



**LUND**  
UNIVERSITY

Department of Political Science

MEA thesis

Tutor: Magnus Jerneck

Characters: 81.870

# The Integration of Muslims in Europe

Constructing A Shared Life World

Esra ARAS

## **Abstract**

The integration of Muslim immigrants into the European societal sphere has have recently received the utmost concern of Europeans. This is because Muslim status has changed from “immigrant” to “threat” or “challenge” to peace and prosperity of Europe in the aftermath of 9/11 attacks. Muslim exclusion from social life is now a problem necessitating an urgent solution. At this point, this study attempts to look for a “shared life-world” for the Europeans and the Muslims in Europe. It proposes the conduct of deliberative democracy through deliberation and argumentation among rational and equal individuals. Communicative action through which nobody dominates the other and everybody is included with their validity claims shall nurture the dialogue between the European societies and Muslim communities in Europe.

While doing so, the study moves from the current political fabric of Europe which is dual-track of nation states and the European Union. By analyzing the failure of nation state strategies to integrate those Muslims, it suggests that the EU, whereas it has a limited concern of the case of Muslims based on immigration policies, can be a viable arena for a shared life-world of communicative action between the Muslims and Europeans as it puts forward the all embracing governance based on the inclusion of diversities.

**Key words:** Integration of Muslims, 9/11 and Islamic threat, shared life-word, communicative action, deliberative democracy, nation state, European Union, including diversity.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. The Subject of the Study.....	1
1.2. Purpose and Research Question: Why Muslims in Europe? .....	3
1.3. Methodology.....	4
1.4. Clarifications .....	5
1.4.1 Political Space: European Politics as a Dual-Track .....	6
1.4.2. Time: Post -9/11 Period .....	7
<b>2. Theoretical Analysis .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1. The Ideal Political Order: A Shared Life-World .....	7
2.2. Europe as a Regional Life World .....	10
2.3. A Space for the Muslims in Europe .....	11
<b>3. The Nation-State Level: Cases of the Netherlands and Britain .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1. Britain .....	14
3.2. The Netherlands .....	19
3.3. An Evaluation: The Failure of Nation-State Strategies .....	24
<b>4. Supra-National Level: The European Union .....</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1. Policy Areas of the European Union .....	29
4.1.A. Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) .....	30
4.1.B. Social Affairs .....	31
4.2. An Evaluation: What is Lacking? .....	32
<b>5. The Shared Life-World in Practice .....</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1. The Nature of the Existing Life-World: Shared or Separated? .....	34
5.2. The Normative Approach of Deliberative Democracy .....	36
Model	
5.3. Making Space for Muslims in Europe: A Common Life-World .....	39
via the EU	
<b>6. Concluding Remarks .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>45</b>

# CHAPTER I

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 The Subject of the Study

Started as a consequence of labor migration in the aftermath of the Second World War, as Ramadan asserts, problems associated with Muslims in Europe have been and are still defined as a problem of immigration, making it very difficult to debate the extent of their public presence in Europe<sup>1</sup>. However, as time passed the presence of Muslims and Islam has become inseparable part of European societal structure, necessitating social, political and theological adjustments. Besides, the widely debated interlink between Islam and terrorism as a result of September 11 attacks on the USA and the bombings in European capital cities resulted in a sense of fear from radical Muslims and atmosphere of antipathy towards Islam. Therefore, it is, now, plausible to think of “Islam in Europe” as well as “Islam and Europe”<sup>2</sup>.

Differing from social aspects such as labor rights that were initial issues of those migrant Muslims to deal with, current atmosphere through exclusion and violence due to the shadow of post-9/11 issues seem to make things more complicated. Dealing with Islam in Europe receives new perspectives and debates. Among them, one can assume that a sort of “Islamaphobia” has

---

<sup>1</sup> Ramadan, T. (2003) “Islam and Muslims in Europe”, *EUMC Equal Voices*, No. 10. [http://fra.europa.eu/fra/index.php?fuseaction=content.dsp\\_cat\\_content&contentid=3e3e8c602f879&catid=3e3e6e32a2316&search=1&frmsearch=islamophobia&lang=EN](http://fra.europa.eu/fra/index.php?fuseaction=content.dsp_cat_content&contentid=3e3e8c602f879&catid=3e3e6e32a2316&search=1&frmsearch=islamophobia&lang=EN), 10.04.2007.

<sup>2</sup> Baxter, K. (2006) “From Migrants to Citizens: 1950s-1990s”, *Immigrants and Minorities*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 164.

emerged in the minds of many, making migration policies closely related with policies regarding Islam and Muslims. In other words, Europe has become a special case in which categories of “immigrant” and “Muslim” are overlapping.

In this framework, this study evaluates the extents of public presence Muslims exert in Europe via migration. Are they European Muslims or Muslims in Europe after decades since they first migrated to Europe? What is the nature of “*shared common world*” between the host and guest societies? Here, it is commensurable to highlight the possibility of incorporating this largest religious minority community of Europe into the society they are living in despite rising violence.

While evaluating the case of Islam in Europe in respect of their engagement into European life, this study moves from the current political fabric of Europe which is a dual-track consisting of national and supranational governance. Thus, its subject can be divided into two themes: member states’ practices and the European Union (EU) dimension of dealing with Muslim people. The reason why I prefer to have a glimpse of member state and the EU levels is that the current political system affects the lives of Muslims as does it for anybody in the continent. For this reason, it seems a viable way to focus on the case of Muslims in compliance with the realities of European style of policy-making.

While doing so, I will first come up with the theoretical framework of deliberative model of democracy which gives the opportunity to question the limits and extents of coexistence of Europeans and Muslims. Then, I will pinpoint how European states approach the social issue of integrating their Muslims which enables us to criticize the validity of nation-state strategies. In

addition to nation-states, the EU, as a sui generis political system exerting power upon nation-states, interferes in many parts of individual lives. Non-Europeans such as Muslim immigrants within the EU are not out of this process. Thus, it makes sense to pay attention to which degree the Union is addressing those people. As the last concern, I will make an analysis of the degree to which there is deliberation and speech act in a common life-world shared by Muslims and Europeans and how to construct such a world.

## **1.2. Purpose and Research Question: Why Muslims in Europe?**

The aim of this study is to have an approach to the way of integrating Muslim people to European society. Drawing from Jürgen Habermas<sup>3</sup>, I will make an analysis of how to create a satisfactory cultural representation for Muslim immigrants within the public sphere and through institutions and civil society in Europe. I argue that greater democratic inclusion and justice lead up to the abandonment of exclusivity, and of course can pave the way for the sense of belonging. Thus, developing a common language between hosts and guests of Europe is a reasonable means for those minority groups to stand at the system. In other words, it is vital to approach the issue as a process of communicative action that necessitates the inclusion of all.

Taking a critical picture of how the Netherlands and Britain lack in addressing the needs and demands of their Muslim minorities and what is new under the umbrella of the EU, my **research question**, here, is what and how can and should be done in addressing those people within the two-tiered political system of Europe which is by the EU and its member states whereas post 9/11 period makes things worse by constituting a basis for deepening the cleavages

---

<sup>3</sup> Habermas, J. (2001) "Why Europe Needs a Constitution", *New Left Review*, pp. 17-21.

between Europeans and Muslims in Europe. In this sense, states have regulated their policies on their own until the EU took new steps regarding migration policies in its establishing treaties. Thus, it is inevitable to include the EU to our subject matter. This question is based on the empirical evidence derived from practices of liberal democratic states and the EU till now, and is related to a normative point of view associated with supranational political developments.

### **1.3. Methodology**

The method to be applied in this study is the “case study” method of most similar systems in which I will take into account the situation of Muslims in Britain and the Netherlands. So, why are Britain and the Netherlands?

There have been three major European systems to treat immigrant minorities in the post-1945 period: the assimilationism affirmed in France, *gastarbeiter* system of German-speaking countries where immigrant workers are denied political citizenship and multiculturalism by Sweden, Britain and the Netherlands<sup>4</sup>. “Pillarization system” of the Dutch and “Integration” notion of the British aim at equal treatment in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance between different cultures. Within this framework, Habermas claims that multicultural societies offer equal protection in the life-forms as each citizen has the opportunity to live in his/her cultural world freely without being insulted by the dominant culture<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup>Lewis, P. (2003) “Christians and Muslims in the West: From Isolation to Shared Citizenship”, *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3., No. 2, pp. 83-84.; Rex, J. (2004) “Multiculturalism and Political Integration in the Modern Nation-State”, in *Governance in Multicultural Societies*, ed(s) Rex, J. & Gurharpal Singh, Wiltshire: Ashgate, pp. 39.

<sup>5</sup>Habermas, J. (1993) “Struggles for Recognition in Constitutional States”, *European Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 143.

However, recent violent events organized by Muslims in the name of Islam indicate the fact that Europe is still far from a shared life-world in which Muslims are included. So are the Netherlands and Britain in spite of their relatively more open systems.

Therefore, focusing on the Dutch and British systems will offer a reasonable analysis of what has gone wrong until now. Britain and the Netherlands seem to have failed to attain such a life-world when considering the persisting problems of their Muslim communities. Not the assimilationism affirmed in France, gastarbeiter system of German-speaking countries where immigrant workers are denied political citizenship, but multiculturalist way of these two countries as the most similar systems<sup>6</sup> seems not to work. In this sense, it is vital to comprehend the experiences of these states.

