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Introduction: Clashes within Civilization

The most striking feature of contemporary moral utterance is that so much of it is used to express disagreements, and the most striking feature of the debates in which these disagreements are expressed is their interminable character. . . . There seems to be no rational way of securing moral agreement in our culture.
—Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*

In our times political controversy seems to follow Muslims wherever they go. This is no less true of Europe, where an estimated twenty million Muslims now reside mostly as a result of large-scale postwar immigration. Non-Muslim Europeans acrimoniously debate how best to handle these “new” Europeans of Muslim heritage. For their part, the Muslim Europeans, comprising approximately 4 percent of the European Union’s (EU’s) population, hardly speak with one voice. Indeed, a central conclusion of this book is that European Muslims disagree vehemently but generally along the same ideological contours of discord that generate controversy among non-Muslim Europeans. To wit, there exists no great, let alone unbridgeable, gulf in outlook or lifestyle forever separating “Islamic” from “Western” civilization. We should be wary of the “clash of civilizations” thesis originated by Samuel Huntington (1996), popularized by the Western media, and applied on European soil as a microcosm of the global clash by an array of bestselling authors (Sarrazin 2010; Fallaci 2006; Ye’or 2005).

I urge instead that we start from the premise of *clashes within Western civilization*. I have in mind profound philosophical-turned-political fissures that have emerged in the modern era. These rifts may have been briefly smoothed over (or suppressed) during the generation immediately following World War II (WWII), during the so-called “end of ideology” (Bell 1960), which coincided with the original wave of postwar immigration to Western Europe (Messina 2007: 188–89). Mass immigration of Muslims to Europe presented a particularly salient (but hardly the lone) occasion for these strains to resurface and intensify beginning in the 1960s in Britain and on the Continent in the 1970s and 1980s. Heightened salience involved what Miller (2000) observed as the shift of immigration issues from low to
high politics from little noticed or discussed to highly salient, appearing regularly in headlines, political speeches, international summits, and so on. One common way of reading this switch from low to high politics is to contend that the newcomers caused the problems that merited the heightened attention. This is the reading I want to counter. The controversies swirling about immigration—“this cauldron of political and policy debates” (Hollifield 1997: 40)—are better understood as deep-seated intra-European tensions rather than as clashes between a preexisting, presumably largely unified Western Europe and a recently settling (invading) non-European “Other” (“Islam”).

Before I outline (and label) the outlooks generating the tensions, let us take a moment to look concretely at some of the political controversies surrounding European Muslims. This will allow the wider contours that I want to stress to come into visible relief, including why these intense controversies are not likely to be resolved any time soon. Consider the headscarf flashpoint (O’Brien 2009). Those who support banning the veil (as the French government has done in public schools since 2004) contend that the sartorial religious practice not only exemplifies but also proselytizes for the oppression of women. Others endorse the ban less out of an interest in women’s rights than because they see it as the most visible symbol of the dilution of their culture by immigration. Given higher fertility rates among Muslims, so goes the argument, immigration will purportedly culminate in making the majority (culture) a “minority in its own land.” Others see the right to cover as a litmus test for the sincerity of the much-touted freedom and tolerance of Western democracies. Many feel that Western European publics and governments fail the test miserably. Some critics don the veil as a sign of resistance to and condemnation of a long history (since the Crusades) of the domination of “Orientals” by Europeans.

Consider additionally the issue of secularism. In contrast to the United States, with its legal separation of church and state, most European governments have long-standing formal or informal relationships with Christian and Jewish denominations. These arrangements in one way or another channel state resources to promote recognized religious communities’ undertakings. For example, most European governments help fund private confessional schools and/or subsidize the provision of religious, denomination-specific education in the public schools. It is only natural that European Muslims would seek to gain similar state aid for Islam, and they have done just that in virtually every European land where they comprise a critical mass (Laurence 2012). Typically, Muslims have demanded that they alone should determine the form and content of publicly subsidized Islamic instruction. After all, must one be a devout, even erudite Muslim to know what is most important about Islam to impart to pupils?
Many critics of Islam (including convinced secularists of Muslim descent) severely doubt Islam’s democratic credentials and even go so far as to maintain that Islam and liberal democracy are fundamentally incompatible. While some want officials to spurn any relationship with Islam altogether, others call on the state to monitor and regulate public Islamic education in order to ensure that its form and content do not transgress liberal democratic tenets (for instance, gender equality). Most European states have, in fact, opened up dialogues with Muslims aimed at gestating so-called “Euro-Islam,” an interpretation of the noble creed that is compatible with and conducive to liberal democratic mores and customs purportedly prized in Europe. Several Muslim organizations have taken umbrage at this paternalistic supervision, assailing it as thinly veiled cultural imperialism of the most insidious variety. Indignantly they have established their own privately funded and operated Islamic schools. Indeed, a few of these schools (and the organizations that oversee them) have been exposed as breeding grounds for vehemently and at times violently anti-Western thoughts, deeds, and actors.

