

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of 8 Mai 1945/Guelma

Faculty of Letters and languages

Department of Letters and English Language

جامعة 8 ماي/1945/قائمة

كلية الآداب و اللغات

الاداب واللغة الانجليزية قسم



The Coming of Conservatives to Power and the Future of
Multiculturalism in Britain.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Master's Degree in English Language,
Literatures and Civilization.

Board of Examiners

Chairman: Mr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid

Supervisor: Mr. ALI ZOUÏ Mahfoud

Examiner: Ms. KRIBES Amina

Students:

BELHOUCHE Amna

BOUDGHIS Hasna

Supervisor:

Mr. ALI ZOUÏ Mahfoud

June 2016

Dedication 1

This work is dedicated to:

The sake of Allah, my creator, master and the ever-magnificent for his bless;
My great parents Henia and Boudjemaa, for granting me all their priceless love kindness,
prayers, and generous support.

My beloved sister, Meryem for being so supportive to me all the time when things look
bleak.

My brothers, Hamza, Ayoub and Mohamed El-Amin who granted me worthy advice to
work hard in order to reach my purpose,

My soulemate and my husband Yacine,

The dearest angels to my heart Ritej and Arij,

My dearest friends, who had been always there to listen and provide me all the persistent
support I need throughout my work,

To all the relatives and people in my life who touch my heart, I dedicate my research.

(Belhouchet Amna).

Dedication 2

My Dissertation is dedicated to:

My precious parents: Belkacem and Fatima and i am grateful to their great support and
countless advice

My sweetheart sisters Samiha, Saliha, Nadia and Zineb

My dearest brothers Lahbib, Yahia and Hamza

My magnificent husband Adel

And finaly, to all my ultimate friends.

(Boudghis Hasna).

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, we would like to express our sincere and wholehearted gratefulness to our respectful tutor, Mr. Mahfoud AliZoui for his valuable aid that kept us always so energetic to offer the best, for his motivation, patience and his appreciation to our efforts.

We owe a deep debt of gratitude as well to the examining members of the jury: Mr. Boudechiche Hamid and Ms. Kribes Amina for their evaluation to our research, perceptive comments, and stimulating discussions.

Besides, we took this chance to highly appreciate the efforts offered by the administrative staff at the Department of Letters and English Language, who did their best to provide us with everything new.

Abstract

The present study investigates the state of the policy of multiculturalism in Britain, which was historically promoted by the Labour Party, since the coming of the Conservative party to power in 2010. It is the general aim of this research to analyze and explore the status of ethno-cultural diversity in Britain; the concept which has been often dubbed as Multiculturalism, with an attempt to foresee its future in the light of the Conservative party and its leader David Cameron's political discourse. Analyzing this discourse which proclaimed openly the failure of what Britain's Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron called 'state multiculturalism' and drawing on the changing social policies adopted by the new government, this study highlights the changes in social policies in Britain before and after the rise of Conservatives to power, scrutinizes the retreat in state engagement towards cultural diversity and tries to foresee the future of Multicultural Britain. The conservative government revealed its intentions regarding ethnic and religious diversity in the country since its early days in office. They argued that multiculturalism have been the origin of many evils in society including separatism, radicalization and terrorism especially among Muslim communities. The Conservative government preferred the "community cohesion" paradigm to that of the old "community of communities" one. This dissertation attempts also to reveal the fallacy of the Conservative claim about the failure of multiculturalism.

ملخص:

تلقي هذه الدراسة الضوء على وضعية سياسة "التعددية الثقافية"، التي ارتبط تطبيقها تاريخيا في بريطانيا بحزب العمال، غداة وصول حزب المحافظين الى سدة الحكم سنة 2010. تهدف الدراسة عموما الى تحليل وضعية التنوع الاثني و الثقافي ومحاولة التنبؤ بمصير "التعددية الثقافية" مستقبلا في ضل الخطاب الجديد و الخطوات التي شرع فيها حزب المحافظين و زعيمه ديفيد كاميرون، من خلال تحليل هذا الخطاب السياسي الجديد الذي يزعم صراحة أن هذه السياسة قد أثبتت فشلها واستنادا على السياسات الاجتماعية الجديدة التي تبنتها الحكومة الجديدة تسعى هذه الدراسة الى ابراز التغيرات في السياسات تجاه الأقليات قبل و بعد وصول المحافظين الى الحكم، كما تبين التراجع في التزام الحكومة البريطانية تجاه التنوع الاثني و الثقافي في البلاد محاولة التنبأ بمستقبل "التعددية الثقافية". لقد كشفت حكومة المحافظين عن نواياها في ما يخص التعامل مع التنوع الديني و الاثني في البلاد منذ البداية حيث زعم ديفيد كاميرون أن سياسة "التعددية الثقافية" كانت سببا في العديد من المشاكل التي تتخبط فيها البلاد من تفرقة مجتمعية و رجعية و اهاب خاصة عند المسلمين كما فضلت نمودجا اجتماعيا جديدا "التماسك المجتمعي" بدلا للنموذج الذي تبناه حزب العمال "مجتمع من مجتمعات". يهدف هذا البحث كذلك الى ضحد مزاعم حزب المحافظين حول فشل سياسة "التعددية الثقافية"

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Overview of British Multiculturalism.....	6
1.1. The History of Immigration.....	7
1.1.1. The First Waves of Immigration.....	7
1.1.2. Post Second World War Immigration.....	9
1.1.2.1. The Commonwealth Citizens.....	9
1.1.2.2. The Refugee Immigration.....	10
1.2. Reception of Immigrants.....	11
1.3. Major Challenges to Immigrants.....	12
1.4. The Government Regulation of Immigration Laws.....	13
1.5. The Rise of Multiculturalism as a Response to Multicultural Ethnicity.....	19
Chapter Two: Labour Party and Multiculturalism.....	22
2.1. “Old” Labour Party.....	23
2.2. Multiculturalism under the “New” Labour Party.....	24
2.2.1. The Rise of New Labour.....	24
2.2.2. The Evolution of British Multiculturalism under New Labour.....	25
2.2.3. The Stating Retreat of Multiculturalism.....	28
2.3. Terrorist Attacks and the New Challenges to British Multiculturalism.....	30
2.3.1. 9/11 and its Impact on Minorities in Britain.....	30
2.3.2. New Labour Responses to 7/7 London Bombing	31

2.3.3. Multiculturalism Post 7/7.....	34
2.4. The Impact of Media on Islamophobia and Multiculturalism.....	35
Chapter Three: The Rise of the Conservative Party and the Place of Multiculturalism in its Agenda.....	38
3.1. The Old Conservative Party and its Attitudes toward Immigration... 39	
3.2. Forming the Coalition Government.....	40
3.3. Significance of David Cameron’s “Multiculturalism Speech.....	41
3.4. Conservatives ‘Responses to Cameron’s Speech.....	44
3.5. David Cameron’s Fight against Extremism.....	44
3.6. The Muslim Groups Responses to the Prime Minister’s Statements about Muslims and Extremism.....	46
3.7. British Multiculturalism under the Conservatives.....	48
Conclusion.....	55
Bibliography.....	59

Introduction

With the massive flow of immigrants coming to Europe and the United States, especially during post-WWII, one of the most vexing issues facing the governments of these countries has been how newcomers could be best absorbed into the mainstream of the host societies. With problems of multi-ethnicity and cultural identity in western societies made up largely of diverse ethnic groups from different cultural backgrounds, many paradigms have been introduced.

During large waves of immigration to Europe, the main obsession was how to make the new immigrants blend their original cultural traditions into a homogenous, ever evolving indigenous identity, and with the passing of time form a kind of common identity. The fact that the different ethnic minority groups wanted to preserve their native identity led to the rise of Multiculturalism.

Under this policy, the emphasis was shifted from eliminating differences to celebrating them. A climate of cultural diversity should be seen as something positive. Multiculturalism was advocated in many European countries then instead of assimilation. It was adopted in Britain as a state policy in 1997 to curb the cultural diversity.

As a social paradigm, Multiculturalism is considered as a product of distinct episodes of immigration, and in its political concept, it came to mean a set of state policies standing for acknowledging multicultural identities and recognizing ethno religious groups. Multiculturalism was seen as an eminent social fact within many European societies such as France and Germany.

In Britain the advance of multiculturalism was historically associated with the Labour party, which provided considerable concessions to ethnic minorities through an inclusive social policy. This has to do with the party's ideology. Labour as a left wing party has always sided with workers and supported their demands and as most immigrants belonged

to the working class, promoting multiculturalism recognizing immigrants' right to keep aspects of their original identities was approached within the framework of supporting workers and of winning their support in elections. When New Labour came to power in the UK in 1997, patronized multicultural policies and promoted a "community of communities" social paradigm which seemed appropriate and promising. Multiculturalism, on the other hand, never seemed compatible with the Conservative party's social and political philosophy.

When the Conservatives came to power and led the first coalition government in 2010, a lot of question marks were put as regard the future of multicultural politics in Britain. This research work's main objective is to shed light on the state of Multiculturalism as a social phenomenon and a state policy in Britain since the coming of the Conservative party to power in 2010, and its reelection in 2015 trying to oversee the future of the British social policy, and the fate of multiculturalism.

Drawing on the political discourse of the Conservative party leaders at the dawn of their rise to power in 2010 concerning multiculturalism in Britain and its alleged role in nurturing radicalization and separatism in the country and thus its failure to strengthen community cohesion, the study investigates the Conservatives intentions regarding state multiculturalism and tries to foresee the future of ethnic and cultural pluralism in Britain.

Thus, this study is divided into three main chapters. The introductory chapter is devoted to supply theoretical frame work and brief historical glimpse about the cultural diversity in Britain, the contradictory factors that forced or even catalyzed immigrants to mobilize. To set this issue into a wider context, we need to explain their actions of the mainstream population to the newcomers, so that to depict their situation in the country and to fully understand the xenophobic tensions they encountered in their presence within this new

geographical area taking into account as well the regulating laws and the potential solutions that the government introduced to manage ethnic pluralism.

The second chapter will firstly shed light on the Old British Labour Party and its principles and social philosophy, then, it will provide an assessment of British Multiculturalism as a new social solution, adopted mainly with the coming of the British labour party to power in 1997, with its political commitment to “Cool Britannia”. Although this new perspective marked a turning point in the British Multicultural nature, it is deemed crucial to put a greater emphasis on the pillar factors that led to its retreat, and to explain how these latter became more stimulated with the terrorist tragic scenes of 9/11/and 7/7 London Bombings, to bring at the end a sort of new challenges to this social and racial mix, putting a significant pressure on Muslims, being the first to be dubbed as the “culprits of terrorism”.

The impact of British mass media in the rise of Islamophobia, and how these incidents had evoked a serious concern of the Labour Party Leaders namely, Tony Blair and Gordon Brown to raise the continual quests, of how to strengthen Britishness through solid integration policies is taken into account.

In chapter three, at the start we are going to weave general overview about the old British Conservative Party and its attitudes toward immigration, discussing the coming of the Coalition Government to power in 2010 under the leadership of David Cameron and on which ground it was formed, moving to the sharp attack of the newly elected Prime Minister on Multiculturalism. This latter decried rhetorically this social trend and proclaimed its failure in a 2011 speech in Munich.

Throughout this chapter, it is necessary to raise the reader’s attention to the critical views of Cameron’s speech, the measures that he adopted against extremism which

breathed in a way several scathing reactions by Muslim groups that saw the speech as derogatory political reflection toward all what is linked to Muslims and Islam.

The significance of the study is to assess the state of British Multiculturalism under Labour party starting from 1997, discussing its fate when the conservatives came to power in 2010, and analyzing the changing rhetoric of the Conservatives and their leader David Cameron about the failure of multiculturalism.

The research method used to approach the objectives is based on the descriptive analytical procedure, in examining and diagnosing the anticipated fate of multiculturalism in Britain from both political and public point of views. The historical approach is used in reviewing the history of immigration to Britain and the chronology of events leading to the rise of multiculturalism in Britain.

Throughout history, Britain was the host land to a considerable number of immigrants from a variety of backgrounds, the phenomenon that was discussed by many writers, among them David Conway who stated in his Book *A Nation of Immigrants? A Brief Demographic History of Britain* that from ancient times Britain received large influx of immigrants which flourished after the Second World War and led to demographic and cultural changes.

Another Book entitled *Multiculturalism: a Civic Idea* written by Tariq Modood who examines the status of Multiculturalism as a social phenomenon and as a state policy under the New Labour government.

The research extended also to encompass other different Articles and reports taking as an example “David Cameron’s Speech on Immigration” in which the Prime Minister show the Conservatives great opposition to immigrants and declared officially that Multiculturalism as a state policy is declined.

Mike Vilensky is the author of a very interesting Article published in the Daily Intelligencer newspaper entitled “David Cameron: Multiculturalism has Failed”, it analyses and examines Cameron’s speech.

Another important Article was written by the freelance writer Kasmi Aycha “It is not Multiculturalism that has Failed, it is David Cameron” in which she argued that Multiculturalism in Britain existed and still exists and Cameron’s speech is no more than a political expediency.

An interesting Article published in the famous newspaper the Guardian and entitled “Labours Sadiq Khan Elected Mayor of London”, discusses the unexpected victory of the first Muslim mayor on the British soils in 2016, the fact that is used in this dissertation as a tangible proof about Multiculturalism existence in Britain. These and many other sources are used in our research.

