

THIS PROJECT IS FUNDED  
BY THE EUROPEAN UNION



IMPROVING US AND EU IMMIGRATION SYSTEMS

# Social Cohesion and Diaspora Politics

by Jonathan Laurence



European  
University  
Institute



**Improving EU and US Immigration Systems' Capacity for Responding to Global  
Challenges: Learning from experiences**

**Research Report  
Case Study  
EU-US Immigration Systems 2011/11**

**Social Cohesion and Diaspora Politics**

**Jonathan Laurence**  
Associate Professor of Political Science at Boston College and  
Non-Resident Senior fellow at the Center on the US and Europe at the Brookings Institution

© 2011, European University Institute  
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

This text may be downloaded only for personal research purposes. Any additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copies or electronically, requires the consent of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.

Requests should be addressed to [transatlantic@eui.eu](mailto:transatlantic@eui.eu)

If cited or quoted, reference should be made as follows:

[Full name of the author(s)], [title], EU-US Immigration Systems [series number], Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute, [year of publication].

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THIS PUBLICATION CANNOT IN ANY CIRCUMSTANCES BE REGARDED AS THE OFFICIAL POSITION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

European University Institute  
Badia Fiesolana  
I – 50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)  
Italy

<http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Publications/>  
<http://www.eui.eu/TransatlanticMigration>  
<http://cadmus.eui.eu>

## **Improving EU and US Immigration Systems' Capacity for Responding to Global Challenges: Learning from experiences**

The project is co-funded by the European Commission in the framework of the Pilot Projects on “Transatlantic Methods for Handling Global Challenges in the European Union and United States”. The project is directed at the Migration Policy Center (MPC – Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies – European University Institute, Florence) by Philippe Fargues, director of the MPC, and Demetrios Papademetriou president of the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) the partner institution.

The rationale for this project is to identify the ways in which EU and US immigration systems can be substantially improved in order to address the major challenges policymakers face on both sides of the Atlantic, both in the context of the current economic crisis, and in the longer term.

Ultimately, it is expected that the project will contribute to a more evidence-based and thoughtful approach to immigration policy on both sides of the Atlantic, and improve policymakers’ understanding of the opportunities for and benefits of more effective Transatlantic cooperation on migration issues.

The project is mainly a comparative project focusing on 8 different challenges that policymakers face on both sides of the Atlantic: employment, social cohesion, development, demographic, security, economic growth and prosperity, and human rights.

For each of these challenges two different researches will be prepared: one dealing with the US, and the other concerning the EU. Besides these major challenges some specific case studies will be also tackled (for example, the analysis of specific migratory corridor, the integration process faced by specific community in the EU and in the US, the issue of crime among migrants etc.).

Against this background, the project will critically address policy responses to the economic crisis and to the longer-term challenges identified. Recommendations on what can and should be done to improve the policy response to short-, medium- and long term challenges will follow from the research. This will include an assessment of the impact of what has been done, and the likely impact of what can be done.

Results of the above activities are made available for public consultation through the websites of the project:

- <http://www.eui.eu/Projects/TransatlanticProject/Home.aspx/>
- <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/immigrationsystems/>

*For more information:*

Improving EU and US Immigration Systems' Capacity for Responding to Global Challenges: Learning from experiences

Convento

Via delle Fontanelle 19

50014 San Domenico di Fiesole

Italy

Tel: +39 055 46 85 817

Fax: + 39 055 46 85 770

Email: [transatlantic@eui.eu](mailto:transatlantic@eui.eu)

**Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies**

<http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/>

## **Abstract**

Faced with difficulties with the operation of their newly established Islam Councils, European governments are increasingly open to the involvement of erstwhile sending states in the social and religious lives of immigrant diasporas in Europe. This is especially visible in the provision of externally-funded religion services (imams and mosques) in the absence of viable domestic alternatives. This paper considers the British debate on social cohesion and offers some context and offers background on recent diaspora outreach from Morocco and Turkey. The sending states are natural partners of Europeans during the current phase of institution-building, and European governments have tried to channel these foreign influences to encourage the institutional integration of their Muslim minorities without ceding sovereignty over European citizens.

## I. Introduction

As European Muslims have become more numerous and visible in public life in the past decade, national governments have expended time, effort and resources on pursuing policies that would encourage the integration of these immigrant-origin populations. The consolidating instinct of the nation-state has been in full resurgence, as governments across Europe ostentatiously pursue the preservation of national identity, social cohesion and “leading culture.” If there was ever a mythical postwar era of “multiculturalism” in which host societies sent mixed signals to new arrivals about the cultural expectations of national citizenship, a new and more demanding phase has replaced it.

An overlooked irony of this new integration-minded approach, however, is the degree to which Europeans’ state activism has inspired countries in the Muslim-majority world to revitalize ties with their emigrant diasporas in Europe. In the last ten years, southern Mediterranean governments have institutionalized outreach to their national communities living abroad, mirroring the inroads that Western European governments have tried to make within these same population groups. Contrary to earlier expectations from the social science literature that political, economic and religious links between successive generations of migrants and erstwhile sending states tend to diminish over time, scholars have taken note of an unexpected resurgence of governmental activity for citizens abroad – including expanded access to elections, investment opportunities and religion services.<sup>1</sup> Former sending-countries have brought to life a growing thicket of emigrant-oriented bureaucracies, where hundreds of officials are charged with the para-diplomatic duties of maintaining political, economic and religious ties with their respective communities of origin residing in Europe.

The Moroccan Minister of Industry made headlines in Europe in 2010 by telling an Italian journalist, “We want to be for the European Union what Mexico is for the USA.”<sup>2</sup> In fact, Morocco is well on its way to playing that role. In much the same way that Moroccan, Turkish and other sending-states in the Mediterranean basin have done, the Mexican state “insinuated itself [into] transnational spheres of action” by registering hundreds of associations and establishing offices of emigrant affairs.<sup>3</sup> As a one-time provider of low-cost labor that are now a reference point for transplanted communities of descent, the major sending-states persistently engage in diaspora politics and tries to remain a destination of investment and cash remittances from abroad. As Michael Tager argues, however, “home-country governments must weigh the advantages of keeping the emigrants happy and the remittances flowing against the potential political uncertainty introduced” by the pooling of diaspora influence.<sup>4</sup> Robert C. Smith’s exploration of Mexican emigrant politics documents the kind of programs that sending states have recently created in service of the “extra-territorial conduct” of national politics.<sup>5</sup> The *acercamiento* policy and its Program for Mexican Communities Abroad, for example, aimed to “intensify, broaden and institutionalize the relationship with Mexicans in the US” through the establishment of cultural institutes as “political agents” who could help achieve the government’s foreign policy goals, and interacted with the “Mexican global nation.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Rey Koslowski, ed., *International Migration and the Globalization of Domestic Politics*, New York: Routledge, 2005; Michael Tager, “Expatriates and Elections,” *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, Volume 15, Number 1, Spring 2006, pp.35-60;