Terrorism, needless to say, has become a salient issue, especially since the attacks of September 11 (9/11), as well as the Madrid, London, and Boston bombings and Paris attacks of 2015. Some scholars discern the “securitization” of immigration policy, by which they mean the tendency of officials, but also media, to view immigration primarily through the lens of its supposed threat to domestic security (Chebel d’Appollonia 2015; Kaya 2012; Givens, Freeman, and Leal 2008). Yet nothing approaching consensus regarding the best way to guarantee security seems discernible. Some have interpreted the terrorist attacks as a wake-up call that Western governments have put their publics at undue risk by maintaining a policy of relatively open and easy immigration and by granting extensive civil, political, and social rights to the newcomers. On this view, the state should deprioritize the rights and privileges of immigrants (by whom is putatively meant Muslims, often including naturalized Muslims) whenever they create even the suspicion of a threat to the security of “natives.” Arrest and deport first! Ask questions and prove guilt later! One need only illustrate this stance as such to bring immediately to mind the counter-argument: human rights are sacrosanct and too important to permit their suspension or transgression for any individuals in the name of homeland security. A free society cannot be a 100-percent-secure society. Moreover, a demonstrable commitment to liberty and equality represents, in the end, the most effective weapon against the terrorists and their would-be sympathizers, a position opponents consider to be the utmost (and perilous) expression of bleeding-heart naiveté. Add to these arguments the viewpoint that the fixation on Muslims as potential terrorists by the Western media (and unofficially by
security officials whose profiling targets Muslims) represents not only an apocryphal distortion, not only an ire-raising affront to peace-loving Muslims, but, because it is both, the single most effective recruiting tool for the very terrorists whom European governments wish to thwart. Why the pre-occupation with immigration? After all, most of the London Tube bombers and Paris shooters were British subjects and French citizens born in Britain and France, respectively. Europe has been spawning homegrown terrorism since at least the anarchists of the nineteenth century. Investigate the reasons why rather than scapegoat Islam.

In this sampling of the controversies, we can detect three normative poles around which the vying stances cluster. Each pole represents something akin to a moral center of gravity that yields a moral compass one can use to chart an ethical way through any specific issue arising from immigration. The first pole underscores equality and liberty for all. Whenever and wherever one detects the claim of (especially innate or unearned) superiority and inferiority (for example, Muslim lives and limbs are dispensable); whenever and wherever one detects the forcing of an innocent, adult human being to act against his or her will (for instance, compulsion to don the veil), one's moral compass should point to potential immorality, a deep intuition that “this can’t be right.” The second pole concentrates moral awareness around the we-group, that wider collectivity beyond the obvious circles of immediate friends and family with whom one identifies or feels a sense of we-ness even when one does not personally know the members (for example, nation, ethnicity, religion). This second moral compass points to immorality whenever the well-being and continued flourishing of that we-ness, however understood, seems imperiled. The moral inclination is to defend the we-group, most often against an allegedly threatening they-group (thus, Muslims take “our” jobs or insult “our” customs). The third pole is actually an amoral pole. Its pointer signals trouble whenever it detects a claim to possess the moral high ground. Its center of gravity is a fully politicized sensibility that behind any claim to moral superiority lurks an ulterior, self-serving, political motive (say, the persistent domination of Muslims in the name of “emancipating” or “enlightening” them).

Each pole just limned represents something like the pithiest expression of a major normative outlook, or what I will call “public philosophy.” I dub these “liberalism” (pole 1), “nationalism” (pole 2), and “postmodernism” (pole 3). This book contends that these three broadly understood philosophical traditions (schools of thought) represent the most influential normative forces in the politics of immigration in Europe today. Other isms, such as Protestantism, Catholicism, communism, fascism, and (explicit) racism, have drifted to the margins; others clearly more centrally visible, such as democratic socialism, feminism, multiculturalism, (implicit) racism, and
Clashes within Civilization: Islamism, can be (and are in this book) interpreted as variants (subcategories) of the broader three public philosophies.

Liberalism, Nationalism, and Postmodernism

I strongly wish to avoid misunderstanding in regard to labels. I devote a few paragraphs at this juncture to explaining (in broad and loose terms) my understanding of the labels “liberalism,” “nationalism,” and “postmodernism.” My hope is that even if readers might prefer slightly different labels, we would all nonetheless (roughly speaking, of course) be considering the same three seismic developments in Western thought and society that I describe below. Labels inevitably involve generalization. I concur with Peter Gay (2002: 5), who sagely observes that “while it may be hard to live with generalizations, it is inconceivable to live without them.”

Liberalism originated as a product and project of the Enlightenment. It emerged among brave, forward-looking men and women of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who sought to liberate humankind from the twin forces of darkness: ignorance and tyranny. Pioneering minds, such as John Locke, Baron de Montesquieu, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant, and Adam Smith, employed their prodigious reasoning powers to discern and articulate universal moral principles that the thinkers believed not only were comprehensible to all persons but also demonstrated the rectitude of man’s yearning to be free. Liberalism insists on the inherent equality of all persons regardless of where and when they exist. From this fundamental equality derives the self-evident, inviolable right of each person to think, worship, work, and live as he or she wishes so long as he or she does not impede another’s right to do the same. Furthermore, each individual must have an equal and voluntary say in determining the laws that govern him or her. Democracy, on this view, also represents the surest way to foster impartial government—that is, a government of laws based on rational, universal principles rather than of individuals moved by whimsical desire. Initially enunciated in philosophical treatises, these ideas eventually became anchored (never perfectly) in law first in countries such as Great Britain, the Netherlands, the United States of America, and France and eventually in the rest of Europe and beyond in what we today generally recognize as liberal democratic governments. Liberal laws established rights of property and person against arbitrary seizure, led to the abolition of serfdom and slavery, and gradually whittled away at forms of legal discrimination. Over time liberal democratic laws extended the franchise to more and more persons. Liberal laws established not only the free market but also, in time, the regulation of that market with an eye to redistributing its rewards more equitably throughout society. Liberalism, as I conceive it, deserves the lion’s share
of normative credit for inspiring and legitimizing the long and hard-fought process in (Western) Europe of securing for all citizens fundamental civil, political, and social rights (culminating in the postwar liberal democratic comprehensive welfare state) that T. H. Marshall so famously traced in *Citizenship and Social Class* (1950). The mention of social rights—“from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society” (Marshall 1950: 8)—should unmistakably signal that, in my conception of liberalism, (democratic) socialism represents a corollary of the broader moral theory and social movement demanding the equality and freedom of all. I gloss over the sniping from the left charging conventional liberalism with possessive individualism as well as the scare tactics from the right equating social democracy with creeping communist totalitarianism. The two generally agree on the same lofty goal of emancipating individuals; they differ only on the means to achieve it—an honest, consequential, but ultimately intramural debate.

