The omnicultural imperative

Fathali M Moghaddam

Georgetown University, USA

Abstract

Globalization is taking place in unprecedented ways, with unprecedented consequences, including large-scale sudden contact between human groups. Sudden inter-group contact without adequate pre-adaptation is sometimes resulting in catastrophic evolution, with radicalization and terrorism arising as (dysfunctional) defense mechanisms among some groups experiencing threatened collective identities. The main traditional policies for managing relations between diverse groups, assimilation and multiculturalism, are critically reviewed and found wanting. Omniculturalism is considered as an alternative policy; in stage one, the *omnicultural imperative* demands that during interactions with others we give priority to human commonalities; in stage two, group-based differences are recognized. A cross-national survey shows support for omniculturalism within the United States, but less so among minority group members.

> Humanity's globalizing civilization must...explore conscious evolution and try new ways of organizing societies to cooperate to solve its burgeoning global problems...We need to set practical goals of how to live and determine how to organize ourselves to reach those goals.
>
> (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 2008, p. 368)

The enormous challenges confronting humankind in the 21st century (Homer-Dixon, 2006; Moghaddam, 2010; Zimbardo, 2007) demand nothing less than what the biologists Ehrlich and Ehrlich (2008) propose: a thorough re-thinking of how

Corresponding author:

Fathali M Moghaddam, Georgetown University, White Gravenor Building (3rd floor), Washington DC, DC 20057, USA

Email: moghaddf@georgetown.edu

we have organized human societies, and concrete plans to consciously shape our evolutionary future to achieve better results. Psychological science can help us to better explore possibilities for such re-organization in the context of globalization. In the first part of this paper, I examine the ways in which contemporary "fractured" globalization (Moghaddam, 2008a) is unprecedented and is raising new challenges for humankind. The most important new challenge examined in this paper concerns the organization of relations between different groups of people characterized by ethnic, religious, linguistic, and other important differences. The challenge of how to best organize inter-group relations is enormously important because the possible consequences, which include terrorism and war, are severe when this challenge is not taken up successfully.

The consequences of fractured globalization for inter-group relations are examined in the context of *catastrophic evolution*, a swift, sharp, and often fatal decline in numbers of a particular life-form (Moghaddam, 2006). Thus, in addition to assessing the human condition in the macro context of contemporary fractured globalization, I adopt an evolutionary perspective that incorporates long-term macro processes. Through this approach, we recognize that the organization of inter-group relationships is continuously changing within a considerable range of possibilities; the currently favored policies, of assimilation and multiculturalism, offer two contrasting visions of the globalization process.

The end result of the assimilation option is a world in which humans are culturally and linguistically more homogeneous and group-based differences in terms of ethnicity, religion, and so on, are minimized. Some would argue that current trends, as reflected in "language death" for example (Crystal, 2000), reflect the reality of assimilation being in line with globalization. According to this viewpoint, we are moving toward a global village (McLuhan, 1964) in which lifestyles become increasingly similar.

The end result of the multiculturalism option, in contrast, is a world in which group based differences are highlighted and celebrated. The global "ethnic revival" and the official adoption of multiculturalism in Canada, Australia, and unofficially in many other countries, including in important sectors of the United States and the European Union, suggests to some that it is multicultural policy that is sweeping the world. For example, in the educational context of most Western societies, multiculturalism has become the "politically correct" policy. However, both assimilation and multiculturalism are plagued by major weaknesses, and this paper is part of an ongoing effort by cultural researchers to critically examine these current policies and also explore viable alternatives (for related discussions, see Ali & Sonn, 2010; Beckstead, 2010; Froese, 2010; Hale & de Abreu, 2010; Kadianaki, 2010; Kwak, 2010; Rudmin, 2010; Tartakovsky, 2010).

A third way: Omniculturalism

Omniculturalism is a new alternative policy for managing diversity that has greater promise than assimilation and multiculturalism, particularly at the global level

(Moghaddam, 2010, ch. 9). The term "omniculturalism" has already been used descriptively by several authors (e.g., Liu, 1998), but in this paper the term refers to a specific policy for managing diversity (introduced in Moghaddam, 2009). According to this new policy, socialization of the young in relation to inter-group relations should involve two stages. During the first stage, the *omniculturalism imperative* compels us to give priority to human commonalities, and requires that children are taught the important scientifically-established commonalities that characterize human beings. Psychological science has a key role to play at this stage, particularly with respect to identifying foundational human commonalities and answering the question: what are the common human characteristics? This concern with universals is in line with the avowed aims of both mainstream psychology and the emerging alternatives, such as cultural psychology ("Cultural psychology is the universal knowledge system—*Wissenschaft*—that reveals general principles of semiotic self-regulation of active organisms within their lifeworlds", Valsiner, 2007, p. 390).

The first phase of omniculturalism parallels the "commonalities of cultures" feature of polyculturalism proposed by historians (e.g., Prashad, 2001) and explored by a number of social scientists (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010; Shwarz & West-Pavlov, 2007). However, whereas in omniculturalism the focus is on universals in human behavior as established by scientific research, polyculturalism focuses on patterns of social interactions and mutual influence – patterns that are often rooted in the historical past. During stage two of omniculturalism, group based differences are introduced, and the value of also having diversity is highlighted. However, the priority remains with human commonalities, and group based differences are treated as secondary. Put otherwise, persons are prior to "kinds of persons" (see discussion in Lamiell, 2003, ch. 10). The end result of omniculturalism is a society in which people are knowledgeable about, and give priority to, human commonalities, but also leave some room for the recognition and further development of group distinctiveness. A cross-national survey shows strong support for omniculturalism in the United States (Moghaddam & Breckenridge, 2010).

Fractured globalization and its unprecedented consequences

In this first section I argue that globalization is taking place in unprecedented ways, with unprecedented consequences. The most important consequence relevant to this discussion is in the domain of inter-group relations, and the increased dangers of radicalization, terrorism, and violent collective conflicts. While I do not propose that there is a direct causal link between globalization and terrorism, I argue that globalization has certain consequences, threatened collective identities being the most important, that make radicalization and terrorism more likely (Moghaddam, 2008a).

Globalization as it is taking place has been described as "fractured" (Moghaddam, 2008b), because it is associated with enormous resource inequalities

and power disparities. To begin with, the main motor for contemporary globalization is technological transformations, which for the most part arise from research and entrepreneurial centers located in Western societies. It is true that the new mass media and electronic communications have dispersed power in some respects, and given opportunities to grass-roots movements to gain influence outside traditional power centers (Castells, 2009), but the main source of the technological innovations in areas such as computer technologies, biotechnologies, and nano-technologies, continue to be in Western societies and particularly the United States (although some smaller countries such as Taiwan show considerable success in small entity patent counts, Kingston & Scally, 2006).

Moreover, the direction and pace of technological changes are unforeseen. Consider, for example, the enormous changes that have taken place in the post-World War II period through new computer technologies and the internet. The international reach of the internet in 2012 and the transformations it has brought about, particularly in the lifestyles of younger generations, were not predictable even a few decades earlier. Nor is it possible to predict the changes that are going to be brought about by technological innovations over the next few decades. For example, it may well be that nano-technology will bring about the next set of societal transformations and changes in social relations, but the exact direction and global reach of these possible changes remain unknown. This unpredictability, and the sense that future developments are disproportionally influenced by Western powers, is threatening to fundamentalists in non-Western societies, particularly Muslim fundamentalists (for a related discussion of feelings of uncertainty and extremism, see Hogg, 2007).

