THEMATIC ARTICLES – MIGRANTS' INTEGRATION IN HOST SOCIETIES

Modes of Minorities' Integration: Explaining Historical, Economic and Political Factors

Andrada COSTOIU

Abstract. There are a great number of states in which different ethnic minorities coexist, each of them having their own culture, language and history. In some of these states, the ethnic minorities have been subjected to marginalization and acculturation, in other states the minority groups were recognized as being distinct parts of the nation and were granted equal rights of participation in the public arena. This paper attempts to explain why states opt for such different ways of integrating their minorities. It first develops a typology of minorities' integration and than, by using the example of two nation-states that fit into each type of integration model it discusses the historical, political and economical factors that could explain each pattern of minorities' integration.

Key words: *integration, ethnic minorities, multiculturalism, assimilation*

Introduction

There is a large variation in terms of how states are dealing with their ethnic minorities. There are states like United States and Canada which recognize the uniqueness and distinctiveness of their minorities. Canada for example has become a nation that is officially committed, through a wide range of governmental policies, to the preservation and enhancement of ethnic diversity. Canadians see themselves as a mosaic[1]. They call for the incorporation of all ethnic groups in the Canadian society via civic assimilation, without trying to override or to lower the importance of the ethnic identities. United States also respects the

---

[1] Kivisto, Peter. 2002. **Multiculturalism in a global society.** United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

ethnic cultural diversity and embraces multiculturalism, nevertheless the promotion and the protection of distinctive ethnic identities it is not a goal of the state's policies.

There are also states like France and Germany which are still reluctant and not very open in supporting their ethnic diversity. Germany for example, is not open but is rather adverse to the idea of multiculturalism. German ethnic minorities continue to suffer political, economical and social discrimination. In Germany a foreigner will always remain a foreigner if it does not have German blood. France also has an adverse attitude towards multiculturalism, but it is not similar with the German case. France, which has built its nation on the republican version of civic citizenship, is trying to override and replace its minorities' different ethnic identities with the identity of French citizen. For France the foreigner will not always be a foreigner as in the case of Germany, rather he could become a French citizen with the condition of replacing its ethnic identity with the French identity.

So why do states have such different and sometimes divergent attitudes towards their ethnic minorities? Why some states are open and willing to integrate their ethnic minorities without impeding on their identity and uniqueness while others are not willing to integrate or they would integrate their ethnic minorities only if they would give up their identity?

The concept of integration

Integration is a "difficult to define" concept. Thus, prior developing on the different ways in which states "integrate" their ethnic groups and on the reasons of their different approaches, there are few important clarifications that we have to make in regards with our understanding of the "integration" concept.

First, as the literature suggests, "integration" of minorities could be understood in many ways. Over the past decades scholars equated the "integration" of ethnic minorities with the removal of the differences between the minorities and the bigger society. These scholars understood through "integration" the process of *re-homogenization* of the society in which the minorities were expected to adopt all the values of the host society, without any reciprocal

accommodation from the host state[2]. Nevertheless the political, economical and social realities have leaded us to change our understanding of the integration of minorities. Nowadays, through integration we understand the process of incorporation with equal rights of all ethnic groups. These ethnic groups should be granted equal rights in all spheres of the society, without being expected to give up their diversity. This is how integration will also be understood in this paper.

Second, integration is *multidimensional*. Integration of ethnic minorities into a society takes place at every level and in every sector of society. Hence, hence we will have to take into account not only parts of the integration process, such is the political or the economical integration of the ethnic minorities, but we have to assess the integration of minorities on political, cultural, social and economical dimensions. The *political integration* should focus on assessing minorities' access to citizenship rights and also on assessing their political participation in the country where they reside. The *cultural integration* should concentrate on the way the ethnic minorities are allowed to preserve and manifest their cultural values both in the public and in the private spheres. The *social and economic dimensions* of integration should asses the social and economic equality between the minorities and the bigger society.