Wherever humans feel humiliated, dehumanized, or forced to act against their will, they can turn to liberal values for moral support. They have done so and they continue to do so. Liberalism remains vital in our times thanks to the boost it has received from compelling intellectuals such as John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas and from courageous activists such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela, Lech Walesa, Václav Havel, Aung San Suu Kyi, and Malala Yousafzai. It has been—in fits and starts no doubt—transforming our world from one oriented around corporate identities and entrenched stratifications to one centered on the individual unleashed to smash (in time) hierarchies of all sorts in favor of human rights and democratic governance.

Nationalism emerged in protest against liberal universalism. Coined by Johann Herder in 1774, “nationalism” first became common in political parlance in the middle of the nineteenth century. But well before that, sharp minds and tongues, such as Herder, Edmund Burke, Johann Fichte, Joseph de Maistre, and Guiseppe Mazzini, who abhorred the French Revolution and the Napoleonic expansionism that sought to impose its political order outside France, rejected the Enlightenment’s pivotal notion of a single, universal human nature. They maintained instead that people were fundamentally different and that these inerasable differences stemmed from being members of different nations. Each nation was said to possess a particular character—Herder called it a “soul” (*Volksgeist*)—that organically takes shape by virtue of the fact that members of a given nation share a common history, language, and homeland, and common customs, mores, and tastes. Moreover, they share as well a common expectation and hope that their nation will survive and thrive into the future so that their progeny will be able
to inherit, honor, and contribute to their culture and its collective achievements. They form a “community of destiny.” Nationalism teaches that because each nation is particular, an idiosyncratic organic whole, it alone can know wherein consists the nation’s well-being. It deductively follows that each nation (or people) must govern its own affairs, must have its own state. The nation-state, understood as the best possible congruence between nation and state, represents the moral and political ideal of nationalism. Despite a comparatively brief discrediting by its association with fascism, nationalism has been revived as a normative public philosophy in the work of prominent postwar scholars such as David Miller, Dominique Schnapper, Alain de Benoist, Marco Tarchi, Samuel Huntington, and Ernst-Wolfgang Bökenförde. A moral offspring of nationalism’s particularism that stresses relative political autonomy for any bona fide cultural community has also found expression through communitarian philosophers such as Charles Taylor, Michael Walzer, and Hans-Georg Gadamer.

Peoples’ endeavors to create and keep their own states have massively altered the modern world in successive waves of independence movements and nation-state formations. The first flowed forth over the course of the nineteenth century and transformed Europe (and the Americas) from a continent of absolutist empires and smaller kingdoms into one of nation-states. A second wave washed across Africa and Asia as new nations-states (often fledgling and cobbled-together) sought independence from European colonial empires. A third wave drowned the Soviet Bloc starting in 1989 and formed the independent nation-states of Central Europe and Central Asia.

The first wave culminated in World War I, the fragmentation of the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires into nation-states, and the founding of the League of Nations in 1919, when 44 states signed the League’s covenant. Today the League’s successor, the United Nations, consists of 193 member states. Because 97 percent of people live in their birth country (Hampshire 2013: 4), practically everyone on the planet has a national political identity (represented by the individual passport). All one need do to discover the importance of passports (all of which, save Vatican City, are at this point national) is to set out on international travel. It is hard to imagine a normative political vision that has had a greater concrete impact on the modern era than nationalism.

Postmodernism too entails a critique of Enlightenment liberalism. But its critique reaches far beyond liberalism to a rejection of any and all claims to absolute certainty, including the sense of wholeness and purpose that the members of a nation can purportedly enjoy when securely ensconced in a national polity. An instructive metaphor here is anti-foundationalism. Post-modernism represents an experiment to approach life precariously (even precipitously) without a metaphysical foundation that anchors us in some
self-serving illusion that our existence fits neatly into a greater order or serves some ultimate end. It was Friedrich Nietzsche, with his philosophical “hammer,” who shattered the foundation of Western thought: that monist presupposition widely held in the West since Plato that cosmos rather than chaos ultimately reigns, that we inhabit a universe whose inherent order we can comprehend. Nietzsche averred that what we take for absolute truth is but a lie that we have conveniently forgotten is a lie. Alleged truths are nothing more than linguistic metaphors rather than facts that correspond to an objective reality that confirms their validity. Our existence is ultimately one of infinite metaphors or contingent perspectives with no final arbiter to determine which of them is objectively true. Furthermore, what drives each perspective is a cloaked, deeply rooted will to power, a largely unconscious psychological urge to dominate others by forcing them to conform to our preferred interpretation of how the world ought to be.

