

Disruptive Concepts in Modern British Society: Refugee Crisis, Immigration, Race, and Racism.

Abstract

Society as described by Benedict Anderson must be settled and organized by taking into account the fears and worries of minorities for, it is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. The institutionalization of the police and their indifference to atrocities inflicted on Blacks and other minorities had brought about that 'war' that should not have taken place if the law-makers or policymakers and politicians had earlier decided to get to the root of the problem. So, why immigration and racism are so problematic and pronounced in a period of globalization where Human Race in general, must be promoted everywhere? At the end of this article, we can state that the notions we are interested in are still disruptive. To the most reluctant with the policy of welcoming refugees they consider as invaders, western values are threatened in the cultural, political and even economic levels. Facts related to those concepts are constantly reported in those western countries. We read into policies on refugee crisis, immigration, race, and racism and then confront them with reality with the implementation and analysis of Stuart Hall's 'critical race theory' and John Solomos' conciliatory strategy to praise diversity merits. We also tackle the role of central and local authorities in handling these boiling issues. As we mentioned in this paper, policies are not always suitable for the resolution of political and social problems. Actually, authorities and natives will not let their guard down; which means that the threat is real and everywhere.

Keywords: Institutionalization, Racial Contract, immigration, National identity, Refugee Crisis.

INTRODUCTION

We have not already come to the end of these complex and somehow paradoxical words that modern society has decreed us. We are far from that historical relief. This is to put ahead Etienne Balibar's opinion, who, in 1993, undertook to understand the very definition of race, nation and class that he systematically called ambiguous identities. Our opinion like his own, is based upon the fact that "modern racism emerges in societies considered egalitarian, a condition not of

thenation per se but of the ‘modern’ nationalist nation-state”¹. And Alana Lentin would bring back a slogan from the first hour of anti-racist movement ‘Racism, it’s all the same shit!’² in order to capture the disruptive and actual nature of this notion that will not be older. Actually, race and racism are paradoxical because sometimes they have no meaning at all but circumstances and interestsoften urge to define them separately and thus give them impetus. This ambivalence means that words and concepts are instable. But what might happen if we put it ‘Human race’ instead of alluding to the color of skin and other moral, economic, political, and epistemological considerations that would confirm what Charles Mills depicts in the *Racial Contract* (1997)? He skillfully points out those “ugly realities of group power and domination”³. Indeed, to him, this contract is for white people. In these conditions, it would be easier to create a link between the three words (immigration, race, and racism) given that it is generally admitted that immigration have racial correlations among which we can find racism. Both words, race and racism, have political derivatives and are facing endless redefinitions which do not allow to capture their elusive nature.

In Britain like everywhere in Europe, there are difficulties in the way of approaching these constructions. As a matter of fact, in his attempt to analyze immigration and citizenship, Adrian Favell, a sociologist, informs us that “Immigration merges as a political issue according to a ‘cycle’ of immigration politics. It is picked up as an issue and blown centre stage”⁴. From this statement, we are now definitely introduced in the wake of politics even though we cannot put aside economics. According to current immigration policies, race and racism are dictating restrictions and are consequently dragging nations into deep isolation; that is why they are disruptive. The fact that these concepts are regularly in the front line of political and social debates makes them disruptive. Thus, decisions are not made with serenity and are conditioned in their practical application. When rules and policies do not face opposition or when they are not occasioned by some kind of institutionally-based constraint, they cannot be productive and reach great expectations. Indeed, minorities or ethnic groups’ organizations are atypical institutions

¹ Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, “Race, Nation, Class. Ambiguous Identities” in *Culture, Globalization and the World System*, The British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 44, No. 3 (Sep., 1993), pp. 550-551 Published by: Wiley on behalf of The London School of Economics and Political Science Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org>.

² Alana Lentin, *Race and Anti-racism in Europe*, London, Ann Arbor, Pluto Press, 2004, p. 5.

³ Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1997, p. 3.

⁴ Adrian Favell, *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration, and the idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*, Palgrave McMillan, Great Britain, 1998, p. 22.

located in a set of 'normal' institutions. Disruption is needed to balance power and impact in multicultural societies like Britain.

The British society does not avoid that trap common to modern societies. In terms of immigration, Great Britain is one of the rare countries which have set rules (e.g the Race Relations Act in 1968) early at the end of Second World War. The aim was obviously to control the immigration of people from former British colonies and thus set barriers between Britain and its colonies. Actually, in this article, we will be first trying to know in what case immigration is or might be a threat to British national identity. And then, we will manage to answer these couple of questions: is immigration a motive for racism and refugee crisis a source of resentment? Why immigration and racism are so problematic and pronounced in a period of globalization where Human Race in general, must be promoted everywhere?

I- IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

When John Solomos talked about "the dynamics of the incorporation of race into the local political agenda"⁵, he actually was conscious about the polemic that immigration was raising in the heart of Britain. National identity, the topic of our memoire a few years ago, is still accurate. Race is not always a problem; it might be a solution to social developments if we consider its political force. Politically, Race is located in a substantial perspective. It allows us to widely address the question of immigration and lull the debate about national identity. Solomos' strategy is a proximity policy aiming to avoid the escalation of prejudice related to race. Local political agenda seems to be the last recourse to cut evil by its roots. High or central authorities cannot deal with race tactfully as the local authorities would do.

The risk of failure would be huge because of the leadership pretentions and the lack of information about the very issue. In the beginning, when Britain decided to open its doors to migrants in early 50's, authorities did not tell the truth to candidates to immigration. The only preoccupation of Britain was to fill the lack of labour caused by World War II. Hospitality regarding newcomers was limited in delivering a certificate of work among other rare symbolic acts. Indeed,

⁵ John Solomos, *Race and Racism*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2003, p. 95

“They were told that the empire was benevolent, born out of a respect for Africans, and a desire to help them, and they believed it. There was nothing to prepare them for the sense of betrayal they felt when they confronted with the fact that they were being mocked by the same people who, they had been told, were part of their own imperial family, and at being treated so blatantly inferior by the institutions they admired”.⁶

In Great Britain, as evidence, Solomos informs us that “from the early 1980s to the early 1990s, considerable public and media attention was focused on local authorities that had introduced radical policy changes in respect of racial inequality”.⁷ This is to show the complex formation and content of race when it comes to involve political policies. Major decisions can be centralized as projects but their implementation is a matter of locally concerted achievement. Indeed, in Britain, local authorities have more often than not good arguments to tackle immigration and better, to face its flow.

In their numerous strategies, local authorities have managed to build solid links between themselves and immigrants in the name of ‘human race’ instead of ‘race’ as a construction based on prejudices and stereotypes. This is to reinforce the idea that “the discursive conception of race – as the central term organizing the great classificatory systems of difference in modern human history – recognizes that all attempts to ground the concept scientifically, all efforts to fix the idea of race foundationally on biological, physiological, or genetic grounds, have been shown to be untenable”.⁸ Biological, physiological and genetic grounds of race are put ahead in a context of differentiation that is not to value some racial groups more than others. This strategy aims firstly, to stability by making everyone conscious about his/her backgrounds, assets, and also weaknesses. However, in a framework of racism in its institutional form, we can take them just like awkward ways to accentuate difference and make some people more vulnerable and valuable than others.

If we decide to join Anthony Appiah, a philosopher, in “The Uncompleted Argument: Du Bois and the Illusion of Race” (1985), in his surprising decision to conclude that races do not exist, we must reinforce race which does exist by adding ‘human’ in order to operate perfection in behaviors and thinking. This disposition is the best one can favor in a discursive environment

⁶ Afua Hirsh, *Brit(ish): On Race, Identity and Belonging*, London, Vintage, 2018, p. 67.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 97.

⁸ Stuart Hall, *The Fateful Triangle, Race, Ethnicity, Nation*, Edited by Henry Louis Gates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England, Harvard University Press, 2017, pp. 33-34.

of definition and redefinition. Actually, concepts are concepts only when cosmogony allows it and when societies that constitute the universe validate them. On the other hand, Stuart Hall cannot help asking “what is all this talk about whether or not race really exist when we only have to use the evidence of our own eyes to see the inscription of racial difference in the skin color, hair, and bones (...)”⁹? The incessant return of this question can be exasperating when we know that we do not have all answers to all questions.

Public and media attention have helped redefine immigration and thus, have delivered race from a small part of negativity and complexity. Actually, it has become a more or less accessible word in the long process of getting rid of the hostility of the first approach and understanding; a concept that anyone might accept and even adopt according to one’s aspirations and insights and the concern about world’s welfare and the good care of human interactions beginning from the direct environment. And Stuart Hall who has migrant identity, has enormously contributed to this big pace forward. Indeed, “he was the first academic to identify the systematic construction and structural configuration of racist discourse in Britain’s media (mis)representations as well as to highlight the reproduction of racism as common sense.”¹⁰ Despite these visible efforts, what Robert Miles and Malcolm Browns call ‘white fragility’ is still active and devastating. Actually, “it is an idea that registers the heart feelings, shattered egos, fraught spirits, vexed bodies, and taxed emotions of white folk”.¹¹ For instance, when it comes to language, that fragility has constrained Germany and Austria (they call themselves monolingual countries) to introduce respectively ‘Integrationskurse’(Integration Course), ‘Orientierungskurs’ (Orientation Course) – Germany- and ‘Wertekurs’ (Values Course) –Austria-. “Both courses aim at conveying societal rules and the imagined values of the dominant society”¹². Immigrants and refugees, longing for freedom and welfare, are stepping away from dignity in these conditions. Compelling someone to embrace somebody else’s values what is more, are imagined, is cruel and is fundamentally a disguised racism. What looks important in that approach is that there is an idea of transformation hidden behind what they called ‘citizen education’. But, how to education an

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 45.

