NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH

Research Paper No. 210

Asylum and the path to citizenship: a case study of Somalis in the United Kingdom

Rebecca Tuck

E-mail: rebecca.tuck@hotmail.co.uk

June 2011

UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

Policy Development and Evaluation Service

Policy Development and Evaluation Service
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
P.O. Box 2500, 1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland

E-mail: hqpd00@unhcr.org
Web Site: www.unhcr.org

ISSN 1020-7473

Introduction

On 3rd December 2008 the United Kingdom Borders Agency (UKBA) announced a proposal for new legislation; the Borders, Immigration and Citizenship Bill. Many changes were proposed in relation to customs, nationality, immigration and asylum. The overall intention was 'to strengthen border controls, by bringing together customs and immigration powers, and to ensure that newcomers to the United Kingdom *earn the right to stay* (emphasis mine)' (UKBA, 2008).

Of particular relevance to refugees were changes to the process of naturalization; with the introduction of an extra period of probationary citizenship during which an individual must earn the right to full citizenship. If a refugee failed to show commitment to the UK, namely by volunteering, the process of naturalisation would be slowed down, delaying access to full citizenship rights. The name given to this policy of proving commitment was 'active citizenship'.

The drive behind 'active citizenship' is the perceived failure of migrant communities to show engagement and commitment to the UK. For some analysts, this problem is intensified by 'super mobility' (Rutter, Latorre & Sriskandarajah, 2008), where migration is becoming less permanent in an increasingly fluid and mobile world.

Where migrants are failing to put down 'roots,' a sense of 'Britishness' must be rethought and reinvigorated (Goldsmith, 2008). 'Active citizenship' aims to strengthen bonds between migrant and others communities in the UK and to create social ties of belonging. In the words of one ex Minister of State for Borders and Immigration; 'in a world without walls, we need shared standards to make Britain feel like home (Byrne, 2008).

Citizenship is being reformulated within a new social cohesion model of integration, where multiculturalism is seen to be failing. Gaining citizenship would become, in the language of the Home Office, a 'journey along the path' (Home Office, 2008) where individuals would prove responsibilities rather than rights. And it was 'active citizenship' which was put forward to create a shared set of 'British values' based on civic duty and responsibility within communities.

In response, refugee and volunteering organizations voiced their concerns, particularly regarding 'active citizenship' and proscribed volunteering (Refugee Council 2008, Volunteering England, 2008). They argued, firstly, refugees do not have to earn their right to stay and they should not have to volunteer to earn the right to permanent security and citizenship status. Secondly, successful integration works by welcoming newcomers from day one and refugee integration would be impeded by imposing this architecture of 'active citizenship'.

Further reservations were made in 2009, as the Bill was going through parliament, by the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee, the House of Lords and the Human Rights Joint Committee regarding compatibility of the Bill's provisions with the European Commission for Human Rights (ECHR) and the Refugee Convention (Kostakopoulou, 2010). Despite these concerns, in July 2009 the Bill gained royal assent, although the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act (2009) failed to include a definition of 'active citizenship'. This lack of clarity, as well as a change of

government, eventually led to the act being dropped 5th November 2010 (UKBA, 2010).
Although the Act was axed, the rhetoric and concepts behind 'active citizenship' remain en vogue in policy circles. Since the last Labour government, social cohesion has evolved as the replacement for multiculturalism, which is blamed for 'integration problems'. For example, a lack of social cohesion has been cited as the reason for the Bradford riots in 2001 (Yuval-Davies, Anthias & Kofman, 2005).

This year David Cameron, in a speech made about terrorism, declared the failure of multiculturalism and the need to 'encourage meaningful and active participation in society' and 'true cohesion' (Cameron, 2011a). In a later speech, this time on immigration, he spoke of the problem of 'discomfort and disjointedness' in communities and the need to achieve 'real communities' and 'real integration' (Cameron, 2011b).

This paper attempts to assess the impact on refugee communities of policy ideas including 'active citizenship' and proscribed volunteering, as well as to unravel the ideas behind the new social cohesion model. How does 'active citizenship' affect refugee integration? Is it a policy which could lead to better integration for refugees or more discrimination? And finally, why is integration of refugee communities seen as problematic?

To try to answer this question a Somali case study has been chosen. In order to evaluate the potential impact of 'active citizenship' a critical lens is applied to the discourse surrounding Somali integration to understand how integration is perceived as a success or failure.

Although Somalis have lived in the UK since the 19th century they have repeatedly been described as 'problematic' or 'difficult' in terms of integration (Harris, 2004; Ward & Spacey, 2008). Amongst the reasons cited are limited successes in socio-economic measures, including high rates of unemployment, as well as tendencies to remain within their own communities, with some claims based on Islamaphobic accusations. There is also now a focus on the mobile and transnational nature of Somali identities and relationships, especially pertaining to remittances and secondary movements within the EU border, which are viewed by some as challenging to the British nation-territory-citizen hierarchy.

Along with other factors voiced within the discourse of Somali integration, these tensions shed light on how Somali integration is currently understood, as well as how the national model of 'Britishness' and integration impacts on this discourse. The analysis used looks at integration as a discursive space within the national ideology of integration in the UK and seeks to understand 'active citizenship' as part of this discourse. At the same time this paper seeks to understand the Somali experience within this discourse and specifically how the concept of 'active citizenship' affects their 'path to citizenship.'

Understanding 'active citizenship' and refugee integration

The policy changes in the Borders, Immigration and Citizenship Bill followed a government green paper; 'The Path to Citizenship: Next Steps in Reforming the Immigration System (UKBA, 2008a). In this paper the metaphor of a path is utilised to emphasise that gaining citizenship, for all migrants including refugees, should be achieved only by following a certain trajectory. Along the path newcomers must not only take on 'British' values and a sense of community belonging, they must also prove they can demonstrate this through community participation.

Under current legislation refugees must wait five years with leave to remain, after which they are able to apply for citizenship. This involves passing a citizenship test and proving language capability and soundness of mind. Under the proposed legislation the main change was the addition of a stage of 'probationary' citizenship. 'During this stage migrants will demonstrate whether they have earned the right to progress to either British Citizenship or Permanent Residence, or they will leave the UK' (Home Office, 2008a:20). By volunteering, which was set out as the real measure of community participation, citizenship applications were to be fast-tracked. For refugees, although they would not have had to leave if they have not volunteered, their citizenship was to be delayed.

Where multiculturalism has produced separate and marginalised communities, a nation wide social cohesion model intends to link society at all levels through a common sense of duty (Brown, 2008). Importantly, this entails a shift in how integration itself is defined. Up until now integration has been positioned as prior to cohesion, defined at the individual and household level. Once integration takes place at this level, wider community cohesion follows (Rutter et al., 2007). Also, integration has been measured in terms of success in public spheres such as education, or needs being met in housing for example (Ager and Strang, 2004). Being socially connected to the community and engaged in society has only been part of the equation.

'Active citizenship' within the emergence of civic identity

The concept of 'active citizenship' was never clarified during the process of legislation of the Bill. The origins of 'active citizenship' in the UK can be traced back to the Conservative government of the 1980s which adopted an urban regeneration policy from the United States. The idea was to achieve regeneration with less input from the welfare state and instead to rely on social networks and community engagement.

When Labour came to power this was adapted within a new communitarian discourse which was directly influenced by Giddens' 'third way' (Giddens, 1998 in Marienetto, 2003). At this time 'community' grew in importance as, under Blair's social democracy, there was a push towards promoting responsibility in ones community. Yet 'active citizenship' policy did not become popular enough and was never fully realised. Marienetto argues this is because it entails an over optimistic notion of national community (Marienetto, 2003).

Despite its original failure, more recently 'active citizenship' has regained popularity and is being used in the context of citizenship education in schools. One leading

organisation that provide information on citizenship education for schools, The Institute for Citizenship, define 'active citizenship' as 'political literacy; social and moral responsibility; and community involvement' (Institute for Citizenship, 2009:5). Corresponding to this, citizenship itself is defined as 'membership of a political community that is internally defined by rights, duties, participation and identity'.

These definitions reflect the way in which citizenship is coming to be redefined in relation to nationality. In an effort to invigorate citizenship where nationality is seen to be unsuccessful distinctions are being made between the two. In particular political solidarity is emphasised over ethnic solidarity;

> Ethnic nationalism promotes an idea of biological ancestry that links an individual to the nation and its customs and traditions. *Obviously immigration threatens a model of Britishness based on ethnicity and common ancestry* (emphasis mine).
>
> Civic nationalism stresses a belonging to a nation on the basis of citizenship rights, shared political values, common civic institutions and a shared language (Fenton 2007) (Rutter, Latorre & Sriskandarajah, 2008).

'Civic nationalism' is being proclaimed as less exclusionary as it is not 'threatened' by immigration and is thought to be more accessible to newcomers than 'ethnic nationalism'. The rationale of this is that identity politics are avoided under a common civic identity (Morrell, 2008).