Nietzsche’s perspectivism has been profoundly explored and augmented in, for example, Ludwig Wittgenstein’s theory of “language games,” Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s notion of “prerefl ective consciousness,” or Martin Heidegger’s idea of “Enframing.” Each theorizes perspectives that stand in for—quite literally re-present—rather than actually coincide with any objective reality. These postmodern musings have reached perhaps their richest expression in Jacques Derrida’s idea of différence, a ceaseless string of referrals between signified and signer that can be deconstructed to show the absence of any fixed starting point. Sigmund Freud, of course, pioneered our exploration of the unconscious and how its sublimated urges affect our conscious lives. His work has been broadened and deepened by the likes of Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, Jacques Lacan, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva. A number of major thinkers have enriched our understanding of the intersection of power and knowledge. Max Weber, for one, discerned in the modern rational outlook a totalizing force that would culminate in the disenchantment of the world—that is, in the total domination by bureaucratic rationality and administration, despite the fact that this bureaucratic outlook was just one of a wide range of world-organizing perspectives, none better than the other in some irrefutably demonstrable way. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno (and other members of the Frankfurt School) developed the argument that the Enlightenment spawned a dialectic of not just increasing knowledge of the world but also increasing domination of those things known, including human beings with the advent of the human sciences. This strand of thinking has arguably attained its most trenchant exploration in Michel Foucault’s hugely influential reconceptualization of power as a “power-knowledge nexus” in which the normalizing power of knowledge replaces older forms of brute physical force in the governing of human beings and societies.
Because postmodernism is the youngest of the three public philosophies, its concrete impact on our lives is perhaps not yet as readily recognizable as liberalism’s generation of a world of individuals or nationalism’s production of an international field of allying and vying nation-states. The sway of postmodernism manifests itself wherever we find challenges to accepted canons. These come forth in the academy with the criticism, say, of “dead white man’s history.” We encounter it too in the arts with the blurring of High Art and pop culture in the work of an Andy Warhol or the collapsing of the distinction between artist and viewer by Joseph Beuys. Works inspired by such postmodern pioneers now overflow modern art museums and galleries across Europe. The postmodern spirit permeates, however, well beyond purely “intellectual” venues. Think, for instance, of the growing interest in non-Western medicine that has spawned a multi-billion-dollar industry peddling alternative healing techniques on practically every corner and computer. We experience a postmodern world also wherever we witness the proliferation, fragmentation, and combination of identities, especially identities conventionally not associated with one another. Thus, we increasingly find hyphenated persons who insist that they are Turkish Dutchmen or French Muslims, or Pakistani-Anglican-homosexual-vegan Britons for that matter. On the rise are hybrid families forged through the growing number of mixed marriages whose offspring go by names such as Muhammad Smith or Dominique Khaled. Europe’s large cities especially brim with such hybrid persons who conspicuously defy stereotypes and undermine conventional expectations regarding identity. Their stories are dramatized in multiple books, like Zadie Smith’s *White Teeth* (2000, TV serial in 2002), or popular films, including Olivier Nakache’s and Éric Toledano’s *Intouchables* (2011), Fatih Akin’s *Soul Kitchen* (2009), Buket Alakus’s *Einmal Hans mit scharfer Sosse* (2013), Phillippe de Chauveron’s *Qu’est-ce qu’on a fait au Bon Dieu* (2014), which reach into every home. They are the nation’s soccer stars, such as France’s Zinedine Zidane or Germany’s Mesut Özil. Finally, the postmodern sensibility turns up in increasingly widespread political cynicism. The expanding distrust of political institutions and personalities coupled with the mounting alienation from politics documented by numerous pollsters in Europe reflect a withering expectation that politics is or can be about serving the common good (Dalton 2006; Inglehart and Welzel 2005). For ever-larger numbers of Europeans, the self-serving, ruthlessly calculating politician willing to do and say anything to gain or maintain power represents the norm rather than the exception. To the extent that European publics have come to expect bias, distortion, manipulation, and corruption in politics rather than being astounded and appalled, they are crossing over, whether knowingly or not, to the postmodern viewpoint expressed in Nietzsche’s notion of the
will to power. Similarly, when viewers and readers take biased, partisan reporting and analysis of politics to be normal and consider the expectation and aspiration for objectivity passé and Pollyanna-ish, they have essentially adopted Nietzsche’s (1968: 267) perspectivism, whereby there are “no facts, only interpretations.”

Kulturkampf

My simplified sketch of the course of modern political thought is the story of unfulfilled hopes and unintended consequences. We have not arrived at the intended destination of modernity’s founders. The ultimate hope inaugurating and driving the modern era (since René Descartes) has lain in the anticipated discovery of secular certainty to replace the (perceived) ontological certainty of the past that was deemed immature and indefensible by modern minds (Toulmin 1990). In terms of morality, the aim was to deduce moral laws to correspond to the physical laws of nature discovered by the likes of Isaac Newton and other natural scientists.

