselves to conceive the human nature as something that is merely individual, detached from the cultural aspects, which are instead deemed to be very important, according to a multiculturalism's view. What it is worth to point out is that, liberal theories tend to focus on equality as a concept only limited to shared features and common identity. According to this view, equality become an easily reachable value due, to a body of rights that pretty much grants the same freedoms to each citizen, in a way that is uniform and insensitive to the differences. This is the breaking point of multiculturalism with other similar theories in political philosophy, starting from this limited concept of equality that is thought to be deeply mistaken. The liberal approach to the concept of equality is only focused on similarities, neglecting the importance that differences have. These, according to the theory of multiculturalism, play a key role in determining what equality truly is. First of all, individuals are said to be both natural and cultural beings at the same time, which means that culture do pervade personality, shaping it, simultaneously with the natural traits of individual's personality. There could not exist one without the other as culture plays a too fundamental role not to be considered of fundamental importance in embodying personal identities. Following this thinking line, it makes perfect sense to assert that differences and identities interpenetrate, making it impossible to assess the priority of one over the other, exactly as it is not possible to do so with the individual's traits that are natural and those that are culturally mediated. So, the first step to understand multiculturalism is to understand the concept of equality as something that it cannot be grounded on uniformity. Every human being must be entitled to be treated equally in respect to the differences between them, and not only in respect to the traits by which they are homologated. This view is sustained in particular by the political theorist Bhikhu Parekh, who believes that sticking to the liberal view of equality, there is the risk to move toward monism. This theory has its bases on the fact that if equality is funded on what make us equal instead of valuing differences as well, it would be impossible for the state not to lead population to a preferred way of life, playing a key role in the marginalization of minorities which do not comply with the worthy one. This makes this theory of equality absolutely unfeasible from a multiculturalist point of view, as it would be unrealistic to encourage equality between human beings through means of homologation, therefore directing people towards a more appropriate lifestyle. Perhaps this concept of equality is just an 'ideological device to mould humankind in a certain direction' (Parekh 2000).

It is true that human beings do share several capacities and needs in common, but are the different cultures which define and structure the role that those needs play on each individual's life, furthermore it also shapes new needs as well. so, equality in a multicultural sense, is based on the concept of the equal freedom to be different. Differential treatment is then necessary to reach such formal equality, because this does not involve the rejection of differences but, on the contrary, the recognition of the relevant ones. At the core of the differential treatment there is the fact that, every norm must be the product of a careful multicultural dialogue, taking into account all the variabilities of the case, because some concepts are uneasy to determine in a neutral manner. An example of that is given by the case that has happened to a British Asian girl. She requested the annulment of her wedding on the basis that she believed it was contracted under duress. She thought so because she was forced into marriage under the threat of ostracism by her own family. The court declined on the argument that, for duress to occur there was the need of a threat of imminent danger to life and liberty, this was apparently not the case. This is a very insensitive interpretation that fails into taking in to account the cultural differences that there might be in different ethnical group in regard to families' relations. In comparison to any other British girl, any Asian girl tend to be far more under pressure and much more sensitive to the wishes of her family. Reason for that, the threat of being ostracized has a much heavier effect on the social life of the latter than on the one of the former. In this respect imposing the same norm to be applied generically to both of them has the effect of creating inequalities rather than equality. The latter is obtained only through a differential treatment, that must be difference sensitive, by giving space to different reactions to the same kind of phenomenon. *Prima facie* it would seem that the Asian girl has been offered of an additional ground for marriage dissolution in comparison to others, hence it seems to be privileged. But if the family dynamics are carefully analyzed, it is safe to say that ostracism to an Asian girl is equivalent to social death and so to duress as well. So, to apply the same norm in a different way depending on the context does not mean giving space to more privileges to a certain group more than another, it rather means that the analysis of the case in relation to the context is done in a culturally sensitive manner.

3.2 The Role of Culture

It is this emphasis on the role of culture that characterizes the debate on multiculturalism, according to its scholars, respect for an individual cannot stem from the disdain towards different cultures, because that is what gives meaning to each person life and it is part of what makes its personality. Respect for a person therefore, involves "locating him against his cultural background, sympathetically entering into his world, and interpreting his conduct in terms of its system of meaning" (Parekh 2000). Beside the concept of respect, since opportunities are a subject-dependent variable, the concept of equal opportunity must as well be sensitive to differences. Inabilities, due to cultural disposition, to take advantage of an opportunity that is formally open to everyone, must be taken into account exactly like a physical inability would be. This is so because, even if a service is public and everyone can accede to it, if it is not culturally sensitive it will automatically cut off a

part of the population. For example, a public school that holds the prohibition to wear the hijab is preventing many Muslims girls from attending classes. The fact that is worth pointing out is that, of course, unlike physical disabilities, those are kinds of behavior that are subjected to human control. But failing in to taking into account religious precepts has something that have real constraints over individuals, is an act of disrespect towards diversities, contributing to the state's path towards monism. In regard to this, according to Bhikhu Parekh, if a norm can be overcome without violating the constitutive individual's sense of identity and without a deep sense of moral loss, then the individual should be asked to accommodate to that norm. This is so because in certain occasions the costs necessary of adapting a norm to every different ethnocultural group in the society, can be impossible to bear, and some groups will necessarily have to accustom. An example of this is the weekly rest day in each society, in a state that is predominantly Catholic this day will be Sunday while, where there is a majority of Muslims, this would be on Friday. It is quite obvious that employers would need to face very high costs, adapting to the fact that they should close twice a week instead of one, or at least they should give an extra day of rest to the part of the employees who, according to religious precepts, should rest on a different day compared to the rest of the company's employees. This is obviously unrealistic and impossible. Perhaps, Once the state has succeeded in to making the religious beliefs of citizens equally respected, it is not an injustice to give precedence to the religion of an overwhelming majority, especially if this historically had an important role in shaping the structure and the mass culture of a country. So, even if a minority's religion deserve acknowledgment, this cannot be equal as the predominant one, because is not as deep and pervasive. This is a very tricky point because at the same time Parekh points out that the historical role that a religion may have exercised in forming the cultural conscience of a country, cannot be an excuse to dominate other religions and perpetuate inequalities. As we can see, is a very thin line that requires a lot of common sense and multicultural dialogue on a case-by-case basis to be deeply understood. However, the previously mentioned case is in turn different from, for example, a school-age Jew who celebrates Hanukah in a predominantly Christian country. In my past experience, when I attended a high school in the United States, this was frequented predominantly by Christian children and, December 25th was a holiday in which there would be no classes due to Christmas festivities. Although there were also Jewish children attending the same school, there was no day-off scheduled to allows those kids to take part of their typical religious festivity. But I remember that although attendance was extremely important, teachers would allow Jewish children to skip the classes. They were very flexible and they would not weight their absence on their grade, they would also allow them to hand later in the week, the assignment due for that day. This is an example of sensitivity to differences, and it explain why to have and equality *de facto* it is necessary to provide differential treatments and to move away from equality *de jure*. It is true that the Jewish kids would enjoy twice the days of rest as Christian kids, but it does not mean that this is unjust towards the latter because they only get to skip school on the days of their festivity. It does not even mean that equality would be reached when both kids could not attend school both for Hanukah AND Christmas independently by their actual religion. This kind of sensitivity is something necessary as it makes up for the fact that, being part of a minority, a certain group of people will

