Beyond Multiculturalism: Interculturalism as an Alternative in Changing South Korea

SEO YOUNGJI *
Keimyung University

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to present a direction of progression—a developmental model for a South Korean society that is changing into a multicultural society. Several problems have emerged throughout the Korean society following its rapid multicultural shift. This study introduces European interculturalism as an alternative for resolving this issue. First, the study examines the definitions, characteristics and policies of multiculturalism and then looks into its limitations with references from the political world and academia. Next, this study investigates European interculturalism, an alternative model of diversity to American multiculturalism. In this section, the definitions, characteristics and policies of interculturalism as well as its differences and similarities with multiculturalism will be discussed. Finally, this study suggests a shift towards interculturalism—while still aiming for multiculturalist values of the acceptance of differences and peaceful coexistence—as a solution to the incomplete model of multiculturalism.

* Corresponding author, oscar1004@nate.com

I. Introduction

Since the 1990s, the South Korean society has been evolving into a multicultural society. According to statistics released by the Ministry of Justice in December 2016, 2.05 million foreigners reside in South Korea, making up 3.9% of the total population. The National Statistical Office expects the number of foreigners residing in the country to rise to 3 million within five years. Due to such a rapid increase in the number of foreigners, the South Korean government has been planning and implementing multicultural policies throughout its society, including in fields like politics and education.

The South Korean government has been setting policies regarding foreigners residing in South Korea since 2005. In that year, the government raised the issue of foreigners to the level of a "task appointed by the president" (Oh, 2007). When the president declared "the Korean society's evolution into a multicultural and multiethnic society" as "inevitable progress" during a convention of state affairs in April 2006, the respective government departments began to competitively come up with multicultural policies. From the "Act on the Treatment of Foreigners in South Korea" in 2007, the "Multicultural Families Support Act" and the "Act on the Employment of Foreign Workers" in 2008 to "Multicultural Family Support Measures" in 2016, a great number of policies have been introduced.

South Korea's rapid progress into a multicultural society, however, raises two questions. The first is an administrative problem on the governmental level; while each department is suggesting numerous policies regarding multiculturalism, the use and definition of the term is still unclear. For instance, the Ministry of Education uses the term "multicultural home" while the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family uses the term "multicultural family." Furthermore, policies put forward by each department overlap and sometimes even conflict with each other, thereby failing to produce a lasting effect as they turn out to be only temporary measures. The majority of policies, in addition, emphasize the importance of the adaptation of foreigners while disregarding the effort and adaptation of the South Korean population. Thus, South Korea's multicultural policies have been criticized for their claim to stand for multiculturalism when in reality they carry out cultural assimilation (Oh, 2007; Um, 2011).

The second problem derives from South Korea's long and predominant stance regarding foreigners. For the past 150 years, South Korea has sent its citizens as emigrants, and its history of accepting immigrants has been relatively short. As a matter of fact, South Korea has only accepted immigrants for the past 25 years. Thus, there has not been enough time for the country to thoroughly undergo a shift in its institutional foundation that could support multiculturalism.

Furthermore, South Koreans have a more entrenched sense of being ethnically homogeneous than other countries. This may be attributed to the vestiges of hardships like the Japanese colonial period or the Korean War, but such a homogeneous consciousness induces a negative assessment of the phenomenon of multiculturalism. Lastly, the multiculturalism of South Korea has been strongly influenced by American multiculturalism. Such a phenomenon appears intact throughout society and politics as well as academia. Multiculturalism forms the general trend of the discourse in South Korean academia, with interculturalism only occasionally introduced by scholars engaged in German or French studies.

Hence, this study will attempt to compare "interculturalism", which may be referred to as "the multiculturalism of Europe", with the multiculturalism of Britain and America. Afterwards the study will discuss which model of diversity a multicultural South Korea should adopt.

