

Putting flesh to the bone: Looking for solidarity in diversity, here and now

Stijn Oosterlynck, Maarten Loopmans, Nick Schuermans, Joke Vandenaabeele and Sami Zemni with the DieGem team

DieGem working paper D 1.2. – 12/09/2014

Please do not cite without permission

www.solidariteitdiversiteit.be

Table of contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	3
Disclaimer	3
1 – Introduction	4
2 – Four sources of solidarity	5
2.1. Interdependence	6
2.2. Shared norms and values	6
2.3. Struggle	7
2.4. Encounter	8
3 – The nationalization of solidarity	9
4 – The nationalization of solidarity in decline	11
5 – Solidarity in diversity here and now	12
6 – Five fields of tension	17
6.1. Particularism and universalism	17
6.2. Consensus and conflict	18
6.3. Recognition and redistribution	19
6.4. Integration and transformation	20
6.5. Proximity and distance	21
7- Conclusion	22
References	24

Abstract

In many Western European countries, concern rises that both formal mechanisms of redistribution and informal acts of charity, reciprocity and support are challenged by ethnic and cultural diversity. Against such gloomy perspectives, this paper draws on insights from sociology, geography, pedagogy and political science to argue that four traditional sources of solidarity (interdependence, shared norms and values, struggle and encounter) remain relevant, but require a rethinking of their spatial and temporal framing to capture today's intricate engagements of solidarity. More specifically, we claim that solidarities grounded in the spatial boundedness of territorial states and the intergenerational continuity of supposedly culturally homogeneous nations should be complemented and enriched with solidarities developing in an entirely different spatio-temporal register, namely that of the everyday places and practices in which people engage across ethnic and cultural boundaries.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by IWT-Flanders under Grant [IWT/120022/SBO]. We are grateful for the input of the members of our project team and advisory committee. We are also indebted to Ash Amin, Jan Blommaert, Eric Corijn, Jozefien De Bock, Bert De Munck, Bruno Meeus, Griet Roets, Peter Thijssen, Jef Verschueren and Jan Vrancken for their comments on a previous version of this paper presented at the 'Solidarity in Superdiversity' conference, 1 april 2014, organized by the DieGem consortium in Antwerp.

Disclaimer

Parts of this paper have been sent out for publication in Ethnic and Racial Studies. Please do not cite without permission.

1. Introduction

'In multiple ways the word "solidarity" is patiently looking for flesh which it could become. And it won't stop seeking eagerly and passionately until it succeeds.' (Bauman 2013, 5)

It is no coincidence that the concept of solidarity is returning to the center of social debates in many Western European countries. International migration and neoliberal economic restructuring have created a situation of socio-political turmoil not dissimilar from the historical conditions under which the modern concept of solidarity emerged. Although the effects of social changes on solidarity are always politically mediated - and therefore, vary significantly between countries - the Europe-wide debates on the 'failure of multiculturalism' testify to the declining support for solidarity mechanisms under conditions of growing ethnic and cultural diversity.

In reaction, this paper explores innovative forms of solidarity emerging under conditions of increasing ethnic and cultural diversity. Our basic assumption is that classic conceptualizations of solidarity remain relevant, but need to be rethought to match rapidly changing societal conditions. With the rise of industrialization, urbanization and modernization in the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century, solidarity was the answer of the newly formed discipline of sociology to the quest for a renewed social order (Prainsack & Buyx 2011). In times of social and political upheaval, cultural shifts and economic instability, solidarity was defined as the willingness to share and redistribute material and immaterial resources drawing on feelings of shared fate and group loyalty (Stjernø 2004, 25).

Just like the classical sociologists conceptualized solidarity in the turbulent context of industrializing societies, this paper looks for new ways of understanding the sources of social order and cohesion in contemporary Western European societies. Our starting point is that a narrowly national framing of solidarities no longer captures the complex and multiple entanglements and engagements of people. We claim that concepts of solidarity grounded in the spatial boundedness of territorial states and the intergenerational continuity of supposedly culturally homogeneous nations can be enriched by solidarities that develop in the different spatio-temporal register of everyday place-based practices. By shifting our perspective from the spatio-temporal register of the nation-state to what diverse populations do, learn and collectively engage in *hic et nunc*, we aim to identify innovative forms of solidarity in diversity.

To do so, we draw on insights from sociology, geography, pedagogy and political science. From sociology, we derive an understanding of four classical sources of solidarity. Based on scholarship in human geography, we shift our focus from the bounded territory of the nation state to the relationally constituted places where diversity is encountered and negotiated. Political science writings on citizenship as a practice inspire us to make an accompanying shift from the historical continuity of the national community to concrete everyday practices in which issues of redistribution, representation and/or recognition become the focus of action and debate. Scholarship in social pedagogy urges us to see solidarity in diversity as a result of learning processes implicated in community making.

Our arguments are spread over five sections and a conclusion. Reviewing classical and contemporary sociological literature, the following section identifies interdependence, norms and values, struggle and encounter as four sources of solidarity. In the third section, we analyse how Western European welfare states consolidated local forms of solidarity into state-organized forms of collective solidarity through the demarcation of national territories, the establishment of formal citizenship rights and pedagogical processes of socialization. In the fourth section, we explain how both formal mechanisms of redistribution and informal acts of charity, reciprocity and support are said to be eroded by growing ethnic and cultural diversity. In the fifth section, we will substantiate our claim that diversity compels us to look for solidarity in a completely different spatio-temporal register, namely that of the everyday places and practices in which people engage across ethnic and cultural boundaries. Section six will focus on five different fields of tension in which place-based practices of solidarity are embedded.

2. Four sources of solidarity

The recent revival of interest in solidarity has inspired several attempts to identify and classify different conceptualizations of solidarity (Silver 1994; Crow 2002; Stjernø 2004; Thijssen 2012). In this paper, we add to this literature by identifying four main sources of solidarity (see table 1). Each of these four sources specifies a distinctive basis for feelings of shared fate and group loyalty. Each also implies a specific perspective on the value and role of social difference and individuality in society. As such, the four sources of solidarity reflect different ideological positions on how societies develop social order and cohesion.

(See table 1)

2.1. Interdependence

Interdependence is the first source of solidarity. This liberal orientation on solidarity stresses the positive aspects of social differentiation. It assumes that solidarity emerges from the division of labour and the awareness of interdependence. Its classical formulation is to be found in Durkheim's concept of organic solidarity. Durkheim (1984, 173) argues that 'even where society rests wholly upon the division of labour, it does not resolve itself into a myriad of atoms juxtaposed together, between which only external and transitory contact can be established'. Instead, he states that 'each one of the functions that the members exercise is constantly dependent upon others and constitutes with them a solidly linked system' (ibid.).