So, as expected from case study method<sup>7</sup>, the Netherlands and Britain as the cases of this study provide fruitful contributions for the general proposition that nation-state strategies failed to engage Muslim people of Europe. This is what motivates me to analyze the British and Dutch model known to be more tolerant than others in order to envisage how difficult it is to come up with a reasonable solution regarding the subject matter of this study.

#### **1.4. Clarifications**

The plan of this study is to discuss the meaning of the presence of Islam and Muslims in Europe through a critical analysis of the cases- Britain and the Netherlands as well as the

---

<sup>6</sup> Hopkin, J. (2002) "Comparative Methods", in *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, ed(s) Marsh, D. & Stoker, D., London: Palgrave.

<sup>7</sup> Lijphart, A. (1969), "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method", The Round Table Conference on Comparative Politics of the International Political Science Association, Turin, 14 October 1969.



supranational steps by taking into account the atmosphere created by debates on terrorism and its link with Islam. As well, I will continue with the theoretical exploration regarding the two-tiered political system which can not be ignored on the European agenda.

In this perspective, it is obvious that things regarding the theme of Islam and presence of Muslims in Europe have become complicated more than ever. This is so because many aspects of the current situation are not the same with that of pre-September 11, 2001 which changed the discourse through threats and challenges to security. As well, a sort of actor diversity is emerging in compliance with the restructuring political system in Europe since the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1991. Therefore, in order to be understandable, it is necessary to make some clarifications and comments concerning the plan and context of the study.

#### **1.4.1 Political Space: European Politics as a Dual-Track**

My focal point in this study is to comprehend what can be done regarding the Muslim presence of Europe under the umbrella of two-tiered political fabric of the continent. Therefore, through a comprehension of the limits and extents the British and Dutch systems will offer a solid illumination about the wrong-goings concerning the co-existence of mostly immigrant Muslims and the Europeans. Then, I will focus on the EU's position at this point in order to question what is the current political system is saying about those people. By amalgamating member states' and EU's concern of how Muslims in Europe are accommodated, I will come up with a normative point of view to think about what can the current two-tiered political system of Europe do in this perspective.

### **1.4.2. Time: Post -9/11 Period**

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 followed by a series of similar events over time constitute a turning point for the destiny of inter-cultural and inter-faith relations in Europe as well as in the world. What has changed for Europe?

Violence seems to have entered into Europe. Violence in Europe up to terrorist attacks and linking those events to the nature or for the sake of Islam ostensibly does not contribute to the dialogue between Muslims and Europeans. Merely, already existent problems related to Muslim communities in Europe such as illiteracy, socio-economically backwardness and ghettoization are worsened due to the involvement of security matters as a new dimension that jeopardize the peaceful coexistence. Hence, in an analysis of the presence of Muslims in Europe, it is of great importance to take into consideration the impact of the post-9/11 period while having an ample picture of the situation.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **2. Theoretical Analysis**

#### **2.1. The Ideal Political Order: A Shared Life-World**

What is the best kind of life? What can be the characteristics of the best political order through which the best life could be enjoyed? These are the normative questions of political philosophy looking for the way of reconstructing the presuppositions of the universal conditions. So, how can the human beings achieve the ideal type of life which responds the needs of all?

“Critical Theory” originated with the works of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt since 1923 has a lot to say about these questions. According to Habermas as a key figure of this theory, the way to the desired life-world is the social transformation which occurs as a result of contradictions within the totality of social relations<sup>8</sup>. Those contradictions are resolved through a normative critique of contending world views which is done by communication on the basis of the capacity for rational debate<sup>9</sup>. The outcome leads to the formation of shared norms and values. Meanwhile, the process is called communicative action presented by Habermas<sup>10</sup>.

According to Habermas’ definition, communicative action looks for reasoned understanding via interpersonal relations and empathizing<sup>11</sup>. In other words, agents harmonize their worldviews on the basis of shared values. It is a process of reaching the common ground through the inclusion of everybody affected on an equal basis. As a result, the ideal type of life-world which is the “shared life-world” in which nobody dominates the other is founded. The objective in this world is to include the will of all via the shared culture of social actors capable of acting and communicating and of a common system of norms and rules<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Buckler, S. (2002) “Normative Theory”, in *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, ed(s) Marsh, D. & Stoker, G., London: Palgrave, pp. 181.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, pp. 182.

<sup>10</sup> Habermas, J. (1991) “*Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*”, Cambridge: The MIT Press, pp. 116-120.

<sup>11</sup> Nieman, A. (2004) “Between Communicative Action and Strategic Action: Article 113 Committee and the Negotiations on the WTO Basic Telecommunications Services Agreement”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 380-383.

<sup>12</sup> Habermas, J. (2003) “Intolerance and Discrimination”, *Oxford University Press and New York University School of Law*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 3-4.

In this context, argumentative rationality of agents<sup>13</sup> is central for action in order to challenge the validity claims and reach a communicative consensus. While doing so, they are open to being persuaded in a deliberative discourse by the better argument and to change their interests in the light of this better argument. Thus, persuasion through reasoning in a rational discourse is essential in order to remove doubts about the validity claims. Then, the will of all will be included into the process.

In this perspective, realization of Habermasian communicative action constitutes the basis for legitimacy and hence deliberative model of democracy derived from collective deliberation conducted rationally and fairly among free and equal individuals<sup>14</sup>. This is because only those norms agreed by all individuals affected by their consequences are valid. In this sense, participation in argumentation process and speech acts is a prerequisite increasing the value of plurality and giving a chance of representation to every voice. So, how can individuals participate into the process?

It is the “public sphere consisting” of the plurality of modes of association in parallel with the plurality of views and opinions<sup>15</sup>. The model of deliberative democracy privileges a public sphere of networks, associations and organizations from political parties to social movements, to citizens’ initiatives and voluntary associations. The public sphere is a platform of exchanging knowledge and communication which eventually transforms them into public opinion or the valid and shared norms and values. Therefore, deliberative democracy puts forward the free public

---

<sup>13</sup> Risse, T. (2000) “Let’s Argue: Communicative Action in World Politics”, *International Organization*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 7.

<sup>14</sup> Benhabib, S. (1996) “Toward a Deliberative Model of Democracy”, in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed(s) Benhabib, S., Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 69.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 73-74.

sphere of civil society including every individual. As a result, it appears to be the principal arena for the articulation and resolution of normative discourses and hence the evolution of a shared life-world<sup>16</sup>.

## **2.2. Europe as a Regional Life World**

As a regional form of cosmopolitan governance, Habermas defines the current structure of Euro-politics as a local life-world which is beyond nation-state at a supranational level<sup>17</sup>. As well, it is beyond a mere market with an unprecedented political system of nation-states. However, with its political power the EU has not developed the necessary social solidarity from a Europe-wide public sphere of civic nations yet. It is still undergoing a process of identity-formation which is experiencing hard times due to the rejection of the Constitution in the Netherlands and France. Therefore, the EU has not solved its problem of legitimacy which represents the will of all by binding European national societies together at a higher level.

So, in order to be a completely legitimate polity, the EU needs the existence of a democratic public sphere which can emerge from yielding to an interpenetration of national communications<sup>18</sup>. It is the plurality of national publics, inclusion of diversities. In return, the Europe-wide public sphere can generate its shared political culture via deliberation and argumentation.

---

<sup>16</sup> Benhabib, S. (2002) *"The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era"*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 115.

<sup>17</sup> Habermas, J. (2003) "Toward a Cosmopolitan Europe", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 86.

<sup>18</sup> Habermas, J. (2001)..., pp. 17-19.

In this perspective, it is clear that Europe is continuing the construction of its local life-world to create the solidarity of a public sphere at the supranational level. Regarding the subject matter of this study, what could be the space for Muslims in Europe in this unfinished local form of shared life-world?

### **2.3. A Space for the Muslims in Europe**

In order to deal with the problems of immigrants and hence Muslims, European states developed a number of systems one of which is multiculturalism. As a normative way, multiculturalism came to the European agenda in the post-1945 era together with mass labor migration from the third world. It has been adopted by the Netherlands and Britain which are famous for their openness to cultural diversity. However, recently rising violence of Islamic fundamentalism that influences even these relatively more liberal states of Europe depicts the fact that problems related to Muslims living in Europe are still persisting. So, what should be done?

From this point of view, I will question the plausibility of a society with communicative action and discourse ethics that necessitates wider and wider participation in the public sphere for Muslim minorities in Europe throughout the study. This is the precondition of being listened to, not just being heard. The public sphere in Habermas' formulation refers to the broader civil society where opinions are formed within the relations of civil society and made politically efficacious<sup>19</sup>. The focal point here is the principle of "discourse ethics" which includes all voices. In other words, as Seyla Benhabib claims, all those affected by the consequences of the adoption

---

<sup>19</sup> Habermas, J. (2001)...., pp. 17-21.

of a norm should have an equal say in its validation if democratic legitimacy is to be attained<sup>20</sup>. So, what can the deliberative democracy model say for the case of Muslims in Europe?

In the light of Habermas' clear-cut division between system and life-world as two aspects of societal integration<sup>21</sup>, the case of Muslims in Europe is complicated in respect of inclusion of all voices in social and political spheres. There is, either satisfactory or not, a certain level of integration for the concerned group of people to European system of governance. For instance, in judicial system there are rules and regulations for the social rights of migrant workers who are granted similar rights with that of Europeans.

