

# ISPI

Working Papers

ISTITUTO PER GLI STUDI DI POLITICA INTERNAZIONALE



## Programma Diritti Umani

WP - 10

**The Integration of Immigrants  
in a Multicultural Society**

*Howard Duncan*

Howard Duncan è Direttore del progetto Metropolis Canada  
e Metropolis International.

*Il presente lavoro è stato realizzato nell'ambito del progetto  
"Diritti Umani e Diversità culturale"  
promosso dall'ISPI con il sostegno della*



*La collana ISPI Working Papers ospita analisi di varia scuola e provenienza. Le opinioni espresse sono strettamente personali e non riflettono necessariamente le posizioni dell'ISPI.*

Tutti i diritti sono riservati. È vietata la riproduzione, anche parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo effettuata, compresa la fotocopia, anche ad uso interno e didattico, non autorizzata.

All rights reserved. No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form or by any means, including photocopying, nor utilized for any purpose, neither internal or didactic, without written permission from the publisher.

Copyright © 2006 by ISPI (Istituto per gli Studi di Politica Internazionale)  
Via Clerici, 5 - I-20121 Milano - Tel. (02) 86.33.13.1  
e-mail: [ispi.segreteria@ispionline.it](mailto:ispi.segreteria@ispionline.it)

## THE INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS IN A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

*Howard Duncan*

### *Introduction*

The migration field has witnessed a remarkable shift in orientation, particularly among those countries apart from the four traditional migration countries of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States. Ten, even five years ago, the migration field was dominated by concerns about out-of-control migration flows, about the migration-asylum nexus, and about sealing borders more effectively through regional co-operation, for example through the European Union. Many countries refused even to acknowledge that they were in fact countries of immigration. Germany was a prime example of a country that continued until recently to maintain that its migrants were but temporary residents who would depart in due course. Although many of these societies were becoming multicultural in fact if not in terms of policy, they were not actively managing the presence of their migrants for long-term results and, consequently, the integration of immigrants was neglected if not actively discouraged. An integrated temporary resident, it was surmised, was less likely to return to the homeland than one that was not integrated.

However, two factors have turned this attitude on its head to the point that most European countries are now actively engaged in managing the admission of migrants to their territory and taking steps, often under the guidance of the European Commission, to bring about the integration of these people into their new societies. The two factors that I have in mind are the awakening to the realities of their aging if not outright depopulating societies and the terrorist attacks in the United States, Spain, the United Kingdom and elsewhere. The first factor has resulted in more countries, and not only in Europe, coming to regard immigration and immigrant labour as not only desirable but perhaps essential to their economic well-being in the future. This implies taking measures to secure their integration in the labour force at the very least, but also other more general integration measures such as host society language acquisition. The second factor, particularly with respect to terrorists who are the children of immigrants, has put a premium on social cohesion and the integration of immigrants in such a way that social cohesion specifically is enhanced and the likelihood of people becoming radicalized against their societies is diminished. These two unrelated factors have together dramatically increased the attention that governments and societies in general are placing on immigrant integration. The backdrop to this is that the

societies that we are referring to are becoming multicultural to a greater extent as migration flows not only continue but diversify with regard to the countries from which the immigrants come.

This is not to say that the concern over illegal immigration has disappeared. Quite the contrary, as it is evident from the recent concentration of efforts in the United States over the illegal entry of Mexicans and others, particularly from Latin American countries. Stocks are now estimated at over 10 million with some estimates reaching to 15 million people without legal status in the United States. In Europe, the flow of persons from Africa remains a major concern whether it be North Africans entering Spain or Italy illegally and subsequently moving to other European destinations, the use of off-mainland destinations such as the Canary Islands and the Spanish enclave cities in Morocco to gain entry to the European mainland, or the illegal flows from sub-Saharan Africa into the countries of the Magreb region whether to remain there or to transit to Europe or other destinations. Despite the fact that the majority of these people without legal authorization to be in their countries of destination are active in the labour force, their illegal presence is a significant political issue in countries where the public regards migration as out of control, as forcibly changing the culture of their countries, or as presenting a threat to national security. However, despite the ever-present concern over illegal migration, more attention is now being given to the successful integration of immigrants, primarily those with legal status, and to the societal benefits that this integration will bring with it.

