

HAS MULTICULTURALISM BEATED THE NATIONALISM?: EUROPEAN SAMPLE

Özge KOÇ*

ABSTRACT

In this study, it was analysed that multiculturalism, which globalization has offered as a solution to cultural differences, has triggered again nationalism in the process of bringing national identities into the forefront again with postmodernism. In the historical process, various cultural policies have been applied over national identities and attempts have been made to solve identity crises based on different acceptances in the lived period. Thus, modernity with nation-state political form has attempted to create a homogeneous nation identity by destroying the sub-identities; likewise the postmodern thought is continuing to take steps towards eliminating upper identity by putting a global ideology that will disrupt social integrity with the emphasis on cultural identities and differences. Multiculturalism, which one of the identity politics of globalization, is pushing the nation-state structure and raising the representation crises of different identities. This identity politics as a solution also carries the risk of turning into nationalism. In this study, it was analyzed that the different understandings of multiculturalism in Europe create this risk rather than reconciliation.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Identity, Nationalism, Globalization.

Citation: KOÇ, Ö. (2023). "Has Multiculturalism Beated The Nationalism?: European Sample", *HABITUS Journal of Sociology*, (4), 73-92.

Atıf: KOÇ, Ö. (2023). "Çok Kültürlülük Milliyetçiliği Yendi Mi?: Avrupa Örneği", *HABITUS Toplum Bilim Dergisi*, (4), 73-92.

Başvuru / Received: 30 Ocak 2023 / 30 January 2023

Kabul / Accepted: 08 Mart 2023 / 08 March 2023

Derleme Makale / Review Article.

INTRODUCTION

The bankruptcy of modernist policies that aimed at creating a homogeneous society since the 17th century and regarded social differences as a security problem and the negativities caused by these policies have led to the emergence of new theories in order to be provided peaceful coexistence in the 20th century. Together with post-modern theory, these steps, which have been taken from homogeneous nations towards pluralist states, have been tried to come into effect since 1970's, in order to remove these negativities and to continue the leadership of global values.

Along with globalization, it has been lived a multicultural world process in which people enter into the effort to rediscover their own cultures. The most important problem that this process has brought is the confrontation of upper and lower identities with local identities coming into the forefront against desired or intended global values and norms. One of the most important reasons for this situation is undoubtedly modernity has suppressed some identities

* Araştırma Görevlisi, Bandırma Onyeddi Eylül Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, E-mail: okoc@bandirma.edu.tr, ORCID Number: 0000-0002-9932-5432

and cultures in the name of standardization for centuries, and also the practices of postmodernity that extolling the cultural differences against this separatist politics. The global world that has fallen into the crisis has been faced with the danger of disintegration of social integrity. In the case of this global and local conflict, it was needed a new political restoration, thus and so multiculturalism has become a current issue. The inadequacies of this new understanding which have been disuccessed success rate is able to observed on the lack of the qualities and number of societies that learn to the tolerant, the multi-ethnic, multilingual, multi-religion and coexistence of life that desired in today's world.

Path to Multiculturalism

Many understandings and practices from the partial understanding of primitive societies to the pluralistic understanding of pre-modern empires that have more than one language, religion, ethnicity and culture together; from the ideology of homogeneity of modern society to the transnational rhetoric of globalization, has existed in order to similarities and/or differences to live together peacefully. But the competitive environment has caused the order of the medieval empires, which have a tradition of holding multi-religious, multilingual and multicultural societies, to leave its place entirely to the nation-states, especially with the years following the French Revolution. In this transition phase from the universalism to the particularism in the form of government, the nationalism movement has undoubtedly played a major role. The real aim in nationalism is the existence of symbols and the providing of adaptation of these symbols to show that rulers and rulers are "identical identities" with each other. Another harmony that such an identity brings will be between the state and society, and between the borders and the people / nation. At this point, nation-states emerge and succeed in identifying the people with themselves, they even convince people to die for themselves (Ongur 2011: 55-57).

With the emergence of the nation-state on the stage of history, politics for differences have been practiced almost monotonously around the world. This is originated the fact that the nation-state builds on a culture that basically identifies itself. As a result of this construction, differences in society, in other words, subcultures have begun to take on a different significance before the nation-state, and in many cases these subcultures have been interpreted as threatening elements of the cultural unity ideal (Örücü 2011: 64).

The single-centered, single-identity and monocultural construction that seen in all societies that are influenced by the modernity process and embraced the nation-state form has brought many problems together. The problems have begun to emerge in the countries that

Has Multiculturalism Beated The Nationalism?: European Sample

received migration and contain the different ethnic, cultural societies in itself (Durdu, 2010: 34). The obligation that nation-states create unity inside and uncover differences outside has caused problems among peoples, and eventually wars. In other words, when operation of homogenization inside is regarded as a project carried out together with externalization outside, this system has begun to harm the future of the global system by means of cause conflicts. What kind of problems this security perception of the nationalist currents will cause in the world (and especially in Europe) is understood by the competition of armament and colonization and the subsequent destructive wars. Thus, federalism, functionalism, transactionalism, neo-functionalism, supra-institutionalism, and interstateism, which encourage the nation-states to overtake their security obsessions, have emerged at the time of trying to embrace the wounds of the two world wars (Ongur 2011: 58-59).