Before Durkheim, classical social thinkers such as Spencer and De Tocqueville had already advanced concepts of solidarity grounded in the mutual interdependencies between free individuals pursuing private interests. Spencer embeds solidarity in joint action on the basis of shared interests (Spencer 1892; Crow 2002, 15). De Tocqueville (1971), from his part, was concerned with the centrifugal tendencies inherent in a political system based on individualism and a very liberal definition of freedom. He believed that horizontal solidarities amongst citizens created by the free association of citizens would counter selfish individualism and excessive state interference.

Among contemporary sociologists, the interdependence perspective is adopted in the work of Beck and Giddens. For Beck (1997), growing individualization does not necessarily rule out the possibility of solidarity as long as individual citizens are reflexive about their social relationships and interdependencies with one another. Giddens (1991, 1994) considers solidarity as not only deriving from reflection on social relationships and interdependences, but also from the active building of trust in other humans with whom we are interdependent.

2.2 Shared norms and values

Shared norms and values are a second source of solidarity. Its classical formulation can be found in Durkheim's oeuvre as well. Particularly in his later work, Durkheim (1984) was convinced that interdependencies are insufficient for nurturing solidarity and that societies cannot sustain themselves without a common belief system ('collective consciousness'). As such, Durkheim became interested in the symbolic and emotional components of social life that bind groups and societies together (Collins 1994, 190 & 204).

Today, communitarian scholars are the main proponents of this perspective. By reinvigorating the community as the motor of social integration, they steer a middle course between the idea of solidarity as the mere aggregation of individual's rational pursuit of self-interests and the expression of solidarity into rights controlled by the state (Crow 2002, 43-48; Prainsack & Buyx 2011, 12-14; Stjernø 2004, 295-299). While the term 'solidarity' is not very central to their thinking, references are frequently made to a concept of social justice based on reciprocity in the community. Such reciprocity is founded on moral commitments grounded in shared beliefs, common values, joint practices and collective histories (Etzioni 1998).

The communitarian debate has inspired a whole body of research on social capital and social cohesion (Putnam, Leonardi & Nanetti 1993; Putnam 2001). Often, these concepts seem to have replaced solidarity as the core concept of the discipline of sociology. Although the social capital literature can by no means be reduced to a communitarian perspective, its popularity cannot be understood apart from the latter's attraction.

2.3 Struggle

A third source of solidarity sprouts from the work of Marx and Weber. For them, solidarity is related to unequal power relations and their capacity to give rise to collective action. Solidarity is then rooted in a joint struggle around common interests against a shared enemy. Historically, this perspective has been most commonly associated with the social-democratic and socialist tradition. Although this notion of solidarity is still very much present in the literature on social movements, contemporary sociological work in this tradition is rare.

For Marx, the capitalist mode of production and its tendency to produce social polarisation forms the precondition for making the working class a 'class for itself', i.e. a group of people who entertain strong relations of solidarity amongst one another in the face of a common class enemy (Bottero 2009). Like Durkheim, Marx acknowledges that interests alone do not provide a stable basis for solidarity (Crow 2002, 25). His solidarity concept therefore combines instrumental (the 'objective' interests that workers share with each other in a joint struggle) and normative aspects (common values and norms and fraternal feelings that are nurtured through joint political practices and struggle).

Just like Marx, Weber acknowledged that society is structured by unequal power relations and that solidarity is nurtured by being part of a particular group in a struggle with other groups. Yet, for

Weber (1978, 927) class position was only a 'possible, and frequent, basis for social action'. Other bases of social consciousness, such as status group, cross cut economic position. Status groups combine specific notions of honour, the monopoly of an ideal and material interests to distance themselves from others and strengthen internal solidarity (Weber 1978, 927 & 935).

2.4 Encounter

The sociological literature identifies encounter as a fourth source of solidarity. This line of thought is associated with the work of Simmel and the urban sociologists of the Chicago School. Whereas proponents of the three other sources of solidarity mainly focus on macro-level sources of societal integration, Simmel and his followers ground solidarity in informal interactions at the micro level.

Central to Simmel's work are processes of 'sociation'. While 'society' consists of permanent interactions and their embedding in consistent structures, 'sociation' refers to the more contingent forms of human action, conscious or unconscious, that bind people together in the informal ordering of social life (Simmel 1950, 10).

This sociological perspective on informal interactions as a basis of solidarity was further developed by Chicago School urban sociologists. When analysing the rapidly changing and hyper-diverse populations of America's arrival cities, they revealed how traditional social bonds were eroded by the division of labour and the weakening of family attachments and replaced by informal social relations and solidarities in the neighbourhood.

One could argue that solidarity grounded in encounter should be seen as complementary to the macro-level sources of solidarity rooted in interdependencies, struggle and shared norms and values (Thijssen 2012). Indeed, the three macro-level sources of solidarity discussed above can be supported by encounters between people in everyday life. However, we maintain encounter as a separate source of solidarity as it may nurture solidarity in the absence of the aforementioned macro-level sources of solidarity. This was very much the point Simmel and the Chicago School researchers aimed to make.

3. The nationalization of solidarity

Since the late nineteenth century, Western European nation states have made efforts to mitigate the consequences of the expansion of capitalism and the concomitant social struggle. Central to this process was a gradual centralization and nationalization of locally organized and often private and religiously informed forms of solidarity in compulsory and universal (i.e. applying to all citizens) institutions. After the Second World War, a steady economic growth allowed for the development of increasingly complex and expansive institutions and redistributive mechanisms in Western Europe. This process culminated in welfare states which aimed to 'provide standardized benefits, in an impartial and automatic form, based on precisely defined rights and obligations, according to highly specialized procedures and with a national scope' (Ferrera 2005, 54).

From a sociological point of view, the nationalization of solidarity in welfare states is rooted in a specific combination of the aforementioned sources of solidarity. First, the institutions of social protection draw on the notion of interdependence. As a social insurance system at the national level, the welfare state is based on the recognition that citizens of a nation state are dependent on each other for their welfare and social protection (Cantillon and Van Mechelen 2013). Secondly, the development of a regime of social rights is the result of decades of social struggle by trade unions and working class parties (Stjernø 2004). This struggle was to a large extent 'nationalized' in the sense that it was waged by national political parties and trade unions and that its gains were embedded in national states. Nonetheless, it also had an important international political dimension in that the fear for the appeal of the communist model on Western European working classes pushed Western European states to develop extensive welfare state arrangements (Flint and Taylor 2007). Third, shared norms and values clearly played a crucial role in supporting the nationalization of solidarity in the post-war period. These shared norms and values were not pre-given, but imagined and institutionalized through processes of nation building (Anderson 1991).