¹⁰ Stuart Hall, *Selected Writings on Race and Difference*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, Paul Gilroy and Ruth Wilson Gilmore, 2021, p. 4.

¹¹ Robert Miles & Malcolm Brown, *Racism*, London & New York, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, Second Edition 2003, p. 12.

¹² Alisha M. B. Heinemann (2017), ‘The Making of ‘good citizens’ : German courses for migrants and refugees, *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 49 :2, 177-195, DOI :10. 1080/02660830.2018.1453115, p. 178.

adult? And more disturbing a process, they intend to transform simple refugees and immigrants into 'democratic subjects' as though democracy were their property and their democracy were the best model on earth.

'White fragility' contrast with diversity which implies tolerance. Consequently, it a big issue in western countries specially when it comes to integration and affiliation. Indeed, race, in its cultural signifier, is at stake when and where diversity is discussed. This dynamic makes everybody comfortable because in these conditions, everybody's culture is valuable and intercultural relationships take place. So, "diversity endorses race as enriching and positive, mainly because the presence of (racialised) others also contributes to signaling the institution as open-minded, welcoming and attractive"¹³.

To erase or to reduce the paradox of race and racism, it is imperative that each community that constitutes the population of the city or area could integrate the narrow sphere of national identity that must no longer be summed up to 'Britishness'. On the contrary, it must undertake an evolution so as to abide by or to go with what is called globalization in its first definition. This strategy is not far from what Charles Mills calls 'the moral contract'. In an attempt to reorganize the Racial Contract and give it a spark, Mills asserts that "the moral contract [...] is the foundation of the moral code established for the society by which the citizens are supposed to regulate their behaviour"¹⁴. As a matter of fact, each immigrant must be conscious about the problem of cultural difference that used to be Favell's subject of reflection.

That is indeed a problem, 'a damaging' one but at least it draws attention to national identity and puts forward the postmodernist belief that we must create ourselves. People from immigration background must create themselves rather than let others sap their identity and even reduce it to nothing. However, the issue is that "in Britain we are taught not to see race. We are told that race does not matter"¹⁵. This kind of usurpation or confiscation should not be found anywhere if we consider that "the migration is voluntary and economic in nature, and widely perceived as beneficial to the nation"¹⁶. Here is one specific reason for the host country to lighten regulations or

¹³Hari Prasad Adhikari-Sacr  and Kris Rutten, 'When Students Rally for Anti-Racism. Engaging with Racial Literacy in Higher Education', *Philosophies* 2021, 6, 48. [https:// doi.org/10.3390/philosophies6020048](https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies6020048), p. 3.

¹⁴ Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract*, op. cit., p.10.

¹⁵ Afua Hirsh, *Brit(ish): On Race, Identity and Belonging*, op. cit., p. 16.

¹⁶Adrian Favell, *Philosophies of Integration*, op. cit. p. 23.

immigration policies. Rethinking those policies and then applying them fairly to immigrants might be profitable to all people that claim Britain being their land and might also “(...) ease Britain’s path towards integration”¹⁷. Actually, there are hardships in the process of integration and thus the assertiveness of British minorities from immigration. That is the reason why David Edgerton, in an article published online in the Guardian, asserts that “all our national history needs rethinking”¹⁸.

What we can call self-assertion in Britain has been a long process given that it starts in the early 1980s with the rise of cultural studies. There are achievements and even big achievements but changes have not been entirely profitable yet because of political reluctance and social barriers. Knowing that “a man’s culture, the idiom within which he was trained and with which he is effectively employable, is his most precious possession, his real entrance-card to full citizenship and human dignity, to social participation”¹⁹. As a matter of fact, successive political regimes in Britain have developed various policies as far as immigrants are concerned. They have indeed promoted participation and inclusion in the way they thought that was the best. The Labour Party has worked the more on that issue. Consequently, the Equality Act has brought many changes aiming to make immigrants feel at home and thus enjoy acceptable equality. Besides, this was previously one of the major recommendations of the Scarman Report on the disturbances in 1981. Actually, it recommended a leap from civil and political rights to full social and welfare rights.

Those riots were centered on police treatment of a case of shooting. The police was accused of getting more and more institutionalized by turning a blind eye to ill-treatments and to crimes on minorities. Then, like any other mass upheaval, these protests brought out several movements of claim in different cities in England. Actually, cities like Brixton, Leeds, Liverpool, are famously known as the core places where minorities’ minds are vivacious when their primary rights are threatened mostly by decision makers. In their understanding, when the police and those involved in government cannot act fairly and set policies that are inclusive, and that they are not expecting improvement at any level, it was imperative that they took things in

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 94.

¹⁸ David Edgerton, “Britain’s persistent racism cannot simply be explained by its imperial history” / [theguardian.com/](https://www.theguardian.com/) visited in August 8th, 2020.

