

Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College

Honors Theses

Florida Atlantic University Libraries

Year 2006

Racial Violence: Examining Causation in
the United States, France, Great Britain,
and Germany

Christine Lynn Sylvain

**RACIAL VIOLENCE: EXAMINING CAUSATION IN THE
UNITED STATES, FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN, AND
GERMANY**

BY

CHRISTINE LYNN SYLVAIN

**A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
The Wilkes Honors College
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts and Sciences
with a Concentration in Political Science
and Minor in Women's Studies**

**Wilkes Honors College
Florida Atlantic University
Jupiter, Florida
May 2006**

RACIAL VIOLENCE: EXAMINING CAUSATION IN THE UNITED STATES, FRANCE,
GREAT BRITAIN, AND GERMANY

by
Christine Sylvain

This thesis was prepared under the direction of the candidate's thesis advisor, Dr. Jacqueline Fewkes, and has been approved by the members of her supervisory committee. It was submitted to the faculty of The Honors College and was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts and Sciences.

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. Jacqueline Fewkes

Dr. Martin J. Sweet

Interim Dean, Wilkes Honors College

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my extreme appreciation and gratitude to the reviewers of this thesis Dr. Mark Tunick, Dr. Martin J. Sweet and especially my advisor Dr. Jacqueline Fewkes. I would also like to thank all the professors I have had at the Honors College, as each has helped me to get to where I am today. Most importantly I would like to thank my family for their support and encouragement throughout my life and their constant love and acceptance over the years. Finally, I would like to recognize my wonderful friends, who keep me sane and provide good company on my breaks from studying.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND.....	6
III.	UNITED STATES.....	12
IV.	FRANCE.....	25
V.	UNITED KINGDOM.....	35
VI.	GERMANY.....	44
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	54
VIII.	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	58

ABSTRACT

Author: Christine Sylvain
Title: Race Riots: Examining Causation in the United States, France, Great Britain, and Germany
Institution: Wilkes Honors College at Florida Atlantic University
Thesis Advisor: Dr. Jacqueline Fewkes
Degree: Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts and Sciences
Concentration: Political Science
Minor: Women's Studies

This thesis examines recent explanations of racial violence in the Los Angeles Riots of 1992, the Oldham Riots of 2001, the French Riots of 2005, and the racial violence of 1992 in Germany. In each case I outline traditional theories claiming that racial violence is caused by competition between ethnic groups for housing, jobs, and cultural identity. These theories may benefit from consideration of the historical elements that have institutionalized racial discrimination in the systematic processes of integration. In conclusion, I argue that the governmental mechanisms of integration; including citizenship models, context of state formation, immigration policy, and nationalist ideology, suggest that the framework of racial prejudice and ethnocentrism may predispose a society to racial conflict.

INTRODUCTION

Prejudice exists in inter-group relations within the political, economic, and cultural spheres of society. When prejudice turns to violence, society must question what factors lead to this shift. Scholars typically claim that the many forms of competition between ethnic groups intensify racial antagonisms sometimes leading to violent outbreaks. While competition may aggravate social tension, the racial aspect of conflict is founded within a history of discrimination. While not all minorities are racially dissimilar to the dominant culture, ethnic groups comprise a large portion of the socioeconomically underprivileged faction. By analyzing how minority groups are subordinated through governmental policy, the cases suggest that social division is often on the basis of race. This thesis inspects the immediate causes of racial violence by analyzing the historical, political, and cultural conditions affecting race relations. Competition for economic and governmental resources is a common condition present in countries across the globe. The racial designation of social conflict is enhanced by historical conditions such as the creation of national identity during state formation, the model of citizenship conditioning the terms of social interaction, and governmental policies reflecting the context of the preceding factors. The terms of competition seem to be conditioned by racial status because expressions of discrimination and prejudice prevail in government, the workforce, and civil society. This thesis examines explanations of racial violence in the United States, France, Great Britain and Germany while situating the analysis through the descriptive framework of their historical contexts.

Underlying social conflict is the antagonism between a more powerful social group and another disadvantaged group, which is observed along racial, class, and social lines and sometimes expressed through race violence. In each case study, the unrest is a symptom of various social conflicts that continually coexist, interrelate and agitate one

another. Minorities are populations that fall out of the scope of majority interests for infinite reasons including, race, religion, class, gender, occupation, economic status, etc.; whereas, immigrants are foreign-born individuals who may or may not have full citizenship rights. It is possible that the interests of these two groups may coincide or be fervently polarized. Although the concept of immigrant is fundamentally different than minority, they will be used interchangeably in this research as a representation of an outside influence on a dominant culture. Furthermore, comparisons between minority groups from different countries should take note of the complexities of minority-majority relations confounded by religious and cultural difference across nation-states and within migrant communities. Whether the conflict is in some cases of a racial nature, due to religious animosity, or economic hardship inflamed by another group, the historical determinants of these manifestations of social conflict can be examined to understand race relations.

My analysis will include the following case studies: the 1992 Los Angeles riots in the United States, the civil unrest of 2005 in France, the riots of 2001 in Great Britain, and the violent summer of 1992 in Germany. While there are numerous incidences of racial violence in the historical canon, I selected these case studies to examine because they occurred in liberal democracies of westernized and wealthy nations that have attracted large numbers of immigrants, the same nations that are generally considered to be immune to such violence. Also these manifestations of racial violence have occurred within a fifteen-year span thus increasing the likelihood that they have been influenced by similar settings in international affairs. During this time period, each nation has attempted to adapt their models of citizenship to accommodate a rapidly changing world and increasingly diverse populations in the 21st century.

Many scholars have focused on the immediate triggers of race riots such as ethnic competition for jobs and housing, poverty, social deprivation, targeting and abuse by the police, etc. While these factors promote social antagonism, it is the deeply embedded racial prejudice within governmental and cultural systems of incorporation that underpin ethnic tension. Long term factors, such as the context of state formation, citizenship models, and immigration policy set the stage for minority/majority inter-race relations. While short-term triggers incite racial violence, models of citizenship implemented in modern nations seem to constitute the foundation of cultural interaction and subsequent racial tension. For each case I summarize the violent events and evaluating short-term theories of racial conflict including the works of competition and deprivation theorists like Roger Karapin (1999), Susan Olzak and Suzanne Shanahan (1996), and Jeannette Money (1997), Albert Bergesen and Max Herman (1998), and Joel Fetzer (2000). Finally, I outline how institutionalized racism is founded within citizenship models through immigration policy and foreordains racial violence. Ethnic disturbances occur as a result of the systematic operations of institutionalized racism. Xenophobia and ethnocentrism propel this racism are exhibited in race-relations policy. Racial unrest symbolizes institutional difficulties to integrate growing minority populations into the host culture. Every country is influenced by a host of different experiences with foreign populations and therefore develops uniquely tailored mechanisms of incorporation in response to these interactions. Therefore, examining the sociopolitical causes of ethnic tension is important if these violent outbreaks are to be understood.

National ideology is manifested through policies concerning immigrant acculturation and toleration. Political opinions and cultural backgrounds influence immigration policy and citizenship models, which are determined by historical factors such as: wars, cultural identity, religion, and the formation of the state. The result of the

state's formation context can take the form of ethno-culturally based aversion to outside influences, or apprehension toward multiculturalism due to conflicts resulting from cultural differences in the past; immigrant policy is shaped by these factors. The institutional structure of incorporating minority groups forms over time and is dependent on experiences with foreign influences. These historical occurrences form the basis for systematic cultural integration and affect the way ethnic groups will interact with each other in the future. Whether minorities form coalitions to influence governmental policy or not is related to the political and cultural climate of the integration system. Racial violence represents the failure of the governmental system to mollify ethnic tension stemming from the processes of integration into the nation state.

To evaluate traditional claims I will incorporate the works of the following authors who examine how state formation and historical factors shape immigration politics and models of citizenship: Jeffrey Checkel (1999), who analyzes the legacy of the *Gastarbeiter* programs in Germany and its effect on immigrant integration; Christian Joppke (1996), who discusses different responses to multiculturalism in Germany, the U.S., and U.K.; William Safran (1997), who examines the ideological conceptions of nationalistic attitudes affecting immigration policy in each of the stated countries; Koopmans and Statham's analysis (1999) of multiculturalism in Germany, the U.K., and the U.S.; and Jeremy Hein (1993), who discusses how minorities are integrated into the political systems of Great Britain and the United States. I will analyze each country's citizenship model within the framework of Veit Bader's 1997 analysis of national citizenship paradigms, referred to as assimilation in France, multiculturalism in Great Britain, postliberalism in the U.S. and postnationalism in Germany. In conclusion, I propose that while existing theories of race rioting are correct at identifying

short term triggers of race riots, they also need to take into account the governmental frameworks and integration policies that predispose ethnic groups to conflict.

BACKGROUND

Immigration policy, minority rights, and integration tactics have been forefront controversial issues in deciding how to deal with increasing amounts of migrants due to transnationalization and globalization. Governments must decide how to incorporate immigrants, what rights to allot them, which minority traditions to tolerate or prohibit, and how to facilitate peaceful integration into society. Every nation-state sets policies in an effort to promote its interests and protect itself from decreasing efficiency, autonomy and power. It would be harmful for any nation to allow for infinite numbers of migrants to live within its boundaries utilizing the services it provides. Governments have a responsibility to allocate funds efficiently and providing too many welfare benefits to numerous interest groups would effectively drain the system's viability. Political scientists generally concede that democracy functions better in societies with relative cultural homogeneity because the less diverse party interests are, the more easily compromises can be reached (Huntington 9). If unlimited numbers of diverse populations are given political participation rights, the autonomy and self-determination of the nation-state would be seriously challenged in a representational government. Therefore, these states must set guidelines governing inclusion and exclusion standards of possible future citizens. When setting this self-protective criterion, the debate often becomes conflated with national ideology and xenophobia, increasing the likelihood that immigrants will experience racial intolerance in their new communities. Accordingly, immigration policy has been conflated with debates about what rights and benefits to allot foreign populations.

When formulating legislative regulations, governments of countries decide why to include some hopefuls and exclude others. Reasons behind immigration selection

standards include potential threats to national security, attempts to fill a labor void, reunification of family members, providing a safe haven for refugees, or increasing the country's technological and scientific advantage ("Developments-Alien" 1337). Some conventional standards that are used in selection involve occupation, age, education, political and religious views, refugee status, etc. This selection process, influenced by national ideology, constitutes the citizenship model and influences inter-race relations because it determines the ethno-cultural make-up of society. Therefore, the policies a country enacts to select immigrants should provide a good indication of how tolerant it is of minority cultures.