From a geographical perspective, the state's efforts to organize solidarity were predicated upon the territorialization of social relations and the spatial boundedness of supposedly culturally homogeneous populations within these territorial limits. In human geography, territoriality is seen as a particular form of socio-spatial structuring based on boundary-making (Jessop, Brenner, and Jones 2008). For Agnew (2007 in Gregory et al. 2007, 744), territoriality refers to 'either the organization and exercise of power, legitimate or otherwise, over blocs of space or [to] the organization of people and things into discrete areas through the use of boundaries'. During the second half of the twentieth century, the development of strong welfare states in Western Europe prioritized national

space as a bounded and bordered territory. The nationalist project aimed to contain social and cultural life, economic interactions and political dynamics within the boundaries of national territories. On the one hand, rights and responsibilities were made dependent upon long term presence in the national territory and assumed integration in its associated culture (Desforges, Jones, and Woods 2005). On the other hand, the nurturing of solidarity reinforced the importance of strong boundaries to oblige solidarity between those inside national boundaries and inhibit solidarity with those outside (McEwen 2002).

In mainstream political science accounts, the nationalization of solidarity is strongly connected with the notion of citizenship as a legal status. This is perhaps best described by Marshall (1950) who held the idea that citizenship is mainly about equal treatment of citizens by endowing them with increasing rights. In this perspective, citizenship – as the entrance to solidarity arrangements – mitigates the negative impact of capitalist markets through the redistribution of (scarce) resources on the basis of social rights. As a result, there is a permanent tension within liberal societies between the principle of equality and the *de facto* inequality of wealth and income that is distinctive to capital formation (Turner 2001).

Treating citizenship as a formal status that gives access to various social and other rights does not mean that it is solely a bureaucratic affair. Educationalists point out how citizenship as a status is bound up with particular processes of community formation and how the making of national political communities in which citizenship rights are embedded have been accompanied by the development of ‘civic learning’ (Peters 1996; Dahlgren 2006). Through processes of socialization, children, youngsters and adults are introduced to the norms, values and rules that exist in society. They also learn that they belong to a community which transcends their individual lives. The link between citizenship and solidarity is maintained by initiating citizens into a cluster of interrelated knowledge claims: ‘knowledge about what a good citizen is; knowledge about what a good citizen needs to learn; and knowledge about how individuals can learn to become good citizens’ (Biesta 2011, 142).

When these sociological, geographical, political and pedagogical understandings are put together, it can be seen that the nation-state was able to embed solidarity in the assumed intergenerational continuity and cultural homogeneity of the population within its territorial limits. Western European welfare states can be seen as encompassing myriad processes of sharing and redistributing resources promoted by varying combinations of social struggle, shared values and norms and awareness of interdependence. Solidarity is accessed through citizenship rights linked to the formal membership of a territorially defined community and supported by the educational process of socialization.

4. The nationalization of solidarity in decline

Over the last decade, scholars have studied the effects of growing ethnic and cultural diversity on nationalized solidarity mechanisms. A first strand of research focuses on the institutional flexibility of welfare states. In this context, Faist (1998 in Mau 2007, 5) remarks that it is a fundamental challenge to 'preserve the balance between the openness and exclusivity of the welfare system without endangering the universal consensus of the welfare state to protect the right to entitlements of both the native population as well as the various immigrant groups'.

A second strand of research focuses on the effects of multicultural policies of recognition and welfare state mechanisms of redistribution on the social mobility of cultural minorities. By way of example, Koopmans (2010, 1) infers that the combination between a generous welfare state and multicultural policies without strong incentives for language acquisition 'have produced low levels of labor market participation, high levels of segregation and a strong overrepresentation of immigrants among those convicted for criminal behavior'. Other authors argue, however, that there is no zero-sum relation between cultural recognition and socio-economic redistribution and that multiculturalism policies can even strengthen socio-economic status by reducing prejudice and mistrust (Tully 2000; Parekh 2004). Canada is frequently cited as an example that has subverted the so-called 'progressives dilemma' (Banting 2010).

A third group of researchers studies the effects of ethnic and cultural diversity on the support for the welfare state. Conflicts might emerge from two sides. On the one hand, minority groups might contest universal public services as reflecting the cultural norms of the dominant culture. On the other hand, majority cultures might resent the expansion of social welfare to what they consider as 'outsider' minorities (Kymlicka and Banting 2006). Based on case study research and statistical analysis, many claim that negative views vis-à-vis migrants and the general feeling of a 'failure of multiculturalism' have eroded feelings of community and solidarity (Barry 2001).

When these three strands of research are confronted with the framework outlined above, it is clear that part of the legitimacy crisis of Western European welfare states stems from the way in which migration challenges the different sources of solidarity. In culturally diverse societies, shared norms and values are weakened as a source of solidarity. Because ethnic-cultural minorities are often overrepresented in unemployment statistics and situations of precarious employment, interdependence through the labor market also has very clear limits as a source of solidarity, given that it excludes those that are perceived as non-contributing. In addition, struggle has become more

complex as a source of solidarity as questions of social justice do not only include struggles over redistribution, but also struggles for the recognition of ethnic and cultural minorities and for the political representation of different groups in society (Fraser 1995, 1998, 2012).

Migration does not only affect different sources of nationalized solidarity, but also their geographical and temporal underpinnings. The nation state model is undermined when its territorial 'container' starts to 'leak'. The erosion of national boundaries by flows of information, people and commodities has led to a rethinking of citizenship space, emphasizing overlapping and interlocking networks instead of distinct and clearly separated territorial units (Castells 1996; Taylor 2003). At the same time, in the temporal dimension, the correlation between a bounded territory and the intergenerational continuity of supposedly culturally homogeneous nations is losing ground. These changes, in turn, have impacted on the conceptualization of citizenship, separating political membership from (national) belonging. Whereas assimilation of newcomers and minorities in the dominant lead culture has been the classic nationalist strategy to forge national social cohesion (Brubaker 2001), such a strategy no longer holds under the pressure of global connections and mobilities, particularly in super-diverse cities. Declaring minority assimilation into a dominant lead culture a dead-end street, the next section therefore explores the possibility of innovative forms of solidarity in diversity.

5. Solidarity in diversity here and now

The basic claim of this paper is that new forms of solidarity can be identified if we re-adjust our focus. We argue that the four aforementioned sources of solidarity remain as relevant as ever, but that the temporal and spatial register in which these sources function needs to be shifted. More specifically, it is our contention that innovative forms of solidarity are not primarily nurtured in the spatio-temporal register of the territorialized nation state, but that the growing ethnic and cultural diversity of the population makes it necessary to look for solidarity elsewhere, namely in the here and now of actual practices in particular places. From a spatial perspective, we propose a shift from the bounded territory of the nation state to the relationally constituted places where diversity is encountered and negotiated. From a temporal perspective, a similar shift is needed from the imagined historical continuity of the national community to concrete practices of solidarity.

The temporal shift builds on the reconceptualization of citizenship within political science. Political scientists generally discuss the issue of solidarity in connection with citizenship and the making and

unmaking of political communities. At least three different conceptions of citizenship can be distinguished. We already discussed the conception of citizenship as a legal status. Citizens are considered formal members of political communities inhabiting clearly bounded territories and upholding shared values, identities and rights (Marshall 1950). This conception is dominant in national welfare states, which grant people access to institutionalized forms of solidarity through their formal citizenship status. However, such a link between national belonging and citizenship has long been questioned by liberal nationalists who tend to downplay commonalities based on tradition, descent, religion or language and instead emphasize political and legal principles as the cement binding people together.

