

Race, Ethnicity and Welfare States

An American Dilemma?

Edited by

Pauli Kettunen

*Department of Political and Economic Studies, University of
Helsinki, Finland*

Sonya Michel

Department of History, University of Maryland, USA

Klaus Petersen

*Centre for Welfare State Research, University of Southern
Denmark*

GLOBALIZATION AND WELFARE

 **Edward Elgar**
PUBLISHING

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Pauli Kettunen, Sonya Michel and Klaus Petersen 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
The Lypiatts
15 Lansdown Road
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 2JA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015933353

This book is available electronically in the **Elgaronline**
Social and Political Science subject collection
DOI 10.4337/9781784715373



ISBN 978 1 78471 536 6 (cased)
ISBN 978 1 78471 537 3 (eBook)

Typeset by Columns Design XML Ltd, Reading
Printed and bound in Great Britain by T.J. International Ltd, Padstow

9. Discourses on Muslims and welfare across the Atlantic¹

Abdulkader H. Sinno, Eren Tatari, Scott Williamson, Antje Schwennicke and Hicham Bou Nassif

The controversy surrounding publication of *Deutschland schafft sich ab* [*Germany, Don't Destroy Yourself*] by German politician and former Bundesbank member Thilo Sarrazin brought renewed attention to the longtime populist anti-Muslim claim that Muslims are and will continue to be a drag on the economy and to overuse welfare services because Islam 'dumbs down' its adherents and keeps them from succeeding economically.² Many in Canada, the United States and Europe still consider such views to be abhorrent and condemnable but they are becoming an increasingly tolerated component of media and political discourses, particularly in European countries.³ Discourses linking Muslims and social services are complex and differ across Western countries. Here, we attempt a first effort to untangle them, mostly by categorizing the frames used to address the topic in newspaper articles in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. We then provide tentative explanations for the variation in the use of frame-based discourses across countries and outlets, and over time. We conclude by evaluating the future political and economic impacts of the current discourses on Muslims and welfare.

Associating Western Muslims with the use and abuse of the welfare state has been one of the strategies used by populist European parties to marginalize Muslims, gain votes, and reduce immigration. Though this strategy has been understood by most Western publics and politicians as an expression of extreme views, the political landscape appears to be changing. Now, majorities among several Western publics are also adopting negative attitudes towards their Muslim minorities and mainstream politicians are following course.⁴ The strategy of marginalizing and 'othering' Muslims by linking them to the abuse of the welfare

system may resonate even more strongly with Western publics as they deal with their countries' economic woes and budgetary strains. If this discourse becomes hegemonic, it could very well result in draconian shifts in policies. These could include depriving immigrants, Muslims in particular, of necessary state services and thereby legitimizing the stereotypes that keep Muslims from gaining education and employment in the first place. Such populist policies would transform European Muslims into permanently marginalized underclasses with limited opportunities in the formal economy and steer them towards economic activities on the margins of the law, society and the market.

Such an outcome would also affect majority populations by keeping immigration from creating a large enough labour base to support retirees, reducing economic growth and increasing security risks and criminal activities. In the long run, it might even lead to increasingly contentious ethnic strife in areas with high Muslim concentrations. Such outcomes are obviously optimal neither for the general public nor for members of Muslim minorities in Europe. Policies grounded in Islamophobia or poorly substantiated arguments could be extremely damaging, and it is therefore important to deconstruct and understand the discourses that motivate them.

DISCOURSES ON MUSLIMS AND WELFARE

There is no logical reason to consider a priori individuals of Muslim faith, heritage or culture as a national or cross-Western minority with common or cohesive interests on redistributive issues, social services or other matters of policy. They are not. To be a 'Muslim' means different things to those who consider themselves connected to the faith or one of its associated cultures or interpretations. The internal diversity within this group of people with fuzzy boundaries defies generalizations and there is no connection between being associated with Islam one way or another and specific political attitudes or welfare needs. Regardless of reality, however, dominant discourses have emerged in Western countries linking 'Muslims' to welfare debates, along with other emotionally salient topics such as security, crime, values and economic well-being. These discourses, the attitudes they engender and the policies they lead to are very real even if the connections they make are tenuous. Because of this, we use the term 'Muslim' for convenience but we do not consider it to necessarily indicate a religious identity. It refers to an identity that may

have religious, racial, political or cultural dimensions, and is often externally imposed on those who are perceived to be members of the group.

Discourses on Muslims and welfare across the West are a subset of a much broader, and increasingly hostile, narrative regarding these minorities. They also differ in the frequency of their use and emphasis across, and within, Western countries. In addition, these discourses make use of various context-specific frames that link Muslim minorities to (among other things) terrorist threats, abuse of the welfare system, cultural rigidity, poor education, economic backwardness, endangerment of women's rights, collusion with Muslim forces outside the country to take over it and Islamicize it and the abuse of state institutions.

We use the term 'discourse' to indicate the body of pronouncements about actions intended for public consumption on the topic of Muslims' use of welfare by politicians, media figures, journalists and other individuals with public reach such as activists with an online presence. Our usage of the term is more restrictive than the Foucauldian one, but is consistent with its general use in the social sciences. The discourse in a country may be hegemonic, include a dominant and counter-discourses, or be fragmented. Each discourse, or strand of a discourse, on Muslims and welfare makes use of frames that associate Muslims' use of welfare with other elements such as terrorism, social justice, crime, etc. By associating the use of welfare by Muslims with any of these elements, the politician, activist or author encourages certain interpretations of this use and discourages others.

To identify and catalogue the most frequently-used frames used in the fairly complex discourses on Muslims and welfare, we analysed qualitatively the content of a sample of articles (10 per cent for the UK and 20 per cent for the US and Canada) from a large, comprehensive compilation of US, British and Canadian newspapers from 2000–10 that is the basis of an *ad hoc* dataset on the topic.⁵ We provide some descriptive statistics about the frequency of the use of frames from eight large UK newspapers in the text.⁶ We also consider the political platforms of some populist parties in Europe, the pronouncements of politicians and the writing and websites of American anti-Muslim activists.⁷ We organized this information based on the various frames used in the discourses on Muslims and welfare. We describe differences in most frames' use across countries and identify who uses and promotes them. Our research is limited by the number of countries, newspapers, activists and entities we could investigate, but the sample of data we have is sufficient to allow us to identify the main frames used and the media, activists and politicians promoting them in at least three countries.

THE 'POLICY' FRAME

This frame, the standard of professional journalism and responsible policy making, presents the use of welfare by Muslims as a matter of general policy to be debated without bias. One example of this surprisingly rarely used frame (5 per cent of UK articles in the Sinno *et al.* dataset)⁸ is an article in the right-of-centre British broadsheet the *Daily Telegraph* that discusses the findings of an October 2010 study titled 'How Fair is Britain', which researches discrimination in British life and its cost to the economy in terms of social services.⁹ The tone is measured, sentences are descriptive of the study's results, and the journalist does not use the findings to make sweeping statements about minorities in order to attack a political party, or to rouse emotions. A 2005 *New York Times* article that compares the effect of state policies on the situation of African Americans and French Muslims finds that the French provision of welfare benefits helps French Muslims from sinking to the depths of poverty that many African Americans reach but that the US emphasis on multiculturalism and use of affirmative action allows African Americans to advance more than French Muslims do.¹⁰ Here too, the tone is measured as the author discusses the benefits and costs of state policies. Muslims (and African Americans) are portrayed as rational individuals responding to incentives and limits imposed on them. Those interviewed include hands-on mayors facing developmental challenges and academics with expertise on the topic. While such a journalistic style is supposed to be the norm, it is distinctly rare in articles that mention Muslims and social benefits in their text in the three countries we researched.