<sup>2</sup> “Intervista ad Ahmed Reda Chami,” *Il Sole 24 Ore*, 25 October 2010

<sup>3</sup> Robert C. Smith, “Migrant membership as an instituted process,” in Koslowski, ed., p.111

<sup>4</sup> Michael Tager, “Expatriates and Elections,” *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, Volume 15, Number 1, Spring 2006, p.36

<sup>5</sup> Robert C. Smith, “Migrant membership as an instituted process: Transnationalization, the state and the extra-territorial conduct of Mexican politics,” in R. Koslowski, ed., *International Migration and the Globalization of Domestic Politics*, New York: Routledge, 2005

In Europe, many governments are not merely open to this kind of influence but have even developed a dependency on it in certain policy areas: counter-terrorism cooperation, and the provision of externally-funded religion services (imams and mosques), because of difficulties in locally financing alternatives. In view of the prospect of continued foreign government presence in the lives of European Muslims for the foreseeable future, it is appropriate to assess the this activity's potential impact on broader questions of integration and social cohesion. What effect does the promotion of ties to official Moroccan, Turkish or Algerian Islamic and political institutions have on those within the community of descent, which includes not just first-generation migrants but also their children and grandchildren? Does "diasporic membership," as one sending-country official put it, conflict with national citizenship?<sup>6</sup> Given the paucity of cross-national integration indicators broken down by country of origin and the relative recentness of these developments, it is difficult to measure these efforts' short-term impact on integration.<sup>7</sup> This essay will therefore limit its analysis to the potential benefits and challenges to social cohesion that are presented by bilateral cooperation between countries of origin and destination in this context.

What follows is divided into three main sections. In the first section, I consider definitions of the term "social cohesion," with particular reference to recent public debates in Great Britain. The second section examines specific instances of foreign government diaspora outreach and the political context in which this has developed, with a focus on Morocco and Turkey. The final section discusses how European governments have tried to channel foreign influences to encourage the institutional integration of Muslims in a national context. The sending states are natural partners of Europeans during the current phase of institution-building, and host governments are experimenting with ways to profit from foreign government involvement without ceding sovereignty over European citizens.

## II. Immigrant Integration and Social Cohesion

It is first necessary to define what we mean by the term "social cohesion" and to discuss briefly the different way in which its usage has evolved in contemporary public debate. Kesler and Bloemraad define social cohesion as being akin to "generalized social trust."<sup>8</sup> Putnam has argued that in the short run, greater ethnic heterogeneity in contemporary Western immigration societies is correlated with lower social cohesion and lower social trust.<sup>9</sup> The challenge that immigrants from the Muslim-majority world have posed to social harmony in Europe has been a controversial topic for decades. Since the second generation came of age in the early 1980s, public debate in European countries of immigration has gone through several phases. Initial complaints regarded the burden of immigrants on public coffers, particularly with regard to the welfare state. The criticism that the children of migrants retained the foreign culture and languages of their parents was also frequently expressed. In the 1990s, this gave way to concerns about petty criminality and unemployment. In the most recent decade, educational performance, religious extremism and terrorism have set the terms of public debate.

---

<sup>6</sup> Robert C. Smith, "The extra-territorial conduct of Mexican politics," in Koslowski, ed.

<sup>7</sup> See, for good examples, Maurice Crul, Liesbeth Heering, *The position of the Turkish and Moroccan second generation in Amsterdam and Rotterdam: the TIES study in the Netherlands*, Amsterdam University Press, 2009; Jean Tillie and Boris Slijper, "Immigrant Political Integration and Ethnic Civic Communities in Amsterdam," Seyla Benhabib and Ian Shapiro (eds.), *Identities, Allegiances and Affiliations*, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming

<sup>8</sup> Christel Kesler and Bloemraad, Irene, "Does Immigration Erode Social Capital? The Conditional Effects of Immigration-Generated Diversity on Trust, Membership, and Participation across 19 Countries, 1981-2000", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43:2, June 2010, pp. 319-347. (335-336).

<sup>9</sup> Robert Putnam, "*E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century*", The 2006 John Skytte Prize Lecture(142-3)

The United Kingdom experienced a full-blown debate about social cohesion in the past decade, and the British case illustrates the evolving definition of the term.<sup>10</sup> Before 2001 politicians did not emphasize ethnic or religious challenges to social cohesion, and used the term in a way that is much more concerned with wealth inequality,<sup>11</sup> citizenship in the public domain,<sup>12</sup> and public participation in civil society/politics.<sup>13</sup> The *State of English Cities* report listed five dimensions of social cohesion: material conditions (satisfactory economic conditions such as employment, income, housing, etc.), social order (tolerance for diversity and respect for others), positive interactions and relationships, social inclusion/integration and finally social equality (equal opportunity in education, employment, etc.).<sup>14</sup> In the aftermath of urban riots that included South Asian youth of Muslim background, however, the 2001 Cantele report adjusted the definition of social cohesion to call for “vitality and integrity within a [national] community,” organized around common rights and responsibilities while remaining sensitive to ethnic and social differences. It called for the “knitting together” of subcultures rather than allowing them to be ostracized or isolated, in order to create a “common sense of belonging” for all.<sup>15</sup> A 2003 Runnymede Foundation report also emphasized “creating a sense of belonging” and called for combating “essentialist approaches to ‘race’ and community.”<sup>16</sup>

After September 11<sup>th</sup>, the term social cohesion came to be used to refer to shared language and values, and respect for the law. Across Europe, politicians demanded that immigrant communities demonstrate the willingness to integrate (what Germans call *Integrationsbereitschaft*) and began to try eliminating instances of linguistic, residential, religious, or educational self-segregation. Furthermore, the view that “loyalty feeds cohesion” became widespread.<sup>17</sup> In December 2006, British Prime Minister Tony Blair issued a six-point plan in support of social cohesion that enunciated the “duty to integrate” and accept “key principles including democracy and equality”; Blair endorsed making the use of the English language as a condition of citizenship, calling it “a matter of both *cohesion* and of justice.”<sup>18</sup> The Cantele report argued that single-faith (especially Islamic) schools threatened social cohesion,<sup>19</sup> and some parties in the UK called for bussing of students in response. If schools are divided along ethnic lines, one British politician stated, “Britain would never achieve integration and full social cohesion.”<sup>20</sup> Social cohesion came to mean a necessary synthesis of “ethnicity and faith with a [common] ‘sense of Britishness.’”<sup>21</sup> In the realm of religious identity, the Secretary of the Department of Communities and Local Government identified social cohesion by its empowerment of Muslims “who might otherwise be attracted to fundamentalist or extremist views as well as those “who take action against Islamists who divisively preach a fundamental impasse between British and Islamic society.”<sup>22</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Thanks to John Delea and Jiyeon Im Bernhoft for research assistance on this section