Communitarian and multicultural thinkers refer to growing ethnic and cultural diversity to question the traditional 'politics of redistribution'. As explained before, questions of citizenship are broadened to include recognition of ethnic and cultural minorities and the political representation of different groups in society (Fraser 1995, 1998, 2012). This leads to a second conceptualization of citizenship in which a group-differentiated politics of cultural recognition and political representation is directed at specific demands of minority communities and groups excluded from political decision-making. Kymlicka (1995) has called this 'differentiated citizenship'.

The focus on recognition and representation calls into question dominant assumptions and representations of citizenship. Citizens can no longer be treated as abstract individuals fitting in particular legal categories, but need to be understood as subjects with varying, and often contradictory, positions in different spheres of society that are at any time the result of the spatio-temporally specific life trajectories they have gone through. Hence, the third conception of citizenship does not define citizenship in terms of legal rights (Marshall 1950), but in terms of acts (Isin and Nielsen 2008) or practices (Mouffe 1992).

Our approach of solidarity in diversity mobilizes the third conception of citizenship and focuses on the actual interpersonal practices of those diverse individuals present in a particular location. We claim that these practices redefine communities and provide the foundations for new and innovative forms of solidarity. By linking solidarity explicitly to citizenship, our approach departs from classic communitarian approaches focusing on social cohesion and community building and sustaining 'a conception of community as embodied in a shared sense of place and cultural order based on consensus, primordialism and harmony' (Delanty 2002, 162). Seeing the interpersonal practices of diverse people as acts of citizenship makes us move from purely social conceptions of community towards more political understandings of community. Community is then no longer only about cohesive social relationships, but primarily about the extent to which issues of social justice such as

those relating to material redistribution, political representation and cultural recognition can be raised and made visible to each other and become the object of discussion and action (cfr. Fraser 1998). Interpersonal practices are hence only practices of citizenship when the new types of collective 'being together' allow for the possibility to make personal issues visible and turn them into a public concern.

The concurrent shift in the spatial register is based on new understandings of place in the era of globalization. In discussions on citizenship and national belonging, place is often defined as a bounded space inhabited by a culturally homogenous group with long-term linkages to that location. In the meanwhile, such a territorial view of place has been challenged by a relational or networked perspective that asserts that places cannot be understood by looking at internal relations over time alone, but that they are also constituted through temporary relationships with other places (Amin 2002a; Massey 2004; Appiah 2010). Places are not just bounded and homogenous, but heterogeneous and constituted through a diversity of relationships that often stretch far beyond that particular place. For Massey (1991, 29), the definition of a particular place 'does not have to be through simple counterposition to the outside: it can come, in part, precisely through the particularity of linkage to that "outside" which is therefore itself part of what constitutes the place'.

Whereas relational perspectives of place dismiss an emphasis on boundaries and timeless identities, they maintain an interest in emotional experience, proximity and intimacy as constituting characteristics of place (Jessop, Brenner, and Jones 2008). Proximity and emotional attachment to place continue to play a role in the development of community and solidarity (Cresswell 2004; Harvey 2009). However, places are no longer characterized by proximity of homogenous elements, but by the proximity of culturally diverse elements and a multiplicity of experiences of its essence and identity. Amin draws political conclusions from this relational view of place. Building upon the work of Massey, Amin (2004, 38) proposes to 'explore a politics of place that is consistent with a spatial ontology of places as sites of heterogeneity juxtaposed within close spatial proximity, and as sites of multiple geographies of affiliation, linkage and flow'. Amin's politics of place consists of a 'politics of propinquity' and 'a politics of connectivity'. With the former, Amin (2004: 39) calls upon us 'to take spatial juxtaposition seriously as a field of agonistic engagement', while the latter implies that this agonistic engagement should result in a political program for particular places, which draws not only on what is inside that particular place but also valorizes its connection to other places.

Such engagement with place ties in closely with the idea of performativity of citizenship as elaborated above. Relational places do not hold a timeless identity to which individuals have to adapt

in order to be accepted into the autochthonous community rooted in that place and to gain access to the rights and solidarities within that community. Places themselves are open and fluid, and issues of recognition, redistribution and representation can be made visible and negotiated through the enactment of citizenship relating to that place. Taking relationality as a starting point therefore opens up perspectives for solidarity amongst heterogeneous populations who do not have anything in common apart from the place they share. In schools and parks, on work floors, sports fields or in neighborhood centers, innovative forms of solidarity develop around the joint appropriation and the envisaged common future of a particular place. Such solidarities do not necessarily presuppose assimilation into a pre-given set of shared norms and values, but require a willingness to negotiate the diversity of people and the practices they are engaged in, particularly as they relate to citizenship issues of redistribution, representation and/or recognition.

The shift from status-based citizenship based on a relationship to a bounded place towards acts of citizenship in open, relational places entails a different perspective on civic learning too. The main assumption is that it is not a separate educational practice that prescribes a top-down curriculum, but that it is inextricably linked to the efforts of citizens made at very different places to address social issues that affect them. Instead of socialization into an established community, it concerns a learning that occurs through engagement in interpersonal practices and interactions. Such learning is intrinsically related to the experiment of democracy itself (cfr. Dewey 1927). According to Biesta (2011, 6), 'it does not lead [...] from a state of not being a citizen to being a citizen, but fluctuates with people's actual experiences of citizenship and with their engagement in democratic experiments'.

Citizenship practices can contribute to learning for solidarity in diversity in various ways. People can learn to work and discuss together and in doing so learn to appreciate that there is something more than the self. Interactions with different others can tighten into a community in which the activity of each refers to the activities of others. People learn to collaborate with others, sharing interests and problem solving strategies. According to Biesta (2012, 692), 'the direction in which such processes move is not determined from the outset, but is part of what is "at stake" in such processes of collective political learning'.

Yet, cooperative forms of learning are often not a cut-and-dried solution to deal with the diversity of contemporary societies. Often, the learning taking place in and through citizenship practices is more radical and transformative, because it happens through a strong sense of being part of a 'community of those who have nothing in common' (Lingis 1994). Learning from this perspective does not consist

of being able to (re)produce the norms and values as a member of a particular political community, but is about the becoming of a new subject in and through acts of citizenship (Masschelein 2010; Biesta 2012). It is about being able to live in the fragile concern for a 'we' for which no common denominator is yet available and which always entails moments of transformation and disruption of the established social order (Biesta 2006, 53; Rancière 2007).

