



# Ethics in Brief

formerly *The Whitefield Briefings*

Spring 2008 (Vol.12 No.6)

## Has Multiculturalism Had Its Day? <sup>1</sup>

### Towards a Christian Assessment

Jonathan Chaplin *with a response from* Jenny Taylor

*This article contributes to the current debate about 'multiculturalism', into which heightened anxieties were recently injected following the Archbishop of Canterbury's controversial intervention on 'Sharia law'.<sup>2</sup> It calls for greater clarity about the various senses in which the term is used in Christian and public discussion and warns against the unqualified disparaging of some undefined phenomenon called 'multiculturalism'. It suggests that Christians have powerful reasons to affirm cultural diversity as a gift of God, and to support those 'multicultural' policies which protect vulnerable cultural or religious minorities against discrimination. It distinguishes these positive senses of 'multiculturalism' from 'multi-faithism', 'imposed secularism' and 'cultural relativism'.*

#### Debating Multiculturalism

Has multiculturalism had its day? Listen to Jonathan Sacks, one of Britain's leading religious public intellectuals:<sup>3</sup>

Multiculturalism has run its course, and it is time to move on. It was a fine, even noble idea in its time. It was designed to make ethnic and religious minorities feel more at home in society....It affirmed their culture. It gave dignity to difference. And in many ways it achieved its aims....But there has been a price to pay, and it grows year by year. [It] has led not to integration but to segregation....It was intended to promote tolerance. Instead, the result has been...societies more abrasive, fractured and intolerant than they once were.<sup>4</sup>

Sacks is echoing a concern voiced by a growing number of influential commentators in recent years. The northern cities riots of summer 2001 led to the Cattle Report's stark characterisation of different ethnic and religious communities living 'parallel' and 'polarised' lives.<sup>5</sup> In 2004, Trevor Phillips, head of the Commission for Racial Equality warned that as a result of a misguided multiculturalism we were in danger of 'sleepwalking into segregation'.<sup>6</sup> Public anxiety was then massively heightened by the London bombings of 7 July 2005, upon which the French writer Giles Kepel remarked in alarmist fashion that the July bombers were 'children of Britain's own multicultural society' and that they 'smashed the social consensus around multiculturalism to smithereens'.<sup>7</sup>

Such misgivings from respected public commentators are relatively recent. In 2000 the Runnymede Trust's Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain, chaired by Bikhru Parekh, a leading theorist and supporter of multiculturalism,<sup>8</sup> portrayed Britain in sanguine terms as not only a 'community of individuals' but also a 'community of communities'.<sup>9</sup> It argued that, if real equality were to be realised among citizens, it was necessary to 'take full account of the differences' between them. The report concluded with what turned out to be a controversial call to officially declare Britain a 'multicultural state'.

That call was not heeded. Indeed by 2007, the government's 'Commission on Integration and Cohesion' produced a report *Our Shared Future* which barely mentioned 'multiculturalism'.<sup>10</sup> While supporting the goal of 'integration without assimilation', it urged 'an emphasis on articulating what binds communities together rather than what differences divide them'. It discouraged, for example, giving public funds to community groups (including religious groups) which were not demonstrably contributing to social cohesion, an obligation not previously thought necessary to impose. In a 2006 Fabian Society speech,

Gordon Brown appealed for a Britishness 'not so nebulous that it is simply defined as the toleration of difference and [so] leaves a hole where national identity should be'.<sup>11</sup>

### **Clarifying and Assessing Multiculturalism**

What are British Christians to make of this debate about multiculturalism? A striking feature of the recent debate is that prominent Christian leaders have entered their own fundamental reservations about 'multiculturalism'.<sup>12</sup> Yet Christianity has long been recognised as an essentially 'multicultural' religion, a universal, global faith community with adherents from virtually every cultural group in the world. Many of them are now resident in, and citizens of, the UK. Indeed some are keeping inner-city churches alive after affluent white Christians have left for the suburbs. If the whole of Britain became Christian tomorrow, the country would remain a vibrantly multicultural society. What precisely is worrying recent Christian critics of multiculturalism? This article does not promise a full answer but rather calls for a more careful clarification of the different senses in which the term 'multiculturalism' is currently being used, by Christians and others. I identify six senses, briefly commenting on each in turn.