However, in terms of integration in the life-world, current language is to be questioned whether it enables such integration or not. Here, the rising trend of inter-cultural conflicts within Europe draws a pessimistic picture. Islam and Muslims have been in Europe for long, but violence associated with them is a new phenomenon which is deepening the already existent socio-economic cleavages between hosts and foreigners in the continent via a second dimension which is security. Hence, it is not possible to talk about the existence of a shared life-world as an ideal type of political environment between European societies and Muslims in the continent.

Within this framework, I will grasp the way how Muslims have been dealt with by nation-states through respecting the cultural differences which seems not to have worked. Then, the EU will be taken into account with its steps concerning Muslims to come up with a response to how a "shared life-world" which is up to the preconditions of communication and acts of understanding

---

<sup>20</sup> Benhabib, S. (2002)..., pp. 147.

<sup>21</sup> Cooke, M. (1997), *Language and Reason: A Study of Habermas' Pragmatics*, London: The MIT Press, pp. 5.

could be valid for Europeans and Muslims in Europe. How can and should consensus and understanding as the fundamental mechanism in social coordination in a life-world<sup>22</sup> be set up between these two sides in the political structure of Europe?

## CHAPTER III

### 3. The Nation-State Level: Cases of the Netherlands and Britain

The presence of Islam in Europe becomes meaningful to pay attention when taking into account their 15 million or more<sup>23</sup> population that is more than the population of many European states. The point, here, is what have made Europe's Muslims a group of people staying outside? Or why could they not be fully engaged in European socio-political architecture? As a recent factor, what is the meaning of perceiving them as a threat to security?

What have impeded social integration of Muslims in Europe? It is possible to reckon many reasons<sup>24</sup>. It might have been due to colonial history and Orientalism, direct implications of political developments in the Middle East such as the Iranian Islamic Revolution, the wicked nature of Islam as a life style, prejudices and blasphemies of Europeans toward Muslims and Islam, or inability of Muslims to get along with modernity and European values. Whatever the reason is, the important thing is the fact that the permanent presence of Islam and Muslims in

---

<sup>22</sup> Cooke, M. (1997)... , pp. 9.

<sup>23</sup> Baxter, K. (2006)... , pp. 164.; Karic, E. (2002) "Is 'Euro-Islam' a Myth, Challenge or a Real Opportunity for Muslims in Europe", *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 436.

<sup>24</sup>Shadid, W. A. (1991) "The Integration of Muslim Minorities in the Netherlands", *International Migration Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 356.



Europe is a social reality that is at the centre of a debate on an insecure environment through violence by Muslims and hatred, or at least antipathy by Europeans. The outcome, in return, is the deepening cleavages between hosts and guests in the continent.

Britain and the Netherlands with their similar models addressing their Muslim immigrants are two striking examples in this sense. In spite of relatively more open and liberal treatments, these European states are also still far from Muslim integration. Then, what is so hard for those Muslims to develop attachments to European norms and values? From this point of view, it is of great importance to have a general outlook of British and Dutch Muslims' situation.

### **3. 1. Britain**

Estimates state that there are 1 to 3 million Muslim people in Britain with diverse geographical and ethnic backgrounds<sup>25</sup>. This makes British society diverse in terms of culture, tradition and religious views and practices. Allen evaluates this diversity as a mosaic in which Muslims from all over the world are present<sup>26</sup>. From this point of view, it is consequential to prevent cultural collisions and to offer an environment fostering peaceful coexistence between the values of indigenous and of minority cultures and religions in the country.

In this sense, Britain has aimed at accommodating the practices of certain cultural and religious values in its socio-political context<sup>27</sup>. To do so, it adopted multiculturalism to embrace

---

<sup>25</sup> Khaliq, U. (2004) "Islam and the European Union: Report on the United Kingdom", in *Islam and the European Union*, ed(s) Potz, R. & Wieshaider, W., Paris:Peeters, pp. 220.

<sup>26</sup> Allen, C. (2006) "United Kingdom- Final Report 2006", in *Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Islamophobia is More of a Predicament than an Explanation*, ed(s). Cesari, J., EUMC, [http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf\\_Challenge\\_Project\\_report.pdf](http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_Challenge_Project_report.pdf), 16.04.2007, pp. 49.

<sup>27</sup> Khaliq, U. (2004) ..., pp. 227.

and legitimate cultural differences on the basis of non-discrimination. Then, quoted in Allen, British style of multiculturalism can be defined with the words of Roy Jenkins<sup>28</sup>:

*“... flattening process of uniformity, but cultural diversity, coupled with equal opportunity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance.”*

For this reason, Britain has received a reputation for openness, seeking to enable minor cultures to maintain their distinct identity while becoming a part of its societal life<sup>29</sup>. This is why Rex claims that British way of multiculturalism has a scope of integrating cultural diversity<sup>30</sup>. As a consequence, the 2002 poll proved the loyalty of 87 percent of Muslims in Britain to British state<sup>31</sup>.

In contradiction with the results of the above-mentioned poll, the place of Muslims and their Islamic culture within British multiculturalist policies and multicultural life is not so ample. The extent to which Muslim people have exerted their presence in British public sphere within British system has been moot.

Problems associated with Muslims in Britain have existed from the outset. As being common in many European states which have Muslim community, as Khalid asserts, seclusion, defensiveness, ghettoization and poverty have been the defining features of British Muslim population<sup>32</sup>. However, with the effect of the 9/11 and the 7/7 Islamophobic tendencies within Britain and marginalization of Muslims have become the most vital issue dividing people on the agenda. Especially the train bombings of 7 June, 2005 in London abbreviated as the 7/7

---

<sup>28</sup> Allen, C. (2006)..., pp. 56.

<sup>29</sup> Baxter, K. (2006)..., pp. 169.

<sup>30</sup> Rex, J. ((2004)..., pp. 39.

<sup>31</sup> Source: Allen, C. (2006)..., pp. 52.

<sup>32</sup> Khalid, U. (2004)..., pp. 262.

constitutes a turning point in the sense that they were assumed to be undertaken by home-grown terrorists. Fight against terrorism and fear of Islamic fundamentalism opened up a fear of “home-grown violence”, “enemy within” and extremism<sup>33</sup>. In this regard, rising violence reflects the fragility of British multiculturalism regarding the Muslims to the greater extent than ever.

From this point of view, it is worth to analyzing how British multiculturalism have addressed the theme of Muslims and Islam in order to comprehend why engagement of Muslims is still a problem in Britain with raising costs to the tranquility of the country.

Historically, the institutionalization of multiculturalism started with the “Race Relations Act” of 1976 that prohibited discrimination, but not bringing about any clear-cut protection of religious minorities. The important thing here is the fact that unlike Jewish and Shikh communities, Muslims were not recognized as an ethnic group, and therefore denied legal protection. In other words, they were not recognized with their distinctive identity. Therefore, while grasping the approach to British Muslims, it is plausible to question the extent of their place in multiculturalist discourse of the country.

In this context, legal framework continued with the implementation of the “European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms” adopted by the “Human Rights Act” of 1998. The Act provided protection against religious discrimination and secured the rights of freedom of religion and freedom to change religion or belief, and regulated the acts of worship, practice and teaching.

---

<sup>33</sup> Ahmad, F. (2006) “British Muslim Perceptions and Opinions on New Coverage of September 11”, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 6, pp. 693-694.

So, it is clear that English Law created tolerance towards diverse cultures and, over time, religions including Islam. Besides, British Muslims were luckier than those in other European countries when thinking of the government's early willingness to confer citizenship and political freedoms to the immigrants. However, the system has had its limits too. At first, non-discrimination and toleration as the theme of British multiculturalism have not been granted to the Muslim communities for long. Second, the system ignored the multiplicity of cultures, beliefs and practices among British Muslims by simplifying them to a single group of people. According to Baxter, it reflects British paradigm of "us and them" in which Muslim community is perceived as a challenge to Westernization of society<sup>34</sup>. This is due to the fact that Muslims are thought to be affiliated with tradition and schism in their ghettos.

As a result, the practical aspect appeared to be disappointing for the British. The pessimism concerning the inclusion of Muslims into Western style of life can be traced back to the Rushdie Affair in 1988 as a prominent case paving the way for a critique of Islamic culture in Britain. The publication of "*The Satanic Verses*" by Salman Rushdie was regarded as a part of literary denigration of the Prophet Mohammed started with H. G. Well's "*A Short History of the World*" of 1922<sup>35</sup>. The novel created serious controversies within the society as Muslims perceived that it had blasphemies to their Prophet Mohammed while the British envisaged the events in terms of rights and freedoms of a novelist. Namely, the debate on the relationship between "freedom of thought" and "freedom of religion" was nourished by the Rushdie Affair, leading to the crumbling of British multiculturalism due to social tensions between Muslim

---

<sup>34</sup> Baxter, K. (2006)..., pp. 171-172.

<sup>35</sup> Piscatori, J. (1990) "The Rushdie Affair and the Politics of Ambiguity", *International Affairs*, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 767.

communities and the British society<sup>36</sup>. Therefore, the Rushdie affair can be assumed as a milestone in the evolution of inter-cultural and inter-faith relations concerning the presence of Muslims in Great Britain.

Following the Rushdie affair, the post 9/11 period has a more profound impact on British immigrant policy together with the approach to Muslims and Islam. After terrorism came to the agenda as the first priority Britain has dealt with Islam as a relatively new phenomenon because of the new debate on the interlink between Islam and terror and on violent nature of Islam. The government introduced the “Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Bill” of 2001 drawing boundaries of policies to fight against terrorism with ostensible restrictions of the rights of third country nationals<sup>37</sup>. After the 7/7 bombings on the London subway, the government updated the Act by issuing the “Prevention of Terrorism Act”. These new codes have a tightening scope as they bring about strict rules and regulations such as allowing the detention of terrorism suspects for up to ninety days without charges and proposing the possibility of stripping citizenship of naturalized ones who are accused of terrorism<sup>38</sup>.