necessarily be discriminated, due to the actual impossibility of being able to accommodate everyone. The similarity between these two examples and the difference in how these are solved, shows that the essence of this theory lies in the necessity to analyze events case by case, with a reasonable optics for the weight of culture. It also shows that there are no general laws that can be universally applied. here lies the sense of paying attention to the differences that make up a multicultural society.

But what if a norm to be overcome requires you to violate the funding principles of your own culture? In this case Parekh believes that the state should bear the costs of accommodating a norm that is closer to a natural inability. Which cultural incapacity falls in which category is only a matter of intercultural dialogue and it can be determined only on a case-by- case basis. Some cases in which a multicultural scholar would require some more flexibility are for example, the prohibition by the United States' law to allow kids under twenty-one to drink alcohol. While it is possible to get married by the age of eighteen, underage Catholics and Jewish kids are not exempted by this law, in regard to the ceremonial use of wine, this is an evidence of failure to be culturally sensitive. Parekh in some cases even advocates differential treatment for what it concerns the protection from the law, according to him it would make sense to give special protection to German-Jewish after the horrible history which saw them protagonist during the Holocaust. In culturally diverse societies citizens are very likely to disagree, this is why equal rights cannot involve identical treatment as it might be the case in culturally homogenous societies. In a heterogeneous cultural context differential treatment is a necessity as disagreements can come in many forms, dissent can be created around more complex social norms as well as around the rules that may seem the most obvious such as clothing. About how people in a society dress, there is a lot to say, and the casuistry is very broad, serving the purpose of showing the multicultural concept of case-by-case process, involving the discussion of all the parties involved, instead of a "one norm fits all approach". In 1972, the British Parliament passed a law empowering the Minister of Transport, requiring the use of crash-helmets for all people who drive a motor-cycle. Due to the high concentration of Sikhs in the UK, the law brought very much disagreement, at the point that, a man kept getting fined between 1973 and 1976 because he refused to wear the helmet instead of its turban, which must be worn obligatorily as imposed by his religion. The law was then amended in 1976, on the ground that the turban was just as safe. According to Parekh the parliament was right to amend the law, even though it was not universally welcomed. This is so because according to him, since the very purpose of the law was preventing people from suffering injuries while riding motor-cycles, it was enough to ascertain if the Sikh's turban met the same security standards of the crash-helmet. Once this was ascertained, it no longer made sense to impose a rule that violated a custom with such an identity character as wearing a turban. In Britain Sikhs are also allowed to wear turbans in the police and armed forces, this is worth noticing because, for example, a very multicultural country such as Canada rejected the idea, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police did not allowed garments such as turbans. This was justified on the ground that the police should be seen as free from political and religious biases, and for this reason policemen should not be allowed to show any religious symbol while in service, as it would

violate the rights of other Canadian citizens to live in a secular state. However, on a multiculturalism' point of view is possible to argue that, if a state recognizes to be multicultural and accepts all the differences as well as all the distinct religions, it should not be a problem if a public institution such as police, reflects this multiculturalism. A neutral and secular state, should not be threatened by the fact that its citizens are free to express their religion. Furthermore, wearing a turban does not mean that the wearer values his religion more than his professional identity. Another relevant case is the *affaire of foulard*, surfaced in 1989 in France, where three girls attended an ethnical mixed school in Creil. The girls used to wear the hijab in the classroom but the headmaster objected that it was against the secularism of French public school. Since the girls refused not to wear the hijab, he banned the three of them from attending to classes. There are many considerations here that must be made on a multiculturalism point of view, the most important one is that, it is true that hijab is certainly visible but there is no fair argument demonstrating that religious symbols should be invisible in order to respect the secularity of the state. We could say that actually, the other way around is true: the state is secular because it should allow to each citizen to express its own religion, without the state suggesting any preferred one. The implications of Parekh's argument are that the only general rule, when it comes to the multiculturalism's approach to the concept of equality is that "different treatments of groups are equal if they represent different ways of realizing the same right, opportunity and if, as a result, each of the parties involved are neither worse off or better off" (Parekh, 2000). In every case it is necessary to consider the nature and the purpose of the norm that it is take under consideration and it must be clear that the differential treatment is justified in terms of equality, otherwise it would only lead to the formation of a general discontent. The multiculturalism approach in this form distance itself from liberalism, even in its more multicultural forms, such as the one showed in the previous chapter. This is possible to be seen by the fact that social harmony, cultural diversity and a common sense of belonging are not seen as something necessary in the sense that they are strictly related to the context in which individual liberties can flourish. While those are only means, serving the purpose of enhancing the individual freedoms, for multiculturalism's scholars are worthwhile collective goals as such.