<sup>11</sup> Richard Wilkinson, “Inequality Kills,” *The Observer*, 8 September 1996; Richard Wilkinson, “Social Change: for richer, not poorer,” *The Guardian*, 11 September 1996

<sup>12</sup> Larry Elliott And Michael White, “Lib Dem Group urges rethink on wealth,” *The Guardian*, 26 July 1995

<sup>13</sup> Andy Green and John Preston, “*Finding the glue that can fix the cracks in our society*,” *Times Higher Education*, 22 June 2001

<sup>14</sup> Communities and Local Government, November 2006.  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/pdf/154184.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team Chaired by Ted Cantele*, UK Home Office, 2001

<sup>16</sup> *The Year of Cohesion*, Runnymede Foundation, 2003

<sup>17</sup> Zuleeg, Manfred, “What Holds a Nation Together? Cohesion and Democracy in the United States of America and in the European Union”, *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, Vol. 45, No. 3, Summer 1997, pp. 505-526, 521

<sup>18</sup> Tony Blair, “Speech: Our Nation's Future - multiculturalism and integration,” 8 December 2006

<sup>19</sup> Madeleine Bunting, “Muslim schools don't cause riots: The insistence that faith schools are socially divisive has become a figleaf for Islamophobia,” *The Guardian*, 10 June 2004

<sup>20</sup> Alexandra Frean, “Race quotas 'needed to end divide in schools',” *The Times*, 12 October 2006

<sup>21</sup> Anna Bawden, “A tug of war over the common ground,” *The Guardian*, 5 October 2006

<sup>22</sup> Ruth Kelly, “Speech: Winning hearts and minds: working together to defeat extremism,” 5 April 2007



If the definition of social cohesion has become more or less a matter of consensus in Great Britain, the role of the state in helping achieve it is less certain. With the arrival of the Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition in 2010, the British government abruptly changed tack. Despite the statements of Labour politicians suggesting the contrary, their time in government is being portrayed as one in which multiculturalism thrived unchecked and separate identities were permitted to run amok. The new British government led by David Cameron and his deputy Nick Clegg has been placing its mark on the future shape of the British state: the austerity measures announced in mid-October will lead to cuts of more than 80 billion pounds, including 19% average cuts in government departments across the board. In particular, the Comprehensive Spending Review issued in 2010 announces the dramatic slashing (by 51%) of the Department for Community and Local Government's (CLG) budget for Community outreach.<sup>23</sup> This indicates that the new coalition does not appreciate, to put it mildly, the general situation of State-Islam relations that it inherited from the last government. The new security minister said that the days of Londonistan are over, and there will be "less emphasis on 'multiculturalist' approaches than the previous government, and more on better social and cultural integration."<sup>24</sup> Previous CLG spending, which amounted to tens of millions of pounds annually, had been the crown jewel of both "New" and "Old" Labour's approach to counter-radicalization and counter-terrorism. There had been rumors already in the summertime that the new government was wary of the CLG's work, and most of all that they were not happy with the return-on-investment on the hundreds of millions of pounds at a time of necessary budgetary austerity. As the security minister put it, "Multiculturalism in its original form meant you were entitled to dignity, to fair treatment and equality, irrespective of your origin, It turned into, well, because you're Sikh we'll give you some money so you can be a bit more Sikh; you're Muslim so we'll give you a bit more money so you can be a bit more Muslim—more mosques, more this, more that."<sup>25</sup> In other words, the new coalition deemed the subsidization of community associations to be counterproductive to integration.

Where does the interaction of second or third generation immigrants with sending state institutions fit into the perceived threat that "multiculturalism" has posed to social cohesion? To what extent does the outreach from national governments exacerbate or otherwise promote separateness? According to the arguments of Kesler and Bloemraad, host society policies that encourage cultural identity of the homeland may actually have participatory benefits – i.e., they can increase civic and political participation and engagement – but would not "necessarily generate a strong sense of social cohesion." They rightly underline the importance of "institutional structures and state policies" in mediating these outcomes. Despite Putnam's underlying pessimistic finding about ethnic diversity's impact social trust and social cohesion, he draws attention to the critical relationship between migrants' identity and their social capital networks by making the useful distinction between "bonding" social capital (ties to similar people) and "bridging" social capital (ties to different kinds of people).

In terms of social cohesion, the interests of the sending states overlapped with, but did not correspond completely with, those of the host countries. In particular, many practices of foreign government outreach did not facilitate or encourage integration. They favored the use of non-European languages (e.g. Arabic, Turkish or Urdu) in religious education, and the imams they exported were also unlikely to have command of the language of the host society. Algeria and Morocco have encouraged the political participation of their citizens in elections in the homeland and have maintained the pretense of political representation for migrant-origin Muslims through special emigrant councils – even as their "constituency" is increasingly likely to hold European citizenship.

In a 2000 study, Nelissen and Buijs found that Moroccan immigrants differ from Turks in terms of internal group cohesiveness and attribute this to differences in their respective homelands' political

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend\\_index.htm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm)

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/ISN-Insights/Detail?lng=en&id=122157&contextid734=122157&contextid735=122154&tabid=122154>

<sup>25</sup> [http://www.brookings.edu/%7E/media/Files/events/2010/1028\\_great\\_britain/20101028\\_uk\\_security\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/%7E/media/Files/events/2010/1028_great_britain/20101028_uk_security_strategy.pdf)

development. Their study appeared before the full blossoming of Moroccan institutions dedicated to grooming the national diaspora abroad. But it is notable that the “pride and solidarity” a Turk may feel about her state was not matched by Moroccans selected for their study, who instead associated the “lack of social justice, corruption and nepotism” with their home country. The effects of this missing group cohesion, the authors suggest, is a weaker ability to promote Moroccans’ collective interests. However, the absence of Moroccan intervention at the time may have translated into certain kinds of integration: Moroccans were more likely than Turks in the Netherlands to marry a “native” Dutch.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the “tendency towards individualization,” the authors argued, “could ease the adoption of elements of Western culture, especially for the later generations.”