---

[2] This view is mostly related with the integration of immigrants through their assimilation into the bigger society. The assimilation models have their roots in the Chicago School of Sociology, and they are mostly related with the name of one of its members, Robert Park. He argued that through a process of interaction between the immigrants and their new society, the immigrants will "move from contact to competition, from conflict to accommodation and finally to assimilation"(Barbara Heisler, " The future of immigrant incorporation: Which models, which concepts", International Migration Review, 1996, Vol. 26(2): 626) Later Gordon (1964) developed a multidimensional assimilation model. He identified seven stages in which the immigrant is moving from the cultural integration to a structural integration within the host society(Gordon, Milton. 1964 "Assimilation in American Life: The role of race, religion and national Origins". New York.). Finally, the more recent literature is suggesting that the assimilation of newcomers is a segmented assimilation, in the sense that the immigrants get assimilated and display the characteristics of different sub-cultures. Portes (1995), for example, builds his model on the United States case. He says that the path of the assimilation of the immigrants is determined by their color and their country of origin. As a result, the white immigrants from relatively high income countries will assimilate into the white middle class, while the dark skinned immigrants coming from poorer countries will assimilate into the inner city underclass. Also, the immigrants coming from countries that have strong ethnic communities in United States will try to maintain their ethnic distinctiveness and they will integrate into their ethnic immigrant community(Portes, Alejandro. 1995. "Children of immigrants: Segmented assimilation and its determinants", The Economic Sociology of Immigration.)

Three models of minorities' integration and the historical, political and economical factors that stand behind them

There is a great variation in the ways states chose to "integrate" their minorities. Yet, we can create a typology of states' minorities' integration in broad terms and characteristics. Though, it is important to understand that no country fits exactly in any of these types presented here. A country can have a different attitude towards different ethnic groups and can also evolve from a way to deal with its ethnic minorities to another, starting for example with a policy of assimilation to gradually move towards a policy of pluralism.

Table1. Three modes of integration

Models of integration	Pluralist/Multicultural	Assimilationsist	Exclusionary/ Formal inclusion
Legal/political dimension	-the minorities have access and can acquire national citizenship - there is a support for minorities political organizations - the ethnic minorities participate in the political life of the country	-the minorities have access and can acquire national citizenship -ignore the minority political organizations - discourage the political mobilization on behalf of the ethnic groups	- ethnic minorities' access to citizenship is very restrictive or they do not have access to citizenship - ethnic group members are deprived of political rights - ignore the minority political mobilization
Socio-economic dimension	- encourage the public institutions to reflect pluralism in their programs and policies - equal access for ethnic minorities to heath care, education and housing - equal opportunities for the ethnic minorities in the labor market	- school desegregation policy - equal access to social services	- accommodation and living conditions that increase the segregation of the ethnic groups - unequal access to employment, education and health care for the ethnic/racial minorities
Cultural-religious dimension	- there is official support for the ethnic minorities to express their cultural and religious particularity - multicultural curriculum in schools; the state allows special education programs for ethnic minorities in languages other than the state language	- oppose the public manifestation of religious beliefs and practices - discourage and oppose the establishment of religious monuments (such a mosques, e.g.)	-no measures or efforts to deal with the ethnic minorities special needs in schools or in any other spheres of the social -school segregation policies

The **pluralist/multicultural** model is based on the premise that all ethnic groups should be granted equal rights in all spheres of the society, without being expected to give up their diversity. The basic ways in which the nation-states are integrating their ethnic minorities without impinging on their particularity are presented in the above table. The state gets actively involved in supporting and promoting the ethnic diversity through policies that range from ones that are accommodating the ethnic groups' specific religious and cultural needs to policies that are empowering different political ethnic organizations. Also, the ethnic minorities are active actors in the political, social and economical life of the nation-state.

As an example, two states can be defined as having multicultural/ pluralist modes of integrating their ethnic groups: Canada and Australia. United States also respects ethnic cultural diversity and embraces multiculturalism; nevertheless United States embraced the "laissez-faire" approach of multiculturalism (Castles, 2000, 139)[3]. In other words, United States incorporates the ethnic minorities as citizens and also tolerates the cultural differences, but the state does not assume an active role to support and promote the maintenance of ethnic cultures.

None of these states were born with a multicultural policy. Until the 1960s they all had racist policies that discriminated against the non-Europeans. In the Australian case, the state maintained an explicitly racist assimilationist policy which was making a clear distinction between the whites and the non-whites. As Kivisto argues "Australia defined itself legally and culturally as "White Australia"[4] and preference was given to the social and cultural absorption of the European-origin immigrants while discriminating against all the other newcomers (and Aboriginals). Similarly, Canada developed a state policy that was bifurcated along two ethnic lines: the Anglophones and the Francophone. Canada continued to ignore all the other ethnic groups until 1971, when multiculturalism was officially embraced as a policy in Canada[5].