The greater inter-dependence of societies means that it is more difficult to remain immune from the economic plight of even "small and remote" economies. For example, the financial troubles of Greece and several other small European countries in 2010 led to a sharp decline of the value of the Euro, and revolutions in a number of Arab countries resulted in a spike in oil prices in 2011, significantly slowing the economic recovery in the United States and other major Western societies. Electronic trading and the rapid movements of capital across national borders around the world have meant that there is an almost instantaneous impact of economic events in one part of the world on events in other parts of the world.

While the sheer speed and penetration of economic influence from one part of the world to another has increased, inequalities in resources and power have become further highlighted. The global mass media continuously sends images of the affluent consumer lifestyle to populations with relatively little purchasing power in distant lands, and raises expectations among such populations—without actually raising their standard of living. Thus, the over 2 billion people who continue to survive on less than US$2 per day still tend to be reached by Hollywood images that are closer to Orange County, California, than to their own impoverished conditions. Of course, resource inequalities within the United States and some other Western societies have increased (Homer-Dixon, 2006, summed up the evidence in this way: " . . . never in history have the differences in income and

opportunity among us been so great'', p. 186), but my main concern in this discussion is increased inequalities internationally—and particularly the *perception* of inequalities and injustices.

The American dilemma

The perception of injustices is at the heart of the *New Global American Dilemma*, which like the first American Dilemma involves a contradiction between stated ideals and actual practices. During the era of segregation, Gunnar Myrdal (1898–1987) explored race relations in *An American Dilemma* (1944), and pointed out the contradiction between avowed American ideals and actual American practices. Myrdal's analysis suggested that this dilemma would have to be resolved, and it eventually was resolved (on paper at least) through Civil Rights legislation. Globalization has brought about a *New Global American Dilemma*: the interconnectedness of the world and the new global mass media means that the United States cannot support freedom and democracy on the one hand, and continue to support dictatorships such as those in Saudi Arabia and some other Arab states, on the other, without the contradiction in this action being recognized by people in many different regions, including in non-Western societies (Moghaddam, 2008a).

Global interconnectedness has also made possible the *Ahmadinejad Effect*, whereby a local ''hothead'' is able to mobilize radical elements in his home society by making threats against, and highlighting the danger from, an external enemy (Moghaddam, 2010, p.12). Of course, in previous eras world powers were also concerned about ''local hotheads'' in distant places. For example, Great Britain at the height of the British Empire in the 19th century was concerned about radical leadership in places such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, but there was not a serious concern that such radical leaders from places such as Afghanistan would directly attack Great Britain—nothing like the 9/11 terrorist attacks could have happened in the 19th century. The new global interconnectedness means that even threats from radicals in distant lands have to be taken seriously, because they might gain access to powerful weapons they can use against the United States. The globalized mass media makes the global impact of 9/11 and other terrorist attacks possible, because such impact can only be realized through the instantaneous and widespread diffusion of information and shocking images.

Globalized communications also enable radicals in even remote and distant lands to propagate their cause globally, for example by connecting to young Muslims in Western societies through the internet. Thus, for example, in the United States and Europe, a number of young people have become ''home-grown terrorists'' through ''being inspired'' by network jihadists based in the Near East and Southern Asia. The new global interconnectedness adds the threat of internal radicalization, domestic collective violence, and even home grown terrorism to the list of ''traditional'' external threats. This new consequence of globalization is best understood in the context of long-term evolutionary processes.

Catastrophic evolution and sudden contact. Among the ways in which globalization brings about changes in interconnectedness, two are of particular importance to this discussion: first, interconnectedness through the global mass media and electronic communications, which now penetrates to the remotest corners of the globe; and, second, interconnectedness through the large scale physical movement of people from one part of the globe to another. This second trend is the focus of discussion in this section of the paper.

From their earliest days of bipedalism about 6 million years ago, human beings were on the move, travelling out of Africa and eventually covering the main land masses of the world by about 12,000 years ago. This movement was motivated by a need to find food, other necessary resources, and ''vacant spaces'' generally. Hunter-gathering societies evolved in groups numbering no more than several hundred, and human social skills adapted to life in small, slow-moving groups. Until very recently, human groups moved only as fast as their own legs could carry them.

The development of more sophisticated transportation systems, first relying on animal power and then on steam, electricity, oil, nuclear, and other sources, resulted in the rapid movement of very large numbers of people over long distances. This was accelerated during wartime. For example, during World War II, tens of millions of people were transported across continents, using rapid trains, trucks, ships, and aircrafts. The invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan by United States-led forces in the 21st century have demonstrated even more rapid deployments of enormous military forces, made possible by rapid mass transportation systems.

More advanced transportation systems enabled the rapid colonization of many parts of the world by Western powers, including Spain, Portugal, France, and Great Britain, from the 16th century onwards. Native peoples in many parts of Asia, Africa, and the Americas suddenly found themselves confronted with militarily stronger Western invaders. This kind of ''sudden contact'' between life forms, including different human societies, but also different plants and animals, can under certain conditions result in catastrophic evolution. The probability of sudden contact resulting in decline and extinction increases when a life form has low preadaptation (after Ehrlich, 2000) for successful evolution in contact with particular other life forms in a given environment. Low preadaptation means that a life form is not able to change quickly enough to survive contact with an out-group in given environmental conditions.

There are numerous examples of sudden contact resulting in decline and extinction of a life form, among animals and plants as well as human cultures and languages. The devastating impact of invasive species has been amply documented among animals and plants, and the resulting decline in diversity in the natural world is widely acknowledged (for example, see Baskin, 2002; Ruiz & Carlton, 2004). The same process of sudden contact resulting in a decline in diversity is evident in the domain of human cultures and languages (Crystal, 2000). Thousands of languages and cultures have been lost over the last few hundred years, and most of the languages alive today will be lost by the end of the 21st century.

The experiences of the native peoples in North and South America are typical; from a total population of over 100 million people, speaking thousands of languages, they have experienced an almost complete collapse, struggling to maintain their collective identities (Taylor, 2002).

The onslaught of globalization, which is often perceived as the spread of "secular American culture" and "McDonaldization" (Ritzer, 2009), is experienced as a threat by various minority cultures, including religious fundamentalists, Islamic fundamentalists among them (Moghaddam, 2008a). The greatest threat faced by Islamic fundamentalists has been the spread of a "liberated', egalitarian role for women. Both in Western and non-Western societies, Islamic fundamentalist have struggled to prevent the "invasion" of new ideas and practices that would liberate women from the Islamic veil, give them equality under the law, and allow them to enjoy voice and power in the public arena (Moghaddam, 2008a). Islamic fundamentalists correctly perceive that their way of life is threatened by a world in which women have the same rights as men and enjoy freedom in the public sphere.

Thus, my argument is that globalization is associated with "sudden contact', and the resultant collective identity threat among groups who perceive that they are going to experience decline or even extinction in the globalization process (Moghaddam, 2008a). Some groups experiencing collective identity threats take "defensive" actions. Radicalization and terrorism are examples of such actions; attempts to repel outside influences and to maintain a way of life through isolation is a broader strategy followed by some groups attempting to avoid becoming part of the global network and being influenced by global trends, such as changes in gender relations (e.g., the ruling dictatorships in Iran and North Korea both follow such isolationist policies).

Minority groups experiencing sudden contact have been confronted with two alternatives: either become absorbed into the global village, or face extinction through other means. So far, they have not viewed the possibility of becoming part of the human group on the basis of commonalities shared by all humans, while at the same time remaining in some ways distinct (as sugguested by the experimental work of Levy et al., 2005, for example). The larger issue concerns inter-group relations in this era of accelerating globalization and sudden contact: to return to the quotation from Ehrlich and Ehrlich (2008, p. 368) that begins this paper, what is the best way to organize ourselves? This question is addressed in the next section through a critical assessment of the traditional policies of assimilation and multiculturalism.