**First**, the term 'multiculturalism' may refer to the mere **fact of cultural diversity**. 'Culture' in this sense refers primarily to ethnicity or nationality. Some also speak of a multicultural society when they mean a multi-racial society, but these should not be conflated. In any event, mainly due to immigration, compounded by differential birth-rates, somewhere between 5-10% of citizens and residents of the 'EU15'<sup>13</sup> are now of non-European descent. So when some say 'Britain is a multicultural society' they may simply be reporting this sociological state of affairs. People might disagree about how culturally diverse Britain actually is, or about whether there are limits to the rate at which Britain can hospitably accommodate new entrants from different cultures. But Christians do not claim that the mere fact of cultural diversity is a bad thing. On the contrary they have powerful biblical reasons for celebrating the richness of diverse historical and ethnic cultures as gifts of God, while also remaining alert to the characteristic deformations such cultures also exhibit.<sup>14</sup>

**Second**, the term is sometimes used to refer to the **fact of religious diversity**, the reality of a 'multi-faith' society. This is an unhelpful usage. Britain is, sociologically, not only a multicultural society but a multi-faith society, but the two are not the same. It is true that particular cultural or ethnic groups do happen to serve as principal carriers of certain faiths. Sociologists call them 'ethno-religious communities', but the term is apt to mislead. While most British Pakistanis are Muslim, many British Muslims are not Pakistani. Christians of all people should be alert to the danger of reducing faith to culture, as might be done by those who suggest that Christianity is merely a product of 'western culture'. Authentic Christian discipleship today requires a searching critique of 'western culture', and specifically of 'British culture'. I've suggested that cultural and ethnic diversity can be received as a gift of God. But unlike adherents to 'religious pluralism', I would not say the same about religious diversity. Deep differences of religious conviction are evidence of the outworking of our fallenness not of our creatureliness, which leads me to my next point.

**Third**, in criticising 'multiculturalism', some commentators really mean '**multi-faithism**'. By this I think they mean the theological doctrine of 'religious pluralism', according to which diverse faiths are to be viewed as equally valid pathways to the divine. Christians cannot endorse 'multi-faithism' in this sense without abandoning their confession of the uniqueness of Jesus Christ as 'the only name given under heaven by which people may be saved'.<sup>15</sup> The priority of religious belief over cultural affiliation was already anticipated in the Old Testament, where, as Julian Rivers notes, 'cultural integration was...treated as intrinsically good, but...was subordinate to the need to preserve religious truth'.<sup>16</sup>

But this proper rejection of 'multi-faithism' is often tied, confusingly, to a defence of Britain as a 'Christian nation'. The argument is that the foundations of British society and government are rooted in Christian faith, so that allowing non-Christian minority faiths to exercise public influence would somehow erode those foundations. Underneath this is the assumption that, because Britain has historically been formed as a predominantly Christian nation, its public institutions retain a standing obligation to keep it

so, and this means keeping the public influence of other faiths at bay. The implication is that, where 'public space' is no longer visibly shaped by a Christian ethos, this amounts to an unacceptable retreat on the part of public institutions, a retreat which may in time undermine the foundations of British public life. I would argue, however, that public space in a multicultural and multi-faith society will inevitably be shared and plural, and that Christians should not turn to government to halt or reverse this development. Rather they should acknowledge the post-Christendom fact of religious plurality as the new context of mission – a context bringing both challenge and opportunity. Other faiths (most importantly secularism) also need to come to terms with the reality of a plural public space. It will certainly be a challenge in such a context to sustain a sufficient minimum adherence to essential political norms (a matter on which Jonathan Sacks has very important things to say in *The Home We Build Together*). Christians should be in the forefront of meeting this challenge, and this will involve reminding the nation of the distinctively Christian roots out of which British political culture has grown. But this task of 'reminding' involves not invoking the constitutional privileges of the past but rearticulating the plausibility of Christian political wisdom within an unavoidably pluralistic context.

