

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

BACHELOR THESIS

VERONIKA FAJBÍKOVÁ

BRATISLAVA 2013

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

**THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE POLICY OF
MULTICULTURALISM AND ISLAMIC RADICALISM IN
GREAT BRITAIN**

Study Program: Liberal Arts

Field of Study: 3.1.6 Political Science

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Arthur W. McCardle, Ph.D.

Degree to be awarded: Bachelor (Bc.)

Handed in: 30.4.2013

Date of Defense: 13.6.2013

VERONIKA FAJBÍKOVÁ

BRATISLAVA 2013

Declaration of Originality

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been published in part or in whole elsewhere. All used literature and other sources are attributed and properly cited in references.

Bratislava, 30.04.2013

Veronika Fajbíkova

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my friends for being there for me through all this time, especially to Simonka. Last, but not least, I would like to offer my sincerest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Arthur W. McCardle, PhD., who was so patient throughout the process of my writing and provided me with space for my own thoughts.

Abstrakt

Autor práce: Veronika Fajbíková

Názov práce: The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism in Great Britain

Názov vysokej školy: Bratislavská medzinárodná škola liberálnych štúdií

Meno školiteľa: Prof. Arthur W. McCardle, PhD.

Komisia pre obhajoby: Dagmar Kusá, PhD., prof. PhDr. František Novosád, Csc., Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Predseda komisie: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Miesto, rok, rozsah práce: Bratislava, 2013, X strán

Stupeň odbornej kvalifikácie: Bakalár (Bc.)

Bakalárska práca *The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism in Great Britain* sa zaoberá otázkou, či je možné, aby politika multikulturalizmu a snaha o rozvoj tolerantnej spoločnosti vo Veľkej Británii vyvolali negatívne reakcie v rámci komunity imigrantov. Aké sú príčiny vzostupu islamského radikalizmu vo Veľkej Británii? Hlavným cieľom tejto práce je analýza potenciálnych dôvodov rozšírenia islamského radikalizmu vo Veľkej Británii a jeho vzťahu s politikou multikulturalizmu.

Hlavná časť tejto práce sa sústreďuje na teóriu a politiku multikulturalizmu. V tejto časti bude vysvetlený pojem multikulturalizmu, ciele zavedenia takejto politiky, a reálne dopady implementácie takejto politiky. Taktiež budú spomenuté názory rôznych odborníkov na túto tému. Priestor dostanú aj prieskumy verejnej mienky, či iné štatistiky.

K najvýraznejším problémom, ktoré súvisia s politikou multikulturalizmu, patria prejavy islamského radikalizmu. V tejto časti bude vysvetlený fenomén islamského radikalizmu, jeho pravdepodobné príčiny a prejavy.

V závere tejto práce bude zodpovedaná otázka z úvodu, a to nasledovne. Politika multikulturalizmu čiastočne umožnila radikálom rozšíriť svoje pôsobenie v rámci krajiny a získať si podporu spomedzi členov Moslimskej menšiny. Zároveň je však nutné poznamenať, že výraznú rolu v tomto dianí zohrali aj iné faktory.

Abstract

Author: Veronika Fajbíkuvá

Title: The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism in Great Britain

University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Arthur W. McCardle, PhD.

Thesis defense committee: Dagmar Kusá, PhD., prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc., Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Chairman of the Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Place, year, number of pages: Bratislava, 2013, X pp.

Academic degree: Bachelor of Science (abbr. „Bc.”)

This thesis deals with the question whether it is possible that the policy of multiculturalism and eagerness for tolerance and diversity in Great Britain have sparked negative reactions on the side of immigrant communities. How and why is it possible that Islamic radicalism grows in a country like Great Britain? This work will analyze what are the potential reasons for growth of Islamic radicalism in Great Britain and its relationship with the policy of multiculturalism

The main pillar of this work is the theory and policy of multiculturalism. In this part, the definition of multiculturalism will be clarified: what were the aims of such a policy; what were the hopes this would possibly achieve; and finally, what has really happened since this policy was implemented. In this section, the thesis will also examine various viewpoints on the policy of multiculturalism in Great Britain by trying to provide juxtaposing arguments by different scholars. This part will be also illustrated by relevant opinions of influential politicians and by public opinion polls.

One of the most notable issues connected with the policy of tolerance and multiculturalism is radicalism, in most cases Islamic radicalism. In this part, the phenomenon of Islamic radicalism will be explained, as well as its possible origins and manifestations. Finally, the thesis will consider whether the policy of multiculturalism may or may not have in fact helped the radicals to extend their actions throughout the country and raise support among the members of Muslim minorities and whether other factors also played any role.

Table of contents

Declaration of Originality	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstrakt	iv
Abstract	v
Table of contents.....	vi
General Introduction	7
Multiculturalism	9
Definitions and models of multiculturalism	9
Contemporary attitudes towards multiculturalism	12
Britishness & Multiculturalism.....	14
Muslims in Britain	18
The Concept of Ummah	21
Possible causes of Muslim radicalization	23
Youth and Education	24
Assimilation or Integration of Muslim Communities into Society	25
Islamic Organizations in Great Britain.....	26
Which one is on the rise: Secularization or Religiosity?.....	27
Domestic and Foreign Policies of Great Britain	27
Conclusion.....	30
Resumé.....	33
List of References	34

General Introduction

In our contemporary world, globalization and migration brought together various types of culture, traditions, values, moral rules and, what is the most important, many different kinds of people. Unquestionably, many people are happy it came to this and some even call themselves “global citizens”. However, life is not a fairy tale, even if we wish it would be. There have always been and probably always will be some conflicts between people with different value systems, whether violent or not. Sometimes we are so convinced of our own truths, we forget to step out of the box and think about other possible variants. The European crisis of identity and the wishful thinking of millions who see themselves as tolerant and open-minded individuals collide with the different views of immigrants who came to Europe from other parts of the world. There is no doubt that a peaceful coexistence is always the better alternative; it is however very hard to achieve with such a diverse mass.

After the Second World War, Europe opened its borders for migrants from all over the globe. Especially Great Britain with its colonization and immigration history can be picked from many others, so we can see what types of domestic policies and measures they have chosen to implement, whether they worked or not, to what extent they were successful. Immigration came largely from countries with which Great Britain had had strong historical ties especially as colonies and which constitute the Commonwealth, and this made the immigration much easier.

One of the topics which is discussed very often is the policy of multiculturalism. Europe is known for its endeavor of tolerance. However, as this work will discuss, it becomes clearer now that there has to be some line between what we can call tolerance and what may actually discriminate against some residents.

Islamic radicalism has become more visible during the last decade. The affair of Salman Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses* in the 1980’s was just a beginning of later events. After 9/11, the bombings of 2005, 2007 and 2008, people became so terrified that their earlier longing for tolerance started to crumble in the shadow of fear. In an effort to ensure security some new rules have been implemented and critiques appeared, directed at multiculturalism.

