



# Cohesion, Community and Citizenship

Proceedings of a Runnymede Conference

Proceedings of the Runnymede Conference of  
May 2002 held at the London School of Economics

# Cohesion, Community and Citizenship



RUNNYMEDE

First published in Great Britain in 2002 by  
The Runnymede Trust  
Suite 106  
The London Fruit and Wool Exchange  
Brushfield Street  
London E1 6EP  
[www.runnymedetrust.org](http://www.runnymedetrust.org)

Copyright © 2002 The Runnymede Trust and individual authors.

### **About Runnymede**

As a prominent, independent think-tank on ethnicity and cultural diversity, the Runnymede Trust has a long track record in leading edge research, working in close collaboration with eminent thinkers and policy makers in the private, public and voluntary sectors. Founded in 1968 as a Charitable Educational Trust, our mandate is to promote a successful multi-ethnic Britain - a Britain where citizens and communities feel valued, enjoy equal opportunities to develop their talents, lead fulfilling lives and accept collective responsibility, all in the spirit of civic friendship, shared identity and a common sense of belonging.

ISBN: 0 9538164 35

All rights reserved.

Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise), without the prior written permission of the copyright owner of this book.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by  
St Richards Press Ltd, Leigh Road, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 2TU

---

# Contents

## Foreword:

- v ■ Rob Berkeley

## Keynote Presentation:

- 1 Common Belonging  
■ Bhikhu Parekh

## Conference Papers:

- 9 Issues of Identity: Intercultural education, citizenship and social cohesion  
■ Jagdish S. Gundara
- 24 The Costs of Citizenship: Assimilation and multiculturalism in liberal democracies  
■ Alan Wolfe
- 41 Euro-Muslims: The experience of middle-class immigrants to Europe  
■ Jytte Klausen
- 54 Liberal Pluralism Under Attack: Reflections on diversity and cohesion from  
Austrian and European perspectives  
■ Rainer Bauböck
- 72 Republican Citizenship, Equality and the French dilemma  
■ Christophe Bertossi
- 96 Who's British?: Prospect and the new assimilationism  
■ Ali Rattansi

## **Transcripts:**

- 106 Transcript of Morning Session Presentation on Issues of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
  - Alan Wolfe
- 113 Panel Discussion (end of the Morning Session)
- 123 Conference Summation
  - David Hollinger

## **Appendices:**

- 130 Conference Programme
- 131 Speaker Biographies

---

# Foreword

Rob Berkeley Runnymede

**W**hen the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain reported in October 2000, the response was not unanimously positive. The Commission had set out to fulfil a task which others had consciously shied away from – to set out a vision of the ‘good society’, to ‘propose ways of countering racial discrimination and disadvantage and making Britain a confident and vibrant multicultural society at ease with its rich diversity’ (p.viii). The members of the Commission recognized that this would not be an easy task and that they would struggle to develop consensus. They could not have expected the response that their work received. After initial praise for the report and its far-sightedness, the mis-reporting by one newspaper turned the media against the report and against Runnymede.

The day after the report’s launch, headlines included ‘Racism slur on the word “British”’ (*Daily Mail*), ‘Drop the word “British” says race trust’ (*The Times*), ‘British tag is “coded racism”’ (*The Guardian*), ‘Ministers welcome report which says “British” is racist and all our history must be rewritten’ (*The Sun*) and ‘British is just another word for prejudice’ (*The Mirror*). The tragedy of this reporting was that the debate the report had *hoped* to start was sidelined in favour of a defence of unthinking patriotism.

The enduring power of the issues raised by the Commission, however, would not allow them to be sidelined forever. The appointment of a new Home Secretary with an avowed interest in re-conceptualizing the nature of citizenship, the response to the disturbances of the summer of 2001 in England's northern mill towns, and the seismic repercussions from the atrocities of September 11 reignited the debate on multiculturalism and citizenship. With the conceptual grounding provided by the Commission's report, and the commitment of Runnymede to the ongoing debate about multiculturalism and racial equality, it was decided to take a lead in developing policy engagement with the concepts of cohesion, citizenship and community.