However the development of 'active citizenship' within the wider trend of creating a 'civic nationality' reveals how nationality and citizenship are being conflated to reinvigorate 'Britishness'. Taking this into account it is important to look at how citizenship and nationality have been manipulated in the past, particularly where this has been used to control migration and exclude others in the construction of 'Britishness.'

Implications of historical context of migration management

To fully understand how 'civic nationalism' may be used it is worth looking briefly at the history of how nationality and citizenship have previously been constructed in relation to each other. In particular the current political rhetoric of migration as threat to citizenship and community cohesion can be compared to how categories of nationality and citizenship have been used as part of past migration management policies.

The distinction between citizenship and nationality is murky. In contrast to nationality, citizenship tends to be recognised as a universal legal category giving rights to inhabitants of a nation-state. All should be entitled to citizenship and it should not be a privilege (Spencer, 1995). However, like nationality, citizenship can also be a contested category with its boundaries defined depending on the nation-state policy.

In the UK the overlapping of 'citizenship' and 'nationality' has historically been used as a political tool to manage migration by adapting the categories depending on who the

government wishes to gain entitlements or not (Hampshire, 2005). In the last century, due to the territorialisation of sovereignty and loyalty, nationality has superseded citizenship as the dominant identity in this relationship.

But this has not always been the case. Before nation building became common across Europe migrants tended to move back and forth between home and where they worked. Access to citizenship was easy and peoples were not defined and included or excluded according to an exclusive concept of nationality (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002). The national passport only came into being after the First World War (Torpey, 2000).

Biersteker and Weber (1991) attribute this historical trend in constructing 'Britishness' as dependent on market forces. During the 1960s the legacy of colonialism meant an array of citizenship categories existed throughout the ex-colonies. Many were attracted to life in the UK, especially as their citizen status provided the opportunity for this. But in reaction to what was seen as too many, nationality was used politically, and redefined as a way of controlling entry. At this point nationality became defined according to race, so that certain citizens could be excluded. Later, after the Windrush Generation, the definition of 'Britishness' was changed again. This time nationality became defined from within the nation state using race to define 'them' in order to define 'us' (Gilroy, 2002).

Now again citizenship, over nationality, has returned to popularity both in theory and policy. The main trends in the study of citizenship in the social sciences are within security debates (Nyers et al., 2004) and anti-discrimination agendas (Lister, 2006).

In response to the question 'what's left of citizenship?' Nyers et al. (2004) critique the exclusionary effects of inclusion in the current atmosphere of securitisation across Europe. As the socio-political context changes, so the citizen becomes a way of normalising migration policy. Just as security concerns are embodying citizens (Muller, 2004), asylum concerns are too resulting in a shift in the idea of self (Walters, 2004). Walters describes the emergence of what he calls 'domopolitics', which is how he sees the UK state redefining its imagined community in the perceived danger of an ever mobile world.

> Domopolitics embodies a tactic which juxtaposes the 'warm words' (Connolly, 1995, p. 142) of community, trust, and citizenship, with the danger words of a chaotic outside - illegals, traffickers, terrorists; a game which configures things as 'Us vs. Them' (Stasiulis, 1997, p.203). (Walters, 2004: 240).

Thus, the identity of the citizen and the protection of identity is becoming a crucial part of migration control. The drive towards 'social cohesion' and 'active citizenship' can be seen as a statement of migration management under a perceived threat of the 'super mobile' 'other'. According to these critical studies, citizenship is now being used to construct walls in the way 'ethnic nationality' was used before.

Concepts of refugee integration

Refugee integration must take into account 'refugeeing' discourses which are involved in the construction of 'us' and 'them'. The historic contingency of the development of the nation-state and the emergence of the 'refugee' is now common knowledge within the study of forced migration. Nation building relies on the refugee as an outsider. As the world came to be seen as divided into a mosaic of territories, the exile or émigré was transformed into the refugee, someone outside of the nation-state territory. Thus the refugee became an individual outside of the legal and social norm; excluded from the international statist model of state-citizen-territory.

Haddad (2003), in describing the refugee as 'between sovereigns,' argues that refugees are an inevitable reality in a world where the nation-state is prioritised. As misfits refugees are inherently 'problematic' for the state.

> Other foreigners, such as migrants and immigrants, may of course present a challenge to the identity or ethnic make-up of a community. Yet their transnational movement has been one of choice and they remain firmly rooted in the 'normal' citizen-state relationship (Haddad 2003:298).

Using Schmitt's notion that political entities rely on the friend-enemy dichotomy for their maintenance, Haddad shows how refugees must be imagined as outside, for the imagined state to appear a reality. The creation of the nation state depends on a certain imagining of the refugee as problematic. In the creation of the 'national order of things' (Malkki, 1995) refugees are given a quality of disorder, as misfits. At stake is the 'imagined community', an imagined culturally cohesive unit created by the state. Soguk (1999) goes further, stating not only are refugees needed for the existence of states, but that the refugee discourse itself is involved in this 'refugeeing.'

> …the refugee discourse, articulating and circulating a specific historical figure of the refugee (by way of concrete governmental and intergovernmental regime activities attendant upon refugee events), serves as one of the many boundary-producing discourses instrumental in the expression, empowerment, and institutionalisation of a certain territorialised figure of the citizen-subject, the presumed foundational subject on the basis of which the sovereign state itself has historically been, and continues to be articulated (Soguk, 1999:243-44).

Analysing refugee integration and 'active citizenship'

These notions of integration and the 'other' can be understood using a Foucauldian lens to look at processes of subjectivity and state-making. All citizen-subjects in the nation-state are created through subjectivity; not just refugees or other migrants. Rather the norm is simultaneously constructed at the same time as the abnormal. Subjectivity involves a process where citizen-subjects are produced through the development of self-awareness.

In this vein, Ong (2003) uses a Foucauldian analysis to understand the every day experiences of Cambodian refugees as they become 'American.' In her analysis of health services Ong looks 'in the gaps' between the categories of refugee and citizen to see how refugees go through the process of negotiating the very different ideas of health that they are used to. Here, understanding the process of becoming American questions the 'normal' and reveals how it is created.

The creation of refugees as citizen-subjects within the norm of a certain type of 'active citizen' allows one to understand integration as a kind of discourse where multiple voices contribute to the creation of the 'normal integrated citizen'. The social space within this subject making process determines to what extent certain identities and practices become discriminated.

The experience of Somali refugees within models of 'ethnic' and 'civic' nationalism can be understood in this way. The analysis used is very much influenced by the work of Leah Bassel (2007, 2009) who looks at the processes of transitioning from refugee to citizen in her work on Somali refugee women in France and Canada, using Althusser's notion of interpellation which can be compared to Foucault's subjectivity.

> He uses the example of a man walking down the street, who is hailed by the police: 'Hey, you there!' The person will turn around, and become a subject by recognising that this hailing was addressed to him. The person being hailed recognises himself as the subject of the hail, and knows how to respond (Bassel, 2009:295).

Hailing takes place according to state ideology and an individual can be hailed even if what is being hailed does not correspond to who they are. Both recognition and misrecognition are possible in the process of making citizen-subjects. Interpellation as an analytical tool is important for Bassel's work because it reveals the differences between how the Somali women are recognised by the state, and how they define themselves. For example a gendered identity in need of protection becomes common amongst Somali women refugees because it is the one recognised by the state.

Interpellation can also be useful for understanding Somali refugee integration in the UK. In the following discussion an extractive form of this type of analysis is used to unpack the processes of integration. Understanding nationality and integration as contested discursive spaces, what has been written about Somali integration in the UK is used to assess the ways in which they are recognised and mis-recognised, as well as how policies of 'active citizenship' could affect these processes.

Somalis in the UK: paths to integration

There has been a Somali population in the UK since the 19th century. Various groups of migrants have journeyed to the UK, forming a significant sized population, many of which have citizen status. Yet Somali communities in the UK are commonly described as difficult to understand. Partly this is attributed to their complex clanship pattern, with an intricate set of group affiliations and politics. It has also been remarked that Somalis themselves have trouble understanding who they are due to a legacy of a complicated

and violent history of 'othering' (Farah, 2000; Steiner, 1998). Misunderstandings have contributed to a common view of Somalis as one homogenous 'problem'.

> 'It is sometimes observed, especially by members of the larger society that Somalis rarely interact socially with others and seem to confine their social activities to themselves' (Jordan, 2004).

As well as misunderstood, Somalis are also often said to be unable to integrate. Reasons put forward include not being able to adapt to bureaucratic administration (Griffiths, 2002), as well labelling of Somalis as welfare scroungers or religious extremists. And in the context of the recent discourse on 'super mobility' (Rutter, Latorre & Sriskandarajah, 2008), Somalis have been cited as one of the groups who may not easily integrate due to their transnationalism and nomadic heritage being at odds with a territorial based national identity.

In order to understand this 'problem' of integration the experiences of two groups within the Somali community are analysed: seafarers and refugees. Although the experiences and histories of the individuals and communities are multiple and complex, these simplified representations are used to be able to analyse the broad trends in Somali integration.

