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About the Project:
SOMI: The Securitization of Migrant Integration

For the last four years, the Securitization of Migrant Integration (SOMI) project has brought together researchers from both sides of the Atlantic. Their goal is to examine the effects of securitization on migrant perceptions of discrimination - and their subsequent responses in terms of conventional and unconventional political mobilization. Securitization relates to a broad array of measures, ranging from restrictive border controls to neo-assimilationist policies of integration, that commonly construe immigrants and their descendants as potential threats to safety, social cohesion or national identity. These policies have generally elicited negative reactions among migrant communities. Yet many studies treat migrants as passive in the face of such measures. The evidence, however, reveals that they are not. While some groups choose to remain passive, others respond in a variety of ways.

Based on that simple insight, the members of the SOMI project team have attempted to piece together both a description of the ways that different groups react and why they respond the ways that they do. Both the academic and the policy implications of such a study may offer significant insights. Attempting to study this dynamic process raises several specific questions that SOMI’s researchers have sought to address. What are the levels of acceptance of these policies among targeted migrant communities? What is the impact of perceived discrimination on group identity and religiosity in these communities? And to what extent have discriminatory measures fostered alienation and resentment, stimulating various types of mobilization and possibly even violent protest? In order to address these questions, SOMI’s team of researchers focused on studying the attitudes and responses of five migrant populations that have been the target of security measures: Muslims and Hispanics in the United States; and Muslims, Sikhs and Nigerians in the United Kingdom.

The overarching objectives of the project were to study the mobilization (or lack thereof) of migrant and minority organizations, as well as to explain why various groups react differently to the same security measures. The project examined a panoply of mobilization responses to securitization, ranging from passivity to protest politics, democratic engagement and even radicalization.

Figure 1. Patterns of Mobilization

Figure 1 illustrates alternative patterns of mobilization, both conventional and unconventional. It charts both the form and intensity of mobilization, and the varied choices that these patterns entail. It details the relationship between the two forms of mobilization and provided a framework for SOMI’s research in examining how varied communities contemplate and implement their responses to security measures.
About Sc. Po

Sciences Po (ScPo), based in Paris, is a renowned university in the social sciences, internationally recognized for the quality of its research and teaching. It's overarching mission includes educating future leaders in the public, private and non-profit sectors. With an academic community of more than 200 core faculty members and 4,000 lecturers drawn from the professional world, the knowledge transmitted to students is both nurtured by its innovative research and rooted in the career experience of its staff. The student body of 13,000 is recruited from nearly 150 countries, nearly 30% of whom receive financial support.

About CEVIPOF

The CEVIPOF (Center for Political Research) is one of Sciences Po's ten research centers. Thirty experts conduct individual or collaborative research in two main programs. The first focuses on political attitudes, behavior and parties; the second examines political thought and the history of ideas. Major projects, lasting for up to four years, are interdisciplinary and commonly transcend conventional research fields.

About CREW (Centre for Research on the English-Speaking World)

CREW (EA4399) brings together three research centers that investigate society and culture in the English-speaking world. The main areas of research deal with the economy in the English-speaking world (CERVEPAS), the ethnic diversity and cultural identities in North America (CRAN), and politics and society in the United Kingdom (CREC). This work has three overarching themes: Democracy, politics and society; Information, media and representations in the context of globalization and exchanges, transfers and identity construction.

About Idex

The Idex Fund of Sorbonne Paris Cité supports innovative and international educational and research projects for eight founding universities and five research institutes in Paris, France. Since 2012 it has funded 108 collaborative innovative projects as well as nine interdisciplinary programs within the framework of its four central themes:

- Progress, environment and societies
- The global diversity of cultures and societies
- Public health
- Data science.

Idex has supported a variety of inter-university collaborative initiative in higher education and research.

For further details regarding SOMI's publications see http://www.somiproject.org/
Executive Summary

This project spanned two continents, three countries and four years. The teams met in Paris and several locations in the United States. Research work was conducted across the UK and in several American states, spanning several thousand miles.

The project entailed the interview of both elite leaders and everyday representatives of four groups commonly targeted for security measures in the UK and US: Nigerians and Muslims in the UK (the diverse British Muslim community in this case being represented by Bangladeshis) and Hispanics and Muslims in the United States. Sikhs in Britain were also studied – as a group who inadvertently suffered as collateral damage from the introduction or tightening of security measures. In each case the researchers employed the same questionnaire in their interviews to ensure that the questions – and the answers - were commensurate. The list of questions is too long to include in this summary. But a sample of their intent is laid out in the accompanying box, “What questions does SOMI try to answer?”

The working papers associated with this project offer a rich panoply of findings that cannot adequately be reflected in this report. We have therefore selected five important ones – a single one for each group. These are briefly listed in the accompanying box entitled “Major findings from the SOMI report.” These are developed at greater length in the pages that follow, providing some illustrative data about each community and boxes designed to give you some insights into their demographics.

Finally, as academics, we are always hesitant to proffer recommendations to career policymakers whose perspective is informed by a sophisticated knowledge of the policy problems we attempt address. Yet, dispassionately viewed from the migrant perspective, there are a series of common problems. They are not, for example, consulted in the design of policy – and thus have no ownership. Alternatively, policy itself is generally conceived on a national scale – and does not take into account their local consequences – particularly in their implementations. The box “Major recommendations of the SOMI report” briefly lists four recommendations – which are discussed in greater length at this report’s conclusion.

In conclusion, we invite you to visit SOMI’s website at http://www.somiproject.org/. There you can read the individual papers, where you will discover many more findings, and an analysis of these individual communities, their views on the security measures, what tactics they choose in response, and why they do so.

What questions does SOMI try to answer?