So, what are British Muslim perceptions in the coverage of the Codes regulating fight against terrorism? Quoted in Allen, a study by the Institute of Race Relations suggests that the anti-terrorism statutes have been used overwhelmingly against Muslim defendants<sup>39</sup>. Of the cases reviewed, one in eight was a Muslim arrested for terrorism violations and turned over to the immigration authorities without any prosecution for the alleged initial offences. It means that the

---

<sup>36</sup> Baxter, K. (2006)..., pp. 180.

<sup>37</sup> Allen, C. (2006)..., pp. 60.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, pp. 60-67.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, pp. 21.

7/7 subway bombings by ‘homegrown bombers’ have deepened the impact of 9/11 shock and urged the British to question the possibility of engaging Islamic tradition into their public sphere and turned the discourse into security concerns. As a result, the difficult process of the recent times proves the fragility or, maybe the failure of British multiculturalism.

### **3.2. The Netherlands**

According to the estimates<sup>40</sup>, there are about 1.5 million foreign-born residents which are about 10 percent of the population in the Netherlands. If we include persons born in the Netherlands with one or two foreign-born parents, the percentage rises from 10 to 17 percent. These numbers are worth to paying attention as, according to Carle, very soon, the Netherlands’s largest cities such as Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and The Hague will be experiencing a “majority-minority case” since, for instance, Rotterdam’s current population consists of 50 percent immigrant minorities who are mostly Muslim<sup>41</sup>. This makes Islam visible in many aspects of the Dutch socio-political life.

The Netherlands draws out its own way to regulate this demographic situation and to enable cohabitation with its Muslim immigrants. I will now make an analysis of the Dutch model addressing those people.

The Dutch model called “Pillarization System” has its roots in the multiculturalist mentality. Basically, it gives religious groups the right to live on the basis of their beliefs in the separate worlds. The fundamentals of the system are the emancipation in a multicultural society,

---

<sup>40</sup> Carle, R. (2006) “Demise of Dutch Multiculturalism”, *Society*, pp. 69.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

equality before the law and promotion of equal opportunity. The aim is to create diversity giving the right of life to every culture. To culminate in a multicultural society, religion has been a part of the agenda of the Dutch government that has targeted to meet the religious demands and needs of everyone through not only legal perspective but also financial assistance in education and labor market. Stipulating such an environment, the system put the Netherlands into the category of tolerant countries in Western Europe.

Since the 1990s, immigrant and minority incorporation policies have placed much greater emphasis on cultural assimilation. “Good citizenship” and “civic integration” were defined as the new policy goals. Within this system, minorities would assimilate to the dominant public culture and to maintain any divergent practices in the private sphere. To give an example, the “Law on the Civic Integration of Newcomers” of 1998 made integration courses compulsory at schools. In respect of such new characteristics of the Dutch model, public discourse turned out to be more critical than ever in terms of the failure of Muslims to get along with Western way of life.

The consequent situation is the fact that engagement of Muslim immigrants into Dutch society still constitutes an obvious problem on the agenda. In practice, those people tend to form a “society within a society” with their own businesses or strong links with their homeland<sup>42</sup>. Namely, in spite of religious freedoms guaranteed through the system the Muslim groups and Dutch society are far from developing a common life-world.

Recent violent events in the Netherlands which has a reputation of being Europe’s most open society have indicated that competing forms of intolerance lead to disastrous effects and

---

<sup>42</sup> (2 April 2005) “Living with Islam: The New Dutch Model”, *The Economist*, Vol. 375, No. 8420, pp. 24-26.

deeper societal cleavages in the country. Mutual attitudes as expressed by politicians and opinion leaders on Dutch side and as seen through inhumane attacks by radical Islamists, are predominantly negative, indicating that the goal of the Dutch multicultural society, including Muslims, is still a utopia<sup>43</sup>. This is due to the fact that even though the necessary juridical conditions for at least peaceful co-existence are widely present, the equally indispensable social basis, in other words, a shared world is lacking or declining extensively.

For this reason, Shadid regards the Netherlands as becoming a stratified society, arguing that from an anthropological point of view, there is not much difference between the ethnic stratification of the apartheid system in South Africa (whites, Asians, and blacks) and the increasing differentiation between native Dutch, Western non-natives, and non-Western non-natives who are generally Muslim migrants in the Netherlands<sup>44</sup>. Within this framework, although Muslims have resided in the country for over four decades, the continuous public discourse about their integration indicate that their position in society is uneasy.

Shadid divides last four decades into three periods in presenting the developments in Dutch public and political discourses on Islam in the Netherlands<sup>45</sup>:

- *The period of negligence* in the 1960s and 1970s when the Dutch who focused on the labor demand of the economy were unaware of the social and political problems imposed by immigrant “guest workers”. As those Muslim workers’

---

<sup>43</sup> Margaronis, M. (2004) “Dutch Tolerance Tried”, *The Nation*, pp. 28.

<sup>44</sup> Shadid, W. A. (2006) “Public Debates Over Islam and the Awareness of Muslim Identity in the Netherlands”, *European Education*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 11.

<sup>45</sup> Shadid, W. A. (2006)..., pp. 12–19.



presence was expected to be temporary, religious aspect was ignored in the country which had a long tradition of secularism.

- *The period of awareness and ethnicization of Islam* in the 1980s when religious demands of Muslim immigrants with rising number through family unification became an inescapable issue. As well, the international conjuncture shaped by the Iranian Islamic Revolution and the Rushdie affair made the Dutch think of the status of Islam in the country.
- *The period of stigmatization and exclusion* in the 1990s when the notion of “us versus them” emerged. Discourse on the wicked nature of Islam stating it as a violent and backward religion became widespread. This period signals the failure of the Dutch multiculturalism as it is the period of tightening immigration policies and strict controls of immigrant population.

In this context, the last period indicates the worsening societal relations with the Muslims in the Netherlands. As well, it can be argued that multiculturalist dreams of the country collapsed during this period, by leaving the question associated with Muslim immigrants without a solution.

So, since the 1990s the Dutch have discussed what to do with the Muslim guest workers. It is not an easy task to engage this community into Dutch public and societal sphere. There is the fear of colliding with the foundations of Dutch society<sup>46</sup>. As Leon de Winter asserts, it is a process of dealing with the influx of mostly illiterate Muslim workers who are with only a superficial grasp of spoken Dutch; and hence unable to get along with Dutch norms and values<sup>47</sup>.

---

<sup>46</sup> Winter, L. de. (16 July 2005) “Tolerating a Time Bomb,” *New York Times*.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

Most importantly, the Netherlands is now undergoing an environment of marginalization and extremism of Muslims and of an antipathy of the Dutch people toward those Muslims. In this spectacle, societal cleavages are deepening day by day. The recent inhumane murders organized by radical Muslims living in the Netherlands illustrate the seriousness of social tensions.

Key among events indicating the antipathy toward public presence of Muslims is the popularity of politicians Pim Fortuyn and Geert Wilders, who have attacked Holland's immigration and ethnic minorities' policies, calling for a ban on immigration and an aggressive policy of assimilating minorities into Holland's liberty culture. Furthermore, eighty percent of Dutch people think that Holland is too tolerant of ethnic minorities<sup>48</sup>. This is because a series of shocks that are the results of rising Islamic fundamentalism in the country have made the Dutch people question many of their liberal policies.

The politician Pim Fortuyn who made the argument that Muslims were undermining the traditional liberalism of Dutch culture and gained a remarkable support in the elections was murdered in 2002. The filmmaker Theo van Gogh who systematically called the Muslims as "goat-fucker" followed Fortuyn. The fact that the murderer of van Gogh was a second-generation immigrant, born and educated in the Netherlands raised the fear of home-grown radicals among the Dutch society. As a result, the failure of the Dutch lenient system has been solidified<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>48</sup> Carle, R. (2006) ..., pp. 69.

<sup>49</sup> Maussen, M. (2006) "Anti-Muslim Sentiments and Mobilization in the Netherlands. Discourse, Policies and Violence, in *Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Islamophobia is More of a Predicament than an Explanation*, ed(s). Cesari, J., EUMC, [http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf\\_Challenge\\_Project\\_report.pdf](http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_Challenge_Project_report.pdf), 16.04.2007, pp. 104.

### **3.3. An Evaluation: The Failure of Nation-State Strategies**

The need for economic recovery in the aftermath of Second World War constituted the incentive for labor migration in Europe from the outset. Over time, social consequences of mass migration from 3<sup>rd</sup> World (especially Islamic) countries came to the agenda. Islam is intertwined in many aspects of European life and policies such as employment, social cohesion, integration of newcomers, identity issues, freedom of religion, protection of minorities and immigration. Karic regards it as an agenda of the definition, designation, identification and concretization of Islam in a specifically European cultural and political context as well as an agenda of Islamization of Europe which heralds undesirable or even dangerous outcomes for some in terms of post-9/11 period<sup>50</sup>. Then, the question has become how to deal with the differences because of the increased social diversity.

In the simplest sense, Muslims in Europe generally settle in ghettos with very poor living standards and maintain powerful attachments to their native cultures by closing in on themselves. It can be argued that there are colonies inside European states whose members are alienated from the dominant cultures. In this perspective, Europe has a problem of integrating those non-Europeans who cling to their own cultural heritage.