3.3 Overcoming the Individualist-Integration

It is now clear what, according to a multiculturalist's perspective is meant in regard to the concept of equality, but what is multiculturalism exactly? According to the sociology and politics' professor Tariq Modood the answer is state-community partnership, aimed at overcoming the concept of integration only limited to individuals. Multiculturalism is about the creating an environment where different groups enjoys a relation of equal respect, the surpassing of the individualist-integration is then essential because, as much a context of robust individual rights is very much needed, society cannot be reduced to individual and need to acknowledge the important role of groups. This multicultural integration must be done through the adaptation of customs and institutions to the plurality of cultures, developing a concept of national identity that reflect the multiculturalist composition of society. In this context, the concept of citizenship is extremely important,

as in Modood's opinion it must be reshaped in order to integrate the post-immigration communities, instead of perpetuating an ideal of "national story" that is outdated and that ends up only for alienating post-immigrations groups, who want to written in the story both backwards as well as forward, this is particularly important to highlight because it is possible to see how far it goes form the idea of an assimilationist model: the new communities want to be part of the history of the country and of what gives meaning to the concept of nationality, but they want to do so by maintaining their own identity, not homologating and canceling their cultural roots. This concept also addresses one of the main critiques of multiculturalism, the one that accuse this theory of encouraging separatism emphasizing differences. In reality, what multiculturalism tries to do is exactly the opposite of encouraging separatism, it sees in the acknowledgment of differences a way to encourage the social cohesion without an assimilationist purpose. This is so because an assimilationist approach according to multiculturalism would only lead to nothing more than a concept of citizenship based on homologation and on the denial of cultural roots, which is in turn what makes people unique. In this way multiculturalism, overcoming the individualist-integration, recognizes the importance of group and tries to bring justice for minorities as well as fighting phenomenon such as the islamophobia and xenophobia. Perhaps at this point it is worth notice that the two mentioned phenomena are actually agents that tend to separate society rather than unite it, further dispelling the myth of multiculturalism as a theory that incites separatism.

Multiculturalism, addresses the post-immigration difference, it defines those contexts whose have been characterized by large scale immigration where difference primarily refers how people are identified and categorized, such as White, Black, or Chinese or Muslim, and how these people identify themselves. Post immigration minorities tend to be categorized according to two axioms, one of *negative differences* that concern stereotyping, exclusion, racism and discrimination. While the second axiom is the sense of identity that stems out from the group's self-perception. These differences mainly fall into the category of race, ethnicity and religion. Here multiculturalism's job is the one of making individuals fit and work along different groups without renouncing to their own identity, favoring integration, anti-discrimination measures. It provides a robust framework of individual rights as well, this is a necessary point of departure, but is has mainly an auxiliary function as the main purpose the accommodation of minorities recognizing the social reality of groups and its importance. The aspiration of going beyond the individualist-integration stems from the fact that multiculturalism values the importance of the social impact that diversity bring into society, ensuring the centrality of the cultural identity but also assuring that those will not be a limit. Thus, threatening the equal opportunities that every member of a society should be able to access. At the same time multiculturalism seeks to creates advantages, not only for minorities but for majorities as well. The very purpose is the formation of a society where there is a maximum freedom, where individual identities coming from any group, they can borrow and learn from everyone. A society where there is not a dominant social identity.

3.4 Overcoming the Liberal Principles and the Intercultural Dialogue

As it has been mentioned, multiculturalism seeks, through the protection of group identity, to empower individuals, and multiculturalism scholars give much importance to the need for a state to guarantee a robust set of individual rights. this would seem to suggest that, the separation with egalitarian liberalism is not so clear-cut and antagonistic. The same Modood describes multiculturalism as an offspring of the egalitarian liberalism (Modood 2013), but he remarks as well that it needs to take distance from it. The overcoming of Liberalism is essential, even though there might be liberal scholars who embrace some principles of multiculturalism, the scholars of the latter believe that the ultimate goal of this political theory can only be reached after the Overcoming of liberalism. The starting point of this argument is that liberal-democratic societies are prone to exclusion of minorities due to their own intrinsic features. A necessity of the liberal democratic societies is that they necessitate a strong identity character, this means that with the eventual aggregation of new ethnic and cultural groups, the society is destined to enter into crisis and its equilibrium is moved. The automatic response to this phenomenon is a closure toward minority groups, and eventually the exclusion. This has deep repercussions on the identity character of a minority ethnocultural group, as a relevant part of the identity formation stems from the recognition of the other individuals, those external to the group, namely the majority. According to Charles Taylor, in his "politics of recognition" those who are victims of non-recognition are confined to an identity who they do not belong to, living an impoverished life. Since has it has long been said, multiculturalism is a theory based on equality, minority protection and integration this model of society is unacceptable.

Multiculturalism' scholars, as the previously cited Modood and Parekh, affirm that authors such as Kymlicka have done a great job in the recognizing the importance of the role of culture in shaping human's needs and goals. But, they still strongly believe that multiculturalism can be achieved only through the surpassing of liberalism. Furthermore, Parekh claims that Kymlicka's theory actually falls short of being a theory of multiculturalism, it is just a theory of cultural pluralism. Despite the concern in his work to recognize the value of culture for the individual, he fails to theorize the importance of cultural diversity. Liberalism tends to be limited, the cultural value is just a mean to achieve an end. This instrumental conception of the role of culture, fails to account its importance as an end itself. Something that can actually enhance society and social relations. Liberal theories that claim sympathy for multiculturalism mainly provide the means to ensure equal rights between different groups, failing to account for the interactions between them. It promotes equal respect for each ethnocultural group without embracing the greater commitment of multiculturalism, a broader vision, one where different groups can actually have a constructive dialogue between them, learning from each other. It is a view that seems to encourage the formation of a separated society in which each group tends to be inward looking. According to Parekh, the potential of the coexistence of different cultures is very vast, it is not only about the formation of the individual identity, it has the potential of expanding the human's horizons,