THE 'TERRORISM' FRAME

The journalist, op-ed contributor, politician or political activist who utilizes this frame implies that the use of welfare or claims on the welfare system made by a Muslim individual, ethnic group or Muslims in general are connected to the financing of terrorism or attract terrorists to the country.¹¹ The British press provides many examples of such linkages (66 per cent of UK articles in the Sinno *et al.* dataset), such as the following extract from an op-ed that was published soon after the 2005 London bombings:

By all means, demand that the mosques open their doors and subject their imams to scrutiny. We have sold our own beliefs short by allowing – not to

say funding – through the benefits system those who preach insurrection against us.¹²

A twist on the theme that we found in a piece written by the editorial page editor of the conservative *Washington Times* is that European countries appease their threatening Muslim populations with welfare benefits to avoid punishment:

Even when the current violence subsides – even when the French government attempts to placate its radical Muslim population by offering more welfare benefits and programs – it will not be the end of the story. A new benchmark of the possible will have been established. The flaccid and timorous response of the French government will only increase the radicalizing Muslim elements' contempt for Western cultural weakness.¹³

An editorial piece in Canada's populist and conservative *Toronto Sun* makes a direct link between the provision of welfare support to immigrants and refugees with the increased likelihood of terrorist attacks on the country:

It got so bad that the US Library of Congress issued a report last year stating: 'Canada has played a significant role as a base for both transnational criminal activity and terrorist activity.' This was thanks to our immense welfare rolls, coddling of criminals and especially our lax immigration and refugee policy ... Once these folks get in, they can collect welfare and other state subsidies to fund their anti-western, anti-democratic, and anti-Judeo-Christian campaigns.¹⁴

The linkage between welfare benefits and terrorism is made with less frequency and with a more restrained descriptive tone in non-conservative newspapers. A long 2008 *New York Times* article, for example, describes how Malika El Aroud, a female recruiter for extremist Islamist organizations in Belgium, benefits from social services while working for her cause, noting that even as she 'remains under constant surveillance, she is back home rallying militants on her main Internet forum and collecting more than \$1,100 a month in government unemployment benefits'.¹⁵

Unlike in the articles in conservative and populist outlets, the *New York Times* reporters interview the individual as well as law enforcement officials involved, thereby providing context to the story, including Ms. El Aroud's biography. The article does not amplify claims of threat, appeal to raw emotions, generalize to entire Muslim populations, or leverage a particular case to achieve a broader agenda.

This frame is frequently deployed to link Muslims' use of welfare to the gross abuse of the system by unattractive or generally loathed individuals associated with religious extremism (43 per cent of articles covering Muslims and welfare in the UK make such a connection). We found several instances of the use of this frame in Canadian papers in reference to the would-be terrorist Ahmed Ressam and the connection of the benefits-dependent Canadian Khadr family with the al-Qaeda organization. The Khadr family lost several members fighting American troops occupying Afghanistan and the youngest son was incarcerated in Guantanamo when he was still a teenager. The conservative newspapers *National Post* and *Toronto Sun* published several pieces with an outraged tone about the family's use of welfare, and even the centrist *Globe and Mail* joined the action:

Who would not be filled with admiration for Mrs. Khadr, Maha Elsamnah? She has redefined the meaning of chutzpah. She knows that having a Canadian passport (even though you've managed to mislay it how many times?) means never having to say you're sorry. It means asking not what you can do for your country, but what your country can do for you. It means demanding free airfare so that your whole family can fly back to Canada to get free medicine, free schooling and free welfare, plus maybe some subsidized housing and free counselling for post-traumatic stress.

Meantime, granny is suing the Canadian government on behalf of Omar, the kid who's stuck in Guantanamo. We all know how awful that place is. Some Afghan kids who were recently released recounted horror stories about how they were forced to play soccer, eat good food, and learn how to read and write. The lawyers say Omar's Charter rights were violated, and they want \$100,000. Maybe legal aid will pay their retainer.¹⁶

In her revulsion at the payments to the family, perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars over the years, the author did not consider that incarcerating an adolescent as 'an enemy combatant' may very well be in contravention of international treaties, that the treatment of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay is degrading and dehumanizing, and that some prisoners have committed suicide and others died from injuries sustained at the hands of American interrogators. In contrast, a book review in *The Globe and Mail* addressed the issue in more neutral tones by contextualizing the treatment of the Khadr family, no matter how repulsive, as an extreme case that does not necessarily warrant revising key principles of Canadian law and life:

How ought we treat the Khadr family? The father lied to his fellow Canadians and the Canadian government about funnelling money to Osama bin Laden, the sons fought for al-Qaeda, and the mother cheerfully castigates Canadian society for its moral corruption. And now she is back again, in part to get

medical treatment for a paralyzed teenage son. The family and its values are repugnant to most of us, but can we deny them the benefits of Canadian citizenship on those grounds alone? We would be breaking our own laws to remove their citizenship and, I think, betraying our own principles.¹⁷

Several conservative British and Canadian newspaper published articles that aim to stoke outrage at how individuals who are put under house arrest (control orders) in the UK under suspicion of being terrorists or terrorist sympathizers are provided with welfare benefits to make ends meet.¹⁸ These individuals include highly visible and disliked individuals such as radical clerics Abu Hamza, Omar Bakri Mohammed and Abu Qatada, who apparently inspired some of the 9/11 terrorists. They were kept under house arrest because they could not be imprisoned without being charged and they could not be put on trial because the security services believed the information that would have been needed to prosecute them was too sensitive to disclose in court. British tabloids, such as *The Express* and *Daily Mail* have used this frame quite frequently, particularly after the 7 July 2005 attacks. The connection is sometimes used by conservative newspapers to attack the left, such as in a 2009 *Daily Mail* article:

The Afghans took their place among a motley crew of foreign undesirables granted refuge in Britain. Top of the list was Abu Qatada, described as Osama Bin Laden's European ambassador. He's been shackled up in West London since 1993, when he arrived from his native Jordan on a false passport. Since then he's cost us £50,000 a year in benefit payments and more than £1.5 million in lawyers' fees.

After 9/11, the government woke up to the enemy within. Tony Blair announced that 'the game has changed'. Britain's reputation as a soft touch was over. The preachers of hate were to be rounded up and kicked out, we were promised. Blair knew perfectly well that was never going to happen, thanks to Labour's embrace of the European 'yuman rites' [sic] act, which he once called his proudest achievement in politics ... The 'rights' of foreign terrorists will continue to trump the rights of law abiding British citizens, who will be forced to carry on picking up the bill for their expensive lawyers and welfare benefits.¹⁹

THE 'WELFARE IMMIGRATION' FRAME

This frame implies that the provision of generous benefits to Muslims will only encourage further undesirable Muslim immigration to the country. British tabloids sometimes (4 per cent of articles) made use of this frame:

As the *Daily Express* looked on yesterday, the boatload of young men sailed into the holiday island of Tenerife after a perilous 600-mile sea trip from the African mainland. They had risked death and paid a fortune to people-smugglers to reach the Spanish coast before travelling north to London and other major European cities.

Many of the boats fail to reach their destination and dozens of the migrants drowned as their vessels sink. But at the end of their trip from lawless and impoverished Mauritania lies the promise of a comfortable life on benefits at the expense of the long-suffering British taxpayer.²⁰

European populist parties also make use of this frame. Jønsson and Petersen, for example, report on a statement by Danish right-wing politician Pia Kjærsgaard in a parliamentary debate in 1995–96:

7,000 people from a country that is irrelevant to us in terms of religion [almost all Somalis are Muslims], temperament, culture, and much more besides. Why on earth do these Somalian citizens want to come here, unless they are tempted by social benefits and our over-liberal attitudes?²¹

THE 'ABUSE' FRAME

This frame suggests that the use of social services by Muslims contributes to the abuse of the welfare system in the country in ways that are disproportionate to Muslim numbers in the population. Sinno *et al.* found that this frame was used in 35 per cent of the articles in their dataset of UK articles. As early as 1991, then Mayor of Paris and head of his party (Rassemblement pour la République) and later French President, Jacques Chirac told 1300 party activists:

Our problem is not foreigners, it is overdose. It may be true that we have the same number of foreigners now than before the Second World War, but they are not the same and that matters. For sure, having Spaniards, Poles and Portuguese working in our country causes less problems than having Muslims and Blacks ... [H]ow can you accept that a French worker who works with his wife and make, together, some 15,000 francs sees next to his a subsidized home, a piled up family of a man with three or four wives and some twenty kids who makes 50,000 francs in social benefits, of course without working! [strong applause] If you add to this the noise and smell [audience laughs approvingly], the French worker will go crazy ... We do not have the means to honor family reunification and we must finally start the big debate that is imposed on our country, a real moral debate, to know if it is natural that foreigners benefit, just like Frenchmen do, from welfare benefits to which they do not contribute because they don't pay taxes!²²

The Leftist Prime Minister Édith Cresson responded to Mr. Chirac's statements in 1991 (particularly about 'noise and odour') by comparing him to the extremist Jean Marie Le Pen, an insult in the context of the time. Such rhetoric has been adopted by far-right politicians from Jean Marie Le Pen to Geert Wilders. We find that this frame is frequently used in right-leaning UK papers, but not in US and Canadian papers.