Chapter One

An Overview of British Multiculturalism

Throughout history, the British Isles have always been a land of immigrants. The arrival of successive waves of different people from different backgrounds including: Romans, Blacks, Asians, Germans, Jews, and Africans have been a persistent fact in British history. Immigrants, thus, constitute an undeniable part of the fabric of British society and have played a significant contributory role to the building of Great Britain since early times.

These immigrants were pushed by different factors to leave their homelands, and Britain was considered for them as a sanctuary in which they could find better life and brighter future. During periods of large waves of Immigration to Britain, newcomers faced many obstacles. The immigration experience was often harsh and difficult.

Immigration to Britain was more active after the Second World War, when the state was suffering economic crisis and in need of foreign hard workers with low wages to help in the reconstruction of the British international reputation, this demand factor, paved the way to a considerable number of people to enter the country and fill the shortage in labour. The huge influx of immigrants, and the existence of multi-races, however, put the country in a dramatic status and led to the rise of xenophobia.

The rise of anti-immigrant feelings forced the British Government (Labour or Conservative) to act in order to restrict the inflow by proposing different laws, and regulating measures in which the number of the newcomers should decrease, and settlement should be permitted to a specific category of people, who were asked to forget about their own customs, traditions, religions, and to adopt the British values and to melt within the mainstream society.

Immigrants played a major role in the development of economic and social sectors, they established new businesses and were self-employed helping in the reconstruction of the

state's welfare, but their high proportion led to the appearance of a new challenge regarding the best way to deal with diversity in the British society.

1.1. The History of Immigration to Britain

The freelance writer Jenny Higgins in her Article "Newfoundland and Labrador Heritage" stated that most of the newcomers were pushed to leave their homelands due to complex and controversial factors such as, political instability, economic crisis, religious oppressions, and Britain was considered for them as the safe heaven where they could find a better life and brighter future. As a result to those demand factors, the immigrants were distanced from their countries and were seen as odds, within a new geographical place.

Immigration is often defined by the researcher Natalie Abrahamova in his Master Thesis "Immigration to Britain since 1962" as:

The movement of people from one place to another. While human migration has existed throughout human history immigration implies long-term permanent or forced indefinite residence (and often eventually citizenship) by the immigrants tourists and short-term visitors are not considered immigrants... (10).

Accordingly, immigration as a social phenomenon is about peoples' transformation of their habitual residence to another place, whereas visitors who came for several months were not categorized within the realm of immigrants.

1.1.1. The First Waves of Immigrants to Britain

The Roman invasion to Britain was a turning point in the British immigration history, following the Celts who were the first settlers localized during the first Millennium BC, the Roman conquest entered the country bringing with it the first Black groups, then, immigration extended to encompass other races from Northern Europe, in particular, Angles, Saxons, Danes, Norse and Jews who were barred from the country by Edward 1 in

1290. During William's incursion to Britain, the unwelcomed Jews were invited again, to help in the economic development, using their own finance, and by the 15th century, a considerable number of "Marranos merchants" constituted a ghetto society (Conway 27, 33; and Vaughan).

The British openness fascinated also a significant number of Muslim merchants, in the 18th century who were known as "Lascars", and centralized in Cardiff, Liverpool, Glasgow and London. ("The United Kingdom..."). The inflow of immigrants to the newfoundland was in a dramatic growth, and by 1846, a new form of displacement emerged which is the internal migration, characterized by the arrival of the Irish groups to Britain, fleeing the miserable life conditions the potato famine, and hold 3 % the total British population by 1880 (Conway 42). Thus, the potato famine of 1846 was a motivating force behind the Irish interregional mobility. Immigration to Britain continued at a high rate, especially, from the 19th century to the 20th centuries. ("The United Kingdom..."). (See Appendix 1).

The successive waves of immigrants to Britain were not restricted to Romans and Jews, it was broadened to include Blacks, Africans, Asians, Caribbeans and so on. The phenomenon was highly eminent between the 16th century and the Second World War.

The Conservative Party since its emergence in 1830, have played a major role in regulating the foreigners entering to Britain, through passing different acts and obligatory measures that permitted settlement to specific category of people, and the establishment of The Aliens Bill of 1904 was an urgent plan and a serious reaction made by the government to constraint the waves, and exclude the odds from the mainstream society (Cesarani and Kushner 30). But, their efforts were not highly successful, and immigration was in a rapid growth.

1.1.2. Post Second World War Immigration into Britain

At first, it is necessary to note that the intense communal debate on multiculturalism and the state of ethnic pluralism was becoming increasingly prominent, particularly speaking, after the Second World War (Modood and May 305). During This era, Britain was suffering from economic crisis, and in need of hard and serious workers, which obliged the Labour Government to establish a new agenda and to declare officially that:

Every person who...is a citizen of the UK and Colonies or...is a citizen of [Canada, Australia, Newzeland, South Africa, Newfoundland, India, Pakistan, Sothern Rhodesia and Ceylon] shall by virtue of that citizenship have the status of a British subject, retaining the legal right to enter, settle, and work in Britain unconditionally” (Smith and Marmo 347).

Consequently, the Labour shortage in Britain resulted in inviting and welcoming the Commonwealth citizens, to enter the Country and help in the reconstruction of what had been lost.

1.1.2.1. The Commonwealth Citizens

From a legal standpoint, nearly 500.000 Commonwealth citizen who were known as British Subjects, made their way to the country before 1962 taking The British Nationality Act of 1948 as a guarantee to their rights, the Act ensure to the newcomers full British citizenship with the freedom of living and working. This picture of human movement, led to a massive increase in the level of migration, and the disability of Britain to control all the waves, which obliged the State to find new laws to regulate immigration (Crowther 268; Somerville, Sriskandarajah, and Lattorre). Accordingly, Britain contributed significantly in mobilizing such a specific category of workers, from their homelands to

benefit from their own experiences and exploiting them with low wages, to re-emerge as an economic power, and the human displacement was not restricted only to ex-colonial migrants.

As it was noticeable that Post Second World War era mainly in 1948 has brought the Windrush conquest, a ship that came from Jamaica and was carrying almost 500 passengers; from the Caribbean descent, since they were welcomed and encouraged by the government to enter, they played a pivotal role in boosting the economic situation of the country (“the Empire Windrush...” 1, 2). Consequently, the British openness and reception of multiple races was the first reaction made by the government to exceed the tragedy. The successive waves of immigrants to Britain helped the country not only in reviving its economy and rebuilding its international reputation, but also they maintained a cultural diversity within the mainstream society.

1.1.2.2. The Refugee Immigration

The Refugee immigration to Britain flourished after the Second World War, since the country was deemed as a shelter to millions of foreigners, escaping political instability. According to the Writer and Professor Panikos Panayi in his Article “Multicultural Britain: a Very Brief History” Britain created a safe environment for those aliens who were looking for international security, when it turned them into Asylum Seekers, and granted them the right to live and work freely, but, the aim behind this solidarity is to benefit from their previous experiences in reconstructing its economic power (8). Thus, the highly educated foreigners were welcomed in Britain for economic purposes, the state confirmed their protection to benefit from what they already knew in rebuilding its economy.

The asylums’ protection was the product of the 1951 Convention, an official draft signed by 102 states and adopted by the United Nations, it came into practice in 1954, and it was devoted for those persons who were seeking international security since they lost it

in their homelands. According to this law, the asylums permitted religious and social freedom (Weiss 1, 3). In response to the Convention, refugees from all over the world came to Britain, and immigration during this era was not restricted only to former colonies citizens or refugees, it comprised millions of people from a variety of backgrounds.

By 1951, Britain had witnessed the arrival of a huge influx of nearly 200,000 black immigrants, centralized in London, Birmingham, and Bradford (“Love Thy Neighbour...” 230). In this point, it seems so obvious that the British Nationality Act had indeed played a significant role in the enhancement of migrants’ situation in Britain, through patronizing and sponsoring their civic rights. Yet, the notion of immigration at that time was still seen as a fraught issue with divergent and continual quests, about the new arrivals’ destiny and their life in the new crowded land, most notably the rise of the racial overlaps, and the bulky “riots” that took a wide place across the country.

1.2. Reception of Immigrants

The newcomers to Britain faced hostile reactions and were subject to different forms of racism and segregation especially in particular periods. Their work, education and housing conditions have been generally worse than that of the mainstream population. Some ethnic and faith minority groups have been continually subject to racism and discrimination.

Many immigrants faced difficulties in integrating and some of them lived in ghettos. Underrepresentation in the different political institutions of the country is a real obstacle in the way of the empowerment of the disadvantaged immigrant minorities in Britain

1.3. Major Challenges to Immigrants

The newcomers to Britain had an apparent effect on the reconstruction of the state, as well as the cultural and demographic growth. Although those foreigners had a significant role in fertilizing the country, they were marginalized and exploited with low wages, politically speaking, most of them were prohibited from voting, the Blacks and the Asians being the best example of a poor minority group, living in deprived places, with poor health, a little chance to work, and a little or no chance to achieve a higher educational level (Chudickova 27, 28). It is worth mentioning that the Foreigners contributed significantly to the development of social, economic and political sectors, but they are still marginalized and disadvantaged in the different sectors.

Also some race tensions were boosted by some Britons who believed that the immigrants came to challenge them for social services (jobs and housing). And the “riots” that came due to the refusal to those immigrants which have been prominent mainly, in Liverpool in August 1948 and further extended to encompass Birmingham, Nottingham and West London in 1950 (“How has immigration...” 2).

Politically speaking, two days after the empire windrush arrival, there were also many hostile and fierce responses against Blacks immigration, under the aspect of the “racial character of the English people 1948”, upon which 11 Labour MPs wrote a letter directed to Clement Attlee, asking him to enforce legislation and to adopt new policies, so as to restrict blacks immigration, the letter showed how the higher proportion of Blacks in Britain will damage the state’s stability and affect its values (Carter, Harris and Joshi 1). As a result to the MPs complains, the racial differences and in particular, the Blacks who came to be commonly labeled as British Subjects had been regarded as a threat to the Briton’s social steadiness, that’s why they must be controlled.

The ethnic exclusion, alienation and exploitation were the major obstacles facing immigrant minorities in Britain, and by 1950, Anti-immigrant sentiments were more apparent and it was based mainly on color and skin. The Immigrants Advisory Council declared that “it cannot be expected from the national system that the various values of the immigrant groups will be supported” (Chudickova 23). In other words, he denied the possibility of accepting the existence of cultural differences. The government, therefore, adopted urgent measures to restrict further immigration closing the doors of mass immigration.

1.4. The Government’s Regulation of Immigration Laws

Due to British opened door to immigration, the country received unexpected number of immigrants. This policy aimed primarily to benefit from immigrants in reconstructing its international reputation following WWII, but, the massive increase in the uncontrolled migration caused some problems. “The Commonwealth immigration made up largely of economic migrants, rose from 3,000 per year in 1953 to 46,800 in 1956 and 136, 400 in 1961” (“Immigration to the United Kingdom...” 63). Thus, the large numbers of legal migrants were a motivating force to the emergence of Multicultural Britain in the second half of the 20th Century. The rise of xenophobia paved the way to the creation of some regulating laws, to control the phenomenon, which was the subject of heated debate by 1960.

In this regard, the Labour Government constituted a secret cabinet committee to revise some procedures that allows it to check black workers immigration to Britain. The administrative laws adopted toward this issue were already left to the government to consider, for instance when the government hardened passport obtaining for immigrants, so that to restrict the entry of the commonwealth citizens (“All White with ...” 1, 2). In this context, it is true that multicultural society’s existence in Britain was once acknowledged

in political sphere, yet, there were governmental measures that came with the perception to end the thriving of racist hostilities and managing ethnic pluralism.

The fear from or hostility towards the continuing migration flows led to an opened discussion made between Britain and West European Countries, and it was ended by some suggested approaches such as assimilation, which was introduced during the 1950's, 1960's, as a response to the numerical superiority of the Commonwealth Citizens who came with new beliefs, customs, religions, that frightened and threatened the British values. The Assimilationist Model aimed at integrating the newcomers within the mainstream society, in other words, they should forget about their customs, traditions, and religions and adopt the British ones (Bourne 2). Throughout this model, the British Government was seeking to unify its population under the same cultural perspectives, and to remove social discrimination.

By the mid-1960, the Assimilationist model was refused and a new policy emerged, known as "Integration", it was defined by Home Secretary Roy Jenkins as "not a flattening process of assimilation but equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance", in addition to this, they had the freedom of cultural expression (3). Thus, this policy was more concerned with equality of opportunity. Members of immigrant minorities, as any British citizen should have equal chance in getting jobs, housing and social services. The Government was trying to establish a society based on cultural diversity and mutual tolerance.

After thirteen years of the Conservative rule in Britain, the Labour Party came to power in 1964 under the leadership of the Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who regarded the labour as "the natural party of the government" (Mchugh 2). And he worked hardly to develop new strategies in a way opposing the Conservative ones. First, in the "Manifesto for the election in 1964", the Party recognized three basic concerns namely, "poverty,

rapidly rising population, and racial conflict". As regarding to these issues Britain's first challenge started with the Commonwealth, as it was argued that "the commonwealth has a major part to play in grappling with the terrible inequalities that separate the developed and underdeveloped nations and the white and colored races ("The Labour Party Election Manifesto"). Thus, in the light of the dramatic increase of immigrants, and the continuation of race riots, the Labour Party leader Harold Wilson gave a considerable attention to immigrants, who reached this land due to contradictory factors.