But such ethical certainty and consensus have proven elusive. The heated controversies surrounding just such an issue as the Muslim question remind us daily of the conspicuous “battle over discourse” (Hampshire 2013: 32) that prevails in the West. The controversies would appear to be irreconcilable and mounting. “It is hard to find a democratic or democratizing society these days that is not the site of some significant controversy over whether and how its public institutions should better recognize the identities of cultural and disadvantaged minorities” (Gutmann 1994: 3). Europe lacks a political ideology possessing enough moral authority to unite all. On the contrary, Europe appears well on its way toward a value pluralism teetering on relativism, as well as to a nasty politics of bitter discord in which each party relentlessly if not ruthlessly seeks to impose its specific agenda on its detractors. Such is the portrait of our political universe painted by Alasdair MacIntyre (1984) in After Virtue. The lack of commonly held standards is the regrettable culmination of Western modernity across the entire spectrum of cultural life according to Jacques Barzun’s (2001) From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life.

I generally see eye to eye with these deservedly esteemed scholars but prefer a more positive interpretation. My reading builds off the work of Isaiah Berlin. Whereas MacIntyre and Barzun mainly animadverted on the emergence of profound value pluralism, Berlin discerned in it the prospect for profound philosophical maturation. Maturation to greater philosophical (and presumably political) sophistication could transpire if value pluralism were to result in the abandonment of monism. In The Crooked Timber of Humanity, Berlin argued that monism represented the underlying
presupposition of Western thought from Plato to his own time. Monism, he claimed, reposed on three presuppositions:

The first position is this: to all genuine questions there can only be one correct answer, all the other answers being incorrect. . . The second assumption is that a method exists for the discovery of these correct answers. . . The third assumption, and perhaps the most important in this context, is that all the correct answers must, at the very least, be compatible with one another. (Berlin 1991: 23–24)

The Oxford don broke the spell that monism held over him via his investigation of Romantic nationalism. In his probing exploration into the thought of its seminal thinkers, in particular Giovanni Vico and Herder, Berlin determined it impossible to conclude that the ideology resulted from faulty reasoning. Rather, it started from different axioms from, and therefore reasoned through to incompatible conclusions with, his own preferred liberalism. But the axioms were unassailably reasonable and the reasoning compellingly sound. Hence, a rational way to dismiss nationalism as error eluded the committed liberal. Berlin was left no responsible option but to conclude that rationality was plural, that there could be more than one right answer to a given query and that there could be multiple upstanding visions of the good life that nonetheless contradicted one another. “Some among the Great Goods cannot live together. That is a conceptual truth” (Berlin 1991: 13).

I augment Berlin’s analysis by adding postmodernism as a third public philosophy with its own internally convincing reasoning. I read these three public philosophies as the currently predominant players in an enduring Kulturkampf, or struggle for ideological hegemony in modern European politics. Ongoing arguably since the outbreak of the Reformation in 1517, the Kulturkampf has seen some public philosophies come and go, gain and then lose their competitive edge against rivals (for instance, Marxism). Liberalism, nationalism, and postmodernism stand today in competition but unable to defeat one another decisively. Each provides compelling reasons for believing its tenets. Each has been articulated by great seminal savants and is defended by persuasive contemporary apologists. Each has accumulated scores of theses and mountains of corroborating evidence to validate its conclusions. Each stands stoutly armed with arguments to fend off attacks and criticisms from rivals.

The metaphor of Kulturkampf, though useful, has its shortcomings. The image draws desired attention to the unavoidable ideological clashes of the three outlooks that I want to underscore. This emphasis on intermural disagreement automatically entails accentuating the intramural commonalities
binding each of the three. That said, none of the three represents a monolith. Within each school there exist vying theories and theorists, different points of emphasis, and varieties of strategies. I will treat these finer distinctions within liberalism, nationalism, and postmodernism in Chapter 2. However, my underlying theme stresses that the differences within each school of thought resemble family quarrels—that is, differing outlooks that, in the end, concur when it comes to the most important values that should govern the public sphere. Liberalism stakes its lot with individual autonomy, nationalism with communal homogeneity, and postmodernism with insuperable heterogeneity and discord.

**Messiness**

Such attention to nuance within the three camps still leaves us with an all too orderly impression of the influence of these normative outlooks on politics. In treating the basic theoretical principles of each public philosophy, Chapter 2 might leave the impression that the concrete political world is filled with easily identifiable liberals, nationalists, and postmodernists. Real politics, of course, is fuzzier. Political actors do not march forth onto the political battlefield like footballers sporting jerseys clearly demarcated with an “L,” “N,” or “P” so that the analyst can clearly spot them. In this book philosophically consistent political actors represent the exception rather than the norm. Legislation itself—in democracies typically the result of complicated manipulations, compromises, negotiations, and concessions—is all the more inconsistent and contradictory.

Gary Freeman describes immigration policy as “an extremely messy reality,” with “ramshackle, multifaceted, loosely connected sets of regulatory rules, institutions and practices” (2004: 946). Virginie Guiraudon (2003) has applied James March and Johan Olsen’s (1989) “garbage can” theory of organized chaos to immigration policy making. James Hampshire (2013: 2) maintains that “the intractable nature of immigration policy is not a failure of governance but rather a reflection of contradictory imperatives of the liberal state.” We wind up, then, with “a mixed bag not fully assimilationist, pluralist, or multicultural” (Freeman 2004: 960). Freeman sagely cautions social scientists against excessive optimism with regard to coherently fitting this policy mess into neat explanatory typologies.