Nevertheless, three central factors led those two countries to embrace multiculturalism.

---

[3] Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson.2000. **Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging**. London: Macmillan.
[4] See note 1.
[5] In 1971 the Multicultural Policy Act was adopted by the government of Pierre Elliot Trudeau through which Canada was committing herself to respect and support diversity

One important factor is determined by the needs of their capitalist economies, which in order to grow necessitated an expansion of their populations. This led to a very diverse ethnical population that proved to be impossible to manage through assimilation policies. At the beginning, Canada's population was divided between the indigenous people and the two charter groups: the British and the French. Nevertheless, as the nation began to industrialize the need for labor force became acute and the country started to receive large numbers of immigrants. Besides the British and the United States citizens, large number of Germans, Scandinavians, Poles, Greeks, Portuguese and other European immigrants arrived in Canada[6]. Also, beginning 1962 when Canadian immigration policy "put an end to the "white Canada" policies of the past"[7], large number of immigrants originated from Asia, Caribbean and Central America flooded the country. Through the newcomers, the Canadian ethnic diversity was greatly enriched and Canada became one of the most culturally diverse countries in the world. Similar with Canada, the population became more ethnically diverse in Australia. At the beginning the majority of Australian population was constituted by the indigenous people together with the British and Irish settlers. Before the Second World War, the Australian immigration policy displayed a preference for the British immigrants, nevertheless the declining birth rate and the growing need for labor force in the manufacturing sector opened the gates for large immigrants from Eastern Europe and Asia. This represented the end of the White Australia, which now became the home of various immigrant communities. Assimilation policies through which these two countries tried to incorporate their immigrants proved to be ineffective, as the new immigrant groups turned into ethnic communities that maintained their mother tongues and took steps to protect their ethnic heritages. Instead of facing a homogenous population, both Canada and Australia were challenged now to control and manage a great collection of ethnic communities. Multiculturalism, in the sense of "civic multiculturalism", came as a solution to bring social cohesion to such an ethnically diverse population. While trying to unite all ethnic groups within their borders via civic assimilation, both Canada and Australia made room for cultural diversity. Hence, in order to become a Canadian or an Australian

---

[6] Robert Harney. "So great a Heritage as Ours: Immigration and the survival of Canadian Polity" in **In Search of Canada**, by Stehpen Graubard(ed.), New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

[7] Idem 1

citizen it was no longer necessary to be culturally assimilated. Tough, it was necessary to be civically assimilated, which meant that as a citizen each ethnic group member had obligations and commitments to their nation-state. Starting 1970s, both Canada and Australian governments embarked to a multicultural policy that promoted equal civic, political and cultural rights to all their citizens. Both states got actively involved to combat social disadvantage, to offer equal access to heath care, education and housing for all ethnic groups and to offer them equal opportunities for participation and decision making in the political life.

The politicization of ethnicity stands as a second important factor of the emergence of multiculturalism. Though, the Australian and the Canadian cases are different. In Australia, as Castles points out, one reason for the introduction of the social policies aimed specifically at the ethnic immigrant groups, "was the realization by political parties that immigrants were making up an increasing proportion of the electorate" (Castles[8], 2000, 151). These policies were first introduced by the Australian Labor Party government and than were continued by the following Australian governments. They developed a wealth of government policies concerned with welfare, education or services that recognized and supported the special needs of ethnic groups. In Canada, the multicultural policies are a reflection of a politically mobilized ethnicity. Here ethnicity was not politicized by political parties for electoral reasons, but it was politicized by an increasingly powerful Francophone community which sought to assert their political rights. The Canadian Francophone politicization of ethnicity led to an increasingly powerful nationalist movement in Quebec that pushed for the separation of this province from Canada. In an effort to diffuse the Quebecois separatism and to keep Canada together the Canadian government had to find ways to accommodate the demands aggrieved by the ethnic nationalists. At first multiculturalism started in Canada as "biculturalism", translated in a set of policies that recognized and protected the distinctiveness of the Francophone cultural identity. Later, the Canadian government expanded its bicultural orientation into a multicultural orientation which granted equal rights in all spheres of the society for all ethnic minorities, while recognizing their cultural particularity.

