Intellectual Discourse

Volume 33 Special Issue 2025

Special Issue on

The Intersection of Theory, Identity, and Security in PCVE (Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism)

International Islamic University Malaysia
https://journals.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse/index.php/id

Intellectual Discourse

Volume 33 Special Issue 2025

Intellectual Discourse is a highly respected, academic refereed journal of the International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM). It is published twice a year by the IIUM Press, IIUM, and contains reflections, articles, research notes and review articles representing the disciplines, methods and viewpoints of the Muslim world.

Intellectual Discourse is abstracted in SCOPUS, WoS Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI), ProQuest, International Political Science Abstracts, Peace Research Abstracts Journal, Muslim World Book Review, Bibliography of Asian Studies, Index Islamicus, Religious and Theological Abstracts, ATLA Religion Database, MyCite, ISC and EBSCO.

ISSN 0128-4878 (Print); ISSN 2289-5639 (Online)

https://journals.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse/index.php/id
Email: intdiscourse@iium.edu.my; intdiscourse@yahoo.com

Published by:
IIUM Press, International Islamic University Malaysia
P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Phone (+603) 6196-5014, Fax: (+603) 6196-6298
Website:http://iiumpress.iium.edu.my/bookshop

Intellectual Discourse
Volume 33, Special Issue on
The Intersection of Theory, Identity, and Security in PCVE (Preventing & Countering Violent Extremism), 2025

Contents

Transliteration Table: Consonants

Arabic	Roman		Arabic	Roman
ب	b		ط	ṭ
ت	t		ظ	ẓ
ث	th		ع	‘
ج	j		غ	gh
ح	ḥ		ف	f
خ	kh		ق	q
د	d		ك	k
ذ	dh		ل	l
ر	r		م	m
ز	z		ن	n
س	s		ه	h
ش	sh		و	w
ص	ṣ		ء	’
ض	ḍ		ي	y

Transliteration Table: Vowels and Diphthongs

Arabic	Roman		Arabic	Roman
◌َ	a		◌ًا، ◌ًى	an
◌ُ	u		◌ٌو	un
◌ِ	i		◌ٍي	in
◌َا، ◌ٰ، ◌َى،	ā		◌َوْ	aw
◌ُو	ū		◌َيْ	ay
◌ِي	ī		◌ُوّ	uww, ū (in final position)
			◌ِيّ	iyy, ī (in final position)

Source: ROTAS Transliteration Kit: http://rotas.iium.edu.my

Intellectual Discourse, special issue 1 (2025) 159–181

ISSN 0128-4878 (Print); ISSN 2289-5639 (Online)

Recognition and Integration: Examining Multiculturalism's Role in Preventing Radicalisation

Muthanna Saari*

Abstract: This paper examines the relationship between sentiments of disenfranchisement and the radicalisation process among certain groups within society. Systematic social, economic and political discrimination, particularly against minorities, is argued to be among the primary driving factors in the radicalisation process. Multiculturalism, as a concept that recognises the differences amongst various segments of society whilst simultaneously requiring these diverse groups to integrate into existing societal structures. The notions of difference and diversity are pertinent in determining whether an individual or group experiences inclusion or exclusion from the broader society. This paper explores how Jürgen Habermas's concept of the politics of recognition could be applied within the framework of multiculturalism to prevent radicalisation. Specifically, the outcomes of multiculturalism will be assessed in light of the progressive recognition of different views and ideologies in ensuring universal human rights. In doing so, the paper will first critically examine the view that cultural differences associated with political identity do not necessarily facilitate the building of a coherent society. Secondly, it will consider the implications of multifarious elements of political recognition in preventing radicalisation. Finally, it will explore the ways in which multiculturalism can sustainably address the challenges of integration and assimilation within multicultural societies.

Keywords: multiculturalism, radicalisation, politics of recognition, integration and assimilation, disenfranchisement

---

* Fellow at the Faculty of Business and Economics, Universiti Malaya, and Doctoral researcher in International Development, University of Sussex, United Kingdom. Email: muthanna@um.edu.my

Abstrak: Kertas kerja ini mengkaji hubungan antara sentimen kehilangan hak dan proses radikalisasi dalam kalangan kumpulan tertentu dalam masyarakat. Diskriminasi sosial, ekonomi dan politik yang sistematik, khususnya terhadap minoriti, dihujahkan sebagai antara faktor pendorong utama dalam proses radikalisasi. Multikulturalisme, sebagai konsep yang mengiktiraf perbezaan di kalangan pelbagai segmen masyarakat pada masa yang sama memerlukan kumpulan yang pelbagai ini untuk diintegrasikan ke dalam struktur masyarakat sedia ada. Pengertian perbezaan dan kepelbagaian adalah penting dalam menentukan sama ada individu atau kumpulan mengalami pengalaman yang inklusif atau terkecuali daripada masyarakat yang lebih luas. Kertas kerja ini meneroka bagaimana konsep politik pengiktirafan Jürgen Habermas boleh digunakan dalam rangka kerja multikulturalisme untuk mencegah radikalisasi. Secara khusus, hasil multikulturalisme akan dinilai berdasarkan pengiktirafan progresif terhadap pandangan dan ideologi yang berbeza dalam memastikan hak asasi manusia sejagat. Dengan berbuat demikian, kertas kerja akan terlebih dahulu mengkaji secara kritis pandangan bahawa perbezaan budaya yang dikaitkan dengan identiti politik tidak semestinya memudahkan pembinaan masyarakat yang koheren. Kedua, ia akan mempertimbangkan implikasi pelbagai unsur pengiktirafan politik dalam mencegah radikalisasi. Akhir sekali, ia akan meneroka cara di mana kepelbagaian budaya boleh menangani cabaran integrasi dan asimilasi dalam masyarakat berbilang budaya secara mampan.

