

RETREAT FROM MULTICULTURALISM?

Betül Duman*

Abstract: September 11 was a turning point for the discourse against multiculturalism both in intellectual and political field. Multiculturalism has developed as a tool of managing diversity of 1970's in many western societies and adopted in different ways depending on the country's experience on national identity and state formation. Under post- September 11 socio-politic climate, many countries have faced with the new realities of immigration and of particularly Muslims. Social cohesion issues such as parallel lives and ghettoisation, segregation of Muslims, decreasing public support, loss of national identity are the selective read of those realities. As a result, calls for retreat from multiculturalism and return to assimilation has developed. This article has discussed the critiques of multiculturalism with special reference to England and Australia cases and confined itself with immigration issue.

Key Words: Multiculturalism, social cohesion, immigration, national identity, parallel lives/ghettoisation

Çokkültürlülüğten Ricat Mı?

Özet: 11 Eylül hem akademik hem de siyasal alanda çokkültürlülük karşıtı söylem için milat oldu. Birçok batı ülkesinde 1970'li yıllarda çeşitliliği yönetmenin bir aracı olarak ortaya çıkan çokkültürlülük, ülkelerin milli kimlik ve devletleşme tecrübesine bağlı olarak uygulandı. 11 Eylül sonrası sosyo-politik ikliminde, birçok ülke göçmenlerin ve özellikle Müslümanların yeni gerçekleri ile yüzleşmektedirler. Paralel yaşamlar ve gettolaşma, Müslümanların ayrışması, kamu desteğinin azalması, kimlik kaybı gibi sosyal kaynaşma meseleleri bu gerçeklerin seçici okumasını oluşturdu. Sonuçta çokkültürlükten ricat ve asimilasyona yeniden dönmek çağrıları yapılmaya başlandı. Bu makale çokkültürlülüğe yöneltilen bu türden eleştirileri, İngiltere ve Avustralya örnekleri bağlamında ve göçmenlik meselesi ile sınırlı olarak tartışmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çokkültürlülük, sosyal kaynaşma, immigration, milli kimlik, paralel yaşam/gettolaşma

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Adıyaman Üniv. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fak. Kamu Yönetimi Böl.

Introduction

September 11 2001 was the starting point for the rise of anti-multiculturalist discourse both in academic and social settings. After then on, immigrants and particularly the Muslims in the USA and West Europe have come across some problems. That people with Muslim roots committed many violent and terrorist events became the reason as to why many people turned their eyes particularly on the radical Muslim minority in the West Europe and the threats they carried against the national security. The reality that the Islamist radicals lived within their societies and this radical attitude went on in second and third generations and Muslim immigrants who spoke their mother tongues increased public anxiety¹. Moreover, crises such as “hicab”, “honor suicides”, “fake marriages” indicated that multicultural policies were inefficient and social cohesion could not take place. It was claimed that multiculturalism was “everywhere and too much”.

Multiculturalism began to be questioned in relation to immigrants and European Muslims.² Within this context, multiculturalism was blamed for a- emphasizing differences in the expense of national identity, b- increasing and rigidifying divisions in ethnic-religious-cultural areas³ c- forming ethnic regions and ghettos with limited social cohesion, d- increasing political radicalism, e- sustaining non-liberal practices in immigrant societies.⁴ Fukuyama⁵ associated the formation of parallel societies with the emergence of the concept “multiculturalism”. A discussion of multiculturalism began in countries such as the USA, Australia, Canada concerning national minorities such as Hispanics, aborigines, French Quebec and the natives.

The term “post-multiculturalism” put forward by Vertoc became popular in Europe and implied a search for alternative models by mowing the excessive

¹ Munira Mirza, Abi Senthilkumaran ve Zein Ja'far, *Living Apart Together. British Muslims and the Paradox of Multiculturalism*, London: Policy Exchange, 2007. Also see, http://www.policyexchange.org.uk/assets/Living_Apart_Together_text.pdf, 5.10.2010'da girildi.

² Non-muslims have increasingly negative opinions about Muslim. According to a 2008 survey, it is thought negatively of Muslims 58% in Spain , 50% in Germany , 38% in France and 23 % in England . Islam is seen as a religion that promotes violence. <http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=262>

³ Mirza et al., *Living Apart Together. British Muslims and the Paradox of Multiculturalis*.

⁴ Lloyd Wong, “Multiculturalism and Ethnic Pluralism in Sociology: An Analysis of the Fragmentation Position Discourse”, *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*, v: 40, n:1, s: 11-32, Bahar 2008, s. 12.