In Putnam’s terms, successful diaspora outreach would appear to be more like “bonding” than “bridging” social capital. The involvement in activities and services organized by the erstwhile homeland were feared to strengthen group ties at the cost of cohesion with the broader host society. The association with homeland institutions could plausibly provide a social glue that bonds members to one another but it is not clear how these activities help bridge the divide with majority society. As Putnam and his critics debated, what should we expect its growing influence to do to sentiments of broader national community and solidarity? According to this set of concerns, the successful harnessing of foreign government offerings could promote Europeans’ own goals: from combating radicalism to encouraging the acquisition and use of European languages. But there is a rich and complex history that must first be overcome in order to transform the sending-state governments from suppliers of cultural identity to partners in immigrant integration.

### III. General Features of Outreach

The contemporary outreach efforts by foreign governments build on decades of uncoordinated activity through the 1970s and 1980s. During the initial period of labor migration, European governments did not view the guest workers and their offspring as destined for citizenship. Islam, the religion of foreigners, was “an exogenous reality,”<sup>27</sup> and host societies tried their best to avoid the hard questions of Islam’s status in European societies. Every European government accepted outside funds and outside authorities to influence their local Muslim population. Even at the end of “guest workers” era and the beginning of family reunification, host governments accepted the religious outreach of Saudi Arabian and Pakistani diplomats, and also welcomed the establishment of Algerian, Moroccan and Turkish outposts. These diplomats from the Muslim world helped build or organize prayer spaces, sent over trained imams, and served as interlocutors for authorities in European countries.

Europeans’ reliance on foreign states for religious oversight was initially pursued in part to avoid an undesirable alternative: that imams representing Islamist opposition in their home countries would promote a revolutionary or violent form of religion in Europe’s receiving societies.<sup>28</sup> Sending states “favored and facilitated the activities of some sending-country leverage organizations over exile associations” out of a fear that the latter “have a propensity to pursue violent strategies.”<sup>29</sup> The Saudi and Pakistani governments, who fashioned foreign policy in the guise of heirs to the Caliphate, treated European Muslims as the objects of state-led pan-Islamic designs. The main sending-states aside from Pakistan – namely, Algeria, Morocco and Turkey – viewed their European diasporas with concern that

---

<sup>26</sup> Carien Nelissen and Frank Buijs, “Between continuity and change: Moroccans in the Netherlands,” in Vermeulen and Penninx, Eds. *Immigrant Integration: The Dutch Case*, Het Spinhuis, 2000, p. 198

<sup>27</sup> Claire de Galember, “France et Allemagne: L’islam à l’épreuve de la dérégulation étatique du religieux” in Rémy Leveau, Khadija Mohsen-Finan and Catherine Wihtol de Wenden eds., *L’Islam en France et en Allemagne*, Paris: La Doc Française, 2001

<sup>28</sup> Nedim Ögelman, “Immigrant organizations and the globalization of Turkey’s domestic politics,” in Rey Koslowski, ed., *International Migration and Globalization in Domestic Politics*, Verlag: Routledge, 2005, 37.

<sup>29</sup> Ögelman, “Immigrant organizations and the globalization of Turkey’s domestic politics,” 2005, 37

dissidents abroad may seek to gather forces to effect policy changes, or change of regime, in the homeland. Their attempts to consolidate their own post-colonial and post-imperial nation-building and to control Islamist and ethnic threats to the secular, unitary nation-state risked being undone by the blooming of the networks in Europe. As one official Turkish study from 1986 analyzed the potential threat, “by virtue of living in Europe, the migrants can carry out their commitment to Islam to its most conservative extremes.”<sup>30</sup> Europeans preferred the safer bet, i.e. the official religious infrastructure of Muslim-majority states, which combated extremism in their own national interest, as a “useful bulwark against Islamic radicalism.”<sup>31</sup> The implantation of Embassy-sponsored Islam in European national landscapes offered a putative security guarantee in this context. As former Interior Minister Pierre Joxe has described, “a generally subversive atmosphere” in which the French government allowed Islam “to be managed by the national police,” reinforced by the secret services of the Muslim states “who aimed to control ‘their community’ and above all ‘their Islamists.’”<sup>32</sup> Homeland governments were a law-abiding administrative counterpart which sought to minimize what they considered to be political radicalism of any kind within their diaspora.

A further point of convergence between sending and host states – and the most surprising one – concerned the absence of policies to help the Muslim-origin labor force integrate into European societies. Here it becomes evident that the return-oriented administrative practices of European host societies and the aims of Muslim-majority sending states and regional religious hegemony were mirror images of one another. Both the European governments and Muslim states have purposely worked against assimilation for decades. From the domestic political perspective in Europe, officials chose to *outsource* critical questions related to migrant laborers’ cultural, linguistic and religious practices as a short-term solution at a time when extreme right parties were finding their bearings in response to economic stagnation and the increasingly visible presence of immigrants in big cities. In general, European countries in the 1970s and 1980s preferred not to consider themselves countries of immigration. In response to the judicial rulings liberalizing family reunification, governments offered cash to migrants who would voluntarily return immediately, and homeland re-entry preparation for those who stayed.

In this way, a basic religious infrastructure – mosques and a handful of imams – was installed in the framework of diplomatic and economic cooperation between Western European and majority-Muslim labor exporting countries in the Mediterranean basin. European governments tolerated the Islamic proselytism of foreign envoys for pragmatic reasons. The large, classical mosques these governments planned and built across Europe – and the prayer rooms they gathered under umbrella organizations guided by their consulates – were a quick fix for the practical needs of local Muslims since governments could apply their experience in the practical administration of Islamic religious practice. Moreover, local laws restricted the use of Europeans’ taxpayer funds for religious purposes in Europe, especially to support new religious communities without official recognition.<sup>33</sup> European governments thus initiated the habit-forming practice of importing imams and allowing foreign governments’ to sponsor mosque construction.

The minimal accommodation of Islam that took place in the first period should be seen in this context of a privileged role for foreign representatives of Islam. With the minor exception of prayer spaces created in some workplaces and public housing units, governments outsourced relations to Muslim representatives to the embassies and consulates of sending states and the regional religious

---

<sup>30</sup> Sabri Sayari, “Migration Policies of Sending Countries: Reflections on the Turkish Experience,” *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 485, 1986, 87-98

<sup>31</sup> Alain Boyer, *L’islam en France*, PUF collection “Politique d’aujourd’hui,” Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998.

<sup>32</sup> Joxe, Pierre. *L’edit de Nantes: Une histoire pour aujourd’hui*, Paris, 1998. 338.