Kata kunci: Multikulturalisme, radikalisasi, politik pengiktirafan, integrasi dan asimilasi, kehilangan hak

Introduction

Little did people expect that a stabbing incident in Southport, England would trigger a mass violent riot regarded as the worst in the country's history in more than a decade. On 29 July 2024, a mass stabbing attack at a Taylor Swift-themed dance event killed three girls and injured ten others, eight of whom were children. The following day, while the nation was still in grief, violent protests broke out in the seaside town, hijacking the vigil held for the victims of the attack. Fuelled by misinformation claiming the suspect was an illegal migrant (Thomas & Sardarizadeh, 2024), the riot, agitated by far-right groups linked to English Defence League (EDL), quickly escalated to several towns across the country, charged with anti-immigrant and Islamophobic sentiments.

When the identity of the suspect was revealed as a 17-year-old Cardiff-born boy to Rwandan parents, the reality of resentment among

British society came to the fore. EDL—a far-right group founded to 'save the country' from Islam and immigrants—gained traction from this incident, capitalising on the social precariousness and identity crisis affecting the white working class (Sibley, 2021; Treadwell, 2013). The attack was not classified as terrorist despite the suspect facing a separate terror charge after being charged with numerous counts of murder and attempted murder. The terror charge was made after the suspect was found to possess a military study of an Al-Qaeda training manual, yet investigators believed he was not motivated by terrorist ideology in carrying out the stabbing (Martin, 2024).

Going back to when the war on terrorism heightened post-September 11, 2001, there had been pessimistic arguments about its effectiveness in stamping out global terrorism. Donald Rumsfeld, the then United States of America (US) Defence Secretary, critically asked if the world was producing terrorists faster than the US could kill or capture them (Krueger & Laitin, 2004). Correspondingly, Kruglanski et al. (2014) note that terrorism seems to imitate the mythical hydra, replicating its heads as replacements for those being chopped off. The apparent deadlock in defeating terrorism through war has led to an approach focused on tracing and reversing radicalisation, defined as "a movement in the direction of supporting or enacting radical behaviour" (Kruglanski et al., 2014, p. 70) as the root of terrorism.

Perhaps the fruit of the war on terrorism has engendered the uprisings in the Arab world a decade later. As Tariq Ramadan writes, possibly no one foresaw that the confiscation of Mohamed Bouazizi's wares in the street of the Tunisian town of Sidi Bouzid would trigger major protests that brought down and caused unrest to several Arab governments. He further suggests that various socio-economic and political factors such as poverty, economic adversity, unemployment, police repression, and oppressive rule created the tipping point that led Bouazizi to become so desperate as to self-immolate, which eventually caused his death (Ramadan, 2012). It is evident that discrimination affecting one's life, involving his or her economic and political identity in society can inevitably radicalise resentful individuals.

The lack of recognition for someone to live a life that he or she values most can be decisive in determining their level of participation in society. Multiculturalism, defined as "the coexistence within the same

political society of a number of sizeable cultural groups wishing and in principle able to maintain their distinct identity" (Raz, 1998, p. 197), could serve as a framework for social cohesion. Jürgen Habermas's notion of recognition for particular cultures and identities would be applicable in the multiculturalism framework as people of minority groups are included in the political society of their adopted country. As a driving policy for a multicultural society, multiculturalism aims to provide sufficient recognition to minority groups to prevent their disenfranchisement from mainstream society.

It is vital to keep all people of different groups engaged and represented, ensuring they are not marginalised by any structural discrimination by state apparatus. Additionally, ensuring rights for all, although problematic in the discourse of differences in society, should be the prime concern as it would also prevent resentment among these groups and reduce the risk of radicalisation. Therefore, this paper explores the ways in which multiculturalism acts as a driver to avoid the radicalisation process among people of different backgrounds in a multicultural society. The first section of this paper will examine how cultural differences associated with political identity affect the building of a coherent society. It will then consider how various factors affecting political recognition contribute to preventing radicalisation. Finally, it will explore how multiculturalism sustainably addresses the challenges of integration and assimilation in a multicultural society.

Cultural Differences

The question of integration in a culturally diverse society has always been discussed within multiculturalism concepts. As Grillo (2007) illustrates through the case of Mr. S, a Muslim who questioned whether integrating into British society meant he needed to stop praying or start going to the pub during his lunch break. The answer was clear: integration means coexisting with the host culture while maintaining one's own cultural practices. Perhaps integration in a multicultural society can best be described from 'Jenkins Formula 1966' of which formulated from the words of Roy Jenkins, the then Home Secretary of the United Kingdom (UK):

> "Integration is perhaps a rather loose word. I do not regard it as meaning the loss, by immigrants, of their own national

> characteristics and culture. I do not think we need in this country a 'melting-pot', which will turn everybody out in a common mould, as one of a series of carbon copies of someone's misplaced vision of the stereotyped Englishman […] I define integration, therefore, not as a flattening process of assimilation but as equal opportunity, accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance […] if we are to maintain any sort of world reputation for civilised living and social cohesion, we must get far nearer to its achievement than is the case today" (Jenkins, 1967, p. 267).

Difference and diversity are aspects that warrant serious attention within the multiculturalism framework. Colombo (2010) raises an interesting argument on how young migrants in Europe use their differences as a tool to keep their hopes alive. Differences have become instruments for inclusion and exclusion in constructing relationships and identity. These youths are proud of their origin whilst simultaneously feeling honoured to adopt the identity and culture of their country of residence. In this regard, difference is conceived either as closely associated with identity, especially when used to stress one's group characteristics, or as a 'dichotomous opposite' when it belongs to another group's attribute. Furthermore, difference has been manipulated as a political resource, both for greater participation and inclusion as well as to produce new forms of exclusion.

The idea of culture merged with ethnic identity is a form of identity politics. This conception poses a risk as culture is presumed to be the property of ethnic group, thus reifying the culture with boundary and distinctness (Turner, 1993). Turner (1993) argues that culture in a multiculturalist perspective is a collective social identity engaged in a struggle for equal opportunity. Culture in this context is not static and is subject to constant revision, which is not an end itself, but a means to an end. Therefore, culture as a collection of knowledge and belief systems could be dynamically constructed through shared understanding (Saari, 2019).