Reactions to the process of modernity, which began to be interrogated and criticized in particular in the 1960s, have begun to make the modern society and state structure transform and yawm by bringing along new seekings. The postmodernism that emerged in these periods forced the nation-state to change by questioning and criticizing modernity in almost all directions. Thus, the repressed, ignored, unrecognized communities have begun to talk and many communities search for ways to gain their immigrant identities and other rights. The phenomenon of globalization, which seems to be the most important factor in the process of questioning postmodernity and nation-state in the 1980s, has increased the pressures on the nation-state and also the voice of different identity demands by influencing economic, cultural and political fields (Durdu 2010: 34-35).

Postmodern theory emphasizes the multiplicity of races, cultures, genres, sexuality and it insists that every element has equal representative in competence, that no style can dominate the other. This atmosphere that created by the postmodernity will soon generate the basis of legitimate for multicultural politics in which differences are sanctified. The pluralistic society design that this theory put forward has started a process that transforms by means of remove some of the anti-modern elements such as community, tradition, commitment to its own creed and roots and nationality which are something that modernity has tried to destroy once, from being in the category of condemned things. This process has also allowed the long-term oppressed social groups, identities and ethnicities to find opportunities to express themselves (Şan 2005: 73).

On the basis of the discussions of multiculturalism, it is seen that this phenomenon is actually related to the great migration waves that emerged during the 20th century, and the great

ethnic diversity that the colonial empires leaved behind (Touraine, 2004: 208). The main aim of these discussions, under a very general title such as human rights, is preventing that states exclude the groups that have differences such as nationality, ethnicity, religion, language and race in state. According to Ongur, contradictory situations, such as immigration, impose political units that can live together in multiple cultures, languages, religions or traditions. In this sense it is possible to define multiculturalism as the recognition of all ethnic, cultural, linguistic, racial, religious and/or individual differences in a society in political and public sense. The main distinction that distinguishes multiculturalism from pluralism is that it wants to apply the principles such as democracy, individualism and universal equality of people that idealized by the 20th century, not because of individual differences, but because of these differences. The behind of multiculturalism whose main motto is equality and difference, lies in the desire to break away from the traditional (nationalist) sense of identity that suggests that more than one culture can not coexist within boundaries (Ongur 2011: 60-61).

According to Vatandaş (2001: 104), multiculturalism is a new seeking that is from assimilation to the melting pot with the aim of search of a new model of social adaptation and stability. The model of multiculturalism has emerged as a new model, that is partly between the models of social adaptation and stability that overlapping with melting pot. In this new model, none of the elements that create the phenomenon that combine by means of melt into one another. In this combination or mixture, each element continues to preserve its originality and they create a new phenomenon with the help of some common elements between them.

According to Taylor (1994: 36), the equal recognition that is the principle of multiculturalism is not only a suitable mode for a healthy democratic society, it is also an application that can harm those who deny it. In this respect, the post-1970 period was a time when the participation of different groups in political, cultural and social life became a global problem (Ongur 2011: 67). Parekh (2000: 7-9) mentions about four important points while distinguishing between the present and the past about minorities. The first of these is that minorities are demanding more, including political rights to equality today, while they are willing to accept the rights that the dominant groups in the past have given them. Second, by learning from past experiences of pain, the culture is understood in terms of politics. The third is that cultural diversity is an inevitable universal reality, thanks to the influence of globalization that links societies and cultures. The last point is that modern multicultural societies emerged after the idea of a homogenizing nation-state, leading to astonishment about which principles nation-states would respond to minority demands.

Has Multiculturalism Beated The Nationalism?: European Sample

For this reason, multiculturalism first begins by recognizing the importance of cultural and cultural identity. It then accepts that all cultures in society are valuable and seeks to find a formula that cultures, cultural belonging, cultural groups and cultural group members can live morally defensible and equally socially. Multiculturalism has been criticized too much in the theory of politics, despite advocating that the differences must live with dominant culture in an equal way. The practice of multiculturalism has been criticized in a wide variety of ways such as incoherent in itself, the new face of global capitalism and trying to destroy the gained universal human rights etc. (Barin 2016: 59).

Ziyaüddin Serdar, a name that draws attention with his writings on postmodern culture, advocates a similar view. According to him, the greatest assertion of postmodernism was to reestablish and centralize the culture and identities, which were alienated by modernity and pushed outside the system. However, although everybody claims to be equally distant and impartial, it is not in fact that. Postmodernism creates multicultural deception and illusion by reducing all cultures and traditions to a single field (Duman 2009: 100).