Most importantly, Harold Wilson introduced Race Relations Act in 1965, in which there was recognition of immigrants' rights, that is to say provision of assistance to the restricted system where those immigrants lived, prevention from the racial segregation and violence against them in social services, and also accepting but limiting immigrants' entry to the United Kingdom. It also introduced Race Relations Board as a democratic vehicle to the different complains that came from immigrants, who were subjected to race assaults. Nevertheless, it could be noticed by some racism opponents and "Labour Backbenchers" that the act was introduced on a shallow basis, since it defined the tribal outrage only in terms of civil offence and not a criminal one, in addition to the fact that this act came to present these assaults only in the external spheres as restaurants and hotels, but not in the "private boarding houses, and even shops" (Abrahamova 31, 33).

In addition to that, 1968, the year that indeed constituted a new chapter in the history of immigrants over Britain, with Commonwealth Immigrants Act that was issued by the Labour Government, this act has been regarded as a reaction to the hostility made by natives towards Blacks, but, the writer Sivanandan stated that the economic reconstruction was in need to susceptible and cheap labor forces (qtd in. Schuster and Solomas 2). That is to say, on one hand this bill emphasized notably the need for economic stability of the

country which was determined by the immigrants' hard work, and on the other hand it reflects the answer of the Briton's paranoia upon the huge flow of black immigrants.

The newly implemented act modified the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962, it was implemented to enforce control policies over immigrants, and even those British citizens who were either born in a colony or registered in the ex-colonies before it gains its liberty like "being born or registered in Kenya" before its independence.

The act created harsh restrictions on immigrants' arrival to the United Kingdom, especially, on Kenyan Asians who escaped at that time from oppressive laws of Kenyatta Government, that is to say after Kenyas' independence in 1963, its government passed a law that aliens in case they got jobs they would be substituted by "Kenyan Nationals" when they were found, that's why many Kenyan Asians have chosen to move to Britain looking for safety. In this case, it was so evident that this law created a gap between those "belonging" citizens that is to say being "born", "naturalized" and "adopted" in the United Kingdom for instance, and 'non belonging' ones.

In this context, as many shrewder critical quests have been raised toward this bill, according to Home Secretary James Callaghan, the one who introduced the act, he often considered that "the origin of the bill lies neither in panic nor prejudice, but in a considered judgment of the best way to achieve the ideal of a multi-racial society" (Home Secretary introduces).

Accordingly, the Labour Party Prime Minister James Callaghan attempted to insist on an important point that the Government decision was not due to fear, for a racist motif, or even in a 'haste' way, instead to maintain a new scope; where there was a recognition of multi-ethnic society, and as he further claimed, "we have to look to the long term, and not just to the issue of the group of people which faces us today" (Abrahamova 34, 37). Accordingly, the bill did not come as an objection to the existence of a racially plural

society or even misplacing them, but rather as a decisive response and convenient political solution to control the continuous influx of Black immigrants to Britain.

Immigration Policies were emerging one after the other. The 1971 Immigration Act was set to control all the migrants to the UK, taking into account specific category of migrants who had the right to enter to and reside in the country (“The Immigration Acts”). Although, the Act included all the minority groups within the British society, an exception was made since the country was in need of intellectuals, who had a role to play in constituting the state’s welfare.

Moreover, as an extension to the 1965 act ideological paradigms, the labour Government proposed Race Relations Act in 1976 (Sooben 2). Upon which the major objectives were the elimination of race discrimination in employment, housing, and education, the bill also appealed the avoidance of verbal insult and harassment against the new comers. Another key element to consider in this act was the formation of the Commission for Racial Equality, so that to prove the effectiveness of the act (“Austerity, Affluence, and Discontent...” 32).

The Labour Party did its best to control the phenomenon of immigration but its attempts did not succeed one hundred percent. By 1979, it was defeated by The Conservatives in a national election, and Margaret Thatcher became the first female leader in Britain. The Prime Minister came with new agenda to restrict migration, and to create reassurance within the society, in her speech she declared officially that the issue of migration threatened the state’s stability, and the government should behave to calm down the citizens:

Well now, look, let us try and start with a few figures as far as we know them, and I am the first to admit it is not easy to get clear figures from the Home Office about immigration, but there was a committee which

looked at it and said that if we went on as we are then by the end of the century there would be four million people of the new Commonwealth or Pakistan here. Now, that is an awful lot and I think it means that people are really rather afraid that this Country might be rather swamped by people with a different culture and, you know, the British character has done so much for democracy, for law and done so much throughout the world that if there is any fear that it might be swamped people are going to react and be rather hostile to those coming in. (Iliou 3).

thus, the Prime Minister was worried about the state's future and stability, since they were threatened by the existence of different cultures, in addition to the growing number of migrants which was continuing at a higher rate. She was asking for urgent reactions to protect the British values, to promote peace all over the country, and to prevent the Foreigners from such hostile reactions that could be made by the natives, the Prime Minister was seeking to make Britain white.

During the Quinn Thatcher's rule, less people came to reside since they were obliged to have a visa that was granted to specific people. And in 1987, a new Act was passed; The Immigration (Carriers Liability) Act, it was mainly dedicated to the owners or agents of ships or aircraft, they were asked to bring legal migrants who were accepted by the UK to enter, and to be sure that they were the right persons with the appropriate visa ("Immigration Acts"). The Conservative leader was in need of legal migration, to restrict the unsystematic flows which put the country in a dramatic status.

During the second half of the 20th century, the British tolerance with the development of the transport technologies, paved the way to millions of people to enter the country, so, multi-races existed within the mainstream society, and constituted a danger to the natives' values ("Globalization" 6). The dramatic change in the level of immigration worried the

politicians about the British future, especially, when the feeling of Anti-Immigrant emerged and the ethnic minorities became aware about their rights and start revolting, to show their anger through different riots.

The Post War era in Britain was characterized by an international as well as interregional migration, and millions of people from a variety of backgrounds arrived, Internal Immigration was more apparent, made by people competing for social services, jobs and housing; through the transformation of their habitual residence. Researchers argued that each year around 10 or 11 percent of the total British population moving about within the country (Dixon 192).

In the educational framework as well which became the main source of racial outrage, and even the multi-ethnic groups failure to attain a good educational level, namely for the West Indians, as a response the Labour Government in 1977 demanded ‘a high level and independent inquiry into the causes of the underachievement of children of West Indian origin’, and as this investigation was established in 1979, it extended its concerns to “review the educational needs and attainments of children from all ethnic minority groups” (Modood and May 306, 307). In reality, the Labour Government had shown concerns about the future of minorities.

1.5. The Rise of Multiculturalism as a Response to Multicultural Ethnicity:

According to the Professor of Sociology at Bristol University Tariq Modood in his Book *Multiculturalism: a Civic Idea*, the phenomenon of immigration had a great impact on the economic and social sectors in Britain. Economically speaking, the immigrants had a great effect on the reconstruction of the British welfare. Socially speaking, the existence of mixed races within the mainstream society, led to the rise of Multiculturalism in Britain which was not the only country that experienced this phenomenon. It was broadened to embrace other European countries such as Canada, Australia, and the United States (3, 4).

In this regard, the higher proportion of nonwhite migrants in the European countries contributed in the rise of multicultural societies, so, multiculturalism is the product of the massive flow of immigrants. By 1960 and 1970, multiculturalism in most of the European countries was reputed and it was defined as the recognition and acknowledgement of ethnic minorities' existence in the public sphere (Modood).

Multiculturalism had been defined by the Professor of Sociology Tariq Modood as “a form of political accommodation, in which differences are not eliminated, are not washed away but to some extent recognized” (qtd in. Chudickova 12). Politically speaking, multiculturalism was a kind of acknowledgement and recognition to the coexistence of cultural diversity within the mainstream society.

To conclude, immigration to Britain is a very old phenomenon dating back to many centuries ago. It increased after the Second World War due to the development of transport means, and the British tolerance in inviting different members, from a variety of backgrounds to enter to the country and participate in reviving the State's welfare, so, people from all over the world saw Britain and many European countries as a safe haven where they could find peaceful and comfortable life; their displacement created large communities with a vast number of permanent residents.

The natives were frightened by the huge influx of immigrants who had stolen their economic opportunities, which led to the rise of anti-immigrant feeling that led the government to put urgent measures with strong emphasis on controlling the borders to regulate foreigners entering to the country.

In Britain it was primarily immigration that created a diverse society racially; religiously and ethnically contributing significantly to the rise of the philosophy of Multiculturalism in which different cultures were celebrated, and diversity was seen as a gain. By 1997, and with the coming of the Labour Party to power under the leadership of

the Prime Minister Tony Blair, the government opted for multiculturalism as the best strategy to guarantee social stability in the country.

Chapter Two

Labour Party and Multiculturalism

By the mid 20th century, Britain has relinquished its status as an imperial power witnessing a high influx of immigrants and refugees from different descents. The settlement of many immigrant communities from different national, faith and racial backgrounds brought to the front problems related to social stability and national identity. This led to the introduction of some social and political paradigms representing different views regarding the appropriate ways to manage diversity in the British society.

Multiculturalism as a policy that celebrates diversity and acknowledges the right of minority groups to be different has been patronized in Britain by the Labour party. This latter tried through the introduction of a set of policies and programmes to promote the idea of a “community of communities” in which different groups could retain aspects of their identities and contribute to the overall British Identity.

Initially, what is important in this chapter is to weave a political reading in order to present a general and historical sight to the Old British Labour Party, briefly discussing the “New” Labour Party’s basic ideologies and its vision of “Community of Communities” that has been well shaped by the Prime Minister Tony Blair in 1997. Taking into consideration the assesement of the political measures or the potential solutions the “New” Labour Party reached, so that to manage ethnic pluralism in the country.

On the conceptual basis of multiculturalism in Britain, this chapter also discusses and analyses the main factors notably 9/11 terrorist attacks in United States and 7/7 London Bombings, that have been used to claim the failure of this paradigm and to casting doubts on its appropriateness to the British context.

For setting these historical moments into a wider context, it is considered crucial to delve into the following questions, how might be the state of multicultural societies in Britain after these spectacles? What is the kind challenges multiculturalism faced before these attacks? And to which extent has the political discourses and the British media turned to be effective factors in the rise of Islamophobia in Britain?

At the end, we need to highlight the views of the opponents of the war on terror and media perceptions that thrived aggressive and virulent opinions toward all what is linked to Islam in a way that manifests it as a rapidly increasing threat.

2.1. “Old” Labour Party

British politics is mainly based on the contest between two notable political powers namely, the Labour Party and the Conservative Party that have divergent ideological tendencies in conjunction with multiculturalism in Britain. Thus, before deeply going on to explore the state of multiculturalism under “New” Labour Party, it is crucial at first to provide a brief overview on the “Old” Labour Party and how it was founded.

“Small socialist groups” established this political party at the very beginning of the 1900’s, as they have gained more influence through the “Trade Union Movement”. The Labour Party at that time was not that powerful and active for planned “manual labour”, and it did not comprise that big number of membership to promote its policies. In general elections it would get only “two MPs”, until 1914 when there was a noticeable increase of membership in the House of Commons with nearly 42 members.

By 1918 due to the First World War political tensions, the Labour Party benefited from the rise of franchise policy, so that to idealize itself as a “ national mass political party” with a “ new constitution and political program” under the policy of “ Labour and the New Social Order“. Few years later, the Labour Party defeated the

Liberals electorally, and by 1922, it has emerged as a powerful political factor, challenging the ideological tendencies of the Conservatives (McHugh 1).

Besides, the Labour Party formed a government for the first time in 1924 under the leadership of Ramsay MacKdonald defeating the Conservative leader Stanley Baldwin. By 1929, it was in power but still as a “minority administration”, at that time MacKdonald’s Government witnessed unexpected decline due to economic crises, mainly the rise of “unemployment” (“History of The Labour Party” 2, 3). MacKdonald served as a Prime Minister until 1935, but he received at that period several antagonistic responses by many members in the party and the Conservatives (“MacKdonald 1866-1937” 2). In general, it seems that “Old “Labour was seen as being oriented towards a socialist trend and “collectivism”, to assert “the working class” developement (Aston 4).

2.2. Multiculturalism under “New” Labour Party

With the coming of the New Labour Party to power in 1997, under the leadership of the Prime Minister Tony Blair, the emphasis shifted from eliminating differences to celebrating them, and as a response to the cultural diversity, multiculturalism adopted as a state policy instead of being a social phenomenon.

2.2.1. The Rise of New Labour

After three successive electoral victories by the Conservatives, the New Labour Party achieved an overwhelming victory in the general elections of 1997, under the leadership of Tony Blair, who responded to the idea of “Modernization” as a way to eradicate views fused with voters “doubts” and thrills concerning “Labour as a Party of Government” (White 2, 6). As Rawnsley (2000) often stated “New Labour was the product of traumatic and multiple failures” (qtd in. White 5).