In the same vein, Ibrahim (2016) argues that the concept of culture should not be romanticised to past memory or even limited to the rites de passage of the past societal norms. In emphasising the need to see culture beyond an encyclopaedic knowledge, he refers to Antonio

Gramsci's idea of understanding culture as a creative process for a human to live meaningful lives,

> We must break the habit of thinking that culture is encyclopaedic knowledge whereby man [sic] is viewed as a mere container in which to pour and conserve empirical data or brute disconnected facts which he will have to subsequently pigeonhole in his brain as in the columns of a dictionary so as to be able to eventually respond to the varies stimuli of the external world. This form of culture is truly harmful…It only serves to create misfits, people who believe themselves superior to the rest of humanity because they have accumulated in their memory a certain quantity of facts and dates which they cough up at every opportunity to almost raise a barrier between themselves and others (Ibrahim, 2016, p. 235).

Heath and Demireva (2014) identify two main challenges for individuals or groups in a diverse society. Firstly, the maintenance of one's individual identity and secondly, the relationship with the larger society. These two aspects determine one's position in a multicultural society. A person is considered to have integrated into the community if they preserve their identity and characteristics whilst maintaining relationships with the larger society. Conversely, if they keep their identity but not their relationships with the larger society, they have segregated or separated themselves. A person is considered assimilated if they preserve relationships with the wider society whilst abandoning their identity. Finally, a person risks being marginalised by society if they maintain neither their relationships nor their identity.

These characterisations of an individual within a multicultural society can also be compared with the types of multiculturalism. Turner (1993) differentiates between critical multiculturalism and difference multiculturalism. The former is a type of multiculturalism which is not static and is open to a democratic culture, whilst the latter reduces culture to a tag for identity which flourishes separatism. These types of multiculturalism could be relevant to the categorisation of weak and strong multiculturalism, as introduced by Grillo (2007). Weak multiculturalism concerns recognising cultural differences in the private sphere with assimilation to the local population. Strong multiculturalism poses an opposite to weak multiculturalism, wherein differences in the

public sphere are institutionally recognised with special provisions granted in areas such as education, language, healthcare, welfare, as well as organisational representation along cultural lines (Grillo, 2007).

Notwithstanding, the categorisation of multiculturalism should be scrutinised to ensure it genuinely recognises the true diversity within society. Multiculturalism should not be skewed solely towards the ideal theory of recognising the plurality of society. The recognition must also come with an assurance that differences are given equal opportunity. There must not also be cultural hegemony from any dominant group over another. As Ibrahim (2016) rightly argues, multiculturalism brings the issue of empowerment and liberation, what Paulo Freire articulated as the act of culture that strives for freedom. Having the right understanding of multiculturalism would entail a sense of solidarity towards marginalised groups in society that come from different economic and social strata.

Heath and Demireva (2014) argue that multiculturalism policies have fostered parallel lives within societies, hence encouraging exclusion rather than inclusion. Critics of multiculturalism claim that such policies have led to radicalisation by bonding people to their groups rather than bridging individuals to the wider society. Multiculturalism policies have also been criticised for providing fertile soil for extremism. The findings from Heath and Demireva (2014), however, in referring to the in-group marriages and friendships of Pakistanis and Bangladeshis in the UK, show that although these numbers are relatively high, parallel lives are relatively uncommon because residential and workplace segregation is low. The intergenerational change among groups who had been granted special rights, such as Muslims and Sikhs, also did not show any clear pattern of entrenchment.

Multiculturalism in France has been practised differently. French secularism or *laïcité*, has proven to be the underlying conception of the country in accepting people of different backgrounds. Strict policies have been implemented in an attempt to conform to the *liberté, égalité, fraternité* motto which first appeared during the French Revolution. Individuals who become French citizens by choice are obliged to assimilate with society. The assimilation policy is problematic as it requires a cultural uniformity. Muslims in France, in particular, find the assimilation policy conflicts with their religious and cultural values,

thus resulting in their reluctance to fully embrace French 'identity' (Franz, 2007).

The situation has been exacerbated by the state-sponsored ghettoisation policy whereby migrant families are situated in certain residential areas. Far from the city, poor suburbs, estates and industrial enclaves become the settlement for migrant families. Therefore, when riots erupted in the suburbs (*banlieues*) of Paris and some other towns (*communes*) in 2005, the participants were mostly immigrant-origin youth (Rattansi, 2011). These suburbs and towns were also characterised by high unemployment and low education levels. The rioters complained about social living conditions and discrimination against their ethnicity. Franz (2007) suggests that these second and third generations of migrants have been disenfranchised by official French policies, leaving them with a feeling of double exclusion based on both ethnic and economic factors.

In the UK, albeit with a slightly better multiculturalism policy compared to other European countries, multiculturalism is seen as fashionable practices whereby certain parts are accepted, whilst the more challenging and important aspects of Muslim identity remain undiscussed. The aspect of faith, which is most essential for Muslims, has often been left out. For example, women's participation in sports has been hindered by the failure to accommodate their faith-related needs. A report on British Muslim women in sports found that the lack of women-only spaces or facilities was a major barrier preventing them from participating in sports (Muslimah Sports Association, 2014). Ziauddin Sardar identified two main obstacles for the development of true multiculturalism: firstly, the Western hegemonic nature of liberal individualism, which cannot be reconciled with the idea of multiculturalism; and secondly, the failure of multiculturalism to be a transformative tool for political and cultural change in society, hence challenging Western liberal values (Modood & Ahmad, 2007).

The idea of belonging and excessive attachment to a particular set of culture and norms can reduce the ability to understand and use differences in context. Colombo (2010) suggests three ideas of belonging: admittance, involvement, and identification. Admittance concerns being accepted without discrimination based on differences. Equal opportunities for personal capabilities should be considered

rather than treating people unfairly due to differences. Involvement represents another level of participation within the larger society. It concerns actual recognition rather than mere acceptance, where proper recognition entails full rights to participate and unhesitatingly use differences for expression. Finally, identification is the idea of belonging that intensify the essentialist dimension in which differences form an identity. Acknowledged identity would promote expression of thought according to common roots.