Fajbíková: The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism
in Great Britain

The tolerant face of Europe is disfigured by various kinds of unrests and accusations on a number of sides. Is it possible that the policy of multiculturalism did in some sense help the radicals to thrive? Will (or did) Europe, and in this case Britain, pay for its benevolence? That would mean the policies should be more austere, shifting away from the usual efforts to be as open-minded as possible. Alternatively, should we search for the solution in policies which were already proposed or implemented and perhaps improve these somehow? Those are the questions to which we will try to find the answers.

Multiculturalism

Definitions and models of multiculturalism

First of all, it is necessary to define one of the key terms of this thesis: “multiculturalism”. One realizes that one is dealing with a very complex term right away, because scholars have not yet been able to agree on one precise explanation of this word. Multiculturalism could be characterized as a kind of state practice, which is, however, inconsistent as the meaning of its own rubric and the compatible ideal against which it could be measured do not exist either (Pitcher, 2009, p.163). In the vaguest sense, multiculturalism is the dominant policy in contemporary Britain (Ibid.).

Evidently, an explanation like this one is not sufficient. Let us look at other opinions. When in doubt about a meaning of some word, one usually turns to a dictionary. Collins English Dictionary (2013) defines 'multiculturalism' simply as the policy of maintaining a diversity of ethnic cultures within a community. Clearly, such a definition is obscure and provides enough space to adapt it to diverse trains of thought. That is one of the main problems when dealing with multiculturalism and it may cause severe misunderstandings. In this case, it seems appropriate to paraphrase Cornel West, who when talking about multiculturalism said that “..it became a slogan, while its meaning is usually not defined. It is unstable, able to adapt. It is also elusive and amorphous” (Barša, 1999).

What exactly do we have in mind when we speak about multiculturalism? One can use the term “multiculturalism“ in two different meanings: descriptive and prescriptive (normative) (Heywood, 2004, p.253). In the descriptive sense it embraces cultural diversity of two or more groups in society. These groups, as Heywood writes further, when living together in a state, for instance, can construct a kind of collective identity. Multiculturalism should endorse this cultural, linguistic, ethnic, religious, etc., diversity and respect these distinctions. Prescriptive multiculturalism is often seen as an example of political correctness (understood as refraining from forms of expressions or actions which can be identified as insulting or discriminating certain groups of people). There is a debate whether being politically correct is just a question of politeness, or whether it might encourage negative attitudes.

More and more countries have had to acknowledge that they are not mono-cultural and politically static (even if they were before, they are not anymore). How is the country supposed to be stable when the foundations of national identity are enfeebled? Some see this as a key issue in modern politics.

In the discourse about the policy of multiculturalism people usually turn to the example of the United States of America, where we can find the beginnings of affirmative or positive action, also called the positive discrimination (defined as a policy or program whose aim is to counter discrimination against minority groups, women, etc.). In addition, we can mention Australia, New Zealand and Canada. In the United Kingdom, as well as in Germany, there were voices which called for the assimilation (as in contrast to integration) of immigrants and minorities. Here assimilation means abandoning one's traditional views or values in favor of traditions of the new host country; integration, on the other hand, is rather incorporating them all into one community while preserving them.

Britain lacks an official "Multicultural Act" or "Charter" as Australia or Canada has that. The long-term trend in British immigration policy was to minimize entry into the United Kingdom of colonial peoples that policymakers believed to be too different to be integrated. This was countered until the 1960s (Schain, 2008, p. 20). However, more than forty years ago Britain said no to the idea of integration based unity through an uncompromising cultural assimilation. Roy Jenkins in 1966 defined integration as "not a flattening process of assimilation but equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance" (Meer, Modood; 2007).

Overall, it is very problematic to even define the term "multiculturalism" as such. Thus, the discussions connected with the notion of multiculturalism very much depend on the basic definition one decides to subscribe to. Nevertheless, the essence of the term has some common grounds. It is almost universally acknowledged that people derive their understanding of the outside world, morality and culture from the culture in which they live or have been living. Therefore, every culture deserves to be recognized and protected. From this one can deduce the existence of minority rights

or special rights. For instance, Will Kymlicka (1995, p.38) talks about three different kinds of minority rights: special group representation rights within the political institutions of the larger society, so that the particular minority is not ignored on country-wide decisions; self-government rights with powers given to smaller political units so that a minority cannot be outvoted; and polyethnic rights which protect certain cultural and religious practices that do not have the sufficient support in the market, for example, a dress code conflicting with religious belief, as in the “burqa ban” in France (Irving, 2012)).

However, there is no universal opinion what should an ideal multicultural society look or work like. Heywood (2004, p.254 – 256) distinguishes between three different models of multiculturalism: liberal multiculturalism, pluralist multiculturalism and cosmopolitan multiculturalism.

Liberal multiculturalism is based on the liberal values of freedom and tolerance. There are some concerns here, too. For instance, tolerance as such is not necessarily morally neutral, because one can tolerate something while not agreeing with it and that can create a problem. Thus, one can really be tolerant only towards other tolerant opinions or practices, otherwise the rules in the society might get seriously undermined. Moreover, it is important to see the difference between the private and public life of an individual. Liberal multiculturalism is not in conflict with civic nationalism, in which one can be loyal towards the state and the same time toward his or her particular culture or tradition. We can illustrate this with the French attitude, where the wearing of a hijab or burqa (a headscarf) in public and other displays of religious belief in schools are prohibited. The third possible issue of liberals might be that their only legitimate political system is liberal democracy, thus they will not agree with the tendencies to implement Sharia law because of the aforementioned factor of tolerance.

Pluralist multiculturalism rests on the theory of value pluralism, a topic broadly analyzed by Isaiah Berlin. According to this theory, everyone can have a different answer to the question of the meaning of life and basic values, and each of these viewpoints is valid. Thus, these values can get into conflict and so do conceptions of morality. One might say, for instance, that the so-called Western values (e.g. personal

freedom, rule of law and secularization) are not any more esteemed than those which contradict them. That might lead to the “politics of indifference,” but Berlin believed that value pluralism can only work in a society which reveres the freedom of an individual. Bhikhu Parekh talks about an alternative view on pluralist multiculturalism, and claims that multiculturalism is founded upon interaction of human nature and culture and says that “complexity of human nature is reflected in the diversity of cultures” (Heywood, 2004, p. 256). According to Parekh, we should acknowledge the complicatedness of human nature as well as admit that every culture can manifest certain aspects of humanity and that would lead us to so-called politics of recognition.

Cosmopolitan multiculturalism supports cultural diversity and politics of identity and endorses the view that different cultures can teach each other. According to this viewpoint culture is variable and reacts to political and social changes. This kind of multiculturalism leads rather to a melting pot of different ethnic or religious groups than to a cultural mosaic (Heywood, 2004, p.256).