In this paper I will look at integration in a contemporary multicultural context, and I will restrict myself to the issues as they concern migrants with legal status in their destination country. Integrating those without legal status is a very complex policy issue, and it brings with it a significantly different set of issues that are best dealt with in a separate paper. I hope to develop a clearer understanding of what societies are trying to achieve through integration and some challenges that are only beginning to surface. To a certain extent, I hope to produce the beginnings of a new perspective on integration, one that pays equal attention to the incentives to integrate as it does to the barriers that migrants might face as they and their children try to become members of their new societies.

The interest in barriers to integration has dominated the discussion for many years. Such a starting point assumes that integration is the *natural*, not only the desired, outcome of immigration. What this position assumes is that immigrants *want* to become members of their host society and will take it upon themselves to take steps to bring this about, these steps being investments in their future or, at least, the future of their children. To say that this is the natural outcome of immigration is to say that in the absence of contrary societal forces, immigrants will become integrated into their society of destination. It is also to imply that the role of government in integration is principally to remove whatever obstacles the society might present to this natural outcome becoming realized. The position assumes that if integration does not come about, it is because the host society

imposes barriers to what would otherwise be a natural occurrence. This, I will argue, is naïve. It has been shown to be so by a number of developments not only in theory but in the ways in which immigrants are coming to live in our societies. But first, let's look at some of the basics of what is becoming the dominant aspect of migration management in multicultural societies, the integration of the immigrants into these societies. A good place to begin is with the concept of 'integration' itself, for here is a source of ambiguity and miscommunication. This concept has a number of distinct meanings and it is worthwhile to review some of them with care if only to avoid confusion later in the paper.

### *1. Some Integration Basics*

Integration is, first of all, a *social phenomenon* that we can consider without regard to anything normative. In the migration field, it refers to relations between immigrants or their co-ethnic communities and the "host" society to which they have come. However, one need not restrict a discussion of social integration to one of *immigrant* and host or to *immigrant* and mainstream society. Within a society there are always groupings of people that have stronger or weaker relations with other groupings. One can speak of integration or a lack thereof amongst any social groupings whatsoever. Multilingual societies such as Belgium, Switzerland and Canada are familiar with this. Considered as a social phenomenon, integration between people and groups will take place to a greater or lesser extent regardless of government policies or programs. Those who regard integration as the natural desired outcome of immigration, although naïve, are not entirely wrong. The U.S. government has essentially no policies or programs for immigrant integration, leaving it to societal forces to work things out as they will. Given their strong economy and liberal traditions, their outcomes are not radically different from those in more interventionist societies. Strong government interest in integration interventions is relatively recent, and it is essential to understand that government action is not normally seen as a necessary condition for integration to take place to some degree or other. The questions, of course, are the extent to which integration will take place out of undirected social developments, whether the society regards this degree of integration as sufficient, and, if not, whether the society supports government intervention to increase the degree to which integration occurs. In principle, this raises the broader political issue of what are the appropriate roles for governments to play in this social phenomenon, when government actions are justifiable and most effective. Can they cause harm? To what extent is social integration an appropriate object of social engineering, to use an old and perhaps worn out term? These are legitimate questions in the context of an occurrence that is a natural one, at least in some environments.

Often when policy makers, the academic community, and civil society speak of the integration of immigrants, they are speaking of a *desired* social condition, not simply of a social phenomenon that has occurred to some extent or other. In this

sense, achieving social integration is a *normative policy objective*, one that carries with it a normative sense of what comprises integration. One might most directly contrast it with segregation, but it is not clear that to do so will convey the meaning of this policy objective effectively. Integration is not simply a matter of people of different ethnic, racial, and religious groups living in the same neighbourhoods and attending the same schools and being able to use the same public facilities and services. Integration in this sense speaks to, perhaps, a state of mind on the part of both the newcomer and the host, a sense of belonging that is shared by both. Some elements of the concept, as policy objective, are the following:

- Equality of all before the law, with some exceptions that may apply to those who are not citizens, such as the right to vote;
- The possible extension of citizenship to the newcomer upon the satisfaction of certain criteria;
- An extension of universal human rights to all who reside in the state including the newcomer;
- Equal treatment by the justice system;
- Non-discriminatory access to housing, health, education, and social services;
- Non-discriminatory access to employment under the same conditions as apply to citizens, with the exception of those who are resident on an explicitly temporary basis;
- A welcome by the host society of such a nature that allows the immigrant, in a reasonably short period of time, to feel a genuine sense of equal membership in the host society;
- Actions on the part of the immigrant that allow him or her to be an active participant in the civic life of the new society. These might include acquiring the language of the society, acquiring employable skills or having foreign qualifications recognized as meeting or upgraded to meet the requirements of the host society, coming to understand the manner in which the society functions, administratively, politically, socially; and
- Social interaction between the immigrants and the hosts.