**Fourth**, and relatedly, the term 'multiculturalism' is sometimes used to warn against **imposed secularism**. Some see this as occurring under cover of an overly-expansive regime of 'equality' or 'human rights', but the concern is wider. It is that, under the guise of official public neutrality among faiths, a substantive secularist worldview is being aided and abetted by government in various areas of public policy, such as education, health care, or social services. The writer Tobias Jones for example, has warned, as his headline put it, that 'secular fundamentalists are the new totalitarians':

There's an aspiring totalitarianism in Britain which is brilliantly disguised. It's disguised because the would-be dictators – and there are many of them – all pretend to be more tolerant than thou. They hide alongside the anti-racists, the anti-homophobes and anti-sexists. But what they really want is something very different. They – call them secular fundamentalists – are anti-God, and what they really want is the eradication of religion, and all believers, from the face of the earth (*The Guardian* 6 Jan. 2007).

Allowing for journalistic hyperbole here, Jones has a serious point. People of religious faith (and not just Christians) have good reason to be concerned about imposed secularism. But again, it is quite misleading to describe it as 'multiculturalism', or to suggest that it is a necessary consequence of 'multiculturalism'.

**Fifth**, the term is sometimes used – also unhelpfully – to refer to what is more accurately described as **cultural relativism**. This is partly what Jonathan Sacks seems to have in his sights. He argues, rightly, that British society is less and less able to serve as a 'home' in which members experience a sense of belonging and in which they are encouraged to display commitment to a common good, and more and more resembles a 'hotel' in which people merely pursue their individual interests indifferent to the lives of their fellow citizens. The basic reason for this, he holds, is the progressive abandonment of shared public values rooted in universal principles, and the retreat into a relativistic celebration of mere 'difference', implying that all cultural practices are of equal moral standing. Christians as well as Jews, committed to a belief in universal moral truths, should reject cultural 'relativism' in the sense I have defined it here, even though they should also recognise the cultural 'relativity' (or 'contextuality') of their own expressions of faith. The disabling political conclusion of cultural relativism is that public authorities should refrain from making any unfavourable judgement at all on a minority group or its distinctive practices. This is an untenable position which no government actually adheres to. The advance of cultural relativism in public discourse is obviously deeply troubling. But again, it is misleading to suggest that such relativism is a necessary consequence either of the fact of a multicultural (or multi-faith) society or of the introduction of multicultural policies, to which I now turn.

**Sixth**, the term 'multiculturalism' may refer to a **set of public policy responses to the fact of cultural and religious diversity**. Let me deal first with policies responding to *cultural diversity*. For example, in the UK a series of pieces of legislation, and several public agencies, have been introduced since the 1960s to protect people against discrimination on grounds of race or

other markers of identity. Gender was later added to the list of protected criteria, and most recently sexual orientation (in the Equality Act of 2005). All of the above groups are now protected by the new Equality and Human Rights Commission (chaired by Trevor Phillips). Multicultural policies have also included, for example, public funding for ethnic minority community centres, language provision for ethnic minorities, the marking of cultural festivals in schools or other public institutions, granting representation on public bodies to leaders of ethnic minorities, and so forth.