In discussing the theory of politics of recognition, Jürgen Habermas relates it to the claim of individual rights for the recognition of collective identities. The struggle for recognition, in his argumentation, is the phenomenon of certain groups defending themselves against oppression, marginalisation and disrespect. In this regard, women, ethnic and cultural minorities, nations and cultures are groups struggling for recognition of collective identities. Although each group experiences similar discrimination and misunderstanding, they represent different dimension for recognition (Habermas, 1994).

Habermas explicates the differences in claims for recognition between feminism, multiculturalism, nationalism, and the struggle against the Eurocentric heritage of colonialism. Feminism, for example, opposed a dominant culture that interprets sexes in ways that deny equal rights (Habermas, 1994). Therefore, feminists approach their cause through the actualisation and contextualisation of their experiences in the struggle for political recognition (Saari, 2019). In contrast, with the struggle of oppressed ethnic and cultural minorities, the majority's revised understanding of minority claims does not incontrovertibly change their role in the same way that reinterpretation of the sexes changes the role of men (Habermas, 1994).

It is worth mentioning Charles Taylor's classical work on the politics of recognition in deliberating the theory of difference and recognition. In his essay, he begins with "[a] number of strands in contemporary politics turn on the need, sometimes the demand, for recognition" (Taylor, 1994, p. 75). This demand for recognition has become the galvanising force not only for nationalists but also for minority or 'subaltern groups', which is identified as the politics of multiculturalism. Taylor (1994) points out that identity is, to some extent, determined by the presence or

absence of recognition. In many instances, the misrecognition by others has resulted in unfavourable consequences for individuals.

The politics of recognition that Taylor advocates entails two different ways of perceiving recognition: firstly, the politics of equal dignity and, secondly, the politics of difference. The former is designated for universally the same set of rights and entitlements, whilst the latter recognises someone's unique identity to mark their distinctness from everyone else. Nevertheless, these two modes of politics are neither unproblematic nor beyond reproach. In disapproving of the politics of difference, the politics of equal dignity accuses the former of violating the principle of non-discrimination. On the other hand, the politics of difference denounces the politics of equal dignity as "forcing people into a homogenous mo[u]ld that is untrue to them" (Taylor, 1994, p. 84).

The politics of equal dignity, in the sense of granting equal rights and opportunities, could be equated with John Rawls's principle of justice as fairness. Argued to be the most egalitarian theory on justice, Rawls constructed the theory within the notion that people are free and equal, and that society should be fair. In the theory of justice, Rawls covered the framework for political and economic equality among citizens. Justice as fairness entails that the "original position of equality corresponds to the state of nature in the traditional theory of the social contract" (Rawls, 1971, p. 12). The theory has been helpful from the standpoint of ensuring a fair and equal society. Concepts of 'the original position' and the 'veil of ignorance' in this theory have been constructed to address the complexity of society with its varied backgrounds.

In essence, the principle aspires to ensure equality of opportunity and arrange social and economic inequalities to benefit the least advantaged people (Wenar, 2017). The theory can be identified in two components: first, thought to be strictly equal and difference-blind and, secondly, argued to be advancing the politics of difference. Through these concepts, Rawls applies a hypothetical approach in 'forcing' everyone to adopt a system which would ensure justice for all (Baharom, 2019). Therefore, Rawls has practically formulated how "a just and stable society of free and equal citizens" could be built from diverse and opposing backgrounds (Baumeister, 2000, p. 49). Nonetheless, from a libertarian perspective of individual rights and minimal state, Robert Nozick criticises Rawls's theory of justice by questioning the need for social cooperation and the terms imposed for this cooperation.

He instead proposes the entitlement theory whereby an individual's acquisition is entitled to its holding, further questioning "why isn't the appropriate (not an inappropriate) set of holdings just the one which *actually occurs* via this process of mutually-agreed-to exchanges whereby people choose to give to others what they are entitled to give or hold?" (Nozick, 1974, pp. 186-187).

Political Recognition in Preventing Radicalisation Process

As was pointed out in the introduction to this paper, political recognition for people of different backgrounds has been shown to influence people's satisfaction levels in society. Without proper recognition, people may become resentful of their abject conditions and societal position. Such situations serve a delicate case for radicalisation process to take place among these people. This premise aligns with the focal goal commitment of terrorists, which can determine the degrees of radicalisation. The underlying motivation for terrorist acts has been identified as the quest for personal significance, which represents "the fundamental desire to matter, to be someone, to have respect" (Kruglanski et al., 2014, p. 73).

The psychological trait to prove one's significance can explain an individual's radicalisation process. Kruglanski et al. (2014) effectively outline the psychological construct of the radicalisation process, which centres around the significance quest. The importance of managing personal significance can be illustrated through opportunities for significance gain or loss, which are often associated with disrespect towards one's social identity. It is worth noting that reversing radicalisation, or deradicalisation, might require the perception that one's significance goal has been fulfilled. Whilst it is not conclusive in determining radicalisation factors, the process involves an interactive framework comprising three elements: the goal of significance, the means to achieve significance, and the social process through which the goal and means are implemented.

The quest for significance has been theorised as a response to societal discontentment due to multifarious factors, including the psychological need to feel respected, recognised and valued in society. In a study conducted by Jasko et al. (2020) on the effects of the quest for significance on violent extremism demonstrated that individual and collective significance quests yield different outcomes. Their findings revealed a positive correlation between individuals seeking

personal significance and violent extremism, irrespective of their level of commitment to the cause. Furthermore, the collective quest for significance emerged as a strong predictor for violent extremism, even among individuals in less radical networks. The study also found that collective action and relative collective deprivation serve as more precise predictors than relative personal deprivation.