---

[8] Idem 3

The transition of Canada and Australia towards a multicultural policy was also facilitated by another factor, and that is the flexibility of their national identity.

Thus it was possible for the Australian and the Canadian states to shift the locus of defining their national identities from the racial and ethnic lines towards a national identity based on civic assimilation. Of course, one could ask how is it possible to shift from ethnicity and race as the factors of defining the national identity towards a national identity based on civic assimilation. The answer is not simple. One of the reasons for which this shift was possible was the emergence of the welfare state. As Kivisto also points out, "the introduction of social policies contributed to the creation of a national Canadian identity based on common membership and social citizenship" (Kivisto[9], 2002, 90). Nevertheless, this answer does not suffice. Both these nations developed as nations of immigrants and from the beginning their process of nation-building was exposed to ethnic diversity.[10] Their national identity did not have time to cement around a single ethnic or racial identity and hence their national identity was not rigid and was not inherently tied to a particular ethnic or racial identity. This permitted to the states to develop a more inclusive sense of sense of peoplehood(one that was not limited to ethnicity and race) and to expand the belongingness to the nation by increasing the salience of other national identity makers, such as the civic belongingness.

At the other pole from the pluralist/multicultural model is the **exclusionary/formal inclusion model** of integrating the ethnic minorities within a nation-state. This model has been developed by the states which have a national identity based on "blood ties", such as Germany and Japan. The membership to the German or the Japanese nation was determined by one's lineage or bloodline. For example, anybody with a German descent is welcomed into the German nation. This explains that the citizenship right was granted to all the returning individuals with German descent that were scattered over Eastern

---

[9] Idem 1

[10] In Canada for example, both the English and the French settlers came with strong ethnic heritages and they had to recognize one another their cultural differences. It is true that the British tried to blend the French into the British mainstream, though that was not possible and starting very early in the process of nation-building they had to officially recognize the cultural right for the Francophone community (e.g. the Quebec Act passes in 1774 granted linguistic and religious rights to the French majority; Kivisto, 2002, 87).

Europe and the fact that that they were also offered a generous state support for their social accommodation in the form of housing benefits, pension rights and other social benefits. Nevertheless, the same generosity was not replicated towards ethnic immigrants of different ancestries that came to reside in Germany. Towards other ethnic groups within their borders, Germany adopted an exclusionary policy that sought to prevent their incorporation into the German society. The members of those ethnic groups were denied the right to citizenship and were the subject of political, economical and social discrimination.[11] Similar with the German case the Japanese national identity is constructed based on ius sanguis ("blood ties") as the Japanese "have historically viewed themselves as a homogenous society that is racially distinct and superior to outside ethnic groups" (Kivisto, 2002, 112). Thus, like its German counterpart, the Japanese government has ignored and marginalized the other ethnic groups.

The exclusionary models developed by these countries are centered on the political and social exclusion of their ethnic minorities, while attempting to culturally assimilate them. At the most basic level the political exclusion started with the denial of citizenship to the members of the ethnic or racial groups and the restriction of political participation of the ethnic minority groups. At the social level both states forged policies that produced unequal access to employment for the ethnic/racial minorities which gradually placed the ethnic minorities in unskilled and low-paying jobs that the Japanese or the German people avoided (Kivisto, 2002, 112&162)[12]. Also, their housing policy concentrated ethnic minorities in certain spatial areas, usually at the cities peripheries. The result of the political and social exclusionary policies was a segregated society, in which the ethnic minorities were viewed and treated as foreigners.

In the present times, due to long time internal pressures from the ethnic groups and also due to the pressures from international community[13], Germany and Japan made efforts to reconsider their policy towards ethnic minorities. On the political realm, a new German immigration law grants the right to citizenship

---

[11] For example, the German educational system reinforces the ethnically based differences while privileging the children of German descent

[12] For example, Koreans are the biggest ethnic group in Japan. Most of the Koreans rarely have good jobs and most of them work as mine or factory workers or as manufacturers and handicrafts.

