

AUGIE FLERAS

Moving Positively Beyond Multiculturalism Toward a Postmulticultural Governance of Complex Diversities in a Diversifying Canada¹

Zusammenfassung

Innovative Regierungs- und Verwaltungsstrukturen geraten angesichts des dramatischen Anstiegs einer aus Migration resultierenden gesellschaftlichen Vielfalt und der wiederum daraus entstehenden Dynamiken zunehmend in Zugzwang. Kanada, als diasporischer Raum, ist von diesen transformativen Ansprüchen an moderne Regierungsführung und dem spannungsreichen Umgang mit sich widersprechenden politischen Prioritäten keineswegs ausgenommen. Die Aufgabe, ein komplexes Geflecht sich überlagernder Identitäten, transmigratorischer Verflechtungen und sich überschneidender Zugehörigkeiten zu gestalten und zu verwalten, stürzt ein zusehends vielfältiges Kanada, trotz seines weltweiten Status als Inbegriff des Multikulturalismus, in eine Legitimitäts- und Selbstvertrauenskrise. Dieser Artikel untersucht die Möglichkeiten eines Modells der Regierungsführung, das neue Wege des Zusammenlebens ermöglichen möchte, ohne dass dabei die Vielschichtigkeit dieses Zusammenlebens kompromittiert wird, und verteidigt das Konzept eines Postmultikulturalismus, der a) auf der offiziellen Politik des Multikulturalismus aufbaut und gleichzeitig über sie hinausgeht; b) das Prinzip einer auf Inklusivität beruhenden Politik für ein Zusammenleben in/mit/durch Unterschiedlichkeit anerkennt; c) der sich der Herausforderungen, die daraus resultieren, Vielfalt und Diversität in unterschiedlichsten Formen zu beherbergen, bewusst ist und d) der das Recht von Migranten auf Selbstbestimmung in Bezug auf Zugehörigkeitsstrukturen und Identitäten, (ohne dass dies ein gleichzeitiges Abtreten ihrer Bindung an eine nationale Identität und einen sozialen Zusammenhalt bedeutet), respektiert. Weiterhin wird der Artikel Konsequenzen und Herausforderungen einer positiven „Überwindung“ des heutigen Multikulturalismus diskutieren, indem er die Vision eines ‚post-Kanada‘ als ein post-multikulturelles Multiversum von komplexer Vielfalt und vielfältiger Komplexität entwirft.

Abstract

Dramatic increases in migrant-driven diversity and diversity dynamics have put pressure on innovative governance frameworks for managing increasingly complex diversi-

1 This is a substantially revised version of a paper originally delivered at the University of Augsburg, 15 April 2014.

ties. The diasporic space known as Canada is no exception to these transformative demands and conflicting priorities. The world's quintessential multiculturalism is experiencing a legitimacy crisis of confidence over the governance and inclusion of hyper-diverse complexities in a diversifying Canada of overlapping identities, transmigrant linkages, and intersecting belongings. In exploring the possibility of a governance model for living differently together without the complexities getting in the way of a cooperative coexistence, this paper argues in defense of a proposed postmulticulturalism framework that: (a) builds on yet transcends an official multiculturalism; (b) acknowledges the principle of an inclusivity-based governance for living together in/with/through differences; (c) recognizes the multiversal challenge of differently accommodating a diversity-of-diversities, and (d) respects the right of migrants and minorities to customize patterns of belonging and identity without sacrificing a commitment to societal cohesion. Discussed as well are the implications and challenges of moving positively beyond multiculturalism by re-imagining a postCanada as a postmulticultural multiverse of complex diversities and diverse complexities.

Résumé

La croissance dramatique d'une diversité due à la migration et aux dynamiques qui en résultent, force la main aux structures gouvernementales et administratives innovatrices. Le Canada, espace diasporique par excellence, n'échappe pas à la nécessité de transformation et aux priorités conflictuelles. Malgré l'exemplarité mondiale du multiculturalisme canadien, le défi qui consiste à gérer un ensemble fort complexe d'identités superposées, d'imbrications transmigratoires et d'appartenances croisées, précipite un Canada toujours plus diversifié dans une crise de légitimation et de confiance en soi. Étudiant les possibilités d'un modèle de gouvernance qui propose de nouveaux modes de coexistence où les complexités ne mettront point en danger cette même coexistence, cet article défend un cadre postmulticulturaliste qui (a) à la fois se réfère au multiculturalisme officiel et le transcende; (b) reconnaît le principe d'une gouvernance basée sur l'inclusion et réalisant une coexistence dans/avec/par les différences; (c) assume le défi de gouvernance qui consiste à accommoder différemment une diversité de diversités et (d) respecte le droit des migrants et des minorités de personnaliser des modèles d'appartenance et d'identité sans refuser tout engagement au niveau de l'identité nationale et de la cohésion sociale. De plus, l'article se propose de discuter les conséquences et défis qui marquent le passage constructif du multiculturalisme au postmulticulturalisme en ébauchant un postCanada en forme d'un « multivers » postmulticultural, fait de diversités complexes et de complexités diverses.

Introduction. Unsettling Diversity Governance in a World of Complex Diversities/Diverse Complexities

To say we live in provocative and perplexing times is (to borrow a phrase) a cliché of understated proportions. The movement of people and diversification of mobility on an unprecedented global scale elevates the management of complex diversities into one of the more pressing 21st century challenges (Rodriguez-Garcia 2012; Spoonley/Tolley 2012; Castles/Miller 2009; Fleras 2014b). The border-busting dynamics of transmigration and transnationalism are unsettling conventional notions of nation-building and national unity. Orthodox patterns of belongings and identities are increasingly contested in a diasporic world of both crossings and connections as well as citizenship restrictions and militarized borders. No less disruptive is the growing popularity of cosmopolitanism as a global governance that adds yet another layer of complexity to an already complex world (Kymlicka/Walker 2012; Brown 2014). The interplay of these dynamics raises a raft of governance dilemmas related to: (a) the relevance of place-based models of governance in a transmigrant and diasporic world of 'here', 'there', and 'everywhere'; (b) the possibility of living together in a de-spatialized world when people's notions of identity and belonging are uncoupled from place but globally linked; (c) the creation of a national framework that encompasses civic participation and meaningful belonging against a backdrop of splintered loyalties, multiple identities, and hybrid affiliations; and (d) the possibility of a new analytic framework for framing a 'multiversal' world of diversifying diversities in need of differential accommodation. Responses to these governance puzzles are not readily forthcoming, as Ulrich Beck (2011, 53) notes when warning the dangers of pouring superdiversity wine into old governance skins:

...[O]ver the last decades the cultural, social, and political landscapes of diversity are changing radically, but we still use old maps to orient ourselves. In other words, my main thesis is: *we do not even have the language through which contemporary superdiversity in the world can be described, conceptualized, understood, explained, and researched.* (italics in original)

Few dare to underestimate the politics of managing complex diversities and diverse complexities as a major governance challenge (Kraus 2011; Garcea/Kirova/Wong 2008). The 'globalization of migration' (Castles/Miller 2009) has expanded the number of countries informed by the volume, range, scope, and complexities of global mobility patterns (but see Czaika/de Haas 2014), in the process exerting pressure for re-conceptualizing the governance of managing complex diversities (Wessendorf 2014). The seemingly ceaseless movement of people has also amplified global anxieties over a 'coming anarchy' in unsettling long established national

markers of identity and belonging, unity and security (Bourbeau 2011). The politics of diasporic transmigration are known to: (a) blur a defense of territorial boundaries, (b) encourage cross-border movements of migrants in search of safety or success, (c) undermine regimes of multicultural governance, (d) transform public space into a contested site, e) coax identities away from a strict national focus, and (f) complicate the search for political forms that respect diversities without renegeing on a sense of community, consensus, and commitment (Birt 2007; Ang 2010). Not surprisingly, national jurisdictions in the post 9/11 era are aiming to discipline those new pluralities that challenge conventions related to normality, acceptability, and monovocality, including (Smith/Ackah/Reddie 2014): tightening up conditions for naturalization; introducing tougher requirements for admission and citizenship (Winter 2014); imposing additional restrictions to thwart unwanted immigration through robust border enforcement and multi/bi/lateral agreements related to deterrence and deportation (Carr 2010; Ang 2010); and reviving the idea of a nation-state as a community of value and values (a 'notion-state') rather than just a disparate collection of migrants and minorities (Anderson 2013; Fleras 2014b).

