

Introduction

Djordje SREDANOVIC, Andrea REA,
Emmanuelle BRIBOSIA, Isabelle RORIVE

1. Contradictory Trends in Diversity Policies: Protection against Discrimination, Valorisation of Identity and Pressures Towards Cultural Conformity

During the 2000s, the European Union (EU) has witnessed a significant change in terms of integration policies for immigrants. Countries like Sweden and the Netherlands, who were both pioneers of multicultural policies in Europe both significantly limited such policies in the late 1990s. Restrictive measures, requiring higher levels of integration in order to access and maintain legal statuses, have been enacted by most Western European countries since then, especially after 9/11. In October 2010, in a very polemic context on immigration and immigrant integration, the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, announced that Germany was to be considered a multicultural failure, words that were soon echoed by the Belgian Prime Minister Yves Leterme. A few months later, the British Prime Minister David Cameron and the French President Nicolas Sarkozy announced the failure of multiculturalism in almost identical terms. These sensational statements, which by and large avoid defining the concept of multiculturalism, are based on a reaffirmation of “Western values” and strengthening of national identity. These statements express the need to review the policies on integration of immigrants, in the sense that they should be more active and voluntarist, more organized by the state and more supported by the EU. In the background, one can see fear for Islamic extremism, but also the idea that the nation states can put some obligations on immigrants, and that for a too long time we have been focusing on “those who arrive”, rather than on “the society that welcomes them”. These speeches are situated in a politico-legal context that in recent years was characterized by an ambivalent attitude towards diversity in Europe. On the one hand, we have seen accusations of racial, ethnic and religious discrimination, based on anti-

discrimination legislation boosted by a strong European equality legal framework. On the other hand, we have seen denouncements of the perceived risk posed by Islam in Europe. These policy statements are also a result of numerous publications, often widely discussed in the media that outline the dangers of Islam in Europe (especially in the Netherlands). These political positions have also led to political decisions demonstrating the lack of legitimacy of Islam in Europe, such as the ban on building minarets in Switzerland or the Burqa bans adopted in the name of protecting national values and the “living together”, notably in France and Belgium (2011).

This book intends to address the relationship between, on the one hand, cultural diversity resulting from migration, and on the other hand social cohesion and social justice within Western societies. In order to do this, we will examine what can be described as two contradictory trends in recent public policies towards foreign people or people with a foreign origin: first, the policies against ethnic, racial and religious discrimination; and second, new harsh integration policies for newcomers in Europe. Since the end of the nineties, and even before in the United States and Canada, anti-discrimination policies have been implemented mainly through the development of legal instruments, on the basis of the principle of equality, and more precisely through legal practices that promote the transition from formal equality to substantive equality. At the same time and following other goals, and especially in Europe, where political intervention is strong, new integration policies were initiated for new migrants with the claimed purpose of strengthening the social cohesion of the host societies. These new integration policies aim to reduce the risk of marginalization of the newcomers but also increase cultural conformity expected from those migrants.

This book aims to provide a trans-disciplinary analysis of the construction of “otherness” in North America and Europe. Some papers are the result of the final conference entitled “Migration, Ethnicization and the Challenge of Diversity. The Others in Europe and Beyond”. Most of the papers on national integration policies here included were produced specifically for this book. Two papers (Pascouau and Bonjour) were written in 2012. The ULB team contributions reflect the results of two transdisciplinary researches: *Outsiders in Europe. The Foreigner and the ‘Other’ in the Process of Changing Rules and Identities* and *In Search of Cultural Conformity. The New Integration and Migration Policies in Europe*, conducted by the center for transdisciplinary research Migration, Asylum and Multiculturalism (MAM) of the Université Libre de Bruxelles. The two researches were funded by the Ministère de la Communauté française de Belgique, Direction recherche scientifique, Action Recherche Concertée.

2. Ambiguous Concepts: Integration, Multiculturalism, Diversity

Most of the concepts used to describe policies are inherently ambiguous. On the one hand, these are general concepts that aim to describe general phenomena, and always depend on assumptions on how contemporary societies work. On the other hand, the same concepts are used to describe concrete legislation, which was obviously enacted with far more goals beyond empirical clarity. Any policy analysis can start either from the general concept or from the concrete legislation existing in different contexts. In these pages we will first try to clarify some of the concepts – integration,

multiculturalism and diversity – largely used to describe policies directed at migrants and minorities¹. We will then look at the change in concrete legislation, giving some interpretation of its directions and causes, and finally advance some general policy implications deriving from our analyses.

Integration can be subdivided – even in the simpler models – in economic (employment, class position), social (sociability, residence, intermarriage) and cultural (knowledge of and adherence to local culture and values) integration. Portes and Zhou (starting with Portes and Zhou 1993) have famously showed that the different dimensions of integration are not necessarily linked in the experience of migrants – that certain migrants reach full economic integration despite only partial cultural and social integration and that others remain economically marginal despite full cultural integration. Portes and Vickstrom’s contribution to this volume returns on the issues of social and cultural integration. While they acknowledge that immigrants do not necessarily enter in tightly-woven social networks, they also criticize Putnam’s (2000, 2007) claim that such networks are necessary for the common good, and show point by point the limits of Putnam’s analysis in this sense.