¹⁹ Ernest Gellner, *Culture, Identity, and Politics*, London, first published by Atheneum Press Lt , 1987, p. 16.

hand and struggle for equal treatment. At any rate, the sense of community and a huge dimension of responsibility have conducted the actions of these rioters. According to them, pride must prevail on prejudice and definitely bring people belonging to the same country together, despite difference.

Society as imagined by Benedict Anderson must be settled and organized by taking into account the fears and worries of minorities for, “it is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion”²⁰. This is the image of the most civilized, the most willful people organized in community imagined in the wake of globalization. Here, difference is recommended and is a motive of communion regardless of race, (we mean color of skin), religion, in a word, culture. It is seemingly immigration that creates this kind of state or community where gathering does not matter a lot but where communion in minds is intense. To this end, Anderson added that “communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined”²¹.

In this type of society, modern society in general, “we can see mirrored there wider process of cultural diversity and differentiation, related to the multiplication of social worlds and social ‘logics’ typical of modern life in the West”²². Actually, the promotion of cultural diversity and differentiation is related to the new and broader understanding of what is called freedom. This notion is debated in societies that are called free societies and is one of the most complex components of modernity. Complexity resides in the fact that one can lose or discredit freedom in the minute one gain it; it is instable and even ephemeral in some circumstances. This is the reason why social worlds (including civil-society) cannot be satisfied with their claims. Their association or link to politics is one of the strangest unions in socio-political environment. Besides, Stuart Hall intrinsically and powerfully asserts that “‘civil-society’ is no ideal realm of pure freedom. Its micro-worlds include the multiplication of points of power and conflict – and then

²⁰Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Revised edition, Verso, 2006, p. 6.

²¹*Ibid*, p. 6.

²²Stuart Hall, *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, Edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, London and New York, Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005, p. 233.

exploitation, oppression and marginalization”²³. Politics and civil society are two structures that cooperate sometimes but collide most of the time.

National identity has never been a small issue and cannot be so. In a broader interpretation it is completed by nationalism. Actually, national identity does exist before nationalism. This transcendence is not noticeable when nationalism is applied to nations. Actually, as Ernest Gellner, a British anthropologist, sociologist and philosopher put it “nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness, it invents nations where they do not exist”²⁴. By inventing nations, nationalism participates in the self-assertion of national identity that includes belonging and togetherness. The objective of such an invention or re-invention is the most optimistic one might imagine. Actually, there was a need to get nations rid of fatality and to make them adopt continuity. This last approach consolidates what Anderson thinks about a nation: “it is imagined as a community because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship”²⁵.

Nationalism is a new identity based on new trends of thoughts oriented on humanity even though it has its fatal and destructive meanings and effects in some places and contexts. It is the role of nationalism to fix imperfections caused by ancient regime or set of nations commonly known as nation-states. These nations were characterized by vertical organization that did not allow diversity in their way of functioning.

But what if immigrants decide to shape their own identity in the country they have chosen to live in so as to form one single identity in the name of prosperity and cohesion? For the reason, “identities are existential projects [...]not found objects”.²⁶ Indeed, in this sort of context, paradox related to race and racism caused by immigration and refugee crisis must be definitely banned. Certainly, the natives will oppose their illegal veto on this legal will of worthy people as it were, forgetting that “nations are made by human will:” a nation is therefore a great solidarity, (...) it

²³ *Ibid*, p.233.

²⁴ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, op. cit., p. 6.

²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 7.

²⁶ George Yancy, *Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, inc, 2008. P. 8.

is summed up by the consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue the common life. The existence of a nation is a plebiscite of everyday”²⁷.

We must bear in mind that immigrants are mostly good players in any field in the world given that the consciousness of them being or being said strangers, make them stronger and willing to prove the contrary. And the best way to overcome the detractor’s expectations is to act efficiently against all oppositions. Beside the evidence that, in Britain, “people are worried about too many changes to their traditional way of life”²⁸ there is the fear of political and social stability that might break their patience and alter their quietude and then drag them to the unsolvable issue of race and racism in a context of immigration.

Culture must prevail or succeed where society has failed to match different fringes of its components in order to form a whole. In a country where disparities are hardly hidden and where policies and rules are easily voted because of a socially individualistic society and politically freed minds and initiatives, issues like **refugee crisis**, immigration, race, and racism cannot go further than the first level of the problem: **we have strangers among us. Such a conception of democracy, harmony, and national identity which is equivalent to Englishness instead of Britishness is spread by Margaret Thatcher when she powerfully stated that**

“That is an awful lot, and I think it means that people are really rather afraid that their country be swamped by people of a different culture. The British character has done so much for democracy, for law, and done so much throughout the world that if there is any fear that it might be swamped, then people are going to be rather hostile to those coming in”.²⁹

II- REFUGEE CRISIS, IMMIGRATION, RACE, AND RACISM

In a first approach, as we mentioned in the introduction, we cannot deal with race and racism, immigration and refugees crisis separately. In any literature, in any social and cultural study, in any humanitarian enterprise, the purpose will almost be the same: immigration has created

²⁷ Ernest Gellner, *Culture, Identity, and Politics*, op. cit., p. 8/ “une nation est donc une grande solidarité, (...) elle se résume par le consentement, le désir clairement exprimé de continuer la vie commune. L’existence d’une nation est un plebiscite de tous les jours ».