While countries have to determine standards of selection, international human rights law encourages states to recognize those "inalienable rights" of every human being. International law encourages liberal human rights doctrine, which involves receiving countries taking on "nation-as-protector" responsibilities to its citizens, such as providing social services, public education, and military protection. What rights do or *should* minorities have in a society? It is internationally understood that all individuals have basic rights as human beings, but it is still contentious what degree those rights should benefit marginal non-native groups, especially when perceived to be at the expense of dominant culture. Another controversial issue is the matter of protection of minority cultural rights. Should minority culture be tolerated and perpetuated despite possibly being contradictory to majority values and beliefs? As Vernon Van Dyke (1980) points out, an implicit right to self-preservation of cultures exists in many international doctrines:

The Covenant on the Civil and Political Rights speaks of culture not only in connection with the right of peoples to

self-determination but also in connection with the rights of persons belonging to ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities. It says that such persons, 'in community with other members of their group,' shall not be denied the right 'to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language. (Van Dyke 2)

Although some nation-states adopt this doctrine of minority culture protection, some countries, such as France, continue to discourage strong cultural ties to minority traditions. However, in Great Britain and the U.S., minority groups have lobbied for protective policies of the right to preserve their cultural traditions. As Koopmans et al. note:

Migrant minorities increasingly put forward demands for special group rights and recognition and support for their cultural difference and identity by the state. Such claims are often seen as challenges to the very essence of liberal values, for instance, when Muslims demand the right to polygamy [or] the circumcision of females (Parekh 1996). (Koopmans et al. 658)

In the course of minority integration, policies tailored to increasing tolerance of minority cultures become a part of national immigration doctrines. Therefore, inevitably minority groups influence the political culture of the host society. The process of minority demands being met by government is part of the acculturation of a minority culture into the host environment. Some countries, usually in response to minority demands, have attempted to appease minority claims for political power and inclusion into mainstream society by subsidizing government-friendly minority religious or cultural institutions. For instance, Great Britain after pressure from minority groups in Parliament now subsidizes both Christian and Muslim private schools. Movements of protest and civil disobedience have often been mollified by inclusive measures; however, some states opt for even more restrictive policies, thus fueling civil unrest. This is the now case in France, where even

during the 2005 riots the government proceeded to make cuts in social programs initially implemented to benefit marginal groups.

Nationalist ideals that government officials wish to promote in their citizenry are symbolized through immigration policy and influenced by nationalism and ethno-cultural identity. Nation-states include or exclude different groups dependent on how minority interests conflict or correspond with that of the government. This majority-minority relationship is also based on international settings over time and perceived threats to national security. The components constructing citizenship within federal systems are unevenly allotted to minority groups. Integration is a multifaceted process involving many different aspects in allotting citizenship rights. Peter Schuck (2000) categorizes four dimensions of citizenship including: the political dimension involving public participation; the legal dimension, where positive law creates the distinct status of citizen involving specific rights and obligations; the psychological dimension based on political identity where people identify with membership in the state or another political community; and finally the sociological dimension which deals with how individual citizens are integrated into civil society (Schuck 207). Each country's citizenship model incorporates these dimensions differently putting more emphasis on some over others. In addition, Schuck emphasizes that "laws governing citizenship, immigration, and the rights of aliens instantiate its particular values about how inclusive it should be, along which dimensions, and on what terms" (Schuck 208). As I will demonstrate, the construction of citizenship may be influenced by nationalist and cultural identity as it is implemented through immigration policy.

Cultural conditions at the time of state formation may affect future definitions of citizenship within that society. The founding characteristics of ethnocultural commonality encompass the values reinforced by nationalist identity and dictate the terms of inclusion and exclusion within society. Governmental institutions reflect the ideals of nationalist ideology; governments attempt to encourage certain values and ways of living and discourage others through education and social policies. Therefore, it follows that how minorities are integrated within a society is dependent upon nationalist ideology and expressed through governmental structures. Likewise, economic structures set the terms of commerce between different factions of society. Different economic paradigms result in particular arrangements and expressions of social conflict. Capitalism creates class antagonisms by constructing classes of laborers and employers. Racial prejudice expresses itself through the concentration of ethnic minorities in the lower echelons of social status. Political participation is largely organized through institutions and interest groups representing different facets of society; these various groups compete within the system for state resources and political clout. Consequently, the dominant cultural groups are advantaged to affect the efficacy of less established minority groups, such as, through federal funding of minority organizations and the legislation of immigration policy. Similarly, socialism is constructed to benefit the majority interests because social institutions are shaped by the governing dominant culture. Furthermore, under a socialist economy it is difficult to incorporate diverse groups because the state has more centralized control over institutions. While economic modes of interaction are implicated through citizenship policy, cultural conditions provide reasons for selection standards.

Past interaction with outside cultures affects how the dominant social group defines national commonality. Wars and religion also have a great affect on the political culture of a nation state; they simultaneously are a result of and reinforce racial and cultural prejudice. This is evidenced by countless examples of religious intolerance, and cultural conflict, one being for example the Holocaust. Religious identity affects the cultural make-up of society and determines the traditions it follows, for instance, in which occasions are selected for national holidays. This connection between religion and policy is also evident when examining colonialist justifications for the enslavement of Africans, which was supported by the Christian ideology of “harmony of interests” and is symbolized in Rudyard Kipling’s 1889 poem “The White Man’s Burden”:

Take up the White Man's burden--
Send forth the best ye breed--
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild--
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.
(Kipling “White Man”)

Additionally, what ideals constitute current nationalist ideology and what meanings are attached to citizenship within a certain country change over time. As John Tehranian (2000) notes, the concept of being “American” at one time excluded Irish and Italian immigrants because they were not considered white, but has changed since then to include these groups and exclude others (*e.g.* Latino and Asian immigrants) (825). Here it is clear that nationalist ideals are formed to sometimes exclude immigrants on the basis of racially discriminatory standards.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Los Angeles race riots began on April 29th, 1992 when four police officers were acquitted of police brutality, despite the videotaped evidence of Rodney King's beating. Riots broke out and several days of violence ensued, around 50 to 60 people were killed, 2,000 injured, 1,100 buildings destroyed, and \$800 million worth of damage inflicted (Smith, Matt et al. "Riot still echoes"). It seems that the community's anger was inflamed more by the light punishments of these acts than by the acts themselves. These incidents were preceded by rising racial tension attributed to the murder of a fifteen-year-old African American girl by a Korean storeowner, economic hardship, and targeting and abuse of African Americans by the police.

Discussions of race rioting in history and political science studies concentrate on socioeconomic deprivation and ethnic competition theories to account for racial violence. Although the following authors focus on different aspects of contentious interaction between groups, they all fall under the common economic paradigm of scarcity, where competition for a declining supply of resources is coupled with increasing demand. Competition theorists Susan Olzak and Susanne Shanahan (1996) examine how declining resources (jobs and housing) during times of population growth increases the level of racial unrest. She suggests that racial violence is more unlikely during immigration influxes that are matched by an expanding labor market. While Olzak's et al. explanation represents a classical ethnic competition theory, alternate theorists opt for variations of this same supply and demand problem. Seymour Spilerman (1970), in his analysis of the 1960s Watts riots, acknowledges relative deprivation theories as a correlating factor explaining race riots. Spilerman recognizes that the socioeconomic gap between Blacks

and Whites contributes to ethnic tension, but argues that the riots were the result of a history of racial tension and inequality from the Jim Crow era and the legacy of slavery (645). Olzak et al. contend that city size and the size of black population have more significant effects on race riots. She claims that poverty alone does not spark racial violence, but is caused by competition for scarce resources during periods of population growth. Furthermore, she argues that race riots occur in places where blacks are relatively better off, or during a decline of racial disparities. Although Olzak's et al. argument is logical, Bergesen and Herman (1998) counter arguing that it does not account for the fact that African Americans were actually the majority-inhabitant of South Central Los Angeles.

Bergesen and Herman argue that the rate of change in the racial group structure triggers violence. They point out "ethnic competition theory assumes that the dominant ethnic groups react with exclusionary violence in reaction to in-migrating minorities," but point out that "within South Central, blacks are the majority at 60.4% of the population" (Bergesen et al. 40). They imply that previous studies had been assuming that Blacks made up the minority population when in reality within these neighborhoods they were the majority. Bergesen et al. continue, stating that the key element behind race rioting is not labor market competition, as Olzak et al. argued, but the arrival of a new ethnic immigrant group into residential areas inhabited by a different already established minority. This argument is troubling because it assumes that geographic integration of ethnic groups is not possible.

Spatial-context theorists like Jeanette Money focus on geo-political factors of competition including districting, governmental representation, and distribution of

resources. This alternative explanation holds that it is the spatial context of immigration politics that underlies ethnic violence. Jeannette Money (1997) argues that the geographic concentration of minorities creates an uneven distribution of the costs and benefits in a political system, thus creating a spatial context of immigration politics. She argues that immigration controls are tightened when there are high rates of unemployment, increasing immigration and a large proportion of immigrants, and competition for access to social services (Money 694). Geographic identity/resource competition theories are not fully adequate, because they do not take into account that minority groups across the world live under similar conditions encouraging competition without the occurrence of racial violence.

None of the above arguments acknowledge police profiling and abuse, and discrimination in the judicial and legislative spheres as factors contributing to racial conflict. The prevalence of these acts, however, is a manifestation of the racist power structure in the punishment systems of modern governments. While the white police officers were acquitted of police brutality against Rodney King, ethnic minorities receive on average harsher punishments. The disproportionate amount of African American males imprisoned signifies differences in the treatment of ethnic groups within the punishment system. As Barry Holman (2001) finds:

In no state is the growth in prison racially or ethnically proportional to the group's overall population. Whites are systematically excluded from prison in every jurisdiction while people of color are locked up at levels that far exceed their proportion of the population or their involvement in crime. (Holman 13)

Blacks are incarcerated more often in proportion to Whites because of racial bias in the judicial system. Some blame black culture for this inequitable imprisonment rate,

claiming that Blacks are more prone to violence; this argument suggests that there is something inherently violent about Blacks. This reasoning is flawed because the problem is not of race but class. Crime is concentrated in economically underprivileged neighborhoods and ethnic minorities, due to the legacy of institutionalized segregation from the Jim Crow era.

POLICY ANALYSIS

At this point it is necessary to examine immigration policies in light of the historical context of their implementation and the subsequent effects on minority integration. While legislating immigration policy is complex because “the effects of immigration are imperfectly understood, occur far in the future and depend on factors unrelated to immigration flows” (“Developments-Aliens” 1338), policies have nevertheless been affected by historical and prejudicial factors that discriminate disproportionately against people of color in relation to other groups. American attitudes towards immigrants and minorities change over time and are dependent upon national ideology, the economy, and international context. Accordingly, all nation-states form immigration policy within the contextual framework of time-specific attitudes towards different minority groups. As Charles Ogletree (2000) notes:

America’s enthusiasm for newcomers has historically been tempered by its skeptical view of outsiders of a different race, ethnicity, economic status, religion, or political affiliation. Concerns about job competition, the burdening of public services and a perceived inability of the U.S. easily to absorb cultural outsiders have accompanied the arrival of immigrants since the eighteenth century. (Ogletree 759)

Dominant majority politics have excluded outside groups that do not fit into ideal immigrant standards. Starting with the Naturalization Act of 1790, the U.S. restricted the

right to become naturalized to ‘free white men’ and only amended this act to include Blacks in 1870, but the racist language was retained until the 1960s (Glenn 4). Moreover, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 barred Chinese immigration and prohibited their naturalization. This restrictionist policy emanated from competition for employment in the railway construction of west between Chinese immigrants and white American laborers (Ogletree 759). The Immigration Act of 1924 implemented the “national-origins” system that assigned each country annual immigration ceilings in proportion to the percent of the population with the same ethnicity already in the United States (Ogletree 760). The purpose of this act was to maintain the racial-makeup of society with White-Anglo’s in dominance. Furthermore, ethnic groups from the Western Hemisphere were not eligible for immigration until 1940, and national origins system remained. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 removed racial restrictions to immigration but still retained per-country quotas.