as cultures can complete and correct one another. As liberalism tends to absolutize itself, so does a society that is made up only by one culture. Due to the coexistence of different cultures people can expand their knowledge, on their own culture as well, as much of the formation of an identity is given by the comparison with the different. It is realizing first what one is not, that one can actually be capable of defining its identity. Furthermore, the accessibility of more than one culture, allows the individual to have a vast range of choice concerning what the good life means for him. The distinction that is fundamental for Parekh is between the arguments for the value of the culture to its members and the value of cultural diversity to all society's members. He conceptualizes this difference as specificity and variation rather than categorical exclusion (Young 2001). When it was said, early in this chapter, that people desires and attitudes are deeply shaped by culture, it does not mean that individuals are not capable of being critical, or to be able to evaluate their needs. It rather means that culture will necessarily influence the view that individuals have about the world. So, this is why a plurality of cultures is needed, so that the individual's capacities of criticism and evaluation can be put into practice in a wider context, where there is no view of the world that is inherited. Only in a context like the one just described people can "expand their intellectual and moral horizons, stretch the imagination and guard from the obvious temptation of absolutize itself" (Parekh 2006). It must be specified that what is meant by Parekh by this argument is not that there are cultures which tend to be wrong, and that people should learn from the "good" ones. The principle here is the exact opposite, rather that there is no such culture that is worthless. In a pluralistic context, there is always something to learn, it is not about correcting defecting culture, it is about enriching and expanding our perspective in life. This is why, the enhanced weight on the role of culture, and cultural diversity, is something that must be reached out for its own intrinsic value. The incapability of doing so, is exactly why Liberalism cannot be kept in a true multiculturalism view.

Cultural diversity predisposes the conditions in which, what Parekh calls "intercultural dialogue" must take place. To this author, this is one of the most important values in multicultural politics. It is a tool through which a multicultural society should solve its conflicts regarding human rights, the creation of norms, practices and educational policies. The core of this theory is that, wherever there is a plurality of cultures, it would be absurd to expect a uniformity of visions and the only moral and just approach to be used to solve those kind of disputes, is the one of a dialogue among the parties with different opinions. This would begin starting from the guiding principle of the society which are called the 'operative public values', these are the values that currently enjoys the majority of consensus. Then the dialogue proceeds in analyzing those operative public values in order to understand if those are mere conventions, if there are any aspects which are deemed to be just or if it simply violates the principles of inclusion. There are no concepts that are wrong, regardless, or fair *a priori*, just because they are shared by the majority, the whole point of the multicultural dialogue is the discussion, to question the values that stand behind the disputed norm, focusing only on its merits and demerits. This is done in a way that is defined *bifocal*, which means that both minority and majority's points of view must be carefully taken in consideration, in a process that expands the ideas of what is right and wrong, and

makes us appreciate it through different points of view, in a process that enriches all the parties involved. What is worth to point out in relation to liberalism is that, in this theory, liberalism should understand itself as one of the two parties involved, a specific voice with a specific point of view in the dialogue. It has the right of trying to persuade other with its view, but it is important not to mistaken it for a neutral framework that transcends culture. Since each culture is inherently limited, a dialogue between them is mutually beneficial (Parekh 2006), Furthermore it might be a form of special measure to prevent the identity of newly arrived groups into the society, namely immigrants. In this way, Parekh ensures that the thoughts of member of recently arrived cultural minorities will not be overwhelmed by the perspectives of a powerful and stronger majority, leaving space for dialogue and reciprocal understanding. It is a process that empowers all the groups involved, whether they are part of the majority or not. It enables them to expand their horizons of thoughts. The dialogue is possible only if each group involved accepts the others as conversational partners, who needs to be taken seriously. This takes them to an objective level where, there is no longer the distinction between majority and minority, but a level of complete equality where every opinion weighs in the same way.

CONCLUSION

Alexis the Tocqueville has been one of the first scholars in the modern era, who first started to question the rights of the majority rule and its relationship with justice. He theorized an inherent weakness of all democratic systems, which consisted in what he has called 'the tyranny of the majority'. This means that generally, the power that the masses derive from being in a majority could lead the democratic system to pursue the interest of the latter, rather than responding to the needs of the whole society, resulting in the oppression of the minority groups. This concept is very current nowadays, today's world is growing of complexity at a very fast rate. Nowadays 40% of the states of the globe are populated by very different ethnocultural groups and different religions. It is very important to pause to reflect on the importance of the problem, caused by the fact that, the many minority groups coexist with larger groups which often tend to impose their will regardless of the different needs of the latter. It is important to question whether the will of the majority always corresponds to justice.

The purpose of my elaborate is not to suggest which of the three approaches mentioned is the one which best addresses the problem of the minority protection and the coexistence of diversity. Nor is it to suggest that there are actually wrong approaches, while one is intrinsically right. The aim is the one of analyzing and comparing each of them throughout the different visions of important authors in the field of political philosophy. It does not matter which one the reader believes to be the best suited approach. My ambition is actually the opposite one, therefore, to create confusion: each chapter has to be equally convincing, challenging the capacity to clearly understand which one was actually suggesting the right solution to the issue of integration and the inclusion of the minorities. Being the aim of my research the one of making the reader confront with different views of a problem that is deeply complex and extremely actual.

Whether focusing more on the individual rights or through specific group rights, what it most important is that this issue must be addressed. We often take for granted that the decisions that reflect the will of the majority are also the fairest, but this is not always the case and it is important to reflect on this and to think through which means it is possible to truly guarantee justice for all. I believe that discussion on this topic should stem from people like me: I am a white heterosexual girl, coming from a catholic family, living in a country predominantly composed by white people, where homosexuals are in part still stigmatized and where Catholicism represents the religion practiced by 74,4% of the population. It might seem that I probably should not worry about the conditions of minority groups, given my condition of advantage, but I believe that it is exactly from these advantaged categories of the society that change must sprout.