So far speaking about the term “New Labour”, it coined initially in 1989 in Gould’s book, (1998). However, the “brand” or Program of “Modernization” and the word officially used in

the Party Conference, in 1994, under the logo of “New Labour, New Britain”. This “Process of Modernization” was perceived as a crucial entity, which has developed to oppose the ancient virtues and the ideological line of the Old Labour Party that came to be labeled as “a Party of tradition” (6). As it is worth mentioning also that, the New Labour Party has appeared principally as a “Post-Socialist Third Way Party”, it has fostered “neo-liberal economic” ideologies that were driven upon the “social inclusion”. With its growing interest to the pluralistic societies that were deemed one of the pillar “planks” and the key components of the political power (Robson 194). New Labour government fostered some policies aiming at empowering members of minorities and patronized community organizations for this purpose.

2.2.2. The Evolution of British Multiculturalism under New labour

Munira Mirza is the Deputy Mayor for Education and Culture of London, deeply delved in an article about how has the policy of multiculturalism evolved over time to be embodied as a national paradigm by the New Labour Party in 1997. Starting with 1960, when weak reactions made by “the state and the civic institutions” to heal the racial tensions prevailing namely in “Notting Hill, Southall and Brixton in London and Toxteth in Liverpool”. The “riots” however, that erupted in 1980 were deemed to be a push factor toward the promotion of new measures by the Local Government, most notably “community relations work and race equality”.

Besides, in the aftermath of these serious chaos, which broke out namely in Brixton (April 1981), the Scarman Report appeared as an influential response since it concentrated mainly on the reasons behind the racist acts that emphasized “housing, policing, and employment”. At that time “anti-racism” was an eminent issue that led to the stimulation of multiculturalism, through “cultural” diversity acknowledgement between societies. In 1985, when there was a big support by several “Local Authorities”, that contributed at

sustaining the racial “equality” projects in towns where a large number of “ethnic” minorities settled among them “Bradford and Birmingham”.

By 1990, there was a virtual “political” interest in multiculturalism and this was noticeable through the vigorous participation in the Anti-Racism Movement that extended over working in the councils and constituting reciprocal influence link with the Local Community Groups. However, the more effective “Institutional” support to Multiculturalism is associated to the rise of New Labour to power.

Multiculturalism under New Labour party was seen as a pivotal policy to earn “new alliances” with distinct minority communities (“What Now for the M- Word”? 2). It seems that Britain since the year 1960 was showing multiple initiatives to diminish racist impulses and intolerance, with a greater acknowledgement to cultural and racial differences.

For further clarification, according to Terry Wotherspoon (1995), “Multicultural policies” have been introduced by the “local administrations”, mainly from 1970 and 1980, embodied virtually in the national commitment only with the coming of New Labour Government to power in 1997. This notion has come to be perceived in its deepest sense as an “approach” supporting pluralism, as it has embraced the principle of multiracial acceptance, and came as well to heal racial discrimination issues, through vigorous recognizing of those “marginalized identities”, and fostering race equality (qtd in. Rascanu 220).

Bikhu Parekh in 2000 employed the concept more broadly as “a perspective on human life, promoting intercultural dialogue between different communities” (221). This means that, multiculturalism is seen primarily as amoral and social creed that came to constitute an ideal coexistence between different communities and cultures within single unitary culture, so that to boost the sense of equality.

The tangible proof and the clearest exemplification that reflect the equality of values was remarkable since 1997, when the Labour Party Leader Tony Blair made the decision that

served and recognized the legal rights of Muslim groups, with his approval to build up the first Muslim primary schools in Britain and provide financial assistance to “minority faith schools”, in addition to his significant support to establish Muslim Council of Britain (MCB), the umbrella body which represented the voice of Muslim minorities in the country.

These governmental concessions have created in a way a reciprocal contact between the Muslims and the New Labour Government (Shi 108). Indeed, in this respect, welcoming and accepting the Muslim minorities, with their distinct culture, and their religion was perceived as a product of a tolerant society.

Andrew Pilkington Professor of Sociology at the University of *Northampton* stated in his Article “Multiculturalism under Siege” that the Political activist and the New Labour Party leader Tony Blair, has carefully fostered a deep investigation, which was carried out by police and headed by senior judge, Sir William Macpherson in 1997, dealing with the racist “murder” of Stephen Lawrence, a black teenager by five white men in 1993, despite the rise of sharp critics by a report on the grounds that “public” institutional circles have failed to acknowledge and consider the social equality in this case. It has been condemned of racism (Pilkington 6). It seems that the Labour Government has devoted considerable efforts to the recognition of the multiracial society, and fighting against the racially stimulated crimes.

For better clarification, the Macpherson report of 1999 was seen as an effective political vehicle, which gave rise to Race Relations Amendment Act 2000, a parliamentary act, which appeared to play a chief role towards enhancing the principle of “equality” between different racial and cultural groups (6). Thus, it can be said that these concrete actions have indeed centered on multicultural relations and on the issues of racism and xenophobia.

Additionally, as regard to multiculturalism as a “public policy”, Tony Blair and New Labour played a pivotal role in its development through introducing “Cool Britannia”, a new political approach that was identified by the notion of “community of communities”(Koenig,

Singh and Rex 40). The political backing of this social trend was clearly recognized by Tony Blair (2000), through his enhancing of “Britain’s multicultural character” as a crucial entity of British “identity”, confirming “Blood alone does not define our national identity. It is precisely this rich mix that have made all of us what we are today” (Shi 107). Accordingly, British identity should be perceived within the framework of multicultural societies as well, those who had utterly changed the social make-up of the state.

Besides, this social paradigm was considered to be an important element, the idea that has been forcibly enhanced by Tony Blair in his speech on April 27, 2004, that immigration played a pivotal agent in making Britain “stronger and richer” country (Wagner 30). Thus, thinking on this basis, Britain was characterized as an economically vital and dynamic country thanks to the huge influx of immigrant groups, who were viewed as a major driver of the nation-building project.

During his ten years in office (1997-2007), Tony Blair payed more attention to “skilled immigrants”, “economic immigrants”, and “international students”, those qualified to offer a greater contribution in rebuilding the British economy. With statistical facts that portrayed the dramatic increase in the number of “international students” from 70,6 in 1997 to 117,20 in 2004, with less stress on the “asylum seekers”. As he also supported “the work visas”, who’s granting increased in his first term from 62,795 in 1997 to 108,825 in 2001(25).

2.2.3. The Starting Retreat of Multiculturalism

The image of Britain as a haven to refugees and asylum seekers, however, has begun to weaken due to several underlying factors, most notably the rise of racist pressure and paranoia that the asylum seekers have witnessed (Koenig, Singh and Rex 40). The actual example was so salient in the late of 1990’s, with the adoption of “dispersal policy” by Tony Blair’s government for asylum seekers, the one that was regarded as the solely solution to put an end

to the increase of refugees, as well as due to the Labour Government inability to provide them with adequate social support.

This government adopted this policy also to avoid heavy “burdens” on the “local authorities”, among them those at “the Port of Dover or Heathrow airport”. Racial disputes and violence against irrupted against refugees, most precisely in the Sighthill district of Glasgow in April 2001 (Farrar, Robinson and Sener 10).

Additionally, there was a rise of antagonistic and fierce responses to the Runnymede Trust report called the future of multi-ethnic Britain (2000) (Koenig, Singh and Rex 40). This report which has been adopted namely by Lord Bhikhu Parekh whose primary concern was to create a prosperous British nation standing on ethnic “diversity”, as it appealed as well to the promotion of equality, recognition of other’s religion, race and culture (“A Community of Communities and Citizens...” 1).

The report sought to sustain “a collective life in which the spirit of civic goodwill, shared identity, and common sense of belonging goes hand in hand with love of diversity”, that’s why it was severely decried since it has provided a shallow understanding to the meaning of “Britishness”, by referring it to “racial connotations” (Travis, 2000). (qtd in. Thaper 13).

The dwindled faith in multiculturalism has appeared also with the intense and violent disputes, which broke out in Northern areas in 2001, between Asian youths and white groups. This race clashes were due to the lack of contact, as the government report often stated, “the depth of polarization” that is apparent in Britain’s “towns and cities, this means that many communities operate on the basis of a series of parallel lives” (Fieschi and Johnson 4, 5).

Therefore, it seems that these “polarized lives” which stimulated with “parallel lives” could serve as a motivating force to the emergence of extremist creeds. Thus, in the face of these problems, it can be said that multiculturalism has faced a sort of challenges even before the

dramatic terrorist events of 9/11 and 7/7. These latter would add insult to injury generating more attacks on multiculturalism.

2.3. Terrorist Attacks and the New Challenges to British Multiculturalism

9/11 and 7/7 attacks were deemed to be radical points and vehicle reasons which led to the violation of multiculturalism principles. The widespread harassment, misery and abuse of multicultural nature came from both the Britons and the government. This latter sought under the name of fighting the acts of terror to face the Muslim, the first multicultural groups to be dubbed as culprits of terrorism.

2.3.1. 9/11 and its Impact on Minorities in Britain

As a response to the horrifying attacks of 9/11, the United States invaded Afghanistan (2001) and later Iraq in (2003) to put an end to the roots of this outrage –AL Qaeda, an Islamic extremist faction led by Ossama Ben Laden (Smith 1, 2). The American military intervention that was commonly termed as “war on terror” has been highly supported by British Prime Minister Tony Blair (Abd al Wahid 1). Although 9/11 took place in American soils, the participation of Britain in the war on Afghanistan and reactions to this war in Britain made the effects of these attacks so apparent in Britain.

Immediately after these terrorist attacks, members of many ethnic groups, not only Muslims living in Britain, were subjected to verbal assault, religious outrage, and social exclusion. Humayun Ansari, Professor of Islam and Cultural Diversity has further shown in his book *Muslims in Britain*; that these bulky “race hatred” attacks prevailed in particular cities. In West London, the actual proof was about “Afghan taxi driver” “Hamidullah Garwal”, who was beaten and “left paralysed”. The Sikh also were not very far from these racial and truculent assaults, because of their traditional clothes which seem similar in a way to those of Muslims. Children, adults and women were insulted and targeted at streets and public places (Ansari 4).

Politically, in the wake of these terrorist attacks that hit the United States in 2001, the British Prime Minister Tony Blair advocacy to multiculturalism was so conspicuous, when he has stated that Labor “celebrates the diversity” (Canadian Immigration Hotline, 2007) (Shi 109) . In this respect, it seems that Tony Blair has offered less talk about this attacks, but what remains unclear, what would his decisive reaction if Britain would be the next target?

2.3.2. New Labour Responses to 7/7 London Bombings

The most notable event which was a radical point and an inlet of high debate in the British politics was “July Bombings” or London bombardments of 2005 that was deemed to be the pillar factor behind the spread of panic, grief and unrest in Britain, and notably the rise of Islamophobia. These attacks began with the explosion of three different London underground trains, consequently, these bombings were seen as the most horrific incidents since the Second World War, and once again the first suspects were British citizens, yet Muslim extremists (“7 7 London Bombing” 1, 2).

After these Terrorist Scenes, as an expected reaction to diminish the atmosphere of paranoia and thrill among the public, the Prime Minister Tony Blair pointed out that:

It's important, however, that those engaged in terrorism realize that our determination to defend our values and our way of life is greater than their determination to cause death and destruction to innocent people, in a desire to impose extremism on the world. (“In full: Blair on Bomb Blasts” 2).

Most obviously, the Prime Minister here viewed this catastrophic and violent crime as an “act of terror” with his hope that Briton’s unified efforts to combat that threatening enemy would be stronger than the other’s ambition to spread horror, and cause devastation.

Blair held a press conference in which he insisted at first on the point that the “rules of the game” for peace exterminators and “terrorists” would be radically altered, for that, he introduced “twelve point plan” against terrorism, in which the major objectives of the plan were notably to put a tough pressure on those individuals who support terrorism, and those who want to settle permanently in the United Kingdom. Also to put an end to the terrorist “recruitment and training” operations in the country (Ahalt 1). Thus to refine the social sphere from terrorist threats.

Anti- terrorism policies followed notably the Prevention of Terrorism Act (August 2005). This legislative response was concerned with taking fierce measures against those suspected of the terrorist attacks and fostering “control order” on them. Moreover, the terrorism bill of 2006 aimed to sustain the police forces, at conduct inquiries regarding “terrorist suspects”, as it outlawed any statement being published on the basis of “glorification” of terror (Awan 3, 4).

When Tony Blair was asked whether the state of multiculturalism must be more sustained after these terrorist bombings, The Prime Minister responded, “Most people understand that you can have your own religion and your own culture”, but, “coming to Britain is not a right...staying here carries with it a duty. That duty is to share and support the values that sustain the British way of life” (Shi 109).

Accordingly, Tony Blair’s vision about the status of multiculturalism or community of community’s concept, which was once responding and acknowledging the cultural, racial and religious diversity started to weaken due to these terrorist incidents, in other words, this rhetoric was firmly delivered as a critical political reflection to multi ethnicities in Britain.

Most obviously, in his speech “Our Nation’s Future” at Downing Street on December, 8, 2006 entitled “our Duty to Integrate: our Shared Values”, Tony Blair stated, “The right to be in a multicultural society was always implicitly balanced by a duty to integrate, to be

part of Britain, to be British and Asian, British and black, British and white ”. In this context he did eloquently focus on “diversity with integration” (109)

Thus, in the light of Tony Blair’s opinion, he insisted on the idea of integration that hold the whole multi-ethnic groups together upon the core British values. That is to say the new perception of Tony Blair concentrates more firmly on the need to sustain the sense of “Britishness”, and to be integrated within the mainstream society does not mean that those minorities are obliged to give up their traditions.