The interplay of these emergent dynamics and contested projections question the relevance of an official (or a managed) multiculturalism as a territorially-bounded governance within the seemingly opposed contexts of an inhospitable national yet the uninhabitable transnational (Karim 2007; Ang 2010; Vertovec/Wessendorf 2004). Consider the following as points of contestation in a multicultural Canada that many regard as the world's quintessential jurisdiction for managing diversity and integrating newcomers. To what extent can an official multiculturalism and its inclusionary commitments provide an optimal governance for managing complex diversities in a diversifying Canada (also Mansouri/de B'beri 2014)? Is an inclusive multiculturalism capable of differently accommodating the non-linear realities and fragmented dynamic of a diversities-within-diversities universe (i.e. 'multiverse')? How relevant is a bounded and managed multiculturalism as a national governance framework and territorial discourse (physically circumscribed, culturally specific, and spatially exclusive national identity) in a seemingly unbounded world of trans migratory movements, translocal linkages, fragmented identities, and de-territorialized belongings (Carruthers 2013; Walton-Roberts 2011)? Why even bother to invoke an official multiculturalism as governance model for managing complex diversities when migrant notions of identity and belonging as points of reference are increasingly delinked from residency and singular citizenship (Karim 2007; Mawani 2008)? Is it possible to conjoin these ostensibly oppositional dynamics – the centrifugal forces of diversifying differences and the centripetal forces of securitization and surveillance – into a multicultural governance 2.0 synthesis that links the dynamics of transmigrant hyperdiversities to the principles of a bounded nationalism and an inclusive governance (Birt 2007)?

Responses to these questions are tricky in sorting out the politics of living together with complex diversities without the complexities getting in the way of liv-

ing together. Then, as now, the governance challenge revolves around the society-building project of forging a 'unity in/with/through diversity' (Jenson/Papillon 2001; Boutilier 2004; Fleras 2013). Or to rephrase this conundrum along governance lines: *How to transform a random array of migrants and minorities into a community ('nation') of citizens whose sense of commitment, conviction and consensus to a unifying set of ideals is pivotal in constructing a cohesive society?* Only the details of this society-building challenge shift over time. No more so than at present where the prospect of managing increasingly complex and diverse societies demands more responsive governance models of diversity management than offered by a managed multiculturalism (RECODE Conference Notes; also Mor Barak 2014). In other words, societies such as Canada are no longer simply diverse societies. Rather they are complexly diverse in demographics and socioeconomic profile, and this emergent hyperdiversity exerts pressure for a new interpretive lens to make sense of what is going on and how to address it (Doucerain et al. 2013). Pressure is mounting for an innovative governance model that capitalizes on, yet goes positively beyond, a managed multiculturalism, thereby securing a framework for differently accommodating this diversified diversity. An emergent postmulticulturalism project anchored in the principle of 'multiversal inclusivity' promises to address the hyperdiverse realities of new (trans)migrants by acknowledging the multidimensionality of their cultural comings and goings beyond fixed borders and permanent locales (Carruthers 2013).

To date, most signs point to a failure of imagination in conceptualizing new forms for managing complexity, fluidity, and hybridity outside of those mindsets and metaphors that miscalculate the logic behind an emergent postmulticultural reality (Blommaert 2012). But an emergent postmulticulturalism project anchored in the principles of multiversality and inclusivity may offer an escape from this governance gridlock. A multiversal-based postmulticulturalism not only constitutes a new discourse and imaginary for managing complex diversities. It also possesses the potential to address the diverse complexities of new (trans)migrants and (hyper)minorities whose translocal identities and belongings transcend fixed boundaries and permanent locales (Carruthers 2013). A novel vantage point (or interpretive lens) advances the postmulticultural narratives of complexity, simultaneity, intersectionality, hybridity, and translocality when applied to the lived realities of diverse diversities whose multiple modes of coexistence, belonging and identity no longer reflect a readily identifiable reality (Vertovec 2013; Blommaert 2012; Collett/Petrovic 2014; Berns-McGown 2013; Wessendorf 2014).² Such a commitment also embraces the inclusivity principle of accommodating different ways of accommodating diversities-within-diversity without sacrificing a commitment to national unity and identity (Messelink/ten Thige 2012; Fleras 2013). The challenge of managing this com-

2 The prefix post- in this paper is employed in the sense of 'engaging with' rather than 'breaking from' the past.

plex diversity is two-fold, *first*, to address the settlement needs of various newcomer cohorts from diverse sources countries and different migration avenues, while (a) ensuring their differences are respected, reflected, and responded to by social institutions, (b) procuring a sense of belonging and commitment to community and country, (c) fostering full participation in political and economic life, and (d) acknowledging their value and contribution to civic life. *Second*, to bolster a governance of unity and cohesion without falling into the trap of antiquated models and anachronistic narratives in addition to capitalizing on new diversity governance models that endorse the principle of both inclusion ('fitting into the system') and inclusivity ('refitting the system').

To put these arguments, assertions, and projections to the test, this paper acknowledges the need to rethink the diversity/multiculturalism/governance nexus by refracting it through the prism of a proposed postmulticulturalism lens. *The paper argues that the politics of managing complex diversities within diversifying contexts point to a postmulticultural governance model that embraces the principle of a 'multiversal inclusivity' as grounds for living together in/with/through diverse complexities.* The paper begins by examining three models of diversity governance for managing diversities, namely, monoculturalism, multiculturalism, and postmulticulturalism. It then demonstrates how moves toward the principles of postmulticulturalism are challenging Canada's managed multiculturalism as governance. Neither a managed multiculturalism nor a multiversal postmulticulturalism are shown to be mutually exclusive in seeking a new governance framework. Rather they constitute a starting point for re-negotiating the challenges of managing complex diversities and diverse complexities (see Moreton-Robinson 2006). Of particular relevance to this paper's argument is reference to a 'multiversal inclusivity' as principle in advancing a postmulticultural framework for differential accommodation (ie, accommodating different ways of accommodating this diversification of diversity). The paper concludes by discussing the possibility and promise of a 'postCanada' as a postnational site for putting into practice the postmulticultural logic of living together in/with/through a diversity-of-diversities.

Conceptualizing Governance Models for Managing Diversity

Reference to governance has progressed from relative obscurity to obligatory slogan in less than a decade. But growing popularity has not exempted it from controversies over definition and characteristics (Fukuyama 2013; Fleras 2009). For our purposes, governance can be defined as *framework of rules that establishes a principled relationship between ruler and ruled, alongside a corresponding distribution of power and authority in addition to an exchange of rights and obligations.* With governance, a principled framework is created for addressing how authority is divided; power is distributed; policies are formulated; valued resources are allocated in a given juris-

diction; priorities and agendas are set; decisions are made and enforced; accountability and transparency are rendered; implementation is secured; services are delivered; and rules of the political game are respected to prevent conflict and promote cohesion (Turton et al. 2007). Three governance models can be discerned for managing migrants and minorities: monocultural, multicultural, and postmulticultural. A premulticultural ('monocultural') society reflects the premise that good governance is impossible without removing differences. A modern multicultural society is constructed on the platform that good governance is tolerant of differences in the private domain yet striving for a relatively neutral public domain free of diversity entanglements. A postmodern and postmulticultural society embraces the principle that good governance is possible only by taking differences seriously and incorporating them into a framework for living together, decision making, and reward allocation. A commitment to postmulticulturalism also acknowledges the reality of diversities-within-diversities as grounds for good governance, while conceding the importance of differently accommodating this diverse diversity along 'multiversal inclusivity' lines.

Monoculturalism Governance

A commitment to monocultural governance embodies a Westphalian model of society building. 19th century nationalist ideologies conflated the notion of a nation with a sovereign state in striving for unity through uniformity by rejecting public affirmation of diversity as contrary to successful governance (Coleman 2011). This Westphalian commitment to monocultural governance and national homogeneity as the first modernity was organized along the lines of a centrist state that embraced an essentialized and uncontested concept of national unity and societal identity. According to the core doctrine of nationalism, the division of the world into nations defined the source of political legitimacy, with each nation possessing its own character, history, and destiny (Smith 2013). Each nation was entitled to its own sovereign status and state, including a corresponding right to protect its destiny and preserve its identity, while the ideology of monocultural nationalism was directed at unifying an otherwise disparate population around a shared sense of national identity and cultural homogeneity (Parekh 2005). The mono-national state was possessed by a dominant national group who manipulated its hegemonic powers to control and contain. Those who didn't belong to the dominant national group were subject to discrimination, assimilation, or expulsion – or worse (Kymlicka 2004). To the extent the concept of citizenship even existed in a nationalistic context where primary loyalty dovetailed with the nation-state, it was (a) restrictive and difficult to access; (b) assigned by blood at birth with only one citizenship possible; and (c) revoked upon naturalization in another jurisdiction. The consequences of monoculturalism as governance model for managing diversity persist

into the present, to the detriment of a multicultural coexistence (Pinder 2010), as Parekh (2005, 8-9) writes;

[C]ontemporary multicultural societies have emerged against the backdrop of several centuries of the culturally homogenising nation-state ... Since the state required cultural and social homogenization as a necessary basis [for a new kind of societal unity], it has for centuries sought to mould the wider society in that direction. Thanks to this, we have become so accustomed to equating unity with homogeneity, and equality with uniformity, that unlike many of our premodern counterparts we feel morally and emotionally disoriented by, and do not quite know how to accommodate, the political demands of a deep and defiant diversity.