If the image of a holistic integration that links the different aspects has been criticized, the single dimensions are not free of criticism either. Cultural integration is the most debated dimension and the one that attracts most perplexity as a concept. Not only there are normative doubts about the requirement to adopt the majority culture, but a more general doubt exists about the existence of shared, homogeneous, easily distinguishable and coherent majority cultures to which migrants should integrate (see for example the critique in Kostakopoulou 2010, and, for a larger critique of the origins and coherence of national cultures, Anderson 1983, Hobsbawm 1990 and Brubaker 2004). However, the other dimensions of integration, while less discussed and controversial, are not exempt from ambiguity. Linguists have not only criticized the general assumptions about monolingualism and universally shared standard variants of language in a given (national) context. They have more specifically objected the role of language tests in immigration and citizenship policies (e.g. Shohamy and Macnamara 2009). In the same way, the political values that republican theorists of citizenship (e.g. Schwarzmantel 2003), but also some liberals such as Habermas (1994), propose as a substitute for cultural requirements, assume a strong sharing of political values in the majority population that is hard to take for granted. Moreover, when the “national” political values are translated in policies and tests, these often refer only to general liberal-democratic principles that are hardly specific of a single state (Joppke 2010).

Social and economic integration have attracted less controversy as concepts, both because the ideas are not as value-charged as cultural integration, and because the processes are understood as being “in the migrants’ own interest”. However, if the same processes rather than descriptive become prescriptive, and are established for prerequisites to access formal rights, some issues arise. Economic integration assumes

¹ These are only some of the concepts commonly used. Others include the peculiarly French concept of *mixité*, or the concept of interculturalism, for which we refer the readers to the chapters by Berry, Crépeau, and Bribosia & Rorive in this volume.

a context characterized by availability of (non-marginal) jobs, social mobility and at least a modicum of economic dynamism. Migration studies do routinely recognize the impact of the job market on migration trajectories, but in many studies the economic success (or lack thereof) of migrants is attributed exclusively to their personal characteristics or, to a lesser degree, to integration policies.

Social integration further assumes the presence of a cohesive, non-segregated society in which significant interaction is normally possible between all sectors of the population. Portes and Vickstrom's contribution in this volume points out how often the point of reference of this assumption is an outdated image of a communitarian society, which has little to do with contemporary societies regardless of the levels of immigration and diversity. More generally, one of the major arguments of the multiculturalism backlash, the idea that it creates separate groups within society, leaves unexamined the isolationism and lack of cohesiveness of the majority group, or, rather, looks only at more clearly ethnically-coded separations within a given society.

A second ambiguity present in the concept of integration is its relation to the older and cognate concept of assimilation. The interpretations of this relation goes from those stating the identity of the two (or at most that integration is a politically correct term for assimilation) (Joppke and Morawska 2003) to positions that consider the two concepts as necessarily separate (Pfeffer 2014). In some cases (Barry 1984, 1997; this volume) integration is explicitly opposed to assimilation and defined as participating both to the culture "of origin" and to the one "of residence", with assimilation involving only a participation to the latter. In this sense, there are two distinct issues involved: to what degree minority cultures are legitimized in a given context, and what is the level of expectations to conformity to the majority culture that migrants and minorities are subject to. If by assimilation we mean the lack of distinguishability from the majority group there are two considerations to make. On the one hand assimilation is a more demanding concept, as it presupposes the disappearance of all markers (which becomes particularly problematic when the marker is racial, as Oppenheimer, Prakash and Burns point out in this volume). On the other hand integration as a concept adds further assumptions: minorities and migrants are not only assumed to become similar to the majority population, but to enter social and economic structures that might not even exist in the society as a whole in the terms assumed by the idea of integration.

Multiculturalism as a concept differs from integration on the cultural dimension, as it does not prescribe that migrants or minorities should acquire the cultural orientation of the majority (on the other hand multiculturalism is silent on economic integration, and, as we will see shortly, can imply different orientations on linguistic and social integration). While multiculturalism abandons the idea of a single coherent national culture, it is in most cases still based on the assumption that cultures are homogeneous (see Turner 1993 and Caglar 1997 for a discussion). Most definitions of multiculturalism prescribe the recognition of the cultures of distinct groups and the conferment of equal cultural rights to all the groups. The ambiguities highlighted for the concept of cultural integration are thus reproduced at a smaller scale, and indeed this has been the origin of many of the criticisms against multiculturalism. The assumption of homogeneity of minority groups has been severely criticized, one of the main objections being that multicultural approaches could reinforce the

marginalization, if not the oppression, of the weaker sectors of each minority group (Eisenberg and Spinner-Halev 2005). As with integration, multiculturalism is also at the center of controversies regarding its definition. In Canada, where the term has originated in the 1970s, multiculturalism has developed as an overall policy, which also includes dimensions such as the acquisition of the majority languages (see e.g. Banting 2014; Cr epeau in this volume). In Europe, in which on the other hand multiculturalism was defined as opposed to assimilation if not to integration, only the measures that attribute cultural rights to groups are recognized under the term. It should be further added that Canadian multiculturalism is more individual-oriented than the mostly groupist definitions existing in Europe (see Kymlicka 2015; Berry and Cr epeau in this volume). Canadian authors, such as Banting (2014) and, in this volume, Berry and Cr epeau, are thus critical of the definitions of multiculturalism prevalent in Europe. This is far from being a nominalist issue, as, as we will see shortly, the judgment on the goals, the success and the acceptance of multiculturalism vary significantly according to which definition is privileged.