Robert Leiken writes that the isolation of these communities allows mujahadeen to fundraise, prepare for jihad, and recruit new members in Europe<sup>51</sup>. In this process, Europe is in alarm regarding security matters. It is ostensibly a problem of the very controversial and hard topic of engaging a minority community into societal sphere while dealing with some of its

---

<sup>50</sup> Karic, E. (2002)..., pp. 436.

<sup>51</sup> Leiken, R. (2005) "Europe's Angry Muslims", *Foreign Affairs*.

members as a strategic threat<sup>52</sup>. This is why the presence of Islam and Muslims in Europe, whereas it is not a new fact, has recently been receiving maximum attention.

Recently, violent events in various parts of Europe such as the banlieues of Paris and the Rütli School in Berlin, assassinations in the Netherlands and terrorist attacks in Madrid and London have opened up a new debate on the relations between citizens and foreigners (Muslims) together with the presence of Islam in Europe. Europe is now facing a serious radicalization of its Muslim population. In addition to socio-economic aspects, Muslim problem of Europe has now a security dimension that makes things more complicated.

In general, determined by present day Islamic fundamentalism in Europe, Muslim ghettos, networking among radicals and the above-mentioned violent events cause an anti-immigrant populism among Europeans towards Muslims. The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) published a report on “*Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001*” in May 2002<sup>53</sup>. Islamophobia has emerged as a modern and secular anti-Islamic discourse and practice appearing in the public sphere with the integration of Muslim immigrant communities and intensifying after 9/11<sup>54</sup>. The concern is whether ordinary Muslims in Europe would be the victims of hatred or discrimination under the shadow of Islamic radicalism and terrorism. Put differently, Muslims could lead to a threat-creating process among European societies. So, do such challenges and threats to security pave the way for a process of abolishing tolerance for and respect to the existence of Muslims in various European countries?

---

<sup>52</sup> Neuman, P. R. (2006) “Europe’s Jihadist Dilemma”, *Survival*, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 79.

<sup>53</sup> EUMC (2002) “Highlights of the Report on Muslims in the European Union: Discrimination and Islamophobia”, <http://eumc.europa.eu/eumc/material/pub/muslim/EUMC-highlights-EN.pdf>, 12.04.2007.

<sup>54</sup> Cesari, J. (2006) “Use of the Term ‘Islamophobia’ in Islamic Societies”, in *Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Islamophobia is More of a Predicament than an Explanation*, ed(s). Cesari, J., EUMC, [http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf\\_Challenge\\_Project\\_report.pdf](http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_Challenge_Project_report.pdf), 16.04.2007, pp. 6.

As observed via the Dutch and British versions that are famous for liberal characters, nation-states have long dealt with the question of engaging those immigrants into European societies with varying policies and strategies. More or less, their objective was defined to include “the different” with its distinctive aspects. In return of their liberal treatments, their expectation was the loyalty toward their state, or at least acceptance of the system<sup>55</sup>. However, even the two very open European states- Britain and the Netherlands- failed to attain a desirable outcome as witnessed in the current atmosphere.

It still seems to be on the agenda to integrate the religious diversity raised by Islam into the secular nature of European liberal societies on the basis of European norms and values. This is since the attitudes of Muslims have changed through radicalization from the very beginning to the current situation. It is not the first, but the second and third generations grown up within the European system and at European schools that are challenging the tranquility in Europe<sup>56</sup>. So, to what extent could they become integrated into the society they live in? What hindered them? What is behind the recent Islamic radicalization in Europe and makes peaceful co-existence of Muslims and Europeans less and less likely? Why did those strategies states applied not work?

The response to all such questions lies in the common characteristics of Muslims in Europe and Europe’s general approach to them from the outset. To make an outline, the first and the foremost reason is the socio-economic situation shared by Muslims in the whole Europe. Muslim enclaves are generally turned in on themselves and characterized by poverty because of illiteracy, lack of linguistic knowledge, unqualified labor supply and hence high level of

---

<sup>55</sup> Baxter, K. (2006)...., pp. 169.

<sup>56</sup> Karic, E. (2002)...., pp. 440.

unemployment<sup>57</sup>. As well, they are affiliated with their distinctive ethno-familial culture of Islam which does not get along with European societal structure<sup>58</sup>. Under such conditions, ghettoization is accepted, even desired with cultural alienation and dependency.

In return, European societies took them into consideration in economic terms from the outset. As mentioned while taking a picture of British and Dutch Muslims the socio-political needs and demands of Muslim communities were not taken on the agenda since it was expected that they would turn back one day in the future. However, things did not happen in accordance with European expectations. Over time their socio-political problems and theological debates emerged by making the presence of Islam a social reality for Europe.

Recently, the debate on terrorism extended over Islam. This is because there is an implicit and sometimes explicit interlink established between terror and Islam. Apart from the 9/11 events, there are good reasons to do so when recalling the radical Muslims' attacks, violent protests and assassinations in various parts of Europe in recent times. Thus, the case of Islam and Muslims has become an urgent problem to solve for everyone's sake<sup>59</sup>.

However, European discourse on Islam seems to deepen the cleavages between Europeans and Muslims leading to the alienation and hence marginalization of Muslims. Maussen defines three sorts of discourse on Islam: "academic speech" on the relations between Islam and modernity, "public speech" on Islam's inherently violent and backward nature and "hate speech"

---

<sup>57</sup> Cesari, J. (2006)..., pp. 17-19.

<sup>58</sup> Shadid, W. A. (1991)..., pp. 355.

<sup>59</sup> Cesari, J. (2006)..., pp. 20-23.

such as the speech of van Gogh calling the Muslims as “goat-fucker”<sup>60</sup>. In this respect, terror-related issues worsen this situation by feeding European discrimination, or at least prejudices against Muslims<sup>61</sup>. However, it should be borne in mind that there are good Muslims as well as bad Muslims which urges Europe to make a distinction between them.

In this perspective, Europe is now on the eve of making a definition of boundaries of basic freedoms of a group of people and dealing with some of its members as a threat or challenge to its peace and prosperity. While doing so, even the tolerant way Britain and the Netherlands have undergone does not seem to be functional. So, what could be the bases of Euro-politics regarding Islam in treating and perceiving its Muslim communities? In this respect, it seems a viable way to take into consideration the case of Muslims in Europe from a “discourse ethics” point of view by considering a mutual learning process for both Europeans and Muslims in Europe. Before that, what the European integration process brought about should be taken into account for a comprehensive analysis.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **4. Supra-National Level: The European Union**

Europe has been undergoing a process of integration since the end of the Second World War. Initiated in a functional sector (coal and steel), the vision of a United Europe culminated in a sui generis formation which did reflect the basic characteristics of neither a nation-state nor an international organization. In this sense, the Maastricht Treaty constitutes the historic success of

---

<sup>60</sup> Maussen, M. (2006)...., pp. 100–101.

<sup>61</sup> Shadid, W. A. (1991)...., pp. 371.

integration project by creating a new political actor called the European Union (EU). The Union, now, stands as a *polity* of a unique institutional structure and is based on a new form of *governance* with a complex set of policies and politics<sup>62</sup>. As a new political form which is more than a confederation and less than a federation the EU interferes into the lives of ordinary people in any policy area<sup>63</sup>. In this regard, Muslims in Europe have also taken place on the agenda of the integration project.

Through a number of steps, the EU seems to have taken the Muslim presence in Europe to its agenda. It has elaborated a series of initiatives in the sphere of immigration control and social affairs and activities organized by the EU institutions. Despite the fact that those steps are far from providing a satisfying consequence they are remarkable because of reflecting the rising awareness of the issue at the EU level.

#### **4.1. Policy Areas of the European Union**

In the general scope, the EU's initiatives addressing the theme of Islam are devoted to the intercultural and interfaith dialogue with Islam in an era of discussions on Islamic terror and violence. Basically, there are the treaty provisions authorizing the EU in this field. For instance Article 52 of the Constitutional Treaty, if it comes into effect, formalizes EU relations with religious communities in the form of consultation and meetings by separating competences between states and the EU institutions. To do so, the Union has policy areas in order to regulate the space of religion: *Justice and Home Affairs (JHA)* and *Social Affairs*.

---

<sup>62</sup>Diez, T. & Wiener, A., (2003) "Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory", in *European Integration Theory*, ed(s) Diez, T. & Wiener, A., New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 18.

<sup>63</sup> Habermas, J. (2001)..., pp. 5.



#### **4. 1. A. Justice and Home Affairs (JHA)**

Renamed as the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) at the end of 2004, JHA regulates immigration and borders control and anti-terrorism measures. It establishes the link between protection of freedoms and development of security. It is a hard task not to abuse the rights and freedoms while taking the EU policies into a security discourse as a precaution to post-9/11 incidents.

Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union puts forward the objective to maintain and develop the EU as an area of freedom, security and justice which makes it a norm-creating power in the international arena<sup>64</sup>. In concern of immigrants and hence Muslims, Articles 61 and 63 of the Treaty Establishing the Community authorizes the EU to adopt appropriate measures on asylum and immigration policies. At this point, by dividing European inhabitants into citizens and immigrants who are mostly Muslim Silvestri warns that strict controls and restrictions on immigration policy which are on the agenda due to security reasons imposed by the fear of terrorism may jeopardize the mutual relations between Europeans and Muslims. Such an attempt could be perceived as an attempt to create barriers between those seen as Europeans and those regarded as the “other” and hence might engender a sense of alienation and isolation on the part of the Muslim communities<sup>65</sup>.