Such policies are not just neutral administrative responses to cultural diversity. They have a clear moral purpose, namely equal respect, which is to be made visible in policies of equal treatment of diverse cultural communities. Beneath this lies the basic principle of equal citizenship which is foundational to liberal democracy. Most Christians today rightly affirm that principle. Debates then turn on what that principle actually requires for public policy, and the answer is by no means always straightforward. Today, some Christians are arguing, rightly, that 'equal citizenship' is being extended into areas where it does not belong and where it actually generates new forms of (in this case, religious) discrimination. The Equality Act is, they say, being used to impose a regime of uniformity on civil society institutions and churches at the cost of their independence and confessional integrity. At the same time, such Christian critics continue to affirm, also rightly, the legal imposition of equal treatment between different races or nationalities (e.g., non-discrimination in housing or employment).

Surely no Christian would want to repudiate multicultural policies in their entirety. Nor do Jonathan Sacks or Trevor Phillips. So the unqualified disparaging of something called 'multiculturalism' is profoundly unhelpful in public debate. A thoughtful response to multicultural policies will demand from Christians, as it does from others, a clear account of why the norm of equal treatment is valid in certain areas of public policy but not in others.

Such an account is surely possible. It would involve, *inter alia*, an argument for the application to 'culture' of what lawyers call 'religious accommodation' (on which more below): i.e. the modifying of uniform laws, where possible, in order to respect the deeply-held cultural identities of citizens. This might involve, first, the recognition of selected equal rights to have one's cultural identity protected where it is under threat, or to have it adequately respected or represented in certain public *fora* where it is in danger of being marginalised. No such rights can ever be absolute, but they are quite properly part of the package of equal citizenship in multicultural societies like the UK.

Second, it might include a case for equitable public treatment of licit cultural associations promoting the interests of a particular cultural group. By 'licit' I simply mean 'within the law', thereby ruling out the use of such associations as a cover for inciting members to engage in violent or other illegal acts. The multiplicity of civil society associations in a modern society is an essential ingredient of a free society in which there are clear limits to the reach of the state. Christian social thought has long championed such a wide dispersal of social and political power, and a network of vibrant cultural associations can contribute to it. Naturally, it is desirable if such associations cooperate with many others, in ways appropriate to their identity and purpose. But it is a mistake, I suggest, to impose upon them an obligation to pursue such inchoate aspirations as 'promoting social cohesion', or to discriminate against those who cannot demonstrate that they are so doing – some Christian associations might be hard put to meet that condition. Social cohesion is a highly desirable goal, but it cannot be compelled by law, only indirectly encouraged by carefully targeted public policies.

Third, the account might include policies designed to address persisting structural economic injustices suffered by minority cultural groups. This problem is greatest in certain inner-city areas where immigrant or other minority communities find themselves trapped in cycles of poverty and disempowerment, aggravated by racial, ethnic or religious prejudice and

discrimination. Some have spoken of the danger of the 'segregation' of minority cultural groups, or of their living 'parallel' lives. I suggest that the real problem is not that some minority communities might choose to live somewhat apart from the social mainstream, cultivating their own cultural and religious lives as they see fit within their own communities and perhaps schools (though they cannot, and rarely want to, isolate themselves entirely). We should question the emerging new public doctrine that all minority cultural communities should 'integrate' into all aspects of British society. The problem arises when the choice to live at a distance is compounded (or prompted) by structural economic deprivation or by social prejudice; or when it leads to, or follows, the fostering of attitudes and practices that might induce some towards illegal or socially disruptive acts. Here government action will be an essential component of a package of responses that will involve many individuals and agencies, and to which there are no simple 'solutions'.

We now come, fourth, to policies responding to *religious diversity*. These need to be kept distinct from policies aimed at respecting cultural diversity, even though in the fog of public debate they are frequently conflated. As noted, lawyers refer to such policies as 'religious accommodation', i.e. the modifying of uniform laws, where possible, in order to respect the deeply-held religious identities of citizens. This is a long-established practice in most liberal democracies, though it is increasingly controversial. In the UK it includes things as varied as: the exemption for Sikh motorcyclists from the obligation to wear helmets; the exemption for faith-based organisations from non-discrimination employment laws where there is a 'genuine occupational requirement' for the post-holder to profess the faith of the employer; exemptions for Christian health-care professionals from the obligation to participate in performing abortions; the provision of so-called 'Sharia-compliant' financial instruments for Muslims in business; or the freedom for church schools to give preference to children of Christian parents in their admissions policies; and so on. It also includes the recognition of Jewish Beth Din courts for the arbitration of