[13] European Union has been a decisive factor in making Germany to reconsider and modify its policies on citizenship

of the immigrant children born on German soil, without asking them to give up their ethnic culture.[14] This new law also liberalized the naturalization policies for foreign-born immigrants. Nevertheless, naturalization in Germany is a long and complex procedure thus the naturalization rates remained very low even after the liberalization of naturalization for foreign born immigrants. Japan is more resistant to change than Germany. While now it is possible for the members of different ethnicities that reside in Japan and whose parents were born in Japan to become naturalized citizens of Japan, they can only become citizens at the expense of their ethnicity. Thus, many ethnic minorities do not wish to become naturalized. For example, Koreans in Japan make up for 85% of the Japan's resident "alien" population[15]. Most of the members of this ethnicity refuse to naturalize as they see as shameful giving up their culture to go through a humiliating process of assimilation which eventually will confer them citizenship. Hence, even though these countries seem to be more open in terms of offering citizenship to their ethnic minorities, their offer is very restrictive and reserved. The ethnic minorities still find themselves politically marginalized. Also, at the social and economical level the segregation of ethnic minorities is still very visible. Ethnic minorities still confront higher level of unemployment and they still tend to occupy the most unskilled sectors of the economy. Also both ethnic minorities and the Japanese and German citizens tend to increase the residential segregation, as the ethnic minorities are choosing to live in ethnic neighborhoods and the Germans and Japanese chose to move out of the mixed areas.

What is interesting is that together with their new citizenship and naturalization law which improved the ethnic immigrant minorities' access to citizenship, Germany became more culturally assimilative towards its ethnic minorities. After the new citizenship law the ethnic minorities which aspired to acquire citizenship had to show that they identify themselves with the German language and culture. Thus, it is possible that Germany is slowly moving from an exclusionary attitude towards an assimilative approach of its ethnic minorities.

---

[14] Until the new citizenship and naturalization law, all applicants had to demonstrate an identification with the German culture; this requirement has been dropped and the applicant has to prove only that he is able to converse in German and to sign a loyalty statement to the constitution

[15] Daniel Strouthes. *Koreans in Japan.* World Culture Encyclopedia.
http://www.everyculture.com/East-Southeast-Asia/Koreans-in-Japan.html

The other model of integration of ethnic minorities is through their **assimilation** into the nation-state. This model is forged by countries like France and Belgium (Belgium is at the intersection of the political assimilationist and multicultural models, with the French community pursuing the political assimilationist French model and the Flemish community pursuing a multicultural approach). The political assimilationist model is based on the premise that all the individuals should be assimilated into the society as citizens. Thus, the inhabitants of the state have access to citizenship and through citizenship the individual enters in a direct relation with the state which cannot be mediated by any kind of groups. Once they become citizens, all individuals have the same rights and duties and there are no policy differences that target the needs of different ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds.

The reason why this model is still practiced today by certain nation-nation states is deeply rooted in their history and in the experiences with their different ethnic minorities.

France had a long history of tension between the Church and the state. The revolution of 1789 created a rupture between these two institutions and the French society became secularized. The Revolution also created the base of the French national identity, by uniting all individuals under the doctrine of "liberty, equality, fraternity", which became the core value of the French national culture. The French Revolution ideology attempted to create equality among individuals through sameness. Throughout centuries, the French state and society have remained loyal to the French Revolution ideology which explains why their model of integrating the ethnic minorities is oriented towards removing the ethnical differences (from the public sphere) and creating homogeneity within the French society. France tries to integrate its ethnic minorities via civic assimilation; France is concentrated on the integration of the individuals and not on that of the groups. While rejecting their cultural accommodation, the access of ethnic minorities to citizenship and naturalization is not exclusionary as we have seen in other states. France offers citizenship based on both the "place of birth" and also on "blood and soil" laws and the naturalization process is much less tedious than the one we have seen in Germany. The French government has also put in place a set of social policies to help the integration of ethnic individuals into the bigger French society by improving their housing, education and employment opportunities. Nevertheless, France's efforts of civic assimilation of its ethnic

minorities deemed to be unsuccessful. The ethnic groups clustered in ethnic ghettos where they confront high levels of unemployment (Rudolph, 2006)[16]. Moreover, not only the ethnic communities did not get dismantled, but in the face of a growing religious diversity of the French population the principle of secularism also got challenged. The integration of a very large Muslim population (who now forms the largest immigrant population in France) created large debates on the position of Islam in the French society. In the present times, France still pursues an assimilative policy towards its ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, the number of ethnic minorities that have retained their culture and "are openly practicing their "foreign-ness" has increased (Rudolph, 2006, 68).[17] Not willing to make compromises and to recognize cultural diversity, France is now trying to restrict immigration (e.g. "by redefining asylum laws to limit their applications, by expelling refuges from civil wars immediately upon the cessation of violence"; Rudolph, 2006[18], 92) and also to make more difficult the stay of the noncitizens (e.g. by "denying noncitizens access to welfare", by "moving refuges to points far from the majority of population" Rudolph[19], 2006, 92).