A variant of this frame suggests that Muslims abuse the system by making uniquely 'Muslim' demands that impose unreasonable costs and strain on the country. Populist or conservative parties and activists use this version to stoke outrage among potential voters who oppose changes made to accommodate immigrants or culturally alien practices. For example Bruce Bawer, a right-wing journalist associated with polemical US advocacy groups, claims in *While Europe Slept* that progressive European welfare policies have unintentionally perpetuated and even intensified the growth and separateness of Muslim communities who are now threatening to destroy European culture.²³

Some Muslims do have unique social services needs based on their culture or faith. These include a preference to be treated by medical personnel of the same gender, same-gender swimming facilities, halal (no pork, animals slaughtered according to ritual) food served in school cafeterias and elder care facilities.²⁴ Some of these needs can be met at low cost by governments in areas of high Muslim concentration.²⁵ Examples include the provision of same-gender literacy and citizenship courses for women of Moroccan and Turkish background by a state-funded Belgian organization called *Le Figuier* and the preparation of halal food in schools with large proportions of Muslim pupils in Dearborn, Michigan.²⁶

The 'unique need' that garners the most coverage in the UK is, however, the collection of social benefits by polygamous families.²⁷ Polygamy is illegal in the UK, but polygamous families who immigrate to the country are allowed to collect social benefits if they are eligible. Such a family could, for example, receive £92.80 a week in income support for the man and one wife if they were unemployed, and a further £33.65 for each subsequent spouse. A polygamous family would also be eligible for more generous housing benefits than smaller families. British government agencies estimate that there are 'up to' one thousand polygamous marriages, mostly bigamous ones and not all of them by Muslims, in the country (there are more than two million Muslims in the UK) but it is not clear how many are using welfare benefits.²⁸

Some articles in British broadsheets address instances of polygamous families' use of welfare as a policy issue, quantify its impact and contextualize polygamy historically (for example, that the institution

evolved to provide safety and protection for widows and their children).²⁹ These articles speak of polygamous families instead of men manipulating women and interview administrators who are closer to potentially available, albeit scarce, reliable information. The majority of the coverage however deploys emotional language that links the practice to the abuse of welfare and of the 'British taxpayer', the 'creeping Islamicization' of the country, terrorism and the exploitation of women. Tabloids in particular speak of these marriages as if they were a ploy by Muslim men to abuse the welfare system by giving agency only to the men and assuming that the women are passive victims. Using loaded orientalist terms such as 'harem' (a term evoking large palatial wings harbouring women dedicated to a medieval Muslim sultan's pleasure), the articles are often accompanied with pictures of fully-veiled women who are not necessarily part of a polygamous marriage, or even images of a movie-set harem from the 1971 movie *The Chastity Belt*.³⁰ And some link it to a wider plot of Islamicizing the country:

Three years after the London Tube and bus bombings, it is alarming beyond measure to record that Britain is even now sleepwalking into Islamisation ... [T]he fact is that Britain is already developing a parallel sharia jurisdiction in such matters, with a blind eye being turned to such practices as forced marriage, cousin marriage, female genital mutilation and polygamy; indeed, welfare benefits are now given to the multiple wives of Muslim men.³¹

This impressive exercise in frame bridging obfuscates the fact that there is no obvious, established or even apparent connection between terrorism and the reliance of some polygamous families on welfare. At the same time, some right-wing politicians use a complex double ploy to link polygamy with gay rights, thereby discrediting both sets of issues. One Tory MP warned that human rights laws and equality regulations could open the door for gays to demand similar recognition for multiple partnerships, with groups of men or women presenting themselves as polygamous 'families'.³²

In spite of the aggressive language and sensational coverage used by right-wing and tabloid media on this issue over the previous three years, in February 2009 the British government decided not to cut benefits to destitute polygamous families in order to avoid contravening human rights legislation and because they felt there were 'no financial advantage to claiming for those in polygamous marriages'.³³ Coverage in the UK abated after this decision.

THE 'FAIRNESS' FRAME

In contrast to the 'abuse' frame, this frame associates the use of welfare or claims on the welfare system made by a Muslim individual or Muslims in general with concepts of equity, fair redistribution of resources, kindness towards those who need a helping hand or social justice. Four per cent of UK newspaper articles make use of such associations and 1 per cent link the use of welfare by Muslims to discrimination against them.³⁴ Some articles in mainstream American newspapers support providing welfare benefits to Muslim refugees from violence-prone areas. A 2009 article in the *San Jose Mercury News*, which is published in an area with a very strong presence of successful foreign-born scientists and engineers, presents Iraqi refugees in a sympathetic light as brave and self-reliant and deserving of more social welfare support.³⁵ And a *New York Times* article even compared the United States unfavourably with European countries while describing the desperation of Iraqi refugees after aid ceases within six months of their arrival to the United States:

The United States government has a reputation for being tight-fisted with refugees compared with, say, Sweden, which grants newcomers benefits for life. By contrast, Mr. Aldeen [a former dentist from Iraq who is a refugee in the US] is entitled to about \$400 a month for four months, plus \$100 in food stamps. He turns over \$375 a month to his aunt and uncle for room and board. Moving out is not affordable, he said. In fact, very little is affordable. A dentist offered to let Mr. Aldeen observe in his San Francisco clinic, but after spending \$15 on train tickets from San Jose two days in a row, he decided it would deplete his meager cash.³⁶

Canada's *Toronto Star*, in an article meant to motivate donations for the newspaper's Christmas Fund, which provides gifts for poor children in the area, featured a Muslim family in sympathetic terms. The article refers to the family's reliance on welfare as something to be expected and accepted. It also associates the Muslim family with Christmas, a holiday that Muslims do not normally celebrate but that is part of mainstream Canadian culture, thus making them the equals of other Canadians in their needs and rights:

The family had a lot of difficulties when they came to Canada, recalled the 43-year-old mother who lives in the city's west end. 'We weren't on social assistance. My husband had \$6 cash when we arrived. We didn't have a place to live.' Since their arrival, Saira and her husband have had three more children. The family cobbles out a meagre existence on welfare. But sometimes it's difficult to make ends meet. When there isn't enough money to buy food they often go to the food bank where they not only get food but diapers

for the baby. While the family is Muslim, Saira, her husband and children try to get into the Christmas spirit and celebrate the holiday time in their own way. But there isn't any money for presents.³⁷

We also found the fairness frame used in some British broadsheets. One article in *The Guardian*, for example, argues that welfare benefits and help with employment search should be customized to help ethnic minorities, particularly Muslims, because word-of-mouth recruitment disadvantages them (a concept referred to elsewhere as 'structural discrimination').³⁸ Another article in the same newspaper, written by a journalist with a Muslim-sounding name, argues that racist attacks (white on Asian Muslim) in economically disadvantaged areas are driven by economic jealousy and the suspicion that Muslims abuse welfare services, when in fact Muslims can weather difficult economic times better than whites because of their tight family networks.³⁹

THE 'NOT BE LIKE EUROPE' FRAME

This frame, which is used in the US and Canada, suggests that the conditions in 'Europe' are nearly disastrous and cautions that the countries of North America may very well become like Europe if they pursue, or continue to pursue, faulty policies. In 2008, for example, the *Vancouver Sun* published an article that borrows the language used by conservative British tabloids and newspapers on the issue of polygamy and then asked, 'Is this where tolerant, multicultural Canada is headed?' The article concludes with urgency:

[Attorney-General Wally] Oppal must do something. If he doesn't, vote-seeking politicians may eventually bow to the religious lobby groups. And we could end up like Britain: not only being forced to tolerate polygamy, but paying for it with our tax dollars.⁴⁰

In a 2008 article in the *New York Daily News*, the editor warns that the USA should not provide welfare benefits to suspects of terrorism it cannot convict like the UK does:

What to do with all these enemy combatants down in Guantanamo who are inevitably going to seek release, courtesy of the US Supreme Court? Here's an idea. Ship them to the island of Jamaica. Let them bask on the beach and eat fruit. Take that.