certain family disputes. These are not, as is frequently supposed, *departures from* the principle of the rule of law or that of equality before the law, but rather the *specification* of what equal treatment should actually require *given the religious diversity of citizens*. Once law makes such 'accommodations' to such minorities, then the law as modified must be obeyed by all: the principle of the rule of law is not breached in any way. Rulings of Beth Din are, in any case, subordinate to uniform civil law, and can be appealed against if a party believes a serious injustice has been committed.

I interpret the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent lecture on Sharia law as a contribution to the necessary debate about how far such legal accommodation of religious minorities should go. What proved most controversial was his suggestion that existing 'Sharia Councils' might be given some form of public recognition. There is indeed a serious debate to be had about arrangements like these. Is there any way under them to offer adequate guarantees that, given the very powerful patriarchal cultures in some Muslim communities, women's civil rights will not be compromised? Might they add to the tendency for some Muslim communities to become dangerously segregated from the rest of society? Christians, especially those with close knowledge of how minority religious communities operate on the ground, will have constructive contributions to make to that needed debate.

### **Conclusion**

I have suggested that Christians ought to support selected 'multicultural' *policies* insofar as they flow from a principle of equal citizenship which Christians already rightly endorse. They should be critical of 'multi-faithism', imposed secularism and cultural relativism, while also relinquishing 'Christian traditionalism'. Christians should be in the forefront of working towards a society in which diverse cultural and religious communities can co-exist peacefully within the law, and where they can cooperate constructively in promoting the common good from out of their own distinctive resources.

## Response: Jenny Taylor

Being a journalist, I am no doubt guilty of hyperbole (!) But who can deny the fact that, in increasing numbers, mainly Muslim mothers, wives and daughters have borne the brunt of our post-colonial discourse angst? We could not call 'honour' crimes of rape, murder and kidnap the horrors that they are, for fear of offending somebody's 'culture'.<sup>1</sup>

Recently, a government minister admitted as much. Lord West of Spithead, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Home Office, in response to a question in the House of Lords from Baroness Cox about honour crimes said: 'At times, nervousness has been felt that this behaviour might step across cultural or religious divides . . .' [I presume he meant *criticism* of this behaviour.] A revealing admission: multi-cultural delicacy disguising the strange prejudice that Asian girls are less affected by sexual abuse – for that is what it is – than white girls, for it is 'their culture'.

This sad state of affairs has its roots in recent history, and I fear that Jonathan Chaplin, who does not actually define culture in his essay, sidesteps what's really at stake. He says: 'It is quite misleading to describe [enforced secularism] as 'multiculturalism', or to suggest that it is a necessary consequence of 'multiculturalism.' And yet, it is enforced secularism, acting like a religion, that has been the default position for our society since the war, in an attempt to create the foundations of a system that would never again lead to the gas chambers.

But to back up a moment and try to define terms. Lesslie Newbigin described culture as 'the way we do things round here'. If that's all that's meant by multiculturalism, there would surely be no problem. It's a platitude much-loved of politicians that we should 'celebrat[e] the richness of diverse historical and ethnic cultures'. Chaplin calls them 'gifts of God'. Does he mean birianis and burkhas, bangla and Borat? Well, OK – but it's a superficial enough point. Cultural appurtenances such as food, costume, feast days and so on are hardly what's at stake.