- **Q1: Do the effects of securitization increase the level of perceived discrimination (both at the individual and group level)?**

- **Q2: What is the impact of perceived discrimination on attitudes towards the host society and members of the dominant group?**

- **Q3: Do concerns about securitization increase religious/ethnic identification, and if so, is it to the detriment of national identification?**

- **Q4: Do concerns about securitization increase civic participation (naturalization, registration, turnout rates) and affect political affiliation?**

- **Q5: Is there a trade-off between conventional and unconventional mobilization?**
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Major findings from the SOMI report

- Most groups respond to security measures by reinforcing their group identity, based either on ethnicity or religiosity.
- There is a generational difference in response, with first generation migrants being more tolerant of discriminatory measures than their children.
- Some minority groups who are not the intended targets of security measures nonetheless become collateral damage in managing their effects.
- Attitudes and responses to national security measures often differ significantly within minority communities. These differences are often accounted for by how these measures get enforced at the local level.
- Security measures can have a detrimental effect upon processes of integration, capacity for economic mobility and thus may increase inequality.
- Most groups engage in unconventional forms of mobilization as a response to discrimination.

Major recommendations of the SOMI report

- Empowerment, for many groups, is a function of opportunity. Where they believe that none exists, the product is alienation. This is counterproductive for the authorities attempting to obtain cooperation from minority communities in the enforcement of security measures. Minority groups should be given a representative voice to avoid alienation and radicalization.
- We often focus on the national effects of security measures. But local conditions often prove as important, if not more important, than national ones when it comes to evaluating the implementation of security measures, their effects, and to addressing the question as to why migrants and minorities respond the ways that they do. This insight reinforces the adage that “all politics is local.” Policy design should try and take into account local conditions where communities predominantly reside, as well as their effects - particularly in the implementation of policies.
- Minorities are not passive recipients of security measures. They generally react to them. Policies designed for any future security measures should include instruments of incorporation for minority communities - thinking about how they might react and how any adverse responses might be avoided - as a central component of any future programs, not as an afterthought.
- If policymakers want to encourage a process of integration among minority communities, then they must balance an understandable concern with internal security in all its forms (criminal, terroristic and economic) with those of democratic forms of representation. Only by doing so can they effectively incorporate migrants and minorities as citizens - with its focus on entitlements, rights, responsibilities and privileges in equal measure.
Background to the Report

The SOMI project was carried out in two stages. The first phase of the project, which took place from early 2013 until late 2014, was devoted to the identification of the key research questions, the development of a survey questionnaire, and the selection of migrant groups in the United States and the United Kingdom. Two workshops were organized, as well as three SOMI panels at held at conferences organized by the International Studies Association (ISA) and the Council for European Studies (CES). The second phase of the project, which commenced early in 2015, was devoted to field research. The main objective of this phase was to evaluate the impact of securitization on perceived discrimination and the subsequent forms of mobilization selected as a response to a real or perceived alienation. Surveys were conducted among Hispanics in Arizona and New York; Muslims in Boston and New York; Bangladeshis, Sikhs and Nigerians in London.

These groups were selected on the basis of two criteria. First, they have been discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity, skin color or religion before 9/11. One objective of the surveys was to measure the evolution over time of their sense of being singled out, and to evaluate the impact of discrimination since 9/11.

Second, these groups have all been targeted by security measures and feel law enforcement authorities have treated them unfairly. Terrorist attacks took place in three of the locations selected (London, New York, and Boston). Security measures (such as racial profiling and spying programs among populations characterized as “suspicious minorities”) are more intense in these locations than other areas. Finally, local authorities in Arizona implemented anti-Hispanics legislation in 2010 (Senate Bill 1070) that sparked controversy for being the country’s toughest immigration law in the United States to date.

Researchers analyzed the responses of all interviewees by focusing on three elements:

- Their perception of the processes of securitization of immigration and integration;
- Their collective identities and modes of belonging (perception of national identity, ethnic identification, religious identities);
- The nature, level and scope of the resulting mobilizations (across a spectrum stretching from indifference and passivity to integration through pressure group politics or protest, and in some cases on to violent forms of protest).

Preliminary findings of the second phase of the project were presented at conferences organized by the International Studies Association (ISA) and the Council for European Studies (CES).

A workshop was organized at Paris III Sorbonne Nouvelle in 2015 to finalize the agenda of the international conference organized by the SOMI team at the CEVIPOF (Center for Political Research) at Sciences Po in June 2016.
Five Key Findings of the SOMI Project

1. From group identity to “reactive religiosity”

The findings from SOMI’s survey of Bangladeshis in Tower Hamlets demonstrate two trends. The first relates to the importance of a “Muslim identity” to respondents. Respondents who feel discriminated against react to unfair treatment by increasing their feelings of identification with the group with whom they belong. They thus express a strong group identity that refers to being feeling of “being Muslim.”

The second trend refers to the notion of “reactive religiosity” to describe the evolution of Muslim group consciousness. Bangladeshi respondents define their sense of “Muslim identity” not only in terms of high levels of group identification but also in reference to Islam as a faith that is practiced intensely among the respondents.

Being targeted by security measures thus increases the intensity of group identity, which is defined in terms of religious affiliation, faith and practices. Reactive religiosity describes the correlation between the experience of discrimination in a securitized context with not just high levels of identification of Islam as a form of group belonging but also with an intensely practiced faith.

The respondents noted that they all were raised as Muslims with 95% being Sunni Muslims. In response to the question regarding what they felt was the main reason for them being treated unfairly, 50% answered it was because they were Muslims. Thirty-five percent responded that it was explained by their “skin color.”

According to their comments, almost half of the respondents (45%) have reactively responded by developing an increased sense of Muslim identity. Indeed, almost 75% respondents said that they consider it appropriate to speak of a “Muslim identity.” The respondents said that they regard Muslims from every part of the world as ‘sisters and brothers’ of the Umma, the global community of Muslims believers.