Seafarers and refugees

The first groups of Somalis to arrive in the UK were seafarers working on British navy merchant ships who initially formed transient communities in port cities, the largest groups in London, Cardiff and Liverpool (El Sohl, 1991; Jordan, 2004). They lived mostly separate from the wider community in Somali hostels and would send back remittances to their wives and family in Somalia, many expecting to return to their wives and families back home. It was also the temporary nature of their residence which was the basis for which many were given citizenship rights. After the Second World War much of the British navy was dismantled and the seafarers went through a period of unemployment and severe poverty.

However, with the economic growth of the 1950s many seafarers found jobs on land and were joined by their wives and families. Since then many have integrated successfully, although their experiences have varied with many experiencing racism. Also many elders that migrated as seafarers claim a lack of recognition of their community in the UK and being ignored (Jordan, 2004). For example, Somalis who had lived in the Docklands area in the East En of London since the time they worked for the British navy had no published sociological research written on them until 1991 (El Sohl, 1991).

After these initial movements to the UK students and refugees followed in their footsteps. During the 1980s the numbers of Somalis in the UK rose significantly due to numbers fleeing from Barre's dictatorship and many of the students became refugees in situ. Some clustered around the seafaring communities in East London and Cardiff but most have not formed strong networks with these older communities. Several reasons have been citied for this. The composition of refugee groups is significantly different, consisting mostly of single mothers and children, compared to the male dominant

seafarer communities. Also the dictatorship and civil war destroyed trust throughout Somalia and there had been many socio-political changes in Somalia in the time period between the two migrations.

Importantly, a key difference between seafaring and refugee communities is in how they have been received in the UK, and how they have been acknowledged in social policy. Most of what is written and what we know about Somalis in the UK is from policy papers dating from the 1980s onwards (Harris, 2004). Here 'Somali problems' have been listed and gone over time and time again.

> The predominance of problem-orientated research reinforces the image of Somalis as passive supplicants of the welfare state…reports rarely deal with community based initiatives and self-help projects. It is the form as much as the content of much research that problematises Somalis (Harris, 2004:14).

Somalis themselves are proactive in seeking research, but it tends to reiterate problems and rarely deals with community based initiatives and self help. Research and recognition is biased towards dependency and problem solving. Thus, whilst the seafaring communities have remained 'invisible' for many years (Jordan, 2004,; Griffiths, 2002; Harris, 2004), the refugee population is under the spotlight as problematic. At the same time, there is a lack of narrative and detail of the community, their struggles and identities, which results in their essentialisation. Regarding the problem of Somali integration, it seems the wrong questions are being asked to understand the problem (Omaar, 2006).

To understand the problem of Somali integration in the context of the national model of 'Britishness' and the perceived differences of seafarers and refugees, experiences of each group are contextualised within the historical national integration model in order to see how problematic subjectivities are created.

Integration of seafarers and elders: from racism to multiculturalism

When the seafarers first lived in the port cities at the beginning of the twentieth century integration was not so high on the public agenda. With smaller numbers these men remained largely invisible in terms of policy. Since then their experience and how they have been seen to be integrated has changed over the years depending on the political climate.

Policies based on racial differentiation have been both popular and not. Jordan (2004) describes the experience of the Somali community in Cardiff when for a period after the race riots in 1919 Somalis suffered at the hands of a racist element in the police. The Aliens Order of 1920 meant Somalis were declared as alien even though were British subjects. Policies were adjusted and attitudes were modified again when labour was needed during the Second World War. After this period the Somali seafarers in Cardiff built up a strong sense of community and ethnic identity amongst themselves.

With the failure of the cultural or racial model of 'Britishness' the multicultural model has remained central to policy. Its basic premise is on group solidarity and social bonds

through ethnicity which then lead to bridges between different ethnic communities. Yet within the current multicultural or ethnic nationalism model, strong notions of cultural values may have limited integration through bridging with other communities for Somali elders.

> Cultural and religious differences put the Somali elders in a disadvantaged position in the wider British society. Somalis are known to be stanch believers in Islam and can also be seen as captives of their culture wherever they go and whatever they do. Any activity that is not appropriate to the broad boundaries of their faith and culture is simply boycotted. Thus, where there are no culturally and socially appropriate facilities, it is likely that Somalis will not make use of these services. (Jordan, 2004:26).

Jordan (2004) also suggests a lack of respect and recognition of the Somali elders has resulted in an 'invisibleness' which has prevented integration. Griffiths (2002) however argues integration did in fact take place but was not recognised, partly due to expectations from other communities that Somalis would gradually adopt British values. Cultural ties to Somalia came to be viewed as a problem.

A sense of ethnic cohesion and bonding seems to have been present during the first waves of refugees, linking newcomers to the older communities. Although there were differences in class between seafarers and refugees, as well as experience, social disadvantage acted as a leveller and older seafarers were proud of the cultural ties. Ethnic homogeneity was thus used for the activation of an ethnic identity. The second generation were referred to the fish and chips generation by the elders (El Sohl, 1991), but still Somali identification was primary: Somali British rather than British Somali.

However, later saw the beginnings of fragmentation of the UK Somali community (Griffiths, 2000) and a lack of 'ethnic economy' (Griffiths, 2002). Within each area ethnicity became determined by the dominant clan, leading to the marginalisation of those clan members with smaller numbers. In this sense the current Somali community does not fit into the multiculturalism model, unified by ethnicity, which may have lead to a lack of recognition of citizen-subject identities for the later waves of refugees.

Refugees: measurements of integration

The current Somali population in the UK is largely made up of refugees from single parent families. The concurrent policy regarding what integration means in the UK is based on 'Indicators of Integration' (Ager & Strang, 2004). The focus is very much on trying to measure integration in its component parts. The experiences of migrants and refugees are analysed using what are called 'means and markers'; employment, health, education and housing.

Using these measures the problem of unemployment in Somali communities is immediately visible. Extremely high rates of unemployment have been present since Somali seaman lost their jobs in the UK after the Second World War. In the 1990s rates were as high as 87% in Tower Hamlets (El-Sohl, 1991) and 95% in Liverpool (Xifaras,

1996). Another common experience for Somalis is 'occupational down grading' (Bloch & Atfield, 2002).

> One Somali man, for example, had qualified as a chemical engineer in Somalia. When he arrived in the UK thirteen years ago he completed a GNVQ in administration and then completed training as a teacher. Despite having experience through work placements and voluntary work he has not been able to get a job in the UK. He now works for the RCO. (Thomas and Abewaw, 2002:33 in Harris, 2004).

Unfamiliarity with the UK employment culture, language, and a lack of permanent status for refugees may act as barriers, as well as racism in the workforce.

There is also a gendered aspect of unemployment because migration involves a shift in household patterns and women often end working whilst the men remain at home (Farah, 2000; Harris, 2004; Summerfield, 1992). The status of men is lowered because of unemployment and men are often too proud to do the menial work which is on offer. Women thus gain independence and are better integrated into the British community whilst men experience 'gender nostalgia.' The inability to realise the gender ideal of the male breadwinner, the lack of recognition of status and competences, perhaps combined with a loss of authority in the family, might be experienced as misrecognition as a man. "Here the men are not even in control of the television and they are greeted like teenagers"(Kleist, 2008:318-9).

Unfortunately under or unemployment has contributed to a common perception of Somalis men as lazy. A lack of self esteem is often represented as laziness or an inherent problem with Somali men, and depression as well as the use of khat makes this worse.

Remittances are also feminised and pressure to remit financial support to devastated areas forces women to work even more, often reinforcing poverty. Further, a disjuncture in terms of citizen-subject recognition may exist in socio-economic measures, where the UK state may not view remittance needs as part of the normal family model. "Imaging a family means giving it a definition that may conflict with the nation state's definition of legitimate immigrant families." (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002:11 in Lindley, 2007). In turn Somalis are said to view the British model of the family as selfish (Lindley, 2007).

Somali health is also seen as problematic and assumptions are made about Somali mental health and a tendency towards madness (Farah and Smith, 1999). Mental health may also be misunderstood by a difference in expectation in what is seen as 'normal' in the recreational use of drugs. Khat chewing is admittedly worrying if abused, yet it is much more stigmatised than alcohol abuse.

> Somalis…drew the distinction between use and abuse, with khat use compared to the English pastime of going to the pub for a couple of pints:
>
> We don't go to pubs, we do have other social activities.

> On the positive side, khat use was seen as "a socialising mechanism", bringing people together to talk. In addition, it was stated, "it makes you feel good" (although this euphoric feeling is evidently short-lived)' (Khan & Jones, 2003:31).

In education, trends of underachievement are the main pattern reported (Harris, 2004). Misunderstandings are present from both sides. Schools do not know about differences in Somali education where, many Somalis find it hard to understand the UK system, the result being that children can become stereotyped.

> Children are sitting around school corridors as they cannot compete. Some of those have difficulty in competing are wrongly assessed as abnormal. The language barrier and the trauma these children have experienced requires specific attention to cater for their needs. (Xifaras 1996:27).