People should not wait to become part of a minority to start worrying about this issue. To neglect the needs of culturally and ethnically minority groups can only bring the society to a situation where discontent

prevails, where there is the tightening of social relations between different groups, and where it permeates a difference between "us" and "them", which I consider to be a regression for society. It is important in the honor of the values Democracy stands for, to make sure of ensuring that every individual in the society enjoys the same rights, as everyone else, to be able to live in a country that protects his interests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, Bruce. 1980. *Social justice in the liberal state.* New Haven: Yale University Press

Balint, Peter. 2003. *"Identity Claims: why the liberal neutrality is the solution, not the problem"* Political Studies 63, no.2 (November): 495-509

Banting Keith and Kymlicka Will. 201. *"Is There Really a Retreat from Multiculturalism Policies? New Evidence from The Multiculturalism Policy Index"* Comparative European Politics 11, no.5 (June):577-598

Barry, Brian. 2001. *Culture and Equality.* Polity Press

Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Council of Europe. Committee of Ministers. 2008. *"White Paper on Intercultrual Dialogue"* CM 2008 30, May 2.

Environics. 2006. *Canadians' Attitudes toward Muslims.* Toronto: The Environics Institute for Survey Research.

Glazer G.1995. *Individual Rights against Group Rights*, in *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, OUP Oxford

Goodin, Robert. 2006. *"Liberal Multiculturalism: Protective and Polyglot"* Political Theory 34, no.3 (June): 289-303

Kymlicka Will. 2003. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kymlicka Will. 2007. *Multicultural Odyssey: navigating the New International Politics of Diversity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kymlicka Will. 2010. *"Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theory and Social Science Evidences"* Canadian Political Science Association and The Québécoise 43, no.2 (June):257-271

Howitz, Morton. 1966. *"Tocqueville and The Tyranny of the Majority*, on *The Review of Politics"* The Review of Politics 28, no.3 (July):293-307

Laden, Anthony Simon and Owen, David. 2013. *Multiculturalism and Political Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Macedo, Stephen. 1990. *Liberal Virtues*: *Citizenship, Virtue, and Community in Liberal Constitutionalism,* Oxford: Claredon Press

Melidoro, Domenico. 2015. *Multiculturalismo: una piccola introduzione.* Rome: Luiss University Press

Modood, Tariq. 2007. *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea,* Cambridge: Polity

Modood Tariq. 2010. *Multiculturalism and integration: struggling with confusion.* European University Institute Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.

Modood, Tariq. 2013. *Multiculturalism*. Polity Press

OECD. 2006. *Where Immigrant Students Succeed: A Comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD, Program for International Student Assessment. Focus

Okin, Susan Moller (1998) 'Is Multiculturalism Good for Women?', in Joshua Cohen and Martha Nussbaum (eds) *Is Multiculturalism Good for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Parekh, Bhikhu .2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, Harvard University Press

Rawls, John. 1971. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Tamir,Yael. 1993. Liberal Nationalism. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, Charles. 1994. *The politics of Recognition*. In *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition": an essay*, edited by Guttmann. Princeton, Princeton University Press: 25-73

Walzer,Michael. 1992. "*Comment"*. In Multiculturalsm and the "Politics of Recognition" ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 2001 *Thoughts on Multicultural Dialogue*. University of Chicago

Young, Iris Marion (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SUMMARY

I diritti delle minoranze sono un argomento di grande attualità ed importanza, che per molti versi rimane ancora molto controverso. Facendo un excursus storico del percorso del riconoscimento ufficiale dei diritti delle minoranze nell'ordine mondiale, è possibile osservare come l'approccio a questa categoria di diritti umani sia cambiato molto nel corso del tempo. Infatti per i primi due decenni del ventesimo secolo questi non erano considerati di notevole importanza, e purché uno stato fosse in grado di prevenire gravi violazioni dei diritti umani quali il genocidio o la pulizia etnica, non vi era considerata nessuna necessità di garantire ulteriore protezione. Inoltre la conclusione del primo conflitto mondale, aveva lasciato in eredità, nell'ordine mondiale che si era venutosi a formare a seguito della guerra, l'idea che i diritti di gruppo potessero essere un potenziale pericolo per la stabilità del suddetto ordine. La società delle nazioni di Woodrow Wilson sembrava puntare sempre di più su un modello di omologazione e assimilazione e questo venne messo in atto attraverso la progressiva sostituzione dei diritti orientati verso i gruppi e la loro preservazione come tali, con dei diritti generici ed universali pensati *uti singuli*. Difatti non vi è alcuna menzione di diritti per i gruppi minoritari, sia nella Dichiarazione Universale dei Diritti Umani del 1948 che nella Convenzione Europea per la salvaguardia dei diritti dell'uomo e delle libertà individuali. In questo modo gruppi minoritari sia etnici che culturali perdevano il potere di essere considerati come tali, aumentando così il rischio di perdere il loro carattere identitario.

Dal 1980 situazione è notevolmente cambiata, a partire dal riconoscimento dei diritti dei gruppi aborigeni da parte dell'Organizzazione delle Nazioni Unite, fino ad arrivare al periodo odierno, dove la protezione delle minoranze è internazionalmente riconosciuta come una prerogativa imprescindibile al fine di evitare lo scoppio di conflitti etnici e religiosi. In questo periodo si è venuto a formare un pensiero filosofico e politico alternativo rispetto a quello predominante di stampo liberale: nasce il multiculturalismo, che rivendica di essere la risposta all'eccessivo individualismo del pensiero liberale. Il multiculturalismo è un responso alla crisi del modello di cittadinanza, sempre più membri di gruppi minoritari infatti hanno espresso un discontento verso le loro condizioni di cittadino, poiché nonostante godano degli stessi diritti universali del resto della popolazione, si sentono in una condizione di svantaggio. Così si sviluppa questo antagonismo nell'ambito accademico tra Liberalismo e Multiculturalismo, da una parte chi difende l'applicazione rigorosa di un insieme di diritti individuali come misura ampiamente sufficiente a garantire la protezione di ogni individuo e delle sue relazioni sociali. Dall'altra invece chi sostiene esserci la necessità impellente per garantire delle forme di diritti di gruppo che possano garantire alle minoranze di preservare il loro carattere identitario. All'interno di questa discussione trova spazio anche il filosofo politico Will Kymlicka che invece presenta la sua versione liberale di una sorta di via di mezzo, o sia garantire i valori liberali riuscendo però a incorporare alcuni principi del multiculturalismo. Nel mio lavoro di ricerca aspiro ad analizzare ognuno di questi tre punti di vista e vedere

come ognuno di questi sia riuscito ad elaborare una propria teoria sugli strumenti più giusti per tutelare i diritti umani e garantire uguaglianza tra tutti i cittadini.