<sup>33</sup> Felice Dassetto, *La construction de l’Islam européen: approche socio-anthropologique*, Paris: L’Harmattan, 1996

powerhouse, Saudi Arabia. This became known as a “Gastarbeiter Islam” or an “Islam des foyers” (workers’ dormitories).<sup>34</sup>

In addition to this Saudi-sponsored pursuit of religious leadership through expansion of its activities in Europe, there is also the national embassy-sponsored Islam of labor-exporting states, i.e. the traditional, everyday engagement of embassies and consulates that try to maintain influence over emigré populations abroad. The largest sending countries to Europe – Algeria, Pakistan, Turkey and Morocco – all developed a robust practice of exporting their official Islam to the diaspora. Each state, concerned for national security diplomatic influence in the countries of the diaspora, eventually asserted its own right of interference (sometimes referred to as a “*droit de regard*,” or oversight) over migrants and their descendants in European host societies, its monopolistic intentions to represent Islam vis-à-vis to host government, and its own status as “moderate Islam.” Algerian governments worried about Islamist advances within its diaspora, and wanted to counter Moroccan influence in Europe; Morocco worried about threats to the ruling regime from Moroccans abroad, and hoped to counter Saudi and Algerian influence in Europe; and Turkey was most concerned about its internal legal order, as well as its geopolitical heft as the successor regime to the *Seyh ul Islam* of the Ottoman era. Each sending state hoped to further its own economic growth and development with the help of its residents abroad. In Morocco, for example, remittances make up the largest portion of GDP after tourism and phosphate. Total remittances to the Maghreb are worth \$11.5 billion, and in Turkey, which had problems with its balance of payments, remittances played an important role in its “perennial foreign-exchange crises.” In this way, Turkish migrants helped cover the country’s large trade deficits. In addition to traditional remittances, migrants were often engaged in sizeable direct investment in their countries of origin as well as the transfer of technology and machinery.

### Morocco and Turkey

Morocco and Turkey are current leaders in the sheer multiplication of institutions for this end. In 2010, for example, a new ministry for Turkish citizens abroad was established in Ankara, and the Moroccan government announced a new religious council for the Moroccan community in Europe based in Rabat.<sup>35</sup> These institutions join existing institutions like the Ministry for the Moroccan Community Residing Abroad, the Consultative Council for Moroccans Residing Abroad, the Consultative Council for Turkish Citizens Abroad, and the Turkish-Islamic Unions for Religious Affairs, which are active in countries with large Moroccan-origin or Turkish-origin populations, respectively. Add to this the presence of diplomatic staff and religious leaders sent to dozens of cities – from Brussels to Paris, and Berlin to Rome and many places in between – and it is possible to discern a tangible layer of homeland culture (and politics) that is being transposed over the latest generation of “hyphenated” Europeans. Each sending government is focused on a strategy of nurturing a close relationship with its own emigré population. The governments of Morocco and Turkey are not merely North Stars, they possess holy authority in their own right. The Turkish Diyanet is the successor institution to the Ottoman-era Seyh-ul-Islam, and the Moroccan King claims direct descentance from the Prophet Muhammad.

The 1990s and 2000s witnessed a boom in state institutions designed for residents abroad. The Turkish directorate for religious affairs (*Diyanet Isleri Baskanligi*, DIB), first internationalized its operations in the early 1980s, and ultimately developed the quintessential model of export-grade “Embassy Islam.” DIB’s foreign operations expanded alongside the activities of the Turkish Foreign

<sup>34</sup> Jochen Blaschke, “Islam und Politik unter türkischen Arbeitsmigranten,” Jochen Blaschke and Martin van Bruinessen, eds., *Islam und Politik in der Türkei*, Berlin: Parabolis, 1989; Nils Feindt-Riggers and Udo Steinbach, *Islamische Organisationen in Deutschland : eine aktuelle Bestandsaufnahme und Analyse; Pilotuntersuchung*, Hamburg: Deutsches Orient-Institut, 1997; Gilles Kepel, *Die Rache Gottes: radikale Moslems, Christen und Juden auf dem Vormarsch*, München: u.a. Piper, 1991.

<sup>35</sup> Conseil des Oulémas pour la communauté marocaine d’Europe

Ministry and a Turkish Consultative Council for Citizens Living Abroad established by Prime Ministerial decree in 1998 in order to coordinate all the issues and activities of citizens living abroad.<sup>36</sup> The DIB's European branches are generally known by the acronym DITIB (*Diyanet İşleri Türk İslam Birliği*, Turkish-Islamic Union for Religious Affairs), for most practical matters relating to the practice of Islam: e.g., visas for imams, permits for mosque construction, teachers for religious education in public schools, etc. As the highest religious authority in Turkey, the president of DIB is the honorary chairman of every DITIB abroad, and he participates in local DITIB membership and executive meetings. Wherever there is a Turkish immigrant minority in Europe, DITIB offers organizational shelter for existing or newly founded Turkish-Muslim cultural organizations in addition to providing services for pilgrimage to Mecca and burial in Turkey.

The DIB has pursued the internationalization of Turkish religious activities in an effort to expand Turkish influence over the country's European diaspora. DIB has funded chairs of theology department in a handful of European Universities, trained teachers in religious education, and developed religious curriculum for use in European schools.<sup>37</sup> At a 2004 conference, DIB leaders adopted a policy of "preference for Turkish religion teachers over European teachers, and for religion lessons conducted in Turkish over lessons conducted in any other language" and resolved to "increase the quota of Turkish imams and muftis overseas."<sup>38</sup> At a DIB conference in Ankara in September 2004, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan proclaimed his ambition that the European branches of DITIB would one day "be accepted as the EU's only partner on related issues" in recognition of the "leading role played by Turkey in the Islamic world." The conference adopted a policy of "preference for Turkish religion teachers over European teachers, and for religion lessons to be conducted in Turkish over lessons conducted in any other language"; they also resolved to "increase the quota of Turkish imams and muftis overseas" and that the organization should ensure there is "at least one Islamic cleric in the catchment area of each consulate."<sup>39</sup>

Ankara aims to "ensure the attachment of émigré populations to the national ideology of Kemalist rhetoric – a perpetual allegiance linked to a secularized Islam and a unified nation under the control of the central state."<sup>40</sup> The Turkish government offers a pre-fabricated, export-ready version of the Islamic religion: a Muslim religious practice within the secular Turkish framework, complete with clergy from the homeland who stick to 15-minute sermons centrally approved and posted on *Diyanet's* internal website from Ankara each Friday.<sup>41</sup> Since the signing of a bilateral treaty in 1984, the German interior ministry has helped DITIB with entry visas and three to four-year German residence permits (and a Turkish-paid salary) for the imams in its employ, and similar arrangements have been struck with all European countries with significant Turkish-origin populations.

The government introduced a new "Presidency for Turks Living Abroad" in early 2010. With approximately 100 employees, this new department in the Prime Minister's office will "address and to

<sup>36</sup> Yurtdışında Yaşayan Vatandaşlar Danışma Kurulu. Ministry of State Website <http://www.devlet.gov.tr/Forms/pYYVVK.aspx>

<sup>37</sup> Aşkoğlu, *Almanya'da temel eğitimdeki Türk çocuklarının din eğitimi [Religious Education of Turkish Children in Germany]*, 1993, 142-148.