Societies that achieve these sorts of conditions can be said to be, to some degree or other, integrated. Some of these objectives are vaguely stated, particularly those towards the end of the list, particularly the last item which bears a certain amount of discussion, raising as it does the issue of the conceptual compatibility of “enclave societies” with “integration”. The question here is whether those who live their lives in an enclave can be said to be integrated into the host society.

Societies can extend rights by encoding them in law and can take steps to ensure that they are acted upon. States can provide services of a sort that would allow an impartial observer to judge that they are offered with an appropriate degree of equality, that is, that these rights are offered in a non-discriminatory way. These sorts of initiative are well within the capacity of a government to deliver, most

easily in a welfare state or where services are delivered directly by or are highly regulated by government agencies. But is equality before the law sufficient for integration? Many would argue that no, one could have a highly segregated society even where all are equal before the law. This is where differential economic conditions, housing and settlement patterns, consumer activities, religious activities, cultural activities, in a word, social behaviours come to the fore, areas that, to a great extent, are beyond the competence of governments in democratic societies. Consider the common phenomenon of self-segregated housing patterns, where members of a national or ethnic group come to reside disproportionately in a specific neighbourhood, creating an enclave when the proportions reach a certain level. This is an exceedingly common phenomenon and occurs because of the social and economic advantages that result from concentrated housing patterns. How does this sit with the goal of social integration, especially if it endures for long periods of time, especially when it is accompanied by frequent travel to and communications with the homeland? Satellite-based communications technologies allow one to easily remain in contact with one's homeland community daily, to read the news from home, to make purchases from the homeland, to conduct business with companies there, and so on. To what extent does the phenomenon of *transnational communities* jeopardize the goals of social integration? Many have argued that an overt multiculturalism policy encourages this sort of result in that it encourages ethnic groups to retain their identities. It should be noted, however, that housing self-segregation is almost never complete and does not necessarily imply an absence of social interaction between the self-segregated groups and others nor does it prevent other forms of civic participation, something highly valued in the current discussions of integration. (Note, too, the difference between an enclave and a ghetto. A ghetto not only is an area with a high proportion of residents from a single ethnic group but, in addition, this area is the *only* area where people from the specific ethnic group live). And it should be noted that societies that do not espouse multiculturalism also have ethnic enclaves. The connection here is weak.

A third way to understand the term integration is as a *policy device* to achieve other social goals. Countries with long and confident experience with integration see its instrumental value and may place that value ahead of any moral or legal imperatives towards the immigrants. All governments value social stability and strong economies. Efforts to successfully integrate immigrants and refugees are normally thought to pay benefits for all members of the society through the maintenance of social harmony and maximizing their economic well-being. Consequently, integration programs are often focussed on measures to improve these sorts of outcomes, to equip both the society and the immigrant for his or her employment by providing language training, skills upgrades, job search services, and so on. Ensuring the economic well-being of immigrants is seen as providing benefits to the society's economy and as helping to prevent social divisions rooted in economic disparity. Integration programs that support the cultural life of the immigrant not only are thought to pay dividends for the immigrant communities

themselves but to the mainstream society because of the greater diversity that immigrant cultures can bring, whether it be in arts and culture, in food, in neighbourhood life, and in architecture. Furthermore, societies that are able to live comfortably with ethnic and cultural difference are thought by some to be better equipped for the knowledge-based, high technology economies that require innovation and inventiveness for their success<sup>1</sup>. Immigrant integration is, then, potentially a vehicle for success in cutting edge economies.