Qualities of multiculturalism that is distinctive in the form of communities, standardize the individualities in its community with religious or moral values, and transform society into micro-communities. As a result, multiculturalism also falls to the totalitarianism of the nation-state structure it criticized, ignoring the individual (Durdu 2010: 47). According to Taylor (1994: 43), the fact that the policy of equality is so-called neutral is, in fact, a reflection of a hegemony culture. The result is that only minorities or repressed cultures are forced to take foreign forms. So, the so-called fair and nondiscriminating approach makes society highly discriminatory not only in inhumanity (because of the suppression of identities) but at the same time subtle and unconscious.

In terms of multiculturalism and minority politics, a long-term multicultural life and the decision-maker of minority rights have to be society's themselves. It will not be possible to speak of a real multiculturalism or a functioning minority regime, unless the social dynamics that have wriggled from the political framework and have achieved to put together a willingness to live together. Thus, both processes can not go beyond being a state project that contains both an open and a hidden nationalism (Ongur 2011: 72-73).

Globalization and Culture Debates

The developments and innovations in the globalizing world, knowledge and communication affect not only through economic, political and cultural struggles between

countries but also by leading to the new legitimacy searching on different ethnic, religious and sectarian identities by means of underline the partiality. This negative effect of globalization on cultural structures is due to the homogenization of cultural structures and the creation of a cultural blend by reproducing them again. This negative effect of globalization on cultural structures is due to the homogenization of cultural structures and the creation of a cultural blend by reproducing them again. Thus, the cultural elements that become fluid in the global world can be open to being driven by global forces. So the globalization process is driving the nation states into a controllable position, blurring their legitimacy. Here the phenomenon of globalization, on the one hand, imposes a single-cultural approach, on the other hand, a dual process that opens the door to diversity. This situation creates the basis for the emergence of new struggles and conflicts that feed on the divergence of the ideology of globalization, but also on the identity discourse based on these dualities among societies (Duman 2007: 5-6).

In this formation, it is seriously discussed that the national state has lost its function and even constituted an obstacle for restructuring. Globalization, makes the nation-state nonfunctional in the social and, in particular, the economic arena. As the nation-state's glue function that holds the different social segments together diminishes, the increasing need for solidarity in the face of impoverishment and marginalization brings the sub-cultures into the forefront. There is no reason to depend on this state in terms of the different ethnic-religious identities within the society in an environment where the national marketplace has left its place to international market, since the nation-state is not able to fulfill its basic functions to provide for prosperity of citizens. Ethnic identity leads to great chaos at regional and national level becoming radicalized, by means of turning into ethnic nationalism and develop political arguments. Thus, nationalism, on the one hand, undertakes a unifying function as the ideology of the established nation-state, on the other hand it functions a disruptive function as the ideology of ethnic groups that want to establish a nation-state (Sönmez 2012: 129).

In this sense, globalization provides the ground for the recognition of different identities, while it increasingly distract the homogenous state myth from reality and making the diversity within states more open. However, this development also brought the objection to the discourse of multiculturalism. This situation has transformed the identity inadequacy imposed by the homogenizing ideology of modernity into a crisis, and globalization and postmodern discourses have made this a global problem. Thus, these developments brought about the politicization of local identity demands (Duman 2007: 6-7).

Besides this, the second effect of cultural globalization, in addition to the effect of homogenizing the societies, is completely contrary to it is to strengthen the micro-nationalist movements and local cultures. In other words, the homogenization of the societies has brought along paradoxically localization and clinging the local cultural values. On the contrary, globalization, which creates the anticipation it will end nationalism with its transformative influence the social and political life, leads to micro-nationalisms by solving the homogenizing nature of nationalism and also increase the national antagonism of the nation that is concerned about the loss of integrity. The change that globalism has created on national ideas, values and institutions has led to a attitude that nationalism towards the anti-globalization (Sönmez 2012: 130).

The weakening of national identity along with globalization means that this social identity is dispersed. In the cultural world of postmodernism, the traditional constructive and unifying powers of national identities are depleted in the face of plural identities. National identities do not have the integrative meaning like in the past. Ultimately, identity is being rebuilt, formed and invented in the changing new postmodern society conditions (Hall, 1998: 57). New identities that emerging in the new global public sphere are formed around women, religion, environment, human rights and ethnicity in their most common forms. The phenomenon emerging as a counter reaction to the rise of sub-identities is rising nationalisms, xenophobia and racism (Sönmez 2012: 129).

Politics of multiculturalism is inviting an end to a environment that allows the new racism that ultimately resulted in the exaltation of singularity in order to emphasize differences. By idealizing ethnic groups, religious communities or racial groups, multiculturalism also creates an isolation that prevents ethnic and minority elements from integrating with the mainstream of society (Şan 2005: 102-106).