Or better yet, put them and their families on the public dole and support them forever, with the understanding that they must wear electronic ankle bracelets sometimes and promise they will not meet with Osama Bin Laden.

Chuckle not. That's the model in Britain, whose turn-'em-loose courts are goofier than America's. And that may well be where we're headed.⁴¹

A very different use of events from European countries, this one from newspapers to the left, points to racism and discrimination as the causes behind Muslim minorities' dependence on welfare. A self-congratulatory opinion piece in the Canadian *Toronto Star*, for example, quotes an academic expert to make the point:

Once a foreigner, always a foreigner, said [Free University Prof. James] Kennedy. 'Having exotic restaurants is good. Having a public sphere that's diverse is good. But the Dutch would never say that these people might contribute to society and make it better.'

Gradually, the jobless rate among the allochtonen [those originating from another country, immigrants and their descendants] shot up to four times the national average of 6 per cent. Many ended up on long-term welfare.

They produced a generation of marginalized kids, products of a public school system not as committed as the Canadian one to providing equal opportunity to all. Their jobless rate hovered around 35 per cent, three times the national rate for youth unemployment. Dutch Moroccan kids in particular got into petty crime.⁴²

And some articles convey a sense of disapproval at the practices of populist European groups that are stoking ethnic hostility by using cynical stratagems that leverage the welfare issue:

Fear and anger over immigrants, especially Muslims and Roma, have also had a major impact on politics and policy in France, Britain, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Hungary, Austria, Switzerland, Bulgaria and Denmark.

The debate is often brutally divisive. The Sweden party's controversial television ad, which helped the party win six per cent of the vote and 20 seats, showed an elderly Swedish woman – looking fearful, helpless and hobbling with the aid of an able-walker – walking toward bureaucrats providing government benefits.

She is overtaken by a half-dozen sinister-looking young women in black burkas, pushing black baby carriages as they rush ahead of her to grab the government dole.

'Now you have a choice,' the ad states in a country where 14 percent of the population is foreign-born, with a disproportionate number being refugees. 'You can choose the immigration brake instead of the pensions brake.'⁴³

The article, obviously with left-leaning sensitivities in mind, goes on to discuss the opposing views of experts on whether the strain the

immigrants put on the welfare system could produce popular discontent and xenophobic parties in Canada, the way it did in European countries.

THE 'LEFTIST INEPTITUDE' FRAME

Right-wing activists, politicians and media use this frame to associate the use or supposed abuse of social services by Muslims with the policies of parties and politicians to the left of the political spectrum with the intention of discrediting them. Sixteen per cent of articles in UK newspapers make use of such associations.⁴⁴ This frame does not always refer to Muslims as abusers; it sometimes mixes anti-leftist views with American multiculturalism to portray them as victims of misguided leftist policies. One op-ed in the then slightly right-of-centre *Washington Post*, for example, blames the French riots of 2005 on unemployment benefits that create a culture of entitlement, laziness, defiance and resentment among immigrant, particularly Muslim, youths.⁴⁵

But the general thrust, particularly in conservative American publications, is to portray the 'leftist' welfare state in Europe as a magnet to dangerous Muslims. The *Washington Times*, for example, published in 2007 a remarkably unrestrained op-ed by a fellow at the Hudson Institute (a conservative think tank) who claims that:

[a] wholly new danger emerged [in Europe], namely that of welfare immigration – the immigration of people, increasingly from cultures which have not been shaped by the basic forces of European civilization, who come purely for the purpose of claiming benefits ... Take Holland, for example, Europe's equivalent of San Francisco. This is Pelosi Land. The Dutch are pampered by an extensive welfare system. They were the first in Europe to legalize abortion, euthanasia and homosexual 'marriage.' Today, Islam is filling the void that was left when the Dutch created a religious vacuum in the heart of their culture.⁴⁶

Nine days after the *New York Times* published an article (see above) arguing that the French welfare system keeps French Muslims from sinking to the depths of poverty and crime that some African Americans reached because they were abandoned by the state, the *Washington Times*, used the same data from France to attack the American left:

American liberals often look fondly to the European welfare state as a model for US social policy. A typical low-income family of four has much of its rent subsidized by the French government and can receive more than \$1,200 a month in various government benefits. The unemployed receive more. There is a universal national health care system and generous retirement benefits.

Yet, despite all this, we now know much of France's Muslim community lives in areas overcome with crime, poverty and unemployment. And in no small measure the blame can be attributed to France's prized welfare system. For, while French welfare has made poverty more bearable, it has done little to promote the ability of people to move up the economic ladder, improve their lives and see a better future. It is a society in which the poor are given much, but own little and are offered few opportunities for self-betterment, a society locked in social and economic immobility ... France provides an important lesson: A growing welfare state financed by ever-higher taxes is not the answer.⁴⁷

Congressman Todd Tiahrt (R-Kansas) introduced the No Welfare for Terrorists Act (H.R. 2338) in 2009 and published an emotional commentary in the *Washington Times* accusing US President Barack Obama and the Democrats of wanting to release terrorist detainees incarcerated in Guantanamo Bay and to provide them with welfare benefits.⁴⁸ Of course, this was never the content or intent of proposals by the Obama Administration. The intention was to repatriate detainees in Guantanamo who were found innocent of ties to terrorism, as many were, to their own countries and, if not possible, to other countries willing to host them while holding others in high security prisons on American soil. Although Tiahrt's bill was co-sponsored by twelve other Republicans, it never made it past the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The highly improbable association between the foreign Muslim detainees in Guantanamo and welfare services was simply a rhetorical tool that the congressman used to attack the left and its support for redistributive programs.

Editorial pieces in the conservative and populist Canadian *Toronto Sun* frequently (and incoherently) blamed security failures on the policies of the previous liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin (2003-6) of providing generous social services to Muslim immigrants and refugees (the services of course are available to all those eligible regardless of religion).⁴⁹

Of course, leaders of European far-right parties use this frame to attack their opponents to the left. A typical example from a 2008 speech by Geert Wilders at the presentation of the government budget deploys exaggeration and emotional language:

In the airplane they [Muslim immigrants] are already being taught: you vote for Wouter Bos [Dutch Labour Party leader], he gives you social benefits. But who is paying the bill? Who pays the hundred billion? That's the people who have built the Netherlands, the people who work hard, the people who put aside money and who pay their taxes on time. The ordinary Dutchman who doesn't get anything for free. Henk and Ingrid [typical Dutch names] are paying for Mohammed and Fatima [typical Muslim names].⁵⁰

THE 'RIGHT-WING PLOY' FRAME

In contrast to the previous frame, proponents of this one argue that accusations regarding the abuse of welfare by Muslims are used as a ploy by right-wing parties to gain popular support or to promote a racist agenda. Five per cent of articles in UK newspapers, less than a third of the proportion of those that use the 'leftist ineptitude' frame, make use of such associations.⁵¹ The 2010 extract above about the use of an anti-Muslim campaign advertisement by the anti-immigration Sweden Democrats from the *Ottawa Citizen* is a good example, even though it deals with politics in another country. The British *Guardian*, in a long article on the dramatic gains achieved by the populist British National Party (BNP) in local elections in Stoke-on-Trent, describes the party's strategy to gain votes:

[T]he BNP has stepped into the vacuum ... Its tactics are typical of those defined by its national leadership. Typical tall stories [they tell at pubs] include a Kosovan cashing a £5,000 cheque from the council so he can buy a car and one of Stoke's historic buildings being renovated by the council to become a mosque.