Multiculturalism Governance

Monoculturalism as governance was eventually discredited for a variety of different reasons (Siemiatycki 2012). A multicultural governance model emerged instead that eventually eclipsed those exclusionary notions of belonging and identity that relegated minorities and migrants to second class status, denied them access to universal personhood and foreclosed practices of active citizenship (Berns-McGown 2007/08). A national commitment to multicultural governance rejected any explicit endorsement of a state-sponsored ethnicity or religion. It advocated instead the secular equivalent principle of separating church from state as governance framework, that is, the state does not interfere in the activities of ethnic communities, and vice versa. A multicultural state materialized that (a) remains ostensibly neutral and impartial when engaging its constituent individuals and communities; (b) endorses the once-heresy that the state belongs to all its citizens not just a single national group; (c) embraces the rights of all migrants and minorities to full and equal participation without forfeiting a right to identity and equality; and (d) ensures all citizens have the same institutional access as the dominant group (Kymlicka 2004).

Canada's official multiculturalism as national governance provides the quintessential model for managing diversity (Rodriguez-Garcia 2012; Heath 2014; Jedwab 2014; Foster 2014). Shifts in emphasis, notwithstanding – ranging in focus from ethnicity to equity to civic to integrative (Fleras 2012) – Canada's official multiculturalism has never wavered from its central mission as a political project to redefine diversity governance through a new set of ideals and corresponding practices (Kymlicka 2010, 99). Or to put it more succinctly: To construct *an inclusive Canada through the integration of migrants and minorities into the existing framework* (Fleras 2014b). A principled framework sought to balance three primary objectives: (1) to foster migrant integration and minority involvement; (2) to promote an inclusive Canada by accommodating diversity in ways workable, reasonable and appropriate;

and (3) to advance a Canada-building without losing control of the agenda or disrupting the status quo (Haque 2012; Biles 2014). Canada's official multiculturalism remains committed to the inclusionary concept of a cooperative coexistence (Habac 2012), primarily by encouraging intercultural/interfaith understanding through dialogue and interaction; promoting shared values and civic pride in Canadian history and society; instilling a climate that respect and accepts diversity; supporting the creation of institutions responsive to the needs of Canada's diverse population; advancing equal opportunities for all Canadians through removal of prejudicial mindsets and discriminatory barriers; and building a democratically pluralistic society (Hansen 2014). An inclusive multiculturalism model focuses on ensuring no one is excluded from citizenship rights for reasons beyond their control. It also acknowledges the right of newcomers to become Canadian on their own terms (within limits) provided they comply with the law of the land, respect people's individual rights, subscribe to core constitutional values such as gender equality, and identify with their ethnicity as a basis for attachment to Canada. This commitment to respect diversity has reaped dividends in bolstering the integration process:

The official ideology of Canadian multiculturalism was that it promoted a 'mosaic' model of immigration, whereby people can come and keep their cultural practices, in contrast to the supposed 'melting pot' model in the US ... In actuality, over the last four decades, the two policy paradigms have had the exact opposite effect. The Canadian model, by being extremely accommodating toward cultural differences was much more successful than the American (or the European) model at integrating new immigrants into the mainstream national institutions. Indeed the thrust of Canada's multicultural legislation was always pro-integrationist. By generating the presumption of fair treatment in all public institutions ... the multicultural policy encouraged immigrants to venture out of their communities – to join political parties, participate in mainstream institutions, and get jobs in places where everyone speaks the language of the majority (Heath 2014, 5).

Of course, no one is suggesting that the inclusiveness logic behind a managed multiculturalism is beyond the pale of politics. To the contrary, a prescriptive commitment to a set of aspirational ideals for securing an integrative inclusion is consistent with a reading of managed multiculturalism as a political act to achieve political goals (related to national unity and identity) in a politically expedient manner (Peter 1978; also Clarke 2009). As might be expected of any state program with hegemonic overtones, Canada's official multiculturalism eschews the idea of: (1) celebrating differences per se, (2) establishing ethnic minority or group rights; (3) promoting parallel communities or distinct cultures indifferently coexisting side by side; (4) transforming structures or challenging liberal democratic principles;

(5) addressing politicized or deep differences; or (6) an 'anything goes' relativism whereby all culture and cultural practices are deemed to be equally valid and beyond reproach. The focus of a 'seeing-like-a-state' multiculturalism as a centrally planned social engineering project is hegemonic: To impose order (including intelligibility and legibility) on those aspects in need of regulation and control by simplifying complex phenomena under a singular solution (see Scott 1998).

However progressive for its day, Canada's official multiculturalism is experiencing a legitimacy crisis of confidence, thanks in part to dynamics and developments largely beyond its control. Multiculturalism as diversity management is criticized as too top-down and rigid to capture the complex and evolving realities on the ground; too silo-ed ('multi-cul-de-sac' [Mistry 1995]) by virtue of exaggerating cultural differences; too divisive in exacerbating the fragmentation of society along virtual grids of distinct ethnic communities ('mosaic'); and too enamored with static, essentialized, and reified conceptions of culture that limit a person's scope for defining self identity (Mukherjee 1989; Kaltmeier/Raab/Thies 2012). Of particular salience are patterns of transmigration and transnationalism owing to the unprecedented movement of people on a global scale and the diversification of mobility worldwide, resulting in a proliferating hyperdiversity in major urban regions whose diverse complexities have outgrown conventional governance models that envision Canadian society as "a mosaic of communities" (Lafontaine-Emond 2013). And yet, governments continue to employ governance models that don't work or, alternatively, they resort to disciplining diversity (from admissions to citizenship) to impose order and centralized control. The fact that conventional governance models for managing diversities no longer resonate with meaning as they once did, pressure is exerted to rethink the relevance of a bounded multicultural governance by building on its strengths while moving beyond its weaknesses. What is being proposed instead as a new theoretical toolkit is a post-multicultural 2.0 framework whose commitment to the principle of 'multiversal inclusivity' underpins a postmulticulturalism model for managing complex diversities in a diversifying Canada.

Postmulticulturalism Governance: From Adjective to Ideology

Increased references to postmulticulturalism³ have not yielded ground to any consensus (Pakulski 2014; Gozdecka et al. 2014). Part of the problem is whether the prefix 'post' refers to a continuation (or engagement with) of multiculturalism; a hybridic synthesis; an alternative approach; a retreat from the present; or a sequential advance that breaks with the past (Pinder 2010). Vertovec (2010) frames post-

3 Definitions of postmulticulturalism may reflect a transatlantic divide. Postmulticulturalism in Canada represents a reaction to a managed multiculturalism that privileges cohesion, unity, and integration over the legitimacy of diversity as assets. In Europe postmulticulturalism may trend toward more integration and cohesion to overcome a misplaced priority on the 'multi cul de sac' multiculturalisms of the past (Fleras 2009).

multiculturalism as a hybrid agenda that fuses the agendas of the left (respecting diversity yet reducing social inequality) with the right's ambitions for national unity and collective identity. It combines the principles of social cohesion, shared values, and common identity with that of valuing diversity in the public domain, a social climate of tolerance, and acceptance and programs to ensure inclusion across all institutional domains. Christian Joppke (2004) alludes to postmulticulturalism as a paradigm shift from a mono-multicultural discourse to one that emphasizes the language of civic integration, citizenship, and social cohesion. Postmulticulturalism has also been deployed to acknowledge adjustments in Canada's official multiculturalism, from a focus on cultural recognition to an emphasis on redistribution (equality and social justice) and representation (involvement in civic and political culture) (Fleras 1994). In short, most references to postmulticulturalism announce it's time to move beyond the status quo of managed multiculturalism 1.0. Nevertheless, critics (Kymlicka 2010, 2014; Modood 2013) dismiss the concept of postmulticulturalism as illusory when it criticizes a largely imaginary multiculturalism that never existed in Canada – one that allegedly privileges differences at the expense of commonality, separatism instead of interaction, group loyalty rather than national identity, and cultural relativism over human rights and democratic values. Kymlicka (2010, 99) writes:

According to post-multiculturalists, it is the gradual recognition of these flaws that explains the retreat from multiculturalism and the search for a new post-multicultural models of citizenship that emphasize the priority of political participation and economic opportunities over the symbolic politics of cultural recognition, the priority of human rights and individual freedom over respect for cultural traditions, the priority of building inclusive common national identities over the recognition of ancestral cultural identities, and the priority of cultural change and cultural mixing over the reification of cultural differences.