Contemporary attitudes towards multiculturalism

The current mood is not kind to multiculturalism. In general, there are more and more critical voices being raised against policies which wear the label of being multicultural. One of the most visible critics – except for the political leaders -Kenan Malik, who has dealt with this topic to a great extent, finds it important to decide what one means by multiculturalism. As he noted in the debate “Multiculturalism at its limits? Managing diversity in the new Europe“, one meaning of multiculturalism can be 'diversity as lived experience' and the second can be 'multiculturalism as a political process'. While the former means to “talk of the experience of living in a society that has become more open, more vibrant and more cosmopolitan”, the latter means something a lot different, precisely “the process of managing the diversity by putting people into ethnic boxes”. In this framework, differences are publicly affirmed, recognized and institutionalized, Malik adds. We should recognize the difference between the diversity and the political process, because diversity gives us the option

to get out of the mentioned boxes and provides us with a space for debate. Moreover, Malik thinks multiculturalism as a political process undermines what is good about diversity as a lived experience and recreates said boxes in the name of recognition and tolerance.

His criticism is not solitary, though. For instance, Lord Sacks thinks that multiculturalism was supposed to bring a tolerant society, where everyone, regardless of creed or culture, could feel at home. Sacks also added that the main message of multiculturalism says “there is no need to integrate”. In addition, he noted that multiculturalism belongs to a wider phenomenon of dissolving national identity, common values and collective identity, which makes it hard to integrate, because there is in fact nothing to integrate into (Sacks, 2011). One could say that there exists a certain trend or tendency to doubt the efficacy and desirability of multiculturalism as used in the governance of the state, which is not exclusive for Britain, but is visible also in Germany, the Netherlands, France, etc. (Pitcher, 2009, p.164).

Probably the most important issue which is usually connected to the policies of multiculturalism is separation/segregation/isolation of the minorities. Many scholars claim that under the broad term of multiculturalism a number of small isolated groups develop. These groups then do not mingle with the rest of the people in the state, as it would be desired in pursuit of integration and tolerance of multiculturalism. Contrary to the original aim of the policymakers, these groups live in their own neighborhoods and thus show that the goals of government did not quite work out. According to one of the most competent people to say something about this problematic, an immigrant student from Iran, “multiculturalism has been working as a landmark term to symbolize a set of social attitudes and governmental policies to endorse coexistence,” although in reality he still perceives “a huge lack of social cohesion in the society” (Shahi, 2010).

Britishness & Multiculturalism

„The British are special. The world knows it, we know it, this is the greatest country on earth.“ (Blair, 2007)

What does it mean to be British? Certainly, every nation has its habits, particular traditions, symbols, foods, etc. However, when one mentions Britishness, one does not have in mind Big Ben, tea at five or fish and chips. More likely, the things which one would mean in this case are values of tolerance, respect, a belief in rule of law, democracy, and freedom.

However, as Easton (2012) notes, it would be very complacent to appropriate these to a single nation, as if any other country in the world could not honor the same values. Similar to many other notions, Britishness is also difficult to define in one sentence, because, in Easton's words, it is like every other identity, it is developing and changing all the time, and if we were to explain it, it would be as trying to paint the wind.

Kallevik (2009) agrees and says the precise meaning of Britishness remains disputed. What is clear though is that it encompasses an identity which is common for all the different peoples of the United Kingdom. Nonetheless, we should ask ourselves to what extent such an identity still exists, given the influencing factors such as globalization, immigration, and so on.

Confronted with the consciousness of a certain disintegration of Britain, Kallevik presents a view of some experts who claimed that the policies of multiculturalism (introduced in the 1960s), originally supposed to simplify cohesion, actually weakened ‚Britishness‘ as a common identity. Malik (2009, p. XI) reproduced the words of Roy Jenkins, former Home Secretary in 1966, who back then announced an end to the country's policy of assimilation and launched instead a new era of ‚cultural diversity, coupled with equal opportunity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance‘ – which, in essence, describes multiculturalism. Subsequently, a few years ago Jenkins expressed an opinion that when he looks back, „we might have been more cautious“ (Ibid.).

Kallevik (2009) explains further that it was specifically education which was influenced by this change of approach. Reforms introduced equal rights to keeping one's own identity, language, tradition and culture, which resulted in giving priority to diversity over common identity. Correspondingly, there are voices which claim that this policy has done more harm than good, stressing the factors which actually divide people, even though the goal was to achieve the exact opposite. Trevor Phillips, head of the Commission for Equalities and Human Rights, thinks that "people were sleepwalking into segregation" and suggested abandoning multicultural policies and bringing back „Britishness“ (Kallevik, 2009). Although to bring the „Britishness“ back, it is first necessary to agree upon a single definition of it. According to a number of researchers, a common British identity should also include the cultures of minorities. This view is supported by a MORI poll from 2002, which had shown that the majority of British people want to define Britishness in an inclusive way (Ibid.). For the purposes of this work it is important to note that according to this poll, in spite of a growing religiosity among the younger generation of Muslims, most of them are well integrated and do not see their religious views as a barrier to being British (Kallevik, 2009).

Not everyone is so optimistic though, for instance Bhikhu Parekh argues that Britishness „should not be seen as common identity because of its controversial past and domination by the majority culture“, and furthermore “Britishness, as much as Englishness, has systematic, largely unspoken, racial connotations, in particular for Africans, Caribbeans and Asians, Britishness is a constant reminder of the unjust treatment of colonisation“ (Ibid.).

As Palmer (2012) writes, proclaimed British values have not been accepted by a significant number of immigrants and some of them even express hopes to distance themselves from Britain completely, while building their own education system where they could maintain their own values.

Shahi (2010) also notes that the notions of fairness, justice or freedom do exist also in other cultures, but because not everyone was brought up in the same framework some people may have conflicting definitions and understandings of these terms. Shahi asks whether we could call it a 'social construct sustained by certain narratives'. Nevertheless, these narratives are not static, they respond to the sociopolitical

particularities of the contemporary society. Moreover, narratives also have a foundation in a certain understanding of the past. He points out that history is merely constructed too, because it is a selective collection of perspectives based on collective memories and collective forgetfulness. How is this connected to multiculturalism? Shahi then concludes that history is crucial in relation to social inclusion because a certain understanding of the past might overshadow a person's understanding of the present. Plus, Shahi ends his argument with a claim that if people regard themselves as historic victims of the state, they may not be able to be motivated themselves to feel responsible toward the society of which they are a part.