II. Multiculturalism

Etymologically, the prefix "multi-" means "many." The addition of cultural to this prefix to create the term multicultural means "to consist of many cultures," and the suffix "-ism" added to this adjective, which produces the term multiculturalism, meaning "the reality, ideal, and policy" of a nation or society formed by many cultures. According to Cantle (2013:77), "Multiculturalism encompasses a range of notions of both "multi" and of "culture" and is always heavily contextualized. It will, therefore, be understood in many different ways around the world and the policies and practices will also have developed in many different ways." Bouchard (2013:102) also states his opinion that "there is a significant variety among the multiculturalisms that have emerged in the world in recent decades."

A. The Diversity of Multiculturalism

First of all, the multiculturalism of Britain and America differs from the multiculturalism of Europe. The former originated from an aim to recognize the cultures and rights of various racial and ethnic groups that have contributed to building the nation. On the other hand, the multiculturalism of Europe, despite having Anglo-Saxon origins, has arisen relatively recently in an attempt to integrate immigrants or minorities in nations with long-established national traditions (Meunier, 2007:18).

Next, even within the British and American sphere, there are slight differences

depending on the situation of the country. Multiculturalism in the US began with the civil rights movement of the 1960s and emphasized the "political correctness" of avoiding discriminatory language and behavior. On the other hand, the multiculturalism of Canada appeared during the process of amending biculturalism and focused on establishing cooperative relationships by paying subsidies to various associations and organizations. Imitating the Canadian model, Australian multiculturalism appeared in the process of replacing the White Australia Policy and has involved encouraging multilingualism through mass media and operating schools by ethnicity (Aprile & Dufoix, 2009:245).

Lastly, scholars interpret the meaning of multiculturalism differently. For instance, the English scholar Cantle (2012:2) claims that multiculturalism and interculturalism are different, and that interculturalism must replace multiculturalism because multiculturalism is not suitable for globalization and super-diversity. On the other hand, English scholars Meer and Modood (2013) claim that multiculturalism and interculturalism are not essentially different and that, if interculturalism fails to produce policies clearly distinguishable from multiculturalism, it is nothing more than a "supplement" to multiculturalism.

B. The Characteristics and Policies of Multiculturalism

A summary of the studies on multiculturalism reveals how multiculturalism is largely used in three meanings — "reality," "ideal," and "policy." Published in 2011, the Council of Europe's report *Living Together: Combining Diversity and Freedom in 21st Century Europe* asks whether multiculturalism is an ideology, a set of principles, or a social reality (2011:10). Canada, which affirmed multiculturalism as its official policy for the first time in the world, uses the term multiculturalism as "a society featuring ethnic and cultural heterogeneity," "an ideal of equality and mutual respect between groups with different ethnicities and cultures," and "a government policy adopted by many local governments after its declaration by the Canadian federal government in 1971" (The Canadian Encyclopedia, 2000:1535). These three meanings almost completely correspond to "demographic-descriptive usage," "ideological-normative usage," and "programmatic-political usage" as distinguished by Christine Inglis.

First of all, although the demographic-descriptive meaning of multiculturalism was limited to cases in the past where the nation was multiethnic from its very foundation, such as the US, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, it is now applied to almost all countries. Next, the ideological-normative meaning of multiculturalism refers to the use of a slogan that emphasizes ethical and philosophical considerations toward diverse cultural groups. This slogan recognizes ethnic diversity, guarantees the right to maintain the inherent culture of an ethnicity and asserts multiculturalism as an enrichment for the

whole of society. Lastly, the programmatic-political meaning of multiculturalism refers to the specific types of programs and policy initiatives designed to respond to and manage ethnic diversity.

These meanings of multiculturalism have spread widely throughout Britain and America, starting with Canada. In Canada, where multiculturalism was first asserted as official policy, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism proposed a transition to multiculturalism from biculturalism in 1965, and in 1971, the federal government affirmed this as official policy. Australia, which carried out the White Australia Policy until 1973, carried out several multiculturalism measures, modeled after Canadian multiculturalism, between 1978 and 1989 and even announced "the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia" in 1989. Furthermore, Since 1975, Sweden has carried out an active multiculturalism policy that involves free choice between ethnic identity and Swedish identity, an equal standard of living for both majority and minority groups, and labor-management relations aimed at increasing economic productivity. The multiculturalism of these three countries is referred to as "multiculturalisme intégré" (Wieviorka, 1998:238). On the other hand, the multiculturalism of the US is referred to as "multiculturalisme écarté" because it separates socioeconomic logic and cultural logic.