The younger generation struggle in the British education system especially because many have had an extremely disrupting schooling, with some never having had the opportunity to a formal education in Somalia. It is common for them to leave school with an expectation to not find work, even those with qualifications. Unfortunately, the consensus of the importance of language has not seen the implementation of language classes for children, maybe due to a lack of resources.

Finally, in housing the state tends to see Somalis as part of a homogenous BME (Black minority ethnicity) community and is unaware of their particular needs. Simultaneously the Somalis are unaware of available resources (Cole& Robinson, 2003). Housing of Somalis is often in deprived and overcrowded areas with statutory homelessness a big problem, as Somalis try to accommodate large extended families in the compact housing offered by the state. They are also affected by the insecurity of being harassed by neighbours (Rutter et al., 2007) and avoid isolation and hostility towards asylum seekers by clustering (Cole & Robinson, 2003). This clustering has lead to over-spill in places like Tower Hamlets which is worsened by being concentrated in poor areas (El-Sohl, 1991). Yet dispersal can lead to isolation.

> The recent spatial dispersal of the Somali community beyond its traditional settlement areas in Tower Hamlets has further exacerbated a sense of isolation. Poverty implies the inability to afford transportation costs or even telephone calls to keep in frequent touch with kin scattered in various parts of London (El-Sohl, 1991:543-544).

Interpreting integration so far: similarities and differences for seafarers and refugees

Although many Somalis have of course integrated successfully, as a group Somalis have been either invisible (seafarers) or problematic (refugees). Seafarers and refugees have both lived in deprived areas, struggled for a voice, underachieved and experienced racism. However Somali integration has only really come to be seen as a problem as the numbers became 'significant' and most of what has been written regarding problematic integration is regarding the later refugee communities. The main difference seems to be

much more of an acknowledgment of this for Somali refugees and the ensuing policy and attempts at understanding this failure of integration.

The current social cohesion policy discourse follows this logic of the failure of the multicultural model due to problematic integration of 'ethnic' groups, such as Somalis. One argument for this failure is because the multicultural model is based on a previous nationality model based on racial discrimination. A limitation-integration policy where 'cultural boundaries' were encouraged so that communities could eventually return home (Hampshire, 2005) was later shaped into the multicultural model to integrate migrant communities after it was realised they were to stay for longer than anticipated. 'Britishness' was adapted to accommodate newcomers but the foundation was culturalism (Duffield, 1982), producing a legacy of racial tensions (Gilroy, 2002).

Indeed some Somali refugees have stated they do not identify as British because they associate this with being white (Sporton, 2006). Equally, they feel unable to identify as Black British because they differentiate themselves from sub-Saharan Africa and thus Black British, the majority of whom have an Afro-Caribbean background. Some Somalis have experienced 'double racism' in Toxeth, a deprived area of Liverpool where Black British feel Somalis take their resources and jobs (Xifaras, 1996).

Interestingly however, some Somalis are still able to form ties of belonging within the multicultural model, although perhaps not using common notions of 'Britishness' and 'nation'. In a comparative study of Somalis in the UK and Denmark, Somalis in the UK were found to be able to feel more British, than Somalis in Denmark are able to feel Danish. The Danish are currently implementing a similar policy to 'active citizenship' where all migrants must complete a three year integration programme which places emphasis on becoming Danish. The difference is that this is being driven by an assimilation model of integration, whereas social cohesion in the UK is being put forward as an amendment to the multicultural model. Somalis in the UK are able to find space for the negotiation of their identity under the current multicultural model, even if it is based on a sense of security rather than a loyalty to the nation.

> …even though they do not identify as British- because at a local level they have a sense of security and emotional attachment….their sense of integration and belonging in the UK is paradoxically built not out of an attachment to the nation, but, rather, from complex webs of emotion and identification…that span local and transnational scales (cf Ghorashi, 2003 in Valentine, Sporton & Nielsen, 2008).

The emergence of social cohesion and 'supermobility'

Within the context of the emergence of social cohesion as the preferred model of integration, there is growing concern regarding transnationalism, movement or 'supermobility'; that these patterns lead to a lack loyalty and thus national cohesion. This issue forms part of the debate on how to maintain sovereignty in a fluid world. Reflecting this discourse, there is a current focus on secondary movement of EU citizen Somalis and general scrutiny of Somali movement.

Movement of Somalis within Europe has been analysed in terms of a nomadic heritage. For example Kleist (2004).describes movement as uncritical 'nomadic' decision making. Following this, descriptions have been made of their fierce pride and doing things their own way (Harris, 2004) and their strong ethnic identity causing trouble in the host context (Nielsen, 2004). Assumptions are made that a mobile identity with transnational connections amount to Somalis as unwilling to participate fully in the host society, to lack what some have called a 'true connection' (Lord Goldsmith QC, 2008).

Movement, and specifically nomadism, is described as deeply embedded in the Somali culture and identity (Lewis, 2008; Horst, 2003,; Kleist 2004). One famous Somali proverb is 'a man who has not travelled does not have eyes' (Jordan, 2004:20). Somalis have 'always' moved within the horn of Africa following trade routes. Yet to simplify nomadic culture as involving 'uncritical' movement ignores the social, economic and political context.

Rather the nomadic heritage enables Somalis to make very precise decisions, both concerning movement or else, to ensure a secure environment in difficult conditions (Horst, 2003). Movement is a 'philosophy' for nomadic groups such as Somalis, 'a manner of interpreting reality and acting upon it' (Claudot-Hawad, 2006:658). Communities spread themselves horizontally and the flow of social communication across space is primary to movement. For Somalis in the diaspora, nomadism signifies transnational family ties as a way of improving opportunity (Griffiths, 2000).

It is also commonly believed that it is difficult for Somalis to give up an attachment to the idea of the homeland (Farah, 2000). Return is something spoken about by refugees after many years of settlement, just as it was and continues to be by the migrant seafaring community. It has been noted that old men talk of their 'recent arrival' fifty years ago (Jordan, 2004). Many of the first settlers never intended to stay and like Bangladeshi communities they had two lives here and there (Summerfield, 1993). Even the refugee communities originally thought they would be able to go back after the civil war had finished.

However, although Somalis are said to be constantly on the move and to long for their homeland, due to it changing beyond recognition, this is mostly nostalgia. Whether nostalgia has an effect on integration is another question, although dreaming of another place does not necessarily amount to limiting social ties in the space a person lives in (Hirsch and O'Hanlon, 1995). A mental negotiation of here and there through multiple identities must be made. Although they might not feel British, belonging is possible.

> Transnationalism, far from erasing the local identifications and meaning systems, actually relies on them to sustain transnational ties…transnational migrants are not free from the constraints that national and local contexts impose (Guarnizo & Smith, 1998 in Leitner 2004: 47).

Thus, since the arrival of the seafarers, Somali integration has gone from a non issue to 'problematic' and now, in the light of the discourse on super mobility, as weakening the social cement of the UK as ideal 'home' with strong and secure borders. With the new national social cohesion model, and policies such as 'active citizenship' the government believes more meaningful social bonds can be built.

In the light of criticism of the way in which citizenship is being redesigned in the context of an increasingly exclusionary and discriminatory national migration management policy, the next section investigates 'active citizenship' to attempt to understand how Somali citizen-subjects would be produced. Could 'active citizenship' lead to more 'problematic subjectivities' and bigger gaps between hailing and recognition, or perhaps 'better' integration and a bringing together of Somali experiences and citizen-subject models?

Somalis and 'active citizenship': New paths to integration?

Social cohesion is being put forward as a progressive policy compared to the current multicultural model, based on the idea that 'civic' ties offer more opportunities for belonging, especially for migrant groups. This rationale stems from social capital theory, where social capital is defined as 'features of social life – networks, norms and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared interests' (Putnam in Zetter et al., 2006:9). Social capital can then be broken down into bonds, bridges and links. Bonds are strong ties within close communities, bridges are weaker ties between different communities and links are ties of communities to institutions (Putnam in Zetter et al., 2006).

This section looks at 'active citizenship' and the ways in which Somali integration could be affected by a policy based on 'civic nationalism' rather than 'ethnic nationalism.' In terms of discursive spaces of subjectivity, could an ideology of social cohesion through 'civic' identity and 'active citizenship' provide the space for more recognition rather than misrecognition of the Somali community?

Volunteering

Volunteering was the cornerstone of 'active citizenship'. It is defined as 'any activity that involves spending time, unpaid, doing something that aims to benefit the environment or someone (individuals or groups) other than, or in addition to, close relatives' (Day, 2009). The aim of proscribed volunteering was to create networks of shared ideals, responsibility and caring. Community cohesion is thus constructed through the voluntary contribution to a migrant's community, whether it is ethnic, local, national or otherwise. All voluntary acts are for the good of all, at all levels of community, which in turn improves the community at all levels.