<sup>38</sup> Dilek Zaptcioglu, "Setting Guidelines for Islam and Politics," [www.Qantara.de](http://www.Qantara.de), October 5, 2004

<sup>39</sup> Dilek Zaptcioglu, "Setting Guidelines for Islam and Politics," [www.Qantara.de](http://www.Qantara.de), October 5, 2004

<sup>40</sup> Riva Kastoryano, "Le nationalisme transnational turc, ou la redéfinition du nationalisme par les 'Turcs de l'extérieur,'" in Alain Dieckhoff and Riva Kastoryano, eds., *Nationalismes en mutation en Méditerranée orientale*, Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 2002; Lemmen, Thomas. *Islamische Organisationen in Deutschland*, Bonn: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2000.

<sup>41</sup> Martin Spiewak, "Vorbeter aus der Fremde," *Die Zeit*, September 21, 2006; however, an internal poll found that less than half of imams in Turkey regularly used the prepared text, and DIB representatives insist the texts are meant only to serve as guidelines (see Dirk Tröndle, "Die Freitagspredigten (hutbe) des Präsidiums für Religiöse Angelegenheiten (DIB) in der Türkei," KAS-Auslandsinformationen, 4/06, p.77)

follow up on the problems of our citizens living abroad, to improve our relations with consanguineous and related communities, to cooperate with civil society organizations.” The minister in charge of this portfolio, Faruk Celik, summarized his duties: “Five million Turks live in Europe and they have different problems... Now we are creating a body which can address all the problems. Obviously our consulates and embassies will continue their services, but when you come from Turkey there will be an institution that will look at your problems.”<sup>42</sup> Celik has also sought to restructure the DIB and limit the terms of its president.<sup>43</sup> In March 2010, the new ministry hosted 1,500 Turkish civil society leaders living in Europe at a conference in Istanbul.<sup>44</sup> Some in Germany took exception to the proprietary stance exhibited by the Turkish government: “The language in the invitations [to the Istanbul conference] already suggested the attitude of the Turkish government toward Turkish-German politicians. Ankara perceives them as being its own. Invitations sent in the name of Turkish Labor Minister Faruk Celik to German Bundestag members were addressed as my esteemed members of parliament’ and Erdogan was referred to as ‘our prime minister.’”<sup>45</sup>

The roughly 3.2 million Moroccans abroad (*marocains résidents à l'étranger*, or MRE's) constitute nearly 10% of the national population, and thus the Moroccan government has also tried to influence religious developments abroad. For approximately two decades, the government has sponsored mosques, Arab language instructors and nurtured relationships with key Moroccan nationals residing in Europe. The Moroccan King created the eponymous Hassan II foundation in 1990 to coordinate with the new Ministry for MREs to export Arabic language and Moroccan “culture teachers” to Europe: in 1995, sixty-six were sent to France, thirty to Italy, ten to Spain and two to Germany and 63 preachers were sent throughout Europe for Ramadan. This grew to 206 preachers in 2006, and the Foundation claims to increasingly involve the “community” of MREs in its “conception and execution.”<sup>46</sup> When announcing the Foundation’s expansion in a Paris speech, King Hassan II said “We have decided to entrust, by the grace of god, the presidency of the FHII for MRE to our loyal daughter Lalla Meryem. Thus our ties will not be solely of allegiance but also of family ties, since you [Moroccans abroad] will be like sons and daughters to me.”<sup>47</sup> Its mission is “to maintain ties of allegiance with Moroccans living abroad” and to encourage “our community abroad to achieve its potential and enrich the development and modernization of Morocco.”<sup>48</sup> It “strives to maintain and develop fundamental ties between Moroccans living abroad with their home country.”

The Foundation had a nearly \$20 million budget in 1998, of which three-quarters was spent on teaching and administration in European countries. Moreover, it “supports migrant organizations’ projects in Morocco or in the receiving country, sends Arabic teachers and social attachés; leads youth exchange programs, offers social and legal advice and helps with administrative problems.”<sup>49</sup> In

<sup>42</sup> *Ikinci Vatan* 02.22. 2009 <http://ikincivatan.eu/devlet-bakani-celik-avrupali-turk-demokratlar-birligi-toplantisina-katildi-haber,815.html>

<sup>43</sup> *New Era in Diyanet, Guncel Haber*, 01.25.2010 <http://www.guncelhaber.com/guncel-haberler/diyanet-isleri-baskanliginda-yeni-donem-455354.html>

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.hurriyet.de/haberler/gundem/510794/yurt-disinda-yasayan-turkler-baskanligi-kuruluyor/Yurt%20d%C4%B1%C5%9F%C4%B1nda%20ya%C5%9Fayan%20T%C3%BCrkler%20Ba%C5%9Fkanl%C4%B1%C4%9F%C4%B1%20kuruluyor>

<sup>45</sup> <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,684125,00.html>

<sup>46</sup> La Fondation Hassan II pour les marocains résidents à l'étranger, <http://www.alwatan.ma/html/FHII/presentation.html>

<sup>47</sup> La Fondation Hassan II pour les marocains résidents à l'étranger, « Discours de Sa Majesté le Roi Hassan II à Paris, » May 7, 1996, <http://www.alwatan.ma/html/FHII/presentation.html>

<sup>48</sup> Zoubir Chattou and Mustapha Belbah. *La double nationalité en question: enjeux et motivations de la double appartenance*, Paris: Editions Karthala, 2002.

<sup>49</sup> Zoubir Chattou and Mustapha Belbah. *La double nationalité en question: enjeux et motivations de la double appartenance*, Paris: Editions Karthala, 2002; Brand, Laurie A. *Citizens abroad: emigration and the state in the Middle East and North Africa*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

addition to its administrative structure, it has a research and analysis unit (the Observatory of the MRE Community) and eight operational poles: education, cultural exchange, sport and youth, legal aid, social assistance, economic development, cooperation and partnerships, and communication. Within the first pole, religious leadership (*l'animation religieuse*) is “considered essential for the preservation of the Muslim identity of the Moroccan community.” Religious instruction holds a privileged place in the foundation’s activities and is implemented in two programs: 1) support for Islamic centers and several grand mosques in Europe through the employment of permanent preachers sent from the Foundation for the MRE, and 2) a special program for the holy month of Ramadan in cooperation with universities, grand mosques, and other branches of the Moroccan administration.