Le accuse mosse nei confronti del Liberalismo hanno a che vedere con un eccessivo individualismo che in quanto tale, è privo di strumenti per poter fornire un adeguato protezione dei gruppi di minoranza. Il Liberalismo in realtà è una corrente filosofico-politica che ha sempre avuto al centro del suo interesse il tema della diversità, ma viene accusato di essere troppo limitato a causa del fatto che esso si concentra solo sulla diversità in relazione ad un'unica cultura, senza tenere conto di realtà nelle quali gruppi di differenti origini etniche e culturali si ritrovano a dover coesistere. Il primo autore menzionato, Stephen Macedo, affronta queste critiche in una dissertazione sull'importanza dei valori liberali nella protezione dei diritti individuali, affermando che tramite questi vi sia la concreta possibilità di tutelare ogni tipo di relazione sociale, senza la necessità di diritti speciali per i gruppi minoritari. Secondo questa visione del liberalismo, assicurandosi di proteggere i diritti *uti singuli*, si può garantire la libertà di ogni singolo cittadino di poter essere chi vuole, di poter formare la propria identità in una società libera da discriminazioni di stampo culturale o etnico. Macedo difende la visione di uno stato che deve essere il più possibile neutrale, poiché solo così i cittadini saranno effettivamente liberi di poter perseguire gli obbiettivi che loro credono essere quelli giusti, senza essere influenzati da ciò che lo stato suggerisce essere il giusto stile di vita. In quest'ottica è quasi semplice capire perché non ci sia bisogno di provvedere a dei diritti speciali per i gruppi minoritari, perché uno stato basato sui principi liberali ambisce a fornire tutti gli strumenti necessari ai suoi cittadini per poter essere liberi e questo ovviamente include anche la libertà di associazione.

Questa premessa, per quanto doverosa, è forse un po' troppo idealistica, tende a spiegare i valori intrinseci del liberalismo ma manca di fornire dettagli su come nella pratica questi possano davvero essere implementati. In più non fornisce nessuna argomentazione pratica volta a fronteggiare le critiche mosse dal multiculturalismo in riguardo all'impossibilità dello stato di essere totalmente neutrale. Il principio dello stato neutrale è stato soggetto di numerose critiche da parte del multiculturalismo, poiché lo stato in maniera più o meno esplicita finisce sempre per promuovere decisioni su argomenti quali le festività pubbliche, i simboli statali e il linguaggio che riflettono gli interessi della maggioranza. Il solo che spesso negli stati esista una sola lingua ufficiale sembrerebbe dimostrare questa teoria. Un autore liberale che controbatte in maniera molto articolata a questa critica è Peter Balint, secondo il quale la neutralità è la risposta al problema e non la causa. Al momento esiste uno stato che sia del tutto neutro secondo i canoni liberali? La risposta è no. Parte della difesa di Balint si basa proprio sul concordare con la critica che gli viene mossa, come sostengono i multiculturalisti è vero che la neutralità è un concetto irrealistico che verosimilmente non verrà mai raggiunto poiché è un ideale. Ciò che è importante da sottolineare è che proprio per il fatto che la neutralità è un ideale gli stati non dovrebbero smettere di cercare di perseguirla e di cercare di avvicinarsi il più possibile. Per questo la critica che è mossa dai multiculturalisti per Balint è priva di senso, è sicuramente vera però poi manca di

criticità in quanto anche la Democrazia è un ideale, non ci sono stati che siano perfettamente democratici, ma non per questo si sente la necessità di trovare un regime alternativo perché i valori democratici sono ampiamente accettati e rimangono un modello da seguire.

Il concetto della neutralità dello stato liberale è basato sull'obbiettivo di creare una nazione dove le persone possano avere piena libertà di scegliere della loro vita, e per poter perseguire questo obbiettivo la neutralità perfetta non è necessaria, questa deve essere bilanciata con gli altri interessi della società. La scelta di una lingua nazionale per esempio, *de facto* non è una norma neutra e in qualche modo discrimina le minoranze etniche che parlano un'altra lingua, ma è giustificata da un fine neutrale, questo perché una lingua comune stimola la coesione sociale e fa si che i cittadini non siano vittime della loro nascita, o sia, incapaci di comunicare con la maggior parte delle persone a causa dell'essere nati in una famiglia facente parte di una minoranza linguistica. Quello che è fondamentale per Balint è poter creare un sistema sensibile al cambiamento, e anche alle differenze, è stato concepito per essere funzionale all'accomodare gli interessi di ciascuno all'interno della popolazione, quindi è senz'altro vero che in questa teoria vi è un forte individualismo alla base però, tutto è focalizzato a un benessere generale, alla formazione di una società che possa essere del tutto libera e rispettosa delle diversità. Essendo questo il fine ultimo, è possibile che lo stato possa riconoscere alcune forme di trattamento differenziato che sia consistente con il liberalismo, ma questo non prende la forma di diritti specifici per le minoranze. Se la neutralità dello stato liberale si fonda sul concetto di uno Stato che non può dimostrare di favorire un determinato stile di vita, allo stesso modo non deve neppur mostrare che ci sono degli stili di vita degni di meno considerazione rispetto ad altri, motivo per il quale è autorizzato a dare maggiore supporto a determinati gruppi marginalizzati. Questo non vuol dire che lo stato privilegia un certo stile di vita, semplicemente è recettivo delle differenze nella popolazione e agisce al fine di rimuovere le differenze.

