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About the Division of Global Affairs

The Division of Global Affairs (DGA) is an inter-disciplinary graduate studies and research institution at the Graduate School of Rutgers University-Newark. The DGA offers two degree programs, a Master of Science in Global Affairs and a Doctor of Philosophy in Global Affairs in more than ten specializations, drawing students from all over the world. The DGA is renowned as a premier research institute, and is ranked 5th in the nation by The Benchmarking Academic Excellence Survey of Top Universities in Social and Behavioral Sciences Disciplines (2006-2007).

The DGA’s mission is to be a cutting edge inter-disciplinary institution for academic pursuits. The DGA endeavors to address issues affecting civilization in the 21st Century through providing opportunities for students and faculty to examine large-scale transformations in politics, governance, economics, culture, diplomacy, cooperation and conflict and their relationship to state and non-state actors. At the core of the DGA’s concerns is the relationship between international, transnational and local issues, globalization and the dynamic role of governments, multilateral institutions, NGOs, civil society and corporations.

The DGA’s research initiatives are housed in the Rutgers Institute for the Study of Emerging Threats in the 21st Century (ET21). ET21’s mission is to address how stakeholders from various policy arenas can best respond to threats that confront vulnerable civilian populations, such as ecological, technological, political or resource-driven threats. In addition, the DGA hosts the Center for the Study of Public Security and the Center for Research in Corruption Studies and organizes collaborative social science research initiatives to inform policy and shape theory.

About the Immigration Integration and Security Network

Since 2004, the Immigration, Integration and Security Network ISI has employed an intellectually diverse group of researchers to define and examine key questions that address the security conundrum in the U.S. and in Europe after 9/11- the challenge of reconciling the maintenance of security and the protection of civil liberties with respect to immigration and integration policies. Failure to adequately do so has generated the security/insecurity paradox. Research on these issues has produced a series of thematic papers that serve as the basis of written products and policy dialogues that engage stakeholders beyond the community of people working in the area of migration. The overarching project objectives are to generate novel and feasible policy proposals, to boost the profile of the issues raised, to mobilize a bipartisan multi-sector response and to protect the civil rights of immigrants and their children while enhancing national security. At this stage, as outlined below, ISI researchers have identified policy recommendations for the treatment of immigrants, particularly Muslims, Arabs and their native-born children, and strategic approaches to legitimate security concerns. With the intent of identifying, sharing and establishing common best practices, ISI hopes to contribute to a broad pattern of trans-Atlantic cooperation.
The following aspects of Muslim and Arab integration were at the core of the presentations, discussion provided the context of the exchange.

Afghanistan, the Iraq War, the 2004 train bombing in Spain and the 2005 public transit bombings in London

In the U.S., only 25-30% of Arabs are Muslim. The reason why Arabs are distinguished in this report is because both are religiously diverse groups that have been

The ISI (Immigration & Security Initiative) is a transatlantic research network assembling a group of experts in the area of immigration policy, drawn from Europe

Paris on March 19, 2009. The Paris Forum concluded the second phase of a larger collaborative project by the ‘Immigration, Integration and Security Network’ (ISI). 1 ISI is a multi-year policy research network that commenced in 2004 and is currently maintained through a trans-Atlantic partnership between the Division of Global Affairs at Rutgers University-Newark and the CEVIPOF. Contained in this report is a discussion of the key findings, lessons learned and recommendations of the Paris Forum deliberation for distribution to a range of stakeholders representing diverse elements of the policy community.

The Paris Forum addressed ways in which security policy post September 11, 2001 has affected the integration of Muslims and Arabs2 in the United States and Europe. Post 9/11 events such as the invasion of Afghanistan, the Iraq War, the 2004 train bombing in Spain and the 2005 public transit bombings in London provided the context of the exchange.

The following aspects of Muslim and Arab integration were at the core of the presentations, discussion and debate:

- The securitization of integration and the de-politicization of security policy;
- Notions of national loyalty and the role of religion;
- The dynamic relationship between civil security policy and the radicalization of Muslim minorities;
- Integration as a process, beginning with the treatment of refugees and asylum seekers;
- Mitigating xenophobia, policy as a reflection of public discourse and changing public perceptions.

Findings:

The security/insecurity paradox is a legitimate concern and clearly constitutes a radicalization push factor.

The securitization of integration is an impediment to the successful incorporation of Muslim and Arab minorities.

In the Muslim-Western context, the continued focus on the notion of ‘loyalty’ can have a marginalizing effect, imposing a dysfunctional choice between religion and nationality.

Current policies present new impediments to the effective integration of refugees and asylum seekers.

While it is commonly thought that the U.S. does not have a formal integration policy, the U.S. has muscular policies that in fact address integration through affirmative action, recognizing ethnicity and supporting a multi-cultural society that is removed from the outdated conventional image of the melting pot paradigm.

The historical image of the inevitable upward mobility of the new immigrant is today a myth. Further studies on immigration are needed to understand its relationship to integration, security policy and implementation in order to address both the needs of immigrants (and their children) and the societies in which they live.

National security objectives currently compete with realizing rights-based approaches to integration. This phenomenon is known as the ‘securitization of integration’. Post 9/11, practicing Muslim immigrants have often been suspected of being divided in their national loyalty and less patriotic than other citizens. A common perception is that Islamic norms and values conflict with those of the new country. Policing practices, such as racial profiling and detention for suspicion of terror without due process have negative effects without proven benefits to security. In this context, stigma, marginalization and xenophobia become ‘radicalization push factors.’ In effect, extreme security measures have countermanding effects resulting in a ‘security/insecurity paradox’: the struggle for security leads to greater radicalization.

Being born in the U.S. or in Europe has not prevented the growth of homegrown radicals and terrorism, regardless of whether young Muslims appear well integrated or to be suffering from economic or social exclusion. The recent arrest of four men in a plot to blow up two synagogues in Riverdale, NY and to fire surface-to-air missiles at National Guard aircraft at a base in Newburgh, NY, are products of the frustration and resentments that – in part - are fuelled by counterproductive aspects of the fight against terrorism. Three of the four men are U.S.-born citizens. The motivational causes of radicalism and terrorism therefore need to be elucidated; alternative policies and new approaches to integration need to be developed and implemented.

1 The ISI (Immigration & Security Initiative) is a transatlantic research network assembling a group of experts in the area of immigration policy, drawn from Europe and America. Their goal is to examine a series of hitherto unaddressed questions regarding the consequences of post-9/11 immigration policies in the European Union and the United States – for immigrants, governments and institutions such as universities and corporations whose performance has often been heavily influenced by immigrant flows.