As mentioned above, these four countries display various forms of multiculturalism in terms of policy in accordance with the histories and conditions of each country. However, in general, their multiculturalism policies are carried out in accordance with the eight items below.

    ① the constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism at the central and/or regional and municipal levels;
    ② the adoption of multiculturalism in the school curriculum;
    ③ the inclusion of multiculturalism in the school curriculum;
    ④ exemptions from dress codes on religious grounds;
    ⑤ the allowing of dual citizenship;
    ⑥ the funding of ethnic group organizations or activities;
    ⑦ the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction;
    ⑧ affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups.
                (Banting & Kymlicka, 2006, Barrett (ed.) qtd. in 2013:16-17)

On the other hand, multiculturalism policies may slightly change over time within a country. In the 1970s, Canada (Kunz & Sykes, 2007, Kunz, 2001) displayed aspects of "ethnic multiculturalism," which focuses on culture and defends ethnic differences. The greatest issue here was prejudice, and the focus of policy was on improving the cultural

sensitivity of individuals. In the 1980s, the emphasis moved toward "equity multiculturalism," which removed the barrier to racial relationships and economic participation. The greatest issue in this regard was discrimination, with the focus of policy on fairness in employment and cultural adaptation. In the 1990s, "civic multiculturalism," which highlights constructive participation and shared citizenship and belonging, came to the fore. The main issue in this regard was social exclusion, and Canada prescribed participation and inclusiveness to remedy this issue. In the 2000s, intensifying conflict due to ethnic and religious issues moved the focus to an "integrative multiculturalism" that emphasizes religious sensitivity, rights, and responsibility.

C. The Limitations of Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism, first appearing during the 1970s and existing to this day, has shown its many limitations. Recently, it has been criticized as a "failure" in the current political and international context. British prime minister Cameron (2011), French president Sarkozy (2011), and German chancellor Merkel (2010) have all expressed negative opinions on multiculturalism.

However, many scholars have refuted their assessments, arguing the "failure" of multiculturalism as a failure of policy, not a failure of ideal or reality. Simply put, the failure these three figures talk about is related to the political and international context, and strictly speaking, is more closely aligned with the various values of Islamic communities within their respective countries.

Next, the criticism leveled against multiculturalism by academia reveals how the multiculturalism of the 1970s is no longer suitable for contemporary society in the 2010s. For instance, according to Cantle, early multiculturalism was essentially "defensive". The focus was on protecting minorities from racism or discrimination and implementing affirmative action aimed at granting equal opportunities to these groups. Subsequent to the Second World War, the segregation policies of multiculturalism, as a result of the prevalence of racism and discrimination, were an inevitable choice at the time. This was an attempt to provide equal opportunity through legal and institutional regulations, to require tolerance for other groups, and to try to minimize conflict and tension caused by isolation from other groups. This early multiculturalism achieved its desired goals but gradually exposed its limitations.

Abdallah-Pretceille (1999:24) states the spatialisation of differences, the denial of cultural universality on the grounds of cultural relativity, and denial of an individual's autonomy—all caused by the prioritization of groups over individuals—as limitations of multiculturalism. According to Cantle, early multiculturalism is no longer suitable for contemporary society, which displays super-diversity amidst a tide of globalism. While

early multiculturalism has also evolved into "progressive multiculturalism" over the course of history, academic circles criticize this modern form of multiculturalism as well.

Barrett (2013:22) summarizes his major critiques against multiculturalism in the following seven arguments.