Furthermore, the vast majority of respondents (64%) expressed an increased sense of religious identity. This strong and increasing identification with their religion was accompanied by an increase in religious practice for 40% of respondents. Just over a third of them attend religious services at least once a week, and 30% of them do so daily. This frequency suggests a high level of religiosity as indicated by Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of attendance at religious services</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>At least once a week</th>
<th>Once every month</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Yet the respondents do not consider this new or heightened religious identity as in conflict with their national identity – old or new. The vast majority of them expressed a clear attachment to Bangladesh. Over 80% of respondents said that they maintain a relationship with their country of origin. Yet, notably, the vast majority (92%) saw no conflict between their strong adherence to Islam, their attachment to Bangladesh and sense of “being British.” It did not represent a choice for them.

Interestingly, although religion is considered by the vast majority of respondents to form a significant part of their identity, religion was not an important criterion when deciding whom they vote for. Of all the respondents, not one said that they considered the candidate’s religious affiliation as crucial. Their primary concern was about the candidates’ proposed programs to tackle the community’s problems.

Overall, the survey revealed a limited increase in conventional mobilization in response to new security measures. Yet, in contrast, there has been a significant rise in unconventional mobilization, focused on defending both the community’s interests and its identity. Respondents frequently mentioned signing petitions and holding demonstrations as the main non-electoral forms of political participation. Eighty percent of respondents, for example, noted that they have already signed petitions. The survey revealed that there has indeed been an increase in this unconventional form of participation for 50% of the respondents, although they are aware that this method of mobilization is less effective than electoral participation (65%). They noted that their primary reason for acting was their disagreements with British foreign policy.

Finally, the survey seems to suggest that Bangladeshis do not regard engagement in religious organizations as a strategic form of empowerment. Forty percent said that they are affiliated with a community-based organization, 25% with neighborhood organizations, and only 10% were affiliated with a religious organization. This contrastingly low level of engagement in formal religious organizations highlights the gap between the importance of religious identity and religiosity amongst community members.

These findings suggest that Muslims in this community are more religious, more concerned about discrimination, and more worried about their negative portrayal in the media. In response, they use unconventional channels to express their feelings. This suggests a shift from active engagement in formal Islamic community organizations, ones that have been central to Bangladeshi Muslim life in Tower Hamlets since their arrival. They now prefer alternative styles of participation or protest. These are increasingly viewed by the respondents as more consistent with the agenda of the respondents, and as more effective conduits for expressing their views.
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Muslims in the UK

- By 2011, Muslims constituted the second largest religious group in the UK (after Christians) with 2.7 million, or approximately five percent of the population of England and Wales. This constituted an increase of 1.2 million from 2001 when they were three percent of the population.

- By 2011, just over half of all Muslims (53%) living in Britain were born outside the UK. The number of foreign-born Muslims has almost doubled from 828,000 in 2001 to 1.4 million in 2011.

- Muslims in Britain remain numerically dominated by the South Asian population. They represent 68% of the total Muslim population. Pakistanis still constituted 38% of all Muslims and Bangladeshis 15% in 2011 despite more diverse migration from Muslim countries in Africa and the Middle East.

- Muslims remain largely under-represented in British politics, with 13 MPs in the House of Commons - 2% of the total number of MPs.

- The electoral participation of Muslims in the UK tends to be lower than that of other religious groups. Eighty-two percent of Protestants vote, 71% of Jews, 67% of Roman Catholics, and 62% of Muslims. (European Social Survey, 2010).

Bangladeshis in Tower Hamlets, London

- Of the UK's total Bangladeshi population, 54% live in the Greater London area. Within London, Bangladeshis are heavily concentrated in a single borough, Tower Hamlets.

- The Muslim population peaked at 38% in 2011, making it the largest religious group. The overwhelming majority of Muslims living in Tower Hamlets are of Bangladeshi heritage. This is why the borough has often been termed the ‘center’ of Bangladeshi life in London.

- Bangladeshis constituted 32% of the borough's population in 2015 (Tower Hamlets borough council, 2015) with approximately 65,000 people.
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2. The ‘migrant optimism versus integration’ paradox

The findings from SOMI’s survey of American Muslims confirm two trends.

The first relates to “migrant optimism,” and demonstrates a generational difference. First-generation immigrants tend to be less sensitive to discrimination. They are more prepared to accept difficult circumstances as a price they have to pay for having new opportunities in the US. They have lower expectations, due to their relative lack of social capital in the United States. And they tend to be more tolerant towards what they adjudge to be the failings of their host society.

The second trend, conversely, highlights an “integration paradox.” American-born Muslims are more aware of, and sensitive to, discrimination. They are less trustful and more critical of US institutions than their less acculturated foreign-born parents. And they are more likely to engage in protest politics.

So being more familiar with American culture and secure as a citizen corresponds with a greater dissatisfaction with how the political system functions.

The evidence drawn from SOMI interviews highlights this problem in three ways.

First, among those interviewed, there are variations in the perception of discrimination, as well as the level of trust in various institutions. Seventy percent of respondents expressed the view that they are treated unfairly as a Muslim by US authorities – including 54% of native-born respondents. All respondents mentioned “being Muslim” as the primary reason for any discrimination against them. American-born Muslims, however, are more sensitive to other reasons than foreign-born respondents, such as gender discrimination (43% versus 28% respectively), and skin color (44% versus 28% respectively).

To the question “do you think it is appropriate to speak of a ‘Muslim identity’ in the US, 90% of both the foreign-born and the American-born people interviewed offered positive responses. Sixty percent of those born in the United States declared that their “feeling of being Muslim” has increased in recent years as a result of discriminatory security measures and a heightened Islamophobic discourse they claim to have witnessed in America.

American-born respondents expressed more negative feelings than foreign-born respondents towards both American federal agencies (58%) and local authorities (67%). Both foreign- and native-born respondents did express low levels of trust in various US institutions. Yet foreign-born respondents tended to trust the judicial system more than American-born respondents.