The states of deprivation, marginalisation, discrimination and recognition in society require careful attention for preventing radicalisation. Economic marginalisation and deprivation, which constitutes a political-economic approach, appeared to be major factors in terrorist acts (Mubarok & Hamid, 2018). Following the 2001 riots in Burnley, Oldham and Bradford involving youths of different ethnicities, the British government's commissioned investigations revealed that systematic policies had led to low employment levels and limited economic opportunities for ethnic minorities (Rattansi, 2011).

A comparable situation occurred in France in 2005, where the disenfranchisement of ethnic minorities stemmed largely from systematic and policy-based discrimination, along with their treatment as second-class French citizens. In response to riots that erupted in suburbs surrounding Paris, Lyons, Toulouse, Lille and other cities, the French government took swift action by re-establishing subsidies to local associations and rectifying its anti-discrimination policies, particularly for residents in these areas (Franz, 2007). Whilst some might simplistically blame multiculturalism without total assimilation for such unrest, the economic and social deprivations experienced by ethnic minority youths were the primary factors driving their demands for equal treatment.

In the Netherlands, multicultural policy has been accused of fostering radicalisation among ethnic minorities. This is exemplified by the case of Mohammed B., a Dutch of Moroccan origin who assassinated Theo Van Gogh, the filmmaker of *Submission,* a film that projected negative perceptions of Islam. For context, the early Dutch version of multiculturalism encouraged cultural preservation among ethnic minority communities. This evolved to include Westernised versions of Islam developed by these communities, which embraced principles such as individual freedom and equality (Rattansi, 201). However, this progress was derailed in the 2000s, particularly after

9/11, which revived earlier concerns about conflicts between Dutch and non-European minorities. Mohammed B.'s case exemplifies the incompleteness of multicultural policy; whilst group cultural rights were granted, anti-discrimination policies in the labour market were neglected.

However, more recent incidents of radicalisation within British multicultural society have somewhat called into question the effectiveness of such policies. In May 2017, a bombing at an Ariana Grande concert in Manchester Arena killed 22 people and injured hundreds. The suicide attack was carried out by Salman Abedi, who died in the explosion, having made the bomb at home with his brother, Hashim Abedi. According to the Public Inquiry into the attack, the key findings regarding his radicalisation journey indicated it was "primarily driven by noxious absences and malign presences. Noxious absences included a prolonged disengagement from mainstream English education and parental absence" (House of Commons, 2023, p. 3).

Similarly, the London suicide bombings of July 2005, which killed 52 people and injured 770 others, were carried out by 4 British nationals. The causes of radicalisation among these attackers remained concerning, as reports suggested that "the threat is as likely to come from those who appear well assimilated into mainstream UK society, with jobs and young families, as from those within socially or economically deprived sections of the community" (Intelligence and Security Committee, 2006. p. 29). The context of their radicalisation was summarised thus: "Some have been well-educated, some less so. Some genuinely poor, some less so. Some apparently well integrated in the UK, others not" (House of Commons, 2006, p. 31).

In summary, it has been shown from this section that malign neglect in the socio-economic sphere can prove fatal in the radicalisation of individuals. Various incidents in the UK and France in 2005 highlighted the need for policies that are inclusive of all citizens, providing equal opportunities in socio-economic activities and political identification. In the varied types of multicultural societies that exist worldwide, multicultural policy offers a potential solution for building social cohesion among people of different ethnicities and backgrounds. Therefore, as Raz (1998) suggests, a new mindset must be adopted that avoids dichotomising societies into majority and minority groups,

instead viewing them as "a plurality of cultural groups" (p. 197). Similarly, Modood (2003) advocates for the articulation of a plural 'us' instead of a 'them', transforming people from sojourners to be part of the future.

Integration and Assimilation of a Multicultural Society

Having discussed recognition and difference, the final section of this paper addresses the issues of integration and assimilation of a multicultural society. It must be noted that multiculturalism has attracted significant criticism. The practice has been accused of fostering and encouraging separate living by recognising the differences between various groups in society. Recognition of differences has been blamed for leading to exclusion rather than inclusion in the wider society and has been identified as a potential basis for radicalisation. Multicultural policy has also been accused of creating tension and suspicion between majority and minority groups (Heath & Demireva, 2014).

Liberal concepts of multiculturalism imply that individual rights take precedence over collective rights. This relates to debates about whether groups or only individuals are entitled to be rights claimants. These debates arose from questions about how to account for rights violations when the rights holder is a group rather than an individual. Will Kymlicka proposes group-differentiated rights as the solution to "enable individuals to form and maintain the various groups and associations", noting that many forms of these rights are individually exercised (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 26). He further argues that group-differentiated rights would address the vulnerability of minority groups against the economic and political decisions of the larger society.

Examining the details of the group-differentiated rights advocated by Kymlicka, it is worth noting that these rights aim to either guarantee rights within groups or secure external protections. First, special group representation rights ensure that minority groups would not face discrimination in country-wide decisions. Second, self-government rights emphasise the devolution of power to prevent minority groups from being side-lined by policy-related decisions of the majority. Third, polyethnic rights target specific religious and cultural practices that might be inadequately protected under normal societal arrangements. Granting these rights to minority groups allows each group to be treated

equally whilst reducing its vulnerability against the larger society (Kymlicka, 1995).

The categorisation of multiculturalism, as it relates to the relationship between individuals and their society, provides insight into how multiculturalism might prevent radicalisation. The extent to which multiculturalism is understood and practised influences inter-group relationships in a multicultural society. This encompasses the sense of recognition and empowerment of different groups, which could influence radicalisation thinking. Furthermore, the relationship between different groups in society raises issues of integration and assimilation into the larger society. This remains a contentious point in multicultural debates, as questions persist about ideal practices for multi-ethnic society co-existence. The prevalent narrative often advocates for uniformed practices and culture across all groups to maintain the cultural authority of the majority, though this is not necessarily the optimal approach.

