UK/BRIC: Practices and Processes of Religious Diversity
AHRC-Funded International Research Network

Introduction

The English sociologist James Beckford argues that religious diversity is now 'central to a wide range of debates, legal issues, and political struggles over such concerns as human rights, equal opportunities, social cohesion, the politics of recognition, and plural jurisdictions' (2012: 111). Intimately associated with the socio-cultural diversification wrought by modern forces and dynamics, religious diversity is an increasingly common feature of contemporary social contexts in many parts of the world. 'As such', claims Beckford, 'religious diversity is like a thread that weaves its way through some of the most contentious and interesting aspects of many cultures and societies in the early twenty-first century' (Beckford, 2012: 112). Academic recognition of the contemporary 'centrality' of religious diversity highlighted by Beckford is reflected in the relatively recent proliferation of publications (see bibliography) and research projects exploring its thread-like diffusion throughout modern society. Among the research projects recently completed or still underway are, for example, the Australian 'Religion, Cultural Diversity and Safeguarding Australia' project, the Canadian 'Religion and Diversity Project', the Danish 'Pluralism Project' and 'Critical Analysis of Religious Diversity' network, the Norwegian 'Religion in Pluralist Societies' network, and the European-wide 'Religare' research programme.

Funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), the 'UK/BRIC – Practices and Processes of Religious Diversity Network' complements these other projects in three key respects. First, its inclusion of the BRIC (i.e. Brazil, Russia, India, and China) nations adds a much needed, though relatively neglected, dimension to contemporary appreciations of the character and consequences of religious diversity. Second, the project's 'glocal' (global + local) approach transcends a 'methodological provincialism' (Beck and Grande, 2010) that fails to identify and reflect upon the commonalities and thematic variations implicated by the interplay of the local processes and transnational dynamics associated with religious diversity. Third, the project gives due recognition to the character and impact of typically *modern* processes and dynamics (e.g. rapid, wide-spread and ongoing societal transformation, detraditionalization, individualization, and globalization) responsible for engendering and shaping religious diversity in an increasing number of societies around the world. In so doing, it makes a timely contribution to understanding the origins, shape and likely future of religious diversity as an increasingly prevalent feature of the contemporary social landscape. The project website can be accessed at http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/religious-diversity/index.htm.

The recent upsurge of interest in religious diversity is part of a broader growth of concern with understanding and managing the political-economic consequences and socio-cultural implications of rapid, large-scale and ongoing societal transformation. As with so much else that shapes contemporary existence in more and more parts of the world, the transformative dynamics productive of religious diversity are most closely associated with modernity and all it entails. Long-term exponent of the socio-cultural implications of modernity for religion, Peter Berger maintains that the processes and dynamics implicated in modern society 'more or less necessarily' entail 'religious

pluralism'. According to Berger, typically 'modern developments' (e.g. mass migration, travel, urbanization, literacy, and technology) bring about 'a situation in which different religious traditions are present to each other in a historically unprecedented manner' (2007: 21).

It is unsurprising that Berger cites migration as first in his list of modern developments that combine to engender religious diversity. For good or ill, the impact and unfolding consequences of migration have over recent years assumed centre stage in academic treatments of and political engagements with religion. As Pratap Kumar argues, the migratory dispersal of different peoples and cultures around the globe is inherently diversifying in both its impact upon host nations and its implications for diaspora communities who must 'find new ways and invent new rituals and practices, modify their beliefs and make some room for their old belief systems' (2006: 363). Migration, however, is only one aspect of a broader dynamic involving both the growing sensitivity to and increasing assertiveness of previously absent or marginalized minority groups. While an extremely important component in any understanding of the politics and practice of religious diversity in contemporary society, transnational migration nevertheless constitutes only one aspect of a larger thematic that elevates the 'integration and accommodation of new [and existing] ethnoreligious minorities' among the more 'central issues of national politics' today (Berman *et al*., 2013: 6).

The pluralizing dynamics of modernity and the diversifying impact of migration are the key drivers behind the relatively recent growth of interest in both religion in general and religious diversity in particular. It should be admitted from the outset, however, that much of this interest is not only pragmatic but also pathological in nature. To paraphrase Gavin D'Costa *et al*., the contemporary 'revival' of interest in religion comprises (as much as, if not more than, anything else) a 'revival of worries about religion' (2013: 3). Whereas many academics treating religious diversity are drawn to the topic as part of broader research interests in theorizing contemporary social change, a greater number are primarily concerned with engaging the political-economic challenges and socio-cultural problems engendered by particular forms of religious belief and practice. Certainly, it cannot be denied that the historically recent revival of interest in religious diversity owes much to a problematization intimately allied with what is most commonly termed 'religious fundamentalism' (Dawson, 2011). From the events of 9/11, through the Bali (2002), Madrid (2004) and London (2007) bombings, to recent killings in Australia, France and Tunisia, murderous acts by Islamic extremists have repeatedly reinforced a Western imaginary in which terrorism sits uncomfortably close to particular kinds of religion. Given the need to comprehend, engage and mitigate the issues associated with such events, the upsurge of interest in religious diversity is as understandable (academically) as it is inevitable (politically).

Though, perhaps, the principal prism through which religion is pathologically refracted for popular Western consumption, a more insightful appreciation of religious diversity must look beyond the potentially distorting preoccupation with fundamentalist extremism. Whereas Habermas, for example, identifies 'fundamentalism' and religiously inspired violence as instrumental to creating a perceived 'worldwide "resurgence of religion"', he also cites the growing influence (by way of immigration and conversion) of 'conservative' religiosities in various traditions that problematize established secular-liberal settlements governing the status and place of belief in the public sphere (2008: 18–19). In the same vein, Ahdar and Leigh complement 'the rapid

growth of Islam in the West' with recognition of growing 'religious pluralism' and state 'penetration into most areas of human interaction' as concomitant factors that combine to put 'religious freedom ... under increasing pressure' (2005: 5). Identifying these same three factors as 'today unsettling democratic accommodations of religion' in pluralist democracies, Nancy Rosenblum concludes that 'these challenges ... threaten to outpace political theory' and, as such, 'political and legal theorists are playing catch-up' in respect of their understanding and impact (2000: 21).

A welcome reminder commonly made by classical, pre-modern and non-Western scholars asserts that religious diversity is, in itself, nothing new. Whether one looks to the pre-Christian Roman empire, the popular religiosity of medieval Europe or the Indian sub-continent, religious diversity was or is an undeniable feature of certain cultures prior to and outside of the modern Western contexts of, for example, Australasia, Europe and North America (see Pew Research Center, 2014). Nevertheless, such is the rapidity, scale and unrelenting nature of modern social transformation that recent decades have witnessed significant changes in respect of both the amount and kinds of religious diversity in existence. Indeed, such is the character of these changes that the growth and vibrancy of religious diversity is impacting virtually every part of the globe, irrespective of the amount or kind of socio-cultural diversity formerly present. Even nations and regions that boast longstanding experience of religious diversity are seeing the extent and substance of this diversity progressively transformed. In view of contemporary transformations in the amount and nature of religious diversity, increasing numbers of scholars signal the practical-symbolic step-change taking place by talking of a 'new religious diversity' or 'new religious pluralism' (e.g. Ahlin *et al*. 2012; Kymlicka, 2009; Machacek, 2003). Like so many interested in the 'new religious pluralism' because of its 'new political implications', Thomas Banchoff describes this typically modern phenomenon as 'a striking development of the last several decades' whose emergence 'poses difficult challenges' to 'basic democratic principles' (2007: 3, 10). Impacting and reshaping more and more parts of the world, this 'new religious diversity' is here explored through four themes that frequently appear in the literature spawned by its emergence. These four themes are: migration, post-secularism, modernity, and governance.