²⁸ John Redwood, *The Death of Britain: the UK’s Constitutional Crisis*, Great Britain, MacMillan Press LTD, 1999, p. 3.

²⁹ Laura Smith et al, “How Britain failed to deal with systemic racism?”, CNN/Updated at 07:15 GMT, June 22, 2020, and visited in August 02nd, 2020, p. 177.

racism and a blatant misinterpretation of race has occasioned racism, and this latter has been made pronounced by refugee crisis in modern days. The movement from one land to another (that is immigration or migration in 'peaceful' times) scarcely maintains people indifferent. There are always consequences that are not often scheduled or predicted by decision makers. And in Britain, one of those consequences is the implementation of policies like positive actions for minorities and contract compliance initiatives.

By adopting this almost conciliatory position, Britain tried to perpetuate her traditional role in the European continent which is to balance power, as asserted by Redwood. It is historically known that British people are not too responsive to provocation even when their country is threatened directly or indirectly. This is absurd and unworthy in a land like Britain where historical wars and struggles and events are constantly updated and idolized. After all, isn't it true that Britain almost ruled the world if we take into account its numerous and tremendous colonies or territories, she had all around the world? Isn't it the empire where the sun never set?

In one of his numerous interventions on immigration and policies, Adrian Favell, in accordance with the Commission for Racial Equality, reminded us of the urgency of the issue. He is convinced that "where racial discrimination has coincided with urban social deprivation and a declining economy, its powers weaken"³⁰. Racial discrimination is not located in medieval cultures; it is a construction of modern societies that are politically weak and socially tested. Regarding the upsurge of immigration, Britain did not escape from that but coped with it by putting ahead deep national interest and not adventurous decisions. Discrimination is mostly experienced by those who are already in the land of immigration and are not accepted by native or the first inhabitants. Social deprivation occurs when economical incomes do not follow the settlement and when social needs are neglected. Life in suburbs, in slums, in provisional shelters, etc is justly conditioned by pauperization. This situation of helplessness has pushed public authorities to introduce limitation on immigration known as border control.

Racial equilibrium is necessary in areas where racism is pronounced. Victims of racism are the first seekers of equilibrium because they need to evacuate the shock of being rejected and

³⁰Adrian Favell, *Philosophies of integration*, op. cit., p. 110.

undermined. Intolerance and reluctance from majority are core points of racism that keep racism from progressing to full citizenship that, according to the Commission on Citizenship, is a cultural achievement, a gift of history which can be lost or destroyed. But let us notice that in Britain, until recently, minorities were far from embodying this definition. Not only they were not authorized to achieve anything but they were also oppressed in different ways.

The only gift from history they received was their humanity and dignity they tried to preserve and that others bungled and continue to bungle. From the point of view that “citizenship is a virtue of a certain cultural heritage and way of life, which may happen to conform with formal expressions of international human rights and so forth, but is not underpinned by them”³¹ there should not be racist flights related to citizenship. Actually, a way of life said to be a virtue is more than laudable. But what to do if one ‘supreme’ community decides to turn it into a flaw? A heritage as a virtue is not to be destroyed but something that is meant to be profitable to everyone that wishes to hold one part of it. International rights derive from this humanly established concept.

The defense of all human beings in their diversity is the purpose of international rights also called human rights. These rights are almost universal given that almost all nations agree to them even though they are not always respected because of complex political and social contexts. This lack of consideration does not honor this powerful argument from Jill Marshall, a British author: “In a democracy, rights to freedoms are often enshrined in human rights law, to enable people to make choices and have their choices respected without being dictated by the state or others, indicating in many ways the fundamental quality of the value of the choices being that individual’s”³². Sometimes, and unfortunately, laws or legislations outweigh rights and thus reduce individual’s initiatives to endless beginnings. Injustice is preferred to integrity and choices cowardly replaced by coercion. This situation makes activists against racism and victims of racism particularly skeptical and not inclined to discussions; hence the difficulty to establish inter-racial equilibrium.

One may copy everything that is good providing that it is useful to a large set of people from different cultures. In the end, we will reach a new level of fairness and goodness, characteristics of a good citizen. Indeed, “the good citizen is the one who, by his or her own volition,

³¹ *Ibid*, p. 124.

³² Jill Marshall, *Personal Freedom through Human Rights Law? Autonomy, Identity, and Integrity Under the European Convention on Human Rights*, Leiden-Boston, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2009, p. 21.

gets involved in local and voluntary organizations for the benefit of the wider public”³³. So, what is racism doing in this kind of environment? Aren’t all nations urging their people to commitment and participation in the life of their country? In most of the cases of racist discrimination, the fear of the strangers, the ignorance of their way of life, the uncertainties in the political field, are put ahead.