⁵ Francis Fukuyama, “Identity and Migration”, *Prospect*, v: 131, 25 Şubat 2007 <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2007/02/identityandmigration>, 15.09.2010'da girildi.

aspects of multiculturalism⁶. As a result, in the last 10 years, during which the essential state policies were social and civil integration, policy in Europe and the USA got far away from multiculturalism⁷. In addition to these, rigidifying the national identity of the hosting country; obligatory introductory programs about the culture/values of the country for this purpose, arranging citizenship and language exams and focusing more on duties and obligations than rights.⁸

In this article, criticisms for multiculturalism have been evaluated within the framework of immigration. Setting out with examples from two countries that are England and Australia, criticism concerning multiculturalism has been discussed. The article has ended by a general conclusion.

Multiculturalism and Its Criticism

Assimilation and integration policies, which are shaped by the demands of industrialism and see the national state as ideal, have left their places to multiculturalism in the last 25 years. Increased immigration due to spreading of transportation and communication technologies and globalization of economy, purchasing estates either for tourism or dwelling, refugees that escape from war or ethnic conflicts increased the mobility of the world population. As a result of these developments, social composition of industrialized national states radically changed. Moreover, globalization made sub-national and supranational identities stronger, which also lead to struggle for recognition. Within this process, multicultural policies began to gain higher importance⁹.

At the first stance, multiculturalism describes a society that consists of groups or nations from different religious-ethnic settings. In this context, multiculturalism implies diversity as opposed to homogeneity. However, multiculturalism even in this sense seems to include a different meaning from the past¹⁰. Secondly, it implies the promotion of cultural diversity. Here multiculturalism, which not only accepts and appreciates the existence of private belongings but also reflects these to political norms and institutions, is

⁶ Wong, "Multiculturalism and Ethnic Pluralism in Sociology", 12.

⁷ Joppke, "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State", p.244.

⁸ Anika Haverig, "Managing the 'Enemy Within': British and German Policy Responses to Muslim Immigrant Populations in the Last Decade", 2009, <http://www3.surrey.ac.uk/Arts/CRONEM/CRONEM-papers09/Haverig.pdf>, 3.9.2010'da girildi.

⁹ Ted Cantle, *Community Cohesion: a New Framework for Race and Diversity*, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p. 3-5.

¹⁰ Milena Doytcheva, *Çokkültürlülük*, Çev: Tuba Akıncılar Onmuş, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009, s.16.

presented as an alternative policy to assimilation¹¹. However, by drawing a distinction between multicultural and multiculturalist societies, Parekh¹² maintained that the first term implied an objective case that includes ethnic-cultural diversity and the second one expresses an ideal case in which there are demands for identity and recognition and the state's playing active roles.

Even though different national states come across similar resistance in the global world, they have different experiences of nationalization. Because of this, even if it is possible to find out a unity, we cannot talk about one type of multiculturalism as a political program and each state has a distinct policy of its own. The Anglo-Saxon tradition accepts the individual as the base of organization and its model for social cohesion lies between assimilation and cosmopolitanism. The metaphor of assimilation in USA has been melting pot and private belongings and differences have been ignored unless they interfere with the common norms and values of which Shills identified as 'center'¹³. England, a union of English, Welsh, Scotch and Irish, took non homogeneous common culture as its basis of social cohesion and developed liberal integration policy for managing diversity. Equal opportunities, mitigating discrimination, developing tolerance have been the main policies of integration. The multiculturalism policies of countries such as Canada and Australia founded as immigrant countries and having national minorities can be said to be close to segregated pluralism. These are countries that recognize group identities and cultures and put minority rights into practice. In these countries, multiculturalism, which had instrumental value for differentiation from the colony and setting up a nation, was adopted as state policy. However, in countries such as England, France and Germany multiculturalism existed together with a strong national identity, was not adopted as state policy and implemented locally.

Actually, September 11th attacks on the USA triggered criticisms against multiculturalism in the world. Train bombings in London and Madrid which caused many civil deaths and casualties, murder of director Teo Van Gogh's by a Moroccan due to a film he made (2004), the discovery that 17 terrorists arrested on June 2006 were planning an attack on the Parliament building and

¹¹ Doytcheva, *Çokkültürlülük*, s. 17, 25.

¹² Parekh, *Rethinking Multiculturalism*, p. 6-7.

¹³ Edward Shils, *The Constitution of Society*, University of Chicago Press, 1982, s. 93.

the rebels that took place in Paris ghettos in 2005 made these criticisms stronger.