This paper employs the term 'post-' not in sense of repudiating a preceding episode ('multiculturalism') but by critically refining its contributions in paving a post-multicultural forward. In contrast to those versions of postmulticulturalism that elevate the principle of unity over diversity, a postmulticulturalism governance shift is proposed that balances unity with hyperdiversity along inclusivity lines. Such a commitment acknowledges the reality and legitimacy of a kaleidoscope of diversities as fluid, contested, multidimensional, and consistent with the intersecting realities of a postmodern world of complexity, change, and contradiction. It also insists on the continued utility of managed multiculturalism to secure a centre that protects complex diversities/diverse complexities as basis for living together (Fleras 2011). The postmulticultural challenge revolves around creating a diversity governance framework that permits complex forms of identity and belonging at both

individual and group levels within a broader societal framework of citizenship, full participation, and democratic rights.

The relevance of a postmulticulturalism applies to the complexities of contemporary migration and migrants. A transnational mode of migration is now well established that acknowledges new social spaces for integration and settlement, in addition to redefining notions of belonging and identity along spatially discontinuous lines because of cross-border transactions (Wong 2007/08; Fleras 2014b). Immigration is no longer framed as a fixed field of location (a “thing”). It’s conceptualized instead as a dynamic field of flows and linkages (a *process*) involving diasporic networks of numerous actors, across diverse domains, and different levels of connectedness and involvement (Simmons 2010). Priority is assigned to the networks that transmigrants retain and cultivate with overseas families, institutions, and political systems, with the result that conventional notions of migrant identity, attachment, and belonging have become unsettled. Immigrant identities are no longer what many assumed them to be, namely, fixed, singular, consistent, and irreversible. They are best envisaged as something multiple, fluid, negotiated, contested, and changing, especially when delinked from geographical location and relinked across borders and translocal spaces. Transmigrants participate simultaneously across different domains in both host and home countries, while identifying with multiple identities across national borders as they settle down. Diasporic communities that offer solidarity, support, information, and identity construct a space that allows transmigrants to identify with and participate across multiple universes (‘multiverses’) without necessarily forsaking commitment to the territorially defined realities (Pieterse 2006). A new kind of immigrant experience has emerged, in other words, one that neither severs ties with the home country nor passively assimilates into the host country, yet thrives in the positives and potential of such ambivalence (Berns-McGown 2013). And yet when coupled with global surges in migration, from temporary to circular to undocumented, it is unclear what kind of multicultural governance will work in contexts other than those of a permanent settlement (Kymlicka 2014; Fleras 2014b). Finally, notions of citizenship as a place-based governance are shifting as well. Patterns of transmigration and transnational social networks are contesting a unitary conception of citizenship despite state efforts to discipline differences through citizenship rules (Pakulski and Markowski 2014).⁴

4 Nowhere are the politics of managing complex diversities more sharply contested than in debates over citizenship as immigrant governance in a postnational Canada within a globalizing world of transmigration and hyperdiversities. To one side of the debate is the notion of a contested citizenship: An analytical framework is proposed that conceptualizes citizenship as multifaceted, constantly negotiated and contested both within and between state borders (Stasiulis/Bakan 2005; Kymlicka 2012). After all, a one-size-fits-all citizenship is unlikely to gain much traction in a deeply divided and multilayered Canada where some are banging on the door to “get in” while others are banging down the door to “get out.” To the other side is a disci-

How then should a postmulticulturalism respond to the challenges of multiversal world of diversifying differences related to divided identities, fractured belongings, and multiple affiliations? The concept of multiversal or multiversality may prove helpful in advancing the principle of a postmulticultural governance that engages with the realities of complex diversities and diverse complexities? According to the Robert Latham (2007/08) and others (Catanzano 2008; Hanlon 2014), the word multiverse conveys the idea of multiple social universes, with a corresponding set of diverse perspectives, premises and lived realities. Differences in a multiverse universe persist across many overlapping and intersecting universes, resulting in a proliferation of *fissions*, *fissures* and *fusions*. *Fissions* within migrant and minority communities are increasingly compounded and crosscut by new axes of differentiation, distinction, and demands related to legal status, religion, gender age, nationality, class, and so on (Vertovec 2007; also Vertovec and Wessendorf 2004). *Fissures* within migrant and minority communities reflect social cleavages, both temporary and permanent, because of internal politics, conflicting agendas, and variable socio-economic statuses. Cue *fusions*: Thanks in part to Canada's vibrant immigration program, Canadian cities now exhibit the dynamics of hybridity, according to Daniel Hiebert, a co director of Vancouver's Metropolis Project (Globe and Mail 2011), namely, a robust *fusion* of cultures, religions, homeland linkages, sexual orientation, and everyday experiences that are more complex yet harder to categorize (Baker et al. 2013).

In other words, Canada is much more than a multicultural social formation. It's also aligned along the cross-cutting lines of multiracial, multiclass, multigendered, multisexual, multilingual, multireligious, multigenerational, multihistorical, and multicitizenship (Latham 2008; 2009; Doucerain et al. 2013). These complex diversities/diverse complexities reflect a dizzying range of differences and entitlements, not only between identifiable groups and communities, but also *within* groups and *across* spaces and borders. Unlike a 'multi cul de sac' (or mosaic) model of multiculturalism that shackles people around their ethnicity and ancestry (regardless of its importance to a person's identity), a multiversal model acknowledges ethnicity as but one component of a moving and multidimensional identity (Ang 2011; Habacan 2012). For example, transmigrants participate simultaneously across different spheres of life in both host and home countries. They identify with and hold on to multiple identities across national borders as they settle into their new homeland; they construct diasporic communities that offer solidarity, support, information, and identity; and they participate across multiple universes ('multiverses') without necessarily dissolving attachment to the spatially defined commitments of the host

plinary model: A post 9/11 era of anxieties over security and failed immigration exert political and public pressure to control ('securitize') residency requirements (Baubock 2008). Citizenship as a formality is evolving into a proxy for disciplining migrants and securing borders without undermining the principle of open borders for trade and commerce.

country (Pieterse 2006). This passage from Gaye (2011) is instructive of the micro politics at play:

My Name is Sophie and I am Canadian. And what does that mean? According to Canadian census, it means: I am third generation Canadian on my mother's side and second generation Canadian on my father's side. My maternal grandparents are Canadian and British. My paternal grandparents are Senegalese. My aunts and uncles come from Canada, Thailand, Senegal, and the Ivory Coast. I am Muslim by birth, my father is Muslim, and my mother is Roman Catholic. Our family celebrates Aid El-Fitr and Eid Al-Adha, as well as, Christmas and Easter. I have multiple citizenships: British, Canadian, and Senegalese. I attend French primary and secondary schools and then went to university in English and French. At home I speak English with my mother and French with my father. I don't remember which language I learned first ... At the moment ... I divide my time living between Abbotsford and Dubai, while working for three companies headquartered in Hong Kong, South Africa, and Guatemala. My taxes are paid on the amount of time I spend in each of my residences.

At the heart of a multiversal-driven postmulticulturalism is the concept of inclusivity. Consider the distinctions (ideal-typical as they may be) between inclusion and inclusivity. Reference to inclusion asserts that nobody should be excluded from full citizenship rights within society because of who they are or for reasons beyond their control (from age and ethnicity to gender and dis/ability). Inclusion models tend to individualize responsibility ('blame the victim'): They assume there is something about the person or community that must be fixed or changed to ensure their fit into the existing system (Harmon undated). Two dimensions stand out: First, to the extent differences are recognized, they tend to be framed around a mosaic metaphor. Differences as the metaphorically defined tiles are firmly positioned into place by a mainstream grouting, in effect boxing ethnocultural groups into parallel communities and essentialist cultures (Malik 2012; 2013). Limits prevail: Yes everyone can be culturally different but these differences cannot break the law, violate individual rights, or contravene core constitutional values such as gender equity. Second, to the extent modifications are necessary to create a more level playing field, inclusion models are concerned primarily with modifying the rules that refer to the conventions, in effect leaving untouched the founding assumptions and foundational principles of racialized (as well as gendered, classed, sexualized, etc) constitutional orders.

By contrast, inclusivity models entail a fundamentally different governance principle: Whereas inclusion is about fitting migrants and minorities into the existing system to ensure no one is *excluded* because of race or ethnicity, inclusivity as prin-

ciple promotes an accommodation model that adjusts ('refits') the system to ensure that everyone is *included* precisely because of their differences-based needs or values. Unlike an inclusive model that tends to frame diversity as a problem to solve or obstacle to surmount (or put bluntly, how to neutralize differences so they are no longer constitute a distraction, cost or inconvenience, or threat), inclusivity as discourse endorses the value of diversity and diversities – neither a problem to solve nor a challenge to surmount, but an asset to nurture for improving workplace climate and the delivery of social services – one in which both workers and clients feel recognized and respected rather than excluded or at risk (Fleras/Spoonley 1999; Dei 2010; Berns-McGown 2013; Council of Europe 2008). Reference to the inclusivity principle is predicated on the assumption that societies are neither neutral nor value free. Rather they are socially constructed and ideologically loaded in terms of founding assumptions and the foundational principles of constitutional orders that, by definition, are racialized, gendered, and classed in ways that advantage some, disadvantage others. In other words, migrants and minorities may possess equal rights; however, they must exercise these rights and achieve success in contexts neither designed to reflect their realities nor constructed to advance their interests. Clearly, then, proposed changes must be transformative to achieve inclusivity; after all, cosmetic changes to institutional conventions such as minority hires or sensitivity sessions are unlikely to dislodge those fundamental principles and foundational rules that reinforce power structures and institutional culture. Taken to its logical conclusion, in other words, a commitment to inclusivity proposes a contesting of the rules that refer to the conventions instead of simply tweaking the conventions that inform the rules.