Blair stated that those who did not adhere integration were not working upon the democratic values of the country “tolerance, solidarity across the racial and religious divide, equality for all and between all” (Blair 2006) (109). At the same time Tony Blair pointed that this rise of sharp “debate” is not due to “extremism” instead “ ...It is a new and virulent form of ideology associated with a minority of our Muslim community” confirming that the “failure” of those individuals to be fully integrated within the mainstream of society could not serve as a justification of multiculturalism demise, with his vigorous insistence on “the common values all citizens were expected to conform to” (Conform to our Society, Says PM 2). That is to say, his attitude towards multiculturalism has partly changed, but not altered completely.

On the other respect, after the 7/7 terrorist attacks, the Chancellor of Exchequer Gordon Brown forcibly insisted on the “need” to reconsider and “revive” the meaning of “Britishness” or British national identity in many of his speeches. In his speech, “Who Do We Want To Be? The Future of Britishness” at “the 2006 annual conference of the Fabian Society, January 14, 2006”, Gordon Brown has defined “Britishness” in terms of “liberty for all, responsibility by all, and fairness to all” (Brown 2006). His vision of Britishness was about the “shared British values”, as he also decried multiculturalism severely for “pushing communities apart with over emphasizing separateness at the cost of unity”.

As a British Prime Minister since 2007, Mr. Brown holds the idea that multiculturalism is about boosting the moral values that acknowledge racial differences, “equality”, and “fairness”, claiming that “our way of life is to reject the prejudice and discrimination practiced by those who preach xenophobia and racism” (Shi 110). Thus for multiculturalism, it seems that Golden Brown has come to the point that the minorities must be given a chance to live equally as other Britons and not in the sense of living under forced integration as Tony Blair claimed. The 7/7 events served as a push factor to multiculturalism reassessment in political spheres.

2.3.3. Multiculturalism Post 7/7

It remains to see to which extent the aftermath of 7/7 terrorist dramatic scenes have been attributed mainly to Muslims, being the first to be accused, suspected and the first who were unable to be integrated within the mainstream of society. The anti-terrorist policies as well left a great impact on Muslims in Britain, as stated by the commission of equality and human rights report (Muchowiecka 2).

It can be even said in this respect, that the terrorist attacks have caused a great hostility and traumatized responses toward all what is related to Muslims’ cultural background and led to the increase of islamophobic crimes, which resulted the spread of horror, trauma and pain among the Muslim communities living in Britain.

There were 269 “religious hate crimes” in the “three weeks after July 7”. The “Independent” reported unexpected rise of religious and racist harassment, since London Bombings according to the police, with no effective reaction of the British Government to act to stop this violence. Instead it pretended pleading for “tolerance and respect” over other minorities, as it demanded as well for every Muslim to confirm his “loyalty” to the country, and his “commitment” to make sure of their denouncing the Islamic extremist factions (Ingram 1, 2).

The most horrible assaults that traumatized the Muslim's dignity in Britain were those, which targeted especially the Muslim woman, who was subjected to outrage and harassment because of her wearing "hijab" that symbolizes the Islamic identity. The actual example was on August 23, 2007 in Southampton, when 30 years old woman was beaten harshly by a driver (Shi).

This state of fear have indeed become common among Muslim community, since the hostility extended to encompass other offences against Muslims mainly on August 9, 2007 when "58 years old imam of the Central Mosque in London's regents Park" was attacked by "assailants". Besides, on August 3, 2007 there was a wide devastation of sacred places of Muslims "Mosques" at Bradford.

London Metropolitan Police Service (MET) has reported 106 "Islamophobic" acts and 89 crimes from April 2007 till March 2008 (*Violence against Muslims...8, 15*). The fact that reflects clearly that Islamophobia was really representing at that time a real threat to Muslim presence in Britain. Accordingly, as Tariq Modood puts it, since 7/7 terrorist spectacles, multiculturalism have come to be widely seen as "scapegoat" (Shi 106). That is to say, multiculturalism seems no longer that ideology which fosters the values of equality and tolerance, as it has become an overshadowing, sinister and abhorred fact in the British public mind, due to the impact of media.

2.4. The Impact of Media on Islamophobia and Multiculturalism

Media is "a significant agent with the potential to influence community perceptions" (Akbarzadeh and Smith 1). The British media became significant apparatus, and a key factor in the rise of Islamophobia in Britain.

Deeming it necessary to mention that this climate of hostility against Muslims in particular was not deliberate, it was also ideologically stimulated and intoxicated by the powerful impact of British mass media that played a prominent part in this ruthless confrontation and

endless challenge. When it comes to the question of Muslims in the British press, as Whitaker (2002) contended, “there are four very persistent stereotypes that crop up time and again in the different articles. These tell us that Muslims are intolerant, misogynistic, violent or cruel, and finally, strange or different” (Ameli, et al 13).

Thus, it can be said that Muslims were the first target of these tough tendencies in the British press. Poole pointed out that the “majority of coverage” that categorizes Muslims in the British press was more concerned with the racial paradigm and “violence” images against Muslims (Moore, Mason and Lewis 6).

In a 2008 study, Barry Mason attempted to identify the mayhem that Muslims have encountered, as it discussed in depth how the Islamophobic visions took as alien part in “the British media and politics”. Among almost 1000 studied articles about Muslims and Islam related issues “since the year 2000”, 68 percent of these articles represented muslims as violent, terrorists, and also abusers to other cultures, while 26 percent of them have shown Islam as a threatening enemy, and as “irrational”.

The media which played a leading role in spreading myths about British Muslims contributing to the rise of Islamophobia, has also attacked multiculturalism and blamed it continually for the rise of radicalization among Muslims. Commentators like Gilles Kepel claimed that the 7/7 bombers “were the children of Britain’s own multicultural society”. Kepel’s view has been more stimulated by William Pfaff in the Observer, who stated that those bombers were a “consequence of a misguided and catastrophic pursuit of multiculturalism”. Moreover, Martin Wolf in the Financial Times argued that “Multiculturalism must be discarded as nonsense”. Other journalists raised questions like, “Is Multiculturalism Dead?”, “Is Multiculturalism Over? And use phrases like “Beyond Multiculturalism” hinting to the failure of this policy.

Thus due to the fact that those bombers were UK-born radical Muslims, multiculturalism in Britain was regarded as the direct cause behind these terrorist (Allen 7, 8). From discussions running in the British Media, it would seem that these terrorist spectacles increasingly led to long-term feelings of distrust and fear from Muslims in particular, who became wreckage.

As an important conclusion, principally no one can overlook the fact that immigration has indeed helped to reshape and boost the British economy for many decades, and it has really made Britain a multi faith, and multicultural society. Yet, thinking on the question of whether multiculturalism as a debatable political subject in Britain was accepted or not under the rule of the “New” labour party. It is crucial at first to draw our attention to an important fact that British multiculturalism has emerged at the very beginning at the local level, responding to race equality and cultural diversity with no practical or concrete responses, till the new labour party gave a set of measures to empower minority groups.

At the end, it is worth to mention also that terrorism contributed significantly, as David Cameron claimed in a 2011 speech, to the failure of multiculturalism. Cameron linked the presence of cultural mix with the spread of terrorism, separatism and radicalization. Thus “Community Cohesion” was to be promoted and the old values of “Community of Communities” under which “different cultures were allowed to live separately, far from the mainstream of society” to be rejected.

Chapter Three

The Rise of the Conservative Party to Power and the Place of Multiculturalism in its Agenda

After thirteen years standing in opposition, the Conservative party regained power in 2010, upon the foundation of the co-operative plan “the Coalition Government” between the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats. The former was led by the Prime Minister David Cameron who declared officially in his speech at Munich Conference that British values were at risk, since the country was a safe haven of radicalist creeds. The continual quests at the political spectrum over the state of Multiculturalism, that was perceived as product of 7/7 tragic facts, has prompted the Prime Minister to delve into this issue, so that to re-assert the notion of Britishness and enhance Community Cohesion dimension instead of Community of Communities.

Before tackling the issue of multiculturalism in the Conservative agenda, first of all this chapter will represent a brief historical background about the old British Conservative party, then, an analytical view about David Cameron’s speech at Munich Conference which marked the clear rupture with multicultural political traditions in Britain will be provided. The chapter also looks for the urgent measures that the Prime Minister adopted to ensure stability in the state, and to which extent have these measures constituted new challenges to the country’s Muslim population? Shall we say that Cameron’s political reflection had really become a controlling power over the British Multiculturalism destiny? How did Muslims react to David Cameron’s new discourse about multiculturalism and radicalization? At the end, has Multiculturalism utterly demised? If it did not, was there any projected or even tangible evidence that could serve as a falsification to his views?

3.1. The Old Conservative Party and its Attitudes toward Immigration

In early times the British parliament was based on two major assemblies the Royalists and the Parliamentarians, by the 17th century the Tory Party which is now called the Conservative was founded by Bolingbroke, The Younger Pitt, Burke, Liverpool, Peel, and Disraeli.

After The Glorious Revolution of 1688, a great opposition within the party resulted its split and the Tories were guided by Pitt and his followers (Ball 2). By 1830, and with the beginning of the Reform Bill Crisis, the term “Conservative” was being officially used to describe the Tories who were a Right Wing Party seeking to keep the essence of the old British values. In 1834, the new appointed leader Sir Robert Peel was aiming to reform the British Parliament on the basis of the old Tory ideologies (“What were Conservatism...” 10). As a result to The Tory Party great opposition within its members, an unexpected split took place, and led to the creation of two separate sides but with different rulers.

The Conservative party and from its first emergence to power in 1830, revealed its attitudes regarding immigration and cultural diversity, considering it to be a threat to the state stability and values. Harry Deferies in his book *Conservative Party Attitudes to Jews 1900-1950* stated that the Conservative Party played a major role in regulating the foreigners entering to Britain, especially, when the country received a considerable number of Jewish refugees who were normally prohibited from entering, this issue obliged the government to look for urgent plans to constraint the waves, and as a first step it established The Aliens Bill of 1894 that was dedicated to the exclusion of the odds from the mainstream society (16).

Femi Adeyemi in his Article stated that the re-election of the Conservative Party in 1979 after multiple defeats with the first female Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in power, they brought a new agenda, and new policies. Thatcher offered the maximum to fertilize the state taking into consideration the Labour Party previous strategies in assimilating and integrating

the immigrants within the mainstream society. She encouraged also foreigners to return back home, to curtail the population growth.

Seemingly, although Margaret Thatcher and many other politicians do their best to end migration and to keep Britain white, they failed to attain the intended goals.

3. 2. Forming the Coalition Government

After taking a general sight about the Old British Conservative Party emergence, it is considered crucial to turn attention to the foundation of the second Coalition Government in the British politics. It is worth mentioning that after three successive defeats since 1997, the Conservative Party came to power through the establishment of the Coalition Government that came to office in May 2010, under the leadership of the Prime Minister David Cameron, which was a cooperative plan made between the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, and it was seen as a concrete evidence about the deficiency of the competitive parties in achieving supremacy of one over the other in the general elections, although the conservatives gained 306 seats they did not achieve the required number of seats (326) needed in Parliament to get a majority (Quinn, Bara and Bartle 5).(See Appendix 2).

The table shows that the convergence in the electoral outcomes between both the Liberal Democrats and Conservatives, and the absence of the overwhelming majority, led to the foundation of the Coalition Government of 2010 (Quinn, Bara and Bartle 7).

Minority groups' strong belief in the British democracy led them to occupy a pivotal part in the establishment of the 2010 government, although not all of them were allowed to vote, 68% of the "registered" voters had chosen the Labour Party 16% had voted the Conservatives and 14% elected the Liberal Democrats, but even after the foundation of the Coalition government, the Black Caribbeans felt that they remained the most segregated group in the country (Heath, and Omar). Despite the great role the minority groups had played in the

establishment of the coalition government, they were always kept on the margins of the mainstream society.

3.3. Significance of David Cameron's "Multiculturalism Speech"

What is more important to be taken into consideration in this chapter is to raise the questions of whether British Multiculturalism, as one of the most weighty political issues under the Conservative-Liberal Democrats Coalition, and notably upon David Cameron's speech, stands for understanding the various other faiths and acknowledging the racially pluralistic society, even after the terrorist attacks? Is it expected that this social trend or the British multicultural moment within the political track has passed, re-treated; or it has become abhorred and a sinister?

Initially, before delving into the state of British Multiculturalism under the Tory Leader's speech, it is important to state that the Prime Minister believed that the previous Government was lacking secure and adequate decisions to treat the issue of British multiculturalism, by depicting it as a "victim of fear" (Wintour). It seems that David Cameron's Speech was delivered mainly as a reactive political vehicle to counter the New Labour Government policies that were seemingly too moderate, when dealing with Multicultural societies in the country.

Then, it can be said that there was a rise of new political perception which has supplanted the concept of Multiculturalism or "community of communities" with "social cohesion", a new paradigm where religious and cultural differences need greater enhancement to respond the common values. This transfer in ideology has been forcibly stimulated by the British Prime Minister David Cameron in 2011, when he eloquently claimed:

Under the doctrine of state Multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart

from the mainstream. We've failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong we've even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run completely counter to our values. (Howarth and Andreouli 1, 2).