Transnational Migration

The 'new religious pluralism' unfolding in Europe and the USA is, claims José Casanova, intimately associated with the 'significant consequences of the new global patterns of transnational migration' impacting various parts of the world (2007: 76). Recent and ongoing increases in transnational migration are closely associated with the relaxation of immigration controls and liberalization of employment laws engendered by the typically modern processes of late-capitalism and the market economy. Enacted in the 1960s and 70s by already urban-industrialized countries in further need of cheap labour, the loosening of immigration and employment restrictions is steadily progressing across the developing world in tandem with the progressive spread of globalizing modernity. At the same time, it cannot be denied that the transnational networks and border-transcending flows of contemporary globalization play a significant part in facilitating rapid and large-scale migratory movements irrespective of changes to immigration controls and employment restrictions. Exemplified by the exponential increase in 'uncontrolled' migration to Australia (from Southeast Asia), Europe (from North Africa) and the USA (from Mexico), the relative ease and

accessibility of modern-day modes of travel go some way to relativizing national controls and restrictions. Whether strategically managed or not, the transnational migrations currently underway in various parts of the world provoke practical and symbolic issues that are in many respects not historically unprecedented. 'What is fairly new', however, 'is the prominence of religion in the recent debates about the changing nature of migrant-receiving societies and migrant cohorts' (Bramadat, 2009: 1). Casanova reminds us that recent debates provoked by migration play out differently around the world relative to prevailing socio-cultural conditions and the religio-cultural character of respective migrant communities (2007). Nevertheless, many of the challenges posed by the new prominence of religion are shared in respect of the scale and rapidity of the movements involved, along with the socio-cultural shifts entailed for both host and migrant communities.

According to Giuseppe Giordan, the societal 'landscape of wide areas of the planet' is being 'radically transformed ... by a transnational migration process' in which 'the number of migrants in the world has grown in the last 50 years from 80 million to 214 million' (2014: 7–8). A similar point is made by Diana Eck, founder and director of the 'Pluralism Project' based at Harvard University, USA (http://pluralism.org/). Eck argues that 'massive movements of people' over 'the last three decades ... have expanded the diversity of religious life dramatically, exponentially'. These rapid and large-scale migratory movements, she continues, 'have brought about a new georeligious reality' (2002: 4–5). Consequently, while Wimmer and Schiller are right to remind us that '95 per cent of the people of the world are not migrants' (2002: 326), such is the scale and rapidity of modern-day transnational migration that a range of challenges are created which impact increasing numbers of the global population, irrespective of their sedentary or mobile status.

Gary Bouma, of the 'Religion, Cultural Diversity and Safeguarding Australia' project (http://amf.net.au/entry/religion-cultural-diversity-and-safeguarding-australia) observes how the influx of migrants from the Asia-Pacific region is progressively eroding the historically dominant 'Anglo-Celtic Christian' ethos of Australia established by earlier migratory movements predominantly from the United Kingdom (1995). A similar point is made by Ahlin *et al*. of the 'Danish Pluralism Project' (http://samtidsreligion.au.dk/en/religion-in-denmark/), who note that while 'new waves of immigrants' are affecting Christianity in Denmark (e.g. by 'saving the Catholic Church from decline'), the largest impact comprises a move away from an established 'internal' Christian 'differentiation' to an external 'diversity of different faith traditions' with increased prominence of Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism (2012: 408–11). In the same vein, Wuthnow writes of the '*significant cultural challenge*' posed for modern-day Americans by the 'fundamental questions about our historic identity as a Christian nation' engendered by the increasing presence of 'other major religious traditions, such as Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism' (2005: xv). In view of the concerns raised by the 'ordinary Americans' interviewed by Wuthnow as part of the 'Pluralism Project', he concludes that the 'common good' of the contemporary USA is best served by a 'reflective pluralism' that takes seriously 'how and why people are different' alongside the need to engage 'across traditions' (2005: 104–5, 289).

As well as the socio-cultural contexts of the host nation, the diversifying implications of transnational migration impact the beliefs, practices and organizational profiles of internationally transplanted religions. Organizationally, diaspora Islam is adopting new

forms of institutionalization as Muslim migrants adapt to the governance models, political opportunity structures and socio-cultural contours of their host nations (e.g. Burchardt and Michalowski, 2015; Laurence, 2012). Such migratory transposition also involves the reconfiguration of religious repertoires, as received traditions and inherited rituals of the 'homeland' are adapted to meet the opportunities, challenges and demands of a new and, perhaps, radically different socio-cultural context. Identified by Dawson (2017), for example, the post-migratory adaptations made by Japanese new religions in Brazil both highlight the practical-symbolic diversification wrought by the processes of re-territorialization and underline their importance to the subsequent success of transplanted religious repertoires. The processes of post-migratory diversification also impact religio-cultural dynamics through the gradual reconfiguration or erosion of long-established associations with, for example, caste, ethnicity and sex. In their respective studies of post-migratory Hindu communities in England and South Africa, Ann David (2011) and Pratap Kumar (2000) identify the incremental erosion of male-dominated gender hierarchies, the decreasing importance of caste as a determinant of spiritual status and the increasing irrelevance of traditional ethnic-linguistic distinctions. Functioning beyond the traditional context of south Asia, the religious repertoire of diaspora Hinduism has decreasing need to call upon the established divisions of sex, caste and ethnicity which stand increasingly out of place in the socially mobile and culturally diverse contexts of modern societies like England and South Africa. Especially when coupled with the secularizing and relatively more diverse contexts of Western modernity, the unsettling dynamics of transnational migration also offer Hindu migrants (as well as others) ample opportunity to completely discard inherited religio-cultural identities or combine them in previously infeasible ways with religious repertoires not formerly encountered (Gallo, 2014). Changes in the established ethnic profile of Christianity are also underway as its 'de-Europeanization' ensues through African migrants impacting Anglicanism in the UK, Korean migrants reshaping Presbyterianism and Hispanic migrants causing the 'Latin Americanization' of Catholicism in the USA (Machacek, 2003: 147; Casanova, 2007: 71). By reconfiguring both migrant communities and their host nations, the dynamics and processes of transnational migration contribute massively to the ongoing diversification of modern and modernizing societies across the globe.