Multiculturalism Understandings in Europe

Multicultural society can occur in many different forms. This distinction can affect the approach of states to subcultures, as well as the demands of subcultures from states. This difference also leads us to the conclusion that multiculturalism can mean different meanings for each state at the same time (Barin 2016: 79).

Cultural diversity as a phenomenon in Europe, with it differs in terms of quality, consists of domestic minorities, immigrants, or minorities that have immigrant background and mobilities in the European Union. The first positive traces of multiculturalism in Europe are

seen in the recognition of minorities, which is more prevalent as an internal security problem. Some states in Western Europe and the European Union have begun to grant more rights to minorities for multiculturalism. In the 1990s, the states in Eastern Europe have made many wars to establish a nation-state that have no minority. The most recent actor in multiculturalism in Europe has been the European Union (EU). While countries such as Spain, Germany and Italy from countries that are members of the Union advocate active participation of the association towards minority groups and give them some collective rights; the states such as France, Greece and the Netherlands view minorities as an internal affair and take sides for obstructive policies that disturb the integrity of states (Kösen & Deniz t.y: 3-5).

According to Tekinalp (2005: 77-78), the European Union, on the one hand, has dwelled on the importance of cultural pluralism, while on the other hand it has begun to create a common European identity. This contradictory situation refers to the creation of a common upper European identity over different cultures. This common Europeanness consciousness would facilitate the unification of Europe as an upper European identity. But it emerged it is a dream with the conclusions that taken from practices and no power could overcome national interests. While globalization, privatizations, regional and continental conventions, electronic publishing, and the intergovernmental political and economic interests have created meltings in the powerful state and nation structures, they have fueled nationalist trends on the other side and have blocked to create a common European upper identity on national identity in Europe. The conditions of competition among countries have moved nationalism forward greater extent rather than creating an upper identity. This identity debate in the European countries has opened the door to much different debates with the events in France today. The postmodernist savior “multiculturalism”, which once embraced the monolingual identity of the tolerance principle for identities in the framework of mutual understanding, has been more closely examined for the benefits and harms invested in the events in France.

Approaches to multiculturalism still show great differences between EU member states because they relate to different national experiences regarding the concepts of state formation and citizenship. For this reason, multiculturalism as an approach is far from being universal. Diversity can be represented by three different models, but EU member states can work on more than one element. The first is an assimilationist model that resists multiculturalism in favor of solidarity. In this model, it is expected that the minority groups assimilate to the dominant culture of the host society. In fact, France, which is multicultural in principle, is often regarded as the ideal-typical example of this model; but many countries have adopted elements of the

assimilation model at certain times in their history. The second model, on the contrary, grants rights not only to individuals but also to collective ethnic and religious groups. In this model, which is called multiculturalism, diversity is celebrated and accepted as a permit instead of a temporary phenomenon. This is a relatively new approach and has become popular to adapt to increasingly multiculturalism in countries such as the UK, the Netherlands and Sweden, even though they are not aware of any consequences of a particular political decision or the host population. Today, however, the multicultural model is criticized more and more for being a monologue for all the difficulties of hosting a multicultural society, largely because it promotes alienation of minority groups in society. In particular, after the murder of Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh in the UK, and after the terrorist attacks in London, it was began to seriously withdraw from this policy and search for a new model for social cohesion. (Aggestam & Hill 2008: 103-104)

The third model is exclusionary for immigrants. Germany and Austria have been associated with this model for years. The immigrants had very limited rights to eventually return to their own country. Ironically, however, Germany will host one of the largest immigrant populations of any EU state. This is partly a large number of guest workers (mostly from Turkey), and was partly explained by liberal constitutional provisions concerning the right of asylum. On the one hand, the development of a more restrictive EU policy framework on asylum has provided an appropriate “overlap” where Germany could limit liberal legislation on asylum. On the other hand, European integration has given way to the emergence of a more civic and republican citizenship model on the basis of “post-national identity” and constitutional patriotism (Aggestam & Hill 2008: 105).

According to Yaylacı (2017: 353), multiculturalism is used in a narrow sense in Britain and Europe. This situation is not the result of a political struggle, but as a consequence of immigration with migrations of non-whites to the countries of the whites and the countries and societies become multicultural. According to Ongur (2011: 69), the structural, social, historical and geopolitical differences between the west and east of continent still remain to preserve their currentness. These differences have also led to the spread of multiculturalism on the continent in different ways. While Western European and EU member states (except for some countries such as France and Greece) have begun to take the multiculturalism experience from minority groups and to define more rights to these groups, Eastern Europe has passed the 1990s with small scaled wars in the process of establishing the non-minority nations.