These insights from geography, political science and pedagogy lead us to the following position. Innovative forms of solidarity in diversity can emerge from concrete interpersonal practices. These practices do not only generate feelings of togetherness and belonging, but allow culturally diverse subjects to make issues of recognition, representation and redistribution visible and public. Such practices are located in relationally constituted places that become sites for everyday negotiation and agonism. As such, solidarity in diversity is dependent on subjectivating practices where learning is not triggered by claims of commonality or sameness, but actually happens as an event of being exposed to the otherness of others and their different claims for citizenship.

This position questions the idea that solidarity can be nurtured most easily by the adoption of - and assimilation into - mainstream norms and values (Desforges, Jones, and Woods 2005). By shifting the focus to the concrete moments and places where cultural diversity is encountered, the idea that shared norms and values are a source of solidarity needs to be reconsidered. Amin (2004) points out, for example, that claims of autochthony become invalid under these circumstances and that no privileged group is to impose norms and values on others. Instead, more progressive place-based communities are shaped by continuous negotiations on the norms and values governing particular places and facilitating co-existence (Lepofsky and Fraser 2003).

The spatio-temporal shift also requires us to view interdependence differently. Interdependence, as a source of solidarity, is nurtured through the sharing and taking joint responsibility for the places where one lives and works. Acknowledging that places are constituted through networks that stretch far beyond them makes it necessary to become aware of how interdependencies exceed the boundaries of administrative territories defining and circumscribing formal citizenship (Agnew 1994; Massey 2004).

In the new spatio-temporal register, struggle requires a different substance as a source of solidarity as well. Struggles over the rules governing co-existence in cultural diversity in particular places and the processes and relations that constitute them cross-cut established social and cultural boundaries. Such struggles strengthen awareness of the democratic value of difference, rather than of sameness.

Finally, the spatio-temporal shift revalues encounter as a source of solidarity. The three macro-level classical sources of solidarity remain as relevant as before, but it is the real life encounter with difference that determines how they are put to work. While many interactions across ethnic and cultural lines provide, at worst, opportunities for fleeting exchanges which harden stereotypes and, at best, incidental encounters which comply with norms of civility (Valentine 2008), engaging in joint practices at work, at school or at leisure can still be the beginning of a learning process that disrupts stereotypes and initiates new attachments among strangers (Amin 2002b, 970).

6. Five fields of tension

Learning solidarity in diversity through place-based practices implies navigating fields of tension. As solidarity is embedded in different, often incompatible traditions of thoughts and ideological currents, the concept itself incorporates important tensions. Rather than trying to overcome these tensions, we believe that these are an inevitable result of the pluralistic world we live in. Hence, it is better to work with these tensions and analyze how concrete practices are situated on them and address them strategically.

6.1. Particularism and universalism

The first field of tension is concerned with who is in- and excluded in the sphere of solidarity. The main difference is between a universalistic and a particularistic understanding of solidarity. While a universalistic interpretation of solidarity aims to include everyone in the sphere of solidarity (e.g. all dwellers of a particular place, all inhabitants of a certain national territory, the whole human population, etc.), a particularistic understanding of solidarity implies that solidarity is by necessity limited to specific groups (e.g. nationality, gender, class, ethnic-cultural).

History teaches us that the dichotomy between universalism and particularism should be understood as a field of tension rather than a simple choice between two contrasting options. Smith (1997) explains, for instance, how Enlightenment discourses about impartiality and universalism served to mask the enduring reality of slavery, colonialism and discrimination against women. According to O'Neill (1996, 11), "the fact that many universalists have in practice narrowed the scope of their principles to exclude certain others - barbarians, women, slaves, the heathen, foreigners - shows that the principles by which they actually lived have far-less-than cosmopolitan scope". In the words of

Smith (1997, 30), “there is clearly a disparity between the common practice of partiality, expressed in the inclination to favor our dearest (often nearest), and the modern moral ideal of impartiality, treating people the same in the same circumstances, such that the same credit, reward, or retribution is assigned for the same virtue, contribution or violation, irrespective of the status, wealth, race, gender of those concerned”.

6.2. Consensus and conflict

The second field of tension is concerned with consensus and conflict. Often, solidarity is considered to be rooted in a strong consensus on a range of basic principles for harmonious or orderly co-existence in a community. Yet, solidarity can also develop if the members of such a community disagree about the fundamentals of living together. The question of how to handle conflict, particularly that emanating from within cross cultural encounters, is undeniably high on the political agenda in western liberal democratic societies. Dialogue and deliberation, it is assumed, can lead us, optimally towards more peaceful forms of coexistence and, minimally, to a reduction of conflict and violence between cultural communities. Deliberative democracy (Habermas) is based on formalized and rationally motivated communication that seeks to resolve conflict through promoting shared understanding (see Todd & Säfström, 2008).

According to Mouffe (2005), democracy stems from the contestations that arise in divided communities where disagreement comes from our encounter with difference. In such communities, the point is not to win the argument or to do away with the passions of others, but to live in that fragile and unstable space of conflictual consensus (= a common symbolic space among opponents who are considered as legitimate enemies) (Mouffe 2005: 52). The commonality here is not founded on respect for the rational subject or on agreement with one another, but on the necessity of living with the tensions that are inherent in our pluralistic world. Mouffe (2005) considers the boundaries of the democratic community to be based on a conflictual ‘consensus about the ethico-political values of liberty and equality for all’ (Mouffe 2005: 120). Subjectifying practices of solidarity are then triggered by different interpretations of universal accepted principles and are based on both a faith in universal principles as the possibility of dissent interpretation of them.

Rancière also fundamentally challenges the insistence on current procedures of deliberative democracy, participation, consensus and agreement (Simons & Masschelein 2010). Where the pivotal educational process of solidarity based on Mouffe is a continually negotiation and translation of universal given norms and values, within a perspective based on Rancière the pivotal educational

process of solidarity is the sporadic event where the interdependent relationship between individuals is reorganized from the assumption of equality. In the more radical view of Rancière, true democracy only occurs when we add something to the consensual order, when we embrace a way of being that had no place in the existing order of things, something that puts this order in question. This necessarily involves a kind of conflict since it puts into question the particular limits of a particular order and it articulates a 'wrong', an inequality or exclusion that is installed by that unequal order. Or as he puts it: 'It makes visible what had no business being seen, and makes heard a discourse where once there was only a place for noise' (Rancière 2003: 30 in Biesta 2011: 2). It is in this claim of equality that according to Rancière the wrong that is done to people in an unequal society can be broken. This claim of equality is always a democratic moment, bigger than the individual as for Rancière 'a dissensus is not a conflict of interests, opinions, or values; it is a division put in the 'common sense': a dispute about what is given, about the frame within which we see something as given'. (Rancière 1998: 304). It is a paradoxical process of subjectification ('two worlds in one and the same world') as it constitutes a 'dissensus about the part-taking in the common of the community' (Rancière 1998: 306).