Accordingly, multiculturalism as a social paradigm had been severely attacked, on the ground that it has failed to adequately heal the community fragmentation and recognize the sense of belonging of those minority groups.

As the conspicuous debate over multiculturalism has to do with the ethnic minorities separatist tendency, or the ethnic social distance from the wider society, this public policy after Cameron's speech has been regarded also as the focal source and the main reason of terrorism, by making those young Muslims subject to radical ideology; most obviously, as Mr. Cameron at Munich Security Conference assured " ...all this leaves some young Muslims feeling rootless and the search for something to belong to and believe in can lead them to extremist ideology". As a response, David Cameron has appealed to react against this complicated aspect of extremism, confirming, "Instead of ignoring this extremist ideology, we as governments and societies have got to confront it. Instead of encouraging people to live apart, we need a clear sense of shared national identity, open to everyone."

(Wright and Taylor).

In this context, David Cameron believed that enhancing "a stronger sense of national and local identity" would assure "the key to achieving true cohesion" by allowing people to say "I am a Muslim, I am a Hindu, I am a Christian, but I am a Londoner... too". At the same time Mr. Cameron's vision has been more justified towards the concepts of "Islam and Islamist Extremism", particularly speaking, when he stated, "we need to be clear, Islamist extremism, and Islam are not the same thing", confirming that Islamist extremism which is a political

ideology that motivates “rootless” Muslims in their own geographical spaces is entirely different from Islam (“State Multiculturalism has...”).

Thus it is worth stating that David Cameron in this new discourse was attempting to empower the inclusiveness of the shared national identity idea, and make an open challenge towards Multiculturalism that brought about extremist and radicalist creeds.

For further clarification, in the light of the terrorist threats which thrived on the British terrains, at that Security Conference that took place in Munich, Mr. Cameron asked as well for “the hands-off tolerance” that allowed ethnic minorities “to live separate lives, apart from each other and the mainstream.” As he also added in his speech, that multiculturalism has declined to strengthen and exalt the sense of common identity that emphasizes namely the democratic principles, “social integration, equality, and human rights” before the law (Burns). David Cameron went also to claim that this social fact led few of natives to feel injustice, being directly accused for their racist responses and ethnic discrimination, but when non-white individuals committed dissatisfactory acts, they were viewed as a source of paranoia and thrill to be condemned compared with white persons (Kirkup). Accordingly, the narrative of multiculturalism failure has been more promoted by David Cameron in 2011, which saw it as an odd and a sinister social fact due to radicalization and terrorism.

Besides, on the conceptual basis of this social policy and its fate, there was an intense debate which has been fueled by political discourses, including notably, Angela Merkel of Germany, and President Nicolas Sarkozy of France. Thus on one hand, Angela Merkel in October 2010 stated that: “the approach to build a multicultural society and to live side-by-side and to enjoy each other ... has failed...” Similarly, France’s Nicolas Sarkozy has declared, “we have been too concerned about the identity of the person who was arriving and not enough about the identity of the country that was receiving him...”, “...multiculturalism has been a failure” (Allen 3). Thus it can be noticed that this debatable issue; and its demise has already

took a salient part within the political concerns in other European countries not only in the British political realm, with perceiving it as scapegoating of distinct ethnic groups.

3.4. Conservatives' Responses to Cameron's Speech

Regarding David Cameron's speech, there were politicized critical views held by many Conservative Party Members, most notably Burjor Avari, a multicultural studies co-ordinate at Manchester Metropolitan University, who believes that upon David Cameron's insistence on integration strategy, disregarding the issue of racism, he would bring about ominous outcomes. Upon the research the minorities fortification of their own cultural backgrounds would serve as an obstacle to racist impulses such as "school failure" and "social" marginalization, likewise the fierce confrontation over this social mix would cause violent and radical responses that David Cameron was reacting against, thus the key concern should be put on fighting racism (Multiculturalism and Britain's national identity). It seems that there must be a great emphasis to halt racism before tackling the issue of integration.

Moreover, Nick Clegg, the Deputy Prime Minister and Cameron's associate within the Coalition Government, delivered his speech in Luton (March 2011), in which he explained his stance towards multiculturalism as being a social fact which stands for diversity and not social division, enhancing the contact between societies and a mutual respect, these latter were seen as fundamental entities for an "open and confident society" with his rejection to take a sharp response against British Multiculturalism (Race 7). In this context, it seems that this static vision of multiculturalism failure was related to a big extent to David Cameron.

3.5. David Cameron Fight against Extremism

So far speaking about Extremism, David Cameron stated "Europe needs to wake up to what is happening in our own countries..." as he was trying rhetorically to look for the roots of these subversive terrorist acts, and also to diagnose this global threat i.e. Islamist Extremism that flew up over European countries (Wintour). In the worst fact, MI5, Britain's

domestic intelligence service, had asserted the overwhelming existence of more than 2,000 Muslims in Britain, who were connected with the terrorist offences.

Therefore, in a reactive attempt to eradicate this extremist activity, Mr. Cameron had adopted a considerable set of security measures, most notably, preventing the “preachers of hate” to reach the host country, for their sole and poisonous purpose, to peddle antagonistic and malevolent opinions toward other faiths at mosques and even at community centers, and also by taking a hard line, and intensifying a greater pressure on Muslim groups which do not subscribe to or even disrelish the principles of “gender equality, democracy and human rights” and prevent them to be close to those individuals in public settings such as universities and jails (Burns).

Additionally , David Cameron’s government has firmly operated with a new policy, as Downing Street asserted, this latter would reflect a push to the Labour Party 2007 “ prevent strategy”, which was a vital part of counterterrorism, the Prime Minister accordingly insisted on confining just the organizations which devote considerable efforts at sustaining the “ human rights, integration” strategy to receive public funds, stating that "Frankly, we need a lot less of the passive tolerance of recent years and much more active, muscular liberalism." (Wright and Taylor). It seems that for tackling the issue of extremism, there is a need to ditch Britain’s passive tolerance with more muscular liberal norms, so that to enhance the key British values.

Most clearly, when he had eloquently affirmed in his speech that his robust emphasis was about doing a deep examination and taking a serious action toward the Muslim Organizations which obtained public money without any effective role in rooting out extremist thoughts in the state (“State Multiculturalism has Failed ... “). Thus, Cameron’s objective was to exert more control on these Muslim Organizations.

Likewise, David Cameron assumed that UK is “bashful about our Britishness”, the cause that gave an opportunity to Muslim radicals to extend their Islamic radical thoughts in more than 20 schools in Birmingham, as a response the Prime Minister put a great focus on the British cannons to be sustained, so that to react against the Islamic extremists or what came to be dubbed as "Trojan Horse Plot". In The Sunday Mail David Cameron referred to the British values namely “freedom, tolerance and respect for the rule of law” as essential components that must be vividly enhanced by the teachers, and not to be only followed in schools, since they reflect the British identity.

The Prime Minister’s active reaction came after the schools watchdog Ofsted had shown in reports that 21 Birmingham schools were involved in extremist factions, in which five of them were seen as clumsy, and they need to be re-treated upon a set of procedures, this issue has urged Michael Gove, Education Secretary to decide that “in the future all of England’s 20,000 primary and secondary schools” are required to adopt the British norms of “tolerance and fairness” (Duggan). Accordingly, in addition to the government’s Prevent strategy, British schools are also required to emphasize the country's culture, as a way to rub this threatening enemy.

3.6. The Muslim Groups Response to the Prime Minister’s Statements about Muslims and Extremism

In David Cameron’s attempt to curb extremism in the country, this political speech has brought divergent vitriolic stances and new wave of protest, fostered by many Muslim Groups, on one hand the Muslim Council of Great Britain with its Assistant Secretary General, Faisal Hanjra criticizing the speech and considering it as ultimately a "disappointing" one, he clarified his attitude mainly at Radio 4's Today programme that the Prime Minister main interest or even his fulcrum did not go for tackling the problem of terrorism, when Muslims were expected to be seen as a positive push to counter this issue,

instead he implicitly considered them as an integral entity of the problematic matter(“State Multiculturalism has Failed... “). Muslims were the first to be harshly convicted and suspected of terrorism.

The Ramadhan Foundation that was established in Manchester, mainly when the terrorist attacks hit London in 2005, led by Mohammed Shafiq its Chief Executive, appeals for more positive contact between Muslims and non- Muslims, enhancing as much as possible a good vision about Muslims, and eschewing vilified “images” especially when it comes to Islam and Muslims.

As a reaction to David Cameron’s comments regarding Muslims and Terrorism, Mohammed Shafiq insisted on the point that the attribution of this anti- humanity crime or terror to the Islamic religion is entirely unacceptable and wrong, most obviously when he pointed out that “Terror is an evil and the killing of innocent people is forbidden in Islam”. At the same time he claimed that David Cameron’s attitude constituted a big mayhem for the “Muslim families”, being marginalized in certain cities as Bradford and West Yorkshire, inquiring “where is the British value of tolerance there? The prime minister made no mention of that in his speech. We are being targeted”.

As he went on to clarify also that Muslim organizations like his own were doing their best to combat those extremist factions, through constituting alliances and organizing meetings with Government Intelligence Agencies, and the Metropolitan Police (Danna). Consequently, this foundation had highly decried Mr. Cameron for supporting “hysteria and paranoia” about Islam and Muslims (Burns).

That is to say, David Cameron’s Speech was tremendously regarded as a racist political reflection that has indeed put a heavy onus and pressure, mainly on Muslims, who were clearly seen as number one targeted culprits and this was under the covert of combating Extremism and Terrorism.

On the other respect Inayat Bunglawala, the activist for Muslim issues and the chair of an Anti-Extremist Group Muslims4Uk has also attempted to show the weakness in Cameron's attitude regarding the British Muslims and terror acts, by confirming that the British Muslims are strongly "proud" of being British, and for them this extremist belief and radical acts are constituting a source of panic and thrill (Wintour). In this regard, it seems that what make the Muslims lacking the interest to social inclusiveness was again due to David Cameron's accusations and fierce comments.

In addition to Muslim groups, it has been also remarkable that David Cameron's speech as stated by the British reporter Mike Vilensky, did not appear from a vacuum, since it has been delivered simultaneously when juggernaut of 2000 members of the Far-Right EDL were advancing in Luton constituency, to combat Islam Extremism in the country. As a response Sadiq Khan, Law Maker for the Opposition Labour Party, took critical and sharp stand against David Cameron's statements decrying him of "writing propaganda for the EDL" (Vilensky).

Entering into the debate over the EDL, Nick Lowles, editor of "Searchlight" argued that this "street movement", which paid a greater attention to 'Islamic radicalization', turned to viciously attack the Islamic religion, as he also stated that this biggest demonstration or this reactionary dogma has put the Muslims on the margins of the wider society (Hasan). As if the Prime Minister here was attempting through his speech that was perceived as political bilk, to reinforce the EDL open Islamophobic objectives, thus to make the issue of extremism more complicated and also to breed hatred against Muslims and heighten internal tensions in the state.

3.7. British Multiculturalism under the Conservatives

The succession of the conservative party to power in 2010 launched a heated debate in Britain over the future of multiculturalism for the simple reason that the promotion of this policy has been historically associated with the Labour party and also because the known fact

that the conservative party is not so sympathetic with issues related to immigrants. Ayecha Kazmi, a Community Member and Activist affiliated with the Islamic Society of Boston Cultural Center, tried in her Article to weave and unpack some factual proofs and political “blunders” that illustrated in a way the fallacy of the Prime Minister attitudes toward the British multiculturalism, as she opposed the idea that this social fact failed.

First of all it is worth stating that despite the Quilliam Foundation Website backing David Cameron’s vision, particularly speaking, when the Prime Minister ensured the separation between Islam and Islamism, enhancing « human rights » and preventing radical groups to get financial support, it was remarkable that there were some political overlaps committed by David Cameron in his attempt to activate safety in the country, most notably, the fierce targeting of the “ young Muslim identity “ in Britain by terrorism, and despite the fact that he distinguished Islam from “ violent extremism “, he went on to agree that those radical thoughts and terrorism come “ overwhelmingly from young men who follow a completely perverse, warped interpretation of Islam”.

The second “blunder” was obvious in David Cameron’s speech, who claimed that British Muslims ‘culture is “ menacing” and incompatible to “ the core British values”, as he assured that the British Muslims highly believed in “ separatism”, whereas he agreed rhetorically that Britain has “ wrongfully tolerated “ those who “ run completely counter to our values”. As David Cameron gave interest to the issue of Muslim’s belief in forced marriage, which in his view depicts the differences between the marginalized culture (Muslims’ culture), and the “super” culture (the British one), he did not care about the circumstances or the most workable solutions of this social matter.

For the same concern to tackle the issue of Islamist Extremism, David Cameron put a great emphasis on muscular liberal policies, through which to give the immigrants the opportunity to know more about the British values and enable them to speak the English language, by

introducing citizen tests, programmes, making them close to job places, and housing. Without overlooking the fact that the previously mentioned policies, as acknowledged by Liz Fekete an expert in Islamophobia and Anti-Terror Legislation at the Institute of Race Relations; would create an assimilation instead of integration. British society will focus on cultural cohesion, where foreigners are taught how to act in ways similar to the British mainstream.