Post-Secularism

It is now commonplace for those introducing works on religion, politics and society to justify their endeavours through reference to the 'comeback' (Ahdar and Leigh, 2005: 1), 'resurgence' (Berman *et al*., 2013: 2) or 'revival' (D'Costa *et al*., 2013: 1) of religion in modern society. For some, religion's newfound social prominence constitutes the falsification of longstanding secularist assumptions of Western social-science in which 'modernization, and its cousin, secularization, were meant to lead inexorably to a decline of religion, both at a societal and individual level' (Ahdar and Leigh, 2005: 1). For others, the continuance of religion as 'an important aspect in modern society' does not necessarily negate secularization theories but does demand an answer to the question of how 'we deal with society that is increasingly becoming pluralistic culturally, religiously and ethnically' (Kumar, 2006: 7). In communist (e.g. China) and post-communist (e.g. former Soviet bloc) societies, the political-cultural secularism bequeathed by decades of Marxist-Leninism engenders a variety of issues and dynamics when confronted with the growing religious diversity spawned by the combined processes of globalizing modernity. The communist regime of China, for example, is

wrestling to understand, manage and mitigate growing interest in home-grown (e.g. Falun Gong) and imported (e.g. Christianity) forms of religiosity whose (still relatively small) growth is significantly problematized by an avowedly secular and anti-Western state ideology (Chan and Lang, 2016; Chau, 2011; Goossaert and Palmer, 2011; Yang, 2012). At the same time, various countries of the former Soviet bloc see the once marginalized institutions of Russian Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism asserting a newfound spiritual hegemony by virtue of providing a post-communist future grounded in the religio-cultural heritage of a pre-communist past (Alisauskiene and Schröder; 2012; Fagan, 2013; Rousselet, 2000; Shterin, 2016). Though contrasting in respect of their continuing or former communist status, the perduring authoritarian ethos shared by China and Russia engenders a range of similarities in respect of contemporary configurations of religion, society and politics (see Koesel, 2014).

In contrast, religion – society relations in Europe and North America, as well as post-colonial nations such as Australia, India and South Africa, have been shaped by the practical-symbolic divisions of Western secular-liberalism and its categorical distinctions between the public secular (political-social) sphere and a private religious (familial-individual) domain. At least in principle, Western liberalism and its various iterations have traditionally framed freedom of religious belief as an *individual* right that is *collectively* beneficial (i.e. a social good), *equally* distributed (by a 'difference-blind' process), *privately* enjoyed, *negatively* conceived (i.e. as a freedom *from* undue interference), safeguarded by a *neutral* (i.e. non-confessional) state, and underwritten by *universal secular* values (e.g. equality, justice, autonomy) of an objectively *rational* kind (see Ahdar and Leigh, 2005: 38–64; Monsma and Soper, 2009). The public and private freedoms enshrined by the political-social versus familial-individual distinctions of Western secular-liberalism lead Katznelson and Jones to observe that it was 'often the religious themselves who pressed for political secularisation', defined here as 'the removal of a specific confessional foundation for the authority and legitimacy of government and the state' (2010: 13). By making 'civil rights ... independent of religion', maintains Champion, these divisions established that 'all citizens were equal whatever their religion' and thereby safeguarded the existence of 'minority faiths' of various persuasions (1999: 43). Referencing the provisions furnished by the secular – religious distinctions of the contemporary USA, Eck makes a related point in that 'secular society' of the modern liberal-state provides individuals with a 'freedom *from* religion' that 'for some' (e.g. immigrants and others raised within religious communities) connotes 'an opportunity to shed identities they do not wish to have as dominant and all-encompassing' (2002: 337). The secular – religious distinctions at the heart of Western liberalism have thereby served to safeguard a range of individual and communal freedoms of a non-religious *and* spiritual kind. In recent decades, however, a number of developments have combined to problematize the Western liberal paradigm and its particular articulation of public secular (political-social) and private religious (familial-individual) domains. In respect of our overarching concern with religious diversity, the most relevant (and frequently overlapping) developments comprise religion's progressive political prominence, the ongoing juridification (or judicialization) of religion and the upsurge of religious identity-politics.

According to Berman *et al*., social scientists, international institutions and governments have all been equally 'surprised by the powerful political resurgence of religion and radical religious movements during the past thirty years' (2013: 2). The political prominence of religion is mainly, though by no means solely, associated with the impact

of religious worldviews beyond the Judeo-Christian traditions that have long been present across the Western world. The aforementioned expansion of immigration starting in the latter part of the twentieth century has seen the arrival in Western countries of Muslim, Hindu and Sikh migrants for whom religiosity represents an important, and sometimes all-encompassing, aspect of their socio-cultural identity. Unaffected by liberal distinctions between public and private domains, the beliefs and practices of significant numbers of immigrants sit uncomfortably with Western conventions in respect of religion's traditional restriction to familial and individual spheres. Catalyzed by the steady advance of religious extremism, state concerns with integrating immigrant communities within the warp and woof of wider society have thereby entailed a raft of political, legal and policy measures addressing the practical-symbolic dissonance between established liberal conventions and newly present (or prominent) religio-cultural worldviews. Irrespective of actual motivation (e.g. inclusion, equality or securitization), the need to mitigate this dissonance and its implications has elevated religion to an unexpected prominence on political agendas across the Western world.

Another relevant problematization of the Western liberal paradigm has occurred through developments in governance and jurisprudence that have incrementally eroded established political and legal distinctions between public secular and private religious spheres. Related to what some describe as a move from 'formal' to 'substantive' liberalism, the expansion of regulatory frameworks and judicial processes into more and more spheres of modern life has inevitably impacted religion (see Plant, 2013). According to Rosenblum, the increased 'activism' of the modern liberal state entails an unavoidable engagement with religion that results in the 'hyper-interaction between a plurality of religious groups and active government' (2000: 13). Described as the 'juridification' (Sandberg, 2014) or 'judicialization' (Richardson, 2015) of religion, the legal fallout of this 'hyper-interaction' is partially shaped by what Spickard describes as the evolution of 'third generation rights' (1999). Promulgated by the 1948 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights' and subsequent measures, the first two generations of human rights (i.e. civil-political and socio-economic, respectively) were typically liberal in character by virtue of their individualistic framing. In contrast, however, third generation rights are communally framed (i.e. 'collective-developmental') and underwrite a range of claims made (usually against the state) by a group for recognition, accommodations, provisions or exemptions on the grounds of, for example, particular cultural, ethnic or religious characteristics. The implications of such recent developments in respect of European law and policy on religious diversity are explored by the 'Religare' research project (http://www.religareproject.eu/).

The problematization of Western liberal distinctions between secular public and private religious spheres has been further catalyzed by the growth of group identity-politics facilitated by what is most commonly known as 'multiculturalism' or the multicultural paradigm (Kymlicka, 2007; Ratansi, 2011). Multiculturalism represents at its core a rejection of many of the aforementioned foundational assumptions of Western liberalism, not least the individualized and negative understanding of rights and claims regarding state neutrality and rational objectivity. Mobilizing progressive critiques linking power, knowledge and position, multiculturalism argues that minority, nonmainstream and marginal groups are (by virtue of being *different* from hegemonic majority cultures) disadvantaged by an unequal distribution of goods, materially and immaterially conceived (Taylor *et al*., 1994). Seeking to mitigate existing inequalities,

multiculturalism employs the language of third generation rights to argue that particular groups (e.g. indigenous peoples, minority cultures and immigrant communities) should be granted a range of practical-symbolic accommodations, provisions or exemptions relative to their specific characteristics and needs. Part and parcel of the collective identity-politics articulated by the multiculturalist paradigm, due recognition of the practices and worldviews of potentially disadvantaged groups inevitably involves political-legal provisions and socio-cultural accommodations in respect of religio-cultural concerns (e.g. Beaman and Beyer, 2008; Beaman, 2012). Such religio-cultural provisions and accommodations pertain to various aspects of public life and include, for example, education (e.g. curricula content and faith schools), employment (e.g. working schedules and task allocation), regulatory frameworks (e.g. ritual slaughter and building construction), and institutional contexts (e.g. diet, dress and rites). The Canadian 'Religion and Diversity Project' directed by Lori Beaman has done much to explicate the issues and dynamics implicated in such provisions and accommodations (http://religionanddiversity.ca/). Likewise, PPRD Network member, Cristina Maria de Castro explores a number of these issues as they relate to Muslim communities in Brazil (2013; 2016; 2017).