Second, the interviews revealed no sense of a trade-off between maintaining high feelings of Muslim identity and American identity among either immigrants or those born in the United States. American-born respondents, however, are extremely sensitive to anti-Muslim sentiments expressed by other Americans. When asked “how does Muslim identity cohere with being American?” the vast majority of respondents (76.5%, including 60% of those who are born in the United States) said there is no conflict between being an American and being a Muslim. Native-born respondents, however, are slightly less optimistic about the coexistence of American and Muslim values. This finding suggests that members of the second (and later) generation are more aware of discrimination and increasingly view themselves as part of a distinctive group – mostly as a result of Islamophobic feelings among the general US population.

Third, there are variations in terms of their views about conventional and unconventional forms of mobilization. The majority (67% of American-born, 55.5% of foreign-born) suggested that their greater perceived discrimination against Muslims since 9/11 has increased their likelihood of voting. All respondents agreed that it is important that Muslims be politically represented. Yet, the vast majority (80%, including 67% foreign born) declared that it was not important that a political candidate was Muslim or had Muslim origins. Among the 10.5% who say it was very important, all are native-born.

The feeling that Muslims are underrepresented in the current political system is shared by 80% of American-born respondents and by 89% of foreign-born respondents. Foreign-born respondents admitted a lack of familiarity with US politics, and a corresponding low level of interest in national politics. By contrast, native-born tend to be more knowledgeable, more interested in politics (both at the national and local levels), and correspondingly more critical.

About 60% of all respondents say that their level of engagement in non-political activities has increased in recent years. All respondents interviewed said that they are affiliated with a religious organization. The findings suggest that American-born respondents are more likely to be members of community (non-religious)-based organizations, especially at the local level, than their foreign-born counterparts. The majority (70% of foreign-born, 60% of American-born) of those interviewed believe that political and non-political activities are two distinct, mutually exclusive, strategies. Importantly, a majority of American-born respondents believe that unconventional activities, including protest politics, are much more effective than electoral participation in advancing their interests.
## Five Key Findings of the SOMI Project

### Muslims in the US
- The Pew Research Center estimates that there were about 3.3 million Muslims of all ages living in the United States in 2015 – which constitutes only one percent of the total population.
- About 65% of Muslim Americans are first-generation immigrants; more than a third (35%) are born in the US.
- Despite the sizeable percentage of immigrants, 81% of Muslim Americans are US citizens, including 70% of those born outside the US.
- Most Muslim Americans (70%) either identify as Democrats (46%) or ‘lean towards’ the Democratic Party (24%). Only 11% identify with the Republican Party or ‘lean towards’ the Republicans.
- Approximately 69% say that religion is very important in their life. Muslims are thus as religious as Christians (70% of Christians also say that religion is important in their life).

Sources: Pew Research Center, 2015 and 2011

### Muslims in Boston
- In 2015, 70,000 or 1.4% of Boston’s city and suburban population identified themselves as Muslims. Originally composed primarily of African-American converts, the Muslim population of Greater Boston now includes immigrants from the Middle East, North Africa, South Asia, and Southeast Asia.
- There are approximately 50 different mosques and community organizations, including the Islamic Center of Boston. There are also active representative Islamic organizations, such as the Islamic Society of Boston, the Islamic Council of New England, and the Muslim American Society.
- Muslims in the city and suburbs have faced particular pressures since the Boston Marathon bombing in 2013. The Tsarnaev brothers, who committed this bombing, have not been the only home-grown terrorists living in Boston. The Boston Globe published an article in June 2015 under the headline “Are Boston terrorism cases a trend?” listing a dozen local Muslim extremists who have been convicted of terrorist activities. Like their New York counterparts, SOMI’s findings suggest that Muslims in Boston deeply resent any suspicion of being associated with Islamist radicalization.
- Boston’s city authorities have recently joined the Countering Violent Extremism pilot program launched in 2011 by the White House. Boston’s plan, A Framework for Prevention and Intervention Strategies, identifies seven focus areas ranging from addressing community isolation to foreign policy concerns and cultural competency.

### Muslims in NYC
- The Muslim population in New York City has been growing rapidly since the 1970s. Estimates of the Muslim population in the metro New York area vary considerably, ranging from 400,000 to 770,000. By 2014, the American Values Atlas Survey found that 2% of the adults in the New York City metropolitan area identified their religion as Islam. With a metro area population of 20,092,883, this would suggest that there are 402,000 Muslims living there.
- Another estimate is derived from an extrapolation of data generated by the Journey Data Center utilizing statistics from the Journey Mosque Census, the 2011 Mosque Study, and the 2011 Pew survey of Muslim Americans. Journey’s estimate puts the number of Muslims in the metropolitan area somewhat higher, at approximately 770,000 Muslims (or 3.8% of the population of the metropolitan New York City area).
- As the number of Muslim immigrants has increased, the number of Mosques has also risen – from 175 in 1979 to 285 in 2015. The Mosque Study found that 26% of the Mosques in New York were established in the prior decade. Notable was a controversy in 2010 regarding the proposed building of an Islamic community center at 45-51 Park Place, which led to massive protests against the so-called “Ground-Zero Mosque.”
Five Key Findings of the SOMI Project

3. The paradox of collateral damage.

SOMI fieldwork data suggest that, for the past fifteen years, Sikhs have become inadvertently entangled in the post 9/11 debate over security and counter-terrorism. Most of the community associations investigated in London (seven out of 11) are comparatively new, in contrast with the long-established presence of Sikhs in Britain. This is because, in recent years, Sikh's appears to have both a new desire and need to express a distinctive Sikh voice amidst Britain's ethnic minorities.

This desire for a more visible Sikh identity may be understood in terms of the preponderant attention devoted to the Muslim community in post 9/11 and 7/7 (i.e. London bomb attacks) Britain. Indeed, among those interviewed, there is clearly a belief that Sikhs political claims have been overshadowed by the greater focus on Muslims as a risk community since 2001. There has been a significant surge in hate crimes against Muslims in the aftermath of these - and indeed the more recent the 2015 Paris -- terrorist attacks. As a result of hateful ignorance, male members of the Sikh community have been mistaken for Muslims and also been targeted by violent extremists.