2 In the U.S., only 25-30% of Arabs are Muslim. The reason why Arabs are distinguished in this report is because both are religiously diverse groups that have been subject to discriminatory practices since 9-11, regardless of whether or not their constituents are Muslim.
As a byproduct of the new security initiatives, more stringent immigration policies of receiving countries as well as administrative delays have adversely affected asylees and refugees, with implications for the pace and depth of their integration. Policy changes have resulted in diminished success rates in legitimate claims for asylum and the admission of refugees. Asylum seekers have remained in longer periods of limbo without legal access to employment. Nationality-based policies targeting Muslim and Arab countries have permitted the discriminatory treatment of asylum seekers justified by the exigencies of national security. Muslim and Arab minorities have faced discrimination, in part due to negative public perceptions. This tendency has clearly been exacerbated by the securitization of integration. In the face of media criticism of minorities and the preeminence given to traditional security approaches, countervailing public policies intended to promote inclusion have often fallen short in enhancing incorporation and civic engagement for Muslims and Arabs.

The Paris Forum produced a number of recommendations that seek to address these issues at the regional, national and sub-national levels. They include effective security policies that break the security/insecurity paradox; citizenship requirements that do not impose a choice between religion and nationality; new regulations that allow and encourage asylum-seekers and refugees to seek formal sector employment; implementation of an affirmative action approach to thwart discrimination; and the creation of a cohesive information framework for the integration of policy. These recommendations offer hope for a shift in individual attitudes and public perceptions towards mutual respect, understanding, acceptance and social inclusion: the foundations in building against radicalization.

2. Partners

Project funding was provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and administered through the National Program, Grant Identification number: D 08080. The Carnegie Corporation of New York (est. 1911) is a grant-making foundation that seeks to realize the vision of philanthropy of its founder, Andrew Carnegie. In fulfillment of Carnegie’s will, grants must benefit the people of the United States. This project received additional support from the host institutions, the Division of Global Affairs, Rutgers University-Newark (DGA) and the Center for Political Research (CEVIPOF), FNSP (Sciences Po, Paris). The DGA is a multi-disciplinary graduate studies and research institution at the Graduate School of Rutgers University-Newark. The DGA offers two degree programs, a Master of Science in Global Affairs and a Doctor of Philosophy in Global Affairs with more than ten specializations, drawing students from around the globe. The DGA hosts the Rutgers Institute for the Study of Emerging Threats in the 21st Century (ET21), and is linked to the Center for the Study of Public Security and the Center for Research in Corruption Studies. ET21 organizes collaborative research initiatives designed to inform policy and shape theory. (See http://et21.dga.rutgers.edu for further details.) The CEVIPOF is a social science research institute that is part of France’s National Foundation of Political Sciences. The CEVIPOF was established in 1960 and has been linked to the National Center for Scientific Research since 1968. The CEVIPOF is comprised of researchers, faculty and doctoral students and is under the directorship of Pascal Perrineau.
The first phase of the project, which took place from late 2004 until the summer of 2007, comparatively evaluated European and American treatment of immigration, integration and security. Two workshops were organized during this phase, the first in Pittsburgh (2005) and the second in Paris (2006), to engage a broader community of stakeholders in identifying aspects of security policy that influence the processes of integration.

The final Phase One findings, which were published in an edited volume Immigration, Integration and Security: America and Europe in Comparative Perspective by Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich, laid the foundation for a debate by which to progress toward achieving the unbiased protection of civil liberties and civil security:

1. That border controls and associated asylum and immigration policies have a very limited utility as a security measure on either side of the Atlantic;
2. That the focus of policies should be in the treatment and effective integration of landed immigrants and their children;
3. That the enforcement of traditional security measures poses problems in terms of abrogating both fundamental civil liberties and the specter of increased radicalization of Arab and Muslim minorities specifically on both sides of the Atlantic.

Furthermore, Phase One recommended that the new ‘security toolbox’ be expanded to include nontraditional approaches that encouraged greater integration of particularly Arab and Muslim minorities through political, economic and social measures.3

These conclusions defined the scope of the second phase: that a reliance on the powers of assimilation or the American ‘melting pot’ model, and stronger internal security measures such as increased border control, will not significantly enhance security nor will it safeguard civil liberties on either side of the Atlantic. Both security and civil liberties, in effect, suffered.

While Phase One identified key components of security policy generally overlooked by American and European policy makers, Phase Two has sought to identify the central ways in which these components can be utilized to positive effect. The formal inauguration of Phase Two took place in September 2007, with an initial meeting in Pittsburgh entitled, “Rethinking Integration: Reconciling the Needs of the immigrant Populations and the Security of Transatlantic Societies,” with the Paris Forum in the spring of 2009 concluding this phase. The central goal of the second phase was to address the question of how to balance the exigencies of security and that of civil liberties with respect to landed immigrants and their native-born children. The work product is a set of findings and a set of policy recommendations that seek to both enhance security and protect the rights of vulnerable immigrant populations. Phase Two participants examined policies, perceptions and practices impacting Muslim and Arab integration, such as the implementation of internal security measures; policing minorities; the administration of social welfare programs; the formulation of anti-discrimination policies; the creation of political processes of integration; and the treatment of asylum seekers and refugees.4

The Guiding Questions for Phase Two Were as Follows:

1. To what extent is the immigrant population politically integrated into the social fabric of their broader communities?
2. Are there significant variations in the degree to which different ethnic, cultural or religious minority groups are politically and socially integrated into civic life?
3. If such differences exist, what factors help explain the variations in the degree of political and social integration from one immigrant group to another?

The Paris Forum agenda, a culmination of the project’s developments to date, was based on the thematic papers of the second edited volume produced via ISI, entitled, Managing Ethnic Diversity After 9-11: Internal Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective, edited by Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich, to be published by the Rutgers University Press early in 2010.

The parameters for the discussion were defined by the following central questions:

1. What non-traditional forms of political, economic and social incorporation may address security problems?
2. Are Arabs and Muslims in fact divided in their loyalties?
3. What effect has security measures had on the claims made by legitimate asylum seekers?
4. Have traditional surveillance and policing security measures enhanced public safety?
5. What has been the influence of such measures on the process of radicalization among minority communities?
6. What policing options are open to policymakers in dealing with minority communities?