The processes and dynamics allied with immigration, religious juridification and multiculturalist identity-politics combine to problematize the Western liberal paradigm and its conventional differentiation between public secular (political-social) and private religious (familial-individual) spheres. Though by no means the only protagonist, Jürgen Habermas has been the most prominent exponent of liberalism to reappraise its secularist foundations in light of religion's newfound prominence within increasingly diverse 'post-secular' Western societies. Whereas Habermas steadfastly refuses to compromise on 'the requisite *institutional* separation of religion and politics' (i.e. 'that only secular reasons count beyond the institutional threshold that divides the informal public sphere from parliaments, courts, ministries and administrations'), he nevertheless accepts that post-secular conditions require both the 'neutral state' and its 'secular citizens' to recognize religion's legitimate place within the 'polyphonic complexity' of modern society's 'diverse public voices' (2006: 9; 2008: 29). As Bouma *et al*., maintain, such recognition of religion's legitimate public presence constitutes a 'significant change' to the 'secular contract' in which 'old modes of construing religion vis-à-vis wider society and governance are being rethought' and by which states are increasingly 'taking notice of their religious dimension in a quite new way' (2010: 256).

Modernity

Although the term modernity appears frequently in the literature on religious diversity, it is rarely analyzed in respect of its actual meaning. This lack of analysis may reflect the fact that authors are dealing with other themes that demand a degree of critical attention leaving insufficient space for an in-depth reflection upon precisely what the term modernity means, whereas others may feel little need to define a term that appears so well established within the conceptual lexicon of political and social science. The word modernity, however, is both contested as to its actual meaning and, for some, highly contentious in respect of its theoretical deployment (e.g. Bhambra, 2007; Mignolo, 2000). Given the frequency with which the term modernity is not only employed in the literature but denoted, to a greater or lesser extent, as a cause of religious diversity, detailed engagement with its meaning and contemporary usage is both overdue and would be something of a theoretical boon to the field. Here, though, is

not the place for such engagement but I should, at least, acknowledge my own interests in arguing elsewhere for the theoretical utility of modernity in helping understand a range of empirical processes and dynamics increasingly at play across more and more parts of the world (e.g. Dawson, 2014a and 2014b).

Long-time exponents of its diversity-inducing character, Berger and Luckmann maintain that modernity comprises 'a quantitative as well as qualitative increase in pluralization'. 'The structural causes of this fact are well known', they argue, and include, among other things, population growth and demographic diversification, migration, urbanization, the market economy and industrialization ('which throw together people of the most different kinds and force them to deal with each other reasonably peacefully'), and the rule of law and democracy that 'provide institutional guarantees for this peaceful coexistence' (1995: 37–8). In large part stimulated by Berger and Luckmann's seminal works on the character and implications of socio-cultural pluralization, subsequent generations of scholars have engaged a range of diversity-inducing processes at play within the macro-structural, micro-social and mid-range institutional dimensions of modern and modernizing societies.

Whereas transnational migration represents the most commonly treated macro-structural process engaged by contemporary treatments of religious diversity, other typically modern diversity-inducing dynamics should not be overlooked. In addition to the inward migratory flow of previously absent religious beliefs and practices from other parts of the world, the macro-structural processes of unremitting transformation and societal differentiation play an important role in the ongoing diversification of modern society. Exemplified by the metamorphic processes of urban-industrialization, modern society is a thoroughgoingly transformative environment characterized by rapid, widespread and ongoing reconfiguration impacting all practical-symbolic aspects of human existence. Modern society is constantly mutating through the ceaseless modification or wholesale replacement of, for example, infrastructural networks (e.g. state, transport and communication), interactive contexts (e.g. education, work and leisure) and extended webs of dependency (e.g. food, health and technology). Concomitant with modern society's perpetual transformation, structural differentiation occurs through the emergence of a dizzyingly diverse number of variegated mechanisms and specialized institutions through which the day-to-day activities of humankind occurs. This variegation of practical-symbolic structures in turn engenders progressively diverse life-experiences for the different groups, strata and classes populating the increasingly varied terrain of modern society. The new life-experiences of the nascent groups, strata and classes spawned by societal differentiation is, in part, explored and expressed through the formation of novel spiritual worldviews or the appropriation and modification of existing religious paradigms. In the West, for example, the late-twentieth century flourishing of New Age religiosity owes much to the preceding formation of an urban-professional 'new middleclass' (Dawson, 2013a), while the dramatic growth of neo-Pentecostalism in the southern hemisphere is closely associated with the constitution of an urban-proletariat formed on the back of internal migration from stable, tradition-dominated rural areas to the highly transformative and differentiated context of the modern city (Robbins, 2004).

The religious diversification of modern society is further catalyzed by the worldwide networks and border-transcending flows of globalization which, according to Berger, is 'of course' an immediate cause of the 'new pluralism' (2007: 19). Grounded in

historically recent technical-scientific developments, globalization unfolds through the establishment of economic, legal, political, ethical, and aesthetic structures and institutions which connect localities and regions to a seemingly limitless number of otherwise disparate locations. This global network of transnational connections enables rapid and large-scale flows of people, goods, data, power, tastes, and values. In combination, the worldwide networks and border-transcending flows of globalization facilitate the transfer of beliefs, practices, materials, and information at a vertiginous speed and scale that both eliminates longstanding spatio-temporal distinctions and relativizes established practical-symbolic systems. More than simply facilitating 'the presence of multiple religions in a particular geographic area', Johnson and Grim maintain, globalization actually 'hastens such a plurality as the movement of peoples, ideas, and cultures across new boundaries becomes the new normal' (2013: 104). Ultimately, however, the transnational networks and border-transcending flows of globalization can only properly be analyzed to the extent that they manifest in and are refracted by concrete political practices and empirical socio-cultural processes of both a regional and local kind. Captured best by Roland Robertson's concept of 'glocalization' (in which 'global' + 'local' = 'glocal'), the contemporary global condition is not one of an *either – or* scenario but rather that of *both – and* (1995). While impacting the nation-state in myriad ways, the transnational networks and border-transcending flows of globalization by no means negate its relevance for contemporary understandings of religious diversity. 'Reconfigured' rather than 'demolished' by globalization (Wimmer and Schiller, 2002: 301), the nation-state nevertheless remains 'a key', if not 'crucial ... political form of modernity' (Chernilo, 2007: 160, 162).