England

Multiculturalism in England came to the agenda not in relation to nationalization or national identity building but migration. When compared to other countries, English national identity is more civil and political and does not have an ethnic and cultural base. Even if the founders of the empire were Anglo-Saxon (White English), Englishness was never the national identity. Instead, Britishness was the supra-identity in which the four nations willingly joined¹⁴. In this sense, Britain never had a base of legitimacy supported by ethnic-nationalism or cultural homogeneity¹⁵. Until 1981 definition of English nationalism and citizenship, "Citizenship of the United Kingdom and its Colonies" was valid. Nevertheless, the change in immigrant profile from the 1970s on, the threat for the segregation of Britain, rising of nationalism in North Ireland, Scotland and Wales and the EU process caused the questioning of English national identity and the paved the way for multiculturalism¹⁶.

In England, particularly when Blair came into power in 1997, multiculturalism reached its peak with the "New Britain" slogan. Race Relations Law (2000) and Human Rights Law (1998) were changed within this context. Through the report, "The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain" which Parekh prepared on Runymede Trust's wish multiculturalism increased its effect¹⁷. In this report Parekh claimed that Englishness and Britishness had quite systematic, mainly unspoken racist connotations. In the report, it was suggested that multiculturalism be the national state policy and group rights be recognized¹⁸. However, the effects of the report did not last long because the public policy changed due to the September 11th attacks and riots in Oldham, Burnley and

¹⁴ Krishna Kumar, "English and French National Identity: Comparisons and Contrasts", *Nation and Nationalism*, 12 (3), 2006, p. 413.

¹⁵ Eva-Maria Asari, Daphne Halikiopoulou, Steven Mock, "British National Identity and the Dilemmas of Multiculturalism", *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 14: 1-28, Routledge, 2008, p. 11.

¹⁶ Moodod, "Multicultural British Citizenship and Making Space for Muslims", <http://revel.unice.fr/cygnos/index.html?id=6208>, 25.10.2010.

¹⁷ Shailja Sharma, "Sleep-walking into Segregation: The Backlash Against Multiculturalism and Claims for a Differentialist Citizenship", *CRONEM*, The University of Surrey, <http://www3.surrey.ac.uk/Arts/CRONEM/CRONEM-papers09/Sharma.pdf>, 22.10.2010.

¹⁸ Parekh, "Rethinking Multiculturalism", p. 38, 56.

Bradford which are in the north of England. After this process, the agenda was set by TED Cantle report.

Cantle Report

This report discussed multiculturalism in relation to three different issues: migration, fake marriage arrangements of South Asians and riots in Northern cities in 2001. The report claimed that particularly the last issue implied an incohesive society¹⁹. The report was prepared as the strategy for community cohesion that emphasized the importance of citizenship, mutual trust and the sense of belonging in a period during which multiculturalism was questioned.

The White Report

Parallel to Cantle Report, Tony Blair, who was the leader of Labor Party and came into power for the second time, stated that minority integration was a failure and it was high time to go beyond multiculturalism. Labor Party General Secretary David Blunkett continued this attitude. By saying "We have norms and those who come to our house should comply with these norms", he published a White Report (2002) combining multiculturalism with the new immigration law.²⁰ In this report, it was stated that England was a multicultural nation and assimilation was never adopted. Through this, particularly the effects of diversity brought forth by the immigrants on national cohesion and identity was highlighted. The message of the report was that the borders could only be opened if the newcomers were willing to accept common norms and identity, which could be secured by eliminating discrimination, accepting the national language, secularism, and respect for religious differences²¹.

When the train bombing event took place in 2005 in London, it was understood that British identity was not internalized and ethnic and religious identities were more dominant. Those who suffered most from this problem were the Muslims and English²². Labor Party, which came into power again in 2005, and its leader Blair tended towards assimilation policies and adopted new identity

¹⁹ Home Office, *Secure Borders, Safe Heaven: Integration with Diversity in Modern Britain*, London: The Stationery Office, 2002, p. 1-5.

²⁰ Joppke, "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State", p. 251.

²¹ Home Office, *Secure Borders, Safe Heaven*, p. 7-8.

²² Asari et al., "British National Identity and the Dilemmas of Multiculturalism", p. 12.

politics of Englishness instead of Britishness due to international terrorism, internal dynamics, and American alliance²³. Actually, they aimed to strengthen civil and social aspects of English citizenship through concrete measures such as citizenship oath, citizenship test, obligatory language learning, preferring England born, and English speaking imams²⁴. Moreover, after 2002 citizenship and democracy courses were mandatory²⁵.