The Guardian (Moss, 2012) organized a poll among people who live in Britain, asking them about their ideas on national identity. For instance, Nadia Hussain (32, biomedical scientist, living in Stratford, East London), who is of Pakistani origin claims that she „experienced a lot of racism growing up. The racial groups – white, black, Asian – tended to keep in their own groups“. She also says that she is proud to be British, but adds that Britain „has lost its sense of Britishness“. Alan Ward (65, retired engineer, living in Bradford, West Yorkshire) represents the skeptics, when he says that „the community falls apart. These foreigners come in, they all have six or seven kids, and they're outbreeding the British people. My grandson goes to the school I went to when it first opened, and he's the only white person in the class. They're just going to take over. We're a third-world country now, and it's going to get worse“. Hilda Nenohwe (19, student, living in Coventry, West Midlands) has parents from Zimbabwe, but was born in London. She mentions an interesting distinction when she says she feels British rather than English, because „if you say English, you really segregate to the white, English people. Britain is more inclusive. Coventry is very multicultural compared with Kent,“ where she claims she experienced a lot of racism and did not feel like she belonged there.

Here we can see the variety of opinions on a very small sample of answers, which only proves the aforementioned fact that the very term „Britishness“ is not clear and thus the answers vary from one to another.

Britain's Prime Minister David Cameron in his speech at the Munich Security Conference expressed an opinion which was then cited very often, where he claims that the policy of multiculturalism in Britain has failed: „Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and the mainstream. We have failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong. We have even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run counter to our values“ (Cameron, 2011). That is a bold statement, but is it true?

Heath (2012) does not agree, and provides us with data from the English and Wales citizenship survey, which had shown the following figures: "85% of white British people agreed to "fairly or very strongly feeling that they belong to Britain", where 89% of both Indian and Pakistani, 87% of Bangladeshi and 84% of both black African and black Caribbean agreed“. Additionally, „there is no evidence to support claims that ethnic communities behave in ways that run counter to the broader society's values. The new report finds that all groups of ethnic minorities support the maintenance of their own ethnic customs and traditions, but they also show equally striking support for mixing and integrating: with positive feelings about the cultures of both origin and destination countries“. Heath notes that on the contrary, the survey had shown that the vast majority of ethnic minorities and white British people feel "one can belong to Britain and maintain a separate/religious identity" (Heath, 2012).

Muslims in Britain

After France and Germany, Britain is now home to the highest number of Muslims in the European Union: according to the 2011 Census, 2.7 million Muslims live in England, thus representing 5.0% of the population. Modood (2006, p. 38) notes that such high numbers are also a result of Commonwealth immigration after the 1950s. Britain and especially London is an urban center, attracting various migrants, many of whom are Muslims. The countries of origin of these people include Somalia, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Iraq and South Asia.

Consequently, the presence of many different minority groups called for new policies within Britain. The case of Islam as something problematic had not been perceived as such a problem for the EU countries until the late 1980's.

According to Modood, (2006, p.41), there was an anti-racist and “minorities politics” development in Britain, first in radical activism and ultra-left groups, and then after the riots in Brixton (1981) also in local government structures, unions, associations, etc. Brixton with its African-Caribbean community was plagued by various economic and social issues which resulted in a conflict between the Metropolitan Police and protesters.

At that time, Modood (Ibid.) explains, the British population was divided into two groups, black and white. The question of ‘race’ began to define the identity of many people. It is not clear though, whether the majority of South Asians or Muslims identified with this differentiation. However, some Asian political activists concerned with the mainstream society rather than with organizing their own community embraced this distinction. Moreover, Modood adds, “from the late 1980s onwards, if not earlier, most Asians were emphasizing a more particular ethnic or religious identity rather than this all-inclusive non-whiteness”.

The *Satanic Verses* controversy, which happened in 1988-1989, is probably the most representative event concerning the Muslim minority in Britain. Muslims back then complained that this novel, written by Salman Rushdie and first published in the United Kingdom, was disrespectful and insulting for them. Rushdie was then accused of blasphemy and in 1989 Ayatollah Ruollah Khomeini of Iran issued a fatwa (in

sharia “a ruling by a recognized authority”) to kill Rushdie. The Iranian government supported it until 1998 and then dropped the allegation. Interestingly, not everyone who expressed being offended by Rushdie’s book had actually read it. Malik (2009, p.2) illustrates this by an example of Syed Shahabuddin, a self-proclaimed leader of India’s 150-million Muslim community, who admitted that he had not read *The Satanic Verses*. ‘I do not have to wade through a filthy drain to know what filth is,’ he said. Shahabuddin had been alerted to the novel by Jamaat-e-Islami activists, which is an Islamist organization founded in India in 1941 by Sayyid Abdul A’la Maududi, one of the heroes of the modern jihadist movement. The Jamaat organized a number of groups in Britain, which were funded by the Saudi government, with the Islamic Foundation in Leicester on top. Eventually, Jamaat-influenced organizations set up the United Kingdom Committee on Islamic Affairs (UKACIA) with a goal of leading a campaign against Rushdie’s book, describing it as „the most offensive, filthy and abusive book ever written by any hostile enemy of Islam“ (Malik, 2009, p.3). However, if one were to look at this case worldwide, there was no turmoil on a large scale; the controversy seemed to be concentrated only in Britain.

It is important to mention though that at the time of the Rushdie affair the media gave excessive space to Muslim extremists, while not taking into account that common British Muslims had expressed sympathies on a very limited scale (Modood, 2006, p. 49). Here we can see that opinion discrepancies among the leaders of organizations and people whom they should represent are not that uncommon.

Even so, everybody who had seen the upheaval around Rushdie could identify the conflict between the West and the Muslim community. This book was able to provide the spark and mobilize Muslims in Britain like never before. Malik (2009, p. IX) describes the burning of Rushdie’s book as “an icon of the rage of Islam“. However, not only Muslims were startled by these events. The question whether Islamic values are compatible with those of Western liberal democracy was posed.

If one were to look at the events of 9/11 in New York as a “turning point”, and then at the train bombings in Madrid in 2004 and London bombings of 2005, there is presumably one common denominator in all these occurrences. The media worldwide call them ‘the acts of Islamist terrorists or radicals’. Thus, it is not altogether surprising that common people had become terrified of international Islamist

organizations.

It is crucial to see the difference between radical Islamists and the opinion of regular Muslims. People are always afraid of the unknown, whether we are talking about those attacked or those who attack. Thus it is fundamental to make a distinction between “Islamic” and “Islamist”, as it seems to be quite common to confuse these two terms which is complicating the situation even more. To put it simply, “Islamic” means simply “Muslim”, while “Islamist” is a term used to describe or characterize as radical Muslim.

Furthermore, when we hear the term ‘radical’ in Islamic context, usually people imagine a religious fundamentalist. It was not always so. In 1980s, a ‘radical’ meant something completely different – that is, someone secular, Western and left-wing (Malik, 2009, p. XII). In the Collins Dictionary (2013), we can see that the meaning of the term „radical“ is explained as follows: of, relating to, or characteristic of the basic or inherent constitution of a person or thing; fundamental; concerned with or tending to concentrate on fundamental aspects of a matter; searching or thoroughgoing; favoring or tending to produce extreme or fundamental changes in political, economic, or social conditions, institutions, habits of mind, etc. Thus, if people are characterized as „radical“, it does not necessarily mean they are extremist. Spalek (2007, p. 193) notes that based on the analysis of the notion, one should be careful while connecting radicalism and terrorism.