Diversity is a third concept that deals with the issue of the coexistence of different subjectivities in society. Other than describing the empirical variety of a population, the term also describes measures taken to increase (and/or to valorize the existing) diversity within a given context. Such concept does not have the large diffusion and social salience of integration and multiculturalism, and it has the largest influence in the context of admission to higher education and hiring practices in the US. Where affirmative action aimed to redress historical injustices and often to represent proportionally different groups (in the US, usually racial groups) in order to compensate unequal opportunities, the diversity approach aims to give space to a larger variety of social profiles existing in society without establishing a strict proportionality. The US Supreme Court ruled against college admission quotas (and thus against proportional representation of the population) in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), but at the same time recognized diversity of the student body as a legitimate justification for prioritizing the admission of disadvantaged minorities. With a backlash against affirmative action gaining strength starting the 1980s, diversity was taken on as a more nuanced and less controversial policy (Anderson 2004; Herring and Henderson 2011). On the one hand diversity can be considered to have the potential to go beyond the groupist approach of multiculturalism² by recognizing several dimensions of disadvantage – ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, (dis)ability, etc. – and has been linked with intersectional approaches to in order to recognize such dimensions within each individual (Padilla 1997; Herring and Henderson 2011). On the other hand, diversity is a more timid alternative to affirmative action, and, according to many critics (e.g. Collins 2011), a depoliticized and management-oriented one. Further, even diversity maintains an essentialist dimension, as each

² The understanding of diversity we propose focuses on what distinguishes the concept from multiculturalism and from affirmative action. However, the uses of “diversity” are particularly far from being uniform: Vertovec and Wessendorf (2012: 18-21) argue that “diversity” is used as a synonym of “multiculturalism” that has not undergo backlash, while in another work Vertovec (2012) argues that diversity is an inherently vague term.

individual is implicitly considered to represent, if not all the groups of which she or he is a member, at least all the cultural and social traits that she or he embodies.

3. The Directions of Change

The diffusion and fortune of the different policies here considered has attracted a significant volume of academic debates. Researchers either study the evolution of a given policy in a monographic fashion, reconstructing in detail the development in a single state, or trace comparatively the evolution in its convergences and divergences in a larger set of states. The present volume, especially in its second part, offers both a comparative framework chapter (Pascouau) and monographic chapters on Austria, the Netherlands, Italy and Belgium (Mourão Permoser, Bonjour, Caponio and Testore as well as Adam, Martiniello and Rea).

In one of the first comparative works based on a larger set of countries, and focused in particular on citizenship and naturalization legislation, Hansen and Weil (1999) suggested three mechanisms through which different countries can converge towards similar policies: institutional imitation, external constraints (in particular supranational law) and similar responses to similar situations. If these are the (cross-national) forces that influence legislation change, each policymaking context is also characterized by some degree of institutional path dependency and inertia, and by more or less codified cultural orientations, which limit the probability of radical changes of direction in the policies.

The main issue in interpreting the evolution of the policies is whether a set of states – usually Western Europe and the Anglo “settler societies” – are converging towards a common approach to migration and integration, or whether there are still strong differences, in term of current policies, direction taken, and distance between the trajectories. The first position is mostly associated with Joppke’s theory of liberal convergence (2007). Such convergence is explained, beyond the categories proposed by Hansen and Weil (1999), also by the role of diffused liberal-democratic norms, and in particular by their entrenchment in the judiciary. On the other hand, several authors (see Jacobs and Rea 2007) have pointed out to continuing differences between states in terms of policy, differences that originate both from path-dependence entrenched in previous national legislation and from the lack of actual clear-cut convergence. The contributions collected in this volume continue to show that the convergence in legislation is far from being definitive. National models do not allow to foresee the direction legislation change takes in the medium period, but even in the EU, where the pressures for convergence should be stronger, the situation is far from homogeneous. Pascouau’s comparative analysis of 23 European countries shows not only the existence of several approaches to (mandatory) integration, but also that even the states that choose similar approaches implement them very differently. Similarly, the single-state studies on Austria, the Netherlands, Italy and Belgium show not only strong differences between the national contexts, but also that even in the more important changes in policy there is a path-dependency effect that brings to the partial reproduction of the previous approach.

The interpretations of the diffusion and change of the three concepts previously examined – integration, multiculturalism and diversity – have to be discussed. The

concept of integration is strictly linked with the nation-building processes that started in the late 18th century (Hobsbawm 1990) and with the first policies that saw immigrants as a component of the future population – the melting pot in the US and its equivalent in France (Noiriel 1988). Joppke and Morawska (2003) point to World War I as a defining moment in the affirmation of assimilation – as the population outside the cultural norm started to become targeted as a possible internal fifth column. World War I has indeed been a turning point in defining several long standing norms that influence international mobility – including the consolidation of the national border as an institution (Torpey 2000). However, rather than the norm of cultural conformity – which is central to national projects and pre-existed the acceleration in nationalizing processes during WWI – it is the idea that immigrants have to become part of the national population that took time to develop. Differently from “settler societies” such as the US, Canada or Australia, European states started integration or quasi-integration policies only when immigrants and their descendants were recognized as a permanent presence – something that happened in Northwestern Europe during the 1980s and in Southern Europe during the 1990s. While there is a certain consensus on the history of immigration policies in Europe until the late 1980s, the period starting from the 1990s is the object of separate interpretations. Mid to late-1990s have shown a marked, although not univocal, restrictive trend in immigration and minority policies across Western Europe and, to a lesser degree, in Anglo “settler societies”. The role of the xenophobic far-right and of international terrorism (New York and Washington in 2001, Madrid in 2004 and London in 2005) are the two most common explanations invoked for this shift. However – while both the phenomena have been clearly important, it should be underlined that in the European countries that had developed explicit multicultural policies – Sweden and especially the Netherlands – the restrictive shift started earlier. Multiculturalism was mostly abandoned in 1997 in both the Netherlands (Entzinger 2003) and Sweden (Borevi 2013), and the Netherlands in particular witnessed over the years a restrictionist tendency in its policies. Not only these events antecede 9/11, they also developed while both countries had no significant xenophobic far-right parties, and indeed after the exit of two smaller such parties (New Democracy in Sweden and the Center Democrats in the Netherlands) from national Parliaments. The far-right has become important later in the Netherlands (first with the List Pim Fortuyn and later with the Party for Freedoms) and more recently in Sweden (with the Sweden Democrats), and its influence has been largely demonstrated for the Netherlands (see also Bonjour’s contribution in this volume). In any case, some additional factors are clearly needed to explain the overall tendency³.