Discussion for Residential Segregation/ Parallel Lives

In the criticisms of multiculturalism, the segregation of residential areas and the emergence of ghetto areas were two main themes that were discussed. Researches about this started after the 2001 riots in Northern cities. The feature of this kind of ethnic regions was not that they were poor. Though there were other poor regions, they did not pose any threats in terms of the security of the country and white identity. The claim was that these minorities segregated themselves from the society. Several researchers published studies expressing that the minorities self segregated their dwelling areas on their own²⁶. Therefore, the responsibility for integration was again put on the shoulders of immigrants.

Cantle Report is also significant in that it highlights 'parallel life'. The finding was that while the hosting group had better ranks, dwelled in better streets, and had more well-being, the minorities had lower socio-economic status²⁷. Cantle emphasized the importance of religious divisions which mostly overlapping with class and ethnic divisions in Europe and the existence of parallel lives in the society by segregation of shopping malls, schools, real estate agencies, working places, cultural and entertainments areas and neighborhoods²⁸.

²³ Tahir Abbas, "After 9/11: British South Asian Muslims, Islamophobia, Multiculturalism, and the State", *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, 21(3): 2004, 26-38.

²⁴ Home Office, *Secure Borders, Safe Heaven*, p. 33-34; Joppke, "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State", p. 252.

²⁵ Asari et al., "British National Identity and the Dilemmas of Multiculturalism", p. 21.

²⁶ R. Johnston, J. Forrest, and M. Poulsen, "Are there Ethnic Enclaves/Ghettos in English Cities?", *Urban Studiep*. Vol 39, 2002, p. 591-618. Johnston, R., Poulsen, M. and Forrest, J., "On the Measurement of Meaning of Residential Segregation: A Response to Simpson", *Urban Studies*, Vol 42, 2005, p. 1221 – 1227. Ludi Simpson, "Ghettos of the Mind: The Empirical Behaviour of Indices of Segregation and Diversity", *CSSR Working Paper*, 2006/06, The University of Manchester, <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/publications/working/2006-06.pdf>, 23.09.2010'da girildi.

²⁷ Cantle, *Community Cohesion*, p. 70.

²⁸ Cantle, *Community Cohesion*, s. 70.

Parallel life is a similar discussion of ghettoisation in USA and even though the discussion was of American origin, it is challenging in that it was claimed to create economic efficiency, employment, and social mobility in the researches carried out in America. Finally, studies were also carried out in England implying that increasing ghettos were only a myth and segregation was in decline. In the journal, "Urban Studies" academic discussions started as to how "segregation" could be defined and measured²⁹.

Later on, studies measuring the interaction between ethnic minorities and the white English people were conducted. In the report "Commission for Racial Equality" published at the same period, 94% of white English people did not make friends from other ethnic roots and they did not have a meaningful interaction or common experience³⁰. In this sense, the phenomenon "white escape" can be regarded as a concrete example of the problems stemming from multiculturalism. Dorling and Rees³¹ alleged that this escape was "motivated by white ethnicity and partially racism" and it increased spatial and social polarization. This issue became very popular in the public agenda, but the problem of spatial segregation/ concentration was negatively approached in relation to cultural difference. This negativity is especially valid for Muslims.

Muslims as a Segregated Group and Islamophobia

A parallel society discussion goes on in the multiculturalist discourse that directly focuses on Muslims. The problem England has with the Muslim identity connects with the change and extension in immigrant profile.

Those who came to England after the Second World War from Pakistan, Bangladesh, and India were welcome as cheap labor force. With the coming of East European and Middle Eastern Muslims, the largest minority group was formed. This increase in population combined with international terrorism and internal riots. That there were Muslim teenagers born in England or grown in

²⁹ Ludi Simson, "Statistics of Racial Segregation: Measures, Evidence and Policy", *CSRN, Occasional Paper*, n. 24. 2004, <http://www.csr.ac.uk/publications/occasion/Occ24.pdf>, 10.09.2010'da girildi. Tartışma için bkz. Johnston, "On the Measurement of Meaning of Residential Segregation", p. 1221 – 1227.

³⁰ Cantle, *Community Cohesion*, p.14.

³¹ Danny Dorling ve Phil Rees, "A Nation Still Dividing: The British Census and Social Polarisation 1971 - 2001", *Environment and Planning, A* 35(7), 2003, p. 1287 – 1313.

England behind the riots created a big disillusion. Today it is clearly understood that second and third generations actually trigger national anxiety³².

On all accounts, Muslims were blamed for the segregation in the society and today it is seen that Islamophobia reemerges in entire Europe including England. Actually, stigmatizing Muslim people as the other is not new³³. What is new is that Islamophobia is being embedded in common sense and it's being made natural. Islamophobia is a definition that perceives Muslims as a unitary group that is threat to the Western culture³⁴.