To sum up: A multiversal multiculturalism differs from the static and fixed framework of a managed and mosaic multiculturalism (also Vertovec 2010). An official multiculturalism is limited in its reach because of its embeddedness as an instrument of state control. This hegemony is antithetical to diversity by exercising the right to define what counts as diversity, what diversities count; it's also consistent with white Eurocentricity as the unmarked norm that establishes an implicit standard by which others are judged and ranked (Pinder 2010). The liberal principles of a state multiculturalism entitles the dominant group to establish the agenda for minority participation while circumscribing the dialogue for belonging and identity. By contrast, a postmulticultural governance seeks to delegitimize the barriers to hyper-different ways of being and becoming, in the process making it compatible with a wide range of transmigrant belongings and recreated transnational identities within and beyond borders once denied or silenced by the discourses of modernity (McKenzie 2013). The logic behind postmulticulturalism recognizes the multiversal realities of differences-within-differences. It also acknowledges a corresponding necessity to find ways of accommodating different ways of accommodating these increasingly complex and diverse differences. This distinction between a multicultural versus a postmulticulturalism governance model is parlayed by way of two

playful inversions: (1) A multicultural governance looks for ways of *making society safe from diversities yet safe diversity*; by contrast a postmulticultural model is more inclined to invert this postulate by ensuring that *diversities are made safe from society yet ensure they are safe for society*; (2) A multicultural commitment begins with the concept of a good society, then incorporates differences accordingly (the principle of 'diversity-in-society'); by contrast, a postmulticultural principle begins with primacy of diversity as inherently valued, then constructs the good society around the prioritizing of diversity (the principle of 'society-in-diversity') (Sandercock 2003).

What is a Managed Multiculturalism For in a Postmulticultural World?

The world at present is an untidy and unruly place. Societies are no longer the ordered jurisdictions of centralized planning and social engineering that many imagined them to be or what they themselves aspired to do (Scott 1998). To the contrary, they are complex, inconsistent, and contested, with many identities, perspectives, and sites of actions, including multiple universes within universes (multiverse) that cross borders while collapsing notions of time and space (Latham 2008). Nation-states confront the challenge of maintaining their integrity, unity, and identity in the face of increasingly disruptive dynamics involving evolving patterns of transmigration and hyperdiversity (Ang 2010). The resulting interplay of complex diversities with diverse complexities may subvert the salience of multiculturalism 1.0 as a governance model, particularly when peoples' notions of identity and affiliation become dislodged from specific locale. Not surprisingly, as Doug Saunders (2013) explains, the balm of a multicultural canopy allowed the first generation of migrants to feel part of the national whole; for the second generation, however, it's perceived as a cultural straitjacket that pigeonholes when it reifies and essentializes (also New Canadian Media 2013)⁵

Not surprisingly, the children of immigrants find the concept of multiculturalism obsolete. The first generation may have drawn comfort from a multicultural policy that made them feel part of the national whole. But the second generation embrace a post immigrant shift. They tend to see an official multiculturalism as a hindrance to inclusion and inconvenient label that boxes them into ethnic silos, defines their needs and ambitions on the basis of this placement, uses these boxes to manage diversi-

5 Contradictions prevail. Polls conducted in 2012 by Mosaic Institute in partnership with ACS clearly indicate high levels of support for Canada's multicultural policy (58%), especially among young Canadians (ages 18-24) with a 74 percent approval rate, and believe that Canada's multicultural model should be exported to other countries (64% including 82% of young adults).

ty and shape public policy, and treats them as second class citizenship.

A static and categorical multiculturalism 1.0 will no longer suffice under these diverse dynamics and deterritorialized conditions. A managed multiculturalism demonstrates a paradoxical propensity to normalize through measurement and standardization, creating a tension that leads to gaps between lived-experiences and common grounds (Baker et al. 2013). It reveals an inability to capture the immensely complex diversities of migrants and minorities within a shifting and multi-versal context of differences-within- differences. Or to phrase it more emphatically, Canada's urban centres are outgrowing a managed multiculturalism model that once circumscribed their lived realities (Sandercock 2006). Evolving instead are those superdiverse realities that fundamentally alter the way people see, interact, and communicate in the 'mongrel cities' of the 21st century (Sandercock 2003; Ley 2005; Habacon 2007; Fleras 2011). Ang (2011:29) points to a postmulticulturalism turn:

[Nation states] are de facto diverse in ways that can no longer be contained within the neat model of unity in diversity. After many generations of immigration history, migrants and their descendants are no longer containable within a fixed and internally homogeneous category of 'ethnic community', as tended to be assumed in the formative years of a state-sponsored multiculturalism. Witness the second, third, and fourth generations, whose ethnic identities are increasingly fluid, hybridized and Westernized. Nor has there been a smooth process of integration of migrants into the national community, not because multiculturalism encouraged them to lead parallel lives, but because differences between people(s) – racial, cultural, religious – are very resistant to erasure: processes of inclusion and exclusion, the differentiation of the self and other, and the drawing of dividing lines between us and them are an enduring feature of the human way of life.

In short, a multicultural governance model for managing complex diversities is proving problematic in a diversifying Canada (Fleras 2011). To one side of the problematic divide is the proliferation of identity politics and the politicization of faith-based communities whose inward-looking commitments complicate and confuse. Pressure is mounting for differences to be taken seriously, even though an official multiculturalism is ill-equipped to address deep differences except in the most superficial or dismissive way. To the other side are those globalizing processes whose transmigratory dynamics threaten to erode multicultural governances as a place-based model of immigrant integration. To yet another side, a mosaic reading of multiculturalism may antagonize those Canadians whose ethnicity matters, but is not all consuming. Yes, ethnicity may inform their complex and hybridic identities

across multiple cultural spaces. Yet it should neither define who they are nor should it box them into a multi-cul-de-sac multiculturalism (Habacan 2007). Kenan Malik (3 June 2012) acknowledges as much in his Milton K Wong Lecture "What is Wrong with Multiculturalism" when he points to the schism between multicultural diversity as a lived experience vs multiculturalism as a political program for managing diversity:

As a political process, however, multiculturalism means something very different. It prescribes a set of policies, the aim of which is to manage and institutionalize diversity by putting people into ethnic and cultural boxes, defining individual needs and rights by virtue of the boxes into which people are put, and using these boxes to shape public policy. It is a case, not for open borders and minds, but for policing of borders, whether physical, cultural, or imaginative.

As well, a managed multiculturalism as governance is often limited to issues and arrangements within the confines of a particular nation state, a clearly bounded territory, and a singular citizenship (Ang 2010; Kymlicka 2014). But what happens when the politics of diaspora come into play in complicating the dynamics of identity and belonging? For example, consider how nearly 9 percent of Canada's population live and work overseas? Are they 'real' Canadians of value in need of innovative arrangements (Lui 2014)? Or are they Canadians of convenience who deserve scorn (Ignatieff 2013)?

Finally, how to live differently together multiculturally when the legitimacy and authority of the prevailing governance is rejected? The political philosopher Roger Scruton (2002) pinpoints the dilemma when he asks the question: Can any cultural or immigrant group whose all-consuming laws, sharply defined social identity to a primary affiliation, and unflinching loyalty that emanates from a religious or tribal source possibly coexist with a Western political culture or membership in a multicultural society? Look at how the challenge of integrating Islam into a secular and multicultural governance has unleashed debate over 'whose rules rule':

For multiculturalism was always about finding a space for the culture of the other, in so far as that culture does not claim a sovereignty over itself that clashes with the laws of the nation ... Multiculturalism has always had capacity to find a space for such minor laws within an all encompassing national law. This is part of what defines it. However, for people who take their religion seriously, this situation is reversed. The laws of God are all encompassing, and the national laws of the host nation are minor. For a seriously religious Muslim migrant, to integrate into the host nation becomes a matter of finding space for these national laws

within the all encompassing laws of God. We then see how the very relationship between encompassing and encompassed cultures, on which multiculturalism is based, is here inverted (Hage 2006).