The EU has been an additional factor in the development of integration policy change. Although the policy of integration of migrants is not a EU competence as such, this policy experienced a profound convergence through the production of soft law, especially since the adoption by the Council of Ministers of the EU, in November

³ Some recent studies have further put in doubt the degree to which the far right can be considered determinant in a comparative perspective – see Meyer and Rosenberger (2015) on the politicization of immigration in media discourse and Sredanovic (2016) on citizenship legislation change.

2004 of the Common Basic Principles of Integration. As member states in some cases opt out of, or simply do not comply to inclusive norms, while restrictive norms in some cases are applied even without being mandatory, some have argued that EU norm harmonization is done aligning the different states to the most restrictive option existing. Rea, Bonjour and Jacobs (2011) have shown that the situation is more complex. On the one hand, member states that have norms more restrictive than those existing in the European directive usually push to have such norms recognized as a possible policy option, in order to legitimize the existing legislation. Once that restrictive norms appear in this fashion within EU directives, single governments can choose the political opportunity to introduce them in their own country. EU legislation can thus influence directly member state legislation and bring about political opportunities, but in the second case the legislation change needs the political will of the government in power in order to actually happen. On the other hand, since the turn of the millennium, several EU directives (subsequently transposed into national law) have improved possibilities to fight against discrimination, by extending the scope of anti-discrimination instruments to race, ethnicity and religion (Bell 2002; Schiek, Waddington and Bell 2007). The results of the MIPEX projects reveal an extension of rights of foreign nationals in Europe. Legal instruments have been heavily reinforced, giving the courts – and in particular the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights – tools to support the emergence of an important case law in the fight against discrimination and management of cultural diversity, for example on the issue of reasonable accommodation (Bribosia, Ringelheim and Rorive 2010 and Bribosia and Rorive 2015). At the same time, other more controversial measures against discrimination (such as positive actions, the collection of data and the use of statistical tools) have remained relatively marginal (Amiriaux and Guiraudon 2010).

The integration programs introduced are based on learning the language, history and institutions of the host country that are necessary for a successful integration. Several countries have imposed integration measures, such as the knowledge of the language, in the country of origin as a condition for obtaining an immigration visa (Germany, United Kingdom) (Groenendijk 2011). Others have imposed such integration measures in the country of installation (Lithuania, Greece, Austria, Cyprus), or both in the country of origin and in the country of installation (Denmark, France, Netherlands). Moreover, various integration conditions were imposed in thirteen countries (Pascouau 2011) for migrants who apply for a permanent residence permit. The EU is now trying to coordinate the integration policies without harmonizing them (Odmalm 2007). Many countries did start this policy well before the emergence of a European convergence process; at least nine European countries had introduced integration courses for new migrants (Michalowski 2004; Carrera 2006; Jacobs & Rea 2007; Carrera & Wiesbrock 2009). As observed by Carrera (2009), European countries expect migrants to be “perfect citizens”. In addition, these new integration policies have evolved since their introduction. They have become more demanding in the sense that integration modules have often changed from being voluntary to being compulsory. Also, the obligation to follow training courses in order to access certain rights has given way to the obligation to successfully pass tests. Finally, coercion was coupled with another

process that is currently only verifiable in the Netherlands: the outsourcing of the implementation of these policies to private commercial actors.

Multiculturalism as an official policy has a clearer history, but is also at the center of a more heated scholarly debate. The idea of giving space to the cultures of different minority groups developed mostly in “settler societies” starting with the 1960s, and was first codified in an official and active policy in Canada in 1971. Kymlicka (2015) underlines how the policy in Canada was initially ethnicity-oriented, and only later incorporated considerations about race and religion. The history of multiculturalism is thus mostly the history of the diffusion of an institution, that reached, to different degrees, Western European countries⁴. The great controversy, as mentioned, is however about the health of multiculturalism today outside Canada. There is no doubt that a backlash hit multiculturalism in Europe, US and Australia since the mid-1990s (Joppke and Morawska 2003; Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010). For some authors such backlash has practically ended multiculturalism and brought the return of assimilation (Joppke and Morawska 2003). Other authors criticize this analysis for a different number of reasons. In some cases the degree to which single European states ever had a real multicultural policy is challenged (see e.g. Schönwälder 2010 on Germany). In other cases the backlash is understood to be mainly discursive as multicultural policies continue locally for pragmatic reasons, or are recombined in new forms (Jacobs 2004; Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010; Kymlicka 2010; Lentin 2014). Some Canadian authors (Banting 2014; Berry and Cr epeau in this volume), as already mentioned, do not see a contradiction between the promotion of minority cultures on one hand and, for example, the teaching of majority language(s), and therefore see the backlash itself as a case of misunderstanding of the concept.