In this climate, Muslims, at least, are the people who took the advantage of welfare state and living in England but unwilling to integrate and reimbursing to the society. Kundnani³⁵ claimed that immigrants cannot live as in their hometown, English is a tool for social inclusion and cultural differences can not be the foundation of women oppression. On the other, Malik³⁶ argued that multiculturalism has gone too far and he drew attention on pursuing a particular religious practice, speaking a particular language and following a particular cultural practice has become public good. Besides, he questioned how well Muslims willing to accept European social and political values such as freedom, secularism, tolerance and sexual equality. There have been other studies challenging these sorts of criticisms. For example, according to Moodod, these criticisms were the results of unequal multiculturalism³⁷. Similarly, Abbas³⁸ claimed that English multiculturalism did not produce intended consequences and led to a deeper ethnic stratification combining with present socio-economic inequalities. That is why Abbas called for return to assimilation.

Criticism of multiculturalism in other countries of Europe is also generally made in relation to migration and Muslim minorities. Development in

³² Bilkis Malek, "Rethinking Segregation", *Soundings*, n: 34, November 2006, p.146-157.

³³ Zafer Iqbal, "Understanding Islamophobia: Conceptualizing and Measuring the Construct", *European Journal of Social Sciences*, v: 13, n:4, 2010, p. 574.

³⁴ Abbas, "After 9/11: British South Asian Muslims, Islamophobia, Multiculturalism, and the State", p. 29.

³⁵ Arun Kundnani, "The Death of Multiculturalism", <http://www.irr.org.uk/2002/april/ak000001.html>, 2002, 20.09.2010'da girildi.

³⁶ Kenan Malik, "Against Multiculturalism", *New Humanist*, v: 117, n: 2, London: Rationalist Press Association, Yaz 2002, <http://newhumanist.org.uk/523/against-multiculturalism>, 19.09.2010'da girildi.

³⁷ Tariq Moodod, "A Defence of Multiculturalism", *Soundings*, After Identity, issue: 29, Kış 2005, s. 62-71,63.

³⁸ Tahir Abbas, "Recent Developments to British Multiculturalism: Ideology, Philosophy and Politics with Special Reference to British Muslims", "Establishing Evaluation Model for Administrative Reform in the 21st Century: Analytical Tools and Cases, Belgium, [www.kapae.or.kr/uploads/...03/.../BritishMulticulturalism\(Abbas\).doc](http://www.kapae.or.kr/uploads/...03/.../BritishMulticulturalism(Abbas).doc), 28.10.2010'da girildi.

international affairs, Islamophobia and discrimination cause Muslims to hang on their cultures even more tightly and turn inwards. Right wing parties' coming to power and increasing social support in European countries feed discussions against multiculturalism and are fed by these discussions. Consequently, it is necessary to rethink multicultural policies over the Muslim side and its relation to religion. This will lead to a deepening of the relation between class-ethnic segregation that conflict with religion and the religion itself with multiculturalism.

Australia

Australia is a country formed by immigrants coming from North America and West Europe. Australia had a white Australia policy until the Second World War by accepting immigrants from colony countries. After the war, it adopted assimilation policy against the immigrants. From the 1970s on, migration policy changed and it accepted multiculturalism as the official state policy following Canada. Anti-Discrimination Law followed this³⁹. Labor Party and Prime Minister Whitlam period (1972-75) became the end of White Australia policy. In 1973, Immigrant Minister Al Grassby launched the program "Multicultural Society: For the Future". Grassby⁴⁰ who defined nation as the "multicultural family" presented a program that focused on the social and economic disadvantages of people who did not speak English. Policies such as the acceptance of ethno-cultural pluralism, extension of social rights, programs for immigrant education and services for settling, ethnic radio and prevention of racial discrimination were put into effect⁴¹. Through the Immigrant Services and Programs, which were put forward by Galbally in 1978, it was suggested that social state functions and educational services were extended to the immigrant people. Fraser government (1975-83) adopted this report and the government gave priority to the ethnic problem. Therefore, it founded an institution for research and educational activities. In the opening of this institution in 1981,

³⁹ Brian Galligan ve Winsome Roberts, *Australian Multiculturalism: Its Rise and Demise*, Australasian Political Studies Association- Conference University of Tasmania, Hobart, 29 Eylül – 1 Ekim 2003. <http://www.utap.edu.au/government/APSA/GalliganRobertp.pdf>, 11.09.2010'da girildi.