Traditional policies for managing diversity

One of the most important challenges raised by contemporary globalization is how we can best organize inter-group relations. In the context of accelerating globalization, relentlessly pushed along by technological and economic forces, how can we best organize relationships between groups that are different in terms of ethnicity, religion, language, and other important characteristics? This question forces

itself upon us through economic necessities, even though for cultural and other reasons we may attempt to avoid interacting with out-groups. For example, even though many Europeans are reluctant to open their borders to immigrants from Asia and Africa, the low birth rate and the aging population in Europe is forcing the European Union to import millions of Asian and African workers to meet the demand for labor in the European economy (for a review of demographic changes and the labor market in the European Union, see Lisiankova & Wright, 2005). Similarly, the United States' economy continues to import well over a million "legal" immigrants each year. Millions of illegal immigrants also annually move to the United States, to South Africa, to Western Europe, and to other parts of the world where there is a market for cheap labor (for a review of international labor migration see International Labour Organization, 2010). The outcome of these vast global migrations is inter-group contact on an enormous scale, and thus arise the challenges of organizing relationships between different groups.

From a "free market" perspective, it might seem that governments should adopt a "laissez-fair" attitude and allow market forces to determine diversity management. After all, both assimilation and multiculturalism are at one level social representations (Farr & Moscovici, 1984) or shared meanings; why should market forces not be allowed to determine which meanings are implemented "on the ground"? However, in practice this is not what has taken place, even in Western capitalist societies. A number of such societies, including Canada and Australia, have explicitly adopted government policies for managing diversity, for example by providing funding directly for the maintenance of minority heritage cultures and languages (Moghaddam, 2008b). In the European Union, a number of governments have directly intervened in the integration of minorities; for example, the French government has (at least at times) attempted to outlaw certain Islamic clothing styles for women, and a referendum in Switzerland resulted in support for a ban on minarets. Thus, despite the rhetoric of a "free market" approach to managing diversity, in practice governments are to a significant degree adopting, sometimes explicitly, policies for managing diversity. Indeed, in some ways the business sector has taken the lead, by developing policies for managing diversity in business organization, policies that are influential in both the private and public sectors (see Mor Barak, 2010; Riccucci, 2002). Also, immigration policy has in practice served as a means to manage diversity, by influencing the size and composition of different groups in society, sometimes based on "IQ" and other psychological characteristics (Calavita, 1996).

Two main policies have been available for managing inter-group relations: *assimilation*, "the melting away of differences between different groups toward a society in which inter-group similarity is maximized and differences minimized" (Moghaddam, 2008a, p. 15), and *multiculturalism*, which involves on the one hand the strengthening and highlighting of inter-group differences, and on the other hand the sharing of in-group culture with out-groups (Moghaddam, 2008a, p. 15). The psychological foundations of these policies are critically

assessed below. In this discussion more space is dedicated to assimilation because there is general agreement that this is the more historically important policy (Alba & Nee, 1997).

Assimilation: A critical assessment. The classic view of assimilation is reflected in the work of the ''Chicago school', depicting a ''straight line'' process that is assumed to bring ethnic minorities into the American mainstream (Alba & Nee, 1997). More recently, critics of the ''classic'' view have argued that rather than following a ''straight line', we now have ''bumpy line'' and segmented assimilation, whereby ''Children of nonwhite immigrants may not even have the opportunity of gaining access to middle-class white society, no matter how acculturated they become'' (Portes & Zhou, 1993; see also Portes, Fernández-Kelly & Haller, 2005). However, some empirical studies (e.g., Waters, Tran, Kasinitz & Mollenkopf, 2010) have not validated segmented assimilation.

  Also, the general end-goal of assimilation seems to be in line with the major trends of globalization. As technological and economic forces push for greater interconnectedness and sweep away national barriers, as more and more people move and interact with others outside their neighborhoods, cities, and countries of birth, and as the global mass media and international corporations homogenize both available products and services and information and images, the actual lived lives of people around the world become more similar to one another. Moreover, people converge to speak fewer common languages, so communications barriers might also be set aside. A number of research themes in psychological science help us to assess the merits of assimilation.

The assumed benefits of contact. A long-established proposition in psychology is that contact between different groups of people will reduce inter-group prejudice (Dovidio, Gaertner & Kawakami, 2003). In the 21st century, the positive outcomes of inter-group contact have been re-evaluated in two main ways. First, meta-analytic reviews have suggested that the general outcome of contact is more positive inter-group relations, particularly for majority group members, irrespective of the conditions (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Second, there is some evidence to suggest that indirectly having contact with an out-group, through friends who have out-group contact or even through imagined out-group contact, can result in reduced prejudice against the out-group (Crisp & Turner, 2009; Turner, 2010). This more positive interpretation of inter-group contact is in line with desegregation policies, for example bringing together White and African Americans in the context of schools in the hope that contact in and by itself will bring about more positive inter-group relations.

  But this optimistic view of the outcomes of inter-group contact seems rather unrealistic, and even simplistic. Allport (1954) stimulated research in this area by proposing conditions that would need to be met in order for contact to have beneficial outcomes: (1) groups should enjoy equal status, (2) the context should be cooperative rather than competitive, (3) the groups should share a common

goal, and (4) contact should be supported by the larger community. The stringent nature of these conditions reflects the great difficulty of overcoming inter-group biases in practice; do the more optimistic new perspectives really reflect reality more accurately than did Allport's (1954) restrictions? Consider, for example, the case of Shiite and Sunni Muslims in Iraq, or Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda . . . or a variety of other real groups in real conflict situations (including torturers and torture victims). It seems unrealistic and even naive to propose that irrespective of the conditions, inter-group contact will result in more positive inter-group relations. Allport (1954) probably did not identify all the key conditions for all inter-group cases, but his focus on necessary conditions seems more realistic and more in line with real world experience.

Similarity.

> They take in any of the inhabitants of the country who wish to live with them. Thus joined with men who are willing, they easily merge into the same way of life and the same habits . . . But those who refuse to live by their laws they drive out of the boundaries they mark out for themselves. (More, 1516/1965 p. 58)

One of the characteristics of the imaginary society of *Utopia*, as described by Sir Thomas More, is that newcomers must assimilate and adopt the "same way of life" as the established inhabitants. More's assumption was that greater similarity is beneficial for society, and a long line of studies which demonstrate a robust link between similarity and attraction would seem to support this idea at the inter-personal (Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Byrne, 1971; Currarini, Jackson & Pin, 2010; Neimeyer & Mitchell, 1988) and inter-group (Osbeck, Moghaddam, & Perreault, 1997) levels. As a general rule, individuals and groups are more positively inclined toward others who they see to be similar to themselves. This would seem to support assimilation policy, since assimilation aims to create a society based on similarity.

On the other hand, experimental evidence demonstrates that inter-group discrimination can arise out of even trivial differences between groups (see the papers in Tajfel, 1978). In Tajfelian "minimal group paradigm" experiments, individuals show bias in favor of their in-group even though group membership is on a trivial basis (e.g., a dot estimation task), the identity of neither in-group nor out-group members is known, and individuals would not benefit materially from the in-group bias they show. In the world outside the laboratory, also, there are numerous examples of trivial inter-group differences being used as a basis for inter-group bias and even violence, a point discussed by Freud (1930/1961). No matter how similar groups become, inter-group differences can be manufactured and exaggerated, to serve as a basis for inter-group discrimination and conflict. Besides, phenotypic differences cannot be eliminated through assimilation policy, and color, body shape and size, and other such physical characteristics often serve as a basis of inter-group differentiation, and sometimes collective aggression. Thus, in practice

the possibility is ever present that dissimilarity will be manufactured to serve as a basis for inter-group differentiation, discrimination, and even violent conflict.