The racially discriminating national origins system continued until its repeal by the 1965 Immigration Act, which was preceded by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The ideology and increasing strength of the Civil Rights Movement helped facilitate the annulment of the national origins system. Inconsistent with the national origin doctrine, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited discrimination on the basis of color, religion, sex, race, or national origin in employment, public facilities and government. Furthermore, the Voting Rights Act prohibited the literacy test requirement to vote opening the door to many previously excluded groups to political participation. The 1965 Immigration Act opened up the door for “source-country universalism” in admission and established caps on immigration from the Western

Hemisphere, limiting it to 120,000 annually (Joppke 1999, 25). Although this act was intended to rectify an imbalance in European migration, it unintentionally opened the door to a wave of large-scale immigration from Asia and Latin America. During the Cold War, the Cuban Readjustment Act of 1966 implemented the “wet-foot-dry-foot” policy allowing predominantly white Cubans to stay in the U.S. after reaching land.

Governmental officials justify this policy citing the refugee status of these groups fleeing communist dictator Fidel Castro’s regime. However, racial prejudice is evident when compared to the automatic repatriation of mostly black Haitian immigrants, whose homeland politics have been equally dangerous and persecutory, but unfortunately, not communist. The Cold War has and continues to affect citizenship models in the U.S. where immigrants escaping communist countries are preferentially granted asylum or characterized as refugees (Ogletree 765). Examining racial discrimination in immigration policy, Alex Stepick III, in his 1992 analysis of the politics towards Haitian migrants, finds:

(1) A consistent U.S. federal policy designed to repress the flow of Haitian refugees to Miami [...]; and (2) a contrast between the negative stereotypes of Haitians and the reality of a diverse Haitian population. (Stepick 57)

While the strong political influence of Cuban immigrants in Miami may also account for their preferential treatment in asylum grants, in comparison to the inhumane treatment of Haitian immigrants, it is dubious that racial discrimination was not in part a factor.

In 1986 legislators reformed immigration policy in order to stimulate decreasing European migration, which was an unexpected byproduct of the 1965 amendments (Ogletree 733-4). The act legalized the status of about three million undocumented immigrants, imposed sanctions on employers who hire illegal immigrants, as well as

included the concept of “alienage” to Title VII of the Civil Rights Acts, which prohibiting discrimination in the workforce based on citizenship status (Joppke 1999, 39). The 1986 law effectively excluded African countries from eligibility by only applying to countries whose immigration numbers had decreased following the 1965 legislation (Ogletree 764). The Legal Immigration Act of 1990 had two purposes as outlined by Joppke (1999), “to strengthen the component of skills within an immigration system that prioritized family-based immigration, [...] and to redress an imbalance in the national origins of post-1965 immigration” (39). These two impulses combined, Joppke argues, amount to a covert attack on the increasing frequency of Latin American and Asian immigrants. Currently there is the same cap on immigration levels for each country, which, coupled with racial bias eligibility considerations, has resulted in fewer visas for people of color (Ogletree 761). At present there are four major paths of immigration: family-sponsored, employment-based, diversity lottery, and refugee. As noted by Hugh Davis Graham, family-based migration may create culturally isolated neighborhoods; especially after the Immigration and Refugee Control Act of 1986, where it has been reported that in some cases foreign townships (observed from Mexico and China) seemed to be wholly transplanted into American neighborhoods (118-119). Cultural and linguistic isolation might impede the natural assimilation processes that could otherwise result if immigrants lived among the majority culture rather than cut off in smaller, peripheral neighborhoods. Family Reunification laws have been linked to increasing deterioration of educational and occupational quality of newly admitted immigrants (Joppke 1999, 39). In continuance, Ogletree highlights discriminatory treatment in the deportation of minorities stating that, “While not all of the top five source countries for

illegal immigrants are in Latin America, the top five countries of citizenship for deported illegal aliens are all Latin American countries” (Ogletree 768). Moreover, Ogletree examines the ‘public charge’ ineligibility standard, that excludes those minorities who are considered likely to end up using public welfare services, and argues that this is troublesome because it is often subject to racial bias and is the most frequent reason cited for visa denials (762). Finally, the diversity visa lottery was implemented to compensate for minority groups underrepresented in the other immigration categories but has served to benefit immigrants from European countries (Ogletree 763).

One major inconsistency of the United States’ immigration policy is the effect of the plenary power doctrine, created by judges at the end of the 19th century. The principle grants the legislative and executive branches overreaching power in immigration legislation and enforcement. Hiroshi Motomora (1996) examines the significance of the plenary power doctrine stating, “because of its existence, courts have been reluctant to apply constitutional norms and principles to immigration statutes and regulations” (1939). Immigration policy, because it is not subject to judicial review, does not fall within the scope of the checks and balances system that maintains the constitutionality of legislation in the United States. This is particularly disturbing when applying the same principle to the Civil Rights Movement during the 1960s.

POSTLIBERAL MULTICULTURALISM

The United States has an extremely complex race-relations history. Current immigration policy has been shaped by numerous historical factors. The colonization period issued in a predominantly Northern European stock of immigrants, but both African Americans, as non-voluntary, enslaved immigrants, and Native Americans, as the

indigenous threat to settlement, have contributed current immigration policy through interaction with the dominant culture. The twentieth century has seen the evolution of immigration policies shaped by two world wars, the many externalities of the Cold War, whose aftermath arguable continues today, the free trade agreements NAFTA and CAFTA, and 9/11. Immigration policy has been modeled, as is the government and economy, after a pluralist, laissez-faire citizenship model, which attempts to integrate these groups into the system and determines the terms of minority-majority interaction. Regulations are implemented based on perceived threat to national security and economic considerations for labor and trade.

The United States has an interesting immigration history because of its entirely different state formation context than that of the European cases. Traditionally there have been two faces to immigration policy in the United States, one that welcomes “weak, huddled masses” and one that attempts to exclude outsider groups. For example, at the entrance to the Statue of Liberty Emma Lazarus’ poem “The New Colossus” is inscribed. The “Mother of Exiles” proclaims:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door! (Lazarus, “New Colossus”)

This poem reflects the unifying concept of American being a nation of immigrants, however, over time nativism has increased and officials are concerned with maintain this increasingly particular “American” way of life. Cultural identification in the United States consists of one unifying “American” concept that includes all minority groups coming to the U.S. to lead a better life, and those locally concentrated groups who

identify with and retain their homeland cultures. During the settlement period, the U.S. encouraged immigration from mostly Northern European countries to stimulate expansion and provide manpower to explore uncharted territory as promoted by Manifest Destiny (Safran 318). Jeanette Money explains the U.S.'s concept of national identity shaped by the settler, "nation of immigrants" mentality saying:

‘Settler’ states are those where national identity and citizenship are based on civic values of participation; immigrants are viewed as potential citizens, and the state is relatively open to immigration. (Money 689)

While the U.S. has been relatively open to immigration, regulation was initially shaped to preserve the "original" ethnicity of the North European settlers, founders, and colonizers. However, after immigrants started coming from non-European countries, the selection policies became more exclusionist with the Immigration Act of 1924 that implemented the national origins system. This was most likely because of a prejudicial preference for a more Northern European Anglo-Saxon stock of immigrants that had been the norm during settlement.

On the other hand, there still exists a fundamental belief, emerging from the American Dream concept that minorities come to America to lead a better life without persecution for religious beliefs and to live freely by participating in a somewhat representational democracy. The values and practices associated with the American Dream as well as a "no looking back," "pick yourself up by your bootstraps" attitude have formed a premise for immigration selection standards for what makes a good immigrant. Such a cultural attitude encouraging working hard is evident in the symbolic "rags to riches" stories of Horatio Alger. This implies that there are certain characteristics that characterize a good immigrant, such as having the ability to learn English and speak

it fairly well, finding a job, and living according to American values and beliefs.

Although, immigration has been relatively open, the U.S. has not escaped the effects of racial prejudice and minority groups' socioeconomic marginalization. Immigrants still must fit into the dominant cultural style or else be excluded by the naturally competitive system, which encourages personal agency, mobilization, and particularistic identification based upon ethnicity and/or religion within interest groups and organizations.

The melting pot conception of identity misrepresents the actual American system. The melting pot should consist of many different groups connected by a common goal or value. This ideal of homogeneous assimilation offers a sense of unity that the society holds dear. However, Bader argues that the melting pot has failed because cultural divisions remain, saying:

Something is inherently wrong with the conception of a melting pot that tries to achieve a new public, political culture by ignoring strong ethnic and national cultures and identities or relegating them to the 'private' realm. Formal 'color-blindness' does not work and cannot work. All political myths and constitutions, as well as citizenship and civic and political culture, are inevitably historically and ethnically colored. (Bader 776)

Ethnic groups still identify based upon their culture of origin and differences in education, living standards, and opportunity are disproportionately distributed along racial and class lines. The melting pot idea was never realized, rather America's cultural identity better resembles a mosaic table, where all the different pieces of glass are unified by a common bond or mortar, that of being an immigrant in a nation of immigrants.

The American execution of multiculturalism focuses on tolerance for the many minority cultures and is unifying in this sense because the dominant culture was still

evolving and undetermined when the U.S. was first founded. The United States models citizenship based on the tenets of postliberalism or pluralism, where various groups of affiliations and interests but are ideally thought to be connected by a higher communal value. Contradictorily, as Joppke states “multiculturalism’s preoccupation with remembering one’s origins is curiously at odds with the immigrant creed of ‘never look back’ that has given American society its unique dynamism and resilience” (Joppke 1996, 465). Part of the American laissez-faire approach is that it encourages competition between different interest groups as in any capitalist economy. The U.S. policy of immigration and minority rights is largely based on a “rights to resources” concept. This system “emphasizes racial and ethnic differences, interest groups, and distribution of jobs and other social goods” (Hein 97). Foreigners compete to enter the country, compete for jobs, housing, and finally for influence in governmental districts. Furthermore, “The fact that relations between American minorities are frequently patterned on conflict and competition than on coalitions and cooperation is congruent with the rights to resources approach” (Hein 108). As Raphael J. Sonenshein (1997) outlines, in California political coalitions among minority groups proliferated more during the 1960s and 70s under the leadership of mayor Tom Bradley; however, “the steady obliteration of the city’s industrial base and the rise of a globally based service economy, sustained by massive immigration [...] helped seal the doom of the biracial coalition” (Sonenshein 50). While it is reasonable that the nature of competition would increase racial tension, it does not explain why this tension would result in conflict because competition exists in many cities across the nation. Furthermore, jobs are unstable for minorities because they tend to concentrate in the bottom echelons of the labor market that require less training and have

less job security. The poorly funded education systems in economically disadvantaged minority neighborhoods abet racial bias in the job market leading to higher unemployment rates among minorities.