These conflicts of interest raise a prickly question: Can a bounded and managed multiculturalism cope with the realities and challenges of an increasingly unbounded (or 'trans-bounded') Canada in a freewheeling yet networked global world of transcendental ties, transmigratory movements, transnational connections, and diasporic identities (Walton-Roberts 2011)? It would appear as though a conventional multicultural framework is both incomplete and outdated, as Kymlicka (2014) contends, because of assumptions and preconditions that no longer apply. And yet although these hyperdiverse realities cannot be squeezed into established governance frameworks, decision-makers are not very good at transforming the complexities of analysis into practices that can impact policies and public affairs (Vertovec 2007).

Moving Positively Beyond Multiculturalism 1.0

Toward a Postmulticulturalism 2.0:

From Managing Diversity to Engaging Diversities

...[A] post-multiculturalism is not a rejection of multiculturalism as much as it is a recognition that renewed energies are needed to create a global understanding of diversity across multiple contexts and locales that can be an asset, and not simply a set of problems in need of better judgement (Ley 2005, 15).

Living in an age of diversity – or more correctly an age infused by the challenge of managing complex diversities – yields an unprecedented level of complexity, contestation, and contradiction. It also raises the inevitability of a pending postmulticultural 'turn' in governance and management – even as governments continue to impose frameworks and utilize frameworks often at cross-purposes with the dynamics and demands of complex and proliferating diversities (Vertovec 2012). Awareness is mounting that conventional governances such as official multiculturalism are experiencing a crisis of legitimacy in coping with the challenges of diversity management in a diversifying world (Prato 2009). Too much of what passes for contemporary multiculturalism as governance for managing diversity is grounded in the metaphorical equivalent of a 'multi cul de sac' multiculturalism, with its concomitant notions of fixed and homogenous mosaic of ethnocultures within a territorially bounded and monocultural nation-state. Too much focus on an uncritical preservation of cultural differences reinforces a multiculturalism that differentiates and manages rather than engages diverse people through the shared humanity they have in

common (Bauman 2011; Mukherjee 1989). Or, alternatively, it reflects an excessive fixation with the principle of liberal universalism, with a corresponding view of differences as subordinate to our commonalities as individuals. To date, however, most signs point to a dearth of new theoretical frameworks to unthink and rethink some of the most basic governance concepts such as multiculturalism for managing a complexity of diversities (Li/Juffermans 2011; Blommaert 2012).

Ours is a profoundly postmulticultural era. The mosaic concept of bounded ethnic entities as basis for multicultural governance 1.0 has given way to the postmulticultural re-articulation of identity and belonging as multidimensional, fluid and hybrid-ic against the backdrop of a changing, diverse, and connected world (Hoyos 2014). A postmulticulturalism governance draws its legitimacy from a postnational society which beckons the postmodernist principle of "doing things differently." Hardly a surprising assessment since a managed multiculturalism is poorly equipped to address complex global issues and multiple identities inspired by transmigrant hyperdiversities. Its focus on *managing* diversity as governance to ensure control and standardization is offset by a growing commitment to constructively *engage* with diverse diversities in different ways (Maaka/Fleras 2005). The interplay of unsettled boundaries, transnational loyalties, and multiple identities has proven consequential as well in dis-establishing the monocultural ideal of a unitary nation-state. Society is caught between the proverbial rock and a hard place. It can neither uphold the rigidities of a fixed national identity for fear of looking inflexible in a world of fluidity. Nor can it afford a no-holds-barred commitment to diversity without the risk of losing control of the agenda. The tensions associated with this balancing act may, if unchecked, threaten to destabilize the legitimacy and integrity of a new global governance.

What is meant by moving positively beyond multiculturalism? Instead of a rejection or retreat from multiculturalism, postmulticulturalism should be framed as building on yet transcending a managed multiculturalism model. The one-size-fits-all approach to normalizing diversity under a managed multiculturalism may have once symbolized a positive step forward, in large part by integrating historically marginalized migrants and newcomers as equals into the existing framework. It promoted the concept of respecting differences as a basis for good governance, encouraged full and equal participation to ensure societal integration, played up the importance of accommodative institutions, ensured that no one was excluded because of who they were ('inclusion'), and relegated the practice of racism into the four letter word basket. Introduction of multiculturalism as governance for managing diversity was premised on an integration promise (Berry 2014). Members from diverse ethnocultural groups would coexist with each other through a process of national integration – a kind of unity within diversity framework paralleled at the global level by the United Nations where each nation-state member possesses a separate seat at the table yet must abide by common rules (Ang 2011, 28). A mosaic metaphor informed the logic behind this 'multi-cul-de-sac' reading of multicultural-

ism, with its attendant notion that (a) the whole is greater than the sum of the parts; (b) every person was affiliated with a cultural tradition, either by birth or by choice; (c) promotion of rights to protect and enhance ethnocultures; and (d) adherence to the tolerance principle of agreeing to disagree in advancing a cooperative coexistence.

In brief, a managed multiculturalism may have addressed the needs and demands of a specific historic period – namely, equality, cohesion, respect, integration, and unity – in hopes of superimposing a shared ‘we’ morality to displace an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ mentality (Hrushetska 2013). But responses under a managed multiculturalism are now holding it back from meeting new challenges, in part because of the generality of the commitments to which they owe their existence (Hollinger 2005). However important its value as a normative framework for Canada-building, a managed multiculturalism cannot possibly attend to the challenges and complexities of a multiversal world of hyperdiversities and transmigration (Tunis 2010). It’s time to move on to the next phase – postmulticulturalism – given how the limitations of a managed multiculturalism are increasingly transparent (Kymlicka 2014). Demographic and social shifts put the onus on matching multiculturalism policies and discourses with the realities of the newest Canadians in terms of what they can reasonably expect as accommodation from their host country (Heath 2014). A newer ‘post-ethnic’ governance model 2.0 is required that (a) recognizes the realities of shifting group boundaries, (b) acknowledges new cultural hybrids and combination, and (c) endorses multiple identities and hybridic affiliations at odds with conventional identity politics, group rights, deterministic communities of descent, essentializing cultures, and fixed identities (Hollinger 2005). A commitment to postmulticulturalism as principle and governance is better suited to address the realities of those whose commitments and connections are trans-national; who reject the prospect of being boxed into a homogeneous and essentialized ethnic category preferring, instead, to visualize identity as a cultural web to be negotiated and navigated (Habacan 2012); who are the lookout for arrangements that can differently accommodate the accommodation of diverse diversities; who insist their differences be framed *as assets* to nurture rather than deficits to control; and who expect to be engaged as valued contributors rather than managed as social problems.

To conclude: Let’s acknowledge the different logic between the liberal universalism of a managed multiculturalism and the ‘multiversal inclusivity’ of postmulticultural particularism. Yet neither should be framed as mutually exclusive principles for managing diversity – complex or otherwise. They should be positioned instead as starting reference points for re-negotiating a new (post)multiculturalism 2.0 governance model that engages with a diversity of diversities across a range of inclusivity channels (Latour/Balint 2013). The words of William Bradley (undated) and others (Pinder 2010; Ley 2005) seem apropos in proposing a postmulticultural governance

2.0 model that capitalizes on multicultural principles:⁶ Postmulticulturalism is less a rejection of multiculturalism 1.0 but more of a recognition that a renewed governance model better addresses the complex realities of the 21st century. The realization that postmulticultural governance model builds upon yet goes positively beyond a managed multicultural governance reinforces yet another inescapable truth. Any understanding of multiculturalism as governance must acknowledge its dynamic status – not as a timeless ideal to defend at all costs – but an unfinished project and a work in progress. Moves to keep Canada at the forefront of initiatives for managing complex diversities should seriously entertain the concept of postmulticulturalism as a governance model if a postCanada is to re-establish its bona fides as a global leader in reformulating the politics of living differently together.

References

- Anderson, Bridget, 2013, *Us & Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ang, Ien, 2010, "Between the National and the Transnational: Multiculturalism in a Globalising World," Keynote address at the Biennial Malaysian Studies Conference, Penang, March.
- , 2011, "Ethnicities and Our Precarious Future," *Ethnicities* 11, 27-31.
- Baker, Lauren et al., 2013, "Whose Diversity Counts? The Politics and Paradoxes of Modern Diversity," *Sustainability* 5, 2495-2518.
- Baubock, Rainer, 2008, "Citizens on the Move: Democratic Standards for Migrant's Membership," *Canadian Diversity* 6.4, 7-12.
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 2011, *Culture in a Liquid Modern World*, London: Polity.
- Beck, Ulrich, 2011, "Multiculturalism or Cosmopolitanism: How Can We Describe and Understand the Diversity of the World," *Social Sciences in China* 32.4, 52-58.
- Berg, Mette Louise/Nando Sigona, 2013, "Demography, Diversity, and Urban Space," *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 20.4, 347-360.
- Berns-McGown, Rima, 2007/08, "Redefining 'Diaspora': The Challenge of Connection and Inclusion," *International Journal* 63.1, 3-21.