4 Political integration was conceptualized through two different paradigms: 1) Political orientations: political trust, interest in politics, political knowledge and information, feelings of identity and belonging, feelings of political efficacy, democratic values, social tolerance and concepts of citizenship. 2) Socio-political behavior: involvement in different kinds of associations (ethnic affiliations, political parties, trade unions, cultural groups, NGOs, etc.) and various forms of conventional political action.
This forum was organized into four thematic panels: the securitization of immigration and integration policies; the impact of the war on terror on radicalization and integration; the policing of minorities and vulnerable populations; and the utility of forms of political and socio-economic integration for civil security. A selection of contributors to the forthcoming edited volume presented essential points of their papers in order to introduce the issues for commentary and debate by experts drawn from the EU, national governments, the police force, and non-profit organizations. (For Participant Bios Please See Appendix A) Each panel concluded with an open dialogue of shared experiences, debate, and question and answer sessions. (To View the Agenda Please See Appendix B.)

1. The Security/Insecurity Paradox

Rights-based civil, economic and political policies are needed to break the security/insecurity paradox and help mitigate radicalization push factors.

New measures designed to generate greater security have paradoxically spurred radicalization - and thus created greater insecurity. The U.S. government, like its European counterparts, has largely ignored this dynamic. Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia5 (ISI’s Co-Principal Investigator) argues that the current securitization of integration policies is not only damaging to both the civil liberties and the integration of minorities, but that it also enhances insecurity. Common to the U.S. and Europe is the notion that immigrants and their children, especially Muslims, pose the greatest current threat to homeland security. There is also the broader perception that foreign-born Muslims domiciled in the West are potentially radical in their views about the West, and are unwilling to integrate. Such stigmatization is common to both American and European Muslims. The general publics’ perception is further complicated by two factors: the phenomenon of homegrown terrorists and the role of security policy as a catalyst for both discrimination and radicalization. Together they constitute a truly vicious circle. The interaction of these perceptions and security policy has ‘created enemies’ among a portion of the domestic population. The drivers for the support of terrorism by young Muslims therefore need to be fully understood - and policy needs to respond accordingly.

The securitization of integration therefore makes the U.S. and Europe more vulnerable to internal acts of terrorism and unrest. It fuels Islamophobia among some portions of the general public, and - reciprocally - a sense of exclusion, frustration, resentment among some Muslims, and, ultimately, radicalization among the very few. Such generally suspicions against Muslims stem from a perceived threat of an “enemy within.” The actions of a few radicals provide substance to these fears. The circle is thus complete: fear engenders security policies; security policies encourage a sense of humiliation, alienation, and radicalization; this radicalization leads to terrorism - and thus the call for greater security.

Yet, less than ten thousand Muslims out of fifteen million in Europe are actually considered a possible threat by security services.6 Security concerns regarding less than one percent of the Muslim population have therefore resulted in the institution of state policies and policing practices that have had both negative and positive consequences. These domestic policies in part, have enabled Jihadis abroad and homegrown terrorists to exploit the claim that Islam itself is under attack.

---

5 Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia is Co-Principal Investigator of ISI, and one of the contributing authors and editors of ISI’s forthcoming book entitled Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9-11: Internal Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective, ed. Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010). Chebel d’Appollonia was a panelist at the Paris Forum, where she presented her findings on the security/insecurity paradox and the process of radicalization in relationship to different aspects of integration.

6 See Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia, ‘How to Make Enemies: A transatlantic perspective on the radicalization process and integration issues’ in Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9-11: Internal Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective, ed. Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010). Chebel d’Appollonia points out that another driver of terrorism, which is not discussed in detail in this report, is foreign policy with regard to the war on terror. The war on terror abroad has given Jihadis the voice they need to recruit more militants.
Racial profiling in this context is a form of institutional discrimination in which ‘Muslim-looking’ or ‘Arab-looking’ people are considered more likely to be equated with terrorism. Such an approach is counterproductive for several reasons. First, identifying Muslims is challenging; Muslims comprise among the most ethnically and racially diverse religious group in both the U.S. and Europe. Second, Islamic radicals have a common solidarity that crosses national boundaries. They are not a simple, identifiable, common subset among all Muslims. Third, racial profiling itself reinforces a Muslim backlash by engendering in Muslims a sense of Islamophobia and discrimination against them, and by giving jihadist groups rhetorical justification in calling for further acts of terrorism. Jihadi supporters are further incited by the arbitrary detention and deportation of suspects. Fourth, profiling, discrimination, detention and deportation increase the sense of alienation among the very people whose cooperation is essential to successful counter-terrorism efforts. The victims of counter-terrorism through “guilt by association” vastly outnumber the tragic victims of terrorism.

Racial profiling combines Muslims and Arabs into one category and thus, in practice, it misidentifies, Latinos, people of Mediterranean origin, non-Muslim South Asians (such as Sikhs) as Arab and/or Muslim. The new anti-terrorism security measures, policing practices, coupled with public ignorance, may have heightened the misperceived link between dress, skin color, nationality, accent, language and (Muslim or Arab-sounding) names and terrorism. The consequences of racial profiling should provoke reflection, notably about which “identifiable characteristics” and stereotypes make Muslims -- and those perceived to be Muslim -- targets of discrimination and violence and how these trends might be reversed through engagement strategies and educating the public. In practice, the opposite has been the case: the focus has been on more sophisticated means of surveillance and engagement, not on education and engagement.

Counterterrorist measures in the aftermath of 9/11 have undermined security objectives by increasing the suspicion towards Muslims who may already feel alienated. Being born and raised in the U.S. or in Europe does not prevent radicalization, regardless of whether Muslims suffer from social and political exclusion or if they appear perfectly well integrated according to economic and political metrics. A better understanding of the radicalization process is needed in order to evaluate the differential impact of various potential contributing factors. In her presentation, Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia identified and examined key potential domestic factors such as, socio-economic deprivation, political disaffection, the role of culture and religion, a sense of alienation, and the identity crisis associated with individual issues. While many Muslims may feel the effects of several of these factors, terrorist recruitment is the final stage of radicalization process in which many of these issues coalesce - and a nominal numbers of Muslims participate.

Which factors are most important as contributory ‘push’ factors to the radicalization process? First, among potential candidates, socio-economic considerations are relevant but are not strong influences. The need for better urban planning, social welfare and access to education and employment are all important policies that will assist in the improved integration of Muslims. They are however, insufficient in themselves as tools in preventing the growth of home-grown terrorists. In the case of the London bombings for example, the participants were engaged in their communities, educated and employed.