Meritocracy. Assimilation policy is intended to result in greater cultural and linguistic similarity, so that newcomers take on the culture and language of the mainstream. In this way, it is assumed, the children of newcomers will gain cultural literacy, which some have argued is essential for successful competition in the mainstream (Hirsch, 1988). Armed with the linguistic and cultural knowledge of mainstream America, for example, new immigrants will not be disadvantaged when taking the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) and other similar tests. In this way, it can be argued, society will become more *meritocratic*, meaning that the progress individuals enjoy moving up the economic, political, and social hierarchy will depend on individual merit, rather than group membership (e.g., race, gender, religion).

But there is a serious flaw in the argument that assimilation will result in a meritocracy, because the major source of inequalities is economic, and assimilation is not intended to bring about greater economic equality. As Ceci and Papierno (2005) have argued, the economic gap between "haves" and "have-nots" has increased, with consequences for some key areas of psychological performance. Cognitive and social development of children is influenced in important ways by the socio-economic status of parents (Bornstein & Bradley, 2003), so that children from lower-income households tend to be at a disadvantage. Assimilation does not attempt to address the size of such economic inequalities.

Group cohesion. A final argument I consider in favor of assimilation concerns the avowed benefits of homogeneity. First, it is argued that assimilation results in greater group cohesion, and an absence of the inter-group divisions that plague diverse societies such as the United States (see Wilson & Taub, 2006, for a discussion of ethnic tensions in the United States). Whereas diverse societies such as Canada and Belgium have struggled to remain intact, because of separatist movements, societies such as Japan have enjoyed cohesion because of their lack of diversity. Second, it has been argued that societies experiencing ethnic cleavages are less likely to become democratic (Stephens, 1993; Welsh, 1993), in part because voting will be along ethnic lines (Horowitz, 1993).

However, the suspicion that diversity hurts democracy has been criticized as unsupported by empirical evidence (Fish & Brooks, 2004), as well as by historical examples—such as India and the United States, the largest democracy and the most powerful democracy, both characterized by diversity. At the same time, Japan and Germany, two "assimilated, homogeneous" societies fell into the deep trap of dictatorship early in the 20th century. These examples cast doubt on the idea that assimilation necessarily results in more powerful, cohesive, democratic societies.

In summary, the psychological assumptions underlying assimilation have major flaws. All differences between people will not "melt away", and new differences can

always be manufactured to serve as a basis for inter-group discrimination. Also, the push to eradicate inter-group differences will result in threatened collective identities, which itself is associated with radicalization and even violence (Moghaddam, 2006). Not surprisingly, the problems associated with assimilation led to interest in an alternative policy, multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism

The rise multiculturalism has been associated with "fractured globalization" (Moghaddam, 2008b) at the international level, and the ethnic revival movements of the 1960s (Glazer & Moynihan, 1970), symbolized by slogans such as "Black is beautiful", at the national level. Such minority movements gave priority to rights and particularly the "right to be different", whereas majority groups gave priority to duties and particularly the duty to conform to societal rules and norms (Moghaddam, 2004). Multiculturalism came to represent the sentiments of the "ethnic revival", even though the term multiculturalism has often been used in very different ways. Most often, "multiculturalism" has been used descriptively, to refer to any collective consisting of groups that differ in terms of perceived racial, ethnic, religious, linguistic, and other such characteristics. As I discuss below, a more formal definition has arisen out of government policies in Canada and elsewhere (Berry, Kalin, & Taylor, 1977).

Motivation for culture and language retention among minorities. Foundational to multiculturalism is the *heritage retention assumption*, according to which minority group members are motivated to retain their heritage cultures and languages. This assumption is questionable in several respects, in both Western and non-western contexts. First, consider the case of a female Muslim lawyer who is qualified to serve as a judge, but will never become one, because according to the rules of her heritage culture female judges are not permitted in Islamic courts. To take another example, consider a Muslim teenager whose family practice female genital mutilation. Such women may well want to cast off at least major aspects of their "heritage cultures", and for good reason. Second, minority group immigrants in Western societies might be motivated to abandon their "distinctiveness" in order *not to stand out*, so as to be less visible targets for discrimination (Moghaddam & Taylor, 1987).

The multicultural hypothesis. Canada was the first country to formally adopt multiculturalism as a federal government policy, and at the heart of Canadian policy is what has been termed the multiculturalism hypothesis, which according to Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau's (1971) statement proposes that national unity must be based on confidence in "... one's own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes, and assumptions." Although some researchers (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1999) have

endorsed the view that pride and confidence in the in-group does not equate with bias against out-groups, considerable evidence stands against this position.

Sumner (1904) established a well documented tradition in social science research to view ethnocentrism as universal (LeVine & Campbell, 1971). This "pessimistic" view is continued by some interpretations of social identity theory, which see stronger identification with the in-group as associated with stronger bias against out-groups (although Turner & Reynolds, 2004, oppose this interpretation). There is some experimental evidence that the pessimistic view is more accurate for minority group members than it is for majority group members (Negy, Shreve, Jensen, & Uddin, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005), but historical evidence contradicts this. For example, the Nazis were the majority power in Germany for almost two decades prior to 1945, and Islamic fanatics have been the majority power in Iran for much of the time since the 1979 revolution, and both groups seem to exude in-group confidence and pride, but neither is known to be open and accepting toward out-groups. Consequently, at best we can find mixed support for the multiculturalism hypothesis (in line with Lambert, Memegis, & Taylor, 1986, who conducted the first direct, empirical test of this hypothesis).

Relativism. In the long term, the most serious weakness of multiculturalism is its association with, and support for, *cultural relativism*, the view that all cultures have equal value and deserve equal standing and support. Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau reflected this relativism in his statement, no doubt intended to appease minorities, that "there is no official culture" (1971/1992, p. 281). On the surface, it may seem that relativism supports minority rights, but in practice relativism works in favor of those with greatest power and minorities become further marginalized (Moghaddam, 1992). The rights and interests of minorities are best served first and foremost through reference to universal rights and duties (which can be established empirically, Moghaddam & Riley, 2004), not local ones.

That minority rights are best served through universal principles immediately becomes clear by considering specific cases, such as equal rights for women in political, legal, educational, and other contexts. Historically and cross-culturally, there are countless examples of local rules and norms that prevent women from enjoying equal rights. Such denial of rights are numerous and enormously varied, from women being denied the right to appear in public without the veil, being under the tutelage of the "man of the house" in the home, being second-class citizens in the workplace, and so on, in Saudi Arabia, Iran, and many other Muslim countries, to women being denied the right to become priests in the Catholic Church. It is only through appeal to, and eventual implementation of, universal principles, as reflected in the *United Nations Declaration of Human Rights* for example, that minorities can progress beyond the despotism of such local cultural practices.

Within the United States and most other Western societies, multiculturalism has enshrined a relativistic ritual of minority youth opting to compete along paths of "differentness" that too often lead to dead-end jobs requiring unskilled labor.

In some cases, education and "bookishness" have been defined as "white" and "mainstream culture" (see Ogbu & Davis, 2003, and the more nuanced assessments presented in Carter, 2005, and Fryer & Torelli, 2010), so that many minority youth do not see educational achievement as part of their collective identities (following Taylor, 2002). Tragically, while multiculturalism (and relativism) is seen by many, particularly minorities (Moghaddam & Breckenridge, 2010), as supporting in-group pride and progress, in practice this policy has contributed to minority marginalization and even dysfunction.

