

## OUTLINE, TOLERACE presentation (18 October)

1. *Racism buried alive* (Goldberg)/ historicist accounts of racism and a history of success: liberal democracies / racism as an externality/marginality that eventually comes to the centre: **the Purging of the colonial/the abyssal line**/ racism double-bind
2. Racisms as the racist individuals to be purged of society: **the exteriority of racism**
3. **Integration and social cohesion** are regarded as **assimilation** with a different label (European/national core values vs. the 'Other')
4. Racism naturalised as the **reaction to difference** but with different centrality of the concept of 'race' and of 'racism' in the construction of the semantic space
5. Portugal, Spain, France, Italy: the political ineffectiveness of mobilizations around difference (and specifically around racial/racially marked differences) beyond certain assumptions of (unsuccessful) universal citizenship.
6. The continuous re-formulation and re-affirmation of the boundary between 'Us' (nationals, majority, non-marked) and the 'Other' (marked, non-European, from developing countries)
7. Policies and Public bodies: **the dissolution of racism and anti-racist policies within the Human Rights frame, integration policies and multiple discriminations:**
  - the Danish Institute for Human Rights; the Ministry for Refugees, Immigrants and Integration (Denmark)
  - Equality and Human Rights Commission (UK)
  - National Office against Racial Discriminations (UNAR) within the Ministry of Equal Opportunities (Gender equality) (Italy) (EU Race Equality Directive 2000/43)
  - High Authority for the Fight against Discrimination and for Equality (HALDE, France: Race Equality Directive 2000/43)
  - Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration; Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (ADS) within the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior citizens, women and youth, 2006 (Germany)
  - High Commissariat for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI, Portugal / Commission for Equality and Against Racial Discrimination, CICDR)
  - European Union Monitoring Centre Against Racism and Xenophobia EUMC (1998-2007) – the Fundamental Rights Agency FRA (2007 – ).

“We have a statutory remit to promote and monitor human rights; and to protect, enforce and promote equality across the seven "protected" grounds - age, disability, gender, race, religion and belief, sexual orientation and gender reassignment” (EHRC, ‘Who Are We and What We Do’ 2006)

### **Disadvantaged groups can simply be ‘joined-up’**

“Since the Human Rights Act promotes a more individualistic approach, which considers the majority of people in need of protection from some form of discrimination, it perhaps risks de-emphasising specific experiences of historically disadvantaged minority groups. The implication for policy making purposes is that uniform rights for individual citizens could take precedence over recognising the situation of diverse and disadvantaged groups in society (Modood, 2007). In so doing, this may facilitate a shift from a group-based approach to a focus on individual rights. While such a move might assist the principled operation of human rights legislation in promoting, for example, the right to religious freedom, it may be less sensitive to promoting specific anti-discrimination measures” (Meer 204: 2010)

8. Racism is implicitly conceived as **an ‘extreme’ unwanted result of unsuccessful integration**; the question of ‘integration’ has been increasingly addressed as a problem of ‘difference’ and therefore the main concern appears as related to **the accountability of the ‘immigrants’ and their desire/performance to integrate** within the *national* majority and their values.

judgement based on common sense and prejudice, and dominant representations of immigrant integration. The idea that immigrant integration is positive to both parts should underlie the debate about it. In other words, that more justice in the access and distribution of resources, more participation and a less limited citizenship contribute to better social integration and is beneficial for the social cohesion hoped for. If political and academic discourses tend to come closer to this idea, the observed practice not always reflects it (Justino, 2007:158).

Reinhard Grindel from the CDU stated that

“coexistence in Germany is possible only if naturalization stands at the end of a successful integration process, if we come to an understanding of common values. The whole issue must not be at the beginning of an integration process – as a big hope or an entrance ticket, as it were – which only at the end will make itself apparent as difficult and mostly unsuccessful.” (Deutscher Bundestag 2007: 12753).

9. Within integration/social cohesion public policies and anti-discrimination bodies' discourses, the discursive space on tolerance is not central; nevertheless, in wider public discourses, both political and academic, tolerance and its limits often surface the debate. It often emerges as a discourse on the behaviour, on the cultural and religious practices of the 'Other' –thus constructed as **the subject of tolerance** (Wendy Brown, 2006). That is the semantics of tolerance always **reveals the fixing/fixity of asymmetrical power relations** (and the idea that the tolerated subject needs to learn that – e-g- the Danish and Portuguese case).

There is a pattern of extraordinarily enriching cultural openness, a pattern of cultural tolerance that acknowledges the enriching potential of other cultures' contributions into the Portuguese culture and society. There is, however, a set, a firm core of values that make up the essence of our culture, values that are related mostly to respect for human rights, which I would not like to be influenced by multiculturalism in Portugal. I would not like to see in Portugal, to give an extreme example, such practices as female excision. That is, practices which originate in other cultures but which, in my opinion, are clearly against fundamental and universal principles of human rights. So the openness is necessary, tolerance is necessary which would favour some multiculturalism, though with limits. And the limits are indeed the fundamental values of human rights. It needs to be discussed publicly in Portugal (Teixeira, 2004: 44-45).

## **10. The immigrant imaginary: integration is always postponed and under surveillance**

Development of a 'first-line reception' strategy for immigrants should be paid special attention, namely in relation to the complex 'language/citizenship', as it constitutes the baseline for unlocking conditions for full integration in the host society. It is on this introductory baseline that the foundations of a continued process of integration should be started, which would combine the command of essential instruments of integration, such as learning the Portuguese language as well as habits and customs of the Portuguese society by immigrants, with the workplace and residence inclusion, simultaneously encouraging participation in the host society on different levels (Vitorino, 2007:30-31).

“Beyond the right of suffrage in the municipal area, the Constitution reserves the rights of political participation to Spanish citizens. Therefore, those immigrant citizens who wish to reach the highest degree of participation have to acquire Spanish nationality, have to advance in their commitment and come to form part of the political community that makes up Spanish society. But, without the necessity of reaching this final level of participation, the condition of long term resident should equally provide a set of rights, obligations and channels of participation that enable such immigrant persons to understand themselves to be citizens” (Gobierno de España, 2007: 182).

By then prime minister of Denmark, Anders Fogh Rasmussen's (from the Danish Liberal Party) New Year address in early 2004:

Immigrants have to make an effort themselves. They must understand the values that the Danish society is built upon. For generations we have taken these values for granted – among others because we have developed them over generations. But these values are contested within recent year ... [In Denmark ] we have freedom of speech. Even the freedom to speak nonsense. And there is freedom to difference...But the Danish society is built on some fundamental values that one must accept to live here.... For many years we have been stupidly generous [tossegode]. We have not dared to say that some [values] are better than others. But we have to say so now.

## WRAPPING UP

11. The semantics of integration and social cohesion underlines a conception of **Difference as distance** (Fabian, 1983) that **re-affirms the abyssal line (Sousa Santos, 2007)** between ethnically/racially marked/non-marked citizens, first/second-class citizens, ontologising and naturalising boundaries between Us (White Christian nationals, Europeans) and the 'Other' (significantly some Others: e.g. Black, Muslims, Roma). **Nevertheless, the emptying out of 'race' and 'racism' in these debates and policies on integration forecloses the possibilities of discussing the link, historically constructed and its contemporary configurations, between Race, Nation and Citizenship in Europe.**