Diversity’s history as a policy is clearly connected to the rise and fall of affirmative action in the US. As in the case of multiculturalism in Canada, affirmative action and equal opportunity policies in the US started with a focus on race but later expanded to gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability. However, the decoupling between affirmative action and diversity in the US was caused by the backlash against the former that developed starting with the 1980s and by the substantial stop to affirmative action policies in the 1990s (Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Lipson 2008). Diversity as a more complex – but according to some critics, also softer – approach, survived the end of affirmative action for two reasons. Kelly and Dobbin (1998) point out to the entrenchment of anti-discrimination professionals within human resources: while the legal requirements linked to affirmative action waned, these professionals proposed diversity as having business value, finding new scopes for their own skills. In the other central domain of diversity in the US – admission to higher education – diversity substituted affirmative action to comply with gradual legal attacks that developed from the late 1970s and well into the 2000s against affirmative action, and in particular against race-based affirmative action (Berrey 2011). Moreover, an

⁴ One should not however underestimate the role that the promotion of the cultures of origin had for Northwestern European states in a perspective in which immigrants were to return back after working for a limited period. In this sense a number of countries maintained similar instruments while re-orienting them from a temporary to a permanent residence perspective.

emerging professional norm sees diversity as a trait that makes universities more attractive to their (non-minority) public (Lipson 2007; Berrey 2011).

The diffusion of diversity outside the US is mainly due to the prestige of US institutions in several areas. Vertovec (2012) points in particular to two processes through which the diversity approach found a place in Europe⁵. On the one hand, the diffusion of the diversity approach benefited from the 2000 EU directives on Race Equality and Employment Equality, as the introduction of relatively new anti-discrimination norms in EU member states was the occasion to import the diversity approach that had become popular in the US (in the UK, where anti-discrimination norms were already developed, cultural proximity with the US played a role). Secondly, the prestige of US management approaches brought several large corporation in Europe to import diversity management even in absence of legislation as the one that brought to diversity management in the US (see also Calás, Holgersson and Smircich 2009).

4. Policy Indications

Given the several controversies presented until now, we can advance only some very prudent policy indications. Firstly, we have underlined the several ambiguities of the concept of integration and of its different dimensions. These do not necessarily mean that any requirement for entering and remaining on a national territory is automatically unfounded. While international norms limit the discretion for what concerns asylum, right to family life and non-discrimination, conditionality remains legitimate in the other fields of migration and integration policies. Three observations however remain for what concerns this conditionality. Firstly, requiring from migrants and minorities to fulfill requirements that are not fulfilled by significant part of the majority that is already entitled to full citizenship brings serious normative issues. Secondly, there should be a larger consciousness about the images of the majority sector of society implied in integration policies. We have underlined how the different components of the concept of integration are based on ideas about the cohesiveness of the majority population that are empirically dubious if not outright unrealistic. When establishing requirements for migrants and minorities, policymakers should never take for granted that the majority population is homogeneous under the point of view of language, culture or values, or that it is socially and economically integrated. Thirdly, one of the major policy approaches in promoting integration is to make entrance to and residence on the territory, and the acquisition of permanent residence and citizenship, conditional on measures on integration. In several cases the trade-off between the goals is potentially questionable. Through this measures governments offer a “low cost”, but precious, good – legal status – to incentivize integration, rather than directing public spending to the same goal⁶. Potentially depriving migrants of rights and security in order to “make them integrate” can be a bad trade-off not only for the migrants, but in many cases for the society as a whole.

⁵ See also Faist (2009) for a similar reconstruction.

⁶ There is obviously the issue of whether integration requirements are matched with publicly funded integration and language courses – see Mourão Permoser and Bonjour in this volume.

The turning point was also made with the publication of several scientific studies highlighting the negative effects of cultural diversity related to migration on the social cohesion of immigration societies. The best-known research in this area is undoubtedly the article by Robert Putnam (2007) “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century”. From a research on the relationship between ethnic diversity and social cohesion, Putnam argued that diversity in the United States is strongly related to the tendency to withdraw from collective life. The main findings of his study point out that immigration and cultural diversity tended to reduce social solidarity and civic-mindedness. Putnam’s paper contains one of the core questions related to the thesis of the failure of multiculturalism: Does cultural diversity reduce the social cohesion of a society or decrease the civic and political participation of its citizens? Some research (e.g. Jacobs, Martiniello and Rea 2002; Bloemraad 2006; Kesler and Bloemraad 2010) shows, to the contrary, that diversity increases the social and political participation of the minority groups and the participation of individuals belonging to the minority group. Indeed, once we define social cohesion in a non-restrictive way – that is, by avoiding the implication of a culturally homogeneous community – then much of the research would suggest the opposite – that cultural diversity actually contributes to social cohesion through participation and recognition. We propose that social cohesion has to be understood as common rules legitimated and guaranteed by institutions and accepted and shared by individual citizens regardless of their cultural background or identity. In this book we define cultural diversity as a public resource and multiculturalism as a policy that promotes and improves equality along with diversity. In other words, multiculturalism is not a policy that promotes the rights of ethnic groups but a policy that allows individuals, from ethnic majorities and minorities, to claim equal rights, not special treatments. This means that only if diversity implies a state of segregation and high levels of racial and ethnic discrimination, it becomes a threat for social cohesion.