7 Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia, ‘How to make enemies: A transatlantic perspective on the radicalization process and integration issues’ in ed., Chebel d’Appollonia and Reich. This forthcoming book will be referenced as ISI’s forthcoming edited volume
8 Ibid
Second, cultural and religious factors are certainly part of the radicalization process. On occasion, they are used to mobilize jihadist groups into action and legitimate violence. In Europe, attempts have been made to combat such radicalism through the “institutionalization of Islam,” establishing a series of official religious organizations that represent Islam in its discussions with state authorities. Such representative structures vary by country, in both form and practice. Such institutionalization is a constructive way to combat extremism, providing a legitimate forum for dialogue between Islamic groups and government officials about democratic rules, norms and values. Furthermore, to limit the influence of radical Muslims, several European governments have contributed to the costs of establishing mosques, state participation in funding faith-based schools, training Imams, the creation of representative bodies (such as the French Council of the Muslim Religion) and have agreed to accept the legitimacy of Muslim practices in public schools - such as the provision of Muslim dietary practices.

Siddik Bakir and Ben Harburg conducted interview-based research on the effects of controversial anti-terror laws on Muslim citizens introduced in Germany since 2002. Bakir and Harburg found that even apparently well-integrated Muslim citizens felt socially and publicly alienated. Their organizations and mosques were under surveillance and subjected to raids without warning or substantial evidence, often forcing them to disassociate themselves from the very institutions that have provided them with individual support and a sense of community. While some Muslim leaders did accept that the raids were “a necessary dragnet to capture potential terrorists,” they disagreed with the methods employed, which displayed a blatant disregard for the rules of holy sites. These efforts resulted in low yields in terms of arrests at the cost of compromising the very relationships that exist between religious organizations and the state that help to preserve security. Some commentators do contend that these relationships are salvageable by fostering greater awareness and interest in Islam, creating a broad-based audience for productive religious and cultural dialogues. However, the state of relations between a Muslim community and any government is dependent upon whether politicians are willing to work with community leaders. UK terrorism expert Robert Lambert, for example, observed that, “politicians are unwilling to stand shoulder to shoulder with representatives of the Muslim community, who are regarded as controversial.” Such reluctance has often led to a breakdown in communications.

As an alternative avenue, empowering young Muslims through civic integration can also address the issue of political disaffection. Civic integration is a process that includes access to citizenship, political representation and opportunities for organizational (and even symbolic) incorporation of Muslims. The 2004 Report of the 9/11 Commission emphasized that security needs to be reconciled with maintaining civil liberties because they help to reinforce each other. However in the aftermath of 9/11, civil liberties were sacrificed, purportedly in the name of enhanced security, undermining democracy, public confidence and respect for the criminal justice system. The exercise of policies in which governments make “exceptions” to the equitable application of the rule of law, to justify and enforce objectionable counter-terrorist measures, conflicts with the protection of human rights. The evidence drawn from this project suggests that such practices have compromised the civic integration of young Muslims who feel that they are under attack without any real justification. Counter-terrorist rhetoric that reinforces negative stereotypes, political propaganda and other practices that propagate hatred impedes progress toward mutual respect and tolerance.

---

9 Siddik Bakir participated in the Paris Forum as policy expert on Islam in Europe, immigration policy and minority rights in Germany and Europe. Siddik is the political assistant of Baroness Nicholson, Member of Parliament (MP) and Member of the European Parliament (MEP)
11 Robert Lambert participated in the Paris Forum as policy expert on terrorism and policing practices in Muslim communities in the UK. Lambert served for thirty-years the United Kingdom Police Service, latterly working on issues of counter-terrorism. In 2001, he established the Muslim Contact Unit (MCU) to partner with Muslim community leaders with the purpose of counteracting the spread of al-Qaida propaganda in London and to enhance counter-terrorism community engagement projects as well as provide support to Muslim communities facing Islamophobic attacks.
2. A “Clash of Perceptions”, Not a “Clash of Civilizations”

Islamic communities and the West are not in conflict. Nor are the national loyalties of Muslims questionable. They are mistakenly perceived to be so by politicians and the media. As a partial remedy, institutional representation and the full plethora of entitlement should be extended to migrants and their children. This is especially a problem in Europe where second or third generation domicile does not guarantee voting rights.

Zsolt Nyiri’s survey research for a Gallop World Poll reveals a clash of perceptions between Muslims and the general public of Berlin, London and Paris on themes such as national loyalty, religious tolerance and integrated living not a clash of values. The three capital cities selected represent the countries with Europe’s largest Muslim populations. The survey data demonstrate that broad public’s perceptions of Muslims in Germany, UK and France are somewhat negative and that there are differences between the perceptions Muslims have of themselves and those of the general public. More optimistically, however, they also show promise for coexistence.

Events both within and outside of Europe have generated views of Islam as a violent culture that aims to undermine Western values. The lack of adequate inclusion of Muslims in public dialogue, and a lack of knowledge about Europe’s Muslim communities, have both served to reinforce a negative public image of Muslims in some European countries. Academics, politicians and media commentators have claimed that Europe’s own growing Muslim population brought Samuel P. Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” to European soil. Some proponents of this view even claim that Muslims have no intention of integrating into mainstream culture, of adopting European values or even existing peacefully in Europe. They ignore the fact that the vast majority of Europe’s Muslims reject radical Islam and seek to integrate. The alleged “clash of civilizations” needs to be demythologized by recognizing the true problem: a “clash of perceptions”.

There is a stark difference between how Muslims see themselves, and what the general public nationally perceives about them with regard to national loyalty. As shown in Graph 2.1, more than 70 percent of Muslims surveyed in Berlin, London and Paris believe that Muslims in their country are loyal citizens. In contrast, the survey responses from the general public across the country reflect a disconcerting perception: only one-third of Germans and less than half of French and British citizens feel that Muslims in their country are loyal citizens.

Graph 2.1

Data Source: Gallup World Poll Nov. 2006 – Feb. 2007


13 As is the case in Graph 2.1, the subsequent set of charts and graphs compare and contrast a survey population of urban Muslims in the capital cities in each country with a survey of the geographically distributed national public in that country.
Furthermore, there is a vast and damaging gap in the perceptions of Muslims and that of the general public about whether Muslims are respectful of other religions. Graph 2.2 illustrates that less than 20 percent of Muslims in each capital city feel that their fellow Muslims are not respectful of other religions. Meanwhile, it also shows that nearly half of the German and French general public surveyed, and one third of British respondents, feel that Muslims are not respectful of other religions.

Graph 2.2

Data Source: Gallup World Poll Nov. 2006 – Feb. 2007

However, when it came to questions concerning a respondent’s own tolerance for people who practice other religions, Muslims in two out of the three cities surveyed demonstrated more tolerance for other religions than the general public. Specifically, Graph 2.3 depicts whether Muslims and the general public agree or disagree with the statement that people from different religious practices threaten their way of life. The French and German public feels their way of life is more threatened by other religions than do their respective Muslim communities. Only 11 percent of Berlin Muslims feel threatened versus 20 percent of the German general public; and only six percent of Paris Muslims feel that way compared to 19 percent of the French general public. There is parity among London Muslims and the British general public with a 22 percent response rate from both groups agreeing with the statement.