Belgium is one federal state, but is governed by two different visions on its ethnic minorities. In the case of Belgium, the Flemish and the Francophone policy makers use different frameworks of integrating their ethnic minorities. While the Flemish government has adopted a model of integrating their ethnic minorities based on multiculturalism (in line with the Anglo-Saxon and Dutch models), the Walloon and the Brussels governments took on the French model based on assimilation. In other words, the mode of integration of the Walloon and the Brussels governments "is ethnocentric and results in assimilation and 'homogeneism' - a fundamental non-acceptance of diversity" (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1994 [20]). As in France, these governments are focused on the integration of the individuals and not of that of groups. Their policies are

---

[16] Rudolph, Joseph. 2006. **Politics and Ethnicity: A Comparative**. **Study**. **Joseph Rudolph**. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[17] According to Rudolph (2006, 62) France contains now "at least five million Muslims, many of whom are beyond easy deportation because they were born or they became naturalized citizens of France". Also, as many as 1.5 million immigrants from the 4 million immigrants exiting in France by 1990 have made the transition from foreign worker to French citizen (Rudolph, 2006, 68)

[18] Idem 16

[19] Idem 16

[20] Blommaert, J. and Verschueren, J. 1994. The Belgian migrant debate, *New Community* 20 (2): 227-251.

targeting the socio-economic integration of individuals while ignoring the needs that steam from the ethno-cultural differences.

General conclusions

One of the first remarks that steams from the analysis presented in this paper is that nation-states developed philosophies about the way ethnic groups should be (or not be) integrated into their society that are strongly related with their historical experiences and evolution. Integration is dependent on the way the state defines its national identity and is also dependent on the state's nation-building process. For the states where the national identity was historically fused with the ethnic or racial identity (such as Germany and Japan) a more inclusive sense of nationhood is very hard to achieve. Thus these states would tend to develop exclusionary models to deal with their ethnic minorities that are centered on their political and social exclusion. At the most basic level the political exclusion is translated in the denial of citizenship to the members of the ethnic or racial groups (on the premise that citizenship can be acquired only through blood lineage) and the restriction of political participation of the ethnic minority groups. At the social level states forge policies that produce unequal access to employment, education and housing for the ethnic/racial. On the other hand, the nation-states where the national identity did not have time to cement around a single ethnic or racial identity (with a national identity that is not rigid and that is not inherently tied to a particular ethnic or racial identity) could more easily transform and expand their sense of peoplehood and belongingness to the nation to include diverse ethnicities. Usually the transformation of their notion of national identity is achieved by decreasing the salience of ethnicity and increasing the salience of civic belongingness. These nation-states are integrating their ethnic minorities without impinging on their particularity. Their governments get actively involved in supporting and promoting the ethnic diversity through policies that range from ones that are accommodating the ethnic groups' specific religious and cultural needs to policies that are empowering different political ethnic organizations. There are also nation-states that have historically created a strictly civic national identity, one in which ethnicity and other types of group identities do not have a place (such as France). Even when faced with a growing ethnic diversity, these states seem to be adamant in pursuing a civic integration of their minorities

and disregard cultural differences. Overall, by comparing these findings, I would say that the nation-states with a national identity created along the ethnic lines (I am referring here at the mono-ethnic national identities) and the nation-states with a national identity created strictly along civic lines are equally rigid towards ethnic diversity. While the states with a national identity created along the ethnic lines do not want to integrate other ethnic groups based on the reason that the nation and the state belongs only to the ones of the same blood, the nation-states with a national identity created strictly along civic lines is trying to dismantle ethnicity by putting accent on the integration of the individuals (and not of the groups) and also by forging cultural assimilation. We should also notice that the states with neither an ethnic nor a strictly civic national identity can be more integrative of different ethnic minorities (such are the examples of Canada and Australia).