Per poter dimostrare come queste argomentazioni possano effettivamente avere un'applicazione nella società odierna ho voluto menzionare il caso degli Stati Uniti D'America, uno stato liberale che è riuscito nell'intento di creare un'identità nazionale e di stimolare la coesione di gruppi etnici, culturali, linguistici e religiosi totalmente diversi fra loro. Certo, sarebbe davvero superficiale affermare che il paese sia completamente libero da disuguaglianze sociali e ingiustizie, spesso anche sulla base di razza o di appartenenza determinati gruppi sociali, ma il mio scopo è quello di mostrare come in questo caso l'individualismo liberale sembri aiutare il processo di eliminazione dei fenomeni negativi sopracitati. Gli Stati Uniti sono stati caratterizzati da un individualismo liberale fin dalla loro nascita, cosa che si riflette anche nella costituzione, la traccia legale più importante a favore di questo approccio è stato il caso Brown v. Board Education, nel quale la Corte Suprema decise di porre fine alla segregazione raziale, era il 1954 e da quel momento in poi tutti gli sforzi vennero concentrati nel promuovere un ideale di rispetto che andasse oltre i concetti di razza o religione. L'approccio scelto per poter porre fine a fenomeni di disparità su base raziale o

religiosa fu quello di garantire in maniera indiscriminata gli stessi diritti individuali per tutti, e non quello di adottare di una serie di diritti speciali per le categorie che potevano essere un target di discriminazione. Le misure suggerite dal Multiculturalismo, quali l'assegnazione di posti nelle istituzioni pubbliche o nelle scuole tramite percentuale per assicurare una quota fissa di membri di ogni gruppo sociale, non ha mai riscontrato un grande successo tra il pubblico americano. I risultati del sondaggio Gallup difatti, mostrano che una grande maggioranza della popolazione, di composizione molto variegata, comprendendo anche numerosi neri e altre etnie minoritarie, è contro alcun tipo di trattamento preferenziale.

In un certo senso, l'applicazione di diritti speciali basata sull'appartenenza a determinati gruppi potrebbe minare il senso di cittadinanza venutosi a costruire negli anni in una popolazione molto eterogenea, un caso pressoché unico nella storia. Inoltre, poiché in tutte le situazioni multietniche i gruppi tendono a classificarsi a vicenda, il riconoscimento istituzionale dell'esistenza di tali gruppi porterebbe a separare la società e a creare più disuguaglianze di quante non ve ne siano nella situazione attuale. Invece il garantire ad ogni cittadino gli stessi diritti, a prescindere dalla razza, origine o etnicità, sembrerebbe star avendo dei riscontri, attraverso il piano individuale anche nei gruppi minoritari. Difatti negli ultimi anni si è potuto osservare come il divario economico tra cittadini bianchi e neri stia convergendo e lo stesso vale anche per altre minoranze etniche. La percentuale di cittadini neri nelle scuole di medicina sta aumentando, e si potrebbe argomentare di come questo non sia il risultato di leggi specifiche che garantiscono una quota fissa di posti riservati ad afroamericani per favorirne l'integrazione, ma sia la dimostrazione di come norme generiche quali quella che divieta la discriminazione sui posti di lavoro su base di razza o etnia, possa avere poi dei risvolti su categorie intere della popolazione. Gli Stati Uniti inoltre sono il paese fondatore delle "hyphenated identities", ovvero le identità con il trattino, quali Italo-americano o Latino-americano, dimostrando che aderendo ai principi liberali è possibile creare un sentimento di unità nazionale che coesista con la propria identità culturale.

L'idea di diritti di gruppo sembrerebbe quindi irriconciliabile con la visione del liberalismo, eppure negli anni ottanta si è sviluppata una concezione di questa teoria che accetta parte dei principi del multiculturalismo, in quanto questi, lungi dall'essere contro i valori liberali, in realtà possono dare un ulteriore agevolazione per le libertà individuali tanto care a questa teoria. Il filosofo politico liberale Will Kymlicka è un esponente di questa teoria, con la sua ipotesi sul liberalismo multiculturale suggerisce un approccio diverso ai diritti collettivi, che lui divide in due categorie: *protezioni esterne* e *restrizioni interne*, nel primo ricadono tutte le misure che un particolare gruppo etnico può chiedere per salvaguardare la sua cultura dall'assimilazione alla maggioranza ed è visto come un aspetto positivo dallo stesso autore. La seconda categoria invece potenzialmente potrebbe avere l'effetto di minare i valori liberali, in quanto questa concerne le restrizioni che alcuno membri di un determinato gruppo vorrebbero imporre ai membri del gruppo stesso, come ad esempio l'imposizione di alcuni precetti religiosi. A causa di questa categoria, i diritti collettivi vengono molto criticati, in realtà è doveroso precisare però, che tutti i governi impongono delle restrizioni interne, essendo questo parte

del lavoro di un governo. Questo viene fatto attraverso vari obblighi quale il servizio di leva o il pagamento delle tasse, in tutte le democrazie ed è ampiamente accettato e ritenuto legittimo. Quindi è molto importante saper distinguere se un gruppo richiede dei diritti volti alla protezione esterna o restrizioni interne in quanto sono queste ultime che potenzialmente possono minare i valori liberali, essendo spesso certe minoranze etniche/religiose, alla ricerca di poteri aggiuntivi con il fine di restringere le libertà individuali dei propri membri. Kymlicka difende invece i diritti riguardanti la protezione esterna, essendo questo un modo di promuovere equità tra le persone all'interno della società. È importante precisare come agli occhi di Kymlicka questa teoria non vada a snaturare i principi liberali, in quanto mantiene comunque una certa distanza dal multiculturalismo, riconosce l'importanza fondamentale che la cultura e quindi anche l'appartenenza a un gruppo abbiano nella formazione della personalità individuale, ma non pone tutta l'enfasi di questo ragionamento sul concetto di gruppo, il fine ultimo rimane sempre l'individuo e la sua libertà di scegliere di perseguire ciò che è meglio per lui in un contesto di totale uguaglianza e libero da ogni costrizione. Secondo Kymlicka i diritti di gruppo dovrebbero essere parte integrante di uno stato liberale in quanto egli ripone molta poca fiducia nel concetto di neutralità dello stato, per lui infatti questo è solo un mito, poiché qualsiasi decisione da parte del governo in riguardo ad ambiti come la lingua nazionale o i simboli statali, inesorabilmente finisce per promuovere gli ideali di vita che sono condivisi dalla maggioranza, trascurando i bisogni delle minoranze. Introducendo però la teoria del liberalismo multiculturale è possibile riportare una condizione di uguaglianza reale tra i cittadini senza snaturare l'impegno per il raggiungimento dei valori liberali.