Research has found that volunteering, such as with Refugee Community Organisations (RCOs), can promote refugee integration by building social capital (Rutter et al., 2007). For example one Somali male describes his experience of volunteering as very positive for him.

> At the British Heart Foundation I got experience, so that's good for my CV and I made friends as well. So nowadays I have got a lot of friends, that's good for me. The more people you know, if you need help… so they help you… My life experience in this country is like, full of good memories, at the same time I do have bad memories, you know, I got hit

> by a car, so I was in hospital for some time. I cover the bad memories with good memories… the volunteering was a nice memory (Rutter et al., 2007:128).

Thus, volunteering has the potential to help Somalis build positive relations and gain confidence in the context of the 'problematic' integration they currently experience. Volunteering could open up new spaces for citizens-subject making and recognition. For example, in terms of employment, unfamiliarity with the UK employment culture and language may be helped by gaining skills through volunteering. Racism is trickier to change. Schemes such as befriending teach both parties about each other and in theory promote tolerance, although the people who get involved tend to be tolerant in the first place. Barriers to employment such as refugee status cannot be helped by volunteering itself, apart from speeding up the time taken to gain citizenship.

The benefits of volunteering could also be seen as ambiguous for Somalis due to the gendered division of work where women may not have time to volunteer as well as support their families. For Somali women high aspirations in education and work may be thwarted by inability to participate (NIACE 2008). The reasons for exclusion from education and work would likely impede volunteering opportunities for women.

Social bonds

Somalis are described as having poor social bonds and ethnic solidarity due to prevalent differences within their communities. It has been suggested the lack of a unified and strong voice impedes their integration. Unlike other migrant communities, where much research has shown how new settlers are helped to integrate through existing social capital and networks, there seems to be lack of continuity between the seafarer communities and the refugee newcomers. This could be due to the 'invisibility' of the older Somali communities in the UK. New migrants would have found it hard to associate with a community that was not itself recognised by others, or seen in another way, there would be no social capital to gain.

A lack of social bonds between old timers and new timers can also be explained within the wider social context of clan factionalism, a key issue for understanding Somali communities. For example, seafarer communities which had been in Tower Hamlets in London's East End since the 1950s were composed of Isaaq and Darod clans from the north of Somalia. When they were joined by refugees in the 1980s, who were mostly Isaaq, competition for 'Somali resources' allocated by the state came to the forefront (El Sohl 1991) and divisions between the Isaaq and Darod resurfaced.

The lack of social bonds that can at times exist between clans also affects RCO organisations, which are known to be disparate, and constantly forming and collapsing due to clan tensions and fighting over resources. Hopkins (2006) describes how in London and Toronto even though there a high number of Somali RCOs there is a low level of political visibility. She argues not only is the relation of the centre and margin, or host and migrant community, important to understand integration, margin/margin relations must also be taken into account.

Clan factionalism is reflected in the following comment which shows misrecognition between Somalis and authority.

> In one of the first discussions of the Somali community meeting (25.02.03) on the formation of coordinating committee to liaise with British organisations, the awareness of disunity constantly surfaced: 'How can we select a steering group if we don't work together? First we must learn to be more united.'' Beyond this plea lurks a consciousness of what is said – both by Somalis and observers – to be the root of Somali discord: clanship, or, in more derogatory terminology, 'clanism' or 'tribalism.' This is an extremely sensitive subject- Somalis resent questioning, assumptions, and commentators' conclusions about this complex social formation (Harris, 2006:66).

To go beyond assumptions of the relationship between clan and social bonds - and thus integration - one needs to understand the political and social context of clan identity, which cannot be understood functionally or as fixed. Firstly, the history of clanship in Somalia is complex. Somalia can be described as a nation made up of patrilineal clans; the two main groups being nomadic pastoralists from the north (Samale, made up of four groups; Dir, Hawiye, Isaaq and Darod) and agro-pastoralists from the south (Sab, made up of two groups; Digil and Rahanweyn, as well as a melting pot of clans and other peoples such as Bantus) (Lewis, 2008).

Secondly, this network of complex social relationships is adapted to the situation; 'Somaliness' and clanship are employed alternatively, clan can lead to both division and unity (Lewis, 1961) and the level at which affiliations are made depend on the particular circumstances, mostly to ensure the security of livelihoods when the environment becomes harsh.

Clan was used as a political instrument under the French, British and Italian colonies to divide the nation, and has been used to gain political recognition and resources. For example some groups who are not clan based have used this identity for political recognition. For Somalis who migrate to the UK clan identity is also important for access to resources. This is particularly true for refugees who compete for more limited funds, especially as Somali groups compete with BME groups for funding.

In a study of Somalis and Kurds in London Griffiths (2002) showed how identities and backgrounds influence the creation of new communities in exile where 'ethnic economy' becomes important.

> The capacity of a particular group within the refugee community to articulate a 'communal voice' may significantly influence their access to resources in the local settlement context (Griffiths, 2002:168).

In his study clans were not just transferred; they were re-imagined, incorporating imaginations of ties with those in different spaces. Likewise, a study by Cassanelli (2001) showed how groups who were part of larger clans in Somalia re-imagined themselves as minority clans to create new networks and group boundaries.

Clan identity and renewal are important in organising and representing economic, political and cultural interest, and past experiences of refugees are important to understand how networks that relate to home are created. Yet clan organisation cannot be essentialised as a way of understanding problematic integration, for example that

Somali culture has inherent weak social bonds. Rather, identity is political, rather than passive and is affected by other factors such as class, gender, and generation which compete for Somali 'identification' rather than 'identity' (Hall, 1996) which takes place in a field of signifying factors including politics and power relations.

Also important to bear in mind is how strong bonds within clans do not always bring about positive social capital. In a study of Somali women settled in Melbourne, social capital was found to have negative effects for their integration (McMicheal and Manderson 2004). Here social ruptures from the conflict produced insularity and gossip. Somali community organisations tend to be bonding for men, but gossip can produce negative experiences for Somali women and cause isolation.

Although the Somali community may be in need of a united voice in order to gain recognition, and perhaps volunteering could strengthen social bonds in the Somali community, the presence of class differences and divisions in community can also act to weaken Somali social bonds. Of course, individuals do negotiate multiple identities both within and between communities, and one does not necessarily cancel out the other (Valentine, 2009). But ignoring the ways in which Somalis identify simultaneously with here and there, and attempting to improve integration only through strengthening social bonds within the Somali community would fail to recognise the wider context of relations with other non Somali communities and identities, such as the relationship with the host community affecting integration (Sporton et al., 2006).

'Active citizenship' and proscribed volunteering could also lead to discrimination and lack of recognition for some. It would fix Somali identity and create disjunctive models of identity and integration, firstly by ignoring the internal political dynamics of the community, and secondly by failing to understand the wider social relations.

Social bridges

The second path to integration using 'active citizenship' is through social bridges, or relations between communities. Community cohesion theory assumes strong bonds in so called 'communities' will create bridges between communities. For the Somali community in the UK relations with non Somali communities could potentially create a space where they become recognised and new subjectivities are made. For example volunteering with non-Somalis allows mutual recognition and understanding. Working with non Somali RCOs could be more beneficial for Somalis who may've been excluded from Somali RCOs due to associated clan divisions, as well as the fact Somali RCOs are often described as disorganised and lacking in communication.

However community spaces do not equate directly to bridges, and when they do the interactions which takes place are not always positive. This is especially true for Somalis who have reported widespread personal and institutional racism (Xifaras, 1996). Somali identity may be silenced 'through dominant narratives such as xenophobia' or become 'submerged' (Sporton et al., 2006). Young Somalis 'must navigate processes of identification and dis-identification (Skeggs, 2004) and learn how to manage tensions between conformity and individuality. For example in school where there is much interaction and bridging, racism still limits Somali integration.

> Identity is not just something that can be claimed by an individual. Rather, it is also dependent, at least in part, on an individual's identity being recognised or accepted by a wider community of practice (Bell et al., 1994; Valentine and Skelton, 2007). For example, a Somali refugee who has UK citizenship may identify as British, yet this may be of little consequence if residents of their wider community do not recognise them as British but, rather, label them an `outsider' and subject them to racist harassment (Valentine, 2009: 3-4).

Another example of when interactions can be negative is gendered bridging which can sometimes become divisive. Some men have claimed it goes against Somali tradition for women to have public profiles, such as those who have started up their own support organisations. Bridging can also have an effect on generational relations. Young Somalis who identify with Rasta culture and the 'liminal ethnicities' of Rastafarians, are criticised by their parents who believe they will lose their Somali identity and unity.

Divisions between first generation and second generation are common. Some of the young blame the first generation for the difficulties they experience and challenge their parental authority. Identities are formed from multiple points rather than just clan and bridging can be divisive for the notion of Somali community. Social bridging theory fails to take into account whether communities want to bridge and the different attitudes towards this within communities, for example it being frowned upon.