> - that multiculturalism encourages members of different cultures to live separately in parallel communities that have only minimal contact and interaction with one another, generating mutual ignorance and mistrust;
> - that multiculturalism weakens collective identities and common values, and undermines national identity and loyalty to the country;
> - that multiculturalism supports and encourages minority cultural practices that are morally unacceptable (such as female circumcision, forced marriage, and the subordination of women);
> - that multiculturalism encourages disaffected minority youth to engage in civil disturbances and riots;
> - that multiculturalism encourages Muslim youth to embrace religious fundamentalism, extremism, and terrorism;
> - that multiculturalism institutionalizes cultural differences based on a view of cultures as monolithic static communities each of which is characterized by a clearly identifiable set of beliefs and practices that are shared by all of its members, a view which ignores the social reality of cultures as fluid, heterogeneous, internally contested and evolving social collectivities;
> - that multiculturalism prevents honest debate about societal problems through a political correctness that brands any criticism of multiculturalism as "racist" and that denies the existence of social problems linked to immigration, race, and ethnicity.

These arguments have been debated intensely over recent years with no consensus emerging. Irrespective of the merits or demerits of these various arguments, there has been a retreat from the use of the term "multiculturalism" in political and policy discourse over recent years. In its place, terms such as "culturally diverse," "diversity management" and "interculturalism" have come to be used more frequently.

III. Interculturalism

The prefix "inter-" means "between," and the word intercultural with "cultural" attached means "between cultures." The addition of suffix "-ism" produces the noun

interculturalism which refers to an "ideal or policy that emphasizes exchange and interaction between cultures." Just like multiculturalism, interculturalism is used with a variety of meanings depending on the region, nation, and scholar.

A. The Diversity of Interculturalism

In terms of time periods, interculturalism appeared in the 1980s as a middle path model that asserted balance and equity while rejecting assimilationism, a model of diversity that continued until 1960s, and multiculturalism, a model that prevailed after the 1970s - both of which fostered division and harmed social cohesion (Bouchard, Cantle, qtd. in 2013:82).

Interculturalism originated from the critique against the pedagogy for foreigners in Germany during the 1960s and the initiation classes of France in the 1970s. These two countries accepted many immigrants after the Second World War. However, Germany was satisfied with simply teaching German to the children of these immigrants because Germany treated these immigrant workers as "guest workers" without recognizing itself as an immigration state. France also did not take any special measures prior to the 1970s, under the belief of treating all students equally, and only began teaching French to non-French speaking children through the installation of initiation classes in 1970 and adaptation classes in 1973 after the increasing academic failure of non-French speaking children. The host country language education of these two countries basically featured the characteristics of assimilationism. When criticism against this assimilationist education emerged, the two countries gradually moved towards an interculturalism that considered the cultural and linguistic diversity of the immigrant children. The recommendations of the Council of Europe played a large role in effecting such a change.

Interculturalism also originated from the critique of multiculturalism. Before the 1960s, Canada carried out a policy of assimilationism. In 1910, Canadian immigration laws allowed the government to reject people who were deemed as having difficulty in assimilating to Canadian culture. In 1923, the government could discriminate between immigrants from a preferred and nonpreferred list of nations. Such discriminatory policies continued until 1962. When nationalism emerged in the state of Quebec in the 1960s, Canada formed the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to study in-depth the essence of Canadian society, which involved tensions between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians and their two majority cultures. In 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau officialized a Canadian multiculturalism policy, with the declaration that, despite having two official languages, Canada did not have a single official culture. When the federal government officialized multiculturalism in such a manner, the French-speaking state of Quebec opposed it. According to the people

criticizing multiculturalism, this policy was denying the people of Quebec the opportunity to maintain their identity. The official rejection of multiculturalism and the will to preserve French-speaking culture brought about Quebec's unique integration policy of interculturalism. This interculturalism values unity through a shared identity and the acceptance and balance between several cultures. This ideal presupposes the attitude of Quebecers to welcome immigrants and the will of immigrants to integrate into Quebecian society and respect shared values. Therefore, this integration policy requires the effort of both immigrants and the host society.