FRANCE

The French race riots of 2005 started when Buona Traore, 15 and Ziad Benna, 17 of Clichy-sous-Bois, were electrocuted by an electrically charged fence after fleeing the police. Over twenty nights from October 27 to November 16, 2005, there were 8,973 vehicles burned, one person killed and €200 million of monetary damage inflicted. Muhtlin Altun, a seventeen year old, a second generation Turkish Kurd, was with Traore and Benna and injured during the incident. Altun told reporters that the boys had been playing soccer and after seeing police patrolling, fled the field attempting to avoid a police encounter. Minorities tried to avoid interactions with the police because they often ended in up to four-hour long questioning sessions. Mostly second-generation immigrant youths from underprivileged neighborhoods participated in the riots and voiced their anger over racial profiling and unfair treatment by the police resulting in the unjust deaths of the two minority youths. Although scholars have not had an adequate chance to theorize the causes of the riots, news reports provide a description of common short-term causes. (“Underclass Rebellion”)

Two indications of the socioeconomic marginalization of minorities in France are that live in isolated ethnic enclaves and are discriminated against in the workforce. *The Economist* suggests that mass unemployment and ethnic ghettos are two policy problems resulting in ethnic tension (“Underclass Rebellion”). An insider-outsider labor market has been created because full-time jobs are protected. Employers try to skirt around strict employment policy by limiting job offers and preferring to hire easily expendable temporary workers. The fact that very few minorities are able to climb up the social ladder reflects this system failure. Furthermore, *The Economist* holds that ineffective

integration policy has led to a parallel, disadvantaged minority subculture, which is supported by the fact that most of the arrestees were sons or grandsons of the 1950s and 60s immigrants (“Underclass Rebellion”). James Hoagland, of *The Washington Post*, observes that the immigrant housing ‘estates’ on the outskirts of major cities in France have become *zones de non-droit*, lawless areas, where police do not go (“French Lessons”). While minority groups are isolated in underprivileged neighborhoods, police patrolling is nonexistent which might contribute to a feeling of being ostracized and neglected as well as encourage blatant disregard on the part of the dominant classes for the woes suffered by minority groups. Although France has a generous welfare system, Hoagland notes that this system was not pacification enough to assuage French internal conflict suffered by urban youths (Hoagland “French Lessons”).

Other theorists analyze French xenophobia to explain ethnic tension. For example, Joel Fetzer (2000) gives a good evaluation of immigration policy and attitudes towards immigration in France from the 20th century to the present. Fetzer argues that cultural marginality theory explains French xenophobia more adequately than economic theories because, even though every economic crisis has coincided with an upsurge in anti-foreigner sentiment, “immigration politics in France appears to turn just as much on whether the country’s culture will remain primarily Catholic and European as on whether most native-born French workers will be able to find jobs” (Fetzer 122). Disdain for religious difference reflects the importance of cultural, if not ethnic, homogeneity in France. Fetzer argues that nativism in France accounts for resistance from the dominant class to accept minority cultural practices and thus dominant-culture change. He characterizes French nativism through three principles: the first, affiliation membership

in Catholic religious majorities; second, lineage originating from old French “stock”; and third, perceived threat to dominant culture (Fetzer 122). Minority groups that do not fit within these characterizations are marginalized from dominant cultural affairs.

POLICY ANALYSIS

French legislators did not systematically regulate immigration until labor shortages after World War II that brought on a need to rebuild and repopulate. The independence and decolonization processes in North Africa during the 1950s and 1960s increased the inflows of Algerian immigrants. The centralized structure of the French government, however, may have set a precedence of strong executive control over legislation leaving minorities out of the domains of immigration and citizenship deliberation. Hollifield clarifies their exclusion, saying:

The political activities of foreigners have been circumscribed by legislation that limits rights of association and restricts occupational and geographical mobility. Such regulation has contributed to the insecurity of foreigners by making their rights subject to administrative discretion rather than constitutional law. (Hollifield 119-120)

Between World War II and the economic recession of 1973 immigration increased. The economy began to suffer after the oil shock of 1973 and France reformed its immigration policy within a protectionist, restrictive framework. Hollifield explains “Foreign workers came to be seen as a political and economic liability. Efforts were made to stop further immigration and [...] encourage foreigners to return to their countries of origin” (114). Hollifield questions the efficacy of the immigration suspension, who asserts that although the policies of 1973 stabilized the immigrant population, they increased inflows in the long run because new immigrants migrated to reunify with family members (126).

The French government attempted to refine the immigrant policies by forming the Commission de la Nationalité in 1987, which suggested that a French-born foreigner instead of being automatically naturalized would have to apply for citizenship after a five year residence period. The Bonnet and Pasqua laws, enacted between 1986 and 1988, tried “to make life less convenient and more unpleasant for people who are not French and who are not expected to become genuinely French” (Safran 316). In 1993, Charles Pasqua, conservative minister of the interior, proposed laws that restricted immigration policy further. By requiring children of foreign parents to officially apply for French citizenship at eighteen years of age, rather than automatically receiving it at birth, the naturalization process was made longer and more difficult (Safran 316). This policy was later amended, however, in 1998 to give automatic citizenship to foreign descendants born in France. The French citizenship model differentiates between categories of foreigners, those born abroad, including children under eighteen and youths who never declared French citizenship; and immigrants, those who accept the ideals of French culture. Although the French government does not require separate statistical data on ethnic communities, it distinguishes between those who have accepted French citizenship and thus the French way of being; and those foreigners who remain outside of the dominant culture.

Family reunification has become the main reason for immigration, “accounting for 70% of the entries” (Hamilton 4). Family reunification policy contributes in promoting the proliferation of isolated ethno-culturally specific neighborhoods. As Hollifield explains:

The development of immigrant enclaves in large cities has contributed to the political salience of the immigrant

problem and has led to deterioration in ethnic relations. The presence of large culturally, linguistically, and sometimes racially distinct populations in the cities focused public attention on immigration. (Hollifield 120)

Subtle legislative reinforcement of quasi-segregation coupled with systematic socioeconomic marginalization explains the creation of a parallel disadvantaged subculture with concentrated economic hardship. On top of disadvantage and discrimination in the workforce, it is not hard to understand the deep-seated ethnic tension and anger expressed through the race rioting.

ASSIMILATION

While the explanations given by news reports are logical in their correlations with race rioting, current modes of conflict are founded by historical factors that affect nationalist ideology and thus government and legislation. After the French Revolution of 1789, which was sparked in part by discontent with the influence of the Catholic Church on government, the French embraced the principle of laicism, or secularity, characterized as separation between the church and the state and a republican form of government. Religious wars and civil unrest, due to conflicting value and belief systems, have caused the French government to embrace a system of solidarity (*Solidarité*), where immigrants are encouraged to embrace French heritage and tolerance for other minority cultures less emphasized in relation to other countries. This ideology attempts to assimilate minority cultures with the least amount of compromise and confrontation between ethnic groups. In practice it does not take into account the inevitability of minority-culture influence on the majority-culture, whether through introduction to new culinary techniques or through their political mobilization. Hein defines *Solidarité* saying:

The essence of membership is protection against being identified on the basis of racial or ethnic affiliation [...] In practice, this social contract requires limiting hate speech, since expressing racism is inherently unjust [...] and that entails an unacceptable level of social conflict. (Hein 104)

Policies included in the solidarity concept include the 2004 ban on displaying religious symbols in public institutions; this ban has most greatly affected Muslim women who want to wear a head covering in public education institutions and has been a forefront controversial debate since 1989. Another is the prohibition of hate speech, punishable with jail time or by fine. These policies are designed to protect ethnic minorities from racial prejudice and discrimination, but in the case of the religious ostentation ban, serve to avoid practice in toleration of multiculturalism at an early age—for example, through teaching children in educational facilities that religious difference should be insignificant when casting judgment. Instead the law promotes the idea that religious difference should not be confronted nor tolerated in the public sphere, because such differences in the cultural make-up of society are contradictory to the ideals of the French Revolution and to those of Solidarity.

While the government touts the ideology of solidarity, in reality minority groups have formed immigrant subcultures isolated from the dominant domain. Because minority groups suffer job and housing discrimination and comparatively higher unemployment rates, social unrest and agitation proliferates. *The Guardian* notes how unemployment rates were around 20-30% for those living in housing ‘estates’ and crime and petty theft had become a way of life (“Paris Burned”). The French model of citizenship aims at being indivisible and tries to assimilate all components of the population by erasing difference. This downplaying of multiculturalism is made evident

by the fact that the government does not allow statistics to be broken down by ethnicity and religion. Furthermore, Hamilton states:

France's long tradition of equating French citizenship with equal treatment has meant that government has not tracked ethnic origins in official statistics, unlike in the United States or Great Britain. (France has traditionally viewed the retention of ethnic identity as an obstacle to both integration and national solidarity.) (Hamilton 7)

Secularity policies have led to more intolerant policies, effectively increasing ethnic tension rather than relieving it. There is, as *The Guardian* suggests, an inherent contradiction between integration based on the concept of equality, and ethnic minorities being told that they do not exist, as well as the subordination of their religious and cultural freedoms to the French ideal ("Paris Burned"). The biggest reason immigrant communities have avoided and simultaneously been inhibited from cultural assimilation rests on the fact that inner cities have developed where socioeconomic hardship is concentrated; that is, disproportionately among minority groups.

After the coup d'état of the government by Napoleon in 1799, immigration policy was opened to give citizenship to revolutionary advocates and supporters of Napoleon (Safran 315). This led to a precedent of cultural assimilation policy, because admittance of immigrants depended upon the foreigners' loyalty to the ideals of the French Revolution and progress in assimilating to the dominant culture. French legislation defines discrimination narrowly by only prohibiting employers from refusing to hire or dismissing minorities/immigrants due to race. Robert Lieberman (2002) argues that, the "French system relies on traditional governmental institutions to enforce anti-discrimination legislation, like the justice system, and the national system of Labor Inspectors" (153). Institutional racism and discrimination in the system is evidenced by

the fact that only “seven out of 380 convictions in the period between 1993 and 1997 were on account of employment-related discrimination” (Lieberman 155). The rest of the convictions were for hate speech violations. This supports the argument that anti-discrimination laws are not being enforced effectively and with so many unemployed minorities on the streets, it is dubious that discrimination does not persist.

France’s attempt to follow color-blind policies in race relations ignores the very real fact that for minority groups, color decreases the likelihood of employment and acceptance in the dominant cultural sphere. In the case of France, the strict policies of assimilation have led to a culture ignorant of the large culturally diverse underclass reflected by the dearth of statistical information broken down by ethnicity. Excluding ethnic difference in census data masks the fact that these groups are disproportionately affected by economic hardship. How can the majority culture effectively integrate minorities of color if they do not recognize that color as a societal standard indicating difference and provoking discrimination? Minority cultural traditions are discouraged and ignored, at the same culturally and individually significant difference in “color” is not even recognized. Dominant society is effectively blind to minority interests. In hopes of spurring amiable cultural interaction between ethnic groups, these anti-discriminatory policies were attempting that unreachable goal of *color-blindness*, however further subordination and marginalization continues. Moreover, minorities are systematically excluded from decision-making processes relevant to immigration. Lieberman explores this marginalization saying, “This feature of French policymaking institutions both limited the options for ethnic minorities to influence national policy and focused those options on a small number of political actors” (Lieberman 152). A more tolerant method

of integration should be to include minorities within discourses that affect their livelihoods.