Customs do not amount to a 'culture'. Such luxuries (for there is no doubt they do add to the colour, flavour and texture of life in 'multicultural' Britain for those who can afford to enjoy them) come at a cost, I suggest; we can enjoy them even as they distract us from the suffering that so much that is unredeemed in cultures visits upon their poor. Where in fact does Jesus 'celebrate' Judaistic or Samaritan cultures? Does he not rather commend those individuals within them that manifest supra-cultural values, e.g. charity? And if Chaplin is talking about Pentecost, surely the point there is that the miraculous unity (not of course *uniformity*) manifesting in a common language among disparate people groups is precisely a non-ethnic unity. It is a unity made possible by the Holy Spirit working *on* culture to transform it.

Ethnicity is the key to understanding what's happening in Britain. If we describe culture as having to do with 'ethnicity' we may get nearer the problem, for ethnicity is, by definition, more than simply race (itself a much disputed reification), and more than simply what you wear or eat. It is all those things that distinguish one people group from the bigger group that surrounds it. Ethnicity carries with it a sense of a discrete territory and of being 'small', a minority. England has not been deemed to have an ethnicity, since historically in these islands, the English have been in the majority. The term 'White' simply does not do justice to this – and is effectively a neologism.<sup>2</sup> Since 1982, ethnicity has been defined in English law as 'having to do with religion'.<sup>3</sup> The 1976 Race Relations Act did not include religion in its definition of 'racial group' and it was only in relation to the case of a Sikh schoolboy who wished to be allowed to wear his turban to school for religious reasons that the word 'ethnicity' had to be redefined. Food and clothing – culture in the positive sense in which Chaplin wishes to celebrate it – is legally indissoluble from religion.

And that's where the problem – and the confusion – begin. For Chaplin is quite clear that multi-faithism is not a good thing. He talks of a 'proper rejection of multi-faithism' while at the same time criticising those who, presumably like

Bishop Nazir-Ali, seek 'a defence of Britain as a Christian nation'. Multiculturalism, at root, is multi-faithism. Of course, it is the ideological standpoint that has to be disputed, not the fact. A Christian nation cannot force people to observe just one faith, and indeed need not.

And that's where we go back to the earlier point – of enforced secularism. Post-Holocaust and Cold War intellectuals deliberately *did* set out to 'disguise a programme of enforced secularism'. After the war and the horror of the internment camps, it became an article of faith that a person's culture identified them *as* a person, and was therefore sacrosanct. An American Anthropological Association project for a Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1947, redrafted its first article as follows: 'The individual realizes his personality through his culture. Hence respect for individual differences entails a respect for cultural differences.'<sup>4</sup> This was a response to the attempt by the Nazis to eradicate Jews and gays and gypsies because they were different. Never again should a dictator be allowed to rise up, on the back of bourgeois church-sanctioned values, and justify genocide. Influential thinkers like Isaiah Berlin and Theodore Adorno, who fled Nazism to the West, believed it was those very values that had permitted the harassment and extermination of a whole race on the basis of its difference from the majority.<sup>5</sup> It was their arguments that lent legitimacy to the Cold War effort to subvert the West by the establishment of policies that would dilute all manifestations of a coherent nationhood, and weaken the state.<sup>6</sup> Paradoxically, respect for difference would mean the gradual replacement of a Christian culture by a secular alternative that could arbitrate a neutral legal and social environment for all. But this is a fallacious hope, and ideological secularism begins to act with the force of a religion. It is the shibboleth of state neutrality that is now crumbling, as evidence begins to emerge of how cultural quarantines – multicultural-*ism* – have in effect imprisoned and dehumanized so many, mainly women. Multicultural-*ism* becomes informal apartheid<sup>7</sup> – and Christians, out of 'respect' have accommodated themselves too much to the prevailing political view and muted their prophetic critique. A robust Christian

political theology is required to shore up the bastions of a civil society that it seeks not to dominate but to protect *for the flourishing of others*. Christianity is not just another pressure group, seeking advantage for itself. It is an acid, if you like, 'breaking down the dividing wall of hostility' through acts of love and service.