Complementing the diversifying dynamics of transnational migration, perpetual transformation and societal differentiation, the processes of globalization further stimulate religious diversity by exposing the modern citizen to a seemingly limitless and variegated array of spiritual beliefs and practices previously unheard of or unavailable for appropriation. Typical of more and more societies across of the world, the objective presence of myriad religions and the options they provide is progressively complemented by the growth and impact of a subjective dimension in which individuals are not only exposed to or tolerant of socio-cultural diversity but also willing, if not keen, to exploit the religio-spiritual possibilities it makes available. The subjectivization of religious diversity is closely associated with the typically modern process of individualization. In tandem with aforementioned modern dynamics, the process of individualization involves the progressive recalibration of collective determination and individual choice in a manner which enervates the former while empowering the latter. While individualization does not eradicate communal forms of belonging or collective modes of identity formation, compared with what has gone before the modern individual enjoys historically unrivalled degrees of self-determination and subjective expression. Individualization's erosion of collective determination manifests through an increased level of societal mobility, as the modern individual enjoys newfound optionality and self-determination in respect of, for example, education, employment, leisure, and personal relationships. Individualization likewise engenders enhanced degrees of subjective expression exhibited through broadened repertoires of, for example, sexuality, belief and lifestyle. Released from the traditional confines of collective determination, the modern individual is now freer than ever to pick and choose whatever practical, conceptual or moral resources are best suited to subjective predilections and personal preferences. Driven increasingly by subjectively oriented needs and aspirations (rather than collective expectations and corporate norms)

individual participation in religious organizations consequently loses both its life-long and exclusive character. On the one hand, religious subjectivity is diversified as individuals become more and adept at mixing and matching otherwise disparate beliefs and practices to form hybrid, fluid and idiosyncratic belief systems whose ultimate meaning is ultimately self-referential; that is, it makes sense *to me*, *for now*. On the other hand, such religious bricolage is accompanied by an increased rate of 'transit' or 'switching' between religions as the typically modern mobile individual (no longer bound by traditional loyalties and received obligations) moves consecutively from one group to another or belongs concurrently to any number of different groups.

Manifest both mentally (as bricolage) and practically (as transit), the subjectively diversifying implications of individualization (aka 'subjectivization', 'voluntarization', 'seekership', 'selfism', etc) are well treated in mainstream sociology of religion (Berger, 2007; Bellah *et al*, 1985; D'Andrea, 2001; Dawson, 2013b; Heelas, 2008; Roof, 1993) but little referenced by much of the existing literature and religious projects on religious diversity. This dearth of attention is an oversight in that it leaves underexplored not just the personal dimensions of subjective diversity but also their mid-range institutional and macro-structural implications. Macro-structurally, for example, the mental and practical diversification wrought by individualization combines with other typically modern dynamics to spawn new forms of religiosity whose beliefs and practices at times bear little resemblance to established kinds of religion and their traditional institutional profiles. This, in turn, creates problems for the state and its prevailing legal systems whose governance of the religious landscape frequently employs assumptions, definitions and templates modelled on longstanding religious traditions that are wholly unsuited to managing new religious movements and their novel practical-symbolic repertoires (Richardson and Bellanger, 2014). The subjectively diversifying implications of individualization also impact religious organizations that must adapt to and accommodate typically modern modes of religious participation shaped by bricolage and transit. Already impacted by the increased competition engendered by secularization (non-religious possibilities) and diversity (more religious options), religious institutions are challenged to attract and retain modern mobile individuals for whom organizational allegiance no longer commonly comprises life-long or exclusive commitments. As well as modifying expectations in respect of membership and participation, religious organizations are diversifying their repertoires in the hope of broadening their appeal. Such diversification of institutional repertoires does not simply respond to the diversity-inducing character of modernity but actively furthers it. In combination with the typically modern dynamics identified above, developments such as these constitute a recursive and intensifying process through which diversity begets diversity. Though relatively underexplored compared with transnational migration, post-secularism and governance, the implications of modernity for religious diversity are no less impactful.

Governance

It is no coincidence that Bouma *et al*., employ the term 'governance' when commenting upon the aforementioned unsettling of the liberal secular contract and its particular configuration of society–religion relations (2010). Though with longstanding credentials within classical political philosophy in respect of state institutions, political processes and government actors, the word 'governance' fell out of favour in the modern period only to return in the late-twentieth century with a more inclusive meaning. According to

Anne Mette Kjær, the term governance 're-emerged' in the 1980s and gained increasing popularity to refer 'to something broader than' or 'outside the narrow realm of government'. As used today, governance points beyond '*state* actors and institutions' to acknowledge other structures, processes and agencies as constitutive of contemporary political-social realities (2004: 2–3). Kjær identifies three important modern developments as primarily responsible for the re-emergence of governance as an inclusive *ad extra* governmental concept. First, modern (here, principally Western) societies have seen 'a change in political practices' from top-down, autocratic approaches to more consensual and inclusive modes. Second, 'increasing globalization' is restricting the reach and impact of the geographically bounded nation-state which must find ever newer ways to exercise influence in an increasingly transnational world. Third, traditional statist strategies are rendered redundant by 'the rise of networks crossing the state–civil society divide and increasing political fragmentation'. As such, the growth and relative strengthening of civic structures and movements, devolution of power and decision making to non-governmental agencies and late-capitalist outsourcing of socio-cultural provision to private and charitable enterprise combine to relativize and disperse formerly centralized governmental power, processes and practices (Kjær, 2004: 4–7). As currently employed, the word governance articulates these changes to look beyond the traditional confines of state institutions.

Used increasingly by those writing about religious diversity in recent years (e.g. Bader, 2007; Bramadat, 2009; Halafoff, 2013 and 2016; Martikainen, 2016; Weller, 2008), the term governance refers here to more than the political mechanisms of government and looks beyond wholesale determination by law and its enforcement through state organisms. Though undoubtedly reliant upon the use of governmental power and legal enforcement, the governance of religious diversity also comprises the knowing activity of non-state organizations and contributory cooperation (wilful or unintended) of the general public (Kymlicka, 2009). Achieved through a combination of power and persuasion, governance is both regulatory (rule-based) and normatively achieved (valued-based). At the same time, the governance of religious diversity is contextual in that the content of the laws, policies and norms (along with the practices and relative importance of the state, private organizations and general public) are informed by a range of historical, cultural, political, economic, and social factors whose particular configuration is specific to a given country or region (Bouma *et al*., 2010). Whereas in some societies, the state will be the primary determinant in what governance occurs by way of its political force and juridical powers, in other contexts private organizations and the general public will have a greater say in respect of how religious diversity is governed and what means are employed to achieve such governance.

Irrespective of the particular context in which religious diversity is governed, such is the influence of the state upon the kind of governance possible that due attention must be paid to the political-legal arrangements through which governments impact the religious terrain (see Ahdar and Leigh, 2005: 67–97; Monsma and Soper, 2009; Richardson and Bellanger, 2014). Writing upon the Canadian context, for example, John Simpson highlights 'the central role the state plays in Canada as a reflexive actor in the field of religion and diversity, an actor that is both a "cause" of diversity [e.g. relaxation of immigration laws] and putative source of solutions to problems arising therefrom [e.g. passing multicultural legislation]' (2008: 217). Veit Bader reinforces this point in his exploration of the regulatory processes by which states govern religious diversity. Among the 'several dimensions of [legal] regulations' through which state governance

of religious diversity occurs, Bader identifies: 1. 'the legal status of (organized) religions', whereby 'states can choose to treat them exactly the same as other associations or to grant them some special status'; 2. 'the autonomy of churches and religious communities', involving either 'non-intervention regulations that are central to church autonomy' or 'positive privileges that enable legal and financial state actions'; 3. 'the public financing of religions', in which 'religious communities receive no public money' at all, 'some or all of them receive' some kind of funding, tax exemptions and subsidies, or, and in addition to indirect funding, 'some receive public money directly' through salaries and other means; 4. 'financing faith-based organizations in education'; 5. 'regulation and financing of religious instruction in public schools'; 6. direct or indirect funding of 'faith-based care and social service organizations'; and 7. 'constitutional establishment' (of a 'strong', 'weak' or 'plural' kind) or 'non-establishment' (2009: 47–53).