Hence, the study of Islamic political radicalism is nowadays essential and as many scholars suggest, a thorough analysis of the causes and consequences of terrorist attacks on Western European targets is necessary and asks for an interdisciplinary approach, with viewpoints from anthropology, political science, psychology, sociology and theology (Abbas, 2007).

However, it is necessary to note that only a relatively small percentage of actual terror suspects were taken into custody in connection with Islamist terrorism. Moreover, the majority of suspects came from the so-called second generation immigrants, meaning they were children of immigrants who found themselves living in a strange place. They did not identify with the views of their parents, nor did they fit into the “Western” society.

The Concept of Ummah

Because of this, they had to find someplace to belong. Often, they turn to the Muslim community, Ummah, which is not constrained by any borders or culture. According to Spalek (2007, p. 201), the concept of 'ummah' refers to a worldwide Islamic community which takes the place over national or ethnic identities. To be more precise, Ummah is an Arabic word meaning "nation" or "community" and it can also be said to be a supranational community with a common history. It is a synonym for ummat al-Islamiyah (the Islamic Nation), and it is commonly used to encompass the collective community of Islamic peoples. In the context of Pan-Islamism and politics, the word Ummah can be used to mean the concept of a Commonwealth of the Believers. As Spalek adds: „Young people may be claiming an Islamic identity for themselves because this places them within a global community and that means they no longer feel so marginalised“ (Spalek, 2007, p. 201).

However, it is necessary to acknowledge that Muslims have been watched very closely and the world analyzes their actions more closely. Patel (2007, p.46) points out that Arabic terms (such as Ummah here), are being mystified and associated with Islam when it might not be even relevant. For instance, the basic meaning of Ummah is simply feeling sympathy with one's co-believers around the world, but nowadays it „became equated with antagonism towards nationalism,“ when Ummah is de facto not any more different from the Jewish sympathy for Israel or Christian sympathies for anyone else following Christ. As Patel writes further - and it seems people in fear have forgotten about it - if one identifies with another individual or group of people it is typical and not at all extreme to show certain amount of sympathy to people with whom they can identify (Ibid.).

It is especially important to note that even though the majority of Muslims as such and also European Muslims have condemned and distanced themselves from the acts of violence which were carried out in the name of Islam (Akhir, 2013), one cannot overlook the fact that some of the terrorists themselves claimed to be Muslim (Ash, 2005) . This undoubtedly helps to build barriers in the ordinary lives of millions law-abiding citizens and immigrants who happen to be Muslim (Silvestri, 2007, p. 57).

According to Silvestri (2007, p.65) it is crucial to consider the exact meaning of used

expressions, because the meaning of phrases such as ‘Islamic fundamentalism’, or ‘political Islam’, etc., can differ or in some cases even be in opposition with each other, especially when it comes to the use of political violence. Also, it is incorrect to assume that Islamist politics automatically carry extremism with themselves. The problem is partially caused by internal fragmentation, unclear hierarchical structure in Islam, and conflicting views of various Muslim clerics and scholars on the interconnection of Islam and democracy, Silvestri adds (Ibid.).

There are a lot of terms that need to be clarified, such as ‘Islamic political radicalism’, ‘Islamic fundamentalism’, ‘Jihadi Salafism’, and how they were created, all that in the context of the society, and taking into account the influence of media and political debate. Moreover, another prerequisite is to understand what it means to become “radicalized” - usually this was not associated with Islam, but more with the political Left in Britain, as was mentioned before.

We should also distinguish the factors which constitute the basis for Islamic political radicalism in Europe, meaning “the local (economic, cultural, social, political alienation; political and cultural marginalization; psychological factors), national (responses to the ‘War on Terror’ which came about after the attacks on USA in September 2001) and also the international factors (concepts of the Ummah and its relationship to the positions of Islam and Muslims in different countries) (Abbas, 2007, p. 2).

Possible causes of Muslim radicalization

The aforementioned Rushdie affair of the year 1989 focused people's attention on the problems of the South Asian Muslim community in Britain, which were mostly unnoticed until then. After the events of 9/11 and unquestionably after 7/7, this part of society became even more visible. It is crucial to remember, according to Silvestri (2007, p.58), that the overall attitude towards Islam and Muslims in European society is based more on the international politics and events rather than on understanding the Muslim minorities themselves. Abbas (2007, p.5) writes that after "increasing anti-terrorist measures, increased policing powers, racial and ethnic profiling in the criminal justice system," a discussion about culture centralized around South Asian Muslims and their seeming inability to assimilate. Suddenly, community cohesion and broadening social/cultural/economic positions exist side-by-side with the radicalization of young Muslims.

Moreover, when people realized that the 7/7 attackers were home-grown British citizens, the focus was directed at potential pathways to radicalization and connections amid extremist Islamists opinions and actual violence (Spalek, 2007, p. 192). Among the topics which were discussed in this context were, for example, issues of marginalized Muslim youth, the degree of assimilation/integration of Muslim communities into society, functioning of Islamic organizations, but also the possible failure of the policy of multiculturalism and the foreign policy of Great Britain (Hellyer, 2007, p.247).

Politically, Abbas adds, the discourse concerning Muslims in Britain is mainly between the right, the left, and the liberals. The left talks mostly about the economic structure and the Iraq war; the right puts in a good word about culture and nation; and then there are the liberals whose main focus is on freedoms and liberties in a democratic society (Abbas, 2007, p.6). Some scholars (Abbas, 2007; Modood, 2006) agree that the political agenda in radical Islam was usually absent among migrants, but its attractiveness is on the rise in the second generation – the children of immigrants, who grew up in Britain and often got much better education than their parents did. This youth then becomes politicized by a radicalized Islam. Abbas observed that in Western Europe these indigenous Muslims frequently encounter

issues not only of inter-generational character (i.e. attitudes towards the majority communities), but also run into problems when it comes to integration. They claim they would like to integrate and make significant efforts to do so, but have negative experiences and thus feel somehow alienated, misplaced. One factor is that the „common“ secular liberal life appears to be quite the opposite of the life of a proper Muslim, Abbas adds. These circumstances might then encourage some to go and search for a solution to their Muslim issues.

Abbas also mentions that it is often the case that Islamic political radicalism represents the tensions of people trying to be European, British Asian, Pakistani or Kashmiri as much as to be a Muslim (2007, p.6). „These individuals can be politically subjugated by radical interest groups, often resulting in their carrying out horrific acts of violence invariably involving the annihilation of the self and largely for other Muslims,” says Abbas (2007, p.4).