In addition to that Shaden Ahmed an Egyptian Primary School teacher in London, the one who has severely criticized David Cameron idea that the political sphere did its best to convince Muslims to combat radical creeds, with his utter refusal of the Government's fierce reactions against Multiculturalism, confirming that this social trend has played a pivotal role within the British society, the fact that must not be simply overlooked, as he also stated that the Prime Minister was not allowed to compel "any member of this society how they should live their lives"

Moreover, Salma Yaqoob Respect Party Member and Birmingham City Councilor, who has highly emphasized the Multicultural triumph in Leicester city; by claiming, "This city seems to be flying in the face of David Cameron's speech "as she added that in Leicester City, there were distinct cultural and religious backgrounds where "Hindu temple stands next to the mosque" the Indian women wearing are with a Muslim women dressing hijab (" it is not Multiculturalism that has Failed , it is David Cameron"). Accordingly, multiculturalism has not really failed, and the fine example in this case was Leicester city, a vivacious multicultural region. Thus the failure has been undoubtedly associated with David Cameron attitudes towards this social fact (See Appendix 4).

The table shows most clearly the classification of Leicester city as one of the most notable British cities that comprises a huge number of racially plural societies with the existence of the Whites (71,5%) and Indians (22,3%) at the first place and with a high percentage,

compared with other ethnic minorities such as Pakistani (1,0%) and Bangladeshi(0,4%)(Koenig, Singh and Rex 43).

Also, Nik Darlington in her Article “ The Doctrine of State of Multiculturalism has Failed” has stated initially that multiculturalism, which took a prominent part in the political life; has been severely decried by David Cameron, even before he became a Prime Minister, when he claimed in 2008 that multiculturalism was a “wrong-headed doctrine” since it sustains ethnic and religious diversity, and provides less perception to community integration until his official announcement as a Prime Minister that “ the doctrine of state of Multiculturalism has failed”.

In his Article “Reaction to Cameron’s Multiculturalism Speech: Hypocrisy and Misunderstanding from Left and Right” Nik Darlington has shown that those pluralistic societies, or even what come to mean “ Organic Multiculturalism” itself has not demised, confirming that for many years ago, multiculturalism has been an important entity; which has praised other cultures, and fostered the principle of “ toleration” towards the foreigners, and what is concerned with the contemporary failure is not Multiculturalism, hence it can be said that the predicative failure is firmly recognized at the level of the State and the Institutional circles; which did not do enough to perceive that “assimilationist” impulses impelling distinct cultural groups to be fully integrated and forget about their own culture a reracially prejudiced and even clumsy responses (“Reaction to Cameron’s Multiculturalism Speech ...”). This means that multiculturalism as a vivid social fact is very far from that failure.

In the Article entitled “ Why David Cameron is Wrong about Radicalization and Multiculturalism”, the political journalist Mehdi Hasan has affirmed that when delving into the issue of Multiculturalism, it seems obvious that this social perspective is entirely different from both Extremism and Radicalization, on one hand Extremism which is defined mainly in terms of “violent” responses, and on the other hand terrorism that is seen as a “political

problem” and not a “cultural” one , the best example was about the EDL , that has been more stimulated by “violent Extremists”, with no reference to Multiculturalism, this means that those pluralistic societies, or Multicultural groups were very far from the EDL radical impulses.

As a worthy idea as well, those terrorists were British born and “ integrated “ Muslims, most notably Mohamed Sadiq Khan, the responsible for the terrorist attacks that hit London in 2005 and the one who was working in the educational sector, calling himself “Sid”, and practicing football with some white children. Moving to the natives, who get involved in terrorism after they decided to embrace Islam, the well-known ones were Nicky Reilly and Oliver Savant. Regarding this point, there were many questions that remain unclear regarding Multiculturalism and its link with terrorism, is it true that those individuals were ignoring the core British values? Or their integration within the mainstream society would guarantee a certain security to the British “railway stations”?

In this Article Mehdi Hasan focused on the political factors or the so-called “Foreign Policy Issues”, notably David Cameron’s acceptance of the war on Iraq in 2003, his continual support of the war on Afghanistan, and his weak attitude over Israeli/Egyptian blockade of Ghaza, as he considered those events as the main vehicle or the push factors behind the spread of these echoes and instability in the state, that is to say Radicalization and Extremism. In this context Robert Lambert the former Met Police Officer went on to confirm the Staggers Blog, how Muslims and Muslim Organizations had contributed effectively to fight against internal terrorism, deeming David Cameron's speech as harmful political reaction into the inclusive understanding of multiculturalism, thus it became seemingly “a step backward rather than forward” (Hasan).

The journalist and editor Amy Hall in her Article “Does Multiculturalism have a Future in Britain” that was written in the Newspaper *Prism*, tries to set her sight on the debate over

David Cameron's speech on multiculturalism, that pushed a group of panelists at the House of Commons on 9 May 2013, to consider it as a "political weapon" and to propagate the controversial view of "we Vs they" while insisting on the British multiculturalism presence as a social fact, confirming, whenever political initiatives had been introduced, racist outrage was always seen as unbreakable and perpetual fact.

More recently in May 2016, Sadiq Khan the first Muslim Labour politician to be elected as the London Mayor, fostered new political dogma "a unity over division and hope over fear" as he has got 1,310,143 million votes (57%), in to a fierce contest against the Conservative Zac Goldsmith, who gained 994,614 votes (43%). Prof Tony Travers, director of LES London asserted that the multicultural nature in London was of great impact on the results (Booth).

Upon Sadiq Khan's commitment to be "mayor for all Londoners", he has sharply decried David Cameron's Conservatives of accusing him that he has espoused the Islamic radical factions, during the mayoral "campaign", with their attempt to sow tensions between London's communities ("London's New Muslim Mayor"). Despite the fact that Islam was always seen as a victim religion, what remains so obvious in this regard that the first noticeable victory of Muslim Mayor on the British soils has indeed made an open challenge over David Cameron's belief that multiculturalism has failed. (See Appendix 5).

The table casts the light on the triumph of the first Muslim Mayor Sadiq Khan with an overwhelming majority for the first time in 2016, compared with both Ken Livingstone and Boris Johnson whose number of votes since 2000 till 2012 were less than Sadiq Khan ones (Elgot and Johnston).

In Britain the presence of Muslims played a pivotal role through the Muslim Organizations which devoted great efforts to fight extremist creeds, Leicester city that was seen as the best exemplification of a vibrant multicultural place and the recent victory of the first Muslim Mayor Sadiq Khan in 2016 are key facts that can falsify David Cameron's attitudes. They

provide strong evidence that multiculturalism has not failed in Britain, in other words, multiculturalism has rhetorically failed, but in practice it did not.

Moreover, the claim that Muslims do not want to integrate into the indigenous majority or that they desire to live separately and keep their own way of life and traditional values cannot be used as a measure for the rise of radicalism or even the failure of British multiculturalism, as the increasing of separatism among ethnic minorities could not be proved.

Since the coming of the Conservatives to power, their political discourse and the measures they took as regard to ethnic and cultural diversity in the country, indicate their intention to create a rupture with the policy of multiculturalism. But at the same time, it is clear that multiculturalism has its deep roots in many British institutions and it still exists as an idea in the minds of many officials, citizens and communities who strongly believe in its effectiveness. And above all its existence as a social fact makes it difficult to eradicate it. Therefore, imagining that a change of policies by the Conservatives will make multiculturalism a matter of history is very wrong.

Conclusion

Broadly speaking, it is worth stating that minority groups in the British soils have been supported by the Leftwing Old Labour Party. Different Labour governments played a significant role in trying to build bridges with minorities and in patronizing organizations representing them. Most gains of minorities have been obtained during Labour terms in office. Legislatively, the British Nationality Act of 1948 opened the door for the Commonwealth migrants and granted them full British Citizenship.

Yet, the first political intention went on to rebuild the British Post War economies of the state and to regain what has been lost. The continuous influx of immigrants has made the British society more and more diverse. The Multicultural nature of the country started to cause real controversy in the 1980's. By 1997, the general perception of this social mix that has turned to be a politicized notion was virtually embodied at the national level for the first time under the rule of New Labour Party.

Tony Blair, the New Labour Party leader, has adopted a new ideological paradigm named "community of communities" as an adequate social solution to patronize those minorities in the state. The Prime Minister has asserted his acknowledgement of the cultural diversity, mainly with his adoption of a set of promotional measures, that were in a way put to wipe out anti-immigrant feelings and racist tensions that were so salient in the post-WWII period.

Yet, the 9/11 terrorist attacks in United States and its conjunction with London Bombings, were attributed mainly to Muslim groups being the first to be suspected and accused. This fact bred shrewder quests and doubts over the destiny of British multiculturalism, and whether there was an urgent need for changing this state policy or not. These attacks have not only thrived beaten debatable views in the Briton's minds, but also they have brought a turning point in the British politics.

Thus it is crucial to reflect on the fact that the re-assessment of this state policy has begun with the Prime Minister Tony Blair, who has forcibly insisted on the idea of integration with balance to diversity. Tony Blair has partly repudiated the policy of multiculturalism, confirming that these extremist tendencies within the minority Muslim groups and even their failure to be integrated within the mainstream society could not be served as a measure of multiculturalism demise, with his vigorous focus only on the British cannons that all the minorities are expected to abide to.

Before delving into the fate of British multiculturalism after the Tory leader David Cameron speech at Munich in 2011, it is crucial at first to state that the right wing Party's hostility to the immigrants or minority groups in the country was conspicuous from the Conservatives early emergence to power, to be clearly asserted at the end by the newly elected Prime Minister David Cameron in his political discourse.

The Conservative Leader has assured "community of communities" failure and its degradation to be supplanted by new political agenda of "community cohesion". The Tory leader heralded his fierce attack on "state multiculturalism" and blamed and denied this long-standing racial and cultural mix confirming state multiculturalism has been a main root of many evils in society including separatism that might broaden a lacuna to be filled by Muslim radicalists.

Cameron's comments on Muslims and the set of measures he did consider to combat extremism, notably prohibition of the Muslim groups to receive public funds, thinking that the Muslim Organizations has not devoted much effort to end extremist impulses, brought a new wave of protest by the victim groups, claiming that David Cameron's speech was rife of derogatory and racist reactions toward all what is related to Muslims, with portraying vilified images over the Islamic religion more than combating extremist factions.

What remains unclear is whether it is true that British multiculturalism has utterly failed? So, in this regard it can be said if the demise of multiculturalism was meant by those minorities failure particularly speaking, Muslims to coexist and integrate within the British society or even the belief that community of communities dimension has paved a way for Muslim extremists to create their own barbaric realm, it is the wrong perception. In other words, multiculturalism has failed because of the increased cultural intolerance, racial outrages and hostilities that were encountered and endured by Muslims since many years ago, that is to say David Cameron sharp blame on multiculturalism was deemed to be a stimulation of the religious prejudice that existed before.

Likewise, according to the Conservative Party Member Burjor Avari, it was David Cameron's failure in his profound focus on social inclusiveness and integration with disregarding the issue of racism that kept the ethnic minorities on the margin of the wider society. More justifiably, to refute David Cameron's claim of multiculturalism failure, many critics went on to agree that multiculturalism existed and still exists.

The fine example was Leicester City that comprises distinct racial and cultural identities, in addition to the contributory role of the Muslim Groups on extremism eradication, that were stimulated with the victory of the Muslim Mayor Sadiq Khan on the British soils for the first time in 2016. These facts were drawn as evidence that indeed made forcible challenges to David Cameron's speech on multiculturalism demise. Accordingly the state of multiculturalism has retreated only at the rhetorical level, and as a social fact it is continuing to shape the future of British society.

Besides, the British backing to United States in its occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan, being seen as driving forces that had clamored some Muslim extremists living in Britain, did not mean to put heavy onus on the entire Muslim community and to weave lethally vision over Islamic religion. Additionally, Cameron's speech was deemed to be political

expediency to enforce the racist objectives of English Defense League demonstration that was advancing on the same day the Prime Minister delivered his speech. So what is necessary to keep in mind is that what politicians have failed to be re-treated cannot be said to have demised.

Multiculturalism under the rule of the conservative party is an endless topic of discussion, and if this party remains in power, this state policy will certainly deteriorate more, but in the same time, it will not be easy to eradicate it since it has deep roots in institutions and in the minds of communities and citizens.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Governmental Documents

House of Lords. *Constitutional Implications of Coalition Government*. London:

The Authority of the House of Lords, 12 Feb 2014.

Speeches

Blair, Tony. "Blair on Bomb Blasts." *BBC News*. 7 July 2005. Web.

Cameron, David. "David Cameron's Immigration Speech". University

Campus Suffolk, Ipswich. 25 Mar 2013. Web.

Secondary Sources

Books

Ameli, Saieder R, et al. *British Muslims Expectations of the Government: the British Media and Muslim Representation: the Ideology of Demonisation*. Great Britain:

Islamic Human Rights Commission, 2007. Print.

Ball, Stuart. *The Conservative Party and British Politics 1905-1951*.

Ed. Roger Lockyer. London: Routledge, 2013. Print.

Carter, Bob, Clive Harris and Shirley Joshi. *The 1951-55 Conservative Government and the Radicalization of Black Immigration:*

Policy Papers in Ethnic Relations. University of Warwick, 1987. Print.

Cesarani, David and Tony Kushner. *The Internment of Aliens in Twentieth Century Britain*.

Ed. David Cerani. London: Franc Cass and Co. Ltd, 1993. Print.