The position of the Sikh community in Britain is rife with contradictions. They fear both becoming invisible as a represented constituency with limited rights while, ambivalently, all too visible as a target. This tension is paradoxically compounded by the middle class status achieved by the vast majority of Sikhs, represented amongst the respondents interviewed for the SOMI survey.

Their high level of socio-economic integration, especially when compared with Muslims in general and those from the Indian subcontinent in particular, means that they are not perceived as a community requiring specific assistance. Their needs are, as a result, underestimated or often ignored by the government.

Community leaders or spokespersons made these tensions abundantly clear in SOMI interviews. One respondent suggested that, “The government don’t see us as a threat, they don’t see us at all,” He added that, “Because we are not what you call ‘the squeaky wheel,’ we don’t get oiled. People who make noise, they get funding for this and that. But we’re the quiet child.” In summary, he added that, “Our problem as a community is that we are not a problem community.”

In the latest UK census (2011) the term ‘Sikh’ only appears as a religious category, although British legislation has recognized Sikhs both as a religious and ethnic group since 1983. To enhance their visibility, Sikhs have been campaigning to have the category ‘British Sikh’ included in the census. This, they believe, is foundational to them obtaining specific consideration for their needs by policy makers. They insist that the way they are monitored at the moment leads to gross demographic underestimates, which itself results in underfunding for Sikh community associations. Furthermore, recognizing Sikhs as an ethnic group would make it possible to monitor Sikh hate crimes. These have been either ignored in recent years or incorrectly recorded incorrectly as Islamophobic offences.

Respondents in interviews thus focused on the issue of ‘mistaken identity.’ British Sikhs have contemplated two alternative strategies to resolve this problem. One is isolation - limited contact with those outside of the community. Some respondents, for example, suggested that a minority of young Sikhs have tended to become more religious in recent years or that certain Gurdwaras (i.e. Sikh temples) have rejected mixed marriages. Alternatively, others have advocated a more integrationist strategy, which consists of enhancing relations with other groups (Hindus, Jews, Christians, Muslims) and in mobilizing Sikhs along ethnic rather than religious lines. This includes encouraging them to get more involved in conventional politics than is currently the case. For the purpose of comparison, there were 90 Sikh councilors nationwide as a result of the 2014 general election - in contrast to 277 Muslims; and no Sikhs in the House of Commons following the 2015 general election, in contrast to 13 Muslim MPs).

Sikhs are clearly not the targets of security measures. However, since 2001, security considerations have proved influential in positioning them in regards to the British government, obliging them, more generally, to reassess the unique position they occupy within British society.

Sikhs in the United Kingdom

- According to the UK’s 2011 census, 432,429 Sikhs live in Britain. They compose 0.8% of the total population. Muslims, by contrast, account for approximately 5 percent and Hindus 1.5 percent.

- Sikhs have a relatively long history in the UK. The UK Sikh Association (the Khalsa Jatha of the British Isles) for example, was founded in 1908 and the first purpose-built Gurdwara (i.e. Sikh temple) was built in Shepherd’s Bush in London in 1913.

- Sikhs tend to live in compact communities (‘little Punjabs’) in a limited number of cities or regions. These are located in the greater London area (Ealing, Southall, Redbridge and Ilford) and parts of the English Midlands (Wolverhampton and Birmingham). Less than 10,000 Sikhs live in Scotland and Northern Ireland.
  - Approximately 56% of UK Sikhs were born in Britain.
  - Thousands of Sikhs living in the UK originated from East Africa. They were expelled as a result of ‘Africanization’ policies in Kenya in 1968, Uganda in 1972 and Tanzania in 1976. As British passport holders, they were then eligible to emigrate to the United Kingdom.
  - Sikhs divide their political affiliation. In the 2011 general election, 49% of British Sikhs voted for the Conservative party and 41% voted for the Labour party. These percentages were virtually identical to those for Hindus. In contrast, 64% of Muslims voted for Labour - more than double the 25% who supported the Conservative party.

Source: British Future think-tank.
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4. Location matters

Hispanics studied in both American locations do share some similarities. The general effect of security measures on Hispanics in both Arizona and New York is withdrawal and low levels of both conventional and unconventional forms of mobilization. Hispanics therefore generally remain passive in the face of security measures. They overwhelmingly see immigration and security measures being implemented by government in a way that marginalizes and targets them. But they consider opposing these measures as a futile battle that they are incapable of addressing in any meaningful way. Hispanics in both locations reported that they thus consider the progression of security as something inevitable that includes a number of burdens for both foreign- and American-born Hispanics. Not surprisingly, as a result, 75% of Hispanics in Arizona and 65% of those in New York believe immigration reform is a top challenge for Hispanics in the coming years.

Yet, beyond these shared views, a key finding of the SOMI study is that there is consideration and important areas of fragmentation within this Hispanic population. There is a notable variation between those living in Arizona and those living in New York. SOMI interviews, for example, suggest that there is greater distrust, fear, and disillusionment among Hispanics living in Arizona in response to immigration and security policies. Since 9/11, these have included heightened police activity, racial profiling, and overt discrimination.

The level of trust in government and government agencies is overwhelmingly concentrated in the “very low” category for Hispanics in both Arizona and New York. But Hispanics in New York expressed more apathy in interviews; they believe that they feel an insufficient direct impact from new security measures in their day-to-day lives to warrant any sort of political mobilization. New York residents were much more concerned with local policing practices, like ‘Stop and Frisk,’ and with police brutality - issues that they believe affect them more directly than national security measures. In interviews, in contrast, Hispanics in Arizona specifically pointed to the discriminatory targeting of Hispanics and immigrants by the Federal and state government since 9/11.

This difference in attitude may have deep roots. Solidarity among Hispanics is historically weak, presenting a challenge to any efforts to political mobilize Hispanics broadly. Over half of Hispanic respondents from both New York and Arizona disagree with the idea that there is one collective Hispanic identity, providing evidence of a diminished group consciousness because they believe that there is no real “linked fate.”