Despite the positive atmosphere of multiculturalism in the late 1990s reflected in the discourse of the political authorities, the positive atmosphere with the 2000s left its place to a negative atmosphere. European societies have begun to display a more negative approach in recent years in the face of the phenomenon of new multiculturalism resulting from immigration and immigration. Even some politicians have declared the official death of multiculturalism. It can be said that in this situation there is effect of some terrorist incidents, such as the uprisings in England, which started in the early 21st century, and the September 11 attacks. After 11 September, which is a kind of a milestone academically and politically, the opposition of multiculturalism has become stronger, while the views that multiculturalism has not produced values for coexistence have intensified. At the same time, this situation is not limited to a single country. Critics relating to multiculturalism are also closely related to Muslims' presence and activity. The scientific validity of the arguments on the necessity of cultural definition of multiculturalism has been intensively discussed in terms of political advantages and disadvantages and why these policies are not popular at the public (Yaylacı 2017: 354).

In terms of Tekinalp (2005: 79), news about the failure of multiculturalism has interestingly come from a European that is inventor of multiculturalism. The education of ethnic groups in their native language was ended with the reason that it made adjustment difficult. For 30 years, broadcast that made from public channel NPS for 45 minutes in every evening in Turkish language has been shortened to 45 minutes in every week. The rationale was that such broadcast hindered the Turks' adaptation to society. MTNL television, which broadcasts half an hour every week in the 4 largest cities of the Netherlands, was converted into Dutch broadcast from January 2006. There is a deviation from the philosophy of multiculturalism, which has been threatened with great respect before in Europe under the harmonization politics; but on the other hand, the instruments of discriminatory policies are playing. After the attacks of September 11th, multiculturalism leaves its place to discriminatory discourse. The fears that have been in the minds throughout history are slowly externalizing. In fact, even there are those who define it as a modern apartheid. We can also say that it is a new racism that is becoming more noticeable in its apparent image. Tolerance and toleration are gradually decreasing to strangers on the media the streets, and the new racism is based on identity and differences of religion.

The attitudes of some countries in the face of multiculturalism are in the center of criticisms of this policy. The examples of England and France give us interesting results. In Britain, the ratio of many different cultural societies exceeds 6% of the population, and

Has Multiculturalism Beated The Nationalism?: European Sample

multiculturalism in this country is subject to harsh criticism, especially by the conservative wing. According to the conservative wing, England has developed a different culture that has been kept together centrally for centuries thanks to largely national identity and this position must be maintained. Britain is not a multicultural society according to the British conservatives because they refuse the arguments that minority cultures are as important as in the same sense as the majority identity, and these identities must be respected, protected and even encouraged to be assimilated over time. But contrary to conservatives, English liberals do not see a problem in the accepting of this definition (Parekh 2002: 8).

But in another European country, France, the situation is completely different in terms of multicultural politics. France does not see itself as a pluralistic society, despite the fact that it receives much more immigration than any other European country. In this country, multiculturalism is rejected without a liberal and conservative distinction. Despite the physical presence of cultural diversity in France, there are some explanations for condemnation to conceptual absence. The revolutionary structure of the republican nation state rooted in this country comes first. The quality of French nationalism created after the political struggle against the church and the ancien regime is shed light on the subject. This perception of nationalism was largely extolling as populist and the community of citizens dedicated to a cause. This new national identity that created, prioritise to embracing of the specific ideals beyond coming from French blood as religious, ethnically or historically: The person, as a republican, was also French in the new sense of the word; when the revolutionary spirit was at its peak, foreigners were welcomed at least periodically (Walzer 1998 trans. from: Şan 2005: 101).

According to the French political tradition based on the idea of a strong citizenship, being a French citizen means being free to relate to the French nation and having the same rights and duties as other citizens. Thus, the French tradition is a structure that recognizes only citizens and does not give minorities the right to live in public space. Citizens are not included in a minority that is organized, isolated and more or less permanent, even if they are in any minority. France have not seen any inconveniency in accepting this approach of minorities because the basic perception of France is based on the assumption that the values of French culture are merely values that are universal validity, not merely French values. Such a culture, of course, could have justifications for recognizing multiculturalism as a policy that means accepting different representations of minorities in society's life (Parekh 2002: 8-9).

Although social diversity has been highlighted by Western political scientists, especially since the late 1970s, there is no definition of a functioning "diversity" or society, which is

considered a universal principle. Although multiculturalism is sensitive to the recognition of different groups and the new rights to be designed for these groups, they are tightlipped about who these groups may be. For example, Kymlicka keeps immigrant groups and guest workers that he considers the reasons for being in the country as “voluntary” away from the issue of new rights design. According to him, the voluntary immigration to a country must bring together voluntary assimilation (with the individual rights of the country and the individual rights granted to them). Indigenous peoples or colonized cultures who live in a country without a migration route but with different characteristics from the majority of that country should benefit from institutional, linguistic, religious, social, political, administrative, economic and even recreational privileges that will help them to protect their social cultures. In this sense, it should be noted that multiculturalism has observed the difference level of analysis that is between voluntary immigration and being connected to historical ties to the same piece of land. However, since ethnic identities can change depending on time and space, the concepts of ethnicity and culture can not be used as if they have a correlate with each other. Therefore, if groups are given special rights due to their political ties, as Kymlicka suggests, it is expected that these rights should be subjected to a continuous revaluation, which would be an action that could disrupt the unbalance of multicultural societies (Ongur 2011: 65-66).