⁴⁰ Grassby, Al. J., *A Multicultural Society for the Future*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1973, http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/grassby_1.pdf, 05.09.2010'da girildi.

⁴¹ Lenny Roth, "Multiculturalism", NSW Parliamentary Library Research Service, Briefing Paper No:9/07, Haziran 2007, s.9. <http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parlment/publicationp.nsf/key/Multiculturalism>

Prime Minister Fraser presented multiculturalism as a “unique achievement of Australia”⁴². With the report *Multiculturalism for All Australians: Our Developing Nationhood in 1982* multiculturalism was located to the centre of the nation and national identity and it’s broadened its scope not only for the immigrants but also for all the Australians. Here, 4 founding principles of the multicultural society were expressed thus: a- social cohesion, b- protecting cultural identity, c- equal opportunity and responsibility, d- commitment and participation to the Australian society.

Multiculturalist policy and programs also went on in Hawke-Keating government that came into power in 1983. The Office of Multiculturalism was founded as being dependent upon prime ministry. Through the change made in Nationality and Citizenship Law in 1984, those who had residential permit were allowed to become citizens. The duration was lowered to 2 years, those over 50 were exempt from English test, citizenship was defined based on abstract civil values, and national unity was defined based on respect towards diversity.

Fitzgerald Report: Discussions of National Identity and Citizenship

Discontent about multiculturalism started in 1988. Multiculturalism which was minimized to be one of the adjectives used for national identity with the 1988 dated Fitzgerald Report named “Migration: Commitment to Australia” reduced its scope. This report was written in a period during which migration to Australia from East-Middle East, South Asia increased, and migration from European countries decreased. In the report, it was pointed out that immigrant should respect the institutions and norms of Australian society and democracy and Australia, Australian identity and commitment to Australia were located at the centre. It was expressed that multiculturalism was meaningful for only immigrants and ethnic societies. For instance, some natives did not identify themselves with it. Moreover, that national identity was ambiguous was underlined ⁴³ and it was stated that multiculturalism would cause less segregation if the Australian identity was straightened. Therefore, the report was somehow a warning for the Australians.

⁴² Galligan ve Roberts, *Australian Multiculturalism: Its Rise and Demise*,

<http://www.utap.edu.au/government/APSA/GalliganRobertp.pdf>, 11.09.2010’da girildi.

⁴³ Stephen Fitzgerald, “*Immigration: A Commitment to Australia*”, The Report of the Committee to Advise on Australia’s Immigration Policies, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1998, p. 10.

In the later period, criticisms against multiculturalism got deeper and it was stressed that Australian national identity should be filled as being different from multiculturalism to –for instance- distinguish it from Canada. Multiculturalism in Australia was such a founding value that “there was nothing behind when multiculturalism was taken out” as Immigrant Minister Al Grassby put it⁴⁴. Actually, multiculturalism as a top down strategy was adopted as a part of differentiation from the colonist country. However, this differentiation has become the basis of oppositions to multiculturalism. Since substituting multiculturalism with national identity has eroded English heritage and more importantly removed the contribution of Australia on multiculturalism, the idea that “Australia is more than multicultural” has gained value⁴⁵. By strong opposition of John Howard, who believes old Australian values and proposed “One Australia strategy”, the political compromise on multiculturalism disappeared. The report of Fitzgerald and campaign started by Howard against multiculturalism has sustained its effect later on.

In the “National Agenda for Multicultural Australia” report published in 1989, it was alleged that English heritage was determinant in defining Australia. This was at the same time the limit for multiculturalism. Furthermore, national agenda added a dimension, which made multicultural policy acceptable for all the Australians: the value given to a management sensible to work force diversity and diversity in order to achieve economic effectiveness in the global arena. In this sense, in order to be able to prevent unqualified ethnic migrations, Australian government began to give qualification and capital based residential permits⁴⁶.

In Keating and Howard period (1995-2000), multicultural policy acquired another new content: multiculturalism includes duties besides rights. The mandatory duties were loyalty to Australian society, commitment to its interests and future, superiority of law-constitution and democratic values and learning the national language. This new policy of multiculturalism became “unity within diversity”⁴⁷ and the effect of multiculturalism decreased by focusing on

⁴⁴ Grassby, *A Multicultural Society for the Future*,

http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/grassby_1.pdf, 05.09.2010'da girildi.

⁴⁵ Joppke, “The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State”, p. 245.

⁴⁶ Joppke, “The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State”, p. 246, 247.