Youth and Education

It is often the case, that young Muslims begin their radicalization at universities (Abbas, 2007, p.4; Spalek, 2007, p.194). When one thinks about it more thoroughly, it may not come as such a surprise. Students are away from home; they get in touch with many other viewpoints, perspectives and experience life in general, with its ups and downs. Sometimes there are disappointments and sometimes it might get worse. Spalek (2007, p. 194.) mentions a paper by the Home Secretary and Foreign Secretary on how to prevent British Muslims from becoming attracted to extremist movements, which had shown that the majority of young radicals belongs to one of these two groups: students or graduates in engineering and IT, or people with no qualifications whatsoever, a number of times with a criminal background.

Anwar (2005, p.44) concluded that concerning education, Muslim children are confronted with issues as deficient number of facilities for teaching of their religion and culture in schools. However, Muslim organizations can support the necessary activities in mosques or community centers, but are not sufficient enough. Those British Muslims who finish their studies still have to face higher unemployment, that being also an example of racial and/or religious discrimination.

Nowadays the Muslim communities in Britain are going through an important demographic phase – the shift from first generation migrants to second and third generation citizens born in Britain. Now more than ever, the questions concerning identity are topical among the minorities in Britain. Young Muslims feel that while they are getting the same education and training, they are not being treated equally as other citizens. They also noticed that their parents have might have tolerated prejudice possibly as some kind of the price they had to pay for staying in Britain. Nevertheless, young Muslims will not accept racial and religious discrimination and unless they receive equal treatment, the tensions between Muslim young people and non-Muslims are probably going to thrive, Anwar (2005, p.45) concludes.

Assimilation or Integration of Muslim Communities into Society

In Anwar's project, there are also a number of important findings in regard not only to education, but to many other spheres, and can be summarized briefly as follows:

- The housing conditions of Muslims are still inferior to those of indigenous white people.
- Muslims are over-represented in the prison population, where they constitute almost 10 percent of the total.
- On the other hand, they are under-represented in the „police, the judiciary, the civil service, the media, public appointments and also in the decision-making process. For instance, there are only two MPs of Muslim origin in the House of Commons, out of 659: to reflect the Muslim population in Britain, however, there should be at least 20 MPs of Muslim origin“ (ibid.).
- Since 9/11, antipathy against Muslims, both verbal and physical, has increased. There are various press reports of violent attacks on individuals and property (e.g. mosques).
- Overall an increase in Islamophobia.

Islamophobia is a fear or prejudice instigated by the existing Eurocentric and Orientalist global power structure. It is directed at a perceived or real Muslim threat through the continuation and expansion of existing dissimilarities in economic, political, social and cultural relations, while justifying the need to use violence as an instrument to accomplish "civilizational rehab" of the target communities.

Islamophobia reinstitutes and stresses a global racial framework through which differences are preserved and enlarged (IRDP, 2009).

As Schain (2008, pp. 18-20) states, the core problem of integration in recent years has been understood both by governments and public opinion as the problem of integrating immigrants from Muslim countries. Accordingly, attitudes about and of Muslim immigrants are usually those which tend to 'probe the sharp edges' of issue of integration. Schain declares that the idea that "immigration is having a good influence" is accepted in both Europe and in the United States, but the confidence that Muslim immigrants seek to adapt to customs in their country, and that there is no conflict between devout Muslim practice and living in modern society, is strongly held in France. Furthermore, "French Muslims are by far the most integrative in their orientation, and the least conflicted between their Muslim and national identities." Recent study of Muslim elites in Europe by Jytte Klausen contains a typology of four preferences as modes of integration for Muslim populations:

- Secular Integrationist: Islam is compatible with Western value and that the organization of Islamic practice should be integrated into existing frame works of church-state relations.
- Neo-orthodox: Islam is not compatible and should not be integrated into existing frameworks
- Voluntarist: Islam is compatible in terms of values, but should not be integrated into existing frameworks
- Anticlerical: Islam is not compatible in terms of values, but should be integrated into existing church-state relations (ibid.)

Anwar closes his paper by saying that it is necessary to implement some positive policies and measures, in order to „facilitate the integration of Muslims by bringing their rights and their working and living conditions into line with those of their fellow-citizens. However, Britain has a long way to go to achieve this goal“ (Anwar, 2005, p.45).

Islamic Organizations in Great Britain

To name the main political organizations which associate British Muslims one certainly needs to mention these: the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB), The Muslim Association of Britain (MAB) and The Islamic Society of Britain (ISB) (Laqueur, p.

60).

Interestingly, Patel (2007, p.52) writes that state uses the MCB to support its policies. Moreover, in the aftermath of 7/7 events, officials claimed that the new anti-terror legislation was discussed with the MCB, and therefore Muslims approved it in a way. The MCB thus got into a situation, where it is seen as government puppy from the Muslim perspective and as a radical organization from the government perspective. As a result, it is not of assistance to any of them (Ibid.).

Abbas (2007, p.5) mentions *Hizb-ut- Tahrir* (HT), which was banned from British university campuses by the National Union of Students (NUS) in the mid-1990s, and is banned from many European countries today. Moreover, there were other Salafi organizations during the 1990s in Britain, such as Al-Muhajiroun. Also, supporters of Shariah and HT were successful at Islamic university societies in Britain before they started to be suspicious. Encouraged to see themselves as engaged in a battle that pits ‘good’ against ‘evil’, angry young Muslims see Western nation states in negative binary terms. The rhetoric of the ‘evil other’ has been used by both George W. Bush, Tony Blair and Osama bin Laden.

Which one is on the rise: Secularization or Religiosity?

It may seem that in the 21st century, secularization has gone a long way already, but as we can see, it may not be true for every sphere of the society. On the individual level it can be on the rise actually, Spalek (2007, p. 194-5) says. Why is that so? “This may be because late modern society, whilst providing a certain degree of material comfort, nevertheless contains mechanisms that have led to the marginalisation of moral questions, leaving people with little sense of a purpose in life. ‘Personal meaninglessness – the feeling that life has nothing worthwhile to offer – becomes a fundamental psychic problem in circumstances of late modernity’.” This is, of course, applicable to every religion and perhaps even country where this phenomenon can be experienced, not only to Islam and Britain.

Domestic and Foreign Policies of Great Britain

Britain’s racial politics have been established in connection with its own imperial

history for centuries. Nowadays it is clear that they are influenced by the United States' imperial practice (Pitcher, 2009, p. 135). The state's ability to maintain ethics of multicultural pluralism when in face-to-face with the demands of war is of much more importance at this time (ibid.).

Rex (2005, p. 238) claims that a number of policy responses came right after 2001 as a part of „The War on Terror“, and these were concerned with security. It seemed as if the government did not have precise knowledge of the nature of any terrorist threat. To cite Rex: „What it did was to cast its net as widely as possible. Individuals could be held without charge under the Prevention of Terrorism Act and Britain had its own centres equivalent to the American Guantanamo Bay. Anyone associated with one of the more radical Muslim sects who had visited Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia or the Gulf States could be detained in this way. Moreover, any radical imam in a British mosque became an object of suspicion“ (ibid.). That does not sound like especially open and tolerant society.