The marginalising of local or immigrant groups is functional in the development of national identity, the attainment and consolidation of national integrity. The immigrant is the “other” which is a potential threat; because it transcends national borders and defies classification within a group of cultures, borders, and ethnicities, and in the form of citizens and others. In other words, this challenge of the immigrant has the danger of “polluting” the unity and authenticity of its group (Triandafyllidou 2014: 42).

However, the process of marginalization becomes active only if the immigrant belongs to certain groups. The common characteristics of “outside-groups” in this case are ethnic, cultural, religious, or racial characteristics that distinguish them from subordinate positions within the society and from the dominant national group, but these characteristics are not why they are perceived as menacing external groups. On the contrary, the difference depends on context: while religious features are valid in one situation (e.g. anti-Muslim anti-British sensitivity), ethnicity can be emphasized in another situation (e.g. prejudices against Albanians in Greece). Often, two categorizations can interfere with each other in a manner that reduces or enhances the difference. Therefore, Christian Orthodox Bulgarian or Russian immigrants in Greece are seen as less threatening than Turkish Muslims or Muslim Albanians. On the other

hand, while discrimination against Muslims in the UK is considered to be racially or religiously expressed until recently, now Muslims can be perceived as threatening others because of their religious beliefs (Triandafyllidou 2014: 44-45).

The 1990s, at least for Western Europe, meant the process of incorporating minorities into the concept of citizenship. In other words, in Western European countries the definition of people has begun to point to the whole of people living in those countries, rather than describing only ethnic, religious, linguistic or historical ties, or a nation. However, this understanding has been conducted more security oriented. On the other hand, according to Ongur (2011: 65-72), it can be said that, even if they have a direct reference to multiculturalism, most of the European states have a regime of protecting minority rights of one kind or another. It can be argued that it is possible to talk about the legal existence of minority rights and the concept of protection for all Europe, based on all kinds of discrimination opposition, especially in the EU and candidate countries, where the multicultural minority rights appearing as an extension of the human rights regime after 1945. Multiculturalism refers to the fact that minorities are “national minorities”, and that this measure of adherence is related to the desire to live together with the land, language and history unity within a group called “social culture”. It should be accepted that the definition of multiculturalism is highly subjective and the subject who makes this definition must o be the state’s itself that will provide certain rights to groups that meet that definition. It is a left to the states which nations will determine their fate once again. Placing multiculturalism and minority politics in the notion of nationalism finds out a paradoxical Picture.

Instead of a common European minority regime, the picture that reveals the minority regimes of the European states should in essence be unobtrusive in the structure of multiculturalism that is more or less in line with the federal states. However, the real problem lies in the minority of states that they choose or define (or that they do not choose / define as they are in France, Greece, Bulgaria, etc.). While some groups, such as Basque, Catalans, Scots, Irish, Welsh, Sami, Frisians, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovenes, Romanians or Poles can benefit from positive discrimination; Roman citizens and other indigenous peoples, such as Russian speakers in the Baltic States, have been subjected to humiliating treatment, such as social discrimination, employment, law paths, bureaucracy, and even citizenship (Pogany, trans. from 2006: Ongur, 2011: 74). Although the countries like Western Europe, Spain, Italy and Sweden are more generous in granting rights to different groups, there is no mention of minority rights in Greece and France. Belgium and the Netherlands are precisely avoiding harmonizing their

rules with Europe in order not to disrupt their different multicultural, multi-ethnic and multilingual structures. Minority rights debates in countries like Finland, Portugal and Luxembourg, which already have almost identical nations, do not create an important domestic policy agenda. The federal states, such as Austria and Germany, apply policies similar to those in Australia or Canada to settled minorities (Ongur 2011: 73).

The situation of other groups that not accepted as minority groups in the European context should also be discussed, except the approach, given by the multicultural theory, that given a limited number of minority and has left this appreciation to state monopoly groups. These groups include guest workers and immigrants in European countries. Western European states are not only migrating from continental countries, but also from countries like Poland and Hungary, which are EU members today. The European states have to offer to the workers that they demand, immigrants and even today illegal asylum seekers who provides them to play a leading role in their sporting successes, a “model of dealing with social differences” to deal with their problems such as language, religion, tradition, unemployment and citizenship. Today, in countries like Germany, France, the Netherlands and Great Britain, it is imposes unilateral and binding treaties against migrants, guest workers and their families. The German and Dutch governments are preparing citizenship exams, aiming at guest workers living in countries for many years, like Estonia and Latvia that have previously been criticized by them. The French government is openly putting into practice the racist politics against African origin workers and immigrants in the country and seemed determined to expel Roman citizens and even it is declaring that “multiculturalism is a mistake and bankruptcy” (Ongur 2011: 76).