'Active citizenship' policy also fails to deal with situations where some 'other' communities, such as the host community may not want to bridge due to aspects of racism. This is related to broader issues of class and struggle over resources, where if not managed in an appropriate manner could exacerbate racism. These real tensions surely cannot be dissolved by attempts to create social bridges through volunteering. Any policy using volunteering as its key tool to integration cannot ignore the wider political and public contexts and hegemonic discourses.

Social links

Social links are ties of communities to institutions. As political representation is commonly said to be lacking within the Somali community, links to institutions could provide an avenue for the recognition of the Somali community. Indeed Somali organisations have acknowledged the need for better integration at the political level.

One such organisation is The Somaliland Societies in Europe (SSE) which held a conference with the goal of building links with European organisations (Somaliland.org, 2009). SSE stated that it wanted to promote 'active citizenship' and social cohesion to help Somali integration. It is important to recognise, however, that this group promotes the recognition of Somaliland, and explicitly says it is different to other Somalia groups. Any social linking exercises the group succeeds in would focus on the improvement of the social capital of certain Somalis, although of course the promotion of one group may not necessarily lead to negative result for the others.

Yet, these patterns of partial participation already exist. Improving social links with institutions may succeed in representing only a section of the Somali community. For

example, in a conference aimed at mobilising the diaspora to present a unified political voice, mostly men attended because they felt more engaged than women with the diasporic imagined community (Kleist, 2008). A shared a sense of gender nostalgia allowed political and clan divisions in the community to be downplayed. Yet any potential institutional links would've been male biased.

This is not to say that Somali representation must be unified, but rather points to the need to acknowledge there is contestation within the diaspora across many lines, be it gender, clan or other factors, and the idealised notion of one Somali community forming links with institutions ignores the struggles within the Somali communities.

Social capital theory and understanding Somali community dynamics

Strengthening bonds, bridges and links could potentially help create new opportunities for the creation of new Somali citizen-subjectivities. For example for Somalis unable to identify themselves as British due to associations with white or black, a rethought Britishness based on civic identity could allow Somalis to see themselves as British in this sense. Also there is potential for the creation of new social spaces and links where Somalis could gain recognition through discursive interaction. For example this could be dialogue with governmental and non-governmental institutions, or perhaps an increased sense of cohesion within or outside the community and a space for the negotiation of needs and identities.

However, using this analysis of the potential impact of 'active citizenship' on bonds, bridges and links, the potential impact on integration is unclear. Using these concepts to improve cohesion, it seems social capital theory lacks overarching clarity. And in all of the above scenarios, interaction does not always equate to integration, especially considering the socio-political context. Rather, the concepts behind social cohesion are in danger of being used heuristically.

Also in analysing the use of social capital through active citizenship the idealised notion of community has to be questioned, especially as where it is idealised as real. For Somalis a sense of community as an ethnic group needs to be understood with an awareness of the fluid and multiple identities within these communities. For example, clan affiliations do not always equate to trust in exile because the familial aspect of gaining trust and reciprocity over long periods, even generations, is lost with displacement and dispersal (McMicheal & Maderson, 2004).

'Active citizenship' is a government policy to integrate communities like the Somalis who are seen as problematic where integration has become focused on national identity rather than service provision. However by seeing the British community as homogeneous, at least by common 'civic' values, migrants groups are assumed to be homogenous based on 'our' assumptions and 'our' imagining of concepts of nationality and ethnic ties.

> With regard to the study of 'transnational communities' …past errors of community studies apply: much of transnational studies overstates the internal homogeneity and boundedness of transnational communities, overestimates the binding power for individual action, overlooks the

> importance of cross community interactions as well as the internal divisions of class, gender, region (sic) and politics (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002:324).

In summary, although at an individual level 'active citizenship' may help integration the potential effects for the recognition of Somalis as a 'community' are limited. The divisions in the community are not problematic, rather they become so in a discourse where community is idealised. An idealised sense of national cohesion ignores the real dynamics of society from local to national, not as cohesive but as also simultaneously non cohesive and fluid. It is in this sense that supermobility has come to be seen as a threat to community, rather than something which can help to maintain it through horizontal family social ties family ties and support.

Could 'active citizenship' improve refugee integration?

Using findings from the analysis of the processes and relations within the discursive space of Somali integration, 'ethnic' nationalism and 'civic' nationalism models are here compared to assess to what extent they produce an inclusive model of the citizen-subject and to what extent they produce 'problematic' subjectivities.

Although a case study is specific to a certain group, it can be useful for raising some common issues which may be pertinent to other refugee groups. Comparing the effects of different notions of citizenship and integration on the Somali refugee community in particular unpacks two areas of tension within the integration debate. Firstly, that Somali individuals and communities experience difficulty in integrating in the UK – a claim made by both policy makers and Somali refugees themselves (Harris, 2004). Second, that 'super mobile' newcomers including Somali refugees threaten the traditional sense of 'Britishness' and lack a shared sense of loyalty – a claim made by some policy makers involved in integration.

A detailed look at 'active citizenship' has shown that the new social cohesion model, which is being harnessed with optimism and vigour as a solution to the perceived failings of multiculturalism, needs be questioned. From the Somali case study, the potential positive effects of amending the multicultural model to incorporate 'active citizenship' seem to be ambiguous. This can be shown on two levels; first, in the assessment of volunteering and social capital, and second by looking more closely at the theory behind social cohesion which is the driving force behind 'active citizenship'.

Volunteering and social capital

A common argument for encouraging refugees to volunteer is that its main overwhelming benefit is that it helps in integration. However, although individuals who do volunteer may experience an increased sense of integration due to many of the positive benefits of this experience, an argument in favour of volunteering as an answer to all problems of integration is flawed because it simplifies the much broader and complex dynamics of integration at both community and national levels.

As we can see from the Somali case study, social capital as a way of bonding, bridging and linking communities also has ambiguous positive effects and is very much dependent on the pre-existing clan, gender, generational and class dynamics of the community. So although volunteering can have positive effects at individual and interpersonal levels, where the potential impact of volunteering is ambiguous in terms of community integration we need to be cautious of not allowing it to become a compulsory measure of citizenship, or as defining integration.

Finally, volunteering tends to require some sort of prior social capital before individuals and groups can take part and for them to be able to build on the existing social capital. For the more marginalised communities, such as refugees, they may be put at risk of becoming even more marginalised as they fail to follow the correct path as part of the new integration and citizenship model.

Understanding ambiguity

This ambiguity in the potential effect of the implementation 'active citizenship' and earned rights leaves a sense of confusion in how to interpret the effects on integration. However, this ambiguity also throws light on the importance of looking at the political intentions of social cohesion and how integration is now coming to being defined.

Multiculturalism as the dominant ideology of the past several decades has been aimed at allowing cultural identities their own space within the creation of a British society. However, within this model one can trace the effects of the legacy of previous racial based UK national integration models by looking at the experience of racism for many Somalis. The emergent cohesion model, said to be an amendment of the multicultural model, is also being put forward as one which will not deny room in the public discourse for cultural or ethnic identities.

However, one can see that within the emergent model the definition of integration is mutated. By claiming the failure of the multicultural model in terms of it being unable to provide a set of shared and agreed values, social cohesion also risks discrimination based on identities such as ethnicity. By defining integration as a shared sense of belonging, integration can only take place if individuals give up competing belongings to other communities (Yuval Davies, Anthias & Korman, 2005).

Within Somali communities, social capital within transnational family members is one form of belonging that may not have space in the new social cohesion framework. Without providing an open and flexible space for the negotiation of identity and belonging, social cohesion could risk excluding those who are constrained by other belongings, including transnational communities, thereby producing the very discriminatory discourses it is claiming to get rid of by the creation of a shared set of values.

Another positive assertion about social cohesion for integration is that by sharing common neutral values one could say that social cohesion is more flexible and doesn't fix identities. However, if all individuals are unable to take part in volunteering, and thus gain access to this shared sense of belonging, the new model would be capable of fixing identities and discriminating even more.

Further, a fluid sense of community relies on a shared sense of memory and imagination. It seems to miss the point to claim a cohesive Britain when it is so diverse, without some kind of tool for allowing for this diversity in the imagining of national identity. 'Active citizenship' or volunteering could be promoted in this sense, to create a shared imagination of what it means to be British, but this would imply all British citizens would have to be included in volunteering and earning rights, not only newcomers.

Here we can see that, in order to understand the potential impact of 'active citizenship', an analysis is required which goes beyond the more rhetorical discourses of social cohesion and integration. Whether social cohesion leads to an open fluid sense of belonging or the fixing of the normal and abnormal to a degree that discrimination would be increased, all depends on the political will behind the policy. Only by understanding the political space for identity negotiation can any real judgements be made about the potential discriminatory effects of 'active citizenship'.

'Active citizenship' in the context of current political developments in migration

The ambiguity of the positive and negative effects of 'active citizenship', and therefore the meaning of social cohesion, can only be understood by looking at the current political context of immigration and asylum and the wider discourses related to integration, nationality and identity that feed into these.