One of the central theses of the Commission's report engaged with the concept of cohesion. As Bhikhu Parekh described it:

How Britain can become a cohesive political community and foster a common sense of belonging among its diverse regional, national, religious, ethnic and other communities. (Runnymede *Bulletin* June 2001: 4)

This had become a central concern of government policymakers in order to achieve a fuller understanding of the reasons for the various outbreaks of disorder. Back in 1981, Lord Scarman had conducted a judicial-style inquiry into the turbulence in Brixton and elsewhere. In late summer 2001, it was to a retired local government chief executive that the Government turned (Ted Cante), and opted for a more informal style of independent review. The Cante Team decided to arrange early autumn visits not just to the three localities at the centre of the disturbances, but also, for comparative purposes, to other localities with substantial minority-ethnic populations: Leicester, Birmingham and Southall, London. John Denham, the minister of state at the Home Office responsible for what was now being termed 'community cohesion', established an inter-departmental ministerial group to examine the issues in parallel with the work being undertaken by the Cante Team, whose work took on a new significance in the wake of the September 11 atrocity in the USA.

In 2001 the pre-Christmas period saw the synchronized publication of four reports on that summer's disorder, with contributions from a retired civil servant, David Ritchie, on the events in Oldham, a draft report from Labour peer Lord Tony Clarke on Burnley's disturbances, joining the '*Community Pride - Not Prejudice*' report on Bradford prepared several months earlier by Sir Herman

Ouseley. The report prepared by the Independent Review team chaired by Ted Cante was published simultaneously with the Government's own (Denham) Report, providing civil servants with the headache of how to respond to a bewildering array of recommendations, addressed to a variety of audiences.

The Denham Report announced its intention of making 'community cohesion' (which, rather curiously, it failed to define) a stated aim of both central and local government, together with plans to establish a high-powered 'Community Cohesion Panel' whose brief it would be to provide ministers with independent and impartial advice. As a demonstration of Government's resolve, the three localities of Bradford, Oldham and Burnley were instructed to prepare 'community cohesion plans' for publication in April 2002, as a precursor to what would be required of all local authorities in England and Wales – to submit their own set of plans 12 months later. We were at the stage of policymaking without a clear conception of ends or means.

To counter this vacuum, the Runnymede Trust, in conjunction with the Industrial Society, mounted an event in London in mid-march 2002, providing Home Office minister John Denham with a platform from which to set out the Government's proposals. However, it remained unclear what form 'community cohesion' would take when translated from policy into practice.

In May 2002, the Local Government Association published draft guidance for consultation, which finally provided some definition to the concept of cohesion. The guidance described a cohesive community as one where:

- There is a common vision and a sense of belonging for all communities;
- The diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances are appreciated and positively valued;
- Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities;
- Strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools, and within neighbourhoods.

In its Community Cohesion Plan published that same month, Burnley Council described community cohesion as

a state where different communities live and work confidently alongside each other, recognising each other's differences, but sharing a sense of belonging and place and working towards a common prosperity.

The cart remained before the horse. What form does a sense of belonging take and how can it be achieved? Which communities are we talking about and how are they defined? What is the relationship of the individual to the community? Who adjudicates in the development of a common vision? Further, what should common values comprise? How is a sense of belonging to be created where it does not exist? And what are the relationships between cohesion, equality and diversity? These questions and more need to be explored *before* policy is formulated and the ideas need to be shared before we can hope to engage communities with policy reform.

As yet there is no consensus around the responses to these critical questions. There are political choices to be made. Runnymede starts from the position outlined in the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain's report:

Britain certainly needs to be 'One Nation' – but understood as a community of communities, and a community of citizens, not a place of oppressive uniformity based on a single substantive culture. Cohesion in such a community derives from widespread commitment to certain core values, both between communities and within them: equality and fairness; dialogue and consultation; toleration, compromise, and accommodation; recognition of a respect for diversity and, by no means least, a determination to confront and eliminate racism and xenophobia.