Graph 2.3

Data Source: Gallup World Poll Nov. 2006 – Feb. 2007
Muslims and the general public were asked which type of neighborhood they prefer to live in and were given “segregated”, “integrated,” and “isolated” from which to select. Graph 2.4 reflects the response rates in favor of living in an integrated neighborhood, which were over 50 percent for both groups across geographic areas. Muslims in Berlin, London and Paris showed even greater openness to integrated living than the general public surveyed in each case.

As a measure of integrated living, respondents were asked whether they would prefer not to have Muslims or Christians as neighbors. In all countries surveyed, Muslims appear to be less opposed to having Christians as neighbors than the general public is to having Muslims as neighbors. Graph 2.5 shows the responses by Muslims and the general population broken down by geographic location.

**Findings and Recommendations**
Post 9/11 policies and counter-terrorist rhetoric have discouraged Muslims from practicing their religion freely, such as wearing headscarves. Yet, national loyalty should not be defined as being a choice between religion and nationality. No other religious group is asked to make such a choice. As with the treatment of other religious groups, these qualities should be regarded as compatible. The survey results support the claim that Muslim immigrants and their children are no less loyal to their country of residence than the general public in those countries.

Muslims are at least as open to integrated living as is the general public in Germany, UK and France, and are more tolerant of other religions than the general public believes. The data contradict the common notion that Muslims feel hatred toward Christians and, conversely, suggests that Islamophobia is more widespread among the general public than the dislike for Christians is among Muslims. Overall, the results demonstrate the need for greater efforts; to combat Islamophobia, dispel misperceptions of the general public about Muslims and to encourage more engagement and dialogue. Political representation at the national and sub-national levels, more balanced portrayals of Muslims in the media by policymakers, and more education in schools and communities to promote tolerance, are all key instruments toward achieving those goals.

3. Asylees & Refugees in the Security Crossfire

Current policies present significant barriers for refugees and asylum seekers. New policies should support and encourage asylum seekers to seek employment during the period of adjudication of their case. Current policies present significant barriers for refugees and asylum seekers. New policies should support and encourage asylum seekers to seek employment during the period of adjudication of their case.

Asylum seekers and refugees have been caught in the crossfire of post 9/11 security initiatives. A combination of the new security environment and a major shift in the geographical source of most asylum seekers and refugees -- from Eastern Europe to fragile states in South Asia and in Africa -- have left most people in these categories in a precarious situation. Receiving countries are failing in their obligations to provide a safe haven to those fleeing persecution, focusing instead on protecting their borders from illegal immigrants and foreign terrorists. The treatment of asylum seekers and refugees should be consistent with international law and ensure that those owed protection are not inappropriately denied. Carol Bohmer points out, in her contribution to the Forum, that the ways in which governments treat refugees and asylum seekers have implications for their integration.

Clearly, more stringent domestic policies in the name of national security have had negative consequences for asylum seekers and refugees. Asylum seekers have been less successful in their claims. In the U.S. and UK, detention of asylum seekers while awaiting a decision on whether they will be granted asylum has escalated since 9/11, especially for those who are from predominantly Muslim countries. In the U.S., there have been delays in granting permanent resident status to asylees and the number of refugees and refugee resettlements has decreased. In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, the U.S. government temporarily suspended the refugee resettlement program until November of that same year, and once it was re instituted, there were delays in processing due to security concerns. But the obverse can also be problematic: the UK’s streamlined ‘fast track’ asylum process may jeopardize an applicant’s right to a fair hearing, due to overly hasty decision-making in which they are given insufficient time to collect evidence on their behalf. Countries therefore ought to seek ways to balance the dual responsibilities of protecting national security and fulfilling their obligations to protect asylum seekers and refugees. Managing this potential tension is challenging and counter to the national ethos adopted by asylum countries in the post 9/11 era.

This report addresses refugees who are protected by international law under the Geneva Convention and therefore does not include internally displaced persons (IDPs) or environmental refugees. The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees or Geneva Convention amended by the 1967 Protocol of defines refugees as the following: “as a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.” What distinguishes refugees from asylees is the location in which they apply for asylum. Refugees are located outside of the asylum country when they apply for asylum. Asylees is the technical term for asylum seekers who are successful in their claims for asylum.
Bohmer asserts that the passage of both the USA PATRIOT Act several weeks after the events of 9/11 and the REAL ID Act in 2005 have tightened asylum policy, creating higher standards of proof by claimants. Furthermore, while, it may not ultimately affect the outcome of claims, asylum seekers may be held in detention for longer periods. These new provisions have led to a decline in the number of refugees admitted to the U.S. The average annual number of refugees admitted has declined significantly: the annual average of 100,000 in the 1990’s fell to an average of only 50,000 during the 2000- 2006 period.\(^\text{18}\) Indeed, the steep drop became more precipitous at the end of this six-year spell, with those granted asylum falling by 23 percent from 53,738 in 2005 to 41,150 in 2006.\(^\text{19}\) (See Graph 3.1) Once domiciled, expanded regulatory authority has given the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), a component of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), sole authority to approve or deny parole to any detained asylum seeker. Without an independent body to conduct oversight of this process, those applying for parole may face delays when requesting release.

In the U.S., periods in limbo have grown far longer for asylum seekers, who are officially ineligible to submit an Employment Application Document (EAD) until at least 150 days after their application for asylum has been processed.\(^\text{20}\) The product is a situation where many emerge in debt, even if successful in their claims. This inevitably limits their capacity to economically integrate, given their subsequent poor credit standing. Alternatively, asylum seekers may opt to work illegally in contravention of their status. More accommodating policies for asylum seekers, providing suitable government assistance, may prevent them from joining the ranks of undocumented migrants.

The situation in the UK is arguably worse; claiming asylum automatically renders a claimant an illegal immigrant. It places legitimate asylum seekers in an insecure predicament where they surrender all rights. The situation has been complicated by the fact that the media (and regarded by the general public) depict many claimants as being ‘bogus refugees’ whose real motive is economic migration rather than safety from persecution. The media has also repeated, and illegitimately, conflated asylum seekers with Islamic fundamentalist terrorists – a claim given superficial credibility by an influx of asylum seekers from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Nonetheless, the reality is that the majorities of Muslims living in the UK are not asylum seekers but are British born citizens and migrants from the former colonies.