The BNP's racist campaigns seem a useful way of getting into communities. Walker [the BNP group leader on the council] talks about care homes, schools and regeneration. He also offers a pungent mix of nostalgia and conspiratorial claims about immigrants and Islam, from the apocryphal Muslim taxi drivers who 'piss in bottles and throw them out of cabs' to the council giving housing priority to immigrants. (This is untrue: lettings are assessed on need – people who are homeless, or in overcrowded accommodation – which is unrelated to ethnicity).⁵²

Articles making use of this frame in the UK tend to be more analytical and less emotional than ones that associate the supposed abuse of welfare by Muslims with leftist policies, perhaps because of their higher concentration in broadsheets. Articles that attack the left on this issue tend to be concentrated in right-leaning tabloids that cater to a less-educated readership.

VARIATION IN THE DIFFERENT FRAME-BASED DISCOURSES ON WESTERN MUSLIMS AND WELFARE

In the previous section, we described different frames used to address the use of welfare by members of Western Muslim minorities. These frames

are the building blocks of discourses and, sometimes, counter-discourses of various degrees of hostility in Western Europe, Canada and the United States. Conservative and populist political activists, politicians, parties and newspapers are comparably hostile against Muslims across the Atlantic. When it comes to Muslims and welfare more specifically, however, the hostile narratives that link Muslims' use of welfare to terrorism or the abuse of the system are more concentrated in Europe. US and Canadian narratives on Muslims and welfare refer either to events in Europe (sometimes with similar hostility) or to Muslim refugees by using the more friendly frames of fairness and empowerment. Our search for newspaper articles from leading publications in 2000–10 that address the topic found 244 pieces from Canada and 219 from the United States, in contrast to the 1509 from the UK.

Hostile narratives on Muslims and welfare in Europe are mostly found in right-wing tabloids and are frequently produced by right-wing populist and, increasingly, mainstream politicians and activists. In the US, they are mostly found in the conservative *Washington Times*, *Daily News* and *New York Post*, while in Canada they are concentrated in the similarly conservative *Toronto Sun* and *National Post*. While we were expecting to find considerable use of hostile frames specifically addressing welfare issues in the websites of ultra-conservative American activists who invest their energy in harassing Muslims and their organizations, we found relatively little compared to attacks based on other issues such as terrorism, threat to the West, misogyny, etc. What explains the variation in the intensity of coverage and the use of particular frames across media and countries?

VARIATION ACROSS COUNTRIES

The Muslim minorities of North America and Western Europe are very different. As of 2011 Muslims make up much smaller proportions of the general populations of the United States (between 1 and 2 per cent) and Canada (around 3 per cent) than of Western European countries, where they are estimated to make up between 5 and 10 per cent of the populations of Germany, the UK, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Denmark. Muslims also make up much smaller proportions of the immigrant components of the population in the US and Canada than in Western European countries. In addition, Muslims are much more visible in Western Europe than in North America because of their concentration in large urban areas.

Muslims across the Atlantic are also very different in their socio-economic accomplishments. Immigrant Muslims and their children in Canada and the United States tend to be academic and professional overachievers who move fairly quickly up the socio-economic ladder.⁵³ In Canada this is partly because of the selective immigration system that advantages applicants who have the educational, linguistic, demographic and cultural prerequisites for success in the Canadian economy. Substantial numbers of Muslim immigrants to the United States are individuals who remained after acquiring higher education in the country (and thus obtaining a prerequisite for success) or had the motivation to cross the Atlantic in search of a new life (and thus already had the drive to succeed).

The quarter to a third of the American Muslim minority that is African American (5 per cent of the African American population) tends to fall below the American public's average in educational and income attainment in ways that reflect broader African American disadvantages. The 'Muslim' component of their identity however is subsumed under their African-American one in US public discourses on welfare's use and abuse.

In contrast, large numbers of Muslim immigrants to Europe are low-skilled workers who were brought in to provide necessary labour during the post-war reconstruction boom, and their descendants. They are mostly poorly educated and hail from some of the more conservative and least advantaged areas of their countries of origin (for example, the Rif in Morocco and Anatolia in Turkey). The combination of a legacy of economic and educational disadvantages, discrimination in the educational and labour markets, and governments that may not have invested sufficiently in their integration for decades, produced social under-classes whose poverty and poor accomplishments are now being increasingly associated with culture and religious identity.⁵⁴

The higher proportion of refugees among European Muslim minorities also makes them considerably poorer than North American ones. By virtue of its cultural (colonial and post-colonial links) and geographic proximity to Muslim countries, Western Europe has attracted many more Muslim refugees than North America. Refugees in Europe generally receive generous benefits and assistance while Muslims (and others) who are given refugee status in the US (mostly Iraqis, Burmese, Somalis and Bosnians) receive only up to six months' worth of minimal training and aid, with the expectation that they will manage to support themselves afterwards.

It is therefore not surprising that West European Muslims rely much more on welfare and social services than their counterparts in Canada and the US, and are also, as a consequence, much more associated with

the use of these services in their countries' media and political discourses. One exception confirms the rule: the rare attacks on Muslims that link them to welfare or state expenditures in the US target the Muslims of Dearborn and Metro Detroit, where the decline of the auto industry and the collapse of the economy have pushed Muslims (along with other populations) in the area to make use of government grants and services. The habitual attacker is the anti-Muslim activist Debbie Schlus-sel, who specializes in hounding Michigan Muslims. She has accused Muslims in Michigan of scamming the welfare system and using social benefits to gain the leisure to plot terrorist attacks, and charged that the government-funded organization ACCESS (which serves all Arabs, including Christians) provides services to 'kids [whose] parents are illegal alien devout Muslims from Yemen–Yay, Anwar Al-Awlaki/UndieBomber/Fort Hood Massacre Land!–and many of the kids are either illegal aliens or illegal alien anchor babies [sic].'⁵⁵

While we do not deal at length with the discourses used in West European countries other than the United Kingdom, it is worth mentioning that they tend to be harsher on Muslims wherever populist parties have a reasonable chance to be elected to the country's parliament. Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark are examples of such countries where an electoral system based on proportional representation provides electoral rewards for populist parties to adopt aggressive discourses *vis-à-vis* Muslims, the 'other' du jour.

It seems likely as well that conservative and populist politicians, activists and parties also use the association between Muslims and welfare (as well as terrorism, crime, etc.) to influence immigration policies while trying to avoid the appearance of being racist, because racism is beyond the pale for large sections of Western publics and explicitly illegal in several West European countries. With their post-racist flavour, the discourses of populist parties portray Muslims as dangerous, alien, irreconcilable, scheming and abusive because of what they do, not because of who they are.

In some countries, such as France, the UK, Germany and Denmark, anti-Muslim feelings have reached such a high pitch that mainstream right-of-centre and even leftist parties have adopted part of the discourse of anti-Muslim activists and unelectable far-right parties or movements. The German Thilo Sarrazin, for example, was a member of the mainstream centre-left Social Democratic Party in 2009 when he made controversial comments such as:

Integration requires effort from those who are to be integrated. I will not show respect for anyone who is not making that effort. I do not have to

acknowledge anyone who lives by welfare, denies the legitimacy of the very state that provides that welfare, refuses to care for the education of his children and constantly produces new little headscarf-girls. This holds true for 70 percent of the Turkish and 90 percent of the Arabic population in Berlin.⁵⁶

Right-of-centre parties do co-opt the far-right's language and attitudes in some countries where they may lose crucial votes to the extremists even if the extremists cannot win seats. For example, Bauder and Semmelroggen find in their analysis of discourses on immigration in the German Bundestag that parliamentarians from the large right-of-centre Christian Democrats (CDU) link immigrants to the abuse of welfare as they recommend restrictions on immigration while parliamentarians from the left-of-center SPD and Greens use high rates of dependence to argue for helping immigrants catch up.⁵⁷ In France, President Nicholas Sarkozy co-opted part of the populist Front National's discourse on Muslims and Romas. In the UK, we find some Tory candidates co-opting the language of the BNP, and right-of-centre parties in Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium have borrowed some of the language and platforms of parties to their right, or toned down their counter-discourses. It could also be that prospects of coalition-making with populist parties may encourage centre right parties to co-opt the discourse of the radical right on Muslims and welfare, the way Green-Pedersen argues they affected the position of Denmark's mainstream rightists on issues of immigration and integration more generally.⁵⁸

VARIATION WITHIN COUNTRIES AND OVER TIME

Coverage and the use of frames vary within countries, over time, and across media as well. Broadsheets in the UK tend to use policy and fairness frames and engage in serious journalism while covering the topic, in contrast to populist tabloids that deploy emotional language, rarely interview the Muslims involved, and heavily use terrorism, unique needs and 'leftist ineptitude' frames. In the US and Canada, where mainstream newspapers are subject to less competition in their markets than in the UK, we find a 'second newspaper syndrome': all of the Canadian and US newspapers that are particularly aggressive in their coverage of the topic are weaker competitors in their own market, trying to wrest subscribers from the leading publication. The *Washington Times*, for example, competes with the mainstream *Washington Post*, while in Canada, *The Toronto Sun* uses the slogan 'Toronto's Other Voice' to present itself as an alternative to the mainstream and moderate *Toronto Star*, and Conrad Black started *The National Post*, also in Toronto, in the

hope of providing a conservative alternative to Canada's premier *Globe and Mail*, which is mainly liberal to left. We hypothesize that mainstream newspapers lean towards professional coverage because they want to hang on to the largest readership possible by avoiding offensive language while rivals, when they exist, consider aggressive populism as a means to differentiate themselves and build their audiences.