In these pages I explore the hypothesis that the policy messiness that Freeman and others uncover stems, in part at least, from normative messiness. Normative messiness differs from mere discord between distinct normative camps. Messiness arises through imprecise and incomplete application of normative theories that obfuscates their critical differences. In the repartee of daily politicking, we rarely if ever encounter the public
philosophies trotted out in full form—that is, as the intricate, comprehensive theories that I sketch in Chapter 2. Rather, we more often come across mere fragments of these larger normative outlooks that have become unmoored, so to speak, from their theoretical home. Few political actors have the time, inclination, or capability to trace a deployed fragment back to its mother theory, let alone explain the grand theory in its entirety. Few political activists are what Martin Carstensen (2011: 148) calls “paradigm man”; most work rather like the improvising “bricoleur” pragmatically and strategically using philosophical fragments like tools in a toolkit (see also Mehta 2011: 38–39). Hampshire (2013: 25) observes that politicians tend to want to “fudge” the immigration issue by sending “different messages to different audiences.”

The resulting ideological “bricolage” generates normative muddle that in turn fosters policy messiness. When political actors employ normative fragments as “performative utterances” (Hampshire 2013: 152) or “schemas” (Bowen et al. 2014b: 14) in specific contexts separated from their mother theories, they make themselves less aware of, or at least less intolerant of, philosophical inconsistency and contradiction. Below the reader will encounter repeated examples of quite glaring philosophical inconsistency in the normative arguments of political personalities, parties, and organizations. Such contradictions irk theorists, but they do not appear to trouble political agents much. Make no mistake. Slogans like “France for the French” and “No human being is illegal” do philosophically contradict one another, but the contradiction goes less noticed in politics or, if discerned, is not given much import. Tolerated and perhaps deliberate inconsistencies find their way into immigration policy and contribute to its becoming “an awesome accumulation of contradictions” (Schierup, Hansen, and Castles 2006: 77) and “a messy state of affairs” (Boswell 2009: 251). As Margaret Levi (2013: 187) observes, “Bad policies are often good politics.”

**Mutual Fragilization**

Another normative dimension in understanding policy messiness is “mutual fragilization.” I borrow the concept from Charles Taylor’s *A Secular Age*. There Taylor (2007: 303–4) interprets mutual fragilization as “certainly one of the main features of the world of 2000, in contrast to that of 1500.” The Canadian philosopher has in mind a heightened awareness, in our times, of views opposing our own. Increasingly, however, these are construed not as the palpably false, immoral humbug of deranged or debased adversaries, but rather as the plausibly correct and prudent convictions of sensible fellow humans who happen to disagree with us.
We live in a condition where we cannot help but be aware that there are a number of different construals, views which intelligent, reasonably undeluded people, of good will, can and do disagree on. We cannot help looking over our shoulder from time to time, looking sideways, living our faith also in condition and uncertainty. (Taylor 2007: 11)

Richard Rorty (1989: 73) discerns something similar with the proliferation of “ironists”—that is, persons so attuned to inescapable contingency that they cannot take their own convictions fully seriously. Zygmunt Bauman (1993: 11) speaks of “endemic inconclusivity.”

We might think of political antagonisms accompanied by diffidence and ambivalence as softer or gentler differences of opinion. To be sure, seemingly confident, uncompromising voices sound forth, like an Ayaan Hirsi Ali (2006) fully convinced that Islam tramples women’s rights plain and simple. There can be little doubt that one consequence of the ongoing Kulturkampf is a hardening of positions among some adversaries. Jagged clashes between opposing parties would seem to close off the kind of empathy toward others’ viewpoints that can open the door to the unifying “fusion of horizons” so nobly yearned for by Hans-Georg Gadamer (2007). I applaud the German hermeneutist’s compelling urgings. But in the pages that follow, I am more interested, following Taylor, in exploring the emergence of a phenomenon that falls short of consensus. I have in mind a spreading disposition characterized by heightened awareness of discord that breeds increased expectation and acceptance of difference, diffidence, and ambivalence. Perhaps years of accumulated collective experience with an ongoing Kulturkampf have

opened a space in which people can wander between and around all these options without having to land clearly and definitively in any one. In the wars between belief and unbelief [in this book public philosophies], this can be seen as a kind of no-man’s-land; except that it has got wide enough to take on the character rather of a neutral zone, where one can escape the war altogether. Indeed, this is part of the reason why the war is constantly running out of steam in modern civilization, in spite of the efforts of zealous minorities. (Taylor 2007: 351)

Martin Schain, like Freeman, underscores the messiness of immigration policies. In his transatlantic comparative study, he finds a “contradiction of policies in different arenas” that governments regularly and quite knowingly, if tacitly, tolerate (Schain 2008: 276, 283). Such glaring inconsistencies, he avers, “reflect the complexities of the democratic political process” (Schain
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2008: 275; see also Hampshire 2013; Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012). Normative fragmentation and fragilization, as I aim to show, is an important but underexplored example of these complexities. Normative fragmentation and fragilization need not persist. Some person or party might very well reconfigure fragments in a new way that would seem so compelling to most involved that they would embrace it and establish an overarching consensus. Rogers Brubaker (2001: 531) discerns something like this in the “return of assimilation.” Christian Joppke (2009: 120) contends that “diversity” has become the “master rhetoric in all Western states.” Jonathan Laurence (2012: xix) observes “a new political consensus” to integrate Muslims into existing institutional arrangements in numerous European lands. I do contend that European states and publics find themselves in a single, international (even global) discourse regarding immigration, but it remains a constantly fluctuating discourse shaped by abiding discord, principally among liberalism, nationalism, and postmodernism.