5. Summary of the Chapters

The volume is subdivided in two parts. In the first part the focus is on diversity, multiculturalism, interculturalism and anti-discrimination in Northern America and Europe. By studying different policy aspects the chapters give a representation of the variety of roles diversity has played in the societies on the two sides of the Northern Atlantic and in history. The second part focuses on integration policies, and in particular integration requirements, in European countries. Looking closely at the restrictive turn took by migration and integration policies in Europe since the late 1990s, it gives a comparative assessment of the state of such policies across the EU. The juxtaposition of the two parts illustrates the coexistence of an integrationist, restrictive turn and at the same time of the continuing vitality and validity of diversity, anti-discriminatory and multicultural policies.

The opening chapter by John W. Berry starts from central theories in social psychology to argue that integration, multiculturalism and interculturalism are not opposite approaches, but rather different hypotheses about the relation between groups. By distinguishing between the strategies of the minority groups and those of the majority/policymakers, and by linking the different hypotheses to different policy

components (cultural, social and communicational), Berry argues that the different approaches are compatible and actually co-present in the multiculturalism policy in Canada. As other Canadian authors (e.g. Banting and Kymlicka), Berry thus gives a perspective that is different from the debate – both scholarly and political – prevalent in Europe, which considers integration and multiculturalism to be two diverging concepts.

Alejandro Portes and Erik Vickstrom return on the long-debated issue of diversity and social capital – defined, as in the work of Putnam, as diffused trust. By reanalyzing the work of Putnam on the US they show systematically how this operationalization of social capital has been overestimated in its social effects. By further reviewing the literature on social capital and diversity developed starting with Portes, they show that there might be evidence that diversity lowers mutual trust, but also that this has a limited impact on society. Rather than fragmenting society, the author points out, diversity merely clashes with a communitarian (in the sense of Tönnies) vision of society which is not only normatively superior, but is also illusory in contemporary complex societies regardless of the role of diversity.

David B. Oppenheimer, Swati Prakash and Rachel Burns also focus on the US, showing how the history of immigration in the country has not been one of integration or accommodation, but rather a history of differentialist rejection, both institutional and social, of each new group of immigrants. The authors argue that it is only through an active effort for assimilation – and assimilation to a norm of whiteness – that Irish Catholics, Eastern European Jews and Italians managed to avoid discrimination. The groups for whom whiteness is not available – including African-Americans, to a lesser degree Chinese and Japanese, and, at the present moment, Mexicans, are also consequently burdened by discrimination despite efforts for assimilation.

With François Crépeau's chapter we return to Canada. As Berry, the author also considers Canada's multiculturalism as a policy which assures the respect of the rights of minorities, but also underlines how some aspects – such as the reasonable accommodation of religious norms – have been brought into existence mainly through the role of the judiciary and the concept of equality. In the context of Quebec, where concern about the continuing vitality of French language has brought an emphasis on interculturalism rather than multiculturalism, reasonable accommodation and other issues linked to minority cultures have been met with significant hostility. The author argues therefore that full respect of minority rights can come only from constitutional entrenchment of such norms, rather than ordinary political measures.

Emmanuelle Bribosia and Isabelle Rorive analyze interculturalism and intercultural dialogue both as enacted within European societies but also within the Council of Europe and the European Union institutional frameworks, with a continuous comparison with the situation in Canada and especially in Quebec. The authors underline two paradoxes in particular. The first is that courts in Europe often find themselves dealing with conflicts between the norm of non-discrimination on the basis of gender and non-discrimination on the basis of religion when examining cases that in Canada would have been dealt under the principle of reasonable accommodation. The second is that, since the supranational courts, and in particular the European Court of Human Rights, deal with the diversity between national

majority cultures while using the national margin of appreciation, the intercultural dialogue promoted by the Court can bring it to consistently favor the majority culture at the expense of an intercultural dialogue within European societies.

In the concluding chapter of the first part Alejandra Alarcon Henriquez present the result of an experimental psychological research about anti-discrimination norms in Belgium. Starting from an actual case of explicit ethnicity-based discrimination in hiring practices, the authors conducted two separate studies to see whether the willingness to take measures against discrimination is influenced by the positive opinion of an expert and by the presence of a referent (in this case, the information that the discriminated person is of the same ethnicity of the interviewee). The conclusion is that experts have a stronger effect, as their opinion increases the willingness to take action, while there is no link between strength of identification with the referent and willingness to act.

The second part of the book starts with the frame-setting chapter of Yves Pascouau on integration policies in 23 European states. The analysis shows a large diffusion of mandatory integration requirements for non-EU migrants (17 of the 23 states studied) and a more modest diffusion of integration requirements for family reunification candidates (5 EU member states). As for pre-entrance requirements, the author underlines that there is potentially incompatibility with EU norms both for the harder version (passing a language test) and for the softer version (compulsory language course) of the requirements. As for the requirements for non-EU citizens present on the territory, the analysis shows a great variation, between approaches based on “contracts”, tests or general requirements, and in terms of definition of language and civic integration requirements.

The remaining four chapters focus each on an EU member state: Austria, the Netherlands, Italy and Belgium. Julia Mourão Permoser analyses the integration norms in Austria from 2003 to 2013. She shows how the mounting exclusionary nature of integration norms on a symbolic and discursive level was matched only partly by actual restrictive effects on immigration. Language requirements did not have an exclusive effect initially because of the lack of sanctions for non-compliance and then because of public funding of language courses and the moderate numeric impact of the sanctions, while the cultural and value-based requirements were implemented in a non-assimilatory way. Only with the 2011 reform of the language requirements, which increased the hurdle without matching it with public funds, did the policy shifted from symbolic to actually exclusionary.