James Beckford further underlines the determinative role of the state in the governance of religious diversity by noting the role that governments play in constituting 'regimes of recognition' that, in distinguishing between different religions, create inequality through a discriminatory allocation of official acknowledgement or access to opportunity structures that impacts organizational status and ultimately informs public opinion (2012: 131). Will Kymlicka maintains that such discrimination is often the result of 'inherited systems of governing religious diversity' that 'contain rigidities and hierarchies that lock-in privileges for older ... religions, while putting up arbitrary barriers to other religions', not least 'those practised by immigrant groups' and minorities (2009: 326). In a recent chapter on India, for example, Kim and Singh argue that the recent upsurge in religious identity-politics stimulated, in large part, by the nation's modernizing trajectory is inadequately addressed by legislative and policy frameworks constituted by historical concerns not readily suited to meeting the claims and aspirations of non-Hindu minority groups (2016). Kymlicka's observation in respect of such inherited path dependence is likewise exemplified by Alisauskiene and Schröder's study of religious diversity in post-Soviet Lithuania. Distinguishing between 'traditional', 'state-organized' and 'other' religions, the Lithuanian state affords the former two categories a range of state subsidies, tax exemptions, institutional privileges (e.g. marriage and chaplaincy rights), and accommodations (e.g. 'religious education in state schools') that are denied to the latter (2012: 6). Fenggang Yang's 'triple market' model of religious provision in China (i.e. officially approved, legally prohibited and ambiguous relative to local interpretations) likewise highlights the determinative impact of the state upon the profile and fortunes of different kinds of religion (2012; see also Chan and Lang, 2016). In the same vein, Casanova argues that the 'secularist world views and very different institutional patterns of public recognition through different forms of church-state relations' make Europe a less conducive context than the USA for 'the incorporation of immigrant religions in the public sphere' (2007: 76).

Matthias Koenig's discussion of governance and religious diversity also highlights the significance of politically constituted opportunity structures (e.g. laws, voting rights and 'historically entrenched church-state relations') that 'directly impinge upon state accommodation of religious minorities' (2009: 308). In keeping with Kjær's analysis of modern governance, Koenig also underlines the importance of extra-statist aspects in 'potentially affecting how nation-states respond to religious diversity'. The 'presence of religious migrant communities', for example, 'has crucial implications for religious claims-making and, hence, for the ways in which policy-makers address religious

diversity'. As well as asserting that different migrant communities (in respect of origin, ethnicity and religion, for example) impact the governance of religious diversity in varying ways, Koenig notes that increasing numbers of migrants 'see themselves as part of a broader transnational religious community' that both transcends and relativizes identification with their new host society (2009: 300). Underwritten by typically modern dynamics treated in the preceding section, the formation of 'multilocal' identities (Eck, 2002: 5) and a 'trans-border citizenry' (Wimmer and Schiller, 2002: 323) has massive implications for the nation-state and its governance of religious diversity. According to Steven Vertovec, the establishment of 'new social formations spanning nation-states' has contributed to 'a broad backlash against' the aforementioned multicultural paradigm and its identity-politics of difference. Enabled by globalizing modernity and valorized by multiculturalism's difference politics, it is argued, the 'homeland orientations' and maintenance of 'too many links ... to places of origin' are blamed for a 'supposed failure of integration' within the broader societal environment (2010: 83, 92). In the same vein, Joppke argues that the 'retreat' from official multiculturalism successively enacted by states in various parts of the world arises from the confluence of a 'the lack of public support for official multiculturalism policies', 'these policies' inherent shortcomings and failures, especially with respect to the socio-economic marginalization and self-segregation of migrants and their children' and 'a new assertiveness of the liberal state in imposing the liberal minimum on its dissenters' (2004: 243–4). Responding to public disquiet, and motivated by concerns with social cohesion and securitization, Western governments have progressively rejected or qualified multiculturalist policies in favour of more robust integration strategies grounded in local/national identity profiles. Andrew Dawson's recent work on the United Kingdom notes this development as part of a broader study of the 'religion policy window' that has framed state governance strategies since the mid-1990s (2016).

The relativization of the nation-state and its traditional ways of governing religious diversity is further developed by Koenig in relation to both 'the transnational diffusion of ideas of human rights in the post-war [i.e. post-1945] period' and 'the institutionalization of rights in governmental and non-governmental organizations'. Koenig echoes aforementioned discussions of third generation rights by identifying a range of declarations, conventions, articles, and covenants that oblige 'the signatory states to adopt a proactive approach' in promoting the 'identity of ethnic or national, linguistic, and religious minorities—and of migrants—on their territories' (2009: 319). Paralleling, and no doubt reinforcing, the transnational identity-politics associated with contemporary post-migratory settlement, Koenig maintains that such developments 'have firmly established a charismatic status of "universal personhood" to which rights are, at least in principle, attached independently from formal state membership or nationality' (2009: 314). Exemplified by Anna Halafoff's work on governance and educational policy in Australia, changes to religious instruction curricula are driven not only by a desire to include those who might otherwise be marginalized but also by a need to establish common ground upon which an increasingly diverse and multicultural population might be united (2013; 2016). In part, the educational constitution of common ground upon which an increasingly diverse population can feel at home comprises a necessary component of contemporary governance that reflects what Koenig describes as a 'transformation of the legitimacy basis of modern statehood' (2009: 314).

Such common ground has also been sought through state funding of interfaith networks and other multifaith platforms. For example, in their case-studies of multifaith platforms in various parts of Europe, Griera and Forteza maintain that although 'local interfaith bodies are not an entirely new phenomenon their extraordinary growth and role in the urban governance of religious diversity is a recent trend' (2011: 114). Writing of the Danish context, Ahlin *et al.* likewise see the proliferation of 'inter-confessional, ecumenical, and inter-religious' initiatives as responding to a 'new diversity' of 'recent decades' (2012: 411, 413). Treating 'interfaith initiatives' in France, Lamine identifies 'crisis' events such as the Gulf War (1990–91) as instrumental in their recent proliferation, but also argues that progressive commitments to equality and increasing concerns with social cohesion likewise piqued state interest (2005). Griera makes much the same point in her overview of the Spanish context and associates 'the growing presence of interfaith groups, councils and initiatives all around the country' with governmental perceptions of 'religious diversity as a "risk factor"' to be minimized through strategic intervention (2012: 571, 580). The work of Tuomas Martikainen, co-director of the 'Religions in Finland Project' (http://www.uskonnot.fi/english/) likewise charts the growing importance of interfaith networks as strategically inclusive ways of managing religious diversity (2013; 2016). Griera and Forteza identify the five key ways in which such 'interfaith platforms' contribute to the governance of religious diversity. First, they help mitigate the 'religious illiteracy' of the modern, secularized, state. Second, they facilitate identification of the most appropriate (authentic, influential, credible, etc.) community 'representatives' with whom governments can deal. Third, they help distinguish *bona fide* religions from 'non-respectable' groups, the engagement of which may prove overly contentious. Fourth, they provide a narrative 'frame' in which religio-cultural 'controversies' might be positively construed by way of discourses of cooperation and mutuality. Fifth, interfaith platforms offer 'a "politically correct" way of representing religious plurality in the public sphere' (2011: 129–30). Whereas recent UK governments have reduced the amount of funding available to support interfaith networks, multifaith platforms nevertheless remain an important element in an increasingly variegated portfolio of religious diversity management (Dawson, 2016).