It is obvious that, raising terrorism and the proclaimed interlink between Muslims and terror, or at least the belief that Islam is inherently violent led up to special attentions and controls

---

<sup>64</sup> Manners, I., (2002) “Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 239.

<sup>65</sup> Silvestri, S. (2005) “EU Relations with Islam in the Context of the EMP’s Cultural Dialogue”, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 388.

on Islamic groups in Europe. However, it is both inevitable and hard to differentiate ordinary Muslims from fundamentalists. It is known that there are Muslim people threatening peace and stability in Europe with a claim to serve for Islam and through violent attacks. At the same time there are blameless Muslim people complaining about discriminatory practices and violation of their basic rights. So, discrimination as a societal fact stands to be problem-creating.

#### **4.1. B. Social Affairs**

Social affairs regulated by the EU are about non-discrimination principle which is guaranteed by Article 13 of the Treaty Establishing the European Community. The Article ensures the principle of non-discrimination based on religion and belief together with sex, ethnic or racial origin, sexual orientation and disability. However, focusing on religion as a specific case is recent. In 2000, the EU issued the “Council Directive Establishing a General Framework for Equal Treatment in Employment and Occupation” that prohibits discrimination on the grounds of religion and belief as well as age, sexual orientation and disability”. Basically, the Directive refers to the protection of religious minorities including Muslims in the EU.

In addition to the legal framework, the initiatives that directly address Muslims and Islam are conducted by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) that publishes country reports on anti-Islamic reactions in the EU especially after the rise of terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism and convenes conferences and workshops focusing on these problems. Another important activity which is sponsored by the EU Commission is the conference “Youth and Gender, Trans-National Identities and Islamophobia” in 2003.

Whereas such activities seems not to have attained a ample outcome it is noteworthy that the EU as a normative power to contribute to the global tranquility and good governance reflects its awareness of worsening relations between Europeans and Muslims in Europe in the atmosphere of current international relations.

#### **4.2. An Evaluation: What is Lacking?**

In the light of the EU's initiatives cited above, the general outlook of its stance before the theme of Islam and Muslims in Europe can be pinpointed as<sup>66</sup>:

- Search for a way to remove the causes of migration and restrict it,
- Search for the possibility of an intercultural dialogue under the umbrella of the EU,
- Developing greater understanding between Europeans and Muslims in the continent,
- Ensuring non-discrimination towards the Muslims.

Therefore, Silverstri argues that by the end of the twentieth century transnational nature of the Muslim population in Europe is involved into the process of European integration<sup>67</sup>. Yet, the steps taken are not satisfactory to attain such goals?

Actually, it is not the EU, but the national societies and governments which deal with the integration problem of Muslim immigrants in the legal context. What the EU does here is to make contributions to the nation-state objectives and strategies. If the subject matter is considered in terms of immigration policies the EU's room to maneuver extends in the sense that with the signing of the Amsterdam Treaty immigration policies were restructured under supranational

---

<sup>66</sup> Neuman, P. R. (2006)...., pp. 78-81.

<sup>67</sup> Silvestri, S. (2005)...., pp. 385.

competence of the EU. Therefore, it can be argued that the theme of EU's position toward the Muslims and Islam is related to immigration policies.

However, as cited before, dealing with Islam in Europe has become an issue which can not be addressed adequately if approached as a subtitle of immigration policies. Whereas the introduction of Islam into the Western Europe is via immigration the topic has become so complicated in terms of social, political, economic and demographic aspects that now necessitate further approaches and perspectives. On the other hand, regarding the question of what is new for the engagement of Muslims in Europe under the umbrella of the EU, it can be argued that nothing more than the harmonization of national immigration policies mostly dealing with the newcomers is new. Then, the situation of those who have lived in Europe for decades and gained many rights from nation-states stays and are still not integrated into the society is awkward.

In this perspective, there is a problem of mutual acceptance and of willingness to build up a common world in an era of terrorism and fundamentalism. Due to the fallout of September 11 terrorist attacks and war on terror, communication between Europeans and Muslim communities in Europe has become one of the losing parties. In other words, the conjuncture is against the process of creating a common life-world. Thus, it is inescapable to find out a response to what is the possibility of inter-cultural discourse under the umbrella of European political fabric which satisfies everyone.

# CHAPTER V

## 5. The Shared Life-World in Practice

### 5.1. The Nature of the Existing Life-World: Shared or Separated?

How can the differences be held together? The co-existence of different cultures, within individual lives as well as within communities is a political issue which necessitates reconciliation among different needs and demands on the basis of respect for rights and freedoms. In other words, tolerated and respected diversity of political communities strengthens the value of plurality and participation of all. Thus, all membership systems gain legitimacy when they nurture democratic participation and cultural representation<sup>68</sup>. As Habermas defines, creating the public sphere as a network that gives societies of all political communities an equal opportunity to take part in is an encompassing process of focused political communication<sup>69</sup>.

So, in respect of this study's subject matter, to what extent are the Muslim communities of Europe involved into the system? What is the space of Islam and Muslims within the European societal structure? These questions are about accommodating religious and cultural diversity into the dominant culture in the rhetoric of equality and human dignity. As a division of tasks, the politics of recognition for equal status or respect is the utmost concern for the Europeans at this point. In return, what the Muslims in Europe are required to do is to accept and take part in the societal structure of Europe because of the fact that provided that somebody rejects being included how can it be possible to include him/her?

---

<sup>68</sup>Duvell, F. & Jordan, B., (2003) "Migration: The Boundaries of Equality and Justice", Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 141.

<sup>69</sup> Habermas, J. (2001)...., pp. 17.

In this context, there are two dimensions of the problem: first is to decide on the boundaries of recognition of the largest religious community in Europe for European societies and second is the extremist challenge to cultural pluralism imposed by the raising Islamic fundamentalism in the continent as well as in the world.

Referring the first part of the problem, it is necessary to decide on whether those Muslim immigrants are going to be a part of Europe or to continue as the guests who will return to their homelands one day in the future. Actually, when taking into consideration the presence of indigenous Muslim people of Europe in many European countries such as Greece as well as those immigrants granted many political and economic rights including citizenship it is hard to say that Europe has the possibility of ignoring the socio-political presence of Muslims within it. So, it can be argued that in terms of “functional integration” theorem of Habermas, Muslims are involved into the European system in many respects. This is because they take part within the system with their rights.

Whereas, those Muslim immigrants are more or less inside the system, they are still out of the societal life in their ghettos in the middle of European cities and societies, as mentioned before. Namely, they are not a part of Europe. Therefore, the “life-world” concept of Habermas which heralds social integration is a controversial topic in respect of co-existence of Europeans and Muslims in Europe. At this juncture, the second aspect of the problem comes to the picture. It should be noted that things are worsening due to the atmosphere created by the post-9/11 period that raised the fears that whether Muslims are terrorists and Islam is producing violence. In this process it has become hard to trust on Muslim people for Europeans while Muslims have received the skepticisms of violent events.

To cap it all, the presence of Islam and Muslims has taken place on not political, but social agenda of Europe as the conjuncture necessitated it<sup>70</sup>. As Islamic radicalization turned out to be a phenomenon in the continent Muslims' alienation in their enclaves has attracted attention. Therefore, it was a matter of immigration till recently and is currently a matter of societal fear. It is not still a fact considered within the social sphere in Europe. So, the boundaries of Muslim presence in Europe are fuzzy as a case of "neither inside nor outside".

## **5.2. The Normative Approach of Deliberative Democracy Model**

In the previous sections, the way the Muslims in Europe isolate themselves in their ghettos is expressed. Quoted in Linklater, Jacques Derrida draws attention to the same risk for Europe. There are the ever-deepening cleavages between European societies and their Muslim communities. Within this framework, Derrida states that Europe while weakening the nation-state and reducing its monopoly power in its political fabric may create the risks of pernicious distinctions between itself and the Islamic world by closing in on itself through extending restrictions on migrants and refugees<sup>71</sup>. In order to refute Derrida, what can be a remarkable way to get along with its Muslims for Europe?

The children of former immigrants, and their children's children, have been in European society since the inception. They could not manage to become simultaneously a part of it.

---

<sup>70</sup> Benhabib, S. (2002)..., pp. 164.

<sup>71</sup> Linklater, A. (2005) "Globalization and Transformation of Political Community", in *Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, ed(s) Baylis, J. & Smith, S., New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 722.

Therefore, their challenge is against civil society. These are people refusing to become a part of the society they are living in. This challenge can be defined in terms of including the different nature of foreign cultures and religious communities while embracing them in civil solidarity. Here, the probable solution seem that as Habermas proposes<sup>72</sup>, those who are affected should be participants on the basis of presumption of respect, equality and reciprocity among people which brings us to egalitarian reciprocity or equality proposed by Seyla Benhabib<sup>73</sup>.

From this point of view, referring to Habermas<sup>74</sup>, creating a “European public space” within a shared life-world appears to be viable to integrate the different. By doing so, the pressing problem of fundamentalist challenge to cultural pluralism can be recovered. Dealing with Muslims from the perspective of immigration policy for far too long did not work on behalf of integrating them into European society. Since the beginning of the discourse on fight against terrorism and linkage between terror and Islam, the method has held a place under the heading of domestic security. In the meantime, social rifts within Europe have thrived.