6 The difference in logic between multiculturalism 1.0 and a postmulticulturalism 2.0 is comparable to that between web 1.0 and web 2.0 (Fleras 2010). The first websites 1.0 produced dial-up content that resembled online extensions of mainstream media. The inability to link with other sites or provide a comment system for reader feedback meant web-based content simply recreated the physical product in digital format without challenging the gatekeeper mentality of deciding who, what, or where. In contrast to the web 1.0's preoccupation creating sites/storefronts, capturing eye balls, and getting everyone on line, web 2.0 as a social networking dynamic has leveraged new patterns of communication by rewriting the rules of engagement by altering how people produce, circulate, and consume content as they capitalize on connections, collaborations, and interactions. In a twitterverse of digital media and mobile platforms, people are empowered by the constancy of their connections to redefine identities, share ideas, create new belongings, and participate in a series of networks. In brief, web 1.0 could be envisaged as a thing or noun (a product to create, distribute, and consume); by contrast, web 2.0 social media are best conceptualized as a process or verb involving communication-making both unfiltered and un-prepackaged in creating more complex world.

- , 2013, "I am Canadian! Challenging Stereotypes About Young Somali-Canadians," *IRPP, Institute for Research on Public Policy*, 15 January.
- Berry, John, 2014, "Multiculturalism: Psychological Perspectives," in: *The Multiculturalism Question. Debating Identity in 21st-Century Canada*, Jack Jedwab, ed., pp. 225-240, Queen's Policy Studies Series, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal & Kingston.
- Biles, John, 2014, "The Government of Canada's Multiculturalism Program: Key to Canada's Inclusion Reflex," in: *The Multiculturalism Question. Debating Identity in 21st-Century Canada*, Jack Jedwab, ed., pp. 11-52, Queen's Policy Studies Series, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal & Kingston.
- Birt, Yahya, 2007, "Multiculturalism and the Discontents of Globalisation," May 25, Retrieved from <http://www.opendemocracy.net>.
- Blommaert, Jan, 2012, "Chronicles of Complexity. Ethnography, Superdiversity, and Linguistic Landscapes," *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, No 29 Tilburg University.
- Bourbeau, Philippe, 2011, *The Securitization of Migration: A Study of Movement and Order*, New York: Routledge.
- Boutillier, Beverly, 2004, *The 'Canadian Diversity Model' in Brief*, Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Bradley, William, undated, "Is There a Post-Multiculturalism?," retrieved from <http://www.ryokoku.ac.jp>
- Brown, Wendy, 2014, *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*, paperback edition, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Carr, Paul R, 2010, "The 'Equity Waltz' in Canada. Whiteness and the Informal Realities of Racism in Education," *Journal of Contemporary Education in Alberta* 3.2, 4-23.
- Carruthers, Ashley, 2013, "National Multiculturalism, Transnational Identities," *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 34(2):214-228.
- Castles, Stephen/Mark Miller, 2009, *The Age of Migration*, 4/e, New York: Guildford Press.
- Catanzano, Amy, 2009, *Multiversal*, Fordham University Press.
- Clarke, George Elliott, 2009, Multiculturalism and Its (Usual) Discontents, *Canada Watch*, Fall, 24-25.
- Coleman, Daniel, 2011, "Imposing SubCitizenship," in: *Narratives of Citizenship: Indigenous and Diasporic Peoples Unsettle the Nation-State*, Aldys Fleischmann, Nancy van Styvendale, & Cody Maccaroll, eds., pp. 177-88, Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Collett, Elizabeth/Milica Petrovic, 2014, "The Future of Immigrant Integration in Europe: Mainstreaming Approaches for Inclusion," *Migration Policy Institute Europe*, March.
- Conference Notes, 2012, "Language and Superdiversity," Sociolinguistics Symposium 19, Freie Universität Berlin, 22-24 August.
- Council of Europe, 2008, *Living Together as Equals in Dignity: White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue*, Strasbourg.
- Czaika, Mathias/Hein de Haas, 2014, "The Globalization of Migration: Has the World Become More 'Migratory'?", *International Migration Review* 48.2, 283-323.
- Doucerain, Marina/Jessica Dere/Andrew G. Ryder, 2013, "Travels in Hyper-Diversity: Multiculturalism and the Contextual Assessment of Acculturation," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 37, 686-699.
- Fleras, Augie, 1994, "Media and Minorities in a Post-Multicultural Society. Overview and Appraisal," in: *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada*, John Berry & Jean Laponce, eds., pp. 267-292, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- , 2009, *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Cross National Perspectives in Multicultural Governance*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- , 2010, *The Media Gaze: Representations of Diversity in Canada*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- , 2011, "Forty Years of Multiculturalism," Paper presented to the 40 Years of Multiculturalism Conference, Ottawa, 25 September.

- , 2012, *Unequal Relations. The Politics of Race, Ethnic, and Aboriginal Relations in Canada*, 7/e, Toronto: Pearson.
- , 2013, "Living In/With/Through Diversity," Paper presented to the Living In Diversity Conference, Central European University, Budapest, 23 May.
- , 2014a, *Racisms in a Multicultural Canada*, Waterloo ON: Wilfrid Laurier Press.
- , 2014b, *Immigration Canada*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- /Paul Spoonley, 1999, *Recalling Aotearoa*, Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Florby, G./M. Shackleton/K. Suhonen, eds., 2009, *Canada: Images of a Post/National Society*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Foster, Cecil, 2014, *Genuine Multiculturalism. The Tragedy and Comedy of Diversity*, Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis, 2013, "What is Governance?," *Governance* 26.3, 347-368.
- Garcea, Joseph/Anna Kirova/Lloyd Wong, 2008, "Introduction: Multiculturalism Discourses in Canada," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40.1, 1-10.
- Gaye, Nicole, 2011, "Super Diversity in Canada," *Policy Horizons Canada*, June.
http://www.horizons.gc.ca/sites/default/files/Publication-alt-format/0072_pag_superdiversity_e.pdf.
- Globe and Mail*, 2011, "Super-Diversity," 12 March.
- Gozdecka, Dorota A/Selen A Ercan/Magdalena Kmak, 2014, "From Multiculturalism to Post-Multiculturalism: Trends and Paradoxes," *Journal of Sociology* 50.1, 51-64.
- Habacan, Alden E., 2007, "Beyond the Mosaic: Canada's Multiculturalism 2.0," Paper to the Annual Summer Conference, The Stranger Next Door: Making Diversity Work, Orillia ON: Couchiching Institute on Public Affairs, August 9-12.
- , 2012, "A Renewal of Multiculturalism," *Culture West*, Winter, 13-19.
- Hage, Ghassan, 2006, "The Doubts Down Under," *Catalyst Magazine*, 17 May, available online.
- Hanlon, Michael, 2014, "The Concept There is not Just a Universe, But a Multiverse, Has Come into the Scientific Mainstream," *The Telegraph*, printed in the *National Post* 22 April.
- Hansen, Randall, 2014, "Assimilation by Stealth: Why Canada's Multicultural Policy is Really a Repackaged Integration Policy," in: *The Multiculturalism Question. Debating Identity in 21st-Century Canada*, Jack Jedwab, ed., pp. 73-88, Queen's Policy Studies Series, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal & Kingston.
- Haque, Eve, 2012, *Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: Language, Race, and Belonging in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Harmon, Bryan, undated, "Inclusion/Integration? Is There a Difference," retrieved <http://www.cdss.ca>.
- Heath, Joseph, 2014, "Misunderstanding Canadian Multiculturalism," *Global Brief*, 24 March.
- Hollinger, David A., 2005, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*, New York: Basic Books.
- Hoyos, Kathleen, 2014, "Canadian Multiculturalism, Same as it ever was?" *Coolabah* 13, Australian Studies Centre, University of Barcelona.
- Hrushetska, Maryna, 2013, "Beyond Multiculturalism. Opinion," Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com>.
- Ignatieff, Michael, 2013, "Preface," in: *Taking Liberties. A History of Human Rights in Canada*. D Goutor/ S Heathorn, eds., pp. v-ix. Toronto: Oxford.
- Jedwab, Jack, 2014, "Debating Multiculturalism in 21st Century Canada," in: *The Multiculturalism Question. Debating Identity in 21st-Century Canada*, Jack Jedwab, ed., pp. 1-29, Queen's Policy Studies Series, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal & Kingston.
- Jenson, Jane/Martin Papillon, 2001, "The Canadian Diversity Model. A Repertoire in Search of a Framework," CPRN Discussion Paper F/19, November.
- Joppke, Christian, 2004, "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy," *British Journal of Sociology* 55.2.