King Muhammad VI (1999-) has pursued an activist policy to bring the kingdom's religious practices to – and to maintain political ties with – the Moroccan diaspora. A handful of institutions in the Moroccan capital, Rabat, now pay close attention to the affiliations and religious practices of MRE's: the Hassan II Foundation, the Ministry for Religious Affairs, and the Ministry for Moroccans Living Abroad (located within the foreign ministry). A new Ulama Council for Europe – a group of learned religious scholars was established in 2009 to keep a hand in the way Islam is lived and experienced by Moroccans abroad. A “restructuring” of the religious affairs ministry in 2005 led to an increase in the exportation of religious personnel. The Hassan II Foundation also announced a program “in continuous expansion” to locate imams and preachers from Moroccan universities, grand mosques and civil service.<sup>50</sup> The Moroccan government experimented in the mid-1990s with the creation of five special parliamentary districts for Moroccans resident abroad (as Italy later did in 2006).<sup>51</sup> But over the subsequent decade, officials decided instead to pursue the creation of a Council of the Moroccan Community Abroad (*Conseil de la communauté marocaine de l'étranger*, or CCME) – a body separate from national electoral institutions – and named 40 members from the Moroccan diaspora (including six outside Europe).<sup>52</sup> With a budget of approximately \$5 million in 2008, the CCME regularly organizes conferences in Rabat or Casablanca for Moroccan-origin civil society leaders and politicians living in Europe. In late March 2010, the CCME put together a high-level event in Strasbourg bringing together 150 Muslim leaders, academics and French government officials.

Despite the steady increase in resources, Moroccan efforts still pale compared to Turkey. The Turkish Diyanet continues to draw up plans on a much larger scale. In April 2010, the organization gathered 30,000-40,000 attendees at the Arena stadium in Amsterdam. Diyanet president Ali Bardakoglu addressed the gathering and while visiting the Netherlands, Bardakoglu told a newspaper “we are going to train Turkish-origin young people in Turkey's theology faculties and then send them back to Europe”<sup>53</sup> Moroccan-origin commentators on a Dutch website lamented the absence in Amsterdam of a similar effort by Morocco for them.<sup>54</sup> Given the rate at which Moroccan outreach has expanded, they may not have to wait long.

#### IV. Consequences for State-Muslim Relations

This increasing flow of resources and personnel for mosques, religious staff, teachers, and the organizational budget of mosque federations is somewhat ironic given the climate of renewed nationalism that slowly conquered Europe over the past decade. Into the mid-1990s, with few exceptions, representatives of embassy-sponsored Islam served as the natural, de facto interlocutor for all “Muslim affairs” in European host societies. Measures have ranged from religious restrictions –

<sup>50</sup> La Fondation Hassan II, « La Fondation Hassan II pour les marocains résidents à l'étranger. »

<sup>51</sup> Michael Tager, “Expatriates and Elections,” *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, Volume 15, Number 1, Spring 2006, pp.35-60

<sup>52</sup> In 2006, its French contact was listed as Mohammed Moussaoui, the future CFCM president.

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.migazin.de/2010/04/09/wir-werden-europas-imame-in-der-turkei-ausbilden/>

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.wijblijvenhier.nl/archives/2437-30.000-Turken-in-ArenA.html>

such as banning burkas, minarets or headscarves – to civic impositions, like mandatory language and integration courses and citizenship tests. In the realm of state-mosque relations, European governments have encouraged the development of national forms of Islam by way of formal councils and consultative bodies. Host governments ultimately judged the one-sided intervention of foreign governments' involvement in diaspora affairs to be too costly for immigrant integration. European governments diversified their contacts beyond homeland governments to include immigrant and religious NGOs and associations. With the creation of Islamic Councils – e.g., the Conseil Français du Culte Musulman (2003), the Consulta Islamica in Italia (2005), the Deutsche Islam Konferenz (2006) – European governments ended the monopoly over religious representation – and the provision of religious infrastructure (i.e. mosques and imams) – that embassy-sponsored Islam had enjoyed for over two decades. The new State-Islam dialogues in the 1990s and 2000s pointedly included rival religious figures and institutions.

Moreover, European governments have created training programs to help acclimatize the religious personnel from North Africa and Turkey, to lessen their “foreignness.” The Dutch government established a complementary training program for imams arriving from abroad. Munich and Berlin have set up pilot programs between imams and local administrative officials to familiarize Islamic prayer leaders with the German school system and bureaucracy. DITIB-France (aka CCMTF) sends imams to participate in the civic training program begun in 2007 by the French interior ministry at the Institut Catholique in Paris, and collaborates with a pre-departure training program at the German Goethe Institute in Ankara. In April 2008, the British Home Secretary announced a plan to bring “moderate imams” from Pakistan and Bangladesh to “counter the threat of violent extremism,” claiming that this would “complement work already underway to ensure imams are firmly rooted in the communities they serve.” Germany has a similar agreement with Turkey, and the Netherlands, Belgium and France also arranged such an exchange with Morocco. The CFCM president called the program at the Institut Catholique “an important but limited experiment,” given that there have been just 30-40 students per semester (out of 1800-2000 imams). “The new generation has a hard time engaging in dialogue with foreign imams,” said CFCM President Mohamed Moussaoui in an interview. “Therefore we need to train them on site, in France.” Nonetheless, he said that exchanges would continue and include reciters of the Qur’an, for example, who carry on an “artistic tradition” and “fill a void” in French Islam.<sup>55</sup>

Even now, with the creation of State-Islam councils, the sending states still want to preserve a say over the nomination of imams and chaplains, and to exert influence over the curriculum and staffing of religious education and training, where it exists. This is a paradoxical situation, since European governments do not want to rid Muslim populations of the perceived benefits of homeland influence. A close look at the composition of the councils reveals that foreign government representatives have been somewhat diluted but are still very much present, however indirectly. This persistent close cooperation and reliance on embassy-sponsored Islamic representatives reflects the general reluctance by European governments to sever ties with homeland states, despite a growing pressure (and the stated policy) to “domesticate” religious personnel and mosque financing. The fact that European governments continue to import imams also reflects the legal and practical difficulties of training and hiring locally-trained imams who are considered legitimate by local European Muslim communities, and who are willing and able to work for the relatively low wages that these congregations can afford to pay. The local financing of mosques is also particularly challenging, given restrictions on the use of public funds for religious purposes and the lack of a large number of wealthy Muslim donors in Europe.