⁴⁷ Amanda Wise, “Multiculturalism or Social Cohesion?: The Australian Debate”, Metropolis Conference, 8-12 October 2007, Melbourne, http://www.compap.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/pdfs/Non_WP_pdfs/Events_2007/Wise%20Multiculturalism%20or%20Social%20Cohesion%20Conference%20Paper%20Metropolip.pdf, 09.09.2010.

national unity and common political values. In 2000's even if multiculturalism continued to be seen as a tool for citizenship and diversity management, it drastically reduced its scope. Prime Minister Howard claimed a retreat from multiculturalism as a condition to consolidate social cohesion. In his speech delivered in National Press Club, Howard stated that:

At the dawn of 21st century, sustaining social cohesion will be the great achievement of Australia. Encouraging differences must not be at the expense of loss of common values. Common values are social cement and without this commonality society is under risk...many nations has experienced cultural diversity at a particular level however at the same time a common dominant culture has been protected... In case of Australia, dominant culture is Ethic of Christianity, progressive spirit of Enlightenment and institutions and values of English political culture.

Kymlica⁴⁸, who examined the example of Canada, does not agree with the criticism that multiculturalism in Australia damages national identity and citizenship. According to Kymlica, since multiculturalism was the official state policy, it has served to form relations between Canadians and the immigrants, and contributed to the formation of more egalitarian and comprehensive public institutions. The problem according to him is strong national identity and pride that exist in other countries, which encourage discriminatory acts against immigrants.

Discussion of Muslims as a Segregated Society

Contrary to Americans and Canadians, Australians do not define themselves with their ethnic roots. Moreover, neither ghetto formation as in the USA nor parallel life experience has been seen in Australia. However, during times of crisis Australians developed hostility towards positive discrimination and groups supported specially. September 11 attack, international terrorism and Cronulla riot in 2006 and Islamic radicals rigidified prejudices and enmity towards non-natives. Even if this group constituting 2% (300.000) of the society and most of whom are from Turkey or Lebanon was accepted not to be the homogenous, Muslims began to be the group which connotated fear,

⁴⁸ Will Kymlica, "The Current State of Multiculturalism in Canada", *Canadian Journal for Social Research*, 2(1), 2009, p. 15-34.

unreliability and hatred on account of the terrorist event. Particularly the hibac worn by Muslim women was the most important item of discrimination⁴⁹.

As a result, the Muslims was perceived not as a separate ethnic group but as a threat to national identity, culture and life styles. Lack of knowledge concerning Islam also strengthened these prejudices. Stereotype judgments about Muslims were shaped within the context of violence, crime, and female suppression⁵⁰.

In a field study conducted with 1401 people in 2007, it was found that nearly half of Australians did not have any contact with the Muslims at all. A great majority of Australians (71%) wanted immigrants from English speaking countries and Europe but not from Middle-east, Asia and other Muslim countries. Two thirds of Australians wanted immigrants to be assimilated, live, wear and behave like Australians. What is more, half of them believed that Muslims had negative effects upon social cohesion. Those who were more pessimists perceived Muslims as a threat to Australian democracy, secularism that was important in the separation of church and the state, law, order and freedoms⁵¹.

The Discussion that Public Support does not Exist

Another criticism against multiculturalism was lack of public support. Actually, it's seen that public opinion became different in the process that started with Fitzgerald Report. In the researches carried out in 1988 and 1997, even if two thirds of the public support multiculturalism, support in terms of sustaining ethnic differences was very little. In 1995 and 2003 Social Attitude Researches, while it was seen that a great majority of public became close to the assimilationist perspective, this did not mean that multiculturalism was completely refused⁵². The content of multiculturalism was being re-defined and social integration, which could strengthen common values, was being stressed.

However, particularly in Cronulla riots in 2006, thousands of young women and men's tearing Australian flag with racist slogans showed the conflict of Australian diversity. As 2007, research indicated too, hostility against the

⁴⁹ IDA, *Australia Deliberates: Muslims and Non-Muslims in Australia*, 2007, <http://ida.org.au/UserFiles/File/UPDATED%20DP%20FINAL%20REPORT/AUSTRALIA%20DELIBERATES%20-%20FINAL%20REPORT%20-%20CHAPTER%20TWO%20-%202008.pdf>, 09.09.2010.

⁵⁰ IDA, *Australia Deliberates: Muslims and Non-Muslims in Australia*, p. 36-37.

⁵¹ IDA, *Australia Deliberates: Muslims and Non-Muslims in Australia*, p. 5-6.

⁵² Roth, "Multiculturalism", s. 7-9.