Connell, Andrew. *Welfare Policy under New Labour: the Politics of Social Security*

Reform. London: I B Tauris and Co. Ltd, 2001. Print.

Conway, David. *A Nation of Immigrants: a Brief Demographic History of Britain*.

London: Institute for the Study of Civil Society, 2007. Print.

- Crowther, Jonathan. Ed. *Oxford Guide to British and American Civilization*. UK: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Duffy, Patrick. *Placing Immigration in History: Geographies of Irish Population Movements*. Belfast: The Ulster Local History Trust, 2006. Print.
- Jefferies, Julie. *The UK Population: Past, Present and Future*. Focus on People and Migration. Ed. Roma Chappell. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2005.
- Heyck, Thomas William. *The Peoples of the British Isles a New History: from 1870 to present*. Ed. Northwestern University: Lyceum Books. INC. Print.
- Hussain, Assifa and William Miller. *Multicultural Nationalism: Islamophobia, Anglophobic, and Devolution*. United States: Oxford University Press Inc, 2006. Print.
- London, Louise. *Whitehall and the Jews, 1933-1948: British Immigration Policy, Jewish Refugees and the Holocaust*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.
- “Love Thy Neighbour: Immigration and Race Relations, 1951-1979” *Austerity, Affluence, and Discontent in the United Kingdom 1951-1979*. N. A. Print.
- Modood, Tariq. *Multiculturalism: a Civic Idea*. UK: Polity Press, 2013. Print.
- Newman, Janet. *Modernizing Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Production LTD, 2001. Print.
- Pathak, Pathic. *The Future of Multicultural Britain*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2008. Print.
- Pitcher, Ben. *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Powell, Martin., ed. *New Labour, New Welfare State? the ‘Third Way’ in British*

Social Policy. Great Britain: Policy Press, 1999. Print.

Weis, Paul. *The Refugee Convention: the Travaux Reprtoires Analysed with Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.

“What were Conservatism and Liberalism.” *Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895*. N. A. Print.

Articles

Newspaper Articles

Booth, Robert. “Labour's Sadiq Khan Elected Mayor of London”.*The Guardian*.
7 May 2016. Web.

Burns, John F. “Cameron Critisizes Multiculturalism in Britain”.*The New York Times*.
5 Feb 2011. Web.

Duggan, Oliver. “David Cameron:it is Time to Stop being Bashful about our
Britishness ”. *The Telegraph*. 15 June 2014. Web.

Elgot, Jessica and Chris Johnson. “Sadiq Khan Officially Takes Over as London
Mayor - as it Happened”. *The Guardian*. 7 May 2016. Web.

Hasan, Mahdi. “Why David Cameron is Wrong about Radicalization and
Multiculturalism”. *NewsStatesman*. 5 Feb 2011. Web.

Kazmi, Ayecha. “It’s Not Multiculturalism that has Failed, it is David Cameron”.
AmericanPaki, 19 Mar 2011. Web.

Kirkup, James. “Muslims Must Embrace our British Values, David Cameron
Says”. *The Telegraph*. 5 Feb 2011. Web.

“London’s New Muslim Mayor Condemns Rivals’ ‘Trump-Style’ Attacks”.
Business World Online. 8 May 2016. Web.

Mirza, Munira. “What Now for the M-Word?”*Spiked* .10 May 2007. Web.

Murry, Douglas. "Mass Immigration will Destroy Britain if we don't Act Now, Blasts Douglas Murray". *Daily Express*. 28 Aug 2015. Web.

"The Empire Windrush: Jamaica Sails into British History". *The Voice*. 22 June 2013. Web.

Vilensky, Mike. "David Cameron : Multiculturalism has Failed ". *Daily Intelligencer* . 6 Feb 2011. Web.

Wintour, Patrick. "David Cameron Tells Muslim Britain: Stop Tolerating Extremists". *The Guardian* . 5 Feb 2011. Web.

Wright, Oliver and Jerome Taylor. "Cameron: my War on Multiculturalism". *Independent*. 5 Feb 2011. Web.

Websites

"How has Immigration Changed Britain since WW2?" *BBC*. 1 Jan 2014.

"Ramsay MacDonald (1866-1937)". *BBC News* 2014. Web.

Kuenssberg, Laura. "State Multiculturalism has Failed, Says David Cameron". *BBC News*. 5 Feb 2011. Web.

Reports

"A Community of Communities and Citizens: Cohesion and Justice in the Future of Britain." Web.

www.runnymedetrust.org/.../Community-of-Communities-and-Citi...

Adyemi, Femi. "Thatcher and Institutional Racism." Web.

inquirycenter.muohio.edu/.../ThatcherAndInstitutionalRacism

Ahalt, Clare Feikret. "The UK's Legal Response to the London Bombing of 7/7." 2013. Web.

Akbarzadeh, Shahram and Bianca Smith. "The Representation of Islam and Muslims in the Media: the Age and Herald Sun Newspapers." *School of Political and*

Social Inquiry.

“All White with Labour.” *Socialist Review*, 1993. Web.

Ansari, Humayun. “Muslims in Britain.” *Minority Rights Group International*. 2003. Web.

Aston, Ben. “What are the key differences between ‘Old’ and ‘New’ Labour? Explanatory Concepts in Political Science.” Web.

Awan, Imran. “The Problem with Defining Terrorism and the Impact on Civil Liberties-Britain is Beginning to Create a Monster with Large Claws, Sharp Teeth and a Fierce Tempter.” University of Wolverhampton: *Politics and Law*. June 2008. Web.

Bourne, Jenny.”In Defence of Multiculturalism: IRR Briefing Paper.”*Institute of Race Relations*, Feb 2007. Web.

Brown, Truth. “Racism and Immigration in Britain.” *International Socialism*, 1995. Web.

“Community Responses to the War on Terror: IRR Briefing Paper.” London : *Institute of Race Relations*, 2007. Web.

Connolly, Mickael. “Multiculturalism in Theory and Practice: Multiculturalism, Compassion, and the Law.” Farrar, Omar, Simon Robinson, and Omar Sener. Eds. *Workshop proceeding: Debating Multiculturalism* .Great Britain: Dialogue Society, Leeds Metropolitan University, Mevlana (Rumi) University, Apr 2012. Web.

Dixon, Sylvia. “Migration within Britain for Job Reasons. ” *Office for National Statistics*, 2003. Web.

Dwankowski, Carol, Jan Erik Mustad, and Åse Elin Langeland. “Multiculturalism – A Challenge?”Eds. Høines, Øivind, and Pål, Frønsdal. Drupal :NDLA. Web.

Fieschi, Catherine., and Nick Johnson. “Islam and Muslim Communities in the UK: Multiculturalism, Faith and Security.” *The International Spectator*, 2013. Web.

“Globalization: Migration and Globalization.” *Suny Levin Institute*. Web.
www.global101.org/upload/File/Migration/migration.pdf.

Hall, Amy. “Does Multiculturalism have a Future in Britain?” 2013. Web.

Heath, Anthony., and Omar Khan. “Ethnic Minority British Election Study.”
Runnymede Trust, 2012. Web.

Higgins, Jenny. “Newfoundland and Labrador Heritage.”2008. Web.

Howarth, Catherine and Elini Andreouli. “Has Multiculturalism Failed?
The Importance of Lay Knowledge and Everyday Practice.” Web.

Igram, Mike. “British Muslims Face Increased Racist Attacks and State
Harassment.” Web.

Jalili, I K. “Study for Consideration of Inclusion of Arab as an Ethnic Group on
Ethnicity Profile Forms.”*National Association of British Arabs*. Web.

MacNicol, Lain. “History of the Labour Party.” 105 Victoria Street: Blue State Digital.
Web.

Moore, Kerry, Paul Mason, and Justin Lewis. “Images of Islam in the UK:
The Representation of British Muslims in the National Print News Media
2000-2008.”*Cardiff School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies* 2008. Web.

Moson, Barry. “Islamophobia in the British Media.” 2008. Web.

Muchowieka, Laura. “The End of Multiculturalism? Immigration and Integration in
Germany and the United Kingdom: Multiculturalism after 7/7.” 2013. Web.

Rascanu, Iulia. “Debating Multiculturalism in the UK. Representation and Analysis in
Cinematic Texts.” *Diasporas and Multiculturalism*. The Bucharest University
of Economic Studies and The University of Mumbai. 22 Feb 2015. Web.

Reluca, Illiou. “Margaret Thatcher’s Step (M) Othering England or Who’s the

Predator in this Alien Story: an Exercise of Imagination.” Web.

Robson, Garry. “Cosmopolitanism and Multiculturalism from below in Contemporary Britain New Labour, the Macpherson Report and Multiculturalism.” *Cosmopolitanism and Philosophy in a Cosmopolitan Sense*. Eds. Áron Telegdi-Csetri, and Viorela Ducu. Bucharest: The New Europe College, 21-22 Oct 2011. Web.

Schuster, Liza, and John Solomos.”Race, Immigration and Asylum: New Labour’s Agenda and its Consequences.” London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, 2004. Web.

“7/7 London Bombing: History of London.” Houses of Parliament, 2005. Web.

Shi, Tongyun. “British National Identity in the 21st Century.” Beijing Foreign Studies University, 2008. Web.

Smith, Evan and Marinella Marmo. “The Myth of Sovereignty: British Immigration Control in Policy and Practice in the Nineteen Seventies.” *Institute of Historical Research*, 2014. Web.

Somervill, Will, Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah, and Maria Latorre. “United Kingdom a Reluctant Country of Immigration.” London: Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2009. Web.

Stahnke, Tad, et al. “Violence Against Muslims: 2008 Hate Crime Survey.” Human Rights First, 2008. Web.

“The Immigration Acts through the Ages.” Web.

www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-24463873

“The United Kingdom: a Multicultural Society.” Web.

<http://www.britishcouncil.org/Languageassistant-multiculturaluk.ltm>.

White, Jon. “New Labour: a Study of the Creation, Development and Demise of a

Political Brand.” University of Birmingham. Web.

Journal Articles

Allen, Chris . “A Critical Analysis of Britain’s Living, Dead and Zombie

Multiculturalism: from 7/7 to the London 2012 Olympic Games.” *Social Sciences* 2014. Ed. Martin J, Bull. University of Birmingham: Institute of Applied Social Studies. Web.

Modood, Tariq and Stephen May. “Multiculturalism and education in Britain:

an Internally Contested Debate.” *International Journal of Educational Research* 2001. Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship: Pergamon.

“Multiculturalism and Political Integration in Modern Nation-States.” Mathias Koenig. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS)*:UNESCO, 2003. Web.

Panayi, Panikos.“Multicultural Britain: a Very Brief History.” Bratberg, Øivind, et al.,

Eds. *The Journal of British Politics Society, Norway* 2011. Web.

Pilkington, Andrew. “Multiculturalism under Siege .” Bratberg, Øivind, et al., Eds.

The Journal of British Politics Society, Norway 2011. Web.

Quinn, Thomas, Judith Bara and John Barttle.”The UK Coalition Agreement of 2010:

Who Won?” *The Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 2011. Web.

Race, Richard. “Teaching the Multicultural in Education: Balancing and Fine

Tuning.” Bratberg , Øivind, et al., Eds.: *The Journal of British Politics Society,* Norway 2011. Web.

Dissertations

Abrahamova, Natali. *Immigration Policy in Britain since 1962*. Diss.

Masaryk University, 2007. Web.

Chudickova, Olga. *Multicultural Britain of the 21st Century*.Diss.

Faculty of Humanities, 2011. Web.

Laura, Vaughan. *The Jews in London 1695 and 1895*. Diss. London:

University College, 1994. Web.

McHugh, Declan. *A 'Mass' Party Frustrated? The Development of the Labour Party
in Manchester, 1918-31*. Diss. University of Salford European Studies

Research Institute, 2001. Web.

Thaper, Ciaran. *Has Multiculturalism Failed? A Critical Analysis*. Diss.

Linkedin Corporation, 1 May 2013. Web.

Wagner, Jordan. *A Changing Immigration System: Immigration Policies under Tony
Blair and Gordon Brown*. Diss. Web.

Speeches

Blair, Tony. "Blair on Bomb Blasts." *BBC News*. 7 July 2005.

Cameron, David. "David Cameron's Immigration Speech". University Campus Suffolk, Ipswich. 25 March 2013.

Secondary Sources

Articles

Journal Articles

Allen, Chris . "A Critical Analysis of Britain's Living, Dead and Zombie Multiculturalism: from 7/7 to the London 2012 Olympic Games." *Social Sciences* 2014. Ed. Martin J, Bull. University of Birmingham: Institute of Applied Social Studies.

"Multiculturalism and Political Integration in Modern Nation-States." Mathias Koenig. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS):UNESCO*, 2003.

Panayi, Panikos. "Multicultural Britain: a Very Brief History." Bratberg, Øivind, et al., EDS. *The Journal of British Politics Society, Norway* 2011.

Pilkington, Andrew. "Multiculturalism under Siege." Bratberg, Øivind, et al., eds. *The Journal of British Politics Society, Norway* 2011.

Quinn, Thomas, Judith Bara and John Barttle. "The UK Coalition Agreement of 2010: Who Won?" *The Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 2011.

Race, Richard. "Teaching the Multicultural in Education: Balancing and Fine Tuning." Bratberg, Øivind, et al., EDS.: *The Journal of British Politics Society, Norway* 2011.