The shortcomings of the traditional policies of assimilation and multiculturalism make it necessary that we explore alternatives, such as omniculturalism.

The omnicultural imperative

> One trait in the philosopher's character we can assume is his love of any branch of learning that reveals eternal reality, the realm unaffected by vicissitudes of change and decay. (Plato, Book six, 485b)

The enormous challenges arising out of fractured globalization place considerable burdens on the policies of assimilation and multiculturalism—burdens that these policies are unable to take up successfully. It is imperative that we explore alternatives and develop policies that are more appropriate for the 21st century. Omniculturalism has been put forward as a viable alternative (Moghaddam, 2010).

In terms of the means of implementation, multiculturalism and assimilation policies have been implemented through both government intervention and free-market forces. For example, government intervention has been used to implement multiculturalism in Canada, but assimilation in France. In the United States, government policies support some aspects of multiculturalism in the education sector, but free market forces are assumed to "melt away" differences and bring about assimilation in the larger society in the longer term. The policy of omniculturalism requires more explicit government intervention, particularly through programs in the education sector. This is because specifically designed, developmentally appropriate programs are required to implement the two phases of omniculturalism.

The first goal of omniculturalism policy is to develop a society bonded by human commonalities and the celebration of important characteristics that we share as human beings. At a second level of priority, omnicultural policy aims to arrive at a society that also recognizes and shares group differences. In this way, omniculturalism to some degree reflects both what Plato refers to as "eternal reality", represented by human universals (although this is not a perfect match, because "human universals" can change through evolutionary processes), and the "vicissitudes of change and decay", of various group differences that can and often do change over time with changing circumstances.

Omniculturalism is not just a combination of assimilation and multiculturalism policies. First, unlike assimilation and multiculturalism as practiced so far,

omniculturalism is founded upon human universals *established through empirical research*. Second, in omniculturalism policy there is a strong bias to socialize citizens to give priority to human universals, and to only secondarily attend to intergroup differences. I have elsewhere discussed possible human universals (Moghaddam, 2010), as have others (e.g., Brown, 1991; Norenzayan & Heine, 2005), and my objective here is not to retread this familiar ground. Rather, my goal is to describe other aspects of omnicultural policy, particularly as they relate to basic moral principles.

The overriding principle I introduce follows ideas from two moral philosophers, Immanuel Kant (1785/2002) and John Rawls (1971). Kant's *categorical imperative* states, "Act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become universal law" (G 4:421). Universal law applies to everyone, including oneself, and so Kant is proposing (among other things) that we act in ways toward others, as we would have them act toward us (Kant's work serves as a useful reference point here, although I am mindful of internal incoherence in some of his writings, as pointed out by O'Neill, 1989, for example). Rawls introduces a thought experiment, asking us to imagine a society in which roles are revised and re-assigned, but nobody can be sure which specific roles they will be assigned. This "veil of ignorance" means that, for example, I do not know if I will be male or female, black or white, rich or poor, high IQ or low IQ, physically attractive or unattractive, and so on. In this situation, I am likely to choose fair rules, because if I choose unfair ones there is a good chance that I will suffer. For example, if I opt to have slavery in this imaginary society, I might be assigned the role of a slave rather than the slave owner. In one sense, then, we come back to the proposition that we should act toward others, as we would have them act toward us. Both Kant and Rawls are pointing to a priority that must be given to human commonality if a just society is to be achieved.

Human commonality is at the heart of the overriding principle I introduce, the *omnicultural imperative*: *During interactions with others, under all conditions, first give priority to the characteristics you share with other people as members of the human group*.

Upon meeting others and during interactions with them, first ask: what is it that I have in common with these other people? You will find that you share important commonalities. This emphasis on commonalities allows for the inclusion (rather than the exclusion) of others in the wider society, and also the acceptance (rather than rejection) of others. This inclusion and acceptance of others corresponds to our own wish to be included and accepted by others in the wider society.

Human commonalities are not to become a focus merely as a means to an ends, but an ends in themselves; echoing Kant's second formula that rational beings ought to "Act so that you use humanity, as much as your own person as in the person of every other, always at the same time as end and never merely as means" (G 4:429). Human universals are essential in themselves, as integral to the common human experience. They are in themselves the essence of being human, and not just a means to achieve other ends. For example, the human desire for a just world

exists in all humankind, independent of the cultural, context-dependent rules imposed by different groups as a means of trying to achieve justice.

That priority *should be* given to human commonalities can be arrived at only through pure practical reason (following Kant, 1785/2002); it is a moral end in itself, not means to ends, and as such cannot be derived through empirical investigation. This priority of human commonalities is independent of context, and independent of the different characteristics of different groups.

However, it is through empirical investigation that we arrive at *what is* universal, and also what are inter-group differences. The issue of inter-group differences brings us to a secondary concern, which is the *distinctiveness imperative*:

> *During interactions with other people, leave some room for, and acknowledge some ways in which, they are different from you.*

The distinct characteristics that become a focus should not serve to exclude the members of other groups from humanity in general; nor should you use such characteristics to isolate yourself. Your objective should not be to put up walls around yourself or others. Rather, distinct features of others and yourself should be used to suggest ways in which everyone can change and improve. However, for this constructive step to become possible, there must first be a sharing of cultural differences, and this leads to the *sharing imperative*:

> *Actively reach out to share cultural differences, teaching others about your group's distinct characteristics and also learning about the distinct characteristics of other groups.*

The distinctiveness and the sharing imperatives are context dependent and *they do* serve as means to ends. Groups manufacture differences, often re-writing the histories of their own and other groups so as to arrive at new ways in which they ''are different''. This trend must not be allowed to become too prominent and to take priority over the focus on human universals, as set out in the omnicultural imperative. The priority focus must always remain the primary membership of all individuals in the human group.

Omniculturalism policy and practical macro challenges. Why would we expect omniculturalism to help deal with macro challenges, including radicalization and terrorism, better than assimilation and multiculturalism? In addressing this question, it is useful to begin with the observation that radicalization and terrorism are in large part (but not exclusively) reactions to threatened collective identities (Moghaddam, 2006, 2008a), and that radicalization in this case is a group defense mechanism akin to ''circling the wagons'', improving ingroup cohesion and protecting the ingroup against perceived ''invading'' outgroups. Thus, the question essentially becomes: how will omniculturalism overcome the problem of threatened collective identities, better than will assimilation and multiculturalism?

Assimilation exacerbates the problem of threatened collective identities, by pushing different groups (depending on the form of assimilation being followed, Moghaddam, 2008a, ch. 7) to abandon their heritage cultures and take on "mainstream" identities. For example, at the global level, religious fundamentalists often feel that they are being overtaken by the onslaught of Western cultural lifestyles and global "McDonaldization" (Ritzer, 2009). By pushing for a "melting away" of differences, assimilation policy can create a backlash among groups who feel they are in danger of disappearing, as so many groups have done before (the history of native peoples of North America and many other indigenous groups attest to this).

In practice, multiculturalism has also failed to deal with the problem of threatened collective identities by giving primacy to the celebration of differences and nurturing a tendency for groups to continually manufacture new ways in which they "are" different from others. This balkanization and differentiation has been associated with the development of group stereotypes that have often detrimentally impacted minority group members, particularly in the area of education (as indicated by the research of Ogbu and others, discussed earlier in this paper). While some aspects of multiculturalism, particularly the sharing of cultures (Moghaddam, 2008, ch. 8a), have greater promise, in practice the tendency has been for multiculturalism to result in a focus on and exaggeration of (real and fictitious) group-based differences, and at the international level as a justification for relativism on issues such as human rights. This explains the keen interest of Iran and some other dictatorships in exploring multiculturalism (for example, as reflected by the International Conference on Multiculturalism and Global Community, Tehran, Iran, 24–27 July 2010), since "death by stoning", torture, and other punishments, as well as the second-class treatment of women in particular, can be argued as "just" through a relativistic approach to international justice. For some fundamentalists, multiculturalism in the international context translates to: "We are different and have our own way of life. Human rights as defined by the United Nations do not apply to us."