Yet Hispanics in Arizona, on average, believe in a common identity far more than those interviewed in New York. An analysis of individual responses finds that Hispanics in New York generally rank their experience as sharing “some in common” with other Hispanics, while Hispanics in Arizona believe they share “a lot in common” with the Hispanic population. The explanations provided by participants in Arizona for their higher ranking were twofold. First, the group shares a similar identity through a common language, cultural beliefs and religious practices. Second, the group shares the disproportionate burden of discrimination and targeting by the Federal and state government. This data therefore suggests that perceptions of discrimination can strengthen a person’s understanding of the collective group and could perhaps strengthen group solidarity.

The homogeneity of the Hispanic population, based on ethnicity, may explain this sense of solidarity. In Arizona, Hispanics of Mexican nationality are the most prevalent Hispanic group in the state, while in New York, those Hispanics included in this study include a
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Evidence of fragmentation within the Hispanic community is illustrated by a series of vectors.

The first concerns party affiliation. Seventy-five percent of all respondents in the total sample identify as members of the Democrat political party. But 20% indicated they have changed their political affiliation in recent years. This 20% is overwhelmingly located in Arizona.

Second, the issue of unconventional political participation shows a clear divide between Hispanic respondents according to location. Only about 32% of Hispanics in Arizona believe that non-electoral political participation, such as demonstrations and participation in protest politics, is more effective in securing civil rights, accommodating immigration concerns, and fighting discrimination. Hispanics there were reluctant to believe in the efficacy of these unconventional methods. In contrast, 70% of Hispanics in New York, responded that they believe protest politics to be more effective than conventional participation methods. This distinction highlights the differences in political opportunity structures in the two locations, and thus their belief that the chance that their voices will be heard and result in change is small.

Third, there were important differences on the issue of more formal modes of political representation. Indeed, there were important variations within Arizona itself on this issue. Hispanics in Phoenix, for example, reported the highest levels of satisfaction in terms of their representation by Hispanic community-based organizations. Similarly, Hispanics in San Luis who are members of a church community expressed higher levels of satisfaction with their representation by Hispanic community-based organizations. This effect changed, however, if Hispanics were not members of a church. Hispanics in Yuma, in contrast, reported lower levels of representation and a resulting discontentment.

Hispanics in New York were more consistent on this issue. They believe they are “moderately represented.” Over 98% of total respondents believe that it is important for Hispanics to be politically represented at all levels of government, highlighting a gap for Hispanics between the current way the political system is structured and the way they feel they should be able to exercise political influence in the United States.

More generally, around 60% of Hispanics in New York indicated no change in any of their unconventional political activities, while in Arizona, 71% indicated their level of unconventional political participation had indeed changed - but that it had decreased in recent years.

Finally, generational cohorts also show substantial differences. Second- and third- generation Hispanics have a far stronger affinity to their identity as Americans when compared to their parents, demonstrating substantial changes in the way Hispanics manage their identity and assimilate. Further careful analysis is needed as this difference may be tied to the issue of English language proficiency, an issue for many foreign-born Hispanics.

Fragmentation within the Hispanic community is thus evident. There is fear among those that are more acutely affected by the government’s implementation of security measures and apathy among those that are better equipped because they have English language skills and more access to resources.
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Hispanics in the US

- Since 1960, America’s Hispanic population has grown by almost an order of magnitude, from 6.3 million in 1960 to approximately 54 million in 2013.
- The foreign-born Hispanic population has grown from one million in 1960 to about 19 million today.
- There are nearly 30 million U.S. born Hispanics in the U.S. today.
- Hispanics make up about 17% of the total population in the U.S. This is expected to approximate 30% by 2060.
- Mexican-born Hispanics have always been the largest Hispanic-origin group in the U.S.
- Net migration levels of immigrants from Mexico to the U.S., however, stopped climbing as of 2011. This has been attributed to a number of factors: a weakened job and housing construction job market, heightened border enforcement, a rise in deportations, and improved economic conditions in Mexico.
- Approximately 52% of eligible Hispanic voters did not cast a ballot in the 2012 elections.

Source: Pew Hispanic Center, Pew Research Center Hispanic Trends, Latino Decisions

Hispanics in Arizona

- Thirty percent of Arizona’s state population is Hispanic, numbering approximately 1,950,000, and 56% is Anglo, according to the 2014 Census. This Hispanic population is majorly Mexican.
- Of this Hispanic population, about 30% are foreign-born and the remaining are native born.
- In 2005, between 400,000-450,000 Hispanics resided in Arizona unauthorized, based on a survey by U.S. Census Bureau.
- Thirty-eight percent of Hispanics that are 17 and younger live below the poverty rate.
- The median age of Hispanics in Arizona is 25 years old while Arizona’s median age, in general, is 35.9.
- Seventy percent of Hispanics in Arizona speak a language other than English at home.
- Rounding out the figures, 62% of eligible Hispanic voters identify themselves as Democrat, 27% identify as Independent, and 11% as Republican.
- About 60% of eligible Hispanic voters in Arizona did not vote in 2012.

Source: Pew Research Center, Hispanic Trends Latino Decisions

Hispanics in NY

- About 18% of New York’s state population is Hispanic, or about 3,497,000 individuals. Of this population, about 60% is born in the U.S. and about 40% is foreign-born.
- The median age of the Hispanic population in New York is 30 while the median age of New York is 35.6.
- About 36% of the Hispanic population that is 17 and younger lives in poverty.
- Approximately 80% of Latinos in New York say they speak another language other than English in the home.
- The largest group of eligible voting Latinos in New York is of Puerto Rican descent (43%), followed by Latinos from the Dominican Republic (20%) and Mexico (7%).

Source: Pew Research Center, Hispanic Trends nacla.org, by Ed Morales
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5. Securitization can have a major impact upon economic mobility as well as collective representation

The case of Nigerians in the UK provides an illustration of how targeted security measures have had a detrimental effect upon a community’s capacity to integrate – reducing their economic mobility and increasing economic inequality. The increased barriers to obtaining a regular legal status has undermined the positions of both adults and their children.