Conclusion

Aforementioned publications and reports demonstrate both the growing profile of and increased attention paid to religious diversity. There is, however, more that can and should be done. The globalizing character of modernity, for example, involves not only an increase in religious diversity but also the manifestation of different kinds of diversity in both modernised and modernising contexts. There is, then, need of a greater appreciation of how the rise and variegation of religious diversity plays out by way of similarities and divergences in particular societies around the world and relative to the transnational dynamics of global-modern forces. A much more inclusive perspective is also required that situates and understands religious diversity as but a particular instantiation of a more general phenomenon (i.e. global-modern diversification). In addition to the requisite sociological focus, such transnational and comparative work should include scrutiny of the respective political responses to religious diversity that unfold against domestic and regional backdrops constituted through the interplay of, for example, socio-cultural heritage and prevailing public opinion, political-economic structures and contemporary developments and preoccupations (e.g. mass migration, securitisation, integration).

Sociological and political approaches will inevitably be complemented by an analytical sensitivity to the role of religious communities and faith traditions that not only refract but also catalyse diversity relative to their particular religio-cultural character. The 'conservativization' of communal traditions, relations with the state and pluralization of practical-symbolic repertoires are but a few exemplary developments of the myriad ways in which religion both manifests and informs contemporary diversification. In the same vein, the broader cultural implications of religious diversity are ripe for further exploration in respect of host societies in general and their progressively mobile populations. To this end, much more is needed by way of qualitative research that explicates the significance and impact of religious diversity for the day-to-day practices and associational experiences of modern-day individuals, be they religious or not. The kind of multi-perspectival and transdisciplinary approaches recommended here will be further enhanced by a formal dialogue between the different research projects mentioned above. Given the variety of contexts and concerns informing aforementioned projects, much stands to be gained from a systematic and sustained conversation that, among other things, compares and reviews the respective analytical concerns, methodologies employed and key insights gained in respect of both religious diversity in particular and global-modern diversification in general.

Bibliography

Ahdar, R. and Leigh, I. 2005. *Religious Freedom in the Liberal State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ahlin, L., Borup, J., Fibiger, M. Q., Kühle, L., Mortensen, V., and Pedersen, R. D. 2012. 'Religious diversity and pluralism: empirical data and theoretical reflections from the Danish pluralism project'. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 27.3, 403–418.

Alisauskiene, M. and Schröder, I. Eds. 2012. *Religious Diversity in Post-Soviet Society: Ethnographies of Catholic Hegemony and the New Pluralism in Lithuania*. London: Ashgate.

Bader, V-M. 2007. *Secularism Or Democracy? Associational Governance of Religious Diversity*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bader, V-M. 2009. The Governance of Religious Diversity: Theory, Research, and Practice, in P. Bramadat and M. Koenig eds, *International Migration and the Governance of Religious Diversity*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 43–72.

Banchoff, T. 2007. Introduction, in T. Banchoff ed. *Democracy and the New Pluralism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–16.

Beaman, L. G. Ed. 2012. *Reasonable Accommodation: Managing Religious Diversity*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Beaman, L. G. and Beyer, P. 2008. Introduction: Religion and Diversity in Canada, in L. G. Beaman and P. Beyer eds, *Religion and Diversity in Canada*. Leiden: Brill, 1–7.

Beck, U. and Grande, E. 2010. 'Varieties of second modernity: the cosmopolitan turn in social and political theory and research'. *British Journal of Sociology*, 61.3, 409–43.

Beckford, J. A. 2012. Public Responses to Religious Diversity in Britain and France, in L. G. Beaman ed. 2012. *Reasonable Accommodation: Managing Religious Diversity*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 109–38.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S. M. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berger, P. L. 2007. Pluralism, Protestantization, and the Voluntary Principle, in T. Banchoff ed. *Democracy and the New Pluralism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 19–29.

Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. 1995. *Modernity, Pluralism and the Crisis of Meaning: The Orientation of Modern Man*. Bonn: VG Bild-Kunst.

Berman, B. J., Bhargava, R. and Laliberté, A. 2013. Introduction: Globalization, Secular States, and Religious Diversity, in B. J. Berman, R. Bhargava and A. Laliberté eds, *Secular States and Religious Diversity*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1–25.

Bhambra, G. K. 2007. *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bouma, G. D. 1995. 'The emergence of religious plurality in Australia: a multicultural society'. *Sociology of Religion*, 56.3, 285–302.

Bouma, G. D., Ling, R. and Pratt, D. 2010. *Religious Diversity in Southeast Asia and the Pacific: National Case Studies*. London: Springer.

Bramadat, P. 2009. Religious Diversity and International Migration: National and Global Dimensions, in P. Bramadat and M. Koenig eds, *International Migration and the Governance of Religious Diversity*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1–26.

Burchardt, M. and Michalowski, I. Eds. 2015. *After Integration: Islam, Conviviality and Contentious Politics in Europe*. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Casanova, J. 2007. Immigration and the New Religious Pluralism: A European Union/United States Comparison, in T. Banchoff ed. *Democracy and the New Pluralism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 59–83.

Castro, C. M. de. 2013. *The Construction of Muslim Identities in Contemporary Brazil*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Castro, C. M. de. 2016. Islam and the State in Brazil: reflections on the Freedom of a Minority Religion, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 67–81.

Castro, C. M. de. 2017. Perceptions and Practices of the Hijab among Muslim Migrants in Brazil, in C. M. de Castro and A. Dawson eds, *Religion, Migration and Mobility: The Brazilian Experience*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Champion, F. 1999. 'The diversity of religious pluralism'. *International Journal on Multicultural Studies*, 1.2, 40–54.

Chan, K-K. and Lang, G. 2016. Religious Diversity and the State in China, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 82–98.

Chau, A. Y. 2011. *Religion in Contemporary China: Revitalization and Innovation*. London: Routledge.

Chernilo, D. 2007. *A Social Theory of the Nation-State: The Political Forms of Modernity Beyond Methodological Nationalism*. London: Routledge.

D'Andrea, A. A. F. 2000. *O Self Perfeito e A Nova Era: Individualismo e Reflexividade em Religiosidades Pós-Tradicionais.* São Paulo: Edições Loyola.

David, A. R. 2011. Gendered Dynamics of the Divine: Trance and Hindu Possession in Diaspora Hindu Sites in East London, in A. Dawson ed. *Summoning the Spirits: Possession and Invocation in Contemporary Religion*. London: I. B. Tauris, 74–89.

Dawson, A. 2011. *Sociology of Religion*. London: SCM Press.

Dawson, A. 2013a. Entangled Modernity and Commodified Religion: Alternative Spirituality and the 'New Middle Class', in F. Gauthier and T. Martikainen eds, *Religion in Consumer Society: Brands, Consumers and Markets*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 127–42.

Dawson, A. 2013b. *Santo Daime: A New World Religion*. London: Bloomsbury.

Dawson, A. 2014a. Putting Baby Back in the Bath: Theorising Modernity for the Contemporary Sociology of Religion, in A. McKinnon and M. Trzebiatowska eds, *Sociological Theory and the Question of Religion*. Farnham: Ashgate, 151–79.

Dawson, A. 2014b. 'Religion, globalization and modernity: from macro-Processes to micro-dynamics'. *Estudos de Religião*, 28.2, 31–58.