Saskia Bonjour investigates the different parliamentary discourses on integration requirements in the Netherlands between 2004 and 2011. She shows how the changes in integration policies can be understood as neoliberal, provided that neoliberalism is not understood as a simple retreat of the state, but rather as a different way of government in which the state maintains coercive measures while decreasing public provision of goods. She further shows how counter-intuitively the left wing parties were the one to depict migrants as needing guidance, in order to promote mandatory participation in state-funded courses without tests. On the other hand the right-wing discourse insisted on the capacity and autonomy of the migrants, which matched their preference for the introduction of tests and the passage of courses on the free market.

Tiziana Caponio and Gaia Testore's analysis of the introduction of the integration agreement in Italy echoes Mourão Permoser's analysis of the Austrian case. The authors show how the measure was promoted as a control policy in the context of a general public order approach to immigration, but also how the implementation measure changed significantly its nature. The introduction of integration policies and the involvement of Ministry of Education structures shifted the integration agreement's nature from mainly control-oriented to control-and-integration, while the decrease of authorized work migration and the exemption of regularized migrants from the requirement *de facto* limited its application to family reunification.

Finally, the chapter by Ilke Adam, Marco Martiniello et Andrea Rea shows the internal articulations of the integration and citizenship policies in Belgium. They show how, starting with the 2000s, the federal citizenship policies first moved towards more open norms, and then back to a restrictive an integrationist approach. In parallel, different integration policies developed between the Dutch-speaking, Francophone, Germanophone and Brussels contexts. While initially only Flanders had a mandatory integration course, the Francophone Community and Brussels have also recently introduced similar course, also because of the need to match the integrationist citizenship policy, and because of a EU context that favors integration programs. At the same time the Flemish approach and that of the rest of the country remain different – cultural integration-oriented in the former, social integration-oriented in the latter, showing the continuing importance of different local approaches to integration.

References

- Amiriaux, Valérie and Guiraudon, Virginie (2010) Discrimination in Comparative Perspective: Policies and Practices. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(1): 1691-1714.
- Anderson, Benedict (1983) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Terry H. (2004) *The Pursuit of Fairness. A History of Affirmative Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Banting, Keith (2014) Transatlantic convergence? The archaeology of immigrant in Canada and Europe. *International Journal*, 69(1): 66-84.
- Bell, Mark (2002) *Anti-Discrimination Law and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berrey, Ellen C. (2011) Why Diversity Became Orthodox in Higher Education, and How it Changed the Meaning of Race on Campus. *Critical Sociology*, 37(5): 573-596.
- Berry, John W. (1984) Multicultural policy in Canada: A social psychological analysis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 16(4): 353-370.
- Berry, John W. (1997) Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1): 5-34.
- Bloemraad, Irene (2006) *Becoming a Citizen. Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.
- Borevi, Karin (2013) The Political Dynamics of Multiculturalism in Sweden. In: Taras, Raymond (ed.) *Challenging Multiculturalism. European Models of Diversity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 138-160.
- Bribosia, Emmanuelle, Ringelheim, Julie and Rorive, Isabelle (2010) "Reasonable Accommodation for Religious Minorities: A Promising Concept for European Antidiscrimination Law?", *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 17(2): 137-161.

- Bribosia, Emmanuelle and Rorive, Isabelle (2015) *L'accommodement raisonnable de la religion en Belgique et au Canada. Comparaison des contextes juridiques, sociaux et politiques*, Bruxelles, PIE Peter Lang.
- Brubaker, Rogers (2004) *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Caglar, Ayse S. (1997) Hyphenated Identities and the Limits of 'Culture'. In: Modood, Tariq and Werbner, Pnina (eds.) *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community*. London: Zed Books: 169-185.
- Calás, Marta B., Holgersson, Charlotte, and Smircich, Linda (2009) "Diversity Management? Translation? Travel?". *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 25(4): 349-351.
- Carrera, Sergio (2006) *A Comparison of Integration Programmes in the EU: Trends and Weaknesses*, CEPS CHALLENGE Paper.
- Carrera, Sergio (2009) *In Search of the Perfect Citizen? The Intersection between Integration, Immigration and Nationality in the EU*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Carrera, Sergio and Wiesbrock, Anja (2009) *Civic Integration of Third-Country Nationals Nationalism versus Europeanisation in the Common EU Immigration Policy*, CEPS policy paper.
- Collins, Sharon M. (2011) From Affirmative Action to Diversity: Erasing Inequality from Organizational Responsibility. *Critical Sociology*, 37(5): 517-520.
- Eisenberg, Avigail and Spinner-Haley, Jeff (eds.) (2005) *Minorities within Minorities. Equality, Rights and Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Entzinger, Han (2003) "The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism: The Case of the Netherlands". In: Joppke, Christian and Morawska, Ewa (eds.) *Towards Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan: 59-86.
- Faist, Thomas (2009) "Diversity – a new mode of incorporation?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(1): 171-190.
- Groenendijk, Kees (2011) "Pre-departure Integration Strategies in the European Union: Integration or Immigration Policy?" *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 13(1): 1-30.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1994) "Citizenship and National Identity". In: van Steenbergen, Bart (ed.) *The Condition of Citizenship*. London: Sage: 20-35.
- Hansen, Randall and Weil, Patrick (1999) "Citoyenneté, immigration et nationalité: vers la convergence européenne?". In: Id. (eds.) *Nationalité et citoyenneté en Europe*. Paris: La Découverte: 9-27.
- Herring, Cedric and Henderson, Loren (2011) "From Affirmative Action to Diversity: Toward a Critical Diversity Perspective". *Critical Sociology*, 38(5): 629-643.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1990) *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, Dirk (2004) "Alive and Kicking? Multiculturalism in Flanders". *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*, 6(2): 280-299.
- Jacobs, Dirk, Martiniello, Marco and Rea, Andrea (2002) "Changing Patterns of Political Participation of Citizens of Immigrant Origin in the Brussels Capital Region: The October 2000 Elections". *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3(2): 201-221.
- Jacobs, Dirk and Rea, Andrea (2007) "The End of National Models? Integration Courses and Citizenship Trajectories in Europe". *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 9(2): 264-283.
- Joppke, Christian (2007) "Beyond national models: civic integration policies for migrants in Western Europe". *West European Politics*, 30(1): 1-22.
- Joppke, Christian (2010) *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Joppke, Christian and Morawska, Ewa (2003) "Integrating Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States: Policies and Practices". In: Id. (eds.) *Towards Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan: 1-36.