Data drawn from SOMI interviews with Nigerians living in London reveals that their unstable legal and socio-economic status poses several unprecedented challenges. These, in turn, have affected the strategies and forms of mobilization used by community members.

Nigerians are, on average, better educated, with higher professional skills than other ethnic communities. Yet more recent arrivals have not had the economic opportunities and social betterment from which the first generation benefitted, as illustrated by Table 2 (see page 16). Enhanced border controls and restrictive entry conditions have prompted some of them to circumvent the rules. This has led to a rise in human trafficking, entry by deception and overstaying. All these circumventions of government regulations have undermined any possibility of obtaining a legal status. Furthermore, increased refusals to grant asylum have left many in limbo, without residency and working rights and have led to deportations to Nigeria. The youngest members of the community have been the most affected, despite the fact that some of them were either born in the UK or have lived there for most of their lives.

As a result, the Nigerian community has had to adapt to this change in circumstance. First, community organizations have had to cater to new needs, with a particular attention given to the youngest to defuse risks of gang violence and petty criminality. Interviewees expressed resentment at the fact that UK security measures have disrupted family structures and damaged the social and educational prospects of the younger generation. They also lamented the lack of government funding needed to implement projects to address these problems.

Second, in the aftermath of the London bombing, spurred by the British authorities Nigerians have sought a better collective representation via CANUK (the Central Association of Nigerians in the UK), their central umbrella organization. Although formally a non-political body, CANUK’s leadership has been asked to interact between the Nigerian community and UK authorities whenever security issues have become prominent, in particular on questions of deportation and visa management. Community leaders interviewed expressed the view that collaboration with UK authorities was the best way to empower Nigerians.

Third, the most prominent and well-educated members of the Nigerian community interviewed believe that conventional politics is also an effective means to influence the policy agenda and better support their community. Nigerians have been elected at local and national levels in increasing numbers. They now have more local councilors than any other group with an African heritage living in Britain (more than 30 out of 39 of African descent out of a total of 704 local councilors drawn from ethnic communities) and since 2015 they also have four members of Parliament and two peers in the upper House. This willingness to seek formal political representation corroborates findings in the survey that suggests a high level of trust in the British political system as illustrated in various ways in Tables 3, 4 and 5 (see page 16).
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Nigerians in the UK

- Nigerians are the seventh largest ethnic group in the UK, comprising 191,000 documented residents - or 2.4% of the total population.
- These official statistics, however, do not include the large number of undocumented Nigerians living in the UK. Foreign and Commonwealth Office calculations estimate that the actual Nigerian population could amount to as many as three million.
- Regardless of which figure is correct, Nigerians constitute the largest African group in the UK.
- Their formal numbers have increased by over 120% in the last decade. Most live in the Greater London area.
- Nigerian students comprise the third largest number of foreign students in the UK. In 2014 there were 17,620 Nigerians studying at British public higher education institutions. Nigerians are forecast to overtake Indians and become the UK’s second biggest source of international postgraduate students.
- The majority of Nigerians originate from the Igbo group, one of the largest in Africa. The first wave arrived in the late 1960s, escaping the Biafran war. More recent waves of Nigerians, in the 1980s and 2000s, moved to the UK to escape poverty and political instability.
- As a group, Nigerians are well-educated. A majority hold professional jobs. But their population situation is bifurcated. As a group, Nigerians also have a high level of unemployment (at 7.3%) compared to some other ethnic minorities. As a result, many are self-employed.
- Ninety-percent of Nigerians living in the UK are Christians and nine percent are estimated to be Muslims. Inter-faiths contacts are regular and encouraged. Religion is central to their identity, and religious institutions play a central social role in each community.
- There are no official figures on the political affiliation of Nigerians living in the UK. But in responding to a SOMI survey, 74% of those interviewed indicated their preference for the Labour party, 8% for the Conservative party, and 2% for the Liberal Democrats. Sixteen percent offered no answer.


Table 2. Nigerians’ socio-economic profile (Source: Data from SOMI interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational achievement and social mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical education completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Conventional forms of mobilization (Source: Data from SOMI interviews, Muslim Council of Britain)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional forms of mobilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter registration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter turnout</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting for general elections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting for local elections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting for European elections</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Nigerian candidate for a local election (Source: Data from SOMI interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is it to have a Nigerian candidate for local elections?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairly Important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very Important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Nigerian candidate for general elections (Source: Data from SOMI interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is it to have a Nigerian candidate for general elections?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairly Important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very Important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned

The SOMI team unearthed numerous findings. The primary ones are listed above. More are discussed in the individual papers available at SOMI’s website. Two major sets of lessons, however, are apparent – each respectively relating to the positive and negative aspects of the securitization process. They are listed as follows:

1. The Positive Lessons of Securitization

A. An overriding positive lesson is that both political and non-political forms of mobilization are facilitated by new social movements and mediating institutions (such as religious/ethnic organizations and interest groups) that have emerged as a response to concerns about discrimination. As a result, migrant and minority groups are better able to shape policy outcomes through processes of mobilization and substantive representation.

B. There is consistent resentment among minority groups generated by new security measures and what they perceive as the resulting increase in the level of discrimination. Yet the vast majority of the groups included in this study remain positive about their host country. Furthermore, they do not consider a sense of national and group identity as a choice: The strengthening of their sense of group belonging is not detrimental to their sense of national belonging.

C. Security policies have afforded targeted groups new opportunities to mobilize where they once languished – and they have often done so. Examples among the communities the SOMI team studied are plentiful. But this response is illustrated by the 2006 Hispanic demonstrations (against HR 4437’s restrictive legislation) and the Muslim protests in 2011 in New York City against the New York Police Department’s surveillance programs, supported by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU). Migrants have thus engaged in the political process.