According to Forum participants who analyze or serve the needs of asylees, the UK’s new fast-track system is a doubled-edged sword. It is often used to hasten the refusal of applications rather than to grant them asylum in a timely manner. Applicants are often given insufficient time to collect evidence in support of their case. Those denied asylum may be sent to an immigration removal center and remain in detention for an extended period, on occasion amounting to several years. Furthermore, the government practices a policy of dispersal whereby asylees and refugees are assigned to a specified area for residence. This often prevents them from being able to rely on community support from their Diaspora. As in the US, asylum seekers in the UK are not permitted to work legally for at least the first year until

---

**Graph 3.1**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Refugees Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>68,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>28,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>28,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>51,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>41,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM), Office of Admissions, Refugee Processing Center (RPC)

---

\(^{18}\) Ibid
\(^{20}\) Asylum seekers with a recommended approval for a grant of asylum do not need to wait the 150 days and may apply for an EAD.
their claims have been adjudicated. In Britain, unlike in the US, asylees can apply to the Home Office for a work permit once the adjudication process has exceeded a year. Yet Forum participants reported that even that work application process is itself subject to long delays.

Many receiving countries in Europe and North America have historically viewed the civic, economic and political processes of integration as central to limiting the perceived risks associated with accepting foreign-born residents and citizens. Despite compelling evidence that refugees and asylum seekers were not responsible for terrorist acts, their integration has become a matter of national security since 9/11. Countries vary in their integration policies. Some Northern European countries, for example, take an institutional approach in which they provide extensive programs with comprehensive benefits although successful completion of integration courses and language instruction programs are a pre-requisite to receiving benefits. These programs may potentially provide substantial benefits yet have unanticipated negative effects: disappointment with the location of housing, lack of unemployment opportunities and dissatisfaction with language instruction are predominant complaints. The U.S. and some Southern European countries take a more laissez-faire approach, in which there is more limited financial assistance (such as, for example) access to health coverage without any obligation to participate in formal programs. The U.S. does have formal resettlement procedures for refugees in which a resettlement agency meets refugees at the airport, makes housing arrangements, and prepares a resettlement plan but offers little further assistance.

4. The Integration Policy Paradox

It is commonly assumed that the US has no formal integration policy, in contrast to its European counterparts. This is not the case. While not having a formal policy by such a name, it has a set of provisions that, collectively, amount to a muscular integration policy.

Conventional wisdom suggests the U.S. is reliant on civic and market-based integration, contrasted with European countries that are reliant on direct intervention by state authorities for such provisions. Martin Schain’s contribution to the Forum, suggested that this is not the case in the U.S., nor has it been for the last several decades. While the U.S. does not have an official national integration policy, it has other policies that shape integration. Schain suggests that the articles imbedded in the Constitution, coupled with legislation addressing discrimination, race relations and the protection of religious freedom, have effectively ‘governed’ the integration of immigrant communities since the 1960’s.

Although often depicted as being at opposite ends of a continuum, the drivers for integration policy in the U.S. and in France have been remarkably similar –motivated by domestic security and public order. This suggests a possible convergence in policy. However, the national ethos, unique to each country, shapes the nature of integration, showing differences between the U.S. and France in policy content, intensity and outcomes. Such differences are tangible. Graphs 4.1 and 4.2, as examples, illustrate huge differences in unemployment rates and political integration rates between immigrants and natives, with the US figures comparing favorably. The conclusion that can be drawn from Schain’s work is that the U.S. affirmative action model of state regulation, when applied to immigrants, may provide solutions for the integration of Muslim and Arab immigrants in both countries, despite the many challenges associated with policy implementation.

**Graph 4.1**


**Graph 4.2**

Data Source: Managing Difference: the Success and Failure of Integration Policy in France, Britain and the United States by Martin Schain

21 Martin Schain is one of the contributing authors to ISI’s forthcoming edited volume. See Martin A. Schain’s, “Towards a European policy of Integration? Convergence and Convergence of Immigrant Integration Policy in Britain and France” in Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9-11: Internal Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective, ed. Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010). Schain was a panelist at the Paris Forum, where he presented his findings on integration policies in France and in the U.S. Martin is a Professor of Politics at New York University (NYU) and is an expert on European Studies and Immigration.
France and the US act as exemplars of different founding principles and avenues for the process of integration. France has primarily focused on civic integration requirements, supplemented by a stress on anti-discrimination policy. The French Civil Code (Articles 21-24) stipulates that no one can be naturalized without demonstrating an ‘assimilation to the French community’ and knowledge of the French language. France’s Reception and Integration Contract (CAI), requires families applying for unification to take two-month courses on language and values of the Republic prior to their arrival. US authorities contrast, in that while they have undertaken comparable efforts, anti-discrimination programs have been emphasized far more civic integration in their panoply of initiatives.

The U.S. informal “integration policy” with regard to affirmative action has strengthened over time, as it has in France. Traditional French Republican norms however have diluted this tendency. In France, ethnic or racial minorities are not a legal category. Rather, categories have evolved through geographic criteria rather than ethnic criteria. Yet a shift in policies that recognize an emergent an ethnic consciousness has occurred, largely in response to urban riots that arose in the 1980’s. This propensity has continued unabated during the last decade, motivated by issues such as challenges to the public order posed by girls wearing hijabs, as well as revived imperative towards stemming Islamic fundamentalism since 2001. Yet the Republican model has proved influential, even in the context of recognition of minority rights: by defining how that recognition is put into effect.

How do these developments compare to those in the United States? American efforts in fact predate those in France by two decades. Like France’s policy shift to quell urban unrest and address racial tensions in the 1980’s, the 1960’s black civil rights movement in the United States led to anti-discrimination programs. Of the remainder of Muslim Americans, many more the economically challenged are covered by other measures. Approximately 35% of Muslims in the U.S., for example, are African American converts, and are therefore protected by affirmative action policies.

Immigration law in the U.S. today, for example, favors and promotes diversity. The Immigration Act of 1990 included a program of diversity visas that would eventually provide for the admission of 55,000 immigrants with high school equivalency or work experience from under-represented countries, determined on an annual basis by lottery. Religious diversity is also supported in several ways; for example by granting religious organizations non-profit tax status that exempt them from state and local taxes or through a recognition of religious holiday observance by local governments which grants permission for worshippers to be absent from work and school.