On the other hand, the interculturalism of Europe appeared in Germany and France in the 1960s and 70s during the process of resolving the academic failure of immigrant children by recognizing their linguistic and cultural diversity. Due to the advent of interculturalism in educational activities rather than theory, the direction and activities of interculturalism were considerably more arbitrary and unstable. Hence, European interculturalism was exposed for its various problems like the error of connecting the issue of multiculturalism to the immigration issue, the indiscriminate use of terms, excessive emotional involvement, and attempts to interpret phenomena as cultural factors (Abdallah-Pretceille, 1999:53). After making its departure from such criticism, interculturalism underwent its first development in academia during the 1980s (Porcher, 1981, Abdallah-Pretceille, 1986) and was then established as a full-scale framework in the 1990s (Clanet, 1990; Ouellet, 1991; Demorgon, 1996).

B. The Characteristics and Policies of Interculturalism

Interculturalism adds value to ideals of cultural diversity and pluralism, and emphasizes integration and social inclusion. The integration stated here is defined as a two-way process in which both minorities and majorities make accommodations towards each other. Additionally, interculturalism, like multiculturalism, fights against pre-existing political, economic, and social disadvantages and inequalities that minorities (occasionally) experience.

Interculturalism can be summarized as having the following features.

First, interculturalism strongly emphasizes intercultural dialogue, interaction, and exchange. Interculturalism suggests that intercultural dialogue allows individuals to deeply understand different cultural beliefs and practices, foster a mutual understanding between individuals that possess different cultures, increase interpersonal trust, cooperation, and participation, and encourage tolerance and mutual respect.

Second, interculturalism argues that exclusive and fixed identities must be abandoned—merely acknowledging the different identities is not sufficient. Interculturalism places much emphasis on the changing nature of identity and cognition

in general. When we accept this "cognitive flexibility," anxiety over losing one's traditional identity—which Taylor (2012) regarded as the Achilles' heel of interculturalism—could be reduced. "Interculturalism (…) is to experience another culture, to accept the truth of the other culture. It is therefore allowing the other culture and its truth to affect me directly, to penetrate me, to change me, to transform me, (...)" (Eberhard, 2008:45)

Third, interculturalism aims to generate a strong sense of a cohesive society based on shared universal values. From the perspective of the Council of Europe, these values are human rights, democracy, the rule of law, and a recognition that all human beings have equal dignity and are entitled to equal respect. From this perspective, interculturalism denies moral relativity based on cultural differences, and criticizes illiberal cultural practices that go against these universal values.

Fourth, interculturalism suggests that citizens foster an intercultural competence to effectively participate in intercultural dialogue. This competence includes virtues of open-mindedness, empathy, multiperspectivity, cognitive flexibility, communicative awareness, the ability to adapt one's behaviour to new cultural contexts, and linguistic/sociolinguistic discourse skills.

Policies that carry the interculturalist approach into effect can be extrapolated from the aforementioned features of interculturalism. The following policies (Barrett, 2013:29) are examples of this approach.

> - implementing reasonable accommodation measures;
> - providing inclusion through employment, which may require forms of affirmative action;
> - providing inclusion through education, which may require devising new non-discriminatory educational curricula and practices;
> - facilitating access to citizenship by migrants in order to enhance their civic participation;
> - legislating to combat all manifestations of discrimination, hatred and intolerance;
> - promoting intercultural dialogue, interaction and exchanges, especially at school, in the workplace and in the community, but also at the organizational, institutional and international level;
> - implementing intercultural education throughout the formal educational system in order to equip individuals with intercultural competence;
> - creating state institutions and supporting civil society organizations that promote intercultural dialogue and provide intercultural education;

IV. Multiculturalism and Interculturalism

For the past ten years, the term "multiculturalism" has gradually receded from the discourse of Western politics and policy. Instead, terms like "diversity management" have gradually taken its place (Barrett, 2013:22). Such a movement was accelerated with the publication of "White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue" by the Council of Europe.