Another fact that steams from this analysis is that states tend to move (even if formal) towards a less rigid versions of integration that the one they have adopted in the past. States that had assimilationist tendencies towards their ethnic minorities have moved in the present time towards multicultural policies. Such is Canada and Australia which replaced the assimilationist policies of the past with a multiculturalist mode of integration of its ethnic minorities. These states are supporting and empowering the ethnic groups through state policies that range from ones that are accommodating the ethnic groups' specific religious and cultural needs to policies that are empowering different political ethnic organizations. Also, states that refused to integrate their ethnic/racial minorities seem to have softened, even if formal, their exclusionary attitude towards their ethnic minorities. It is even possible that these states are slowly moving from an exclusionary attitude towards an assimilative approach of their ethnic minorities.

These states seem to redefine their notion of citizenship and making it more inclusionary, in order to integrate the ethnic minorities that have been long time residents of the state. In the case of Germany for example, the access to citizenship was granted only based on "blood ties". In the present times Germany adopted a new law that grants the right to citizenship to the immigrant children born on German soil. This new law also liberalized the naturalization policies for foreign-born immigrants. Together with their new citizenship and naturalization law which improved the ethnic immigrant minorities' access to citizenship, Germany became more culturally assimilative towards its ethnic minorities. After the new citizenship law the ethnic minorities which aspired to acquire citizenship

had to show that they identify themselves with the German language and culture. Thus, it is possible that Germany is slowly moving from an exclusionary attitude towards an assimilative approach of its ethnic minorities.

The "more open" integration policies seem to be a response to the crisis of the nation-states in managing their increasing ethnic diversities. On one hand, in confronting with an irreversible increasing of its ethnic diversity the state has been challenged in maintaining its national unity and had to recreate and expand the notion of belongingness and peoplehood in order to keep together or to include different ethnic groups. On another hand the state's attitudes towards diversity has been challenged by increasing internal pressures from ethnic groups as well as by increasing international pressures from international community challenge. The movement towards more open modes of integration came also as a response to these pressures.

Nevertheless, we cannot generalize on the conclusion that that the nation-states tend to move (even if formal) towards a less rigid versions of integration. There are also states which have been adamant in the way they deal with their ethnic minorities. Instead of modifying their integration policies, these states tend to restrict the influx and the settlement of new individuals into their society by modifying their immigration and naturalization policies.

Limits and shortcomings

The typology of the models of integration of the ethnic minorities presented here is characterized by few shortcomings.

First, the models of integration developed here are merely centered on states' policies and responses towards their ethnic minority groups. They present ways in which nation-states integrate their ethnic minorities. However we do not have to understand that ethnic minorities' integration is realized only on a one way avenue, which is from the state towards the ethnic minority groups. While the state policies and attitudes towards their ethnic minorities seem to be the most significant factor for their integration within a nation state, it is also important to acknowledge the ethnic minorities' efforts to integrate into the bigger society. The integration of the ethnic minority groups is also dependent on their willingness and efforts to integrate. On one hand, not all ethnic minorities are willing to integrate into a nation-state. When dealing with these types of minorities even the most

open integration models would deem to be ineffective. For example the integration of the Romany communities in Romania has been promoted and facilitated through numerous governmental policies. These targeted the improvement of the education of the Romany children in special education classes, the equal access for the Romany population to employment and housing and the right of the Romany population to enhance and protect their ethnic identity. Nevertheless, these communities manifested a great unwillingness to integrate and they continue to remain insulated. The ethnic Romany population has Romanian citizenship, though they do not vote. Despite the fact that they have organized a political party ("the Party of the Roma") to politically represent their minority, the Romany political participation is minor. Also, the Roman communities continues to deny education (and as a result they have a very high illiteracy level) and continues in practicing their traditional professions (e.g. horse trading, melting copper and other metals). On another hand, some ethnic minorities are more assertive than others and they tend to politically intervene and influence their integration process. As a result it is possible that they could get better integrated into a nation-state.

Second, the models of integration developed are centered only on the state level. Thus, these models do not allow assessing and explaining any local variations within countries (assuming that some cities or regions more opened towards their ethnic diversity than other).