Yet the multicultural approach to immigration in the U.S needs to be extended and expanded into the integration process itself. Unlike in France, the majority of the Muslim immigrant population in the U.S. is middle class and would therefore not benefit from welfare programs. Of the remainder of Muslim Americans, many more the economically challenged are covered by other measures. Approximately 35% of Muslims in the U.S., for example, are African American converts, and are therefore protected by affirmative action policies. Rather, the primary challenge for the U.S. is to extend anti-discrimination policies to Muslim and Arab immigrants and their children.
Catholics and Jews have paved the way for the observance of Muslim cultural practices with respect to establishing legal precedent and institutional recognition of religious holidays, dress codes and dietary restrictions. Yet approaches to reconciling the diverse religious, ethnic and geographic composition of Arab and Muslim immigrants, to address them as minority groups, require further examination. While this path to social inclusion is constructive and necessary, it has limitations with regard to the status and treatment of Muslims and Arabs. Developments in the last eight years have stigmatized Muslims and Arabs in the US, with marginalizing effects. The implications of the Forum’s findings is that recognition of their status as a definable ethnic or religious group, coupled with a positive approach to civil integration, will assist in buttressing against alienation and radicalization. It points to the need for affirmative action strategies of incorporation.

The application of such affirmative action policy would raise important issues in the context of Arabs and Muslims. Using either religion or ethnicity as the basis for affirmative action raises distinct problem. The categorization of Muslims as a religious minority group would be the first time that affirmative action policy would be applied to a religious group in the United States. Doing so would potentially violate the separation of church and state. Furthermore, many non-Muslim Arabs living in the U.S. would be excluded from these protections. In addition, a multitude of other religious minorities could claim similar protections. Identification on the basis of either race or geographic origin for the purposes of affirmative action is also problematic, primarily because Muslims are such a diverse ethnic and geographic group. Such complications imply that, for practical reasons, affirmative action policies might better be applied to a targeted subset of Arabs and Muslims.

5. Understanding Integration

A set of common definitions, standards and protocols for the integration of vulnerable minority groups ought to be adopted.

There are several factors that point to the need for a set of common definitions, standards and protocols (collectively referred to subsequently as ‘guidelines’) to assist in the integration of vulnerable minority groups, such as Muslims and Arabs. While the presiding assumption is that immigration, integration and national security are interrelated, little is understood about how they are associated. Such guidelines will assist in enhancing the understanding of academics, commentators and policy makers.

As mentioned earlier, Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia establishes that the relationship between integration, securitization and radicalization is extremely complex, requiring the examination of a plethora of cause-and-effect relationships. Little is currently understood about the radicalization process, how different aspects of integration affect it, and to what degree. She notes that, “a real or perceived sense of alienation does not always lead to radicalization, and the radicalization process may take various forms such as, the desire to disengage from the host society; the rejection of the principles and institutions of liberal democracy; or the growing acceptance of violence as an instrument of change.” Zsolt Nyiri argues that census data collection is an insufficient policy tool in cases where misperception and suspicion dominate, creating friction between groups. He further argues that unbiased public opinion polls are badly needed for dispelling myths and developing mutual understanding between Muslims and non-Muslims. Nyiri warns that the level of mutual understanding between Muslims and non-Muslims is deteriorating, making the call for increased dialogue more urgent.

In sum, we lack both a common language and sufficient data given the significance of the problem: both would provide the basis for improved dialogue and policy-making. A set of common definitions would enhance the quality of data collection, complementing the EU framework for integration that is currently being developed. Equally, the scope of integration-related information would potentially be transatlantic and therefore of greater utility.

What might be the composition of such guidelines? Forum participants discussed numerous dimensions of integration, identifying several universal indicators as a basis for comparison across countries at national and sub-national levels. Such an effort would support the European Union’s initiative towards greater evidence-based policymaking. More broadly, the dynamic nature of current migration flows represents a significant challenge to policymakers who need reliable and timely information on which to base their decisions. In practical terms, common guidelines for data collection could thus be linked to changes in security policy, policing practices and events. They could also serve as a forum for reconciling different perspectives on addressing integration issues, developing new policies and practices.

26 Louisa Anastopoulou, Policy Officer for the European Commission- Directorate for General Research submitted a statement subsequent to the Paris Forum advocating for evidence-based policy research. The following is an excerpt: “The EU places a high priority on the Lisbon Agenda’s goal to advance a knowledge-based society. Policy decisions should be supported by scientific evidence. In this context, robust migration research findings are really needed.”
Developing universal guidelines is always a difficult exercise. Defining integration as a concept is itself subjective and challenging. Each host society creates its own mix of policies that direct the ways in which immigrants fit into economic, social, cultural, and political life. Expectations of integration are determined by different cultural and social norms in a process that is dynamically redefined. Since 9/11 many host societies have become less accepting of cultural diversity with respect to Islam, notably in formerly multicultural countries like Britain and the Netherlands. Many have demanded modifications to religious practice and dress. In addition, migration data are lacking in quantity, quality and uniformity. There are disparities in data collection and in the categorization of migrants. Carol Bohmer points out that statistical data lump asylees together with refugees, making it difficult to determine their original status. In addition, the term ‘refugee’ in Europe includes asylum seekers before they have been granted or denied asylum while legally, their status is quite different. She adds that definitions employed in documents issued by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) vary depending on their purpose.

What might be the practical benefits of such an approach? A common myth is that migrants often struggle but that each successive generation of their offspring become well integrated, economically and socially. Yet much of what we currently know confounds that claim. One contribution to the larger project on which the Paris Forum was based supports the contention that the original conditions under which the first generation of immigrants arrives has an enormous influence on the civil, economic and political integration of successive generations. Reality is far more complex with the educational attainment and income-levels of the original immigrants proving far more influential than is commonly recognized. To better understand the path of integration (and its link to security), cross national data might be collected on recently arrived non-immigrant visa-holders, refugees, asylum seekers, naturalized citizens and several generations of their progeny based on universal categories – whether on broad or targeted populations. The importance of such work is reflected in the fact that, at present, the French census does not collect data on race, ethnicity or religion, despite a recent public debate on the issue. The UK government has only been able to collect data about Muslims because of a Muslim community-led initiative to do so. As a result, the UK is thus the only country that collects official data on where Muslims live and how they live. In practice, proponents of this initiative claim it has built trust and encouraged participation by Muslims in civic decision-making.

The policy dialogue of the last twelve months has engendered a reassessment of the utility of an over reliance on national and civil security instruments. The evidence drawn from the work of ISI 9/11 suggests that one product of this approach has been to retard the process of Arab and Muslim integration on both sides of the Atlantic. Indeed, one unforeseen consequence has been to alienate many Arabs and Muslims whose values are largely consistent with the broader societies in which they live. A tiny minority has gone further, becoming radicalized and ‘home-grown’ terrorists. Complementary instruments designed to forestall this process of alienation have, with few exceptions in few places, largely been ignored. Targeted policies designed to address problems associated with education, poverty; social incorporation and political representation have not been considered means of consolidating civil security, even as integration itself has become increasingly ‘securitized’. The result is what Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia refers to as the ‘security/insecurity paradox’: an overt reliance on one set of mechanisms has made the goal of reduced terrorist violence more unattainable.