Fear is another factor that drives negative coverage of Muslims in general, including in connection to welfare, and we find spikes in coverage after terrorist attacks such as the 11 September 2001 attacks on New York and the London bombings of 7 July 2005, as well as during intense phases of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It also appears to us based on a preliminary assessment that negative coverage also increases during pre-election seasons, with a particularly frequent use of the 'leftist ineptitude' and 'right-wing ploy' frames in newspapers. Finally, the few articles that we found by authors with Muslim-sounding names tend to attempt to dispel the increasingly dominant views that the use of negative frames propagate. These articles are all published in left-leaning newspapers.

One way the use of frames spreads across national borders and leads to the creation or consolidation of discourses is through corporate media ties. Newspaper and other media outlets owned by Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation, for example, borrow articles linking Muslims with welfare from each other across markets and national borders. These articles tend to frequently use the 'terrorism' or other hostile frames.⁵⁹

THE DANGERS OF CURRENT DISCOURSES ON MUSLIMS AND WELFARE

A dominant argument in the literature on welfare is that increased demographic diversity is correlated with the lesser provision of social services.⁶⁰ In this chapter, we provide a first attempt at tracing and unravelling the complex narratives that may be used to justify a reduction of welfare services when the recipients of such services are 'othered' in the public's imagination. These narratives rely primarily on negative frames and stigmatize the othered minority as a perpetually under-achieving, threatening, ungrateful and irreconcilable class of like-minded individuals who unjustifiably strain redistributive systems. These discourses often rely on half-truths and generalizations, rarely use the measured tone of those seeking sound policy, but contribute to a wider emotional discourse that distorts and exaggerates the importance of specific events to define the targeted minority as a source of cultural, economic and security threats.

Such narratives have already gained traction, in the case of Muslims, as shown by the gains of populist parties and the co-option of part of their agendas by right-of-centre ones.⁶¹ They may lead to discriminatory laws that produce further marginalization and damaging cleavages, to borrow Lipset and Rokkan's term, within European societies.⁶² Some studies have already shown that European publics rank immigrants in general as the least deserving group of social beneficiaries and, one would expect based on the many surveys of West European public opinions of Muslims, that they would consider Muslim immigrants to be even less deserving of such services.⁶³ This would logically lead vote-seeking politicians on the right of centre to adopt populist agendas to modify welfare systems to reduce benefits for Muslim immigrants and their descendants, as well as for other immigrants. Such laws are already being passed in some European countries, as Thomas Faist shows in his contribution to this volume. Heidi Vad Jønsson and Klaus Petersen describe such recent changes to the welfare system of Denmark that, while not explicitly aimed at Muslims, do target behaviour that has been associated in the conservative and populist discourse with Muslims.⁶⁴ These measures include a minimum age of 24 for foreign wives to join their Danish husbands, lower social benefits for couples where the wife does not work, rules for refugees to be selected on the basis of 'integration-potential', reduced incremental benefits for larger families beyond the second child and tougher testing for citizenship that requires advanced cultural and language skills.

Modifying the system purposefully in a way that restricts access to benefits for a specific minority is problematic. As Desmond King (this volume) and Sanford Schram have shown in the case of the US, welfare reform can reinforce existing racial inequalities that have developed as part of a discriminatory racial policy regime – an outcome that seems to be in store for the increasingly 'racialized' Muslim populations of Europe, who are subject to discrimination in education and the labour market.⁶⁵ In addition, it is quite possible that Muslims will be discriminated against in the provision of welfare services if the intent of welfare reform is understood by bureaucrats to be the reduction of social benefits to Muslims in particular. It is quite likely that this process, also unfolding in the Netherlands, Belgium and France, would expand and contribute to the gradual formation of a permanently marginalized European Muslim caste that suffers from both discrimination in the educational and labour markets as well as lack of access to the services that are supposed to make up for the harm caused by such discrimination.⁶⁶

The welfare systems of Europe may need to be adjusted to better meet current economic challenges, but they do not need to be 'reformed' to

exclude Muslims and other immigrants the way populist activists and conservative media propose. A better policy would be to implement strong anti-discrimination programmes that help Muslims not to rely on welfare benefits more than others. In spite of the caricatures of Muslims as overly-dependent on welfare in Europe, their employment rates can very well be improved through sound policy that reduces hostility and discrimination in the job market. Gallup surveys of European publics and Muslim over-samples found the difference in employment levels between the general public and members of the Muslim minority in 2009 to be only 9 percentage points in France (54 per cent versus 45 per cent) and 5 per cent in Germany (58 per cent versus 53 per cent), but a large 24 per cent in the UK (62 per cent versus 38 per cent).⁶⁷ Of course the quality of employment is also probably much lower for employed Muslims, but the situation is not irremediable. And West European states have no better choice than to help their disadvantaged Muslims do well and integrate into the workforce if they want to support the welfare system in the long run for their ageing societies.⁶⁸ Alas, the aggressive anti-Muslim discourse on welfare could restrict policy discussions on the topic and lead to sub-optimal outcomes for both Western publics and their Muslim minorities. The Canadian experience has been more positive in part because of the greater socio-economic attainment of Muslim immigrants to the country in conjunction with Canada's enshrined multiculturalism. Even Canada, however, is susceptible to a contagion of damaging ideas from Europe, with conservative newspapers leading the way.

NOTES

1. Funding for this study was provided by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It was also supported by a fellowship at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars. The authors thank Pauli Kettunen, Michael Klitgaard, Sonya Michel, Klaus Petersen and Fatima Zibouh for providing valuable information and comments.
2. Thilo Sarrazin, *Deutschland schafft sich ab: Wie wir unser Land aufs Spielsetzer* [*Germany is Doing Away with Itself*] (Munich, Germany: Deutscher Verlags-Anstalt, 2010).
3. A survey conducted by Timothy Hellwig and Abdulkader Sinno, 'Attitudes towards Different Immigrant Groups in Britain: Evidence from a Survey Experiment', in American Political Science Association, Seattle, Washington, 2011, for example, reveals that 36 per cent of the British public either agrees or strongly agrees with the statement 'Muslim immigrants abuse welfare'. Abdulkader Sinno, Antje Schwennicke, Hicham Bou Nassif and Scott Williamson, 'Newspaper Readership and Attitudes towards Immigration and Welfare in the UK: Tabloids, Murdoch and the Formation of Stereotypes', in American Political Science Association, Seattle, WA, 2011 found an increase in both coverage and bias in the coverage of welfare and Muslims in the UK: the number of articles in eight major newspapers increased from 15 to 89 from 2000 to 2010 and the negative bias of these articles increased from 2.92 to 4.29 on a 5-point scale.