European multiculturalism does not regard Muslims as a separate minority group, just as the multicultural theory predicts. Appropriate adjectives for them are sought in areas such as immigrants, guest workers and refugees. As mentioned above, European multiculturalism does not offer anything beyond basic human rights to these “voluntary” migrants, and even when the issue comes to Muslim groups, even the provision of basic human rights becomes problematic. Studies in the field, such as unemployment rates, low educational levels, unhealthy living conditions, poverty and social institutions to provide for the application of linguistic, religious and cultural differences, have shown that European Muslims have been exposed serious discrimination even in developed countries such as France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands (Cesari 2007).

Thus, with Erdogan’s expression (1998: 188), “the integration policy also creates an impact on the dissolution of society and the disintegration of its cultural integrity. By extension,

cultural diversity in today's societies is increasingly perceived as more value, and this has weakened the unity of political understanding".

As we have seen, intellectuals who thinks over the ideological and cultural meaning of the EU ideal are generally associated with European self-centeredness, nationalism and racism. We need to open up the idea that media policies also serve this understanding. The "barbarians" of ancient history are now replaced by "the other", which is a softer term and includes Eastern, African immigrants and Islam (Tekinalp 2005: 83). How accurate is it to speak of pluralism in such a world?

European citizenship based on national citizenship, by definition, recognizes different nations and minority groups as part of Europe and the EU. Ideally, EU citizenship provides the appropriate normative and institutional framework for member states to establish their own multi-nationalist perspectives and to identify the dynamic and internal diversity of majority and minority groups. All the same, EU citizenship and European identity have been privileged to the weak form of multi-nationalism until now. While the special needs of "old" local minorities are accepted and guaranteed, the demands of the new "others", especially the immigrant minorities and immigrants, are not welcomed internally. Especially in the last crisis conjuncture, these requests have become scapegoat. This situation is valid for European Muslims, especially Muslim populations of post-migration ethnic minorities and the "illegitimate other" in many European countries. Existing institutional and political regulations that can meet the needs of historical minorities remain incapable to meet the needs of these groups (Triandafyllidou 2014: 54).

Consequently, contrary to the claims of some academic circles, nationalism has not suffered a heavy defeat against multiculturalism and has lost only a few positions. Even if we read this tension, it does not seem irrational to say that "nationalism has fallen in order to regain power". From this point of view, nationalism will continue to be a phenomenon that is still keeping up to date in today's global world (Şan & Öğür 2016: 141).

CONCLUSION

Multiculturalism, as a reaction to these modernity projects, has emerged as a design that finds itself in a suitable space in the shadow of postmodernism. But the project of multicultural citizenship is carried a lot of problems in its structure. This system is far from providing a satisfactory explanation as it has a dimension that ignores values such as solidarity, equal

chances of survival and altruism, and is not very sensitive to the sense of culture, tradition, community, origin and belonging.

While it comes to the fore how national unity and cohesion can be achieved in a society of such a differentiated state, the possibility of seeing people only as individuals without considering their ethnic or national identity is ignored. Not only marginalization create a problem, the things that also done in the name of diversity creates problems; important thing is the attitudes that will prevent the division besides the accentuated cultural recognition (which applies not only to settlers but also to immigrants). The most important of these is not to spread fear with the propaganda that the differences will take to divide. The solution is not to ignore or exaggerate the differences, but to lead to the common good with the treatment that will create the love of citizenship throughout the people. Here too, the greatest role falls to the states first, then to society that has tolerance and respect for the fact that everyone has an identity. This is because unless recognizing of the equal value of different identities is basic value, internal of these values become empty.

In addition to being recognized, being active in national issues, not becoming introverted is an important and necessary element. If a well functioning public sphere with open communication structures that allow and encourage spontaneous discussion in multicultural societies can evolve on the basis of voluntary associations, the democratic process of achieving equal individual rights will also be prolonged. It is necessary to guarantee the right to live together with different ethnic groups and their cultural life forms. This does not necessitate a specific justification or alternative principle because it can not be guaranteed without preserving the integrity of people's legal entity, the shared experiences where people socialise and develop their identity of the individual and life contexts. As Taylor expresses (1994: 129), the identity of an individual can be stabilized in a cultural network that is intertwined with collective identities and can not be allocated as private property more than the native language.

As a result, multiculturalism does not seem to be a very universal policy to promote a general model of the whole nations on the earth beyond any absolutization, with accepting the circumstances that can present the necessary way out for some societies. The multiculturalism approach expressed by ethnic mosaic, fruit salad, vegetable soup metaphors that appropriated for countries with emerging immigrants from more or less the world's mainland, such as the US, Canada and Australia that have historical roots based on two or three century, it does not seem to be a correct approach to say that for the societies that carry the thousands of years

historical heritage, that have housed elements that won a seat the same homeland and that developed a different ethos of coexistence.