The foreign governments, however, have begun to adapt to European contexts. Now, the children of immigrants are encouraged to learn the local language, and not just cajoled into learning their parents (or grandparents’) mother tongue. The indirect representatives of Turkey, Algeria and Morocco have responded to Europeans’ efforts to create State-Islam Councils in the last 15-20 years

---

<sup>55</sup> Interview by the author with Mohamed Moussaoui, 09.23.2008



by undergoing a process of qualified “domestication”: 1. They have accepted to participate in State-Mosque relations and seek to retain a dominant position. 2. When their relative importance is diminished by the inclusion of other representatives, they have tried to block or obstruct the progress of State-Mosque relations. 3. Finally, they have taken steps to become less “foreign” in terms of personnel (e.g. imams, spokesmen), the use of European languages, cooperation with European governments on the training of religion teachers and imams and adapting religious content (e.g. school curriculum, Friday sermons) to the European context. They have also begun to accept the legitimacy of rival organizations in European Muslim communities. Nonetheless, these same countries’ authorities have increased their targeting of the diasporas with the exportation of personnel and religious institutions. There has been a flurry of European cooperation with homeland governments, most of which has taken place *since* the creation of the Islam Councils.

European governments have reserved a leadership role for “Embassy Islam” within Islam Councils for the same reasons that made their leadership such palatable interlocutors in the first place – these official representatives projected a reassuring appearance of an Islam at peace with the rule of law. They come with an implicit “guarantee” of good behavior from the sending governments, they have the expertise to provide trained imams, and they have experience building and administering mosques and religious communities.. Algerian, Moroccan and Turkish governments have transitioned to the use of European nationals as local representatives, slowly accompanying their diplomatic leadership with European citizens.

The content of foreign government outreach has been both multiplied and adapted to new integration policies. Thus, even while homeland governments export more personnel and infrastructure, they also grant a greater degree of autonomy to national European branches their networks, and the sending states are themselves more likely to work in concert with European governments. They have appointed greater numbers of European-born Muslims to executive positions, begun to address gender disparities on governing boards and among prayer leaders, and regularly meet with rival federations in official contexts. Imams who arrive from Algeria, Morocco, Pakistan, and Turkey now attend destination-specific civic, political and linguistic training courses.

Although sending states have redoubled their involvement in providing religious infrastructure in Europe – increasing the number of imams they send and mosques they build -- they no longer operate as independent subcontractors. They have been constrained to work together with Islamist leaders in the Islam Councils, or they work in cooperation with European governments on the design and content of training for religious personnel. Thus even while rival Islamic NGOs and federations have been allowed into state-mosque consultations, the prominent leadership positions in Islam Councils remain in the good graces of the former sending states. In 2010 as in 1990, Embassy-sponsored Islamic leaders are the face and voice of Muslim communities in European countries. If one looks at three of the most advanced cases of State-Mosque relations where a formal Council has been created – France, Germany and Italy – the Turkish DITIB’s “dialogue commissioner” has been the only German Muslim invited to speak at joint Deutsche Islam Konferenz press conferences with the Interior Minister; a Moroccan-sponsored leader succeeded the two-term Algerian-sponsored rector as head of the French Council for the Muslim Faith (CFCM); and the Moroccan diplomat who leads Italy’s Islamic Cultural Center is often the only Muslim leader invited to official government events in Rome. This reflects the general reluctance by European governments to sever ties with homeland states, despite a growing pressure to “domesticate” religious personnel and mosque financing.

Since the foreign governments have shown themselves to be natural partners for European authorities in the adaptation of Islamic practices to domestic politics, the question for European governments is mostly of how best to channel this influence. The Islam Councils have been one such forum, as have ad hoc agreements to offer civic training for imams, organized by the Goethe Institut in Turkey, for example, or at the Institut Catholique in Paris. Cooperation on these and linguistic programs with could also lead to more truly bilingual personnel sent to Europe for service in the diaspora (imams, Qur’an reciters, religious counselors in diplomatic outposts).

Despite the experience of working together, sending states' resistance to Europeans' taking matters into their own hands is still palpable. When imam training in four German universities was announced in 2010, a Turkish DITIB official regretted that his organization was not consulted. When asked why he thought DITIB was excluded, he ventured that "Germany has been in a phase of cultural decline, and it is not good for the country to give in to its fears." When he was then asked whether Germany was simply copying the Turkish model of imposing state control over imam-training, the official said: "There is no state control of Islam in Turkey. Knowledge is the basis of our content, not politics."<sup>56</sup> The German government, like others, is looking to inject *national German culture* into the basis of religious content, as well.

## V. Conclusion

In the year 2010, most adult Muslims in contemporary Europe are still third country nationals, and thus a degree of foreign government involvement in their religious lives is to be expected. Even as the integration of 2nd, 3rd and 4th generations progresses, European governments will still need the cooperation, expertise and support of the former sending states. This practice of relying on Embassy Islam does not necessarily have the same adverse integration effects of earlier outsourcing. The willingness of foreign governments to adapt to the use of European languages and imam training programs, in concert with host states, will pose fewer integration issues. And indeed, Embassy Islam has its advantages: They are uniquely placed to contribute to Islam's "normalization" in many European cities in several ways. Foreign governments can afford the construction of visible and dignified prayer spaces, and they can help coordinate the training of imams who are versed in European languages and cultures. Their cooperation with European authorities can build up a transparent religious infrastructure that earns greater acceptance from host societies.

In addition to adopting this stance for reasons of social cohesion, there are more prosaic grounds for sending states to maintaining links with residents abroad, including to support economic growth and development in the homeland. Over time, as much as 5% of these sending countries' labor force have moved to Western Europe, and remittance outflows from European states to these countries are worth billions of dollars annually. Labor migrants have annually sent home the equivalent of anywhere from 2%-3% of national GDP (Algeria and Turkey) to 8%-10% (Morocco); indeed, remittances often represent the second or third largest single contribution to GDP.

The reliance on foreign governments' indirect representatives is a logical short- and medium-term solution to the lack of prayer spaces and imams in Europe, and it can have a net positive impact on linguistic integration and shared respect for the law. Nonetheless, this arrangement could lead to complacency by European governments and the entrenchment of new drawbacks. The persistent involvement of embassy-sponsored Islam could threaten Europeans' efforts to build "national Islams" by way of State-Mosque consultations, since it can amount to foreign interference in European Muslims' affairs. The homeland governments' *droit d'ingérence* (right of intervention) will become more legally and politically tenuous over time as their outreach targets European citizens and not only their own nationals. Future generations of European Muslims have fewer direct ties to their ancestral homelands (and hold only a European citizenship). The continued oversight of Muslim communities by the consulates and embassies of sending states can often surpass straightforward security concerns, and can have civil liberties implications when non-violent reformists get caught up in this net of surveillance and, occasionally, persecution. Foreign intervention by former "sending states" may serve social cohesion but it also delays the true "domestication" of European Islam, and may also interfere with the development of the independent, reformed practice of Islam in a European context.

---

<sup>56</sup> "Turkish Minister criticizes German Imam Education," *Die Welt*  
<http://www.welt.de/politik/ausland/article10696044/Religionsbeamter-sieht-Deutschland-im-Niedergang.html>