First, scholars like Vertovec & Wessendorf (2010), Meer & Modood (2012), and Levey (2012) consider these two isms as basically the same. Vertovec & Wessendorf (2010) say that the term interculturalism may be used instead of multiculturalism but their meanings essentially have no differences. Meer & Modood (2012)'s argument is stronger. They say that people who support political interculturalism assert encouragement of communication, recognition of dynamic identity, emphasis on unity, and freedom-limiting cultural implementation as the advantages of interculturalism but, because these have already been highlighted by multiculturalism, the two cannot be viewed in the same way. They say that before interculturalism presents a different viewpoint clearly distinguishable from multiculturalism, it cannot, at the very least, undermine multiculturalism at an intellectual level and must be considered as a supplementation to multiculturalism.

Levey (2012) states that interculturalism will only be "another noticeable and publicly merchantable trademark" (2012:223) when multiculturalism is "wrecked" after decades, and he does not view interculturalism as a distinguishable philosophical and practical concept that can replace multiculturalism.

Next, scholars like Maxwell et al. (2012), Taylor (2012), and Cantle (2013) claim that multiculturalism and interculturalism are essentially different. According to Maxwell et al. (2012:432), "The pursuit of integration and diversity management in multiculturalism regards the recommendation and valuing of cultural diversity as political goals in themselves. On the contrary, interculturalism diverges in that it regards the integration of new citizens as a dynamic and open process that transforms a shared society and culture through dialogue, mutual understanding, and intercultural contact."

Taylor was regarded as the representative scholar of multiculturalism with his work *The politics of Recognition* (1992), but in his recent book *Interculturalism or Multiculturalism*? (2012), he acknowledges the possibility and necessity of interculturalism. He sees the difference between multiculturalism and interculturalism in the difference of their point of emphasis. According to Taylor (2012), multiculturalism emphasizes "the recognition of difference" while interculturalism emphasizes "social integration." "If the general meaning of multiculturalism includes policies that pursue both the recognition of differences and integration, the prefix "multi" gives greater weight to the recognition of diversity whereas "inter" gives greater weight to integration." (p.

416) To support this claim, Taylor compares the multiculturalism of Canada and the interculturalism of Quebec and finds interculturalism to be more suitable for Quebec because the pending issue of this region is integration. On the other hand, Cantle (2013) is one of the scholars that most clearly distinguishes the two concepts. According to him, an "interculturalism with a wider outlook of the world must now replace multiculturalism and develop a new positive model that deals with changes traversing region and nation because a multiculturalism based on a notion of race is no longer suitable for a contemporary society that displays features of "super-diversity" as a result of globalization." (2013:70). According to Cantle, "multiculturalism is the past and interculturalism is the future."

If that is the case, what is the position of international organizations like the Council of Europe and UNESCO? These organizations also clearly distinguish the two isms. Published by the Council of Europe in 2008, the *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue* (2008:19) expresses the limitations of multiculturalism and the potential of interculturalism in the following manner:

> Multiculturalism is now seen by many as having fostered communal segregation and mutual incomprehension, as well as having contributed to the undermining of the rights of individuals – and, in particular, women – within minority communities, perceived as if these were single collective actors. The cultural diversity of contemporary societies has to be acknowledged as an empirical fact. However, a recurrent theme of the consultation was that multiculturalism was a policy with which respondents no longer felt at ease.
>
> Neither of these models, assimilation or multiculturalism, is applied singularly and wholly in any state. Elements of them combine with aspects of the emerging interculturalist paradigm, which incorporates the best of both. It takes from assimilation the focus on the individual; it takes from multiculturalism the recognition of cultural diversity. And it adds the new element, critical to integration and social cohesion, of dialogue on the basis of equal dignity and shared values.