Assimilation in France requires potential immigrants to subordinate their former culture and religious ties in favor of French culture and nationalism. This policy of solidarity and laicism has been, however, hard to enforce. Hein defines the French system saying:

The essence of membership is protection against being identified on the basis of racial or ethnic affiliation, an element of what the French call *solidarité* (translated as interdependence or mutual responsibility). In practice, this social contract requires limiting hate speech, since expressing racism is inherently unjust. (Hein 104)

This citizenship presupposes assimilation as being the best solution to inequality and social unrest that might result from a multicultural society with a large majority culture and many varied minority cultures. Jeffrey Reitz (1988) argues the major limitation of assimilation theory follows that “the focus is primarily on the newcomer and his/her ability to adjust, to be accepted by the host society, while the host society remains virtually untouched and unchanged in this process” (Reitz 626). Assuming that the effect of minority cultural influence can be avoided is irrational within the processes of cultural integration. In this system, religion and tradition come second to the dominant culture. The efficiency and success of the assimilation model of citizenship is widely debated, especially in light of the controversy surrounding the law banning all signs of religious affiliation including Muslim women wearing headdresses in public schools. In France, on the surface there is a great concentration on tolerance and equal opportunity, so much that any derogatory or racist statements are punishable by fine or even imprisonment. However racial minorities have been marginalized because the assimilation ignores and

marginalizes cultural difference. Such a society, it seems, is apprehensive of dissent and social unrest caused by racial, religious, or cultural disagreement among its citizens. By attempting to deter the reoccurrence of cultural and religious conflict like that of the French Revolution, the French government promotes dominant cultural values and beliefs through its citizenship model into which minorities are encouraged to assimilate. In actuality, the French integration model typifies that of a forced-melting pot, where minority traditions are discarded as scraps and the different spices of cultural difference are overpowered by the taste of French nationalist ideology.

Debates about the ability of Muslims to be integrated into a democratic system have been frequent in the political realms. These concerns should be pacified by such cases of a large Muslim population operating in a democratic system as India and Malaysia. The media often points to Islamophobia and the inability of Muslims to integrate into a democratic western society as the catalysts of ethnic violence. However, this explanation assumes different cultures cannot find peaceful means of mediation. This is a disturbing suggestion in today's increasingly multicultural world. Moreover, this argument does not take into account the structure and historical background that helps shape integration politics. The problem with integration lies in the fact that the government's attempts at integration have failed because they are themselves ineffective. There is not a genuine inability of Muslims to integrate into Western culture; there is, however, simply an inability or reluctance to absorb minority cultures into the host country's cultural ideology and tradition.

UNITED KINGDOM

The so-called Oldham Riots occurred in May 2001 and expanded into Bradford and Burnley. Racial tension intensified when Walter Chamberlain, a 75-year-old white man was attacked by Asian youths on April 22. Although Chamberlain doubts it was racially motivated, the media reported the incident as so. Arun Kundnani (2001) explains this discrepancy, arguing that in the media, “the regular racist violence against Asians was marginalized, while Asian crime on whites was sensationalized and misinterpreted as racially motivated” (Kundnani 107). The Oldham Riots began when a crowd of “football hooligans” and Neo-Nazis from the group Combat 18 was marching down the street singing racist songs, such as “Keep Me English” and “If you hate Pakis, clap your hands” (Kundnani “Nine Months”). After a fight provoked by a white youth, who threw a brick at two Asian youths, violence spread all over the city, with Asian minorities being attacked and retaliating. A pregnant Asian woman was treated for shock after several bricks were thrown through her window, and there were fire bombings of stores and pubs owned by both whites and Asians. As Arun Kundnani (2003) recounts:

When the police responded to white racists going on a rampage through the Asian area of Glodwick in Oldham by donning riot gear, arresting Asians and attempting to disperse the increasingly angered crowds of local residents, it lost any claim to be defending ‘the rule of law’. Rather, it was an invading army. And Asian youths responded to it as such, using stones, burning cars and petrol bombs to drive the police, dogs and vans and all, off their streets.
(Kundnani 109)

Twenty-two defendants of Asian descent on trial for affray during riot were sentenced to an average of three and a half years whereas out of 12 white defendants, 10 received nine months and the other two were underage and received minimal sentences for the same

offense (Kundnani “Nine Months”). The inequities in sentences between the two ethnic groups highlight how institutionalized racism operates within the judicial system of the UK. White instigators of the riot might have been trying to stir up anti-foreigner sentiment to increase far right support of two candidates from the British National Party in the upcoming election. The BBC reviewed comments made by *Le Monde* in Paris stating that “racial tensions were stirred up by the far-right National Front” who were trying to capitalize by producing anti-immigrant sentiment and winning over new voters for their two candidates in the next legislative elections (“European Press”).

The BBC reported that the Cattle report, commissioned by the Home Office (responsible for internal affairs like law and order) to investigate the causes of the rioting, warned that people in the United Kingdom live different “parallel and polarized” lives where ethnic backgrounds do not mix (“Race Segregation”). The report also points to deep-rooted segregation and claims authorities had failed to address this societal issue. As I will discuss later, the ethnic groups had been segregated through housing policy privileging whites. Segregation is linked with cultural intolerance and misunderstanding. Young states that “These were not only the most sizeable disturbances in 20 years but indicated unrest not merely at the initial dispersal points but in communities which had settled for two or more generations” (Young 449). The Islamic Human Rights Commission states that Oldham is polarized between rich and poor and cites that the Trades Union Congress (TUC) had warned in April of 2001 that “institutional racism is responsible for unemployment rates among Blacks and Asians, which is twice as high as the rate for Whites” (qtd in Ahmed et al. 4). Young argues that poverty explanations are insufficient because the UK had experienced worse poverty and unemployment without

rioting (Young 454). It further noted another case of racial preference exemplified by Single Regeneration Budgets that allotted money to help revive the minority communities in Oldham; however, the money was in actuality allocated more to the benefit of the white community of Oldham (Ahmed 4).

With respect to the Oldham Riots, governmental structures helped shape the circumstances leading to racial tension and subsequent violence, such as unemployment and segregation. Kundnani outlines how the textile industry employed many of Britain's minorities, but after its collapse the inner cities became depressed (107). This situation of economic hardship led to housing restructuring in the surrounding residential areas.

Segregation practices were in effect supported by the state. As Kundnani explains:

Those who could not afford to buy themselves out took advantage of discriminatory council housing policies which allocated whites to new housing estates cut off from Asian areas. Out of Bradford's large stock of council housing, just 2 percent has been allocated to Asians. (Kundnani 107)

Furthermore, Kundnani notes that the Commission for Racial Equality investigated housing practices in Oldham in the early nineties and found the city guilty of implementing a segregationist housing policy (107). Segregated housing policies leads to segregated school districts, resulting in Asian ghetto schools 'in which expectations of failure were common: poor results could be explained away by cultural problems' (Kundnani 107). Governmental discriminating policies have led to the development of urban ghettos where minority groups have disproportionate opportunities for educational or career advancement. In addition, this situation is further conflated by soaring rates of unemployment among minorities, where for Asians in Oldham the rate is around 50 percent (Kundnani 106).

POLICY ANALYSIS

The party and parliamentary systems in Great Britain are structurally centralized and, as Lieberman argues, are not conducive to a strong influence of localized interests, where minorities are mostly concentrated. This has left minorities, as Lieberman states, “without the leverage in national politics and policymaking that would have allowed them to make the most of a race relations law that on paper offered very strong inclinations toward collective, race-conscious enforcement” (Lieberman 149). Because minorities tended to support the Labour party, their influence was diluted because the Labour party’s seats in government were relatively guaranteed (Lieberman 149). This caused the Labour party to advocate more protective policies for ethnic minorities to counter especially restrictive immigration policy. In 1976 Parliament passed the Race Relations Act aimed at decreasing discrimination and encouraging equal treatment in the spheres of employment education, and public accommodation (Lieberman 149). The structural nature of British politics is important because as Lieberman notes, the parliament frequently resulted in majority governments, where “the process of policymaking does not depend on the piecemeal assembly of legislative coalitions, nor does it, as a rule, allow either concerted minorities or fragments of the majority party to block government-sponsored legislation” (Lieberman 150). Furthermore the British judicial system does not usually grant claims based on constitutional rights and is therefore an insufficient system to facilitate antidiscrimination policy. (Lieberman 151)

The British government started to restrict immigration as soon as too many nonwhite immigrants looking for work exercised their right to citizenship in the U.K. The 1962 Commonwealth Act implemented a distinction between the citizenship rights of

native-born and those who received UK passports (Sriskandarajah et al. 2). As Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah and Francesca Hopwood Road (2005) indicates, “While the legislation was intended to halt ‘colored immigration,’ it had the opposite effect, especially in terms of South Asian migration,” and furthermore, “Many temporary labor migrants, as well as those who had already settled permanently, took advantage of family reunification provisions, thus increasing immigration from these countries in the short-term” (Sriskandarajah et al. 2). In 1971 legislators tried to encourage immigration from former colonies with predominantly white ethnicity, like Australia, Canada and New Zealand, to try to retain kinship ties with future immigrants. The British Nationality Act of 1981 attempted to limit incoming immigrants by prohibiting the right of residency to only British citizens. Foreigners received permanent settlement rights by marrying a UK national, attaining refugee status, or living and working in the UK for a specified period (Sriskandarajah et al. 4).

MULTICULTURALISM

Great Britain has historically operated with a relatively free and unregulated immigration system; however, as increasing numbers of colonial citizens immigrated to fill post World War II labor needs, migration has been gradually and purposively restricted. The colonial legacy of Great Britain has been the driving force for the cultural integration and tolerance of minorities in immigration and minority affairs. People in countries such as India or Jamaica have been taught that they are citizens of the Commonwealth from birth and already had citizenship rights. Due to the large inflows of nonwhite, nonnative, British subjects, Britain has attempted to integrate these minorities within the framework of multiculturalism. Koopmans and Statham state this is the

process of “increased cultural differentiation of nation-states that results from immigration leading to the development of a ‘multicultural’ citizenship, which gives special rights, recognition, and protection to minority groups and their cultures” (Koopmans et al. 654). This system is multicultural as it has many different minority groups who participate in the political system and because it tries to accommodate each minority culture through political participation rights and has even subsidized some minority organizations. Because many migrants had received citizenship through the past imperialism of the British Empire, they were already citizens and had political participation rights. To retract this citizenship would have most likely led to social unrest and revolutionary movements, so the dilemma of the British government entailed how to properly acculturate these groups with respect to their already existing ethnic identities. Roger Karapin (1999) introduces the political autonomy hypothesis arguing that Great Britain has followed the anticipatory policies of tight border control and liberal multiculturalism in attempts to avoid racial conflict (430). While they have not been successful at deterring all racial unrest, cultural diversity is encouraged and cultural toleration and understanding are emphasized in the spheres of race relations, unlike in France.

Technological advancements in communications reinforced by globalization allow for immigrants to maintain their traditional identities while living in a new country. Joppke further clarifies how multiculturalism develops when various immigrant identities develop within a receiving country saying:

Contemporary migrations occur within a developed nation-state system, in which there is a strong disinclination on the part of migrants to abandon entrenched national loyalties. Secondly, due to advanced transport and communication

technologies, migrations are no longer 'one-way trips.'
(Joppke 453)

This new type of migrant does not bear the same circumstances inhibiting communication between cultures, therefore multiculturalism is a good system to embrace because cultural diversity will perpetuate. Joppke notes that Great Britain avoided the assimilation model in favor of the multicultural because "assimilation carries the premise that the dominant white culture is superior and assumes that the problem lies in the ethnic groups [inability to assimilate]" (480). However, multiculturalism is also problematic because, although it encourages racial diversity, minority cultures are integrated in such a way as to structurally support racial discrimination. Young clarifies:

In a late modern world where people increasingly create their own sense of identity and culture, multiculturalism encourages exactly the opposite, to go to your roots and find your 'true' self. Such a fixed essence is then contrasted with 'Others' (Catholics against Protestants, Islam against non-Islam, White against Black) and allows prejudice to be based on notions of fixed differences. A multiculturalism that seeks tolerance paradoxically creates the conditions for prejudice and intolerance. (Young 459)

Although, multiculturalism is supposed to integrate minority groups, they are still excluded from the political domain and are discriminated against in their treatment by the police, employers, and in civil policy such as housing.