Other policy goals that integration is often thought to serve include:

- the prevention of ghettos, here integration being considered from the points of view of settlement patterns and housing as well as economic well-being;
- encouraging tolerance and respect for minorities, whether immigrant or native. Immigrant integration is often part of programs designed to reduce racism and discrimination;
- crime prevention, whether crime committed against immigrants or crime committed by immigrants. Criminality involving immigrants is often seen as indicating an integration failure; the extreme example today might be seen as terrorism or other treasonous acts against the host society;
- ensuring a healthy political life in the society of destination. Democracy requires that citizens participate in the political process of the country. Offers of citizenship with full political rights are often thought of as being part of the spectrum of integration programs and are designed, in part, to encourage the political participation of newcomers.

When integration is seen as a policy device to further independent ends, it may be presented as an *offer* to the immigrant or as a *requirement*, perhaps a requirement so strong that its non-fulfilment may result in penalties including deportation. In some countries such as Canada and the United States, language training is offered with encouragement to immigrants for their benefit but is not required as a condition of continued residence, although in Canada language proficiency is a requirement of attaining citizenship. In some other countries, however, language training is compulsory. The point to note here is that integration policy need not be seen as being of benefit for only the migrant whose human rights and other moral claims might be seen as obliging governments to offer services to promote or permit integration. Integration is also strongly supported from the point of view of national self-interest, for example, by enhancing social cohesion and harmony, national or regional economic well-being, and cultural life. Countries that have only recently come to accept migration as a relatively permanent feature of contemporary life in a globalised world often see integration as an essential tool in managing an otherwise unwelcome phenomenon. For some, full assimilation represents the ideal in integration outcomes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Florida's recent work has created much interest in this hypothesis. R. FLORIDA *The Flight of the Creative Class. The New Global Competition for Talent*, New York, 2005.

These three ways of conceptualising the integration of immigrants are not mutually exclusive. One would expect to see all three at work simultaneously. But it is important to understand these different senses of the term, to realize that as a social phenomenon significant degrees of integration may exist independently of any government interventions, whether those be based on instrumental need or out of consideration for human rights. Again, in the United States, little is done at the federal level to promote integration and yet immigrant outcomes are not palpably worse there than elsewhere, especially with respect to employment. And countries whose governments remain uncomfortable with immigration and with extending rights and privileges to their newcomer populations might find solace in the instrumental value of integrating migrants.

## *2. Integration and Segregation*

In this paper, I will use the term “integration” to refer primarily to a normative policy objective. At its most basic, we are talking about people being part of the same society in a significant way. In this sense, integration is simply the opposite of segregation and could refer to:

- Sharing or being accorded common rights and protections of, for example, citizenship;
- Acceptance of what might be called minimum social responsibilities such as adherence to the law;
- Participation in the fundamentals of a society such as its labour force, schools, volunteer sector, neighbourhood life, and political life;
- Holding certain basic beliefs common to a society such as those often referred to as core values, perhaps as expressed in a constitution or other fundamental laws or law-like principles, religious beliefs, moral principles, and so on. Examples might include acceptance of the principles of liberal democracy, the attitudes codified through a policy of multiculturalism, norms regarding the treatment of minorities or vulnerable people, and attitudes towards violence; and
- Living amongst others in one’s neighbouring environments, in the workplace, the schools, places of leisure; being in contact with one’s neighbours, co-workers, fellow students, etc.

Segregation implies either a rejection of the above sorts of relations with a society in favour of a life apart, e.g., by selecting to live in the environment of an enclave society or, an exclusion because of a denial of access by a society which chooses to discriminate against or exclude the members of a particular group of people. Segregation can be either imposed or embraced. However, one must be careful not to assume that all instances of self-segregation are from free choices to embrace the advantages of an enclave or other form of segregated life. Self-segregation can be a defensive position taken to protect the members of a group from an aggressive and unwelcoming host society. One must recognize that segregation

can result from either an exclusionary attitude on the part of the host society or from a choice on the part of the immigrant to live apart from the host society because of the benefits of such a decision. Societies are now beginning to confront the implications of self-segregation on a large scale, to ask what integration measures can be taken to produce a more integrated society, the assumption being that integrated societies are preferable, that is, safer, more just, or more prosperous, than segregated societies.