According to the *White Paper*, multiculturalism is a policy approach that recognizes various cultures within a society, whereas interculturalism is a dynamic policy approach. Published in 2009, UNESCO's World Report: *Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue* (2009:29) likewise highlights the limitations of multiculturalism and the potential of interculturalism:

> Since the 1970s, multiculturalist policies – notably in the areas of education,

information, law, religious observance and media access – have been one of the main approaches to ensure equality in diversity. Such policies have proved to have a number of shortcomings, particularly that of encouraging a drift towards cultural isolationism. Several countries are currently challenged with finding new models that fuse agendas for promoting national identity with those 'celebrating' diversity. In this context, the aim is to go beyond assimilation and multiculturalism conceived in terms of separateness, in order to highlight multiple interactions and allegiances and facilitate access to other cultures, particularly through the development of networks and new forms of sociability.

V. The Choice of Korean Multicultural Society

Korean society is gradually changing into a multicultural society. The government and local self-governing bodies have continued to present various multicultural policies in accordance with changes since the mid-2000s. A summary of the policies over the past 15 years demonstrates the Korean government's contradiction of affirming multiculturalism (Park, 2008) while at the same time implementing assimilationism, and one of the main causes of this contradiction is the acceptance of multiculturalism as "the only alternative" without serious academic discussion over it. Recently, Korean scholars have begun serious discussions on multiculturalism but almost all of these discussions have concentrated on the British and American sphere including the US and Canada, with no particular interest in the interculturalism of the European sphere. On the contrary, multiculturalism is gradually receding in Europe amidst much criticism, while interculturalism has come to the fore as an alternative. Therefore, South Korea must now examine whether the Korean multicultural situation is closer to the British and American sphere or the European sphere and must focus on a cultural diversity management model closer to its domestic situation.

To such a purpose, this study proposes considering the connections between the Korean multicultural situation, multiculturalism, and interculturalism in connection. First, the study will connect the "reality," "ideal," and "policy" of multiculturalism with the Korean multicultural situation. If multiculturalism is viewed as the reality of "a society that features ethnic and cultural heterogeneity," then the Korean society can be said to be moving toward such a society because the number of foreigners residing in Korea continues to increase.

Next, if multiculturalism is viewed as "an ideal of equality and mutual respect between groups with different ethnicities and cultures," it wouldn't be easy for this ism to be as persuasive within the Korean society as it is in others. Such an ideal was asserted as

the foundational ideology of nations like Canada, the US, Australia, and New Zealand, which began with multiple ethnicities upon their inception. While Korea may be able to support this ideal, it might be hard for it to accept multiculturalism as a founding principle of the nation due to it staying in a relatively homogeneous state for a long period of time. Instead, Korea is more similar to Europe in terms of immigration than it is to the U.S., as the European continent remained relatively homogeneous before massive waves of immigration during World War II. Finally, if we view multiculturalism as "a form of policy that the central or local government proclaims and adopts," it doesn't exactly match with the "multiculturalism" of Korea. If we compare the eight multicultural policies previously mentioned by Banting & Kymlicka (2006, cited in Barrett, 2013:16-17) with Korea's policies, Korean multiculturalism falls under the category of an "extremely weak" form of multiculturalism. To summarize, the multicultural situation of Korea may match the "reality" of multiculturalism, but is not as similar in terms of its "ideals," and even less so in terms of its "policies."

Next, let's connect the multicultural situation in South Korea with the "reality," "ideal," and "policy" of interculturalism. If the reality of interculturalism is people of different cultures and languages living together, this reality considerably suits the South Korean multicultural situation. Foreigners entering South Korea mostly consist of foreign workers and marriage immigrants who live with Koreans in the workplace and at home as soon as they enter Korea. Foreigner enclaves like Wongokdong Ansan, Hyangnam Hwasan, and Daerimdong Seoul are increasing but do not display a clear "spacialization of difference" that is observed in the US. In fact, it is difficult to create spaces for each ethnicity because Korea does not have a large territory to begin with. Furthermore, the creation of such spaces is not desirable. If the ideal of interculturalism is people of different cultures and languages living well together, then this also matches the Korean multicultural situation.