6.3. Recognition and redistribution

A third tension relates to the economic and cultural dimensions of solidarity. The main question here is whether solidarity involves a redistribution of material resources or a recognition of cultural differences. Scholars discuss the tensions and challenges which arise from the simultaneous implementation of multicultural policies which target cultural recognition with welfare policies aiming at economic redistribution (Pearce 2004, Banting 2005, Koopmans 2010, Van Oorschot 2010). Some authors infer that a cultural politics of recognition undermines the support for an economic politics of redistribution. Drawing on case studies and statistical analyses, they assert that negative feelings vis-à-vis immigrants generate welfare chauvinism among broad sections of the population (Rorty 1988, Barry 2001). In addition, they claim that multiculturalist policies impede the integration of immigrants by increasing welfare dependency and reducing incentives for language acquisition and education (Koopmans 2010). Other authors come to the opposite conclusion, however. They infer that multiculturalist policies help to build stable coalitions for social justice by reducing prejudices and stereotypes (Parekh 2004). Referring to the example of Canada, Banting (2010) concludes, for example, that the country has become an immigration state, but that support for health care and pensions has not decreased (Kymlicka and Banting 2006).

Among political scientists, the relationship between culture and economy is also discussed at a sub-national scale. Already in the 1950s, leftist scholars noted that social movements do not only mobilize around material inequalities and economic exploitation, but also around identity issues and cultural domination. Building upon Weber's (1978: 927) assertion that class interests are not the only potential basis for collective action, they underlined that social stratification is much more complex than a simple economic analysis suggests. Radical scholars involved in the civil rights movement emphasized, for instance, that the universal enforcement of citizenship rights alone would not bring about an equal treatment of minority groups in society. In 1989, Young (1989: 250) repeated that "when citizen rights have been formally extended to all groups in liberal capitalist societies, some groups still find themselves treated as second class citizens". As such, these scholars advocated that local and national struggles against exclusion needed to reconcile economic solidarity under the form of financial redistribution with cultural solidarity under the form of recognition and respect for cultural diversity. Since cultural and socio-economic forms of exploitation cannot be disentangled in concrete instances, it is essential to study the practical implementation of Fraser (1995: 70)'s claim that "virtually every struggle against injustice, when properly understood, implies demands for both redistribution and recognition".

6.4. Integration and transformation

The fourth field of tension deals with the effects of solidarity. The main question is whether solidarity transforms the existing social structures or is geared towards integration in the existing social structures. The difference between integrative and transformative forms of solidarity is central to the work of Fraser (1995). She distinguishes two major approaches to remedy injustice. While affirmative remedies are "aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework that generates them", transformative remedies are "aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying framework" (Fraser 1995: 82). For Fraser, the distinction between the two needs to be applied to both cultural and economic injustices. Related to the former, she argues that affirmation dominates multiculturalism, while transformation directs the project of deconstruction. To illustrate this, she argues that gay-identity politics counteract homophobia by revaluing gay identities, whereas queer-theory politics target the annihilation of the dichotomy between homosexuals and heterosexuals. A similar difference recurs in Fraser's discussion of the economy. On the one hand, she explains how liberal welfare states set up income transfers to redress economic inequalities without changing the underlying structures of class differentiation. On the other hand, she clarifies how the transformative remedies of socialism

develop new relations of production to adjust the unequal distribution of assets (Fraser 1995: 184). According to Fraser, the best solution to the redistribution-recognition dilemma combines economic socialism with cultural deconstruction. In her own words, “the project of transforming the deep structures of both political economy and culture appears to be the one over-arching programmatic orientation capable of doing justice to all current struggles against injustice (Fraser 1995: 93).

The binary between integration and transformation is central to debates among educationalists as well. Lorenz (1994: 93) questions, for example, whether pedagogical projects should socialize individuals into the moral fabric of a society so that they comply with its general rules and expectations or whether social pedagogy should be “an emancipatory program for self-directed learning processes inside and outside the education system geared towards the transformation of society”. Along the same line, Eriksson (2011: 416-417) infers that community development and social pedagogy differ in many respects, but that they share the tension between a conservative side which wants to make individuals an adapted and integrated part of society and a more radical side, often inspired by Freire (1972), which tries to reach the same effect by exposing and transforming fundamental social structures. Rancière on his part asserts that equality and emancipation will not be achieved through deliberative democracies, participatory trajectories and concerns with consensus, but in moments where the social regime is interrupted and disturbed (cfr. Mouffe 2005, Todd 2010).

6.5. Proximity and distance

A fifth field of tension relates to the geography of solidarity. The main question here is whether innovative forms of solidarity develop in geographical proximity or across spatial distances. Is solidarity limited to the proximate and the intimate? Or can it also include the distant and the remote? The tension between proximity and distance takes up a very central position in geographical discussions of solidarity. Geographers continue to debate whether proximity is a prerequisite for solidarity or whether it can extend to distant strangers as well. One argument is that solidarity is generated through physical encounters and that distance, therefore, leads to indifference (Smith 1998: 23). Referring to a nested set of Russian Matryoshka dolls, Massey (2004: 9) explains that “there is a kind of accepted understanding that we care first for, and have our first responsibilities towards, those nearest in”. Another line of reasoning emphasizes, however, that institutions and infrastructures help to bridge physical distances and that there is no reason to believe why solidarities cannot extend across distances (Silk, 2000). To substantiate this claim, scholars do not only refer to the proliferation of fair trade products (Popke 2006), but also to the growing flows of remittances across the world (Kankonde 2010).

The tension between proximity and distance is often related to the dichotomy between particularism and universalism (Smith 1997: 30). The tendency to favor our nearest is, then, said to be an expression of particularism, while the inclination to treat people the same, irrespective of their location, is said to be a sign of universalism. By adopting a relational reading of space and place, such a mental chain between impartiality and distance, on the one hand, and particularity and proximity, on the other hand, becomes disturbed, however (Barnett and Land 2007: 1066). By looking the connections and the networks between (people at) different places, it becomes clear that solidarities which emerge in a place do not necessarily have to be restricted to that place (Massey 2005: 184). If spaces are connected with other spaces through flows of people, goods, services and meanings, one can nurture particularistic forms of solidarity over distance. As such, it is important to note that our quest for place-based forms of solidarity in diversity does not necessarily imply that they are also place-bound. In relational spaces, proximity based solidarities can transcend distances through networks of connectivity.

Commentators of Massey's work underline that solidarity in propinquity cannot be disconnected from solidarity in connectivity. Amin (2006: 1015) asserts, for instance, that the inhabitants of a socially just city should "recognise the constitutive of the distant other in whatever counts as the social 'ours', rather than, as has been the case in the history of modern welfare, drawn on a solidarity or charity or instrumentalist support for the fallen insider within a predefined community of belonging". Referring to Castree (2004), Darling (2009: 1947) argues that "the concern is to consider how a responsibility towards distant others might be reconciled with the demands of internal and constitutive heterogeneity". Drawing on an analysis of the City of Sanctuary movement in Sheffield, he infers that "the political challenge of relational thinking might be captured in accommodating the negotiations of both proximate diversity and distant connectivity which construct specific places" (Darling 2010: 127).