According to Hellyer (2007, p.249), British foreign policy has impact on Muslim communities around the world. The contemporary Western world policy towards the Arab and Muslim worlds has met with evident opposition in many Muslim groups. This is aggravated by the advantages of modern communication: not everything might make it to the evening news, but it will certainly find its ways via the Internet and other mediums. Hellyer points out that this is not supposed to describe all British and Western foreign policy as not fair and horrendous. Nonetheless, many Muslim communities see it like that. However, the way they perceive it, it really is disproportionately unjust and full of prejudice.

In order to fight against allegations of anti-Islamic opinions, many Western politicians indicated that they do see a difference between the religion of Islam and Islamic radicalism, saying that Islamic radicalism misuses Islam to carry out violent political ideas, as stated in Patel (2007, p.47).

In the wake of the London bombings, Tony Blair made sure to accuse a singular 'evil ideology' in Islam, but not Islam itself, while capitalizing the idea of a pluralist national society (Pitcher, 2009, p. 141).

As Patel writes further, „It is profoundly dangerous and misleading to blame some part of Islam for political violence, and is clearly a means of identifying the groups responsible for 'terrorist attacks' with Islam“ (2007, p.48) and it exacerbates the

Fajbíková: The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism
in Great Britain

alienation of Muslim citizens who will be from that moment seen as suspects by those who rely on media to assess and formulate their opinions. Politicians stay safe, their speeches are politically correct, but the everyday experience is different for common people.

Conclusion

Let us recapitulate the main question of this thesis. What is the relationship of the policy of multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism in Great Britain? These two happenings are certainly connected, although this nexus encompasses a vast number of different influencing factors which need to be considered.

Silvestri claims it is beyond question that multiculturalism, understood as the cohabitation with diversity – has produced reciprocal curiosity and sociocultural métissage (which brought various artistic and culinary products). Nevertheless, it has also generated social and racial tensions which may cause the ghettoization of some communities. Therefore, Silvestri concluded, “there is no reason for celebrating multiculturalism as the best strategy of integration of immigrants and minorities”. Moreover, she adds that regardless of the characteristics of Islamic tradition and culture, and despite the endeavor of European institutions and citizens, the “doubt on whether Islam belongs to or can fit in with Europe remains and that is very much a reflection of feelings expressed in everyday conversation.” In addition, there have been issues in relationship of Islam and other traditional religions and Muslims seem to have problems expressing their concerns, which seemingly do not help to solve the situation (Silvestri, 2007, pp.67).

A famous critic of the politics of multiculturalism, Kenan Malik writes: “Liberal multicultural policies have not created radical Islam, but they have helped created a space for it in Western societies that previously had not existed. They have also provided a spurious moral legitimacy to Islamist arguments. Every time a politician denounces an ‘offensive’ work, every time a newspaper apologizes for causing offence [...], they strengthen the moral claims of the Islamists. There will always be extremists who attempt to murder cartoonists or firebomb newspaper offices... What we can do is refuse to create a culture that emboldens such people by accepting their voices as somehow legitimate” (Malik, Essay on the Danish cartoons, the Salman Rushdie affair and Radical Islam, 2010).

Shahi (2010), who is the most capable to say something to this topic, since he is an immigrant living and studying in Britain, advocates a broad social dialogue

concerning the legacies of multiculturalism in Britain and suggests that “both the political system and the excluded communities have not done enough to translate the differences into cohesion and social strength. There is a limit to how far the culture of political correctness can prevent social conflicts. Thus, in order to actualize the positive potentials of diversity, new measures should be taken to address the repercussions of multiculturalism in Britain.”

Modood (2006), on the other hand, claims that Muslim politics in Britain clearly include an advocacy for multiculturalism” and “some of this group of Muslims believe that the Qur’an, Islam and Muslim history are powerful sources of multiculturalism and represent a superior form of multiculturalism than has been developed elsewhere or is on offer in the contemporary West.” Modood explains that for some Muslims, multiculturalism means “identifying dimensions of ‘difference’, with other religions not just included but given primacy in terms of respect”. He expresses regret over the fact that the emergence of Muslim political agency caused confusion in the British politics of multiculturalism, and mentions also changes in the Netherlands and elsewhere, while pointing out nationalism and secularism. Finally, we should not forget that “there are more Muslims in the European Union than the combined populations of Finland, Ireland and Denmark,” and they certainly should be properly represented and heard.

Pitcher (2009, p. 148) points out a contradiction in British politics, especially in the case of the War on Terror in relation to multiculturalism. Islam has been chosen as an antagonistic element and exposed millions of British Muslims as a potential threat. Pitcher also notices a certain characteristic of the British multiculturalism, and that is its nationalistic character (which might sound like an oxymoron, but if we compare it to the concept of Ummah, it is quite clear that he has a point here). Moreover, he draws an interesting parallel between McCarthyism in 1950s in the United States and the post-2001 changes which occurred worldwide, but also in British politics and brought more repression, suspicion and surveillance in fear of „an enemy within“.

Abbas (2005, p.16) wraps his argument by claiming that British multiculturalism justifies „the demands on unity and diversity, of achieving political unity without cultural uniformity, and cultivating among its citizens both a common sense of belonging and a willingness to respect and cherish deep cultural differences“. Also, he adds that multiculturalism is an attractive goal, which is at the same time not

especially easy to achieve. Furthermore, he says that The New Labour experiment has had „both high successes and low failures – the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000), the Human Rights Act (1998), the Stephen Lawrence Report – but then, as a result of September 11 and the Northern ‘riots’, public policy focus has been on domestic security and the war against international terrorism. Both of these fronts significantly impact on British Muslims in the current period.“

Resumé

Prvá kapitola tejto bakalárskej práce sa zaoberá teóriou, a to konkrétne problematikou definície pojmu multikulturalizmus a vysvetľuje jeho rôzne modely. Následne sa sústreďuje na súčasné postoje voči politike multikulturalizmu a jej dopady. V ďalšej časti rozoberá vnímanie britskej národnej identity (“Britishness”) a jej vzťah s multikulturalizmom.

Druhá kapitola práce čitateľa uvádza do obrazu života Moslimskej menšiny vo Veľkej Británii, vysvetľuje pôvod konfliktov ako napríklad kontroverziu ohľadom Satanských veršov Salmana Rushdieho. Taktiež tu vysvetľuje pojem “Ummah” a jeho význam pre moslimov na celom svete.