- Kaltmeier, Olaf/Josef Raab/Sebastian Thies, 2012, "Multiculturalism and Beyond: The New Dynamics of Identity Politics in the Americas," *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 7.2, 103-114.
- Karim, Karim, 2007, "Nation and Diaspora: Rethinking Multiculturalism in a Transnational Context," in: *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 2.3 (20070208), 267-282.
- Kraus, Peter, 2011, "The Politics of Complex Diversity: A European Perspective," *Ethnicities* 12.1, 3-25.
- Kymlicka, Will, 2004, "The Global Diffusion of Multiculturalism: Trends, Causes, and Consequences," Paper originally delivered to the International Conference on Leadership, Education, and Multiculturalism in the Armed Forces, La Paz, Bolivia.
- , 2010, "The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism? New Debates on Inclusion and Accommodation in Diverse Societies," *International Social Science Journal* 61.199, 97-122.
- , 2012, Prospects for Multicultural Citizenship. Pluralism Forum on Reframing Europe's "Multiculturalism" Debates, Global Centre for Pluralism, April.
- , 2014, "The Essentialist Critique of Multiculturalism: Theories, Policies, Ethos," EUI Working Paper RSCAS 2014/59, European University Institute, Budapest.
- /Kathryn Walker, eds., 2012, *Rooted Cosmopolitanism*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Lafontaine-Emond, Isabelle, 2013, *Multiculturalism: More Than Cultural Diversity*, Ottawa: Library of Parliament Research Publications.
- Latham, Robert, 2007/08, "What Are We? From a Multicultural to a Multiversal Canada," *International Journal* 63.1, 23-42.
- , 2008, "Canadian Society is not Just Multicultural; It is Multiversal," ResearchSnapshot, York University, Toronto.
- , 2009, "After Multiculturalism: Canada And Its Multiversal Future," *Canada Watch* Fall, pp. 28-30.
- Latour, Sophie Guerard de/Peter Balint, 2013, "The Fair Terms of Integration: Liberal Multiculturalism Reconsidered," in: *Liberal Multiculturalism and the Fair Terms of Integration*, P Balint/S Latour, eds., pp. 1-16, New York: Palgrave.
- Ley, David, 2005, "Post-Multiculturalism?" Working Paper No. 05-17, Vancouver: Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Diversity.
- Li, Jinling/Kasper Juffermans, 2011, "Multilingual Europe 2.0: Dutch-Chinese Youth Identities in an Era of Superdiversity," Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies, Paper No. 71.
- Lui, Samantha, 2014, "Diaspora Canadians are Key to Success for Companies Looking to Expand Internationally," *New Canadian Media*, 15 October.
- Maaka, Roger/Augie Fleras, 2005, *The Politics of Indigeneity*, Dunedin NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Malik, Kenan, 2012, *Conflicting Credo's But the Same Vision of the World*, Paper presented at the Criticise This: Rethinking the Question of Difference Seminar, Ulcinj, Montenegro, 21 May, retrieved from <http://kenanmalik.wordpress.com>.
- , 2013, "In Defence of Diversity," *The New Humanist*, Winter, 18 December. <http://www.eurozine.com>.
- Mansouri, Fethi/Boulou Ebanda de B'beri, 2014, *Global Perspectives on the Politics of Multiculturalism in the 21st Century: A Case Study Analysis*, New York: Routledge.
- Mawani, Aysha, 2008, "Transnationalism: A Modern Day Challenge to Canadian Multiculturalism," Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, May 22, available online at <http://www.allacademic.com>.
- McKenzie, Heidi, 2013, "Decolonial Aesthetics," *Fuse Magazine* 36.4, 8.
- Messelink, A./J.D. ten Hijne, 2012, "Unity In Super-Diversity," *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1.1, 80-101.
- Mistry, Rohinton, 1995, *A Fine Balance*, New York: Vintage.
- Modood, Tariq, 2013, *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*, 2/e, Cambridge: Polity.
- Mor Barak, M.E., 2014, *Managing Diversity. Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*, 3/e, Los Angeles: Sage.

- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen, 2006, Toward a New Research Agenda? Foucault, Whiteness, and Indigenous Sovereignty, *Journal of Sociology* 42.4, 383-395.
- Mukherjee, Bharati, 1989, *The Middleman and Other Stories*, Toronto: Penguin.
- New Canadian Media, 2013, "The Third Opinion: Moving Beyond Multiculturalism," *New Canadian Media*, 28 January.
- Pakulski, Jan, 2014, "Confusions About Multiculturalism," *Journal of Sociology* 50.1, 23-36.
- /Stefan Markowski, 2014, "Globalisation, Immigration, and Multiculturalism – European and Australian Experiences," *Journal of Sociology* 50.1, 3-9.
- Parekh, Bhikhu, 2005, *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, 2/e, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peter, Karl, 1978, "Multi-Cultural Politics, Money, and the Conduct of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association," *Bulletin of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association* 5, 2-3.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen, 2006, "Global Multiculturalism, Flexible Acculturation," Paper presented at various conferences in North America and Europe.
- Pinder, Sherrow O., 2010, *The Politics of Race and Ethnicity in the United States*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prato, G.B., 2012, "Introduction – Beyond Multiculturalism. Anthropology at the Intersection Between the Local, the National, and the Global," in: *Beyond Multiculturalism: A View from Anthropology*, G.B. Prato, ed., pp. 1-19, Ashgate.
- RECODE Conference Notes, 2013, "European-Canadian Research Meeting: Responding to Complex Diversity in Europe and Canada – Future Research Directions," Montreal, 12-13 September.
- Rodríguez-García, Dan, 2010, "Beyond Assimilation and Multiculturalism: A Critical Review of the Debate on Managing Diversity," *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 11.3, 251-71.
- Rodríguez-García, Dan, 2012, "Managing Immigration and Diversity in the New Age of Migration: A Transatlantic Dialogue," in: *Managing Immigration and Diversity in Canada*, Dan Rodríguez-García, ed., pp. 1-60, Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Sandercock, Leonie, 2003, *Cosmopolis 11: Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century*, London: Continuum.
- , 2006, *Rethinking Multiculturalism for the 21st Century*, Working Paper No. 03-14. Research on immigration and integration in the metropolis, Vancouver: Vancouver Centre of Excellence.
- Satzewich, Vic/Lloyd Wong, eds., 2006, *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Saunders, Doug, 2013, "Immigrants' Children Find Multiculturalism Obsolete," *The Globe and Mail*, 26 January.
- Scott, James C., 1999, *Seeing Like a State*, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University.
- Scruton, Roger, 2002, *The West and the Rest: Globalization and the Terrorist Threat*, Delaware: ISI Books.
- Siemiatycki, Myer, 2012, "The Place of Immigrants: Citizenship, Settlement, and Socio-Cultural Integration in Canada," in: *Managing Immigration and Diversity in Canada*, Dan Rodríguez-García, ed., pp. 223-48, Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Simmons, Alan, 2010, *Immigration and Canada. Global and Transnational Perspectives*, Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Smith, Anthony, 2013, "The Land and Its People': Reflections on an Artistic Identification in an Age of Nations and Nationalism," *Nations and Nationalism* 19.1, 87-106.
- Smith, R. Drew/William Ackah/Anthony G. Reddie, eds., 2014, *Churches, Blackness, and Contested Multiculturalism*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Spoonley, Paul/Tolley Erin, eds., 2012, *Diverse Nations, Diverse Responses: Approaches to Social Cohesion in Immigrant Societies*, Queen's Policy Studies Series, Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.
- Stasiulis, Daiva K/Abigail B Bakan, 2005, *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*, University of Toronto Press.

- Tunis, Deborah, 2010, "Fostering an Integrated Society," Talk at University of Western Ontario, London 19 October.
- Turton, Anthony R., et al., eds., 2007, *Governance as a Triologue: Government-Society-Science in Transition*, Springer.
- Vertovec, Steven, 2007, "Super-diversity and its Implications," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30.6, 1024-1054.
- , 2010, "Toward Post-Multiculturalism? Changing Communities, Conditions, and Contexts of Diversity," *International Social Science Journal* 61.199, 83-95.
- , 2012, "Diversity" and the Social Imaginary, *Arch. europ. social.* LIII.3, 287-312.
- , 2013, "Reading 'Super-Diversity,'" MPI-MMG, December, Retrieved from <http://www.mmg.mpg.de>.
- /Susanne Wessendorf, 2004, *Migration and Cultural, Religious, and Linguistic Diversity in Europe. An Overview of Issues and Trends*, COMPAS, University of Oxford.
- Walton-Roberts, Margaret, 2011, "Multiculturalism Already Unbound," in: *Home and Native Land: Unsettling Multiculturalism in Canada*, M Chazan, L Helps, A Stanley, and S Thakkar, eds., pp. 102-122, Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Wessendorf, Susanne, 2014, *Researching Social Relations in Super-Diverse Neighbourhoods. Mapping the Field*, IRiS Working Paper Series No 2, University of Birmingham.
- Winter, Elke, 2014, "Becoming Canadian. Making Sense of Recent Changes to Citizenship Rules," *Institute for Research on Public Policy*, 16 January.
- Wong, Lloyd L, 2007/08, "Transnationalism, Active Citizenship, and Belonging in Canada," *International Journal* 63.1, 79-100.