For this reason, my final issue with Chaplin's analysis is his comment that 'public space in a multicultural and multi-faith society will inevitably be shared and plural, and that Christians should not turn to government to halt or reverse this development'. This is a secularist argument that reifies religions as if they were all commensurable, and therefore interchangeable. The reification of 'religion' was a sociological and political exercise for reasons of bureaucratic convenience. If we follow this line, we accede to the very identity politics that has got us into difficulties, and which, as Gerd Bauman saw in his study *Contesting Culture*, based in Southall, encourages clientelism and patronage, with religious groups competing for government favours along ethnic lines.<sup>8</sup>

Christianity, at least for the Christian, is not simply one among the world faiths, a sort of co-equal member of a board of religions. It is the guarantor of the State, calling it to justice and reminding it of its limitedness.<sup>9</sup> It underpins rather than threatens the very survival of a civil society that can offer hospitality to those who seek its benefits, and provides the resources for wise rule. I would ask Jonathan Chaplin: Where in the world of 'other faiths' does he see civil society? Where in the world is there a system that does not persecute its own? And why should a Christian see the vacating of a public square to which it has given rise, an opportunity for mission? Our presence in the public square should not privilege the church, but benefit those for whom the church acts and speaks. Christianity is supremely and *uniquely* a religion *for the sake of others* – which is the meaning of the loathsome Cross. It seems to me to be contradictory to seek to have influence by vacating the very places and opportunities that afford it – unless we have become so corrupted by it that we no longer deserve a place.

---

## End notes (Chaplin)

1. This article is adapted from a talk given at a conference on 'Multiculturalism: Template for Peace or Recipe for Division' at the West Yorkshire School of Christian Studies, Leeds, 8 December 2007. <http://www.wysocks.org.uk/recordings.php>.
2. Archbishop of Canterbury, 'Civil and Religious Law in England: A Religious Perspective', 7 February 2008. <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1575>. Commentaries on the theme by Andrew Goddard, Jonathan Chaplin and Jenny Taylor can be found on the 'Fulcrum' website: <http://www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/articles.cfm>.
3. Jonathan Sacks is Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of Britain and the Commonwealth.
4. Jonathan Sacks, *The Home We Build Together: Recreating Society* (Continuum, 2007), 3.
5. The 'Cantle Report' (Home Office, *Community Cohesion: Report of the Independent Review Team*, Chaired by Ted Cantle, 2001). <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2001/12/11/communitycohesionreport.pdf>.
6. Interview in *The Times*, reported at: [http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1061114\\_1,00.html](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1061114_1,00.html).
7. Giles Kepel, 'Europe's Answer to Londonistan', *openDemocracy*, 24 August 2005. [http://www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-terrorism/londonistan\\_2775.jsp#](http://www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-terrorism/londonistan_2775.jsp#)
8. See also Bikhu Parekh, *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* (Macmillan, 2000). For a more recent defence of multiculturalism, see Tariq Modood, *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea* (Polity, 2007).
9. The Runnymede Trust, *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (The Parekh Report) (Profile Books, 2000).
10. [http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1061114\\_1,00.html](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1061114_1,00.html)
11. 'The Future of Britishness', Fabian Society, 2006. <http://fabians.org.uk/events/new-year-conference-06/brown-britishness/>
12. See, for example, Lord Carey's critical response to Archbishop Williams' lecture on 'Civil and Religious Law in England', *Sunday Telegraph*, 10 February 2008. This followed remarks in January 2008 by the Anglican Bishop of Rochester, Michael Nazir-Ali, also in the *Sunday Telegraph*. [http://rochester.anglican.org/bishop\\_michael\\_addressarticles\\_subpage\\_2008.htm](http://rochester.anglican.org/bishop_michael_addressarticles_subpage_2008.htm).
13. This refers to the number of member countries in the European Union prior to the accession of ten candidate countries in 2004. The EU15 are: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.
14. See Gordon Wenham, 'To Veil or Not to Veil: Multiculturalism and the Bible', *Ethics in Brief* 11/4 (Autumn 2006); Julian Rivers, 'Multiculturalism', *Cambridge Papers* 10/4 (December 2001) [http://www.jubilee-centre.org/online\\_documents/Multiculturalism.htm](http://www.jubilee-centre.org/online_documents/Multiculturalism.htm); Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Abingdon Press, 1996).
15. Vinoyth Ramachandra, *Faiths in Conflict? Christian Integrity in a Multicultural World* (Inter-Varsity Press, 1999).
16. Julian Rivers, 'Multiculturalism', 4.