In conclusion, the multicultural situation of Korea has progressed after massive influxes of immigrants since the 1990s, changing the makeup of a previously ethnically and culturally homogeneous populace living within a small territory. As discourse regarding multiculturalism came into full swing in 2006, the government and academia began to show interest in a variety of areas related to immigration, multicultural policies, and multicultural education. While the government and local self-governing bodies have been practicing a multitude of policies and programs for immigrants through this process, these efforts seem to be closer to the ideals of cultural assimilation than they are to respect the lifestyles and values of the immigrants and integrate a multicultural society (Lee, 2007; Yoon, 2008). This criticism is reasonable considering that most of the policies are focused on helping immigrants adjust to the Korean society rather than trying to change the Koreans' understanding and attitude towards immigrants.

Our society is becoming more diverse, and it will continue to change in this direction. Each society must alter its model of diversity based on its historical, cultural, and social background. Some societies may be more fit for multiculturalism, while others may be more suitable for "multiculturalisme intégré" or "multiculturalisme écarté." Yet another society may find interculturalism to be the most appropriate model of diversity. In which direction should the Korean society advance in? This study suggests that it turn towards interculturalism; while being based on the ideals of early multicultural societies - acceptance of differences and peaceful coexistence - interculturalism would allow the Korean society to go beyond earlier models of multiculturalism through more active interaction and dialogue, dynamic identities, being less groupist and emphasizing synthesis, allowing stronger social cohesion, cultivating the capability of individuals to criticize violations of basic human rights, and overall acting as a remedy for imperfect multiculturalism.

References

Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (1999). *L'éducation interculturelle*. Paris, PUF.

Aprile S. & Dufoix S. (2009). *Les mots de l'immigration*. Berlin.

Banting K. & Kimlicka W. (2012). *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*. Oxford University.

Barrett M. (eds) (2013). *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: similarities and differences*. Council of Europe.

Cantle T. (2013). "Interculturalism as a new narrative for the era of globalisation and super-diversity". In M. Barrett (eds) (2013). *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: similarities and differences*. Council of Europe.

Council of Europe. (2008). *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue - "Living together as equals in dignity"*. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.

Council of Europe. (2011). *Living together. Combining diversity and Freedom in 21st century Europe.* Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.

Eberhard, C. (2008). *Rediscovering education through intercultural dialogue*. Contribution to the international meeting of experts "Cultural diversity and Education" at UNESCO/UNESCOC (Barcelona, 14-16 January 2008).

Inglis Ch. (1996). *Multiculturalism: New Policy Responses to Diversity.* United Nations Educational, El Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.

Lee, S. O. (2007). Migrant labor movement and multiculturalism in South Korea. *Multiculturalism in South Korea: a critical review. Hanul Academy.* 82-107.

Levey G. B. (2012). Interculturalism vs. multiculturalism: A distinction without a difference? *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 33*(2).

Maxwell et al. (2012). Interculturalism, Multiculturalism, and the State Funding and Regulation of Conservative Religious Schools. *Educational Theory, 62*(4).

Meer N. & Modood T. (2013). "How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism". In M. Barrett (ed.) (2013). *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: similarities and differences*. Council of Europe.

Meunier O. (2007). *Approches interculturelles en éducation. Étude comparative international*. Institut national de recherche pédagogique.

Oh, K. S. (2007). *Multiculturalism in Korea*. Hanwool.

Park, K. T. (2008). *Minority and Korean society*. Humanitas.

Ramsey & Williams (2003). *Multicultural Education: A Source Book* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Taylor, C. (2012). Interculturalism or multiculturalism? *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 38*(4-5), 413-423.

Um, H. J. (2011). *Multicultural Society*. Sowha.

Unesco. (2009:29). *UNESCO's World Report: Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*.

Vertovec S., Wessendorf S. (ed.) (2010). *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*. London/New York: Routledge

Wieviorka M. (1998). Is Multiculturalism the solution? *Ethnic and racial studies, 21*(5).

Yoon, I. J. (2008). The development and characteristics of multiculturalism in South Korea- With a focus on the relationship of the state and civil society. *Korea Journal of Sociology, 42*(2), 72-103.

Authors

Seo Youngji
Keimyung University
oscar1004@nate.com