From the perspective of receiving society, integration is a long-lasting process of including and accepting minority groups into core institutions and working environments. For migrants and minority groups, integration represents "the process of learning a new culture, acquisition of rights, access to positions and statuses" and the mutual process of building relationships between receiving and immigration societies (Grillo, 2007, p. 983). This understanding of integration relates to the Jenkins Formula mentioned earlier, which emphasises mutual tolerance. Therefore, integration should be viewed as a two-way process in which both the larger society and migrants or minorities adapt to each other. This mutual understanding was exemplified during the Salman Rushdie affair, where the concept of consent from both parties was brought forward to address questions of political community membership (Parekh, 1990).

In the context of British Muslim society, Abbas (2011) argues that the inherent value of a group and its importance are essential within a society of different ethnic and religious groups. While opportunities, recognition, and to a certain extent acceptance from the larger society are required, Muslims as a minority group need to maintain confidence in their beliefs and values. Multiculturalism can contribute to social cohesion when it acknowledges shared citizenship with common universal values as the binding force, and more importantly, when

allegiance to this citizenship is not hampered by ethnic belonging. In his example, the idea of 'Britishness' or 'Englishness' need not be developed within the preoccupied norms and values of being white and Anglo-Saxon (Abbas, 2011).

Integration from a multiculturalist perspective does not necessarily require cultural uniformity. It does not demand that minority groups with different ethnic backgrounds relinquish their culture, heritage, and language entirely. They should be permitted to maintain their cultural differences to preserve their connection with their roots. Granting minority groups their cultural rights enhance their profile in a multicultural society. However, this raises the question: what is the purpose of integration if these minority groups are not fully incorporated into the larger society? This question is best answered by reflecting on the concept of mutual tolerance in the two-way process of integrating minorities into the existing society.

Whilst cultural differences are recognised and maintained, there are notable concerns that minorities might seek to recreate their own societal culture. To the larger society, it may appear that these groups are demanding national rights to legitimately claim their cultural rights. However, as demonstrated in many multicultural societies, this is not the case. Kymlicka (1995), in his defence of minority rights, distinguished between the recognition of polyethnic rights that he advocated and the separate societal culture among minorities that worried the larger society. The sentiment of apparent threat from granting these rights to minority groups is possibly one reason why multiculturalism is deplored, as demonstrated by the emergence of the EDL and its ferocious responses. This may cause mainstream society to become adamant about pushing for total assimilation into the established society.

The case of ethnic revival in American history reinforces the belief that differentiated rights might threaten social coherence. What began as an attempt to express distinctive characteristics of minorities escalated to demands for group-based ameliorative action, challenging certain socially accepted aspects. Although minorities were recognised as ethnic groups rather than national minorities, the ethnic revival challenged the notion of integration. The integration process was condemned for oppressing these ethnic groups, resulting in demands

not only for recognition of separate ethnic institutions but also for self-determination within the existing mainstream society.

However, this does not present the complete picture of integration. Only a fraction of minority groups caused anxiety among mainstream society through their demands for national rights. Indeed, hostility towards these claims from minorities could result in ignorance of these groups' existence. Even when their existence is recognised, what Michael Walzer and Nathan Glazer termed as "benign neglect" could indirectly jeopardise the status of minority groups in society (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 64). Despite sentiment against ethnic revival, it should be noted that contemporary ethnic revival involves revising integration practices rather than rejecting integration entirely. In this regard, as Kymlicka (1995) points out, ethnic revival aims to make ethnic identity an acceptable part of mainstream society.

Multiculturalism, for that reason, provides a means to address the integration of minority groups into the mainstream community. Polyethnicity demands signify ethnic groups' readiness to participate in the larger society, thus making integration a process of inclusion. Allowing minorities to maintain certain practices is not intended to exclude these groups or separate them from mainstream society. Rather, it accommodates them by enabling adjustments to mainstream society's institutions and structures for better integration. If multiculturalism contributes one thing to multicultural integration, it is the tolerance for diversity that breaks away from a homogenous society.

The underlying principle of integration in multiculturalism is to bring people of all different backgrounds together. As Modood (1998, p. 396) writes: "the goal of democratic multiculturalism cannot and should not be cultural neutrality but, rather, the inclusion of marginal and disadvantaged groups, including religious communities in public life." Integration and differences are intrinsically linked to equal treatment of rights in society. It must be recognised that people who are different require different treatment to ensure they are placed in comparable positions. In *The Constitution of Liberty,* Hayek (1960, p. 86) argues that "uniformity theory of human nature would undermine basic ideals of freedom", thus inferring that individual differences are crucial in determining one's worth in society.

In contrast to integration, assimilation in a multicultural society appears to offer a different solution for achieving social cohesion. Assimilation is portrayed as minimising the disturbance caused by minority groups to the society they are settling in. It is fundamentally a one-way process designed to ensure that assimilating people become as similar as possible to their compatriots (Modood, 2011). This results in assimilation being viewed as a process whereby a minority individuals must surrender their native culture to merge with the majority society, even if this places them in an inferior and disadvantaged position (Alba, 1999). Although contemporary practice considers assimilation "impractical, illiberal and inegalitarian" (Modood, 2011, p. 4), its early formative phase represented a form of liberation from rigid bonds of group loyalty (Alba, 1999).

The penchant for uniform and unified cultural practices in society has consistently driven the thinking behind assimilating people of different backgrounds into one entity. However, this notion does not necessarily yield the intended outcome, as exemplified by France's case, where assimilation policy has been contentiously challenged and met with resistance. Whilst the desire for a common culture and understanding is not entirely invalid, the conception must not be taken out of proportion. In his analysis of the importance of sharing a common culture, Joseph Raz identifies that common culture should not be understood as requiring common ethnicity, language or religion. Instead, what matters is people's ability to identify with political society to which they belong (Raz, 1998).