To pacify the situation resulting from the large immigration influx, the British government passed the Commonwealth Immigrant Act of 1962 making difficult to receive citizenship by categorizing which subjects qualify for citizenship and which must go through immigration (Safran 324). In congruence Britain has implemented a relatively closed policy toward border control attempting to quell immigration. Also within domestic politics there was already internal pressure by minority groups for equal

treatment. As Joppke indicates, Great Britain deals with the contradiction of discrimination in immigrant selection standards at the border while protecting those immigrant populations internally (479). This contradiction signifies the complex ways racism and discrimination manifest through societal institutions. Koopmans and Statham argue that after minority groups receive citizenship, they start demanding anti-discrimination rights (683). Accordingly, minority groups are still fighting for equal representation and the right to preserve their cultures in this society. Reitz argues that the institutional structure of immigration integration affects the way minorities operate within a host culture. As Reitz states the “cultural hypothesis predicts greater inter-racial competition in Great Britain across institutional sectors where racist culture expresses itself” (121). Reitz argues that the institutional structure of immigration in Britain affects the perception of immigrations as a nascent welfare problem because immigrants entered the already settled nation to fill a labor void (125).

Indigenous cultures might exclude minority cultures because they are perceived as a threat to the socioeconomic status quo. Integration of minorities involves changes to the dominant as well as minority cultures. Each group in society must compromise to find a peaceful means of interacting and coexisting. Jock Young (2003) explores the affects of integration and exclusion in society, arguing that the exclusion process operates both socially and spatially. Exclusion begins with the cultural ‘othering’ of the immigrant population, opposed to the cultural normality of the indigenous population (Young 455). Furthermore, Young argues that “It is the second generation immigrants who have become more assimilated to the values of the wider society who most acutely feel relative deprivation, the discontent of which frequently leads to higher crime rates” (Young 455).

This implies that second generation immigrants would be able to assimilate if integrated into all facets of society: social, political and economical. Young goes on to fervently assert that the prevalence of criminality in minority neighborhoods:

Is not a product of any racial essence but of subcultures which have adapted to the new country and which transmute rather than replicate the original culture of origin [...] Over and over again the determinants of class are confused with the propensities of 'race' or ethnicity. (Young 455)

GERMANY

In 1992 Germany experienced a rash of anti-immigrant violence. Far-right groups burned down the residences of two Turkish families in the towns of Mölln and Solingen and there were 17 deaths and 2,285 acts of racial violence in total for the year (“Dissidence”). While the violence is not considered rioting in the strictest sense, the racial implications are the same. Public property was not targeted and the violence did not occur in the street like fashion of a riot. These attacks were however executed with the malicious intent of harming foreigners. As Fetzer (2000) notes:

Asylum seekers probably fare much worse, however, often exchanging political persecution in their homeland for another form of terror in Germany. During the 1992 wave of hate crimes, skinheads and other hoodlums beat up or burned out hundreds of such *Asylbewerber* and Turkish immigrants, cause several deaths. (Fetzer 72)

The wave of violence occurred the year following the reunification of Germany, where the East suffered considerably more economic hardship than the West. While anti-immigrant violence and neo-Nazi movements are more prolific in the East, racial assaults occur all over unified Germany.

Familiar arguments circulate in the political science arenas fingering economic competition and segregated cultural practices as the culprits behind racial violence. Hollifield claims that “the development of immigrant enclaves in large cities has contributed to the political salience of the immigration problem and has led to deterioration in ethnic relations,” and this has led to culturally, linguistically and sometimes ethnically isolated communities (Hollifield 120). While segregation certainly impedes cultural integration, the factors leading to violence lie deeper. Immigrants are commonly perceived as a drain on the system, soaking up government funded welfare

benefits and contributing little in return; however, Hollifield points out that contrary evidence exists showing that immigrants contribute more in taxes than they receive because of their higher employment rates (120). Alternatively Koopmans and Olzak (2002) suggest that the “legacy of pre-world war II fascism provides a ready explanation for contemporary surges in radical right violence in Germany” (Koopmans & Olzak 2-3). While I agree that this legacy continues to disturb peaceful integration, the suggestion that the connection between the Nazis rise to power and anti-immigrant sentiment of the early 1990s can be linked to economic hardship is inadequate explanation of racial violence (Koopmans and Olzak 2-3). This strain theory concept recognizes the historical components that lie at the foundation of race relation policy. However, the element of socioeconomic deprivation theory evident in their argument does not account for the prevalence of racial violence in cities across Germany.

POLICY ANALYSIS

Immigration in Germany was infrequent and unregulated until the demand for labor post World War I led policymakers to recruit Polish workers. As Fetzer notes, Germany enacted policies to exclude these foreigners from attaining citizenship: “In 1913 the German Reichstag passed a law making German nationality almost completely a function of having German ‘blood,’ thus excluding all ethnically Jewish or Polish immigrants” (Fetzer 65). During the Bonn republic Germany tried to weed out some of the anti-Semitic doctrine that has plagued its past. Governmental officials did this by abandoning the racial approach to defining citizenship. But unfortunately the hereditary and ascriptive definition of the nation survived strongly; for example, in the continuance

with *jus sanguinis* as well as continuing to prohibit dual citizenship (Safran 321). As Jeffery Checkel (1999) notes:

Dual citizenship would promote the assimilation of a large foreigner population. In most cases, present German law requires immigrants and foreigners to give up their original citizenship if they wish to seek it in Germany; this is an obstacle to integration since many do not wish to sever all ties to their homeland (Checkel 97).

Many foreigners living in Germany are recalcitrant to forfeit all citizenship rights in their countries of origin because homeland for infinite and varied reasons. This policy leads many immigrants to pass up the opportunity to receive full citizenship rights in Germany, which is most likely that the generous welfare of the state makes this policy tolerable because foreigners already receive benefits of membership without actual citizenship rights.

Following World War II there was a dire need for a cheap labor force to help with reconstruction and the rebuilding of the nation devastated by the war. Mostly in the 1960s, Germany started a labor recruitment program encouraging laborers from countries such as Italy, Greece, and especially Turkey to come there for a temporary period of time and then leave. These workers were called guest workers, or *Gastarbeiter*. Not according to the German plan, many of these workers ended up staying. This is probably due to the fact that foreigners, “even as noncitizens, because of the generous nature of the postwar state, enjoy many of the same social and welfare benefits as do citizens. (What they lack are full-fledged political rights)” (Checkel 105). German politicians have allotted social benefits to noncitizens because they are concerned with their international reputation for human rights especially after the Holocaust. Furthermore, due to Germany’s illiberal immigration policy, most of these workers and their children ended up staying and

starting new lives in Germany, but did not, until recently, have the possibility to attain citizenship although they have lived there for generations. In effect, these groups have been excluded from the system and there still exists a huge difference between the way nationals and foreigners live over thirty years later. Most foreigners continue to forge a strong connection with their homelands, and this may be due in part to the intolerant and unwelcoming policies of the German government. As Koopmans and Statham point out, immigrants who are treated as foreigners behave themselves as such (691), and particularly in the case of Germany these foreigners are accepted into the labor market and not much else.

While the German government tried to “de-organize” their immigration policies in the 1980s, they were met with a large opposition coming from a xenophobic attitude in the political sphere (Safran 322). In response to the racial violence of 1992, the government tightened restrictions on asylum law (Oezcan “Immigrant in Transition”). In 1993 an Inter-party agreement further restricted the options for asylum seekers by categorizing certain countries as “safe.” Any potential asylum seekers entering Germany from one of these countries would be denied asylum and returned to the country of origin. This also applies to safe countries that were the last place of transit even if the country of origin was not considered “safe”. As Karapin explains:

The passage of Article 16a of the German Basic Law in May 1993 went far beyond the asylum restrictions adopted in the 1980s. By undercutting access to a full-fledged judicial appeals process for most asylum seekers, it greatly reduced applications. (Karapin 435)

While legislators were trying to restrict access for incoming groups, the judicial system considerably hindered the effort by liberally interpreting and defending the rights of

foreigners in the courts (Joppke 1999, 69). This was accomplished because the rights of individuals supersede the power of the state, and granting basic civil rights is done regardless of nationality (Joppke 1999, 69). Germany's immigration policy differentiates between *Aussiedler*, German descendants living in other countries mostly in the Eastern bloc, and immigrants of other ethnicities. While both groups are in reality foreigners to German culture, *Aussiedler* are given assistance with language training, employment, and welfare (Oezcan "Immigrant in Transition"). The fact that one group of foreigners is treated preferentially over another on the basis of race is symbolic of Germany's concentration on bloodlines and heredity and is conducive to the doctrine of *jus sanguinis*. Legislators only changed immigration policy in 2000 to include the children of foreigners born in Germany. The children automatically receive citizenship as long as one parent has been a resident for at least eight years; however children can also decide to claim their parents' nationality but must choose between the two countries before 23 years of age (Oezcan "Immigrant in Transition").

POSTNATIONALISM

The German word associated with immigrant groups is *Ausländer*, which means foreigners. This categorization of immigrant groups as foreign is indicative of the German reluctance to accept different minorities as German citizens. Until recently minorities have had relatively little contact or influence on local governmental affairs and policy is in the hands of the dominant culture. As a result Germany has implemented a postnational model of citizenship where immigrants' civil rights are acknowledged but avenues to citizenship and therefore political participation rights have been traditionally

limited. Postnationalism, as applied by Germany, is characterized by both exclusionary integration methods and liberal humanitarianism. As Koopmans and Statham note:

The postwar period has seen the rise of new forms of 'postnational' citizenship that have rendered national citizenship increasingly unimportant and are based on the transnationalization of migrant communities and the growing role of supranational organizations and conventions that have strengthened the rights of migrants. (Koopmans et al. 654)

As stated earlier, citizenship is based upon *jus sanguinis*, or right of blood, where citizens must prove their German descent to become nationals. Generally, it is difficult to achieve full-fledged citizenship rights because immigration was officially suspended in 1973 and the only paths to citizenship are through asylum law, marriage to a national or family reunification. Furthermore, immigrants have not been allowed access to a political voice.

As Hollifield states:

The political activities of foreigners have been circumscribed by legislation that limits rights of association and restricts occupation and geographical mobility. Such regulation has contributed to the insecurity of foreigners by making their rights subject to administrative discretion rather than constitutional law. (Hollifield 119-120)

In this system the level of cultural tolerance is relatively low and disparities between *Ausländer*, foreigners, and citizens flourish. While Germany is exercising its sovereignty in enacting immigration policy, the civil and social implications of such illiberal policy is evident by tense race relations. In order to fix the problems brought on by policy in the past, Germany needs to liberalize its citizenship model to include minority groups and benefit the social system overall.