4. 'Unfavorable Views of Both Jews and Muslims Increase in Europe', Pew Research Center, 2008. Available at: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/955/unfavorable-views-of-both-jews-and-muslims-increase-in-europe>
5. The ad hoc dataset by Sinno *et al.* 'Newspaper Readership' codes all articles and opinion pieces from major tabloids from the UK, US and Canada that mention Muslims or members of Muslim minorities in the West in conjunction with welfare benefits provided by the government. The dataset was compiled by using the NexisLexis database. The search string used is 'Muslim AND Welfare OR Benefits'. The authors exclude articles and opinion pieces that do not include a meaningful link between Muslims who live in a Western country and welfare, even if both are mentioned within it. The dataset includes 1509 articles from the UK (23 newspapers and tabloids), 243 from Canada (10 newspapers and tabloids), and 218 from the US (15 newspapers).
6. Sinno *et al.* 'Newspaper Readership' coded the content of a sample of 441 articles from eight UK newspapers for frames used, among other data. The newspapers are: *The Guardian*, *The Independent*, *The Mirror*, *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Times*, *The Sun*, *The Daily Mail* and *The Express*. Articles are from 2000–10, inclusive.
7. The activists, polemicists and media figures who frequently attack Muslims include Daniel Pipes, David Horowitz, Robert Spencer, Debbie Schluskel, Pamela Geller and Glenn Beck.
8. Sinno *et al.*, 'Newspaper Readership'.
9. Tim Ross, 'Indians and Chinese Get Better Jobs than White British Men', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 October 2010, 10.
10. Graig S. Smith, 'France Has an Underclass, But Its Roots Are Still Shallow', *New York Times*, 6 November 2005, 3.
11. Rayna Flye, 'Outsiders and the Welfare State: How Increased Ethnic Heterogeneity and Anti-immigrant Attitudes Affect Support for Welfare', PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2010. Flye already identified the dominance of this frame in British newspaper coverage of Muslims and welfare.
12. Anne McElvoy, 'Time to Stand Up for Liberal Britain', *Evening Standard*, 3 August 2005, section A, p. 13.
13. Tony Blankley, 'Islamist Threat in France: Critical Lessons for the West', *Washington Times*, 9 November 2005.
14. Michael Taube, 'It's Time We Joined the War on Terror: We've Been Coddling Criminals with Lax Immigration, Refugee and Welfare Policies', *Toronto Sun*, 1 August 2005 Monday, editorial, . 19.
15. Elaine Sciolino and Souad Mekhennet, 'Warrior for Al Qaeda Rallies Recruits With Her Online Fury', *New York Times*, 28 May 2008, A10.
16. Margaret Wente, 'Oh Those Khadrs, They've Taken Chutzpah to New Heights', *Globe and Mail*, 15 April 2004, A19.
17. Margaret MacMillan, 'Terrorism: the Democratic Dilemma', *Globe and Mail*, 8 May 2004, Book review section, D6.
18. See, e.g. James Kirkup, 'British Terror Suspects Given \$1M for Living Costs: Under House Watch', *National Post*, 17 November 2009, A12. Reprinted from the British *Daily Telegraph*.
19. Richard Littlejohn, 'Under This Rule, even Bin-Laden is British', *Daily Mail*, 20 February 2009.
20. Cyril Dixon, 'Risking all to Reach the Promised Land: "Spain just first stop for flood of asylum seekers heading to UK"', *The Express*, 20 May 2006, 6.
21. Heidi Vad Jønsson and Klaus Petersen, 'From a "Social Problem" to a "Cultural Challenge" to the National Welfare State: Immigration and Integration Debates in Denmark 1970–2011', in *Citizenship and Identity in the Welfare State*, (ed.) Andrzej Marcin Suszycki and Ireneusz Pawel Karolewski (Baden-Baden, Germany: Nomos Verlag 2013), 165–88.
22. Jacques Chirac, 19 June 1991, Orléans, published in *Le Monde*, 21 June 1991. Video of speech online at <http://www.ina.fr/economie-et-societe/vie-sociale/video/CAB91027647/meeting-cresson-le-pen.fr.html>. Translation by author.

23. Bruce Bawer, *While Europe Slept: How Radical Islam Is Destroying the West from Within* (New York: Doubleday, 2006).
24. Rooshey Hasnain and Shoab Rana, 'Unveiling Muslim Voices: Aging Parents with Disabilities and Their Adult Children and Family Caregivers in the United States', *Topics in Geriatric Rehabilitation* 26 (2010):46–61; Shaheen Azmi, 'Canadian Social Service Provision and the Muslim Community in Metropolitan Toronto', *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 17(1) (1997): 153; Fauzia Ahmad and Sarah Sheriff, 'Muslim Women of Europe: Welfare Needs and Responses', *Social Work in Europe* 8 (2001): 2–10.
25. See Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka, *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), which deconstructs the argument that recognition undermines the welfare system.
26. For more information on Le figuier, see <http://bruxelles.alphabetisation.be/article146.html>. Other countries and administrative units that have a tradition of giving religious and ethnic communities social services customized for their needs have also accommodated Muslims in the past. The government of the State of Michigan and other governmental sources, for example, fund the \$18 million budget of the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS), which focuses mostly on economic and social development, immigrant support and outreach for Arab Americans (including Muslims) in the state. This is, of course, only one of several such ethnically-based organizations funded by government sources in the state. A few London boroughs (municipal governments) fund housing agencies for Muslims and Islamic community centers that provide English and job skills training, as they do for other faith groups. Such government-funded programmes that help immigrants integrate are generally not controversial, but they figure little in newspaper articles and the writings of anti-Muslim activists who use this frame. See Abdulkader Sinno and Eren Tatari, 'Muslims in UK Institutions', in *Muslims in Western Politics*, (ed.) Abdulkader Sinno (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2009), 113–34; and Abdulkader Sinno and Eren Tatari, 'Toward Electability: Public Office and the Arab Vote', in *Target of Opportunity: Arab Detroit in the Terror Decade*, (ed.) Sally Howell, Nabeel Abraham and Andrew Shryock (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2011), 315–46.
27. Sinno *et al.* 'Newspaper Readership', find that 6 per cent of UK articles covering Muslims' use of welfare mention welfare needs that are unique to Muslims.
28. 'Polygamy', Standard Note: SN/HA/5051. Available at: www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05051.pdf
29. For example, Dominic Kennedy, '1,000 Men Living Legally with Multiple Wives Despite Fears Over Exploitation', *The Times*, 28 May 2007, 11.
30. 'Polygamous Husbands Can Claim Cash for their Harems', *Evening Standard*, 17 April 2007. Available at: www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-23393028-polygamous-husbands-can-claim-cash-for-their-harems.do
31. Melanie Phillips, *Daily Mail*, 8 July 2008, 1st section, 26.
32. Matthew Hickley, 'Polygamous Husbands Can Claim Cash for Extra Wives', *Daily Mail*, 18 April 2007, first section, 27.
33. Brian Brady, 'Polygamy Claimants Keep the Money', *The Independent on Sunday*, 22 February 2009. Available at: www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/polygamy-claimants-keep-the-money-1628957.html
34. Sinno *et al.* 'Newspaper Readership'.
35. Ken McLaughlin, 'Safe, but not Secure: Iraqi Refugees Struggle to Make it in Silicon Valley', *San Jose Mercury News*, 18 April 2009.
36. Neil MacFarquhar, 'Leaving Home Behind to Escape a Nightmare', *New York Times*, 22 June 2008 Sunday, section A, 15.
37. Debra Black, 'Boosting Immigrant Family's Spirits', *Toronto Star*, 23 November 2005, A17.
38. Tania Branigan, 'Racial Gap in Employment Will Take 45 Years to Close', *The Guardian*, 9 November 2006, 12.