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that globalization and migration are challenging established forms of solidarity. These established forms of solidarity have been framed in the spatio-temporal register of the national state with its fixed territorial boundaries and perceived historical continuity. In this spatio-temporal register, solidarity is strongly institutionalized and access is regulated through legal citizenship status. Citizenship is learned through civic education. This particular configuration draws –

in varying combinations - on the different sources of solidarity identified in the classical sociological literature (see left column of table 2).

(See table 2)

Increased ethnic and cultural diversity does not negate a continued relevance of solidarity and its main sources (interdependence, struggle, shared norms and values and encounter), but requires us to look for solidarities emerging in a different spatio-temporal register. Using insights from political science on citizenship as acts and practices, from geography on relational spaces and the politics of propinquity and connectivity and from social pedagogy on different types of learning and community formation processes, we have argued that new forms of solidarities in diversity can be found in the here of relational places and the now of instantaneous acts and practices (see right column of table 2).

In opposition to the social cohesion or social capital narrative of communitarians, we claim that interpersonal practices in places of diversity give rise to solidarities if they allow the people involved to turn private issues into public concerns of redistribution, recognition or representation. Places become sites for the everyday agonistic negotiation of claims of diverse subjects. This argument offers, we believe, a convincing alternative for the 'loss of community' narrative of communitarians, but also grounds cosmopolitan notions of solidarity in particular places and practices, thus bringing it closer to the everyday engagements of ordinary people with issues of representation, recognition and redistribution.

All this is not to do away with the 'old' types of solidarity situated at the national level. The national legacy of defining solidarity remains strong. Local practices of citizenship evoke an alternative ontology, but take place on a terrain structured by the silent operations of the national welfare state as a territorial 'solidarity machine' and its politics of assimilation, differentiation and selection (Isin 2000). The everyday is where the practices of solidarity in the here and now and the mechanisms of solidarity institutionalized on the national scale meet and interact. For this reason, it would be erroneous to separate them as two worlds apart. Solidarity in diversity implies plural models of being in the world and a sensitivity to the various spatio-temporal registers in which social life plays out.

References

- Agnew, J. 1994. "The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory." *Review of International Political Economy* 1 (1): 53-80.
- Amin, A. 2002. "Spatialities of globalisation." *Environment and Planning A* 34 (3): 385-399.
- Amin, A. 2002b. "Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity." *Environment and Planning A* 34 (6): 959-980.
- Amin, A. 2004. "Regions unbound : towards a new politics of place." *Geografiska Annaler B* 86 (1): 33-44.
- Amin, A. 2006. "The good city." *Urban studies*, 43, 1009-1023.
- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined communities*. London: Verso.
- Appiah, K. A. 2010. *The ethics of identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Banting, K. G. 2010. "Is There a Progressive's Dilemma in Canada? Immigration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State." *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique* 43 (3): 797-820.
- Barnett, C. & D. Land 2007. "Geographies of generosity: beyond the 'moral turn'." *Geoforum*, 38, 1065-1075.
- Barry, B. 2001. *Culture and Equality. An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. 2013. "Solidarity: a word in search of flesh." *New Eastern Europe* 2013 (2): 1-6.
- Beck, U. 1997. *The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Biesta, G. 2006. *Beyond learning. Democratic education for a human future*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta, G. 2011. *Learning democracy in school and society: Education, lifelong learning and the politics of citizenship*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Biesta, G. 2012. "Becoming Public: Public Pedagogy, Citizenship and the Public Sphere." *Social & Cultural Geography* 13 (7): 683-697.
- Bottero, W. 2009. "Class consciousness." In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by G. Ritzer, 539-542. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Brubaker, R. 2001. "The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (4): 531-548.

- Cantillon, B. and N. Van Mechelen. 2013. "Poverty reduction and social security: Cracks in a policy paradigm." CSB Working Paper 13/04. Accessed September 2.
<http://www.centrumvoorsociaalbeleid.be/index.php?q=node/4054/en>
- Castells, M. 1996. *The rise of the network society. The information age: Economy, society, and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Castree, N. 2004. "Differential geographies: place, indigenous rights and 'local' resources". *Political Geography*, 23(2), 133-167.
- Collins, R. 1994. *Four Sociological Traditions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cresswell, T. 2004. *Place: a short introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Crow, G. 2002. *Social solidarities. Theories, identities and social change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dahlgren, P. 2006. "Doing citizenship: The cultural origins of civic agency in the public sphere." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9 (3): 267-286.
- Darling, J. 2009. "Thinking beyond place: the responsibilities of a relational spatial politics." *Geography Compass*, 3, 1938-1954.
- Darling, J. 2010. "A city of sanctuary: the relational re-imagining of Sheffield's asylum politics." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35, 125-140.
- Delanty, G. 2002. "Communitarianism and citizenship." In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, edited by Isin, E.F. and Turner, B.S, 159-174. London: SAGE.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1835) 1971. *Democracy in America*. Reprint, London: Oxford University Press.
- Desforges, L., Jones, R., and M. Woods. 2005. "New geographies of citizenship." *Citizenship studies* 9 (5): 439-451.
- Dewey, J. 1927. *The Public and its Problems*. New York: Holt.
- Durkheim, E. (1893) 1984. *The Division of Labour in Society*. Translated by W. D. Halls. Houndmills/London: MacMillan.
- Eriksson, L. 2011. "Community development and social pedagogy: traditions for understanding mobilization for collective self development." *Community Development Journal*, 46(4), 403-420.
- Etzioni, A. 1998. "The responsive communitarian platform: Rights and responsibilities." In *The Essential Communitarian Reader*, edited by Amitai Etzioni, xxv-xxxix. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ferrera, M. 2005. *The Boundaries of Welfare. European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flint, C., and P. Taylor. 2007. *Political geography: world economy, nation-state and locality*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

- Fraser, N. 1995. "From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a "postsocialist" age." *New Left Review* (212): 68-93.
- Fraser, N. 1998. "Social justice in the age of identity politics: redistribution, recognition and participation." *Discussion Paper Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Forschungsschwerpunkt Arbeitsmarkt und Beschäftigung, Abteilung Organisation und Beschäftigung*. Accessed September 2. <http://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/44061/1/269802959.pdf>
- Fraser, N. 2012. "Marketization, social protection, emancipation: toward a neo-Polanyian conception of capitalist crisis." Unpublished manuscript.
- Freire, P. 1972/2000. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. 1994. "Risk, trust, reflexivity." In *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, edited by Beck, U., Giddens, A., and Lash, S., 184-197. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gregory, D., R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. Watts, and S. Whatmore, eds. 2007. *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Malden and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. 2009. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Isin, E.F. 2000. *Democracy, citizenship and the global city*. London: Routledge.
- Isin, E.F. and G. Nielsen. 2008. *Acts of citizenship*. London: Zed Books.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N., and M. Jones. 2008. "Theorizing socio-spatial relations." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26 (3): 389-401.
- Kankonde, P. 2010 "Transnational family ties, remittance motives, and social death among Congolese migrants: a socio-anthropological analysis." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 41, 225-244.
- Koopmans, R. 2010. "Trade-Offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant integration multiculturalism and the welfare state in cross-national perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(1): 1-26.
- Kymlicka, W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, W. and K. Banting. 2006. "Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State." *Ethics & International Affairs* 20 (3): 281-304.
- Lepofsky, J. and J.C. Fraser. 2003 "Building community citizens: Claiming the right to placemaking in the city." *Urban Studies* 40 (1): 127-142.