To the majority of natives, immigration is a source of more problems like disturbance in the economic respect because it confiscates the jobs ‘reserved’ for them. The lack of trust in one another can be dangerous for a country and especially for that of immigration like Britain. In Britain, decision makers have so a negative interpretation of race and immigration that “citizenship is not linked to nationality”³⁴. This strategy is an indirect way of reminding immigrants of their background and that they might be sent back home at the slightest behavioral error.

Another explanation might be the fact that, “western states, in the aftermath of the Holocaust and colonialism treated racism as an external force, coming to divert the course of democracy”³⁵. What a misinterpretation! How can it come from the outside given that it is mostly perpetrated by natives that feared invasion? They thought that after a period of expansion, it would disappear from their lands, cultures and behaviors. That huge mistake has led them to the hardships in tackling the issue in the right way. Indeed, immigration, refugees crisis, race and racism cannot go to the direction of stabilizing human relationships because each notion reveals a truth that is no one is ready to deal with.

In another field of reflection, we must bear in mind that tradition and modernism can be directly or indirectly sources of conflict bringing about racism. Actually, as Redwood asserted in his analysis, “there is in every culture a battle raging between modernisers and traditionalists”³⁶. In British culture like in any other culture, tradition is almost sacred, be it in good memory or not. The multiple social and religious reforms have been achieved under the supervision of traditionalists even though some modernizers have forced the change.

³³ Adrian Favel, *Philosophies of integration*, op. cit., p. 125.

³⁴ Odile Join-Lambert et al, « L’immigration en Grande-Bretagne : état des lieux et évolutions récentes » in *Santé, Société et Solidarité*, 2005, pp. 193-201, number 1. Persee.fr/doc/oss n 1. Visited in August 2nd, 2020/ “la citoyenneté n’est pas liée à la nationalité”.

³⁵ Alana Lentin, *Race and Anti-racism in Europe*, London, Ann Arbor, Pluto Press, 2004, p.19.

³⁶ Adrian Favel, *Philosophies of integration*, op. cit., p. 10.

The pressure was not like that of rioters who chose to fire streets and administrative institutions. On the contrary, the modernizers opted for softening strategies accompanied by 'new energies and ideas'. They are more responsible than rioters because they did not neglect one of the imperatives of any change. Indeed, Redwood is convinced that "changes should enable people to see more clearly the principal issues, to see who is making the decisions and whether those decisions are well made or not"³⁷. In order to implement positive discrimination and new legislations about immigration, and without disturbing the existing order of things, decision-makers and rulers must be cautious for, once again, migrants and refugees have rights, and "rights are ascribed to people because they are the beings who exhibit certain capacities that are worthy of respect."³⁸ One cannot reject everything from these people. There is forcibly something in them and from them that is laudable and that is useful to the all other people.

The objective does not reside in self-interest or in individual aspirations but in social interactive bounds that involve choices according to occasions and specially to needs. The problem with decisions is that often they are not unanimous but adopted for some reason. And the most frequent reason is that of choice; it is about "choices that nearby almost depend on a rich social autonomy found in rich cultural setting and cannot be reduced to individualist presumptions"³⁹. In this case, cultural settings can determinate choices in a large scale. As a matter of fact, this predisposition spreads to community when choices, individually made, turn into collective interest, when we know that

"Cultural hegemony is never monolithic and never formed by a unified system of values. Rather, we are confronted with complex social structures. The struggle to reach hegemony is a paramount to the understanding of social, cultural and political power and is a battle fought by civil society"⁴⁰.

In this situation, we mean, if individual aspirations are put aside, racism cannot flourish because people consider one another as members of the same nation with symmetrical values. The purpose of racism is that of the perpetuation of individualism. Actually, individualism has

³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 13.

³⁸ Jill Marshall, *Personal Freedom through Human Rights Law? Autonomy, Identity, and Integrity Under the European Convention on Human Rights*, op. cit., p. 22.

³⁹ Adrian Favel, *Philosophies of integration*, op. cit., p. 140.

⁴⁰ Alisha M. B. Heinemann (2017), ' The Making of 'good citizens' : German courses for migrants and refugees, *Studies in the Education of Adults*', op. cit., p. 185.

given rhythm to British social life for centuries and now, because of immigration, as we mentioned it earlier, it has a new and more globalized pattern that is racism. However, “most people do not have infinite depths of individuality that is theirs alone. What they believe to be their true inner self is actually constituted by their relationships with other people, and by the norms and expectations that those others provide”⁴¹Collectivism is a result of the numerous enterprises of civil society but in the beginnings, it was promoted by local communities and ethnic groups.