Muslims increased and the perception that Muslim groups posed a threat to their lifestyles gained strength⁵³, which prepared a base of legitimacy to the politicians for getting away from multiculturalism and tending towards social integration. Within the light of all these developments, the state abandoned the terms “multiculturalism”. It will be meaningful to maintain that the name of the institution, which was founded as “Migration and Problems of Multiculturalism”, was changed as “Migration and Citizenship”. The government explained that the political bases of multiculturalism would remain, but it will emphasize the sense of common citizenship that is based on central values. The problem was that some Australians put their cultures before national commitment and loyalty, discriminatory tendencies strengthened and a weakness was created by behaving not as a unitary society but as a federation of ethnic cultures. Within this framework, the government brought 4 years’ residential permit and put the citizenship and language tests into practice again.

Conclusion

It seems possible to claim the following things in this study in which retreatment from multicultural policies and the reasons for this has been discussed. *The first one* is that multiculturalism came to the fore as an alternative social cohesion policy to assimilation in order to manage diversity caused by immigrants, native groups, and national minorities. However, we cannot say that there is one type of multiculturalism in terms of its meaning and practices. While the Anglo-Saxon tradition follows a model of multiculturalism that focuses on individual and individual integration and far from recognizing group identity, countries such as Canada and Australia have a model of multiculturalism that respects differences, prioritizes group properties and rights, and is supported actively by the state. *The second* is that it is seen criticism of multiculturalism gained hegemony with September 11th attacks and shaped a new psycho-political setting which included racism, hostility against foreigners/non-natives, politic-religious intolerance and discrimination. Even though there are different ideas in examples given concerning different countries; disappearance of national identity, ghetto formation and discussion of parallel societies, particularly Muslims’ segregation as a separate society,

⁵³ Tilbury, “The Retreat from Multiculturalism”, p. 11.

disillusionment and the lack of public support can be enumerated as the criticism of multiculturalism in relation to social cohesion.

One another consequence in relation to this is that there is a retreatment from multiculturalism both in practice and discourse in terms of immigration. Changes such as citizenship test, citizenship oath, mandatory citizenship courses, demand for competency in that country's language and the extension of dwelling periods are important in this sense. Banting and Kymlica⁵⁴ make the point that retreatment from multiculturalism is related to migration rather than native groups or national minorities and this is only at the rhetorical level. According to them, if Western democracies are to refuse the idea of multiculturalism, they should also do this for native groups and national minorities. *The third* is that Muslim immigrants who are the focus of attention in the criticism of multiculturalism constitute the largest minority and it is predicted that this 15-20 million population will be twofold in 2025⁵⁵. That belongings other than nation-state came to the fore due to globalization, there are even more migrations from Muslim countries, the Muslim population's birth rate is high and the Muslims are strictly tied to their cultures began to produce unintended results by combining with the low-standards they encountered in the countries they migrated. This fear fired by the September 11th attack seems to have started a process of otherness in the rhetoric of governments as if there were a homogenous Muslim society.

Anti-multiculturalist discourse shapes the public opinion by claiming that Islam conflicts with western culture and democracy, and creates tension by forming ghettos. Actually ghettoisation is not a threat on its own. If the people in the ghettos enclose themselves to their residential areas and not have interaction with the rest of the society, then it means that the threat has started⁵⁶. In this sense, discussion for parallel society seems unrealistic and feeding prejudices against Muslims will force them to turn inwards. However much the economic crisis decreased the need for immigrants and the pressure on work force market, the problem that the Europe is getting older and needs workforce will start a new wave of migration. Because of this, repercussions on the policies for multiculturalism will go on.

⁵⁴ Keith Banting ve Will Kymlica, "Introduction", *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Setting the Context*, K. Banting ve W. Kymlica (Der.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 22006, 1-47, p. 7.

⁵⁵ Gallis, *Muslims in Europe: Integration Policies in Selected Countries*, p. 13.

⁵⁶ Parekh, "Unity and Diversity in Multicultural Societies", p. 16.

The last one is that criticism for multiculturalism does not include a call for turning back to assimilation policies before multiculturalism. Actually, this does not seem possible. A genuine policy should focus on founding a balance between homogeneity and diversity. In this context, prevention of segregation at school and residential areas, struggling with discrimination, equal opportunities, building tools that could enhance interactions between ethnic-religious identities, media, and cultural policy can be regarded as tools to manage the relation between social cohesion and diversity. Policies for Educational and religious institutions are on the agenda as other tools.

As a result, multiculturalism discussion will go on getting deeper and deeper. It will be handled not only in relation to immigrants but also to national minorities and natives. As for the problem of migration, it is clear that multiculturalism needs to be considered particularly in relation to religion.