- Lingis, A. 1994. *The community of those who have nothing in common*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Marshall, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship and social class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Masschelein, J. 2010. "E-ducing the gaze: the idea of a poor pedagogy." *Ethics and Education* 5 (1): 43-53.
- Massey, D. 1991. "A global sense of place." *Marxism Today* 35: 24-29.
- Massey, D. 2004. "Geographies of responsibility." *Geografiska Annaler B* 86 (1): 5-18.
- Mau, S. 2007. "Ethnic diversity and welfare state solidarity in Europe". Paper prepared for the AGF midpoint conference, Berlin. Accessed January 14. www.cas.ed.ac.uk/_data/.../paper_midpoint_conference_project_3.pdf
- McEwen, N. 2002. "State welfare nationalism: the territorial impact of welfare state development in Scotland." *Regional & Federal Studies* 12 (1): 66-90.
- Mouffe, C. 1992. "Citizenship and political identity." *October* (102): 28-32.
- Mouffe, C. 2005. *On the political*. London: Routledge.
- O'Neill, O. 1996. *Towards justice and virtue; A constructive account of practical reasoning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parekh, B. 2004. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: cultural diversity and political theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Pearce, N. 2004. "Diversity versus solidarity: a new progressive dilemma." *RENEWAL-LONDON* 12 (3): 79-87.
- Peters M. 1996. *Poststructuralism, politics and education*. Westport, CT and London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Popke, J. 2006. "Geography and ethics: everyday mediations through care and consumption." *Progress in Human Geography*, 30, 504.
- Prainsack, B., and A. Buyx. 2011. *Solidarity. Reflections on an emerging concept in bioethics*. Wiltshire: Nuffield Council on Bioethics.
- Putnam, R. D. 2001. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D., R. Leonardi, and R. Nanetti. 1993. *Making democracy work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rancière, J. 2007. *On the shores of politics*. London: Verso.
- Ritzer, G. 2010. *Sociological Theory*. Eight edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rorty, R. 1988. *Contingency, irony and solidarity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Säfström, C. A. 2011. "The immigrant has no other name." In *Rancière, public education and the taming of democracy*, edited by M. Simons and J. Masschelein, 93-105. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Silk, J. 2000. "Caring at a Distance:(Im) partiality, Moral Motivation and the Ethics of Representation- Introduction." *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 3, 303-309.
- Silver, H. 1994. "Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms." *International Labour Review* 133 (5/6): 531-578.
- Simmel, G. (1950) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Glencoe Illinois: The Free Press.
- Simons, M., & Masschelein, J. 2010. "Hatred of democracy... and of the public role of education?" *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42 (5-6), 509-522.
- Smith, D. M. 1997. "Geography and ethics: a moral turn?" *Progress in Human Geography*, 21, 583-590.
- Smith, D. M. 1998 "Geography and moral philosophy: Some common ground." *Philosophy & Geography*, 1, 7-33.
- Spencer, H. (1850) 1892. *Social Statics*. New York: D. Appleton.
- Stjernø, S. 2004. *Solidarity in Europe. The history of an idea*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, P. 2003. *The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World System*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thijssen, P. 2012. "From mechanical to organic solidarity, and back: With Honneth beyond Durkheim." *European Journal of Social Theory* 15 (4): 454-470.
- Todd, S., & Säfström, C. A. 2008. "Democracy, education and conflict: rethinking respect and the place of the ethical." *Journal of Educational Controversy*, 3(1).
- Tully, J. 2000. "Struggles over recognition and Distribution." *Constellations* 7 (4): 469-482.
- Turner, B.S. 2001. "The erosion of citizenship." *British Journal of Sociology* 52 (2): 189-209.
- Valentine, G. 2008. "Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter." *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (3): 323-337.
- Van Oorschot, W., 2008 "Solidarity towards immigrants in European welfare states." *International Journal for Social Welfare*, 17 (1), 3-14.
- Weber, M. (1922) 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Young, I. M. 1989. "Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship." *Ethics*, 250-274.

Table 1: Four sources of solidarity

	Definition	Example	Authors
Inter-dependence	collective benefits of specialization and social differentiation	social insurance system	- Durkheim on organic solidarity - Spencer on voluntary co-operation - de Tocqueville on civil society - Beck on reflexive individuals - Giddens on active trust
Shared norms and values	moral integration in community of norms and values	religious organizations	- Durkheim on collective consciousness - Etzioni on reciprocity in the community - Putnam on social capital
Struggle	struggle for shared interests against common enemy	labor class movement	- Marx on the unity of the working class - Weber on class and status groups
Encounter	informal social interaction with strangers	living with strangers in public space	- Simmel on sociation - Chicago School of urban sociology

Table 2: Solidarity in different spatio-temporal register

	Rise of nationalization of solidarity	Decline of nationalization of solidarity	Solidarity here and now
Spatial register	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Territorialization of social relations within national borders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Erosion of national boundaries by international flows of people and things 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rooted in the concrete places where diversity is encountered and negotiated in everyday life - Relational places constituted by their linkages to other places
Temporal register	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intergenerational continuity of supposedly culturally homogeneous nation - Historical continuity of political community and citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of newcomers undermines the perceived historical continuity of the national state - Citizenship rights disconnected from belonging to nation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grounded in the actual practices that people engage in in diverse settings - Citizenship as an act or practice rather than a legal status
Learning processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Socialization into norms, values and rules of the national society through top-down curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Socialization as cultural assimilation of newcomers in national imagined community, but increasingly failing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning through engagement in interpersonal practices and interactions, either as bottom-up social learning or as disruptive subjectivation
Sources of solidarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interdependence in a collective insurance system at national level - Social struggle for redistribution by trade unions and working class parties at national level - Shared norms and values of the national community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interdependence excludes migrants perceived as non-contributing - Social struggle needs to be broadened to include recognition and representation of ethnic and cultural minorities - Diversification of norms and values in national society leads to its weakening as a source of solidarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Negotiating norms and values governing particular places with all those present on equal footing - Interdependence nurtured through the sharing of place and structured by relations constituting places - Struggles over co-existence in particular places cross-cut established socio-cultural boundaries - Encounters in the here and now