Differences and cultural diversity are of course beautiful, but the only possible way of experiencing this is not the multicultural theory of politics. Multiculturalism and mosaic metaphors as members of a society that have created in the past a political tradition that everyone can live in peace with their different belongings and have seen differences as a source of wealth and vitality are not compatible with the whole society structure we have created in the past. This is not just for us, but for many communities. Although the mosaic has created a structure in which each participant reflects its own color to the whole in a certain measure, it remains so intolerant that it can be dismissed at any moment. But the situation of fusion is different. No element express a meaning as far from the other. Such an approach, however, should not come to mean that ignoring of every society that sees itself in the minority according to the great assembly. To meet the needs of these minority elements and to provide living conditions in proper with human and universal norms should be the main responsibilities of the states. However, this does not pass from increasing the number of existing ethnicities and by differentiating them by subjecting individuals living in the society to the census of identity. There is a need to find ways to reconcile legitimate unity and diversity claims, to be inclusive without assimilation, to create a common sense of belonging while respecting the legitimate cultural differences of their citizens, and to protect pluralistic cultural identities without harming the shared identity of shared and valuable citizenship.

It will not be possible to speak of a true multiculturalism or a functioning minority regime unless social dynamics have eradicated from the political framework and have driven away from an understanding of the concept of “hospitality”, such as “tolerance”, and have begun to put together a willingness to live together. The word forbearance is condemned to face its own limit either way or another. The foreigner will accept the foreigner up to a certain point and therefore within the restrictions. In this way, both processes can not go beyond being a state project that contains both an open and a hidden nationalism.

REFERENCES

- Aggestam, L., Hill, C. (2008). The Challenge of Multiculturalism in European Foreign Policy, *International Affairs*, 84(1), 97-114.
- Barın, T. (2016). Farklılıkların Bir Arada Yaşamasında Liberal Bir Yaklaşım: Çokkültürlülük Teorisi, *Yıldırım Beyazıt Hukuk Dergisi*, (2), 57-87.

- Cesari, J. (2007). Muslim Identities in Europe: The Snare of Exceptionalism, A. Al-Azmeh ve E. Fokas (Ed.), *Islam in Europe: Diversity, Identity and Influence* içinde (49-67), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duman, M. Z. (2007). Modernden Post-Moderne Geçişte Kimlik Tartışmaları ve Çokkültürlülük, *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 4(13), 3-24.
- Duman, M. Z. (2009). Küreselleşme, Kimlik ve Çokkültürlülük, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), 93-112.
- Durdu, Z. (2010). Küresel Siyaset ve Çokkültürcülük, *YDÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 27-50.
- Hall, S. (1998). Yerel ve Küresel: Küreselleşme ve Etniklik, Kültür, A. D. King (Der.), *Küreselleşme ve Dünya-Sistemi* içinde (39-61), Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Kösen, İ., Deniz, T. (t.y.). Avrupa'da Çokkültürlülüğün Çöküşü ve Milliyetçiliğin Artması.
- Ongur Ö. H. (2011). Avrupa'da Çokkültürlülük İflası (Mı), *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika Dergisi*, 7(26), 55-85.
- Örücü, E. (2011). Diverse Cultures and Official Laws: Multiculturalism and Euroscepticism?, *Law & Justice Review*, 1(2), 63-84.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism- Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, London: Macmillan Press.
- Sönmez S. S. (2012). Dünden Bugüne Milliyetçilik: Küresel Dünyada Yükselen Sesler, *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(3), 117-136.
- Şan, M. K. (2005). Farklılık ve Çokkültürlülük Siyasetleri Üstüne Bir Deneme, *Milel ve Nihal*, 3(1-2), 67-114.
- Şan, M. K., Öğür, B. (2016). Çokkültürlülük Söylemleri ve Milliyetçiliğin Dönüşümü, *Bilgi Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Dergisi*, 11(1), 131-142.
- Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, A. Gutmann (Ed.), Princeton University Press.
- Tekinalp, Ş. (2005). Küreselleşen Dünyanın Bunalımı: Çokkültürlülük, *Journal of İstanbul Kültür University*, 1, 75-87.
- Touraine, A. (2004). *Modernliğin Eleştirisi*, H. Tufan (Çev.), 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2014). Kültürel Çeşitlilik, Çoğul Milliyetçilik ve Avrupa Kimliği, A. Kaya (Der.), *Farklılıkların Birlikteliği: Türkiye ve Avrupa'da Birarada Yaşama Tartışmaları* içinde (41-56), İstanbul: Hiperlink Yayınları.
- Vatandaş, C. (2001). Çok Kültürlü Yapıda Ulusal/Etnik Kimlikler (Kanada Örneği), *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(2), 101-116.
- Yaylacı, F. G. (2017). Süper-Çeşitlilik Çağında Çokkültürcülük, *Hitit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1, 345-364.