Nel 2006, Willy Kymlicka ha elaborato il "Multiculturalism Policy Index" un parametro volto alla analisi delle politiche multiculturali nelle democrazie liberali nel periodo tra il 1980 e il 2000. Lo studio ha dimostrato che tendenzialmente quasi tutti i paesi liberali occidentali si stanno muovendo verso un sistema più vicino al multiculturalismo, anche se la tendenza non è omogenea, dimostrando come sia in realtà possibile applicare delle norme multiculturali senza snaturare i principi e i valori liberali. Questo ha avuto un risvolto non solo nel riconoscimento simbolico delle minoranze, ma in effettive redistribuzioni del potere politico ed economico, tramite più adeguate politiche di perequazione sociale. Secondo l'esperienza dell'autore, di origini Canadesi, una delle prime nazioni a mettere in atto politiche multiculturali, il liberalismo di stampo multiculturale apporta alla società dei benefici indiscussi, quali una maggiore coesione e un forte senso di solidarietà all'interno della società.

L'opinione degli studiosi del multiculturalismo contrasta molto con le visioni esposte fino a questo punto, in quanto queste vengono definite troppo limitate, avendo come unità ultima di misura l'individuo umano, completamente separato da tutti gli aspetti culturali che lo rendono tale. Il multiculturalismo inoltre, pone molta attenzione nel ruolo che le differenze ricoprono all'interno dei rapporti sociali, una critica mossa al liberalismo in questo senso è proprio la sua negligenza nei confronti di queste, creando un concetto di libertà

e diritti basati solo su quello che omologa gli individui della società. Il concetto di uguaglianza in chiave multiculturalista, invece come suggerito da Bhikhu Parekh, è un'uguaglianza basata su un trattamento differenziale sensibile alle differenze. Anche il concetto di pari opportunità segue questo modello, difatti da un punto di vista multiculturale, le restrizioni imposte da precetti religiosi dovrebbero essere prese in considerazione come delle vere e proprie disabilità fisiche; Una scuola pubblica che vieta l'uso del Hijab per esempio sta promuovendo una norma insensibile alle differenze e negando il diritto all'istruzione di un sacco di ragazze di religione musulmana. In un contesto multiculturale, un trattamento differenziale è dunque necessario in quanto, dovuta alla coesistenza di numerosi gruppi culturali diversi il dissenso si può manifestare in forme molto diverse. Per poter realizzare i propositi del multiculturalismo è quindi essenziale oltrepassare ogni forma di Liberalismo, anche nelle sue versioni più multiculturali, di fatto anche la teoria di Kymlicka per Parekh non rappresenta una vera forma di liberalismo, ma solo una teoria sul pluralismo culturale. Inoltre Kymlicka, nonostante faccia un importantissimo lavoro nel riconoscere l'importanza della cultura, per lui questa rimane meramente uno strumento per il raggiungimento degli scopi dettati dai principi liberali, mentre per gli studiosi del multiculturalismo questa è un fine che è necessario raggiungere a causa del suo valore intrinseco e non solo ausiliare. Per Parekh i vantaggi apportati alla società un contesto multiculturale, sono estremamente positivi in quanto ampliano gli orizzonti della società e la arricchiscono. Tutte le società liberal-democratiche inesorabilmente tendono all'esclusione, questo poiché essendo fondate su un forte senso di carattere identitario nazionale, sono destinate a venire destabilizzate ogni qual volta si aggiunga una nuova minoranza etnica e culturale. Il responso automatico a questo fenomeno è quello di chiusura ed eventualmente di esclusione nei confronti dei gruppi minoritari. Per questo il raggiungimento di una società multiculturale può essere solo il frutto del superamento dei valori liberali.

Un contesto di questo genere, predispone le basi per quello che è stato teorizzato da Parekh come il dialogo interculturale, l'unico strumento moralmente giusto attraverso il quale una società multiculturale può venire a capo di qualsiasi conflitto creatosi. In qualsiasi società fiorisca una molteplicità di culture è impensabile che vi sia un consenso unanime su ogni decisione presa, per questo è necessario un approccio dialogico tra le varie parti in disaccordo. Il dialogo interculturale inizia mettendo in discussione i valori portanti della società, quelli che attualmente godono di maggior consenso, e si procede a cercare di capire se questi siano effettivamente valori giusti o mere convenzioni sociali, in questo processo non ci sono concetti che sono giusti o sbagliati a priori, lo scopo è quello di analizzarli da vari punti di vista per poterli comprendere più a fondo. Il dialogo deve essere bifocale, il che significa che i punti di vista di entrambe la maggioranza e la minoranza devono essere prese in considerazione nello stesso modo, senza nessun vantaggio di uno sull'altro dato da una superiorità numerica, questo processo mira a sdoganare tutte quelle cose che a sembrano scontate, ciò che si pensa giusto a prescindere, lo scopo è quello di poter rielaborare lo stesso concetto sotto diversi punti di vista, per un approccio più critico e arricchito dal pensiero di chi rappresenta una voce di diversità all'interno della società.

Ognuno di questi tre approcci presenta delle teorie molto dettagliate sulla medesima necessità della protezione della diversità culturale. Ciascuno di essi fa questo con una serie di priorità che riflettono i propri valori fondanti, lo scopo di questo elaborato non è quello di suggerire che una di queste tre teorie sia effettivamente più giusta o completa delle altre due menzionate, ma quello di avvicinare il lettore alla complessità del dibattito.