The current decision on the need to change the substance of citizenship and citizen-community-state relations has evolved from the consensus that newcomers represent a problem and that current integration is not working. Emphasis is now on belonging to nation state and making citizenship 'more meaningful' (Lord Goldsmith QC, 2008). The reasoning is that although the sense of pride in British identity is high, with changing conditions, the bonds are weakened and threatened. The development of social cohesion through clarifying rights and responsibilities is both to create a 'true connection' and 'clarify the difference between citizens and non citizens' (Lord Goldsmith QC).

Multiculturalism like any model has problems where it fails to adapt to the fluid dynamics of reality, but many would argue that it has responded to changes in the national identity and evolved over the years. Although a legacy of racial policies still remain in how 'Britishness' is considered by many and racism is still widespread today, it has been argued that these can be overcome if we come to terms with the colonial past and racial politics (Gilroy, 2002). On this basis, there is a future of multiculturalism.

However the latest anxieties over the failure of integration have been intensified by anxieties over security. Now social cohesion has come to mean the securitisation of identities. Tracing this trend back historically, the mutation of integration can be followed from the 1980s in the way that it has influenced the way integration policy is carried out. Zetter et al. (2006) describe how there has been a shift in policy from improving service provision for migrant communities in the 1980s to a concern with how to define and defend 'Britishness' in the 1990s, despite the general consensus on the importance of services for integration at both the individual and community level.

Alongside these changes, the understanding of cohesion itself has been transformed. Previously described in terms of equality, economic activity, a sense of belonging to a locality and nation, trust and reciprocity, social networks, social capital and shared values (Zetter et al., 2006), the politics of identity management, securitisation and restrictionism have transformed its initial aims. After 9/11 the cohesion discourse has been used to tackle extremism rather than to overcome income inequality. Security fears and Islamaphobia feed into discourses that are linked to integration.

Thus when 'active citizenship' is being proposed as a means of helping integration, these wider security discourses which aim to differentiate who are secure citizen-subjects and who are not, must be included to understand what is now meant by cohesion. The aims of the Borders, Immigration and Citizenship Bill were to secure borders, partly using legislation relating to borders and customs police, but also by differentiating citizens and non citizens (Home Office, 2008). Only those who prove their commitment to the UK would have been eligible to full citizenship rights. In a sense the logic is one of better integration by exclusion.

Implications for discrimination concerns

Although one of the main drivers behind the proposed legislation was to strengthen local and national ties where transnational and mobile communities are seen as problematic, previous studies on citizenship politics provide evidence that when transnational ties are restricted it can have the opposite effect and lead to less integration. Conversely, policies more open to transnational identities seem to strengthen integration.

> In more inclusive political contexts, migrants play a more important role in the public debate on issues concerning them; they are much less oriented toward the politics of their homelands, and focus more strongly on issues pertaining to their integration and rights in the receiving society (Koopman, 2004: 458).

Critically, in the case of the Somalis and other 'super mobile' communities, the effects of focusing on national and local ties suggest that identities relating to transnational communities will be problematised or silenced under the new model of social cohesion.

At this stage it is impossible to make a final verdict on the merits and faults of social cohesion as it is being proposed now. Many of the faults included in the above critique are based on assumptions made from applying potential scenarios to patterns from past integration models. However the historical analysis shows the importance of understanding the wider discourses, such as economic policies, which influence how integration and 'Britishness' come to be defined.

In periods before when ethnic nationalism played second hand to citizenship, migrants (who could also be described as transnational before the term was coined) were encouraged by the states they lived in to maintain ties with their homelands. Due to the market forces and geopolitical circumstances, horizontal belongings outside the nation state territory were not problematised as they are now. However, in the current

geopolitical context, citizenship has come to have a different meaning. As citizenship becomes conflated with nationalism, increasing the importance of civic ties does not seem to downplay any notions of national inclusion/exclusion mechanisms.

> In the end, the extent to which social cohesion characterises migrant communities depends less on the strength and variety of their social capital than on the prevailing immigration policy discourse, the backwash of hostility to asylum seekers and refugees and how this impacts on the migrant groups' perceptions of belonging, and the instrumentality of social cohesion policies implemented in the simplistic form of inclusive citizenship. From this perspective we suggest that the concept of social capital, premised on a notion of social cohesion and consensualism, is at best only partially relevant to the more contested political landscape and host community responses at the present time. In this milieu, the coexistence of multiple identities, some perceived to be threatening to an ideology of cohesion, others surprisingly 'on message', may be the most useful way of viewing relationships between different migrant groups and the settled 'host society' (Zetter et al., 2006: 31).

Conclusion

This analysis, by focusing on the interactions which take place in the discursive space concerning Somali integration, has sought to unravel the various discourses, voices and ideas that have lead to a disjuncture in the integration of Somali subject-citizens. By looking at the gaps between the national model of 'Britishness' and Somali experience, the relations between Somali refugee and state have been made visible; specifically how Somalis are seen to be recognised, or not, within the British subject-citizen model.

Integration is said to be problematic when gaps occur between state models and Somali experiences. Applying this analysis to the components of 'active citizenship' has allowed the potential impact of changes in the national model to be broken down into two levels of understanding; firstly, what is known about the theory behind 'active citizenship' and, secondly, by using what has been written about the Somali community in the UK, how does this theory interact with these problematic subjectivities?

The results very much depend on how 'active citizenship' is interpreted. Using the idea of volunteering and social capital theory, the results are ambiguous. Some benefit and some are discriminated, although it tends to be those who lack social capital to begin with who lack access to activities such as volunteering. Here, community dynamics, such as clan, gender, generation and class come into play and 'active citizenship' fails to address the complexities which may lead to the production of problematic subjectivities.

The potential results of 'active citizenship' for the integration of Somali refugees, as well as other refugees, are ambiguous depending on how one interprets social cohesion itself. This is where this new policy is in danger of being used in a heuristic manner and co-opted into in wider securitisation discourses. The theory behind a move towards a civic type of nationalism could be said to offer more space for multiple identities in a multicultural UK, through a universal sense of participation. Yet in the current political

climate of exclusionary asylum and immigration policy, this sense of inclusion could apply to certain groups and in effect the policy risks creating cohesion through more exclusion.

Here, it is interesting to ask whether a civic focused identity could ever be effective in being more inclusive than exclusionary, specifically towards refugees, who have been described as being between sovereigns, and thus periphery to the nation state system. Historically, a civic community stems from the city based democracies where the focus of identity making was on the centre rather than the periphery and borders. In the current context where identity is made at the border it seems unlikely any nation state would consider civic identity based on past notions of the city and inclusion from the centre.

The optimistic argument behind 'active citizenship' policy, as a move towards better integration of refugees due to notions of civic nationalism, seems to misunderstand the integration needs of refugees. Instead integration policy must address the issue of the refugee as liminal and 'dangerous'. It seems the important broader lessons learnt from this case study lead to issues of identity politics related to the idea that refugee identity is both problematic and useful at the same time because it helps to define of the modern nation state.

The trend in policy behind 'active citizenship' silences the processes of 'othering' which take place within the national model of 'Britishness'. 'Active citizenship', based on civic nationalism, rather than ethnic nationalism, appears neutral by being promoted as based on a more homogenous sense of ourselves. But here, essentialising 'us' could hide the processes which essentialise 'them'. In effect this could lead to more discrimination.

REFERENCES

AGER, A & STRANG, A (2004) *Indicators of Integration: Final Report*. London: Home Office. Available from: <www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/dpr28.pdf> (accessed 10th January 2009).

BASSEL, L (2007) 'From Refugee to Citizen: Politics of Integration in France and Canada', D.Phil. thesis, Department of International Development, University of Oxford.

BASSEL, L (2008) 'Citizenship as Interpellation: Refugee Women and the State', *Government and Opposition*, 43(2):293-314.

BIERSTEKER, T & WEBER, C (1996) *State sovereignty as social construct.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BLOCH, A & ATFIELD, G (2002) *The professional capacity of nationals from the Somali regions in Britain: Report to Refugee Action and IOM.* London: Goldsmith's College and Refugee Action. Available from: <repository.forcedmigration.org/pdf/?pid=fmo:2322> (accessed 3rd March 2009).

BORDERS IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP ACT (2009) London: HMSO.

BYRNE, L (2008) *A More United Kingdom.* London: Demos. Available from: <http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/amoreuk> (accessed 1st December 2008).

CAMERON, D (2011a) PM's speech at Munich Security Conference, *No 10 UK 2011*, Available from: <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/speeches-and-transcripts/2011/02/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference-60293> (accessed 7th June 2011).

CAMERON, D (2011b) David Cameron on integration: Full text of the speech, *The Guardian.* (online) Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/apr/14/david-cameron-immigration-speech-full-text> (accessed 7th June 2011).

CASSANELLI, L (2001) 'Rethinking History and Identity in the Somali diaspora'272-282. in Lilius, M., (ed.) *Variations on the theme of Somaliness.* Abo Akademi University Finland: Centre For Continuing Education.

COLE, I & ROBINSON, D (2003) *Somali Housing Experiences in England.* Sheffield Hallam University: Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research.