39. Faisal Bodi, 'The Racists are Driven by Envy of Asian Success: My Home Town, Preston, Doesn't Feel Like Britain's Race Hate Capital, But the Social Decay in White Areas has Created Tensions', *The Guardian*, 26 July 2006, 28.
40. Daphne Bramham, 'UK Pays Price of Polygamy', *Vancouver Sun*, 8 February 2008, B1. Other conservative US and Canadian newspapers covered the issue of polygamy in similar terms and American anti-Muslim activists have re-posted some of the more aggressive UK pieces to their websites. Examples include: Natalie Alcoba, 'Only One Wife Gets Benefits: Social Services Minister Upset by Polygamist Claim', *National Post*, 9 February 2008, A21; Al Webb, 'Britain Clears Way for Polygamy Benefits: Foes Slam Role of Islamic Law', *Washington Times*, 12 February 2008, A1. For coverage in anti-Muslim activists' websites see, for example: www.jihadwatch.org/2007/04/polygamous-husbands-settling-in-britain-with-multiple-wives-can-claim-extra-benefits.html. See also a piece by Daniel Pipes in the *Washington Times* in which he generously uses the term 'harem': 'Westerners welcome harems', *Washington Times*, 7 December 2008, Available at: www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/dec/07/westerners-welcome-harems/
41. 'Comfort for the Enemy', *Daily News*, 8 July 2008, editorial, 20.
42. 'How the Tolerant Dutch Became so Intolerant', *Toronto Star*, 22 June 2006, opinion section, A23.
43. Peter O'Neil, 'Is Canada Up to the Immigration Challenge? Hostility toward Newcomers has Caused a Shift in Europe's Political Landscape', *Ottawa Citizen*, 25 September 2010, A6.
44. Sinno *et al.*, 'Newspaper Readership'.
45. Jim Hoagland, 'French Lessons', *Washington Post*, 9 November 2005, editorial, A31.
46. Paul Belien, 'Reshaping America: Don't Look at Present-Day Europe', *The Washington Times*, 14 February 2007, A19.
47. Michael Tanner, 'Welfare Lessons from France', *Washington Times*, 15 November 2005, A20. Tanner was the director of health and welfare studies at the Cato Institute.
48. Todd Tiaht, 'No Welfare for These Enemies: Any Release of Detainees with Benefits Must be Resisted', *Washington Times*, 15 May 2009, A19
49. For an example of how this was done in the context of the case of Ahmed Ressam, the would-be terrorist who lived in Canada and was sentenced in the USA for his attempted attack on the Los Angeles International Airport in 1999, see Bob McDonald, 'Must Target Terror: As Ressam Case Shows, Current Strategy Leaves us Vulnerable to Attacks', *Toronto Sun*, 31 July 2005, 38.
50. Geert Wilders during 'General Political Considerations' ('Algemeen Politieke Beschouwingen') at the presentation of the government budget for the year 2009, 18 September 2008.
51. Sinno *et al.*, 'Newspaper Readership'.
52. Tom Baldwin and Fiona Hamilton, 'Turning a Blind Eye on Campaign Trail as BNP Targets a Prize Seat', *The Times*, 13 February 2010, 38–9.
53. Pew Foundation, 'Muslim Americans: Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream', Pew Research Center, 2007; Azmi, 'Canadian Social Service Provision and the Muslim Community in Metropolitan Toronto'; 'Muslim Americans: A National Portrait', in *The Muslim West Facts Project: What the People Really Think*, (ed.) Dalia Mogahed (Gallup and the Coexist Foundation, 2009).
54. In the UK, for example, the unemployment rate for Muslims was triple the average in 2004 and the economic inactivity rate (not being available for work and/or not actively seeking work) was twice the average for Muslim men (31 per cent versus 16 per cent) and three times the average for Muslim women (69 per cent versus 26 per cent for all women). Data is from the British Office for National Statistics, available at: www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=979. For a survey-based comparison among Western Muslims' perceptions of their economic situation, see Dalia Mogahed, (ed.), 'The Gallup Coexist Index: A Global Study of Interfaith Relations with an In-Depth Analysis of Muslim Integration in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom', Washington, DC: The Coexist Foundation, 2009.

55. See, for example: Debbie Schlusssel 'Wikileaks: Huge #s of UK Muslims Support Violent Jihad, Sharia; Muslims Most Likely 2B Unemployed, Claim "Disability"', 22 December 2010. Available at: www.debbieschlusssel.com/30813/wikileaks-13-of-muslims-support-violent-jihadterrorism-almost-50-want-shariaislamic-law-to-govern-uk-24-muslims-claimed-disability-muslims-most-unemployed/; Debbie Schlusssel 'Alhamdulillah [Praise Allah (sic)]: Your Taxes Fund Christmas Toys for ... Muslim Illegal Aliens', 20 December 2010. Available at: www.debbieschlusssel.com/30680/alhamdulillah-praise-allah-santas-toys-go-to-muslim-kids-illegal-aliens-courtesy-of-your-tax-s/
56. 'Sarrazin muss sich entschuldigen', *Die Zeit*, 1 October 2009. Available at: www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2009-10/sarrazin-aeusserung-integration?page=all
57. Harald Bauder and Jan Semmelroggen, 'Immigration and Imagination of Nationhood in the German Parliament', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 15 (2009): 14–15.
58. Christoffer Green-Pedersen and Jesper Krogstrup, 'Immigration as a Political Issue in Denmark and Sweden', *European Journal of Political Research* 47 (2008):610–34.
59. See, for example, 'Evil Welfare Sheik Cheers on Jihad from Within', *The New York Post*, 23 July 2005, 4; which refers to the editorial of the British *The Sun*, another News Corporation tabloid.
60. Martin Gilens, *Why Americans Hate Welfare* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1999); Flye, 'Outsiders and the Welfare State'; Alberto Alesina and Edward L. Glaeser, *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Alberto Alesina, Reza Baqir and William Easterly, 'Public Goods and Ethnic Divisions', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114 (1999):1243–84; Erzo Luttmer, 'Group Loyalty and the Taste for Redistribution', *Journal of Political Economy* 109(3) (2001): 500–28; Esteban F. Klor and Moses Shayo, 'Social Identity and Preferences Over Redistribution', *Journal of Public Economics* 94 (2010): 269–78; Holger Stichnoth and Karine Van der Straeten, 'Ethnic Diversity and Attitudes Towards Redistribution: A Review of the Literature', in Centre for European Economic Research: Discussion Paper No. 09-036, 2009.
61. For examples of studies that show that the media have perpetuated stereotypes of Muslim minorities, see various chapters in Elizabeth Poole and John E. Richardson, *Muslims and the News Media* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006). Stanley Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: the Creation of the Mods and Rockers*, 3rd edn, (New York: Routledge, 2002) shows how the media frequently show interest in groups of Others that is disproportionate and excessive compared to the actual threat they pose, often hindering the reasoned discussion of policy issues. The news media have also linked minorities to the disproportionate use of welfare in ways that have been effective in shaping the attitudes of whites in the US. See Ange-Marie Hancock, *The Politics of Disgust: The Public Identity of the Welfare Queen* (New York: New York University Press, 2004); Gilens, *Why Americans Hate Welfare*; Paul Hartmann and Charles Husband, *Racism and the Mass Media* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1974).
62. See Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan, *Party Systems and Voter Alignments* (New York: The Free Press, 1967); and Carl-Ulrik Schierup, Peo Hansen and Stephen Castles, *Migration, Citizenship, and the European Welfare State: A Twenty-First Century Dilemma* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) for an elaborate argument about the racialized exclusion of the new migrant minorities from full citizenship rights in European welfare states.
63. Wim van Oorschot, 'Making the Difference in Social Europe: Deservingness Perceptions among Citizens of European Welfare States', *Journal of European Social Policy* 16 (2006): 23–42; Hellwig and Sinno, 'Attitudes towards Different Immigrant Groups in Britain: Evidence from a Survey Experiment'.
64. Jønsson and Petersen, 'From a "social problem" to a "cultural challenge"'
65. Sanford Schram, 'Contextualizing Racial Disparities in American Welfare Reform: Toward a New Poverty Research', *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (2005):253–68.
66. Several studies have documented discrimination against Muslims in the labour markets of Western countries. See, for example: Claire L Adida, David D. Laitin and Marie-Anne

Valfort, 'One Muslim is Enough!' Evidence from a Field Experiment in France', IZA DP No. 6122, November 2011, DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.19573512011 for discrimination in France. See also European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey EU-MIDIS Report, 9 December 2009. Available at: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/EU-MIDIS_MUSLIMS_EN.pdf

67. Dalia Mogahed (ed.), 'The Gallup Coexist Index: A Global Study of Interfaith Relations with an In-Depth Analysis of Muslim Integration in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom', Washington, DC: The Coexist Foundation, 2009.
68. See Paul Gallis, 'Muslims in Europe: Integration Policies in Selected Countries', Congressional Research Services, The Library of Congress, 2005, 17–18 for examples of policies by the Blair government in the UK to reduce welfare dependence among Muslims in particular.