Methodology

My analysis employs a mainly constructivist methodology. Constructivism reposes on the premise that ideas matter. They form the expectations that we bring to the world and thereby shape the way we experience it (Béland and Cox 2011). Ideas are not, then, separate from or secondary to an independent social reality; they are constitutive of it (Berger and Luckmann 1967). Specifically, I work with the notion of public philosophy (Mehta 2011; Favell 1998; Lowi 1969). Of a kind with what other constructivists label “worldviews” (Weber 1949), “frames” (Bleich 2003), “political discourses” (Connolly 1993), “repertoires of evaluation” (Bowen 2010: 6), “policy paradigms” (Hall 1993), or simply “political ideologies” (Freeden 1996), a public philosophy is a loosely integrated, internally varied vision of how the public sphere ought to appear and function. A public philosophy determines for a political actor under its sway what stands out as significant as opposed to insignificant in the political arena. It shapes what comes forth as a problem in need of being addressed and prescribes what passes for a desirable solution. It is that set of expectations, ultimately normative, that inclines a political actor toward one position but away from another, to be perturbed by large-scale immigration rather than pleased, to view the newcomers as a threat rather than a benefit to one’s life and land.

Most importantly, a public philosophy is an organic entity, a living tradition of related ideas that constantly morphs (Berman 2011; Freeden 1996). A public philosophy has a birth, an unfurling life, and presumably someday a death (a passing into political oblivion like, say, royalism, fascism, or Stalinist socialism). Needless to say, the latter fate has yet to befall liberalism,
nationalism, or postmodernism. A public philosophy forms around a core set of tenets, fundamental and interconnected presuppositions, theories, and principles, typically enunciated by seminal thinkers acknowledged as such inside and outside the tradition. However, because a public philosophy is a protean tradition, offshoots and variations of the core ideas inevitably spring forth. These are typically developed by subsequent thinkers working self-consciously with the tenets of the masters in an effort to explore, expand, and improve them. There is a mutually dependent relationship between seminal and subsequent thinkers. Though the latter would have nothing to inspire them without the pioneering intervention of the former, the pioneers’ ideas would, without their expositors’ efforts, fade into oblivion—that is, turn into largely ignored ideational relics seriously considered by none but a few specialists in the history of ideas. A public philosophy, then, resembles an extended family rooted in a common (philosophical) ancestry but expanding to include many related yet still distinct individual members (dead and alive).

I offer family portraits, as it were, of liberalism, nationalism, and postmodernism. Perhaps it is better to think of them as caricatures—sophisticated caricatures, I hope, but caricatures nonetheless. I do not pretend to offer anything like a comprehensive history of liberalism, nationalism, or postmodernism of the kind one would expect to find in a volume such as *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (Kohn 1955). Again, such an effort exceeds the scope of this study and remains only tangentially related to its purpose: making sense of normative influences on contemporary immigration policy. My approach is informed more by what Michel Foucault (1979a: 30–31) calls the “history of the present.” I assemble the caricatures with an eye to how each public philosophy is understood (and deployed) today in the politics of immigration. Aspects that do not figure much or at all in current debates (for instance, the kind of unabashed Aryanism/Anti-Semitism that played such a critical role in the nationalist thinking of the first half of the twentieth century) will receive only passing mention in the caricatures. The same holds for dimensions of the three isms that do not pertain much to politics proper (for instance, the Romantic art associated with nationalism or the mark of postmodernism on contemporary literary criticism or architecture). The sources on which I draw to create the caricatures are the primary works of the thinkers treated as well as prominent secondary interpretations of those works.

I treat the public philosophies as political ideologies. I thus structure the caricatures in a way that facilitates analyzing them as performative discourses that do political work by legitimizing and advancing some concrete agendas as opposed to others (Schain 2012: 370–71; Schmidt 2010: 15–20). This interest in examining public philosophies not merely as theories but as real forces in the day-to-day politics of immigration—the ultimate aim of
the book—has a number of important consequences for the organization of the study.

In the first place, Chapter 2 is a service chapter, preparing the ground for the main analysis that takes place through four case studies carried out in subsequent chapters. These examine the following policy areas and the debates surrounding them: (1) citizenship (especially naturalization policy), (2) the so-called “headscarf controversy” (l’affaire du foulard), which has mushroomed beyond France to all corners of Europe, (3) secularism (mosque-state relations), and (4) domestic security (especially as it pertains to immigrants and refugees). The rationale for the choice of these four is explained further below. I can say at this juncture that each of the four studies focuses on persons of Muslim heritage residing (or seeking to reside) in Europe. Whether fairly or unfairly, they are the group around which the most controversy exists (Dancygier 2010: 286). As Anne Norton (2013: 2) observes, “The figure of the Muslim has become the axis where questions of political philosophy and political theology, politics and ethics meet.”