D. Security measures can serve to reinforce group identity in positive ways. Among Sikhs, for example, it has served as a tool of engagement. They entered into a dialogue about strategies that might be suitable for asserting their visibility, one long overshadowed by the mobilization of comparatively less economically successful communities. The effect has been to clarify their goals. One of their main objectives now, for example, is to convince the British government to add a ‘Sikh’ ethnic box to the UK’s census. The Nigerian community, operating from a different set of concerns, have done much the same – but in this case through increased institutional channels of representation at the local and national level.

2. The Negative Lessons of Securitization

A. The evidence of this study conclusively suggests that all the groups included in this study express serious concerns about the introduction of new security measures. They particularly noted the alienating effects of racial profiling, police surveillance, and spying programs that they believe infringes on their civil liberties and religious freedom. In three of the locations selected (Boston, New York, and London), relevant authorities intensified the securitization process as a result of terrorist attacks (the Marathon bombing, 9/11 and 7/11 respectively) and a series of thwarted terrorist plots. The respondents in these cities expressed awareness that they had been targeted by counter-terrorism policies (such as the British program, PREVENT), and discriminatory security measures (such as the NYPD spying programs, assisted by the CIA, that targeted mosques, schools, business, student groups, non-governmental organizations and individuals, in the metro New York City area). These measures strained community-government relations.

B. Despite the exceptions listed above, the evidence drawn from SOMI interviews suggests that minority community concerns over securitization tend to preclude their civic participation. Their experiences often decrease the level of institutional trust and increase a sense of inadequate representation. In the United States, many Muslims and – to a lesser extent – Hispanics remain politically active outside the formal political system. Policymakers and scholars therefore have to consider the factors that alienate some communities under pressure while it leads to cooptation among others.

C. Security measures can also have an unintended effect on the ability of some minorities to integrate socio-economically. Findings on Nigerians in London, for example, suggest that securitization policies have had an impact upon the economic mobility of those who arrived more recently when compared to those whose arrivals predated the introduction of new measures. The first large scale arrival of Nigerians benefited from a series of policies that were liberal when it came to issues such as extended stays, work permits and naturalization applications. This has been become more problematic since the late 2000s. Restrictive entry conditions (ex: the visa bond fee), an increased number of refusals of asylum requests, and more stringent criteria for residency have made it harder for adults to gain and keep employment, and for children to benefit from financially stable households.
Future Recommendations: Four Big Takeaways

Any extensive study of this sort will generate numerous findings and recommendations. They cannot all be addressed in the confines of this policy report. But many are discussed in depth in an assortment of papers available at SOMIProject.com. We note three that we regard as particularly important.

A. Not surprisingly, the relationship between securitization, perceived discrimination, attitudes towards the host society, sense of group consciousness, and various forms of mobilization is extremely complex and contingent. The reaction to the same security measures differs both between and within groups. Some variation in the forms and degree of responsive political mobilization can explain the character of new regulations and the ways in which they may target specific groups, or help or hinder civic incorporation. Yet, clearly, other factors deserve further inquiry. These include inter-group relations among minorities (as illustrated by the sensitive relationship between Sikhs and Muslims, Muslim Nigerians and Christian Nigerians, or Middle Eastern Muslims and African American Muslims); how groups view themselves and their relationship to government in the context of the societies where they live; and whether they believe that strategies that might result in their political representation are feasible. Empowerment, for many groups, is a function of opportunity. Where they believe that none exists, the product is alienation – which is counterproductive for the authorities attempting to obtain cooperation from minority communities in the enforcement of security measures.

B. Much of the study of minority groups understandably operates at the national level. Yet local conditions often prove as important, if not more important, than national ones when it comes to evaluating the implementation of security measures, their effects, and to addressing the question as to why migrants and minorities respond in differing ways. This insight reinforces the adage that “all politics is local.” Evidence drawn from the SOMI study, for example, suggests that Hispanics feel targeted by the growing number of anti-immigration legislation in the United States. Yet, interviews reveal that Hispanics in Arizona feel more insecure than their counterparts in NYC for two reasons. The first relates to the local vectors of insecurity, such as the 2010 Senate Bill 1070 making it a misdemeanor for non-citizens to not carry proof of their immigration status. Over ninety percent of respondents in Arizona, for example, indicated that they knew families or friends who had moved out of the state or had returned to Mexico as a result of escalating security and immigration practices in the state. The second reason relates to the differential impact of securitization in a world-city like New York. It provides lots of opportunities for grassroots mobilization. This contrasts with small cities (like Yuma or San Luis) where access to any organizational structure remains difficult, or rural areas close to the US-Mexican border where Hispanics are often least likely to become engaged in any form of political or civil protest.

C. Despite the immediate political pressures, and the temptations that they create, policymakers cannot design and implement security measures with a narrow, short-term focus that ignores their broader and longer-term implications. Minority communities are not passive recipients of measures and almost invariably respond with some form of mobilization. The engagement of government officials with the leadership of minority communities is one now well-known potential means of incorporation. But the effects of such strategies are inconsistent and unpredictable. The result is often, nonetheless, alienation and a resulting lack of cooperation. Perceived discrimination can result in militancy rather than incorporation. Security programs should include instruments of community incorporation when being designed as a central component. Community leaders should be involved in their formulation. This will help avoid the belief that they are an afterthought – or worse, simply an instrument for those government officials implementing a program to justify their policies to community leaders. There is clearly need for more research work on if, how and when community leaders are involved in the design of security measures, rather than being left to policymakers and security experts.

D. SOMI’s study represents a first step in evaluating the patterns of migrant mobilization in response to security measures. There is a need for more in-depth studies that examine more migrant communities, in more countries, in an effort to establish why some communities prefer democratic forms of incorporation rather than estrangement and violence. That goal should, in principle, be the aspiration of any liberal democracy. If policymakers want to encourage that process, then they must balance an understandable concern with internal security in all its forms (criminal, terroristic and economic) with those of democratic forms of representation. Only by doing so can they effectively incorporate migrants and minorities as citizens – with a focus on entitlements, rights, responsibilities and privileges in equal measure.
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