Omniculturalism tackles the challenge of threatened collective identities first by including all groups in the larger category of human beings, not by pushing change upon groups, but by giving highest priority to human characteristics that scientific research has demonstrated humans *already share*. The omniculturalism imperative demands that we interact with others giving priority to such scientifically established similarities. This approach, I argue, improves inter-group relations by enhancing superordinate goals and common group identities (in line with Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Sherif, 1966). At a second level, space is opened up for group-based differences, but these are treated as subservient to human commonalities. This "dual-track" approach will help diminish radicalization and terrorism, by limiting perceived collective threats.

Implementing omniculturalism. The main avenue available for the implementation of omniculturalism policy is the school. Historically schools have been thought of as the most important socialization instruments through which immigrants and

minorities can assimilate into mainstream society, and achieve social mobility. Schools are at the heart of the ''American dream'' narrative, whereby ''anyone can make it'', including those children of minority families who are willing and able to study hard, learn the mainstream language and culture, work their way through college, and eventually grow up to and become part of the middle class. Until the ethnic revival of the 1960s, a main role of schools in America and other immigrant receiving societies was assumed to be to facilitate assimilation and the ''melting away'' of group-based differences.

In more recent decades, schools have, often explicitly, adopted a goal of implementing multiculturalism policy. Through *Black History Month*, *Hispanic History Month*, the celebration of minority holidays, the recognition of minority leaders, and a myriad other ways, schools now ''celebrate differences''. This is the case for children of all ages. Indeed, in some school districts, particularly those with large number of minority children, the celebration of differences is given even higher priority in elementary and middle schools than in high schools.

Major changes will need to be made in school programs and activities in order to implement omniculturalism. A first major change is that children, until the age of about 14 years, during their elementary and middle-school periods in the United States, would be taught in school through an emphasis on human commonalities. In particular, children would be taught that in social interactions they should give priority to what they have in common with others, rather than to group-based differences and how their group membership might make them different from others (following the ''omnicultural imperative'' discussed earlier).

By extending the first phase of the omniculturalism policy to the age of 14 (the end of middle school), we can be assured that the majority of children have reached what Piaget (1954) terms the formal operations stage. This is essential, because it is in the formal operations stage that individuals gain the capacity to deal with abstract concepts, such as ''human universals''. Many children reach this stage by around the age of 11 years, but by the age of 14 the vast majority can deal with abstractions and hypothetical situations. Consequently, when the questions of ''What is a human being?'' and ''What do human being have in common?'' are addressed in elementary schools with children younger than 11, most of these children are not able to deal with abstractions such as ''human universals'', and teaching of ''what people have in common'' will need to take this limitation into consideration. That is, ''human commonalities'' will need to be taught starting with more concrete illustrative examples, starting with basic biological characteristics.

The second phase of the omniculturalism policy involves the recognition of group-based differences, and its implementation would begin in school around the age of 14, the start of high-school in the United States. Of course, children would already be well aware of their group affiliations in terms of gender, ethnicity, religion, and the like, through family and community socialization processes. However, my proposal is that, unlike what takes place today, prior to the age of 14 the school would not highlight and celebrate group-based differences.

Consequently, all the programs and services that "celebrate diversity", such as
Black History Month and so on, would only be introduced to children at 14
years and older. This introduction of group-based differences would be made on
a solid foundation of understanding about human commonalities.

The implementation of an omniculturalism policy requires a major shift not only
in formal educational policy, but also in broader government funded programs
that serve an important socialization role, such as *Sesame Street*. Those programs
that target children at 14 years of age and below would shift from a focus on group-
based differences to human commonalities. The central message would be that
there is enormous overlap in important human characteristics and capabilities.
The main question at this first stage of the implementation of an omniculturalism
policy becomes "What is a human being?" rather than "What is a member of group
X?" This universalist stage prepares the framework for the life story narrative
that emerges in adolescence, during the second stage of the implementation of
omniculturalism. As a result, what Habermas and Bluck (2000) termed "getting
a life" through the crafting of identity narratives during the adolescence years
becomes influenced, but not dominated, by group memberships and group-based
differences.

In summary, the implementation of omniculturalism policy requires the recog-
nition that a focus on, and celebration of, group based differences should not take
place continuously throughout the school years. Rather, the formal education
of children aged 14 years and younger should take place through a focus on
human commonalities, and the enormous overlap between the characteristics and
abilities of humans. With this solid universalist foundation in place, group-based
differences can be recognized and become part of the identity narrative during the
adolescent years.

Support for omniculturalism. Because of the serious weaknesses of multiculturalism
and assimilation policies, and the need to explore alternative policies such as
omniculturalism, it is important to assess public support for these different poli-
cies. The enormous cultural influence of the United States around the world
makes it particularly instructive to discover how Americans evaluate the available
policies. Among the research questions addressed in a recent study (Moghaddam
& Breckenridge, 2010) were: the extent to which Americans would support omni-
culturalism, as compared with multiculturalism and assimilation, and the support
of majority and minority group members for the different policies. Previous
studies (e.g., Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006) show that African Americans and
other minorities express stronger support for multiculturalism, whereas white
Americans express stronger support for assimilation policy.

Moghaddam and Breckenridge (2010) included a nationally representative prob-
ability sample of 4,000 adults aged 18 and older, selected randomly from an inter-
net-enabled panel maintained by Knowledge Networks (KN). Recruitment
for these panel members is through a random digit telephone dialing system based
on a sample frame covering the entire United States. KN panel members

are selected on the basis of known, non-zero probabilities; this contrasts with "opt-in" web surveys, which recruit participants of unknown characteristics via "blind" internet solicitations. In the KP panel, individuals are not permitted to volunteer or self-select for participation. Also, computers and internet access is provided without charge to individuals who lack either. There is general agreement in the research literature about the efficacy of KN panel-based surveys (e.g., Baker, Bundorf, Singer, & Wagner, 2003; Dennis & Li, 2007; Heeren, Edwards, Dennis, Rodkin, & Hinson, 2008).

The response rate to invitations to participate in Moghaddam and Breckenridge (2010) was 71%. Although this is a high rate, steps were taken to reduce the effects of potential nonresponse and noncoverage bias: post-stratification sample weights incorporating the probability of participant selection based on age, gender, race and ethnicity benchmarks from the most recent available Current Population Survey and supplements (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008) were employed in all statistical analyses using algorithms modified for complex survey designs in the statistical software packages STATA (Stata Corp., 2007) and HLM (SSI Scientific Software, 2006).

The views of participants concerning assimilation, multiculturalism, and omniculturalism were assessed by asking:

Which statement below best fits your view about immigration to the United States:

When people come to America,

1. people should set aside their cultural differences and "melt into" the American mainstream

2. people should maintain and celebrate their distinct group culture

3. people should first recognize and give priority to what they have in common with all other Americans, and then at a second stage celebrate their distinct group culture.