Second, I intend the caricatures to operate in a way analogous to Max Weber’s ideal type. They exist nowhere in real politics in the form in which they are represented in Chapter 2. However, formulating the public philosophies as pure theory (ideal types) generates heuristic devices that enable us to identify liberal, nationalist, and postmodern arguments or rationales when they are being deployed in politics. I must warn, however, that there is a limit to how much neat ordering the serious student of politics can do. Politics, especially democratic politics, tends to be messy. It is the nature, and perhaps even the beauty, of the beast (Blyth 2011). As intimated, many if not most political actors’ stances do not square neatly with the theories of liberalism, nationalism, or postmodernism. Most people’s beliefs are indeterminate, inconsistent, and mutable (Carstensen 2011; Geuss 2008: 2–6). Typically we encounter but fragments of the theories, and often fragments from two or more theories employed by a single actor or articulated in a single policy. It might irk some readers with a proclivity for consistency when I associate, say, Nicolas Sarkozy with a liberal position on one page and a nationalist one on another page. Inconsistent or not, the truth is that the former French president, like scores of other political actors, espouses normatively inconsistent or slippery positions.

Michael Freeden (1996: 37–41) maintains that just such inconsistency prompts many political theorists to shy away from the study of politics proper. Theorists scoff at the dumbing down and pandering by politicians. As a result, the conventional approach to the study of political philosophy has been to limit inquiry to the works of other political philosophers—essentially what I do in Chapter 2. I concur with Freeden that this convention regrettably relinquishes analysis at arguably the most important
point—namely, where political ideas become forces in real politics as opposed to mere ideas in thinkers’ minds. Pure theorizing about normative issues that pertain to immigration is far more advanced than the empirical investigation of how normative ideas affect politics (Schain 2012: 370; Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul 2008: 155; Koopmans et al. 2005: 150). Empiricists tend to steer clear of normative factors because they resist exact measurement and quantification. The impact of normative ideas on politics winds up in a no-man’s land neglected by both theorists and empiricists alike. “For too long,” complains Seyla Benhabib (2004: 143), “normative political theory and the political sociology of the modern state have gone their separate ways” (see also Bader 2007: 22). Several studies have pointed to the influence of normative factors on immigration policy, although accompanied by the claim that their impact demands deeper exploration (Sainsbury 2012: 277; Triandafyllidou 2010b: 2; Gest 2010: 65; Messina 2007: 76; Koopmans et al. 2005: 182–209; Sniderman, Hagendoorn, and Prior 2004; Lamont 2000: 9).

This study aspires to be a constructive piece in building the bridge across the normative-empirical divide. Doing so entails tracing what Freedon (1996: 37) calls the “morphology” of political ideologies from their inception in seminal minds to their development and further exposition by subsequent theorists to their application in politics by political actors. All three aspects of “how ideas go from individual thought to collective action” (Schmidt 2010: 15) are necessary to come to grips with how normative ideas weigh upon politics. This is a formidable challenge that prevents me from pursuing other intriguing and important avenues of inquiry. For one, I pay little attention to how agents acquire normative ideas. My accentuation of normative fragments would seem to suggest an instrumentalist approach that reads actors as rational agents who choose normative fragments with an eye to advancing perceived interests. But I do not exclude from possibility structuralist accounts whereby social structures, for instance, class, ethnicity, religion, gender, or geography, lead actors to adopt certain views rather than others. Institutionalist approaches, which hold that a major institution can in effect transfer a prevailing ideology to those who come into contact with it, are plausible as are other theories of socialization, such as the impact of family (see Bleich 2003: 188). The point to underline here is that I do not take a position in this study. I examine how ideas are deployed rather than acquired by political actors.

Needless to say, normative theories, fragmented or whole, are hardly the only forces at work in politics. Indeed, policy analysts have identified a range of nonnormative factors that color immigration policy. These include demographics (Koopmans, Michalowski, and Waibel 2012), health of the economy (Anderson 1996), political opportunity structures (Koopmans...
et al. 2005), international crises (Tichenor 2002), interstate politics (Betts 2011), media salience (Givens and Luedtke 2005), type of party in power (Goodman 2014), strength of radical right parties (Koopmans, Michalowski, and Waibel 2012), policy venues (Guiraudon 1998), level of government (Schmidtke and Zaslove 2014; Dancygier 2010; Money 1999), courts (Kawar 2015; Joppke and Torpey 2013), institutional and legal heritage (Goodman 2014; Brubaker 1992), history of colonialism (Howard 2009), political access (Dancygier 2010; Freeman 1995; Kriese et al. 1995), asymmetry of available resources (Smith 1999; Mann 1987; Castells 1975), ethnic origin (Rex 1996), type of political actor, such as (opportunistic, ideological) elected officials versus (pragmatic, problem-solving) administrators (Howard 2009; Ellermann 2009; Schain 2008), cross-national learning (Goodman 2014: 219; Astor 2014: 1728–29; Laurence 2012: 19), institutional habitus, such as school as opposed to hospital as opposed to military (Bowen et al. 2014a), and administrative rationality or “governmentality” (Cohen 2009: 116–25). I will allude to such factors as they seem relevant to a particular normative stance under examination. I want to make clear, however, that I undertake in these pages no systematic weighing of the various factors to determine precisely where normative influences fit into the overall equation. That obviously important effort exceeds the scope of this book (see Hampshire 2013: 51–54; Schain 2008; Tichenor 2002). My study deliberately spotlights but one dimension of the politics of immigration. I do not purport, then, to provide a full explanation of how a given policy becomes law or why a given political actor espouses the view(s) he or she does. I aim rather to show that fragmentation and fragilization in the normative sphere contribute to the “dizzying” complexity (Hampshire 2013: 132) and “the bewildering diversity” of immigration policies (Bader 2007: 26).