## Endnotes (Taylor)

1. See the disturbing report *Crimes of the Community: Honour-based violence in the UK* published on 4 February 2008 by the Centre for Social Cohesion. The debate on it in the House of Lords can be found at <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200708/ldhansrd/text/80310-0001.htm#08031016000438>
2. Timothy Jenkins makes the point in *Religion in Everyday Life* that there has never been an ethnography written of the English. 'There is no single book concerning the anthropology of Britain . . . such works as exist are scattered in focus and method, and isolated in time and place one from another, and there is no overall appraisal of the situation of ethnography in Britain, neither its achievements, nor its limitations, nor its prospects. Moreover, if interest is confined primarily to England and its specificity, these criticisms may be redoubled' (Oxford, 1999), iv .
3. See *Mandla v. Dowell Lee*, first at the Court of Appeal, reported at [1982] 3 All ER 1108, then at the House of Lords, reported as [1983] 1 All ER 1062, cited in T. Asad, *Genealogies of Religion* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 258.
4. Alain Finkielkraut, *The Undoing of Thought* (Claridge Press, 1988), 73.
5. See Melanie Phillips, 'The Corruption of Liberalism', lecture given at the Centre for Policy Studies, 1997.
6. The Marxian Antonio Gramsci was a chief proponent of this 'ideological warfare'. See the article 'Gramscian Damage' at <http://esr.ibiblio.org/?p=260>
7. See my chapter 'Multiculturalism and the Cult of Silence' in *Faith and Power*, Lesslie Newbigin et al (Wipf & Stock, 2005), 87-92.
8. G. Bauman, *Contesting Culture* (Cambridge, 1996), 203.
9. See Oliver O'Donovan, *The Desire of the Nations* (Cambridge, 1996).

## For further reading

- Chaplin, Jonathan, 'Respecting Diversity, Rejecting Neutrality: From "Liberal Pluralism" to "Christian Pluralism"', *Christian Scholar's Review* 35 (2006), 143-175.
- Modood, Tariq, *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*, Polity Press, 2007.
- Mouw, Richard J. & Griffioen, Sander, *Pluralisms and Horizons*, Eerdmans, 1993.
- Rivers, Julian, 'Multiculturalism', *Cambridge Papers* 10/4 (December 2001).
- Newbigin, Lesslie et al, *Faith and Power: Christianity and Islam in 'Secular' Britain* (Wipf & Stock, 2005).
- Sacks, Jonathan, *The Home We Build Together: Recreating Society*, Continuum, 2007.
- Volf, Miroslav, *Exclusion and Embrace*, Abingdon, 1996

**Dr Jonathan Chaplin** is Director of the Kirby Laing Institute for Christian Ethics. He has edited three books, and authored many articles, on Christian political thought.

**Dr Jenny Taylor**, a former grantee of the Whitefield Institute, is Director of Lapid Media, a consultancy promoting religious literacy in world affairs. She is author of 'The Myth of Multiculturalism', in Lesslie Newbigin et al, *Faith and Power: Christianity and Islam in 'Secular' Britain* (SPCK 1998/Wipf and Stock 2005).

The Kirby Laing Institute for Christian Ethics,  
Tyndale House 36 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge, CB3 9BA, UK  
T 01223 566619 F 01223 566608 E Ethics@Tyndale.cam.ac.uk