Dawson, A. 2016. Religious Diversity and the Shifting Sands of Political Prioritization: Reflections on the UK Context, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 133–52.

Dawson, A. 2017. New Religious Movements and Globalizing Brazilian Modernity, in C. M. de Castro and A. Dawson eds, *Religion, Migration and Mobility: The Brazilian Experience*. Abingdon: Routledge.

D'Costa, G., Evans, M., Modood, T., and Rivers, J. 2013. Introduction, in G. D'Costa, M. Evans, T. Modood, and J. Rivers eds, *Religion in a Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–8.

Eck, D. 2002. *A New Religious America: How a 'Christian Country' Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation*. San Francisco: Harper.

Fagan, G. 2013. *Believing in Russia. Religious Policy after Communism*. London: Routledge.

Gallo, E. Ed. 2014. *Migration and Religion in Europe: Comparative Perspectives on South Asian Experiences*. London: Ashgate.

Giordan, G. 2014. Introduction: Pluralism as Legitimization of Diversity, in G. Giordan and E. Pace eds, *Religious Pluralism: Framing Religious Diversity in the Contemporary World*. Switzerland: Springer, 1–12.

Goossaert, V. and Palmer, D. A. 2011. *The Religious Question in Modern China*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Griera, M. M. 2012. 'Public policies, interfaith associations and religious minorities: a new policy paradigm? Evidence from the case of Barcelona'. *Social Compass*, 59.4, 570–87.

Griera, M. M. and Forteza, M. 2011. New Actors in the Governance of Religious Diversity in European Cities: The Role of Interfaith Platforms, in J. Haynes and A. Hennig eds, *Religious Actors in the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge, 113–31.

Habermas, J. 2006. 'Religion in the public sphere'. *European Journal of Philosophy*, 14.1, 1–25.

Habermas, J. 2008. 'Notes on post-secular society'. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 25.4, 17–29.

Halafoff, A. 2013. *The Multifaith Movement: Global Risks and Cosmopolitan Solutions*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Halafoff, A. 2016. Governance and Religious Diversity in Australia: Multifaith Relations and Religious Instruction in the State of Victoria, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 101–17.

Heelas, P. 2008. *Spiritualities of Life: New Age Romanticism and Consumptive Capitalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Johnson, T. M. and Grim, B. J. 2013. Religious Diversity, in T. M. Johnson and B. J. Grim eds, *The World's Religions in Figures: An Introduction to International Religious Demography*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 93–110.

Joppke, C. 2004. 'The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy'. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55.2, 237–57.

Katznelson, I. and Jones, G. S. 2010. Introduction: Multiple Secularities, in I. Katznelson and G. S. Jones eds, *Religion and the Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–22.

Kim, H. and Singh, G. 2016. The Challenges of Managing Religious Diversity in India: Between Hegemonic Domination and the Quest for Equality, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 49–66.

Kjær, A. M. 2004. *Governance*. London: Polity.

Koenig, M. 2009. How Nation-States Respond to Religious Diversity, in P. Bramadat and M. Koenig eds, *International Migration and the Governance of Religious Diversity*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 293–322.

Koesel, K. J. 2014. *Religion and Authoritarianism: Cooperation, Conflict, and the Consequences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kumar, P. P. 2000. *Hindus in South Africa: Their Traditions and Beliefs*. Durban: University of Durban.

Kumar, P. P. 2006. Introduction, in P. P. Kumar ed. *Religious Pluralism in the Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill, 1–12.

Kumar, P. P. 2006. A Brief Word, in P. P. Kumar ed. *Religious Pluralism in the Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill, 363–5.

Kymlicka, W. 2007. *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. 2009. The Governance of Religious Diversity: The Old and the New, in P. Bramadat and M. Koenig eds, *International Migration and the Governance of Religious Diversity*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 323–34.

Lamine, A.-S. 2005. 'Mise en scène de la "bonne entente" interreligieuse et reconnaissance'. *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions*, 129, 83–96.

Laurence, J. 2012. *The Emancipation of Europe's Muslims: The State's Role in Minority Integration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Machacek, D. W. 2003. 'The problem of pluralism'. *Sociology of Religion*, 64.2, 145–61.

Martikainen, T. 2013. Multilevel and Pluricentric Network Governance of Religion, in T. Martikainen and F. Gauthier eds, *Religion in the Neoliberal Age: Political Economy and Modes of Governance*. Ashgate: Farnham, 129–42.

Martikainen, T. 2016. Managing Religious Diversity in Finland: From Church Law to Governance Networks, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 118–32.

Mignolo, W. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Monsma, S. V. and Soper, J. C. 2009. *The Challenge of Pluralism: Church and State in Five Democracies*. Second Edition. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Pew Research Center. 2014. *Global Religious Diversity: Half of the Most Religiously Diverse Countries are in Asia-Pacific Region*. www.pewforum.org/2014/04/04/global-religious-diversity/.

Plant, R. 2013. Religion in a Liberal State, in G. D'Costa, M. Evans, T. Modood, and J. Rivers eds, *Religion in a Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 9–37.

Rattansi, A. 2011. *Multiculturalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, J. T. 2015. 'Managing religion and the judicialization of religious freedom'. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 54.1, 1–19.

Richardson, J. T. and Bellanger, F. eds, 2014. *Legal Cases, New Religious Movements, and Minority Faiths*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Robbins, J. 2004. 'The globalization of pentecostal and charismatic Christianity'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33, 117–43.

Robertson, R. 1995. Glocalization: Time–Space and Homogeneity–Heterogeneity, in M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson eds, *Global Modernities*. London: Sage, 25–44.

Roof, W. C. 1993. *A Generation of Seekers: The Spiritual Journeys of the Baby Boom Generations*. New York: HarperCollins.

Rosenblum, N. L. 2000. Introduction: Pluralism, Integralism, and Political Theories of Religious Accommodation, in N. L. Rosenblum ed. *Obligations of Citizenship and Demands of Faith: Religious Accommodation in Pluralist Democracies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3–31.

Rousselet, K. 2000. 'The challenges of religious pluralism in post-Soviet Russia'. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 2.2, 55–75.

Sandberg, R. 2014. *Religion, Law and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shterin, M. 2016. Friends and Foes of the 'Russian World': the Post-Soviet State's Management of Religious Diversity, in A. Dawson ed. *The Politics and Practice of Religious Diversity: National Contexts, Global Issues*. Abingdon: Routledge, 29–48.

Simpson, J. H. 2008. Afterword: Religion, Diversity, and the State in Canada, in L. G. Beaman and P. Beyer eds, *Religion and Diversity in Canada*. Leiden: Brill, 217–23.

Spikard, J. V. 1999. 'Human rights, religious conflict, and globalisation – ultimate values in a new world order'. *International Journal on Multicultural Studies*, 1.1, 2–19.

Taylor, C. 1994. The Politics of Recognition, in A. Gutmann ed. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 25–74.

Vertovec, S. 2010. Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International Social Science Journal,* 61, 83–95.

Weller P. 2008. *Religious Diversity in the UK: Contours and Issues*. London: Continuum.

Wimmer, A. and Schiller, G. 2002. 'Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences'. *Global Networks*, 2.4, 301–34.

Wuthnow, R. 2005. *America and the Challenges of Religious Diversity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Yang, F. 2012. *Religion in China: Survival and Revival under Communist Rule*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Professor Andrew Dawson
Project Principal Investigator
Dept. of Politics, Philosophy and Religion, Lancaster University, UK