So, in order to tackle such hurdles coordination and acts of understanding should be flourished by a wider polity. For Linklater<sup>75</sup>, neo-medievalist approach states that there should be a political order with multi-tiers of government –sub-national, national and transnational. Then, people will develop loyalty to the state while improving emotional ties with supra- and sub-levels. In this sense, the political order introduced by the Maastricht Treaty offers the opportunity

---

<sup>72</sup> Habermas, J. (1996) “Three Normative Models of Democracy”, in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed(s) Benhabib, S., Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 24-25.

<sup>73</sup> Benhabib, S. (2002)..., pp. 19.

<sup>74</sup> Habermas, J. (2006) “Opening up Fortress Europe”, <http://www.signandsight.com/features/1048.html>, 16.04.2007.

<sup>75</sup> Linklater, A. (2005)..., pp. 725.



of such a wider polity as it signals the time to go higher to the world and lower to the local with no claim of supremacy among them.

Within the political fabric of Europe consisting of nation-states and the EU, identity formation process should be extended beyond the national boundaries through the construction of European-wide public sphere and a political culture embracing everyone. Henceforth, such a public sphere will result to the shared life-world through a valid discourse which is based on deliberation. Then, the glue for the construction of civic solidarity which is the solidarity among strangers will be nurtured<sup>76</sup>.

What is necessary for this glue is the dual-track approach of official and unofficial public spheres within deliberative democracy model<sup>77</sup>. Put differently, not only the representative governmental institutions such as legislative, executive and judiciary but also the civil society including cultural, religious and political associations should be included into the process of communicative action. This is because people who respect for plurality and deliberation capacity of everyone are the legitimating agents of deliberative democracy. Therefore, the inclusion of civil society will create the process of understanding, coordinating action and socialization of individual in the common life-world<sup>78</sup>.

Hereafter, in the light with these theoretical clarifications with an aim of imagining what kind of a political environment might recover the relations between Europeans and Muslims in

---

<sup>76</sup> Habermas, J. (2001)..., pp. 16.

<sup>77</sup> Benhabib, S. (2002)..., pp.21-22.

<sup>78</sup> Cooke, M. (1997)..., pp. 19.

Europe I will continue with an evaluation of what advantages the current political system in Europe yield regarding the Muslim presence in the continent.

### **5.3. Making Space for Muslims in Europe: A Common Life-World via the EU**

The EU has culminated in de-territorialized cultures and communities based on categories of race, religion, and lifestyle in the continent by removing the borders<sup>79</sup>. In creating such a polity the objective is to attain the shared values of liberty, peace and stability, democracy, human rights, tolerance, solidarity and non-discrimination under the umbrella of shared policies and institutions<sup>80</sup>. For this reason, political integration is pursued by taking full account of national and regional identities, cultures and traditions as a melting pot. It shall be assessed as the culture of Europe's new political system.

This pluralistic discourse of the EU envisions a cohesive societal structure and the recognition of group-specific rights for cultural minorities within the supranational authority. In other words, unity and diversity will be together as cultural differences will be recognized under the umbrella of Europe's common cultural heritage<sup>81</sup>. Within this framework, the EU as an ever-closer union could be more successful than its member states in dealing with Muslims in Europe

---

<sup>79</sup> Fetzer, J. S. & Soper J. C. (2003) "The Roots of Public Attitudes Toward State Accommodation of European Muslims' Religious Practices Before and After September 11", *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 247.

<sup>80</sup> Barroso, J. M. (2005) "Mutual Respect, Transparency, Exchanges, Unity in Diversity: The Dialogue between the European Commission and Churches and Religions in Europe", Speech/01/804: Meeting with Religious Leaders, Brussels, [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy\\_advisers/activities/dialogues\\_religions/docs/speech\\_president\\_12\\_07\\_2005\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy_advisers/activities/dialogues_religions/docs/speech_president_12_07_2005_en.pdf), 17.04.2007, pp. 1-4.; Commission of the European Communities (2000) "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Strategic Objectives 2000-5: Shaping the New Europe", Brussels, [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/off/work/2000-2005/com154\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/off/work/2000-2005/com154_en.pdf), 01.05.2007, pp. 3.

<sup>81</sup> Hellström, A. (2003) "(Re)making European Union", in *Identity Dynamics and the Construction of Boundaries*", ed(s) Petersson, B. & Clark, E., Lund: Nordic Academic Press, pp. 181-182.

who have already started to take place on the EU agenda with day-by-day growing awareness. What can the Union do to integrate those Muslims into European societies?

At first, the EU is undergoing an identity-building process. It creates a new form of belonging via an all embracing discourse with respect to any distinctive identities. It puts forward the objective of unifying people from diverse backgrounds and identities by creating the soul of Europe<sup>82</sup>. This is a great advantage for the EU which will get more involved in Islamic affairs in the continent. In this sense, the discourses at the nation-state levels which reflect the fear from Islam due to security matters have nothing to do to be compared with that of the EU for fostering mutual understanding. Therefore, the Union can be more successful than its members to diagnose the dialogue with the Muslim communities and should make use of this advantage by giving a frank emphasis on the presence of Muslims in Europe as engaged in societal life.

Bound with this inclusive discourse, the EU which tries to reconcile different national and cultural identities can offer a fruitful basis for cross-cultural and inter-cultural associations and regional platforms which are necessary for deliberation of people. In other words, the EU shall foster communicative action as it is on the way of being a common life-world of everybody inside its borders.

Apart from the discourse change that the EU is able to incarnate while constructing its own identity there is another reason why the EU may be more successful than its member states at engaging the Muslim communities. As known, nation-states have been encapsulated by supranational authority of the Union. Habermas questions the capabilities of nation-states to cope

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid, pp. 189-191.

with the challenges of transnational economic and political activities stating that a cosmopolitan regime could be more operative<sup>83</sup>. In the case of Euro-politics, according to Benhabib, as the Union citizenship progresses, discrepancies in each member country arises between those who are foreigners and third country nationals, and foreign nationals but the EU members<sup>84</sup>. As a result, a two-tiered status of foreignness at both national and supranational levels has been emerged<sup>85</sup>. So, there is the necessity to harmonize the laws of member states to reduce those discrepancies in juridical and political status of immigrants at the supra national level.

The last but not least advantage that the EU has in its initiatives regarding Muslims and Islam is the normative nature of its policies. As a normative power it targets to contribute to the global as well as continental peace and prosperity through conditionality. It highlights the promotion of human rights for equality, rule of law for anti-discrimination, liberty for social solidarity and good governance for the wealth and prosperity of all while developing its policies<sup>86</sup>. Such goals are high likely to gain the sympathy of Muslim communities toward the EU as they can cultivate the sentiment of being considered.

To sum up, to develop a common policy towards Islam and Muslims can be possible only through more initiatives by the EU at least where the member states hardly take steps. This is since those member states are still the major agents of the process. However, recalling the failure of the states' realization of socio-political problems associated with their Muslim immigrants the EU should be more careful about its steps in this regard. It is no doubt that the EU is an essential

---

<sup>83</sup> Habermas, J. (1998), "Beyond Nation-State", *Peace Review*.

<sup>84</sup> Benhabib, S. (2002)..., pp. 158.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Manners, I., (2002)..., pp. 242-244.

actor affecting the lives of those people and does not yet reveal enough concern for them in spite of its growing awareness. Its focal point is just the external dimension of the overall immigration policies in the continent by trying to come up with solutions to the reasons of immigration<sup>87</sup>. From this point of view it is the time for the EU to attach the necessary attention to the case of Muslims in Europe while undergoing a construction period of its socio-political fabric and identity dynamics.

## CHAPTER VI

### 6. Concluding Remarks

By grasping whether the presence of Muslims in Europe has exerted influence in the socio-political fabric of Europe, this study proposes three conclusions.

*Firstly*, their presence in Europe has never received and does still not receive the due concern. Recently, their social status has transformed from being the “guest workers” of European economies to being the threats or challenges to the security of European societies because of raising religious fundamentalism and radicalism. Therefore, they have taken part on the agenda as a security matter in addition to immigration. Hence, after decades of their first coming to the continent, their place within the public spheres of nation states they are living in started being questioned with reluctance. The social tensions imposed by immigrant Muslims’ ghettos pushed the way for further attention to them.

---

<sup>87</sup> Boswell, C. (2003) “The Externalization of Immigration and Asylum Policy”, *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 3, pp. 622-630.

In this sense, nation-state strategies, even the ones with a reputation of tolerance have failed to bring about remarkable solutions to the question of the Muslims in Europe. On the one hand, there are the Muslim groupings in their isolated and alienated enclaves at the centers of European cities. Those groupings are far from getting along with European social life and strictly bound with their homeland culture and tradition. On the other hand, under the shadow of the post-9/11 period and debate on the linkage between Islam and terror there are the European societies with a fear from and antipathy toward those enclaves. Social cleavages between the hosts and guests of Europe are deepening as there are mutual fear, distrust and skepticism between the parties instead of mutual understanding and deliberation based on rationality.

Simultaneously, there is an ongoing political restructuring through the European Union in the continent. The *second* concern of this study is to have a glimpse of EU level policies promoting cultural diversity on an equal basis in order to comprehend what can and should the EU do to deal with the integration problem of Muslims. The EU is the current form of the unfinished integration project. It is still undergoing a process of identity formation with an all embracing mentality to bring the diverse European societies together. In this picture designed for a more peaceful Europe via the coexistence of differences, however, the EU is still far from addressing the case of Muslims inside the continent adequately.

