

Review of: "Resentment and Multiculturalism: Kymlicka's Canada, Bonilla Maldonado's Colombia and Modood's UK"

Miguel Rojas Sotelo¹

¹ Duke University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author (I have follow your work for years. Thanks for all you do). However, I do not see the real purpose of this article. I find the contrasting readings of Bonilla and Modood reductive, by only utilizing one work of each and comparing them to a well recognized (but outdated) author like W. Kymlicka does not make for a robust argumentation. It is hard to compare different cases, setting Canada as example, and social contexts, such as the 1988 Multiculturalist Act in Canada (with all its problems of implementation, the reality on the ground does not match the rhetoric), with the 1991 Constitution in Colombia and the case of muslim communities living as migrants in the U.K (even though they were colonial subjects). I do see a liberal bias on your argument, that matches your reading of the authors across the paper. While discussing Bonilla, you bring another Colombian author, Moreno Parra, who aligns better with your argument to criticize Bonilla's point of how after 15 years of the 1991 constitution the multicultural liberal agenda was incompatible to deal with indigenous non-liberal societies (you brand them illiberal). Bonilla's work from a legal standpoint refers to the hardship of the 1991 Constitution (liberal) to deal with alternative, autonomous, forms of governance, justice, and ways of being of indigenous peoples within the nation state. Current migration waves (Venezuelans in particular) are not consider in Bonilla's 2006 piece you mentioned (or respond to the 2007 piece by Kymlicka). More problematic was your discussion, a kind of militant liberalism (that I found problematic on the way you refer to resentment by muslim communities in the UK), when you talk about Modood's representation of islam in a multicultural space (you showed a liberal-secular bias on this article). Your sentence: "Multiculturalism is a Canadian value -among other Canadian values- and its basis is to treat all immigrants and non-immigrant alike respectfully in order to help them enter within the mainstream systems and to participate in centers of power, instead of encouraging children to dream of excluding or killing others, and considering others as inferior or dangerous... is reductive, problematic, and shows the social engineering of multiculturalist agendas from the top (you did also use the dualistic lens on Modood's / instead of). I believe, the problem started with the outdated definition of culture (that of W. Welsch, 1999), which you compare to Kymlicka's perspectives on Multiculturalism (also is outdated). Multiculturalism is not an invention of Canada, nor a theoretical development of Kymlicka or Taylor, it is a reality of multiple nation/states trapped in fictional border lines, law frames, and ideological divides (colonial and post-colonial). if there is a problem with multiculturalism is the logic that tries to surrender it to a national framework. Just look at interesting innovations in the south, multinational nation-states, with different legal, economic, cultural frameworks and institutions that can recognized difference without flattening them from a liberal/democratic perspective.