Tretia, najdôležitejšia kapitola sa snaží poskytnúť vysvetlenie, čo vedie moslimov k radikalizácii a uvádza rôzne faktory, ako napríklad marginalizácia detí v školskom veku až po tendencie vysokoškolákov pridávať sa k radikálnym hnutiam. Ďalej nesmieme opomenúť otázku asimilácie a integrácie moslimskej menšiny do spoločnosti – a faktory ako nedostatočná politická participácia a reprezentácia, diskriminácia, a podobne; rôzne Islamské organizácie, ktoré združujú veriacich. Práca sa tiež venuje otázke sekularizácie súčasnej spoločnosti. Ďalšou neoddeliteľnou súčasťou práce je pohľad na zahraničnú politiku Veľkej Británie, hlavne čo sa týka vojny proti terorizmu, a jej vplyvy na domácich moslimov.

Celkovo by sa dalo povedať, že multikulturalizmus ako ideál je atraktívny, nie je však vôbec jednoduché priblížiť sa mu. Je však možné, že svojou otvorenosťou a tolerantným prístupom multikulturalizmus vytvoril priestor pre radikálnejšie názorové smery a poskytol legitimitu napríklad aj islamistickým argumentom. Navyše, manichejská logika vojny proti terorizmu je v konflikte s multikultúrnym charakterom Veľkej Británie.

List of References

- 2011 Census, Key Statistics for Local Authorities in England and Wales. Published December 11, 2012. Retrieved February 3, 2013 from the Office for National Statistics: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-286262>
- Abbas, T. et al. (2007). *Islamic Political Radicalism: A European Perspective*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Abbas, T. et al. (2005). *Muslim Britain: Communities Under Pressure*. Zed Books Ltd.: London.
- Akhir, J. (2013). *Rejecting Terror*. Published April 11, 2013. Retrieved April 15, 2013 from The Muslim Council of Britain: <http://www.mcb.org.uk>
- Anwar, M. (2005). Muslims in Britain: Issues, Policy and Practice. In T. Abbas (Ed.) *Muslim Britain: Communities Under Pressure*. (pp. 31-45). Zed Books Ltd.: London.
- Ash, T. G. (2005). *What we call Islam is a mirror in which we see ourselves*. Published September 15, 2005. Retrieved January 18, 2013 from The Guardian: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/sep/15/iran.religion>
- Barša, P. (1999). *Politická teorie multikulturalismu* [The Political Theory of Multiculturalism]. Brno: Centrum pro stadium demokracie a kultury.
- Blair, T. (2007). *Blair's Resignation Speech in Full*. Published May 10, 2007. Retrieved February 26, 2013 from BBC News: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/6642857.stm
- Cameron, D. (2011). *Speech on radicalisation and Islamic extremism - Full Transcript*. Published February 5, 2011. Retrieved February 18, 2013 from The New Statesman: <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/the-staggers/2011/02/terrorism-islam-ideology>
- Defining "Islamophobia" (2009). The Islamophobia Research and Documentation Project (IRDP). Retrieved March 11, 2013 from Center for Race and Gender, University of California, Berkeley: <http://crg.berkeley.edu/content/islamophobia/defining-islamophobia>
- Easton, M. (2012). *Define Britishness? It's Like Painting Wind*. Published March 2, 2012. Retrieved March 19, 2013 from BBC News UK: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-17218635>
- Heath, A. (2012). *Has multiculturalism failed in the UK? Not really*. Published August 10, 2012. Retrieved March 27, 2013 from The Guardian:

Fajbíková: The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism in Great Britain

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/aug/10/multiculturalism-uk-research>

- Hellyer, H. A. (2007). Ruminations and reflections on British muslims and Islam post-7/7. In T. Abbas (Ed.), *Islamic Political Radicalism: A European Perspective* (pp. 247-262). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Heywood, A. (2004). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Irving, H. (2012). *France's "Burqa Ban" Enforcing Not Solving Inequality*. Published April 13, 2012. Retrieved March 20, 2013 from Open Society Foundations: <http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/france-s-burqa-ban-enforcing-not-solving-inequality>
- Kallevik, E. (2009). Britishness, multiculturalism and ethnicity . (Ø. Bratberg, Ed.) *British Politics Review: Journal of the British Politics Society*, Norway , 4 (3), 9.
- Laqueur, W. (2006). *Poslední dny Evropy... Humanistická Evropa nebo islamistická Eurábie? Analýza – perspektiva – prognóza- řešení. [The Last Days of Europe. The changing face of a continent]*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.
- Malik, K. (2009). *From Fatwa to Jihad: The Rushdie Affair and Its Legacy*. Atlantic Books.
- Malik, K. (2010, April 18). *Kenan Malik's essay on the Danish cartoons, the Salman Rushdie affair and Radical Islam*. Retrieved October 29, 2012, from Kenan Malik: www.kenanmalik.com
- Malik, K., Sebej, F. (2011). *Multiculturalism at its limits? Managing diversity in the new Europe*. Published January 18, 2011. Retrieved November 11, 2012 from Eurozine.
- Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2007, Summer-Autumn). *Islam and British Multiculturalism*. Retrieved September 27, 2012, from the Centre for World Dialogue: <http://www.worlddialogue.org>
- Modood, T. et al. (2006). *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Moss, S. (2012). What does Britishness mean to you? Published February 5, 2012. Retrieved December 30, 2012 from The Guardian: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2012/feb/05/what-does-britishness-mean>
- Multiculturalism. (2013). Collins Dictionary. Retrieved January 14, 2013, from <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/multiculturalism>
- Palmer, A. (2012). *Multiculturalism has left Britain with a toxic legacy*. Published February 11, 2012. Retrieved February 26, 2012 from telegraph.co.uk.
- Patel, I.A. (2007). The Scales for Defining Islamic Political Radicalism. In T. Abbas

Fajbíková: The Relationship of the Policy of Multiculturalism and Islamic Radicalism in Great Britain

(Ed.), *Islamic Political Radicalism: A European Perspective* (pp. 42-54). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Pitcher, B. (2009). *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Radicalism.(2013). Collins Dictionary. Retrieved March 14, 2013 from: <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/radical>

Sacks, J. (2011). *Having Pride in Britain Protects All Cultures*. Published February 7, 2011. Retrieved December 22, 2012 from The Times: <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/columnists/article2901440.ece>

Schain, M. (2008). *The Politics of Immigration in France, Britain, and the United States: A Comparative Study*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Shahi, A. (2010). *The Failure of British Multiculturalism and the Virtue of Reciprocity*. Published December 9, 2010. Retrieved February 26, 2013 from e-ir.info

Silvestri, S. (2007). Europe and political islam: Encounters of the 20th and 21st centuries. In T. Abbas (Ed.), *Islamic Political Radicalism: A European Perspective* (pp. 57-67). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Spalek, B. (2007). Disconnection and exclusion: Pathways to radicalisation?. In T. Abbas (Ed.), *Islamic Political Radicalism: A European Perspective* (pp. 192-206). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.