One intent of the project and subsequent Paris Forum is to engage the policy and advocacy communities in dialogue, with the goals of information exchanges and innovative policies that both enhance security and protect the rights of individuals – notably in this case that of vulnerable minorities. Beyond dialogue, the findings of this project and forum is that policymakers need to

- Recognize the importance of mechanisms of civil and economic integration in addressing the problem of domestic terrorism;
- Recognize the distinction between a clash of civilizations and a clash of perceptions, and collectively address the problem caused by misperception;
- Encourage and mechanisms for formal dialogue between policymakers and leaders drawn from the Arab and Muslim communities over issues such as policing practices;
- Develop affirmative action policies that enhance the prospect for political representation among groups most at risk in the current climate;
- Develop operational guidelines for both categorization and data collection around the issues of immigration, integration and security;

Such a list entails an active agenda for academics and various stakeholders in the policy community alike in the enhancement of knowledge and formulation of policy. Given the demonstrated limits, and the costs, of current policy, the benefits of doing so, however, appear tangible.
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SIDDIK BAKIR (Office of Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne, European Parliament and the House of Lords) is the Political Assistant of Baroness Nicholson, MEP. Siddik also works with the Baroness’s AMAR International Charitable Foundation; an NGO specializing in primary health, universal education projects and capacity building in Iraq, Lebanon and other conflict-zones. Siddik interned with German MEP, Cem Özdemir, in 2007, in the European Parliament and worked on Turkey’s accession to the EU, Islam in Europe, immigration policy and minority rights in Germany and Europe. As a Lantos/HIA Congressional Fellow, Siddik worked for the late Representative Tom Lantos (CA-D) on U.S. Foreign Policy and Middle Eastern Issues in the House Committee on International Relations.

BERNARD GODARD (Ministry of the Interior, Government of France) a sociologist and expert on Islamic issues, has held the position of Advisor at the Central Office Religious Practice of the Ministry of Interior, France, since 2002. As an expert on Islam, Bernard served as an Advisor on Islam to the former Ministers of Interior Jean-Pierre Chevènement (1997-2000) and Daniel Vaillant (2002-2004). Bernard has researched, presented and written on terrorism and Islamism in security services, connecting Muslim communities and governments in the United States and Europe and religious diversity and conflict in the secular state.

ANTTI KESKISAARI (Immigration Advisory Service – IAS) is a Tribunal Review Counsellor and European Liaison Officer, based in the London offices of the Immigration Advisory Service (IAS). IAS is the UK national charity providing legal advice and representation to immigrants and asylum seekers. Antti appears as a legal advocate at reconsideration hearings of immigration and asylum appeals, including country guidance cases, in the UK Asylum and Immigration Tribunal. Antti’s work includes addressing European immigration and detention issues, preparing responses to government consultations, attending conferences and collaborating with the Migration Policy Group based in Brussels on initiatives such the 2009 Second Migrant Integration Policy Index MIPEX project.

ROBERT LAMBERT (University of St. Andrews, United Kingdom Police Service, ret.) is a lecturer on Terrorism Studies at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence (CSTPV) at the University of St. Andrews. Robert had a thirty year career in the police service (1977-2007), working in counter-terrorism for the majority of his tenure. Together with a colleague Robert set up the Muslim Contact Unit (MCU) in 2001, to establish partnerships with Muslim community leaders equipped to help tackle the spread of al-Qaida propaganda in London. This role enabled him to participate in pioneering counter-terrorism community engagement projects and to support Muslim community groups faced with Islamophobic attacks.

BERND MARIN (European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research) is the Executive Director of the European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research, affiliated with the United Nations in Vienna. Bernd collaborates and consults with governments, inter-governmental organizations such as The World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), enterprises and NGOs. Since 2003, he has guided the monitoring process on “Mainstreaming Ageing: Indicators to Monitor Implementation” together with the UN-ECE. Bernd has taught courses in political science, government and sociology in Europe, Asia and the U.S., and has published extensively in the social sciences in several languages.

GUIDO TINTORI (University of Bath) is a Visiting Research Fellow at the Department of European Studies, University of Bath, and member of the research team of Italian Studies at Oxford. He researches citizenship and the comparative integration policies of migrants in Europe and the U.S. In 2006, Guido was a consultant to the Government of Italy on citizenship policy. Since 2003, he has served as a member of the Network of Excellence IMISCOE (International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion in Europe), a trans-EU research collaborative funded by the European Commission. Guido’s most recent publication is a book on the transnational and domestic implications of Italy’s citizenship policies.
# Conference Programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.00 – 9.15 | Welcoming Address  
Simon Reich, Director of the Division of Global Affairs, Rutgers University (United States) |
| 9.15 – 10.15 | The Securitization of Immigration & Integration Policies  
**Introductory Remarks by:**  
Martin Schain, NYU (United States) – Security and Immigrant Policies in France and the United States  
Debate with experts including:  
Guido Tintori, University of Bath (United Kingdom)  
Andy Hull, Institute for Public Policy Research (United Kingdom) |
| 10.15 – 11.15 | Issues Raised by the Impact of the Radicalization Process on Integration  
**Introductory Remarks by:**  
Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia, CEVIPOF (France) – How to Make Enemies – War on Terror, Radicalization and the Failure of Integration  
Debate with experts including:  
Robert Lambert, Center for Studies in Terrorism and Political Violence, University of St. Andrews, United Kingdom Police Service and Co-founder of the Muslim Contact Unit (United Kingdom)  
Bernard Godard, Ministry of the Interior, Government of France (France) |
### 11.15 – 12.15 Policing Minorities & Vulnerable Populations

**Introductory Remarks by:**

**Carol Bohmer**, Dartmouth College (United States) – Asylees and Refugees – A Comparative Examination of Problems of Integration

**François Bonnet**, Sciences Po (France) – Typologizing Discriminatory Practices – Law Enforcement and Minorities in France, Italy, and the United States

**Debate with experts including:**

**Bernd Marin**, European Centre for Social Welfare and Research (Austria)

**Antti Keskisaari**, Immigration Advisory Service (United Kingdom)

### 12.15 – 13.15 Lunch

### 13.15 – 14.15 Policing Options & other Forms of Political & Socio-Economic Integration

**Introductory Remarks by:**

**Manlio Cinalli**, CEVIPOF (France) – The Impact of Policies on Migrants and Their Descendents: Differentiation Across Cultural Groups

**Debate with experts including:**


### 14.15 – 15.00 Concluding Remarks & Policy Recommendations