DAY, A (2009) 'Improving Skills and life chances through volunteering'. London: Volunteering England.

DUFFIELD, M (1982) *New Racism, New Realism. Two sides of the same coin?* Available online at: http://repository.forcedmigration.org (accessed 3rd March 2009).

.

EL-SOLH, C (1993) 'Somalis in London's East End: A community struggling for recognition', *New Community*. 17: 539-552.

FARAH, N (2000) *Yesterday, tomorrow: Voices from the Somali diaspora.* London: Cassell.

FARAH, L.H & SMITH, N (1999) *Somalis in London.* London: Bow Family Centre.

GILROY, P (2002) 1st ed with new introduction, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack.* London: Routledge.

GRFFITHS, D (2000) 'Fragmentation and consolidation. The contrasting cases of Somali and Kurdish refugees in London.' *Journal of Refugee Studies* 13(3): 281-302.

GRIFFITHS, D (2002) *Somali and Kurdish Refugees In London: New Identities in the diaspora.* Burlington: Ashgate,

HADDAD, E (2003) 'The refugee: The individual between sovereigns'. *Global Society* 17(3): 297-322.

HAMPSHIRE, J (2005) *Citizenship and belonging: immigration and the politics of demographic governance in post-war Britain.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

HARRIS, H (2004) *The Somali community in the UK. What we know and how we know it.* London: The Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees in the UK (ICAR). Available from:
<http://www.icar.org.uk/9602/about-us/publications.html> (accessed 2nd January 2009).

HIRSCH, E & O'HANLON, M (1995) *The Anthropology of Landscape. Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HOPKINS, G (2006) 'Somali Community Organisations in London and Toronto: Collaboration and Effectiveness.' *Journal Refugee Studies* 19(3): 361-380.

HORST, C (2006) *Transnational Nomads. How Somalis cope with refugee life in the Dadaab camps of Kenya.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

INSTITUTE FOR CITIZENSHIP (2009) *Active Citizens Resources* (online). Available from:
<http://www.citizen.org.uk/index.html> (accessed 3rd March 2009).

JORDAN, G (ed) (2004) *Somali Elders: Portraits from Wales (Odeyada Soomaalida: Muuqaalo ka yimid Welishka).* Cardiff: Butetown History & Arts Centre.

KHAN, S & JONES, A (2004) 'Somalis in Camden: challenges faced by an emerging community'. Available online:
<https://www.camden.gov.uk>(accessed 6th March).

KLEIST, N (2004) *Nomads, sailors and refugees. A century of Somali migration.* Sussex Migration WP 23. Brighton: University of Sussex.

KOOPMANS, R (2004) 'Migrant mobilisation and political opportunities: variation among German cities and a comparison with the United Kingdom and the Netherlands'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 30(3): 449-470.

KOSTAKOPOULOU, D (2010) 'Matters of Control: Integration Tests, Naturalisation Reform and Probationary Citizenship in the United Kingdom', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(5):829 – 846.

LEWIS, I.M (1961) *A Pastoral Democracy*. London: International African Institute.

LEWIS, I (2008) *Understanding Somalia and Somaliland. Culture, History, Society.* London: Hurst and Company.

LINDLEY, A (2007) *The early morning phonecall: remittances from a refugee diaspora perspective.* WP 07-47. University of Oxford: COMPAS.

LISTER, R (2007) 'Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential', *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1): 49-61.

LORD GOLDSMITH QC (2008) *Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/reviews/citizenship.htm> (accessed 15th December 2008).

MALKKI, L (1995) 'Refugees and exile: From 'refugee studies' to the national order of things.' *Annual Review Anthropology*. 24: 495-523

MARINETTO, M (2003) 'Who Wants to be an Active Citizen? The politics of practice and community involvement.' *Sociology*, 37 (1)103–120.

McMICHEAL, C & MANDERSON, L (2004) 'Somali women and well-being: Social networks and social capital among immigrant women in Australia.' *Human Organisation.* 63(1): 88-99.

MORRELL, G (2008) *Multiculturalism, Citizenship and Identity: A literature and policy review*. London: The Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees (ICAR). Available from: <http://ceris.metropolis.net/events/seminars/2008/Morrell2008_RightsAndResponsibilities.pdf> (accessed 2nd April 2009).

MULLER, B (2004) '(Dis)qualified bodies: securitization, citizenship and 'identity management' (online) *Citizenship Studies* 8(3): 279-294. Available from: <http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/998633_751304857_713605941.pdf> (accessed 27th January 2009).

NIELSEN, K. B (2004) *Next Stop Britain: the influence of transnational networks on the secondary movement of Danish Somalis.* Sussex Migration WP 22. Brighton: University of Sussex.

NYERS, P (2004) 'Introduction: What's left of citizenship?' (online) *Citizenship Studies* 8(3): 203-215. Available from: <http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/833294_751304857_713605936.pdf> (accessed 27th January 2009).

OMAAR, R (2007) *Only Half of Me. British and Muslim: The Conflict Within.* London: Penguin.

ONG, A (2003) *Buddha is Hiding: Refugees, citizens, the new America.* London: University of California Press.

REFUGEE COUNCIL (2008) *Refugee Council response to 'Path to Citizenship: next steps in reforming the immigration system.'* London: The Refugee Council. Available from: <http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/policy/responses/2008/citizenship.htm> (accessed 30th November 2008).

RUTTER ET AL. (2007) 'From refugee to citizen: Standing on my own two feet. A research report on integration, 'Britishness' and citizenship. London: Metropolitan Support Trust/Refugee Support.

RUTTER J, LATORRE, M & SRISKANDARAJAH, D (2008) *Beyond Naturalisation: Citizenship policy in an age of super mobility*. London: Institute For Public Policy Research (IPPR). Available from: <http://www.ippr.org.uk/publicationsandreports/publication.asp?id=594> (accessed 10th December 2008).

SOGUK, N (1999) *States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft.* London: University of Minnesota Press.

SOMALILAND SOCIETIES IN EUROPE (SSE) (2009) SSE Conference & Annual General Meeting. Promoting Community Cohesion, Active Citizenship & Preventing Extremism. (online). Available at: <www.somaliland.org/2009/02/28/sse-conference-annual-general-meeting> (accessed 1st April 2009).

SPENCER, S (1995) Migrants, refugees and the boundaries of citizenship. London : Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR).

SPORTON, D, VALENTINE, G & NIELSEN, K.B (2006) 'Post conflict identities: Affiliations and practices of Somali asylum seeker children' *Children's Geographies* 4(2): 203-217.

STEINER, M (2001) 'What is this thing called Somaliness?' 199-202 in Lilius, M., (ed.) *Variations on the theme of Somaliness.* Abo Akademi University Finland: Centre For Continuing Education.

SUMMERFIELD, H (1993) 'Patterns of Adaption: Somali and Bangladeshi Women in Britain', 83-98 in Buijs, G., (ed.) *Migrant Women. Crossing Boundaries and Changing Identities.* Oxford: Berg Publishers.

UK BORDER AGENCY (2008a) *The Path to Citizenship: Next Steps in Reforming the Immigration System*. London: Home Office. Available from: <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/aboutus/consultations/closedconsultations/pathtocitizenship/> (accessed 1st December 2008).

UK BORDER AGENCY (2008b) 'Borders, Immigration and Citizenship Bill'. London: Home Office. Available from: <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/newsarticles/bordersimmigrationandcitizenship> (accessed 1st December 2008).

UK BORDER AGENCY (2010) 'Government announcement on settlement reforms.' Available from: <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/newsarticles/2010/nov/15-settlement-reforms)> (accessed 8th June 2011)

VALENTINE, G, NIELSEN, K.B, SPORTON, D (2009) 'Identities and Belonging: A study of Somali refugee and asylum seekers living in the UK and Denmark: *Environment and Planning D: Space and Society* 27(2): 234-250. Available online: <http://www.envplan.com/contents.cgi?journal=D> (accessed 3rd March 2009).

VOLUNTEERING ENGLAND (2009) 'Volunteering England briefing. Borders, Immigration and Citizenship Bill. Available online at: <http://www.volunteering.org.uk> (accessed 6th March 2009).

WALTERS, W (2004) 'Secure borders, safe haven, domopolitics' (online) *Citizenship Studies* 8(3): 237-260. Available from: <http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/451265_751304857_713605939.pdf> (accessed 27th January 2009).

WARD, J & SPACEY, R (2008) *Dare to Dream: learning journeys of Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Somali women.* Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE).

WIMMER, A & GLICK SCHILLER, N (2002) 'Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation state building, migration and the social sciences'. *Global Networks* 2(4): 301-344.

XIFARAS, S (1996) 'Refugees: The 'Underclass' of racism debate'. Thesis, School of Education and Community Studies, Liverpool John Moores University.

YUVAL-DAVIES, N, ANTHIAS, F & KOFMAN, E (2005) 'Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(3): 513-535.

ZETTER, R. ET AL. (2006) *Immigration, Social Cohesion and Social Capital: What are the links?* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.