Across all sociodemographic groups, omniculturalism represented a clear majority preference. This outcome seems to be in line with findings from Levy et al. (2005), which showed support for messages that depicted people as both similar in some ways, and unique in other ways, as opposed to messages depicting each person as basically the same, or unique. However, Moghaddam and Breckenridge (2010) also found that a substantial portion of participants preferred an alternative policy. Despite the preferences of the majority, Whites, men, and older adults were more likely to prefer Assimilation to Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism was more likely to be preferred to assimilation by Non-Whites, women, and adults under age 30. An important finding was that Blacks, other non-Hispanics, and Hispanics were respectively 1.9, 2.5, and 2.5 times more likely to support multiculturalism over omniculturalism. However, women and those with greater

number of years of education supported omniculturalism over assimilation. These results suggest that future exploration of the Omnicultural perspective must fully attend to the generational and diversity differences that underlie dissenting perspectives among a significant portion of the population. The need for careful scrutiny of the pattern of minority preferences identified in the present study is underscored by the finding that such differences predicted the roughly 4% of participants who declined to state a cultural preferences, as well as the 29% of those who declined to participate in this survey.

Future research directions. Traditional psychological science has neglected research on inter-group relations, which only gained momentum in the 1970s, mainly through the influence of European researchers (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). This bias has included a neglect of policies for managing inter-group relations in societies characterized by diversity. In recent years, there has been greater efforts to explore the implications of inter-group research for diversity management policies (e.g., see Esses, Deaux, Lalonde, & Brown, 2010). A first proposal is that psychological science in the United States should "mainstream" inter-group research, and give greater importance to collective processes and their policy implications.

The psychological foundations of traditional and alternative policies, including assimilation, multiculturalism, polyculturalism, and omniculturalism, need to become the focus of a more serious and concerted research effort. There are already strong links between research and policy through studies on the contact hypothesis, similarity-attraction, social identity, among other topics (see chapters 7 & 8 in Moghaddam, 2008b, and Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). However, more direct research is needed toward the critical assessment of traditional and alternative policies, with a view to: first, educating the lay public about the scientific merits of the different policies; and, second, building more effective policies.

A particularly important role for psychological science is envisaged in omnuculturalism policy. The foundational stage of omniculturalism policy concerns human commonalities, and educating people to scientifically address the question: what is a human being? More research is needed to examine the consequences of approaching social interactions with an emphasis on differences versus commonalities. This issue gains in importance as globalization processes result in increased "sudden contact" between groups of people who have previously not had any contact.

Finally, research on policies for managing diversity must take place in light of accelerating "fractured" globalization. As revolutions and "near revolutions" in the Arab world showed in 2011, communities around the world are now intimately inter-connected: What might have remained an isolated revolt in an Arab country until several decades ago, is now transformed into an avalanche rippling across many societies through Facebook and other communications tools of the new age. Policies for managing diversity must take into consideration, and explore, this new global dimension of the human experience. The psychological

impact of globalization on inter-group relations must become a more important research topic.

Concluding comment

Globalization is having a powerful impact on inter-group relations, bringing about unprecedented sudden contact and sometimes catastrophic evolution. Some power minorities, Islamic fundamentalists among them, have reacted through radicalization and even terrorism. Such reactions, as well as the unprecedented pace and depth of globalization, highlight the need for a re-assessment of the policies for managing diversity at national, regional, and global levels. Omniculturalism represents a realistic alternative policy, one that builds on the strengths of both assimilation and multiculturalism.

Recent assessments of multiculturalism versus "color blindness" have shown multiculturalism to be associated with lower bias on the part of majority group members against minority group members (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2006). Indeed, "color-blindness" and the minimization of group differences have been shown to "artificially depress" perceptions of bias against minorities (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010) and to reinforce majority dominance (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Unfortunately, these studies have set up a very limited dichotomy involving two faulty policies, offering problematic alternatives. Of course, the poor educational performance of minorities is only partly due to the currently favored policy of multiculturalism, but serious scrutiny of the actual impact of multiculturalism in the education sector dispels any myths about how this policy is "working" for minorities; the high school graduation rates and test scores for African American and Latino students compares very unfavorably with that of majority group students (Barton & Coley, 2008; Greene, 2002). Current policies, both multicultural and "color blind" assimilationist, have failed minorities, and ethnic stereotypes associated with multiculturalism have influenced this process (my interpretation of Fryer & Torelli, 2010; Ogbu & Davis, 2003).

This paper is part of an effort to spark further critical debate, within and outside the academy, about the merits of established policies. The fact that multiculturalism has become the "politically correct" policy, and has especially strong support among minority group members, makes it highly challenging to question its merits. However, a historic strength of the academy is support for the critical questioning of generally accepted assumptions. This is both a right and a duty for academics, who will surely increase their scrutiny of all policies for managing diversity in the next phase of research on inter-group relations in the context of accelerating globalization.

References

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, *31*, 826–874.

Ali, L., & Sonn, C. (2010). Constructing identity as a second-generation Cypriot Turkish in Australia: The multi-hyphenated other. *Culture & Psychology*, *16*, 416–439.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Sommers, S. R., & Ambady, N. (2010). In blind pursuit of racial inequality? *Psychological Science*, *21*, 1587–1592.

Baker, L. C., Bundorf, M. K., Singer, S., & Wagner, T. H. (2003). *Validity of the Survey of Health and Internet and Knowledge Network's Panel and Sampling*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Barton, P. E., & Coley, R. J. (2008). *Windows on achievement and inequality*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service (ETS).

Baskin, Y. (2002). *A plague of rats and rubber vines*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Beckstead, Z. (2010). Liminality in acculturation and pilgrimage: When movement becomes meaningful. *Culture & Psychology*, *16*, 383–393.

Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa, Canada: Supply and Services Canada.

Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, 4th edn., pp. 193–281). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429–444.

Brown, D. E. (1991). *Human universals*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Bornstein, M. H., & Bradley, R. H. (2003). *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Calavita, K. (1996). The new politics of immigration: "Balanced-budget conservativism" and the symbolism of Proposition 187. *Social Problems*, *43*, 284–305.

Carter, P. (2005). *Keep'it real: School success beyond black and white*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ceci, S. J., & Papierno, P. B. (2005). The rhetoric and reality of gap closing: When "have-nots" gain but the "haves" gain even more. *American Psychologist*, *60*, 149–160.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, *64*, 231–240.

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Currarini, S., Jackson, M. O., & Pin, P. (2010). Identifying the roles of race-based choice and chance in high school friendship network formation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *107*, 4857–4861.

Dennis, J. M., & Li, R. (2007). More honest answers to Web surveys? A study of data collection mode effects. *Journal of Online Research*, *10*, 1–15.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Inter-group contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 5–21.

Ehrlich, P. R. (2000). *Human natures: Genes, cultures, and the human prospect*. Washington DC: Island Press.

Ehrlich, P. R., & Ehrlich, A. H. (2008). *The dominant animal: Human evolution and the environment*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Esses, V. M., Deaux, K., Lalonde, R. N., & Brown, R. (2010). Psychological perspectives on immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 635–647.

Farr, R. M., & Moscovici, S. (1984). *Social representations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fish, M. S., & Brooks, R. S. (2004). Does diversity hurt democracy? *Journal of Democracy*, 15, 154–166.

Freud, S. (1961). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (vol. 21, pp. 64–145). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1930).

Froese, F. J. (2010). Acculturation experiences in Korea and Japan. *Culture & Psychology*, 16, 333–348.

Fryer Jr, R. G., & Torelli, P. (2010). An empirical analysis of "acting white". *Journal of Public Economics*, 94, 380–396.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1970). *Beyond the melting pot* (2nd edn). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Greene, J. P. (2002). *High school graduation rates in the United States*. New York, NY: Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute.