Although Germany's citizenship policy is exclusive and restrictive, Germany executes a liberal asylum policy that includes social welfare benefits to foreigners

regardless of citizenship. This generous welfare system may keep minorities content and deter rioting from their past. However, groups belonging to the majority have violently targeted foreigners, perceiving them as drains upon the Germany's welfare system. Integration is a relatively new domain for Germany because, large-scale immigration postdated the nation-building experience in Germany; therefore the state has maintained relative ethnic and cultural homogeneity. This has allowed policy to be shaped to benefit the dominant majority however policy did not change after large numbers of immigrants entered Germany. As Joppke notes, German naturalization policy has been shaped by two core principles: absolute state discretion and cultural assimilation (1999, 203). German officials have a large amount of discretion in deciding whom to include or exclude dependent upon the relative level of cultural assimilation. The path to citizenship is difficult and immigrants have had little incentive to mobilize for policy changes because they receive the benefits of traditional citizenship without actually becoming naturalized. As Evelyn Glenn (2000) notes "there is a status of being a denizen, in which one has the same rights as citizens in terms of protection from arbitrary treatment, but not the vote or the right to hold political office" (6). However in light of unequal employment practices lack of protection by the policy and violent targeting by right extremists, it seems that the former is not fully enforced by the German state. Furthermore, Joppke notes how Germany's "stubborn rejection of dual citizenship" is a last hurdle towards integration of second and third generation minorities (1999, 204).

As demonstrated in its immigration policy, Germany has a history of excluding foreign populations from dominant social and political affairs. This exclusionist practice stems from a history of defining citizenship based on cultural and blood ties. Safran

refers to this as an organic approach to defining citizenship, where *Volksgeist*, the ethnocultural commonality of the people, has created a system where sovereignty and national identity has been defined through traditional and lingual similarity (321). The state formation of Germany was due to external pressures such as in resistance to Napoleon rather than an internal unification desire. This is significant because the state later used ethnic characteristics to define citizenship in order to protect the state from invasion of a foreign culture (Safran 322). Such an attitude toward outsiders formed by that same fear during state unification founds Germany's frequent xenophobic attitude when dealing with minority groups. Moreover, Germany's past can be traced back to this organic approach in defining nationality and has left a scar on society, where on the one hand they are trying to reconcile a new more liberal, less racist and intolerant attitude with deep founded cultural fears of the possible negative influence of outsiders. On the other hand, deep-seated intolerance and a strong ethno-nationalist identity have impeded liberalization of Germany's immigration law. In fact, Fetzer found that in Germany, "the apparent nativistic influence of believing that immigrants threaten the dominant culture remains robust and very powerful" (128).

In light of the historical factors that shape immigration policy, the anti-immigrant violence of the early 90s is not surprising. Right wing extremists target minority groups because they view them as an outside threat to the historical essence of German culture. The reason that the violence did not evolve into rioting is because right wing groups have a greater influence in governmental policy and decision-making. Right wing groups are effectively backed by the system. In fact, the conservative government of Helmut Kohl deliberately tried to cover up racial violence to deter international scorn for these racist

expressions from the populace. However, it should also be noted that far-right groups are in the minority. It has been reported that out of the violent assaults based on race, many cases were omitted from the list (Zimmerman, “Nearly 100”). These groups are racist and put the blame on minority groups for their economic woes, as they were especially violent after reunification. Although some ethnic Germans may resent immigrant groups because of perceived economic threat, in actuality Germany needs migrant labor because of declining population rates and an ageing population. The apparent contradiction with excluding minorities on basis of ethnicity but still providing social benefits signifies the complexity of a postnational citizenship model, where nationalist ideals are very important especially in terms of ethnocultural commonalities. The German case exemplifies how historical factors shape tactics, which provide the foundation of race relations in modern society. While influenced by economic competition, the violence is a result of a history of xenophobic exclusionary practices and intolerance of outside races.

The German government has not traditionally recognized the immigration problem, as Helmut Kohl asserted, “Germany is not a country of immigration.” In 2003, the number of legally resident foreigners in Germany was 7.3 million, which comprised 8.9 percent of the total population (Oezcan “Immigrant in Transition”). Germany is in the center of Europe and serves as a locus for international trade, and this location catalyzes the processes of transnationalization and cultural diversification. However this attitude, reluctant to accept the inevitability of foreign influence on the dominant society, is constructed by Germany’s political and cultural historical evolution. Minority groups in Germany have not rioted and have only displayed minimal resistance to Germany’s illiberal immigration policy. It seems that social benefits alone have kept foreigners

relatively content, although not having participation rights gives them few outlets to expressive discontent. This may also be attributed to the judicial system's influence in interpreting Germany's asylum law (Karapin 433). Surprisingly Germany's courts have been more open to foreigners than even the United States, because American courts follow the plenary power doctrine.

CONCLUSION

In a world of permeable borders and expanding globalization, nations must determine the best way to accommodate growing populations of transnational citizens and immigrants in wealthy nation-states while avoiding cultural tension and violence. The processes of globalization have increased exposure of many different societies to large influxes of culturally diverse populations and have; therefore, highlighted the need for harmony between races. As cultures become more exposed to each other and dominant cultures integrate minority traditions, the probability of racial tension may increase when the system of incorporation is founded within a context of racial hierarchy and prejudice. Where in the past assimilation into a dominant culture has been relatively unavoidable, technology has broadened access to communication mechanisms that allow foreigners in new lands to maintain strong identity and cultural ties to their homelands. As Joppke states:

Contemporary migrations occur within nation-states where there is a strong disinclination of the part of minorities to abandon entrenched national loyalties. Secondly, due to advanced transport and communication technologies, migrations are no longer 'one-way trips.' (Joppke 453)

As a result, a new group of transnational citizens has been born. The existence of this new breed of migrant has drawn many of the complexities and inadequacies of the concepts surrounding immigration law and theory into the spotlight by clarifying its inequities and irrationalities.

I have examined the models of postliberalism in the United States, assimilation in France, multiculturalism in Great Britain, and postnationalism in to assess and explain factors that cause race rioting. I have used as examples the riots of 2001 in Britain, of

1992 in Los Angeles, California, of 2005 in France, and of 1992 in Germany in the hopes of explaining the historical preconditions of short-term causes.

How minorities express themselves and the conditions leading them to riot may be different in settler states than in organically formed nation-states. These cases indicate that minority groups are generally more active in settler states; this may be because the traditional powerful forces were themselves immigrants at one time and are accustomed to including foreign groups. The European states, each with an absolutist government background, seem more reluctant to include minority groups. France and Germany maintain strong, centralized governments with few avenues for participation from the masses, and as such minorities are less expected mobilize for political change. The case of Great Britain, however, questions such a principle, as the formation of civil rights coincided with the political mobilization of the underclass and preceded the influx of minority groups.

Although it is difficult to predict when racial violence will occur, symptoms of ethnic tension may be examined to understand the causes of racial violence. The few cases in this thesis make it seem that there are particular scenarios that are similar in all cases including: harassment and abuse by the police, segregated neighborhoods, economic competition, and nativism. These factors appear to be affected by racially prejudicial standards implemented through citizenship models and immigration policy. An expansive understanding of the precipitating causes of racial antagonism is necessary to understand the complexities in explaining racial violence. A follow up study to this research could analyze the citizenship models of cases where the above four factors were present, but no racial violence resulted. Other factors indirectly encouraging racial

differentiation in society also resonate in each of the cases examined. Family reunification laws need to be reexamined in terms of their effects on housing patterns and segregation. In each of the cases of racial violence, segregation of ethnic groups was present. Segregation likely impedes cultural tolerance practices by enhancing prejudice and misconceptions through scarce contact with another ethnic group. Additionally, the role of the judiciary in reviewing immigration policy may be significant. In Germany, the courts have upheld the civil rights of foreigners; whereas in the U.S., the judiciary has taken a backseat in immigration policy legislation yielding their power to the executive and legislative branches.

What resonates throughout the analysis is that the mechanisms of integration need to be reconsidered. Countries have formed the foundations of modern immigration policy in the aftermath of both WWII and the Cold War. The world is changing and the countries now have different stakes in future international relations. Global warming, AIDS, international environmental policy, stem cell research, U.S. spread of democracy, genetic modification, and terrorism are global economic controversies that highlight the need for international standards and negotiation in immigration law. The concept of integration supports cultural homogeneity, leads to cultural imperialism, breeds ethnocentrism and xenophobia, and founds an “us” v. “them” racial dichotomy, which leads to ethnic tension. Assimilation is not a goal worth pursuing, because it creates and maintains cultural stereotypes of ethnic superiority and/or inferiority. As many scholars acknowledge, peaceful integration of a minority culture should also entail change on the part of the majority culture during the acculturation process. The process of integration involves acquiring language, education, and economic mobility. The amount of

incorporation into civil society also determines racial harmony. Differences in housing, jobs, and arrest rates inflate the likelihood of violence. If the occurrence of each of these factors were equally likely to occur to any person regardless of ethnicity, it would more likely indicate that the system operates on equal footing for all groups.

While the nation-states analyzed in this thesis are widely held to be some of the most liberal and free societies in the world, each country's immigration policy has differential treatment for minority groups. When the racial basis for citizenship rights is eliminated, nations will be one step closer to achieving social equality. Equal opportunity and representation in political and economic affairs might result in more inclusive rights for immigrants. Whether this ideal will be achieved is largely dependent on the dominant culture's willingness to include these groups. Up until this point, minority groups still experience disadvantage and subordination to the dominate culture. Until this unequal footing is rectified, the states in question cannot be considered completely free or equality based.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abudu, Margaret J. G., Walter J. Raine, Stephen L. Burbeck, and Keith K. Davison. "Black Ghetto Violence: A Case Study Inquiry into the Spatial Pattern of Four Los Angeles Riot Event-Types." *Social Problems* 19(3) (Winter 1972): 408-426.
- Ahmed, Nafees Mosaddeq, Faisal Bodi, Raza Kazim, and Mossoud Shadjareh. "The Oldham Riots: Discrimination, Deprivation and Communal Tension in the United Kingdom." June 2001 Media Monitors Network. Islamic Human Rights Commission. Accessed 12 Jan 2006. <<http://www.mediamonitors.net/mosaddeq6.html>>.
- Allen, Sheila; and Marie Macey. "Race and Ethnicity in the European Context." *The British Journal of Sociology* 41 (3) Special Issue: Britain as a European Society? (Sep. 1990): 375-393.
- "An Underclass Rebellion." 14 Nov 2005. Economist.com. From *The Economist* print edition. Accessed 5 Dec 2005. <http://www.economist.com/world/europe/printerfriendly.cfm?/story_ID=5138990>.
- Bader, Veit. "The Cultural Conditions of Transnational Citizenship: On the Interpenetration of Political and Ethnic Cultures." (in Citizenship and Sovereignty) *Political Theory* 25(6) (Dec. 1997): 771-813.
- Bergesen, Albert, and Max Herman. "Dynamics of Race, Residence, and Residential Mobility: Immigration, Race, and Riot: The 1992 Los Angeles Uprising." *American Sociological Review* 63(1) (Feb. 1998): 39-54.
- Carrell, Paul. "Shots Fired as French Riots Escalate." 3 Nov 2005 Reuters: UK. Accessed 5 Dec 2005. <<http://today.reuters.co.uk/news/newsChannel.aspx?type=worldNews>>
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. "Norms, Institutions, and National Identity in Contemporary Europe." *International Studies Quarterly* 43(1) (Mar. 1999): 83-114.
- "Developments in the Law: Immigration Policy and the Rights of Aliens." *Harvard Law Review* 96(6) (April 1983): 1334-1370.
- "Dissidence and Terrorist Activity in Germany." Aug 1995 Allrefer.com Country Study and Guide: Germany. Accessed 5 Dec 2006. <<http://reference.allrefer.com/country-guide-study/germany/germany171.html>>.
- Evans, C. "European Citizenship: A Novel Concept in EEC Law." *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 32(4) (Autumn 1984): 679-715.