*(The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report 2000: 56)*

This conference – '*Community, Cohesion and Citizenship*' – held with the support of the LSE Centre for the Study of Global Governance, aimed to highlight some of the debate that had emerged in the wake of and in response to the Commission's report. It also aimed to take an international perspective on the issues to examine how other nations dealt with them. The conference papers published in this collection have no pretensions to being the final word on cohesion and citizenship. They represent a range of approaches, and they report on current debates in order to better inform the political decisions that will lead to definitions of the key concepts of cohesion.

In his keynote address, Bhikhu Parekh outlines his current thinking, which informed the central tenets of the Commission's report. Alan Wolfe and Jytte Klausen challenged these at the time, and we were pleased to invite them both to engage in debate with Professor Parekh about their differing concepts of citizenship. We have decided to include Alan Wolfe's paper and a transcript of his address to better reflect the debate that took place on the day. In addition, Ali

Rattansi offers a different perspective on the Parekh/Wolfe debate and the magazine (*Prospect*) in which the debate first surfaced.

Jagdish Gundara develops a thesis which considers schools as the locus for what he terms ‘intercultural education’. This is especially relevant in terms of the emphasis in policy to consider future generations and their engagement with an agenda based on social cohesion. Lola Young shared her thoughts on the development of cultural policy and social cohesion. [Unfortunately, in her new role as a policymaker, and due to pressure of time, she was unable to prepare a paper for inclusion in these proceedings.]

The afternoon panel considered international (European) perspectives on social cohesion. Jytte Klausen focuses on obstacles to integration experienced by middle-class immigrants – in this instance ‘Euro-Muslims’ specifically. Rainer Bauböck reflects on immigration and asylum from an EU and specifically Austrian perspective, noting the effect of an emergent ‘securitization’ agenda on immigration policies. Christophe Bertossi’s paper considers the French approach to social cohesion, noting that: ‘French politics of citizenship simply ignore probable ethnic, regional, or religious minorities. Only individuals are citizens, citizens are equal, therefore all individuals are equal citizens.’

David Hollinger sums up the conference with an address that responds to some of the major debates of the day, including religious disestablishment, common values, multiple identities, devolution and supra-national polities.

These conference proceedings are published with a view to engaging the widest number of people possible with these concepts, and as a contribution to a national debate on cohesion and citizenship.

Runnymede will remain engaged with this debate, and we are developing ways of both taking the ideas forward and supporting others in formulating creative and innovative responses to the promotion of cohesion, equality and diversity. Having held two conferences that concentrated on the theoretical and academic debates about cohesion, our next event focuses on enabling policymakers and practitioners to better understand the issues and, by virtue of that improved understanding, deliver solutions to the problems posed by a lack of social cohesion.

Runnymede will also be pursuing major projects in the coming year that will engage young people with the debate about the future of multi-ethnic Britain. We will continue to use the ideas developed by the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain to push for positive change in terms of leadership,

training, representation and regulation. Our work with the UK education systems and with colleagues across Europe will further develop our thinking about multiculturalism and racial equality. There will also be projects to examine the nature of racial violence and the means of preventing it, alongside further engagement with the private sector to support their efforts for change.

It is clear that the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain touched on some crucial matters, and that the quality and value of its observations were then largely obscured by the hostile responses exhibited in the media. The issues themselves, however, are enduring. These proceedings represent one of the ways in which Runnymede will continue to illuminate the debates about race equality and multiculturalism that will undoubtedly continue to rage for a long time hence. It is only through engaging a range of audiences – academic, community, policymaker and practitioner, younger and older – that we can hope to deliver positive change.

The Chair of the Runnymede Trust, Dr Samir Shah, noted the resolve needed to maintain heart in the struggle:

Runnymede is used to marching towards the sound of gunfire. We have had over thirty years' experience in this complex and sensitive field. Born during the Powellite years of the late 1960s, Runnymede has lived through riots in the streets, immigration panics, and politicians playing the race card. Through it all, Runnymede has made a significant contribution to race relations legislation and policy development. On this history, Runnymede has built a reputation for independent, original and, on occasion, provocative thinking. Runnymede is well versed in the practice of ensuring that the sound and fury of the moment does not deflect from the substantive issues of the day.  
(Runnymede *Bulletin* December 2000: 1)

**Rob Berkeley is Senior Research and Policy Analyst at Runnymede**