John Redwood’s fears and arguments are in line with general concerns of British people about Britishness. To the opposition to European Union is added the skepticism about labor’s policy or government, hence the turbulent Brexit (2019). The fear of aperture to a globalized world they consider as a threat is deeply experienced in their lives. And consequently, pressure is put on government and politicians in general. These latter are accused of being literally deaf and blind having regard to people’s interests and opinions. So, Redwood thinks that “public opinion is vital for a democracy. No democratic politician should be uninterested in it. Every democratic politician, if he is doing his job daily, has to balance public opinion against the needs of the country”⁴²and also balance the majority concerns against the minority needs.

This is how things should work in order to ban discrimination and hatred. And when it happens that attention is more paid to minority’s inquiries than to the fears and concerns of the majority, there is a problem of governance or balance in a ‘fair’ State and a matter of discernment in a society that goes low and poor of moral virtues. Justly, racism derives from that distant and impetuous confrontation between society and government; between majority and minority, between needs and opinions, etc.

Let us mention that positive discrimination is not always a solution; it is sometimes a big damage if we take into account government’s mistakes while implementing policies related to it. So, it is not because the majority does not agree to the policy but disagrees to the way it is being implemented. And Rex & Tomlinson, respectively sociologist and education specialist, in their quest of valid responses to the problematic of racism, had noticed some “limitations and

⁴¹ Francis Fukuyama, *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*, New York, Farrar, Atrous and Giroux, 2018, p. 52.

⁴² John Redwood, *The Death of Britain*, op. cit., p. 17.

contradictions of state policies”⁴³ that had considerably thwarted nations’ harmony and homogeneity.

Responses to racism are at the origin of what Solomos called ‘criminal subculture’ because crime has become a second identity for minority groups. For instance, because of frustration experienced in their childhood and youth, criminal gangs like the ‘yardies’ from Jamaica, have raised from deprived areas. And this is fact. The narrative of crimes in those places oversteps the understanding of those who legally or illegally hold power. These are places that are out of control; even the police are almost overwhelmed by stories.

The ‘black on black’ violence or crime is not actually a matter of ‘institutionalized racism’ but what Ibram Kendri calls “internalized racism”⁴⁴ a conflict between gangs dealing with drugs more often than not and also of rivalry between small ethnic groups like the one between West Indians and Asians. This is to mention that “groups complement each other and fit into interdependent whole, but do not identify with each other culturally”⁴⁵. The competition between such groups is still accurate but does not have the scope of the 1970-1980s. Members of those small groups have opted for compromise and cooperation despite strategical oppositions. It did make time for them to understand that they must get together and thus form a community, the community of minorities.

The most remarkable retort to racism focused on minority groups is what the Daily Mail of July 6th, 1981 called ‘Black War on Police’. And the notorious Enoch Powell who was involved in solving the issue could not help saying ironically that Britain has not seen anything yet referring to the violence and the way action is organized. And “racism itself as a phenomenon becomes a blurred line”⁴⁶ because the causes and the consequences of racism are mingled to the point of creating cacophony. Actually, there is no planned violence if we take account of the recent developments at the aftermath of George Floyd’s death. We remember Patrick Hutchinson, the man who carried a white man because he did not want the main message of the

⁴³John Solomos, *Race and Racism*, op. cit., p.139.

⁴⁴ Abram X. Kendi, *How to Be an Antiracist*, New York, One World, 2019, p. 11.

⁴⁵ Ernest Gellner, *Culture, Identity, and Politics*, op. cit., p. 23.

⁴⁶ Jude Yawson, “The Truth about Racism in the United Kingdom”, 13-03-2020, visited in August 2nd, 2020.

protests to be overshadowed by one moment of violence. Don't white people say that black people are violent that's why they go after them at any occasion and any time⁴⁷.

The institutionalization of the police and their indifference to atrocities inflicted on Blacks and other minorities had brought about that 'war' that should not have taken place if the law-makers or policymakers and politicians had earlier decided to get to the root of the problem.

CONCLUSION

As generally admitted, if you sow colonization, you will reap immigration. Immigrants and refugees are people looking for democracy, for wealth, for law, in a word, for welfare. They come to Britain because they were told that they belong to the same empire even after colonization and the physical end of the empire. Given that our world is not able of existing with entire peace between nations and between people from the same nation, immigration and refugees crisis cannot be things of the past. Nations will always have to face them with their negative but also positive aspects. Race and racism are seemingly determined by society and politics that involve economic reason. But the genetical aspect of race forbids it from being treated the same way as racism. Race is honorific and peaceful until it turns into racism. So, racism is an unfair deformation of race brought about by personal motivations that are unfortunately devastating and dehumanizing to other people. Racism hates humanity and all its correlations. And where racism is active, race is passive. Therefore, physics defeats genetics.

The function of immigration can be raised in two different ways: the broad definition from immigrants in one side, and the understanding of the natives and the politicians of the phenomenon on the other side. To immigrants, it was their destiny to move to another land; they could not escape from it. So, predestination is the only reference in some cases. Their exodus ends up where they can find peace and welfare because peace is not always determined by war and welfare not by natural resources. Politicians might be strong manipulators according to the needs of the moment. But this time, it is a question of national interest instead of self-interest.

