

- I. Rough definition of multiculturalism: Respect, recognition, and accommodation, by majority group, of cultural practices and group identities of ethnocultural minorities
- II. 3 different types of groups to recognize, respect, and accommodate [according to pro-multiculturalism point of view] [typology derived from Will Kymlicka, Canadian political philosopher]:
- A. National minorities: territorially-based groups incorporated into the nation-state by force (in U.S.: Native Americans, Puerto Rico, ethnic Hawaiians. In Canada: First Nations [Native Americans])
 - B. Non-territorially-based ethnic or racial groups brought or incorporated by force (African-Americans, possibly Mexican-Americans. No analogous groups in Europe or Canada)
 - C. Immigrant ethnic groups (and pan-ethnic groups)
 - D. Different models required for each type
- III. Canada
- A. Large, politically and historically important distinct linguistic group – Quebec Province
 - B. First Nations
 - C. Existence of these groups has led to official multiculturalism & polylingualism (more than one official language), i.e. official recognition of *all* ethnic or cultural identities
 - D. This official recognition carries over to new immigrant groups – promotes cultural autonomy and communal identity within ethnic groups
- IV. Britain (UK)
- A. Former colonized people (Afro-Caribbeans, South Asians) are the immigrant groups
 - B. Among the countries discussed in F's article, British are the least welcoming and least tolerant of racial/cultural deviation from dominant and historically definitional "British" type.
 - C. Anti-discrimination law (based on racial model as in U.S.) offers some protection for "Blacks," but applies less well to Muslims, against whom discrimination is more cultural/religious than racial.
 - D. Muslims seek multiculturalist recognition for Islam comparable to what Anglican Christianity has
- V. Germany
- A. German identity and citizenship is based on *ethnic* identity. (Russians who are ethnically German but ancestors left Germany centuries ago are eligible for automatic citizenship, while 3rd generation Turkish Germans have much more trouble becoming citizens)[some changes since F's article]
 - B. So unfriendly to multiculturalism
- VI. France
- A. National identity is *civic* (loyalty to institutions and political ideals) rather than *ethnic* (based on ethnic ancestry, as in Germany)
 - B. Receptive to immigrants (more like US than Germany or Britain)
 - C. Immigrants are expected to assimilate to French culture, which is seen as representing universal human ideals (liberty, equality, fraternity). I.e. immigrants expected to become culturally French (especially if cultural difference is bound up with religion, against French *laïcité*).
 - D. The French are less racist than British or Americans, but more "culturalist," i.e. hostile to (non-French) cultural particularity. So, more prejudice against N. African Muslims than against "blacks" per se
 - E. So France is unfriendly to multiculturalism, but for opposite reason than Germany
- VII. U.S.
- A. For much of US history (ending only in 1952), national identity was racialist (analogy to Germany's ethnic nationalism): Only "whites" could naturalize (though since 1868, birthright citizenship is independent of race and ethnicity).
 - B. But U.S. also has tradition of *civic nationalism* like France.
 - C. Blacks, as racial (not so much as cultural) group, have been the most distinct target of discrimination and unequal treatment. This forces or encourages other groups into a race-like stance (e.g. pan-ethnicity), from both external and internal forces.

D. U.S. as pluralistic nation of immigrants. So more tolerant of cultural plurality than Germany or France. But this tolerance extends primarily within white groups; with non-white, the racial and the cultural/ethnic get mixed up.

1. but linguistic plurality issues

E. Blacks are not analogous to national minorities or immigrant groups. Are closer to a "caste-like" group (segregated, much smaller intermarriage, lower status), although that is not an exact analogy either. But special policies are needed to overcome caste-like status that are not appropriate for any other group in U.S.