Integration remains fundamental to multiculturalist practice as it provides greater self-identification with cultural characteristics whilst simultaneously valuing good relationships with mainstream society. In this context, one's identification with political society is essential, as Raz elucidates: "first, identification involves a sense of belonging, of being a part of a larger whole; second, people identify with a variety of groupings and institutions; third, identification with a political society does not replace, but incorporates identification with other groups in that society" (Raz, 1998, p. 203). Furthermore, the balance between integration and diversity should be understood in the context of mutual efforts between both host and new groups in society, as "without empowering the disempowered, the various ethnic, cultural, religious and gender divisions will remain, if not intensify" (Abbas, 2007, p. 297).

Conclusion

Multicultural policy, as extensively discussed, encompasses sensitive issues concerning relationships between different groups in society. It is not merely a fashionable approach with a sleight of hand to deceive people of different groups with token recognition without substantial impact in society. The challenges in managing relationships between different groups in society involve people's tendency to associate their identification with asserting their position in society. This is where multiculturalism addresses the issues of difference, diversity, integration and assimilation for people of different backgrounds. The issue of cultural identity among different groups is typified by the extent to which the maintenance of group identities and cultures can avoid the reification of culture with rigid ethnic identity boundaries, as Floya Anthias points out: "debates on cultural diversity confuse culture and ethnicity […] Is it the boundaries that should be kept or the cultural art[e]facts that act as their barbed wire?" (Yuval-Davis, 1997, pp. 197-198).

There is a substantial correlation between recognising differences and adopting integration processes in a multicultural society with tendencies towards radicalisation. The inclusion of minority groups into mainstream society is crucial for social cohesion, as the sense of disenfranchisement among minority groups could be manipulated towards radicalisation. This paper has critically discussed the extent to which multicultural policy and practice for society with different backgrounds can diminish the temptation towards radicalisation. Multiculturalism has addressed the issue of cultural differences and their identification in political society to achieve the best possibility for a coherent society. It is also pertinent to acknowledge the importance of political, social and economic recognition for these groups to ensure no room for radicalisation can be exploited.

Integration constitutes an essential element within multicultural discussion. Through integration, minority groups can be accommodated with proper treatment that regards them as inclusive members of mainstream society. It must also be noted that integration cannot be one-dimensional, as this would risk emboldening resentment among the wider society. Therefore, the extent to which differing communities integrate to become part of mainstream society would diminish factors

contributing to radicalisation. The issue of integration remains an intriguing one that could be usefully explored in further study. The dynamic nature of current society requires additional studies regarding the way in which integration is understood, thus limiting opportunities for radicalisation to take place within a coherent and integrated society.

REFERENCES

Abbas, T. (2007). Muslim minorities in Britain: Integration, multiculturalism and radicalism in the post-7/7 period. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *28*(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256860701429717

Abbas, T. (2011). *Islamic radicalism and multicultural politics: The British experience*. Routledge.

Alba, R. (1999). Immigration and the American realities of assimilation and multiculturalism. *Sociological Forum, 14*(1), 3–25.

Baharom, H. (2019). *Perihal keadilan: Tinjauan wacana keadilan moden*. SIRD.

Baumeister, A. T. (2000). *Liberalism and the politics of difference*. Edinburgh University Press.

Cantle, T. (2001). *Community cohesion: A report of the independent review team chaired by Ted Cantle*. United Kingdom Home Office. https://tedcantle.co.uk/pdf/communitycohesion%20cantlereport.pdf

Colombo, E. (2010). Crossing differences: How young children of immigrants keep everyday multicultural alive. *Cultural Anthropology, 31*(5), 455–470. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2010.513081

Franz, B. (2007). Europe's Muslim youth: An inquiry into the politics of discrimination, relative deprivation, and identity formation. *Mediterranean Quarterly, 18*(1), 89–112. https://doi.org/10.1215/10474552-2006-036

Grillo, R. (2007). An excess to alterity? Debating difference in a multicultural society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 979–998. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599424

Habermas, J. (1994). Struggles for recognition in the democratic constitutional state. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism* (pp. 107–148). Princeton University Press.

Hayek, F. A. (1960). *The constitution of liberty*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Heath, A., & Demireva, N. (2014). Has multiculturalism failed in Britain? *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 37*(1), 161–180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.808754

House of Commons. (2006). *Report of the official account of the bombings in London on 7th July 2005* (HC 1087). House of Commons. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7c7bc840f0b626628ac62e/1087.pdf

House of Commons. (2023). *Manchester Arena inquiry volume 3: Radicalisation and preventability. Report of the Public Inquiry into the Attack on Manchester Arena on 22nd May 2017* (HC 1137). House of Commons. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/63ff865ae90e0740dc92d1d8/MAI_Final_PDF_Volume_3.pdf

Ibrahim, A. (2016). *Menyanggah belenggu: Kerancuan fikiran masakini*. SIRD.

Intelligence and Security Committee. (2006). *Report into the London terrorist attacks on 7 July 2005* (CM 6785). Intelligence and Security Committee. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7c470140f0b62dffde1050/isc_terrorist_attacks_7july_report.pdf

Jasko, K., Webber, D., Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Taufiqurrohman, M., Hettiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2020). Social context moderates the effects of quest for significance on violent extremism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 118*(6), 1165–1187. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000198

Jenkins, R. (1967). *Essays and speeches by Roy Jenkins* (A. Lester, Ed.). Collins.

Krueger, A. B., & Laitin, D. D. (2004). "Misunderestimating" terrorism: The state department's big mistake. *Foreign Affairs*, *83*(5), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.2307/20034063

Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Bélanger, J. J., Sheveland, A., Hetiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2014). The psychology of radicalization and deradicalization: How significance quest impacts violent extremism. *Political Psychology, 35*, 69–93. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12163

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford University Press.