⁴⁷Laura Smith et.al, "How Britain failed to deal with systemic racism?", CNN/Updated at 07:15 GMT, June 22, 2020, and visited in August 02nd, 2020.

For instance, when in 1948 the ‘Windrush’ ship coasted in the South of England with 441 “citizens”, it was because Britain needed to rebuild her economic and social wreck.

The ‘Windrush Generation’ as they call it, was a total mockery given that many of them do not have British nationality yet. This scandal continues to shake political field until now; that is to say that immigration remains a problem and a major one, to politicians. Yet, a mere recognition of a well-done job is common and was what those immigrants asked for and keep on asking for. Anyway, if it cannot be a reward, it might turn into a right if we are to consider the duration of the issue, the scope it has in the media, and the interpretation it inspires in the black community.

After all, all the ‘riches’ in Britain might exist in their motherland but certainly not in the same scale or degree, because most of those countries were new or fake democracies and laws were freshly voted and unfairly applied, etc. So, there should not have been any room for hostility but for deep acknowledgment. Besides, didn’t British people say that they are ‘chosen’ by God? In these conditions, other peoples settled in their country to copy on them; this should clear a path for salvation for everyone then.

Placed out of the ravages of racism and out of the stereotypes of identity and culture, immigration might gain positive appreciation. As a matter of fact, the meaning we can give to immigration depends on various factors we underlined in previous lines. However, we are far from completing the list. The complexity of the issue does not allow that; no end is conceivable. But at least, we can rule that the function of immigration is that of a strong humanity which has neither barriers nor frontiers. Immigration, refugees crisis, race and racism are phenomena that will not disappear in our world as long as there will be cultural and community and even interest conflict for, it is all about conflict.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson Benedict, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Revised edition, Verso, 2006.

-Balibar Etienne and Wallerstein Immanuel, Race, Nation, Class. Ambiguous Identities, Culture, Globalization and the World System, in *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (Sep., 1993), pp. 550-551 Published by: Wiley on behalf of The London School of Economics and Political Science Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org>.

- Edgerton David, “Britain’s persistent racism cannot simply be explained by its imperial history”. Theguardian.com/ visited in August 8th, 2020.

- Favel Adrian, *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration, and the idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*, Great Britain, Palgrave Mcmillan, 1998.

-Fukuyama Francis, *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*, New York, Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2018.

-Gellner Ernest, *Culture, Identity, and Politics*, London, first published by Athenaeum Press Ltd, 1987.

- Hall Stuart, *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, Edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, London and New York, Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

-----*The Fateful Triangle, Race, Ethnicity, Nation*, Edited by Henry Louis Gates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England, Harvard University Press, 2017.

-----*Selected Writings on Race and Difference*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, Paul Gilroy and Ruth Wilson Gilmore, 2021.

-Heinemann Alisha M. B. (2017), The Making of ‘good citizens’ : German courses for migrants and refugees, *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 49 :2, 177-195, DOI :10.1080/02660830.2018.1453115, p. 4.

- Hirsh Afua, *Brit(ish): On Race, Identity and Belonging*, London, Vintage, 2018.
- Join-Lambert Odile et.al, « L’immigration en Grande-Bretagne : état des lieux et évolutions récentes » in *Santé, Société et Solidarité*, 2005, pp. 193-201, number 1. Persee.fr/doc/oss n 1. Visited in August 2nd, 2020.
- Kendi X. Abram, *How to Be an Antiracist*, New York, One World, 2019.
- Lentin Alana, *Race and Anti-racism in Europe*, London, Ann Arbor, Pluto Press, 2004.
- Marshall Jill, *Personal Freedom through Human Rights Law? Autonomy, Identity, and Integrity Under the European Convention on Human Rights*, Leiden-Boston, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2009.
- Miles Robert & Brown Malcolm, *Racism*, London & New York, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, Second Edition 2003.
- Mills Charles, *The Racial Contract*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Adhikari-Sacré Hari Prasad and Rutten Kris, ‘When Students Rally for Anti-Racism. Engaging with Racial Literacy in Higher Education’, *Philosophies* 2021, 6, 48. <https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies6020048>, p. 3.
- Redwood John, *The Death of Britain: the UK’s Constitutional Crisis*, Great Britain, MacMillan Press LTD, 1999.
- Smith Laura et.al, “How Britain failed to deal with systemic racism?”, edition.cnn.com/ Updated at 07:15 GMT, June 22, 2020, and visited in August 02nd, 2020.
- Solomos John, *Race and Racism*, New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- Yancy George, *Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, inc, 2008.
- Yawson Jude, “The Truth about Racism in the United Kingdom”, 13-03-2020, creativereview.co.uk/ visited in August 2nd, 2020.

UNDER PEER REVIEW