- “European Press Review.” 28 May 2001 BBC News Accessed 12 Jan 2006.
<<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/1355268.stm>>.
- Fetzer, Joel. Public Attitudes toward Immigration in the United States, France, and Germany. New York: Cambridge University Press, (2000).
- Glenn, Evelyn. “Citizenship and Inequality: Historical and Global Perspectives.” (in Presidential Address) *Social Problems* 47 (1) (Feb. 2000): 1-20.
- Goldman, Ralph M. “The Politics of Political Integration.” *The Journal of Negro Education* 33(1) (Winter 1964): 26-34.
- Hamilton, Kimberly. Nov 2004. “Challenge of French Diversity.” Migration Information Source. Accessed 11 Nov 2005
<<http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?id=266>>.
- Hein, Jeremy. “Rights, Resources, and Membership: Civil Rights Models in France and the United States.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530, Interminority Affairs in the U. S.: Pluralism at the Crossroads. (Nov. 1993): 97-108.
- Henderson, Donald. “Minority Response and the Conflict Model.” *Phylon* 25 (1) (1st Qtr., 1964):18-26.
- Holman, Barry. “Masking the Divide: How Official Reported Prison Statistics Distort the Racial and Ethnic Realities of Prison Growth.” May 2001. National Center on Institutions and Alternatives: Research and Policy Report.
<<http://66.165.94.98/stories/maskdiv0501.pdf>>.
- Hollifield, James P. “Immigration Policy in France and Germany: Outputs versus Outcomes.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 485 From Foreign Workers to Settlers? Transnational Migration and the Emergence of New Minorities (May 1996): 113-128.
- Hoagland, Jim. “French Lessons.” 9 Nov 2005. Washington Post. Accessed 19 Nov 2006
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/08/AR2005110801257.html>>.
- Hudson, J. Blaine. “Affirmative Action and American Racism in Historical Perspective” *The Journal of Negro History* 84(3) (Summer 1999): 260-274.
- Huntington, Samuel. Political Order in Changing Societies. New Haven: Yale University Press, (1968).

- Ireland, Doug. "Why is France Burning?" 6 Nov 2005 Znet Europe Accessed 5 Dec 2005 <http://www.zmag.org/content/print_article.cfm?item ID=9066§ionID=74>.
- Joppke, Christian. "Multiculturalism and Immigration: A Comparison of the United States, Germany, and Great Britain." *Theory and Society* 25(4) (Aug. 1996): 449-500.
- Joppke, Christian. Immigration and the Nation-state: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain. Oxford University Press: 1999.
- Karapin , Roger. "The Politics of Immigration Control in Britain and Germany: Subnational Politicians and Social Movements." *Comparative Politics* 31(4) (Jul. 1999): 423-444.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The White Man's Burden." 1899. Reading About The World Washington State University Website. Accessed 21 April 2006. <http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~wldciv/world_civ_reader/world_civ_reader_2/kipling.html>.
- Koopmans, Ruud and Statham, Paul. "Challenging the Liberal Nation-State? Postnationalism, Multiculturalism, and the Collective Claims Making of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities in Britain and Germany." *The American Journal of Sociology* 105(3) (Nov. 1999): 652-696.
- Kundnani, Arun. "From Oldham to Bradford: the Violence of the Violated." Institute of Race Relations *Race and Class* 43(2) (2001): pp. 105-131.
- - - "Nine months for white racist thugs who sparked the Oldham riots." 19 June 2003 Independent Race and Refugee News Network. <<http://www.irr.org.uk/2003/june/ak000009.html> >.
- Kunz, Joseph L. "The Future of the International Law for the Protection of Minorities." *The American Journal of International Law* 39(1) (Jan. 1945): 89-95.
- Kunz, Joseph L. "The Present Status of the International Law for the Protection of Minorities." *The American Journal of International Law* 48(2) (April, 1954): 282-287.
- Lazarus, Emma. "The New Colossus." 1883. Poet.org. Accessed 10 April 2006 Academy of American Poets <<http://www.poets.org/viewmedia.php/prmMID/16111>>.
- Lieberman, Robert C. "Weak State, Strong Policy: Paradoxes of Race Policy in the United States, Great Britain, and France." *Studies in American Political Development* 16 (Fall 2002): 138-161.

- Miller, Herbert Adolphus. "The Menace of Minorities." *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* 175 The Shadow of War (Sept. 1934): 60-64.
- Money, Jeannette. "No Vacancy: The Political Geography of Immigration Control in Advanced Industrial Countries." *International Organization*, 51(4) (Autumn 1997): 685-720.
- Morrison, Patt. "10 Years After, Victories and Lingering Sorrows." May 1, 2002 Los Angeles Fire Department Historical Archive. Accessed 12 Dec 2005. <http://www.lafire.com/famous_fires/920429_LA-Riots/LATimes-2002-0429-0501/2002-0501_latimes_10YearsAfter-Morrison.htm>.
- Motomura, Hiroshima. "Whose Alien Nation? Two Models of Constitutional Immigration Law." (in Law and Equality) Review of Peter Brimelow's Alien Nation: Common Sense about America's Immigration Disaster. *Michigan Law Review* 94(6) Survey of Books Relating to the Law (May 1996): 1927-1952.
- Oezcan, Veysel. "Germany: Immigrant in Transition." July 2004 Migration Information Source Social Science Centre Berlin. Accessed 19 Nov 2005. <<http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?id=235>>.
- Ogletree, Charles J. "America's Schizophrenic Immigration Policy: Race, Class, and Reason." *Boston College Law Review* 41(4) (July 2000): 755-770.
- Olzak, Susan and Suzanne Shanahan. "Deprivation and Race Riots: An Extension of Spilerman's Analysis." *Social Forces* 74(3) (Mar. 1996): 931-961.
- Olzak, Susan, Suzanne Shanahan, and Elizabeth H. McEneaney. "Poverty, Segregation, and Race Riots: 1960 to 1993." *American Sociological Review* 61(4) (Aug., 1996): 590-613.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. "Minority Practices and Principles of Toleration" *International Migration Review* 30 (1) (1996): 251-84.
- Poulter, Sebastian. "Muslim Headscarves in School: Contrasting Legal Approaches in England and France." *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 17(1) (Spring 1997): 43-74.
- "Race 'segregation' caused riots" 11 Dec 2001. BBC News Accessed 12 Jan 2006. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/1702799.stm>>.
- Reitz, Jeffrey G. "The Institutional Structure of Immigration as a Determinant of Inter-Racial Competition: A Comparison of Britain and Canada." *International Migration Review* 22(1) (Spring 1988): 117-146.

- Rosenbaum, Stephen "Educating Children of Immigrant Workers: Language Policies in France & the U.S.A." *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 29(3) (Summer 1981): 429-465.
- Roucek, Joseph S. "Minorities- A Basis of the Refugee Problem." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 203 (May 1939): 1-17.
- Roucek, Joseph S. "Procedure in Minorities Complaints." *The American Journal of International Law* 23(3) (Jul. 1929): 538-551.
- Safran, William. "Citizenship and Nationality in Democratic Systems: Approaches to Defining and Acquiring Membership in the Political Community." *International Political Science Review* 18(3) (1997): 33-35.
- Sanchez, George J. "Face the Nation: Race, Immigration, and the Rise of Nativism in Late Twentieth Century America." *International Migration Review* 31(4) Special Issue: Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans. (Winter 1997): 1009-1030.
- Schechtman, Joseph B. "Decline of the International Protection of Minority Rights." *The Western Political Quarterly* 4(1) (Mar. 1954): 1-11.
- Schmitter-Heisler, Barbara. "The Future of Immigrant Incorporation: Which Models? Which Concepts?" *International Migration Review* 26(2) Special Issue: The New Europe and International Migration (Summer 1992): 623-645.
- Schuck, Peter H. "Citizenship in Federal Systems" *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 48(2) (Spring 2000): 195-226.
- - - "The Transformation of Immigration Law." *Columbia Law Review* 84(1) (Jan. 1984): 1-90.
- Shaw, Jo. "The Interpretation of European Union Citizenship." *The Modern Law Review* 61(3) (May 1998): 293-317.
- Smith, Matt, Charles Feldman, and Anne McDermott. "Los Angeles riot still echoes a decade later." 29 Apr. 2002. [CNN.com](http://archives.cnn.com/2002/US/04/28/la.riot.anniversary/index.html) Accessed on 12 Mar 2006. <<http://archives.cnn.com/2002/US/04/28/la.riot.anniversary/index.html>>.
- Sonenshein, Raphael J. "Post-Incorporation Politics in Los Angeles." In Racial Politics in American Cities edited by Rufus P. Browning, Dale Rogers Marshall, and David H. Tabb, 2nd ed. New York: Longman Publishers (1997).
- Spilerman, Seymour. "The Causes of Racial Disturbances: An Analysis of Alternate Explanations." *American Sociological Review* 35(4) (Aug. 1970): 627-649.

- Sriskandarajah, Dhananjayan and Francesca Hopwood Road. "United Kingdom: Rising Numbers, Rising Anxieties." May 2005. Migration Information Source. Institute for Public Policy Research. Accessed 19 Nov 2005
<<http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=306>>.
- Stein, Mark. "Wake Up, Europe, You've a War on Your Hands." 6 Nov 2005. Suntimes.com Accessed 5 Dec 2005. <<http://www.suntimes.com/output/steyn/cst-edt-steyn06.html>>.
- Stepick, Alex III. "Introduction." In Miami Now! Immigration, Ethnicity, and Social Change. Edited by Guillermo J. Grenier and Alex Stepick III. Gainesville: University Press of Florida: 1992.
- Sulkowski, Joseph. "The Minorities Problem." *New Europe* IV(6) (July-August 1944): 10-29.
- Sulkowski, Joseph. "The Protection of National Minorities: Past Experiences as a Basis for Future Solution" *Bulletin of Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America* Vol. II (1943) Vol. III (1944).
- Tehrani, John. "Performing Whiteness: Naturalization Litigation and the Construction of Racial Identity in America" *The Yale Law Journal* 109(4) (Jan. 2000): 817-848.
- "The Week Paris Burned." 6 Nov 2005. Guardian Unlimited Accessed 5 Dec 2005. <<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/focus/story/0,6903,1635373,00.html>>.
- "Three Days of Hell in Los Angeles: A Series of Reports." 29 April 1992. Emergency Net News Service. Accessed 12 Dec 2005. <<http://www.emergency.com/la-riots.htm>>
- Van Dyke, Vernon. "The Cultural Rights of Peoples" *Universal Human Rights* 2(2) (Apr. - Jun. 1980): 1-21.
- Waters, Chris. "'Dark Strangers' in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963." *The Journal of British Studies* 36(2) Twentieth-Century British Studies (Apr. 1997): 207-238.
- "Where Europe Fails in its Treatment of Minorities in Comparison with America." 10 Nov 2005. Economist.com. From *The Economist* print edition. Accessed 5 Dec 2005. <http://www.economist.com/world/europe/printerfriendly.cfm?/story_ID=5135956>.

Young, Jock. "To These Wet and Windy Shores." *Punishment and Society* 5(4) (October 2003): 449-462.

Zimmermann, Elizabeth. "Germany: Nearly 100 people killed by right-wing violence over last decade." 30 Sep 2000 World Socialist Web Site Accessed 19 Nov 2005. <<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2000/sep2000/ger-s30.shtml>>.