Martin, A-C. (2024, October 30). *Why is the Southport stabbing not being classed as a terror attack?* Independent. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/southport-stabbing-axel-rudakubana-terror-charge-ricin-b2638251.html

Modood, T. (1998). Anti-essentialism, multiculturalism and the 'recognition' of religious groups. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 6*(4), 378–399. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00060

Modood, T. (2003). Muslims and the politics of difference. *The Political Quarterly, 74*(S1), 100–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2003.00584.x

Modood, T. (2011). *Multiculturalism and integration: Struggling with confusions*. European University Institute. https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/mars/source/resources/references/others/38%20-%20Multiculturalisme%20and%20Integration%20-%20Modood%202011.pdf

Modood, T., & Ahmad, F. (2007). British Muslim perspectives on multiculturalism. *Theory, Culture & Society, 24*(2), 187–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276407075005

Mubarok, M. Z., & Abdul Hamid, A. F. (2018). The rise of radicalism and terrorism in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Review of Islam in Southeast Asia, 1*(1), 29–43.

Muslimah Sports Association. (2014). *Muslim women in sport report.* Muslimah Sports Association. https://mcusercontent.com/9ff512b2c4b15839ae339461f/files/0af3dd9e-0529-4e4a-156c-387635725a7f/MSA_Reserach_Report.pdf

Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. Basic Books.

Parekh, B. (1990). The Rushdie affair: Research agenda for political philosophy. *Political Studies, 38*(4), 695–709. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1990.tb01511.x

Ramadan, T. (2012). *Islam and the Arab awakening*. Oxford University Press.

Rattansi, A. (2011). *Multiculturalism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Raz, J. (1998) Multiculturalism. *Ratio Juris, 11*(3), 193–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9337.00086

Saari, M. (2019). *Hak asasi manusia dan persoalan budaya*. ILHAM Books.

Sibley, A. (2021). What attracts people to the English Defence League and who is most vulnerable to recruitment? In K. Bhui, & D. Bhugra (Eds.), *Terrorism, violent radicalisation, and mental health* (pp. 53–64). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780198845706.003.0005

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 75–106). Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Thomas, E., & Sardarizadeh, S. (2024, October 25). *How a deleted LinkedIn post was weaponised and seen by millions before the Southport riot*. BBC News. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c99v90813j5o

Treadwell, J. (2013). The English Defence League and the counter jihad: James Treadwell asks whether precariousness is a factor in extremist violence. *Criminal Justice Matters*, *93*(1), 8–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/09627251.2013.833754

Turner, T. (1993). Anthropology and multiculturalism: What is anthropology that multiculturalists should be mindful of it? *Cultural Anthropology, 8*(4), 411–429.

Wenar, L. (2021, April 12). *John Rawls*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). Ethnicity, gender relations and multiculturalism. In P. Werbner, & T. Modood (Eds.), *Debating cultural hybridity: Multi-cultural identities and the politics of anti-racism* (pp. 193–208). Zed Books.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

Intellectual Discourse is an academic, refereed journal, published twice a year. Four types of contributions are considered for publication in this journal: major articles reporting findings of original research; review articles synthesising important deliberations related to disciplines within the domain of Islamic sciences; short research notes or communications, containing original ideas or discussions on vital issues of contemporary concern, and book reviews; and brief reader comments, or statements of divergent viewpoints.

To submit manuscript, go to http://www.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse

The manuscript submitted to Intellectual Discourse should not have been published elsewhere, and should not be under consideration by other publications. This must be stated in the covering letter.

1. Original research and review articles should be 5,000-8,000 words while research notes 3,000-4,000 words, accompanied by an abstract of 100-150 words. Book review should be 1,000-1,500 words.
2. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with a 1-inch (2.5 cm) margins. Use 12-point Times New Roman font.
3. Manuscripts should adhere to the *American Psychological Association* (APA) style*,* latest edition.
4. The title should be as concise as possible and should appear on a separate sheet together with name(s) of the author(s), affiliation(s), and the complete postal address of the institute(s).
5. A short running title of not more than 40 characters should also be included.
6. Headings and sub-headings of different sections should be clearly indicated.
7. References should be alphabetically ordered. Some examples are given below:

Book
In-text citations:
Al-Faruqi & al-Faruqi (1986)

Reference:
Al-Faruqi, I. R., & al-Faruqi, L. L. (1986). *The cultural atlas of Islam*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Chapter in a Book
In-text:
Alias (2009)

Reference:
Alias, A. (2009). Human nature. In N. M. Noor (Ed.), *Human nature from an Islamic perspective: A guide to teaching and learning* (pp.79-117). Kuala Lumpur: IIUM Press.

Journal Article
In-text:
Chapra (2002)

Reference:
Chapra, M. U. (2002). Islam and the international debt problem. *Journal of Islamic Studies, 10*, 214-232.

The Qur'ān
In-text:
(i) direct quotation, write as 30:36
(ii) indirect quotation, write as Qur'ān, 30:36

Reference:
The glorious Qur'ān. Translation and commentary by A. Yusuf Ali (1977). US: American Trust Publications.

Ḥadīth
In-text:
(i) Al-Bukhārī, 88:204 (where 88 is the book number, 204 is the ḥadīth number)
(ii) Ibn Hanbal, vol. 1, p. 1

Reference:
(i) Al-Bukhārī, M. (1981). *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.
(ii) Ibn Ḥanbal, A. (1982). *Musnad Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal*. Istanbul: Cagri Yayinlari.

The Bible
In-text:
Matthew 12:31-32

Reference:
The new Oxford annonated Bible. (2007). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Transliteration of Arabic words should follow the style indicated in ROTAS Transliteration Kit as detailed on its website (http://rotas.iium.edu.my/?Table_of_Transliteration), which is a slight modification of ALA-LC (Library of Congress and the American Library Association) transliteration scheme. Transliteration of Persian, Urdu, Turkish and other scripts should follow ALA-LC scheme.

IIUM Press (Marketing Unit)
Research Management Centre
International Islamic University Malaysia
P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Phone (+603) 6196-5014, Fax: (+603) 6196-4862
E-mail: intdiscourse@iium.edu.my; intdiscourse@yahoo.com.
Website: http://iiumpress.iium.edu.my/bookshop

In This Issue

ISSN 0128-4878 (Print)

ISSN 2289-5639 (Online)

ISSN 0128-4878

2289 5639