It is true that there is a growing awareness at the EU level to deal with the problem but the strategy seems not to be promising. This is due to the fact that the EU has a concern of the theme of Muslims from an “immigration policy” point of view by focusing on how to prevent the newcomers. The problem of the inhabitant Muslims who are either the citizens in the country

they live in or with many political and economic rights stays untouched at the EU level. Nation states are still the major actors regarding this problem despite lacking with their policies.

*Thirdly*, the findings of this study show that the way to include the Muslims into European societies is to apply to the instruments of the model of deliberative democracy under the umbrella of the EU. Why is the EU?

The EU has greater advantages compared to the nation states. Its discourse for openness to diversity can be a fruitful basis to culminate in dialogue between the Muslims and Europeans and these parties can debate their arguments and positions. As well, it does not recall bad memories for people as it stands with completely fresh and unique strategies as a normative power. In this picture, the task of commencing dialogue and deliberating with the Muslims becomes easier. In addition, there is a continuing process of creating Europe-wide public sphere and this process shall provide the opportunity of representation for everybody including the Muslims in order to prevent further alienation and hence marginalization of these people. So, the EU should be more involved into the subject matter of this study.

# REFERENCES

## Books

Allen, C. (2006) “United Kingdom- Final Report 2006”, in *Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Islamophobia is More of a Predicament than an Explanation*, ed(s). Cesari, J., EUMC, [http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf\\_Challenge\\_Project\\_report.pdf](http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_Challenge_Project_report.pdf), 16.04.2007

Benhabib, S. (2002) *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, S. (1996) “Toward a Deliberative Model of Democracy”, in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed(s) Benhabib, S., Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cesari, J. (2006) “Use of the Term ‘Islamophobia’ in Islamic Societies”, in *Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Islamophobia is More of a Predicament than an Explanation*, ed(s). Cesari, J., EUMC, [http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf\\_Challenge\\_Project\\_report.pdf](http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_Challenge_Project_report.pdf), 16.04.2007.

Cooke, M. (1997) *Language and Reason: A Study of Habermas’ Pragmatics*, London: The MIT Press.

Diez, T. & Wiener, A., (2003) “Introducing the Mosaic of Integration Theory”, in *European Integration Theory*, ed(s) Diez, T. & Wiener, A., New York: Oxford University Press.

Duvell, F. & Jordan, B., (2003) *Migration: The Boundaries of Equality and Justice*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1996) “Three Normative Models of Democracy”, in *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed(s) Benhabib, S., Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1991) *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Hellström, A. (2003) “(Re)making European Union”, in *Identity Dynamics and the Construction of Boundaries*, ed(s) Petersson, B. & Clark, E., Lund: Nordic Academic Press

Hopkin, J. (2002) “Comparative Methods”, in *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, ed(s) Marsh, D. & Stoker, D., London: Palgrave.

Khaliq, U. (2004) “Islam and the European Union: Report on the United Kingdom”, in *Islam and the European Union*, ed(s) Potz, R. & Wieshaider, W., Paris: Peeters.



Lijphart, A. (1969), "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method", The Round Table Conference on Comparative Politics of the International Political Science Association, Turin, 14 October 1969.

Linklater, A., (2005) "A European Civilizing Process?", in *International Relations and the European Union*, (eds) Hill, C. & Smith, M., New York: Oxford University Press.

Linklater, A. (2005) "Globalization and Transformation of Political Community", in *Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, ed(s) Baylis, J. & Smith, S., New York: Oxford University Press.

Maussen, M. (2006) "Anti-Muslim Sentiments and Mobilization in the Netherlands. Discourse, Policies and Violence, in *Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Islamophobia is More of a Predicament than an Explanation*, ed(s). Cesari, J., EUMC, [http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf\\_Challenge\\_Project\\_report.pdf](http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_Challenge_Project_report.pdf), 16.04.2007.

Rex, J. (2004) "Multiculturalism and Political Integration in the Modern Nation-State", in *Governance in Multicultural Societies*, ed(s) Rex, J. & Gurharpal Singh, Wiltshire: Ashgate.

## Journals

Ahmad, F. (2006) "British Muslim Perceptions and Opinions on New Coverage of September 11", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 6, pp.961-982.

Baxter, K. (2006) "From Migrants to Citizens: 1950s-1990s", *Immigrants and Minorities*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 164-192.

Birt, J. (2006) "Good Imam, Bad Imam: Civic Religion and National Integration in Britain", *The Muslim World*, Vol. 96, pp. 687-705.

Boswell, C. (2003) "The Externalization of Immigration and Asylum Policy", *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 3, pp. 619-638.

Carle, R. (2006) "Demise of Dutch Multiculturalism", *Society*, pp. 68-74.

Fetzer, J. S. & Soper J. C. (2003) "The Roots of Public Attitudes Toward State Accommodation of European Muslims' Religious Practices Before and After September 11", *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 247-258.

Habermas, J. (2006) "Opening up Fortress Europe", <http://www.signandsight.com/features/1048.html>, 16.04.2007.

Habermas, J. (2003) "Intolerance and Discrimination", *Oxford University Press and New York University School of Law*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 2-12.

- Habermas, J. (2003) "Toward a Cosmopolitan Europe", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 86-100.
- Habermas, J. (2001) "Why Europe Needs a Constitution", *New Left Review*, pp. 5-26.
- Habermas, J. (1993) "Struggles for Recognition in Constitutional States", *European Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 128-155.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993) "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, pp. 22-49.
- Karic, E. (2002) "Is 'Euro-Islam' a Myth, Challenge or a Real Opportunity for Muslims in Europe", *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 435-442.
- Kelly, R. (9 April 2007) "Time for a British Version of Islam", *New Statesman*, pp. 11.
- Leiken, R. (2005) "Europe's Angry Muslims", *Foreign Affairs*.
- Lewis, P. (2003) "Christians and Muslims in the West: From Isolation to Shared Citizenship", *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3., No. 2, pp. 77-100.
- "Living with Islam: The New Dutch Model" (2 April 2005), *The Economist*, Vol. 375, No. 8420, pp. 24-26.
- Manners, I., (2002) "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 235-58.
- Margaronis, M. (2004) "Dutch Tolerance Tried", *The Nation*, pp. 6, 28.
- Neuman, P. R. (2006) "Europe's Jihadist Dilemma", *Survival*, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 71-84.
- Nieman, A. (2004) "Between Communicative Action and Strategic Action: Article 113 Committee and the Negotiations on the WTO Basic Telecommunications Services Agreement", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 379-407.
- Piscatori, J. (1990) "The Rushdie Affair and the Politics of Ambiguity", *International Affairs*, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 767-789.
- Ramadan, T. (2003) "Islam and Muslims in Europe", *EUMC Equal Voices*, No. 10. [http://fra.europa.eu/fra/index.php?fuseaction=content.dsp\\_cat\\_content&contentid=3e3e8c602f879&catid=3e3e6e32a2316&search=1&frmsearch=islamophobia&lang=EN](http://fra.europa.eu/fra/index.php?fuseaction=content.dsp_cat_content&contentid=3e3e8c602f879&catid=3e3e6e32a2316&search=1&frmsearch=islamophobia&lang=EN), 10.04.2007.
- Risse, T. (2000) "Let's Argue: Communicative Action in World Politics", *International Organization*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 1-39.

Shadid, W. A. (1991) “The Integration of Muslim Minorities in the Netherlands”, *International Migration Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 355-374.

Shadid, W. A. (2006), “Public Debates Over Islam and the Awareness of Muslim Identity in the Netherlands”, *European Education*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 10-22.

Silvestri, S. (2005) “EU Relations with Islam in the Context of the EMP’s Cultural Dialogue”, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 385-405.

Winter, L. de. (16 July 2005) “Tolerating a Time Bomb,” *New York Times*.

Ziauddin, S. (3 July 2006) “Can British Islam Change?”, *New Statesman*, pp. 34-36.

(2 April 2005) “Living with Islam: The New Dutch Model”, *The Economist*, Vol. 375, No. 8420, pp. 24-26.

## Official Documents

Barroso, J. M. (2005) “Mutual Respect, Transparency, Exchanges, Unity in Diversity: The Dialogue between the European Commission and Churches and Religions in Europe”, Speech/01/804: Meeting with Religious Leaders, Brussels, [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy\\_advisers/activities/dialogues\\_religions/docs/speech\\_president\\_12\\_07\\_2005\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy_advisers/activities/dialogues_religions/docs/speech_president_12_07_2005_en.pdf), 17.04.2007, pp. 1-4.

Commission of the European Communities (2000) “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Strategic Objectives 2000-5: Shaping the New Europe”, Brussels, [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/off/work/2000-2005/com154\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/off/work/2000-2005/com154_en.pdf), 01.05.2007, pp. 1-12.

“Consolidated Versions of Treaty on the European Union and of the Treaty Establishing the European Community (Consolidated Text)”, *Official Journal C 321E of 29 December 2006*, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/ce321/ce32120061229en00010331.pdf>, 04.04.2007.

“Council Directive 27 November 2000 Establishing a General Framework for Equal Treatment in Employment and Occupation”, *Official Journal L 303 of 2 December 2000*, [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2000/l\\_303/l\\_30320001202en00160022.pdf](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2000/l_303/l_30320001202en00160022.pdf)

“Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe”, *Official Journal C 310 of 16 December 2004*, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:310:SOM:EN:HTML>, 04.04.2007.

EUMC (2002) “Highlights of the Report on Muslims in the European Union: Discrimination and Islamophobia”, <http://eumc.europa.eu/eumc/material/pub/muslim/EUMC-highlights-EN.pdf>, 12.04.2007.