For many of us, the notion of a segregated society is one dominated by the ideas of apartheid in South Africa or the systematic discrimination in the United States prior to the civil rights movement in the 1960s that resulted in major legislative change. In other words, for many if not most of us, the idea of a segregated society is the idea of a society of exclusion, where the segregated groups are marginalized by the dominant groups and excluded from many aspects of “the good life”. However, of equal interest to our thinking on integration must be the self-segregation that members of enclaves not only accept but desire for the benefits that it confers to them. This raises difficult policy questions about the nature of the society in which we live and the range of legitimate action that a government can take or ought to take in bringing about the integration of those who do not want it.

This question is most difficult from a normative point of view when the group in question is not a threat to the society. And if a group does pose a threat, what sort of threat and of what magnitude would justify government intervention? Should a government be able to impose integration upon members of a group that prefer a separate existence? Most societies have such groups, religious groups for example that deny the central values of a society. In liberal democracies, freedom of religion is valued and, accordingly, these groups are normally allowed to live as they wish so long as their behaviours are within the law. However, these groups tend to be small and are rarely regarded as threats to overall social cohesion. It is not clear how societies and their governments should react to the development of large middle class enclaves that arise from the self-interest of their residents. Are they in themselves a threat to social well-being or do they simply represent a less-than-desirable situation where some people do not interact with others? In some examples such as that of long-standing Jewish enclaves in, say, Montreal or Toronto, there is little notice given of the enclaves. But in other cases, such as the Moroccans in Rotterdam, there has been serious public and political concern raised over the failure of integration of this group with mainstream Dutch society. To a significant extent, the discourse was in terms diminished social cohesion in Rotterdam stemming from this integration failure.

### 3. *Social Cohesion*

“Social cohesion” is a concept related to that of “integration” and may be considered as a relatively strong result of the integration of immigrants when it is seen in this specific context. Of course, “social cohesion” is conceptually independent of associations with immigration because we could speak of the cohesion of a society that has no immigrants or history of immigration whatsoever. The concepts are logically independent of one another although they have become related *a posteriori* and contingently. A cohesive society is one whose members, or a sufficiently large percentage of whose members, share certain features of the society, be they values, attitudes, history, behaviour, or adherence to a common goal or national project<sup>2</sup>. The latter is most easily exemplified in the case of a defensive war where the national project is one of societal survival; here social cohesion can be instrumental in the outcome of the war. The point is that a society, with or without immigrants, can be assessed as more or less cohesive, just as its immigrants can be more or less integrated. The relations between these two concepts are intricate; they are closely related but not identical. One can imagine a society that is highly segregated but possesses strong social cohesion, for example, when under attack by a foreign power. One can also imagine a highly integrated society that lacks cohesion because of a divisive political situation. But it is the impact of immigrants on social cohesion, especially immigrants from a diversity of backgrounds, that will concern us here. Immigrants pose a special case because they are, as newcomers to a society, outsiders. The challenge before the societies of the West is to negotiate their membership in our societies in such a way that they become integrated and contribute to a cohesive society, all of this within a context and spirit of liberal democracy.

There is a growing concern throughout the countries in the West that have sizable immigrant populations that immigration is diminishing their social cohesion. Other countries worldwide with sizable minority populations are concerned about their internal cohesion, whether they have large immigrant stocks or not. Failure to achieve secure social cohesion can, it is argued, lead to civil unrest as we saw in the riots in the French suburbs in 2005 and, more worrisome, although less common, can lead to political extremism and terrorism. This has led to some calls for reductions in immigrant flows into their countries and to increased attention to the integration of immigrants on the assumption that integration will help to preserve social cohesion. For many of those concerned, social cohesion is a product of a strong national identity, something that large numbers of immigrants are thought to threaten by the fact that immigrants bring with them the

---

<sup>2</sup> It is only fair to point out that the concept of social cohesion is highly contested with numerous commentators denying its clarity and meaningfulness. I will not debate this matter but will try to use the term in as close a fashion as I can to conventional usage, however vague that usage might prove to be.

identities of their homeland. Integration is, to some degree, intended to replace the homeland identity with that of the host society or at least to set the immigrant on a path to adopt the identity of the host society, even if that identity is shared with that of the homeland or other identity bearers such as religion or language. Attempts to establish a Francophonie and a Lusophonie are examples of the latter type of identity bearer being used to create transnational identities. Recently, we have seen these concerns