- Kelly, Erin and Dobbin, Frank (1998) "How Affirmative Action Became Diversity Management. Employer Response to Antidiscrimination Law, 1961 to 1996". *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(7): 960-984.
- Kesler, Christel and Bloemraad, Irene (2010) "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/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 43(2): 319-347.
- Kostakopoulou, Dora (2010) "Introduction". In: van Oers, Ricky, Ersbøll, Eva and Kostakopoulou, Dora (eds.) *A Re-definition of Belonging? Language and Integration Tests in Europe*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff: 1-23.
- Kymlicka, Will (2010) "The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies". In: Vertovec, Steven and Wessendorf, Susanne (eds.) *The Multiculturalism Backlash. European discourses, policies and practices*. London: Routledge: 32-49.
- Kymlicka, Will (2015) "The Three Lives of Multiculturalism". In: Guo, Shibao and Wong, Lloyd (eds.) *Revisiting Multiculturalism in Canada. Theories, Policies and Debates*. Rotterdam, Sense: 17-36.
- Lentin, Alana (2014) "Post-race, post-politics: the paradoxical rise of culture after multiculturalism". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(8): 1268-1285.
- Lipson, Daniel N. (2007) "Embracing Diversity: The Institutionalization of Affirmative Action as Diversity Management at UC-Berkeley, UT-Austin, and UW-Madison". *Law & Social Inquiry*, 32(4): 985-1026.
- Lipson, Daniel N. (2008) "Where's the Justice? Affirmative Action's Severed Civil Rights in the Age of Diversity". *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(4): 691-706.
- Meyer, Sarah and Rosenberger, Sieglind (2015) "Just a Shadow? The Role of Radical Right Parties in the Politicization of Immigration, 1995-2009". *Politics and Governance*, 3(2): 1-17.
- Michalowski, Ines (2004) *An overview on introduction programmes for immigrants in seven European Member States*, report, ACVZ.
- Noiriel, Gérard (1988) *Le Creuset français. Histoire de l'immigration XIX^e-XX^e siècles*. Paris: Seuil.
- Odmalm, Pontus (2007) "One size fits all? European citizenship, national citizenship policies and integration requirements". *Representation* 43(1): 19-34.
- Padilla, Laura M. (1997) "Intersectionality and Positionality: Situating Women of Color in the Affirmative Action Dialogue". *Fordham Law Review* 66(3): 843-929.
- Pascouau, Yves (2011) "Mandatory integration provisions in EC and EU Member States law". In: Bonjour, Saskia, Rea, Andrea and Jacobs, Dirk (eds.) *The Others in Europe. Legal and social categorization in context*. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles: 37-50.
- Pfeffer, Daniel (2014) "The integration of groups". *Ethnicities*, 14(3): 351-370.
- Portes, Alejandro and Zhou, Min (1993) "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530: 74-96.
- Putnam, Robert D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, Robert D. (2007) "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture". *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2): 137-174.
- Rea, Andrea, Bonjour, Saskia and Jacobs, Dirk (2011) "Introduction". In: Bonjour, Saskia, Rea, Andrea and Jacobs, Dirk (eds.) *The Others in Europe. Legal and social categorization in context*. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles: 7-19.

- Schiek, Dagmar, Waddington, Lisa and Bell, Mark (eds.) (2007) *Cases, Materials and Text on National, Supranational and International Non-Discrimination Law*. Oxford: Hart.
- Schönwälder, Karen (2010) “Germany. Integration policy and pluralism in a self-conscious country of immigration”. In: Vertovec, Steven and Wessendorf, Susanne (eds.) *The Multiculturalism Backlash. European discourses, policies and practices*. London: Routledge: 152-169.
- Schwarzmantel, John (2002) *Citizenship and Identity. Towards a New Republic*, London: Routledge.
- Shohamy, Elana and McNamara, Tim (2009) “Language Tests for Citizenship, Immigration, and Asylum”. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 6(1): 1-5.
- Sredanovic, Djordje (2016) “Political parties and citizenship legislation change in EU28 countries, 1992–2013”. *International Political Science Review*, 37(4): 438-452.
- Torpey, John (2000) *The Invention of the Passport. Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, Terence (1993) “Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology That Multiculturalist Should Be Mindful of It?”. *Cultural Anthropology*, 8(4): 411-429.
- Vertovec, Steven (2012) ““Diversity” and the Social Imaginary”. *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 53(3): 287-312.
- Vertovec, Steven and Wessendorf, Susanne (2010) “Introduction: assessing the backlash against multiculturalism in Europe”. In: Id. (eds.) *The Multiculturalism Backlash. European discourses, policies and practices*. London: Routledge: 1-31.