Habermas, T., & Bluck, S. (2000). Getting a life: The emergence of the life story in adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 748–769.

Hale, H. C., & de Abreu, G. (2010). Drawing on the notion of symbolic resources in exploring the development of cultural identities in immigrant transitions. *Culture & Psychology*, 16, 395–495.

Heeren, T., Edwards, E. M., Dennis, J. M., Rodkin, S., & Hinson, R. W. (2008). A comparison of results from an alcohol survey of a prerecruited Internet panel and the National Survey on alcohol. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 32, 222–229.

Hogg, M. A. (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 39, pp. 69–126). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Homer-Dixon, T. (2006). *The upside of down: Catastrophe, creativity, and the renewal of civilization*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Horowitz, D. L. (1993). Democracy in divided societies. *Journal of Democracy*, 4, 18–38.

International Labour Organization (2010). *International labour migration: A rights based approach*. Geneva, Switzerland: ILO.

Kadianaki, I. (2010). Making sense of immigrant identity dialogues. *Culture & Psychology*, 16, 437–448.

Kant, E. (2002). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals*. In A. W. Wood (Ed. & Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Original work published 1785).

Kingston, W., & Scally, K. (2006). *Patents and the measurement of international competitiveness*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kwak, K. (2010). Self-development and relationships through acculturation. *Culture & Psychology*, 16, 365–381.

Lambert, W. E., Mermegis, L., & Taylor, D. M. (1986). Green Canadians' attitudes toward own group and other Canadian ethnic groups: A test of the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 18, 35–51.

Lamiell, J. T. (2003). *Beyond individual and group differences: Human individuality, scientific psychology, and William Stern's critical personalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1971). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Levy, S. R., West, T. L., Bigler, R. S., Karafantis, D. M., Ramirez, L., & Velilla, E. (2005). Messages about uniqueness and similarities of people: Impact on U.S. *Black and Latino youth*. Applied Developmental Psychology, *26*, 714–733.

Lisiankova, K., & Wright, R. E. (2005). Demographic changes and the European Union labour market. *National Institute Economic Review*, *194*, 78–81.

Liu, E. (1998). *The accidental Asian: Notes from a native speaker*. New York, NY: Random House.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Moghaddam, F. M. (1992). There can be a just and moral social constructionist psychology, but only in a social world that is homogeneous and/or static. In D. N. Robinson (Ed.), *Social discourse and moral judgment* (pp. 167–179). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2004). The cycle of rights and duties in inter-group relations: Interobjectivity and perceived justice re-assessed. *New Review of Social Psychology*, *3*, 125–130.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2006). *From the terrorists' point of view*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2008a). *How globalization spurs terrorism*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2008b). *Multiculturalism and intergroup relations: Psychological implications for democracy in global context*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2009). Omniculturalism: Policy solutions to fundamentalism in the era of fractured globalization. *Culture & Psychology*, *15*, 337–347.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2010). *The new global insecurity*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Moghaddam, F. M., & Breckenridge, J. (2010). Homeland security and support for multiculturalism, assimilation, and omniculturalism policies among Americans. *Homeland Security Affairs*, *4*, 1–14.

Moghaddam, F. M., & Riley, C. J. (2004). Toward a cultural theory of human rights and duties in human development. In N. J. Finkel, & F. M. Moghaddam (Eds.), *Human rights and duties: Empirical contributions and normative commentaries* (pp. 75–104). Washington DC: APA Press.

Moghaddam, F. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1987). The meaning of multiculturalism for visible minority immigrant women. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *19*, 121–136.

Mor Barak, M. E. (Ed.) (2010). *Managing diversity: Toward globally inclusive workforce*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

More, T. Sir. (1965). *Utopia*. (P. K. Marshall, Trans.). New York, NY: Washington Square Press. (Original work published 1516).

Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy* (2 Vols). New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Negy, C., Shreve, T. L., Jensen, B. J., & Uddin, N. (2003). Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and ethnocentrism: A study of social identity versus multicultural theory of development. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *9*, 333–344.

Neimeyer, R. A., & Mitchell, K. A. (1988). Similarity and attraction: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social and Personality Relationships*, *5*, 131–148.

Norenzayan, A., & Heine, S. J. (2005). Psychological universals: What are they, and how can we know? *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*, 763–784.

Ogbu, J. O., & Davis, A. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic disengagement*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

O'Neill, O. (1989). *Constructions of reason: Explorations of Kant's practical philosophy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Osbeck, L., Moghaddam, F. M., & Perreault, S. (1997). Similarity and attraction among majority and minority groups in a multicultural context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *219*, 113–123.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytical test of inter-group contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751–783.

Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child* (M Cook, Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books. (Original work published 1937).

Plato (1987). *The Republic* (D. Lee, Trans.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, *111*, 1–3.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *530*, 74–96.

Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2005). Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *28*, 1000–1040.

Prashad, V. (2001). *Everybody was Kung Fu fighting: Afro-Asian connections and the myth of cultural purity*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Riccucci, N. (2002). *Managing diversity in public sector workforces*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*, 417–423.

Ritzer, G. (Ed.) (2009). *McDonalization: The Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2010). The colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches to improving inter-group attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *4*, 215–246.

Rudmin, F. (2010). Phenomenology of acculturation: Retrospective reports from the Philippines, Japan, Quebec, and Norway. *Culture & Psychology*, *16*, 313–332.

Ruiz, G. M., & Carlton, J. T. (Eds.) (2004). *Invasive species: Vectors and management strategies*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation: Their social psychology*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shwarz, A., & West-Pavlov, R. (Eds.) (2007). *Polyculturalism and discourse*. New York, NY: Rodopi.

Stata Corp (2007). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 10*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Stephens, J. D. (1993). Capitalist development and democracy: Empirical research on the social origins of democracy. In D. Copp, J. Hampton, & J. E. Roemer (Eds.), *The idea of democracy* (pp. 409–446). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston, MA: Ginn.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.) (1978). *Differentiation between social groups*. London, UK: Academic Press.

Tartakovsky, E. (2010). Found in transition: An acculturation narrative of immigration from the former Soviet Union to Israel. *Culture & Psychology*, *16*, 349–363.

Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Taylor, D. M. (2002). *The quest for identity*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Trudeau, P. E. (1992). Statement by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, October 8, 1971. *Multiculturalism in Canada: The challenge of diversity* (pp. 281–283). Scarborough, Canada: Nelson Canada. (Original work published 1971).

Turner, R. N. (2010). Imagining inter-group contact reduces implicit inter-group prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *49*, 129–142.

Turner, J. C., & Reynolds, K. J. (2004). The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes, and controversies. In M. B. Brewer, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Self and social identity* (pp. 259–277). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

U.S. Census Bureau (2008). See Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Survey*. Washington DC: U.S. census Bureau, http://www.census.gov/cps/.

Valsiner, J. (2007). *Culture in minds and societies: Foundations of cultural psychology*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 121–138.

Waters, M. C., Tran, V. C., Kasinitz, P., & Mollenkopf, H. (2010). Segmented assimilation revisited: types of acculturation and socioeconomic mobility in young adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *33*, 1168–1193.

Welsh, D. (1993). Domestic politics and ethnic conflict. In M. E. Brown (Ed.), *Ethnic conflict and international security* (pp. 43–60). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, *19*, 277–306.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York, NY: Random House.

Author Biography

Fathali M Moghaddam is Professor at the Department of Psychology, and Director of the Conflict Resolution Program, Department of Government, Georgetown University. His most recent books include *Psychology for the Third Millennium* (2012, with Rom Harre) and *The New Global Insecurity* (2010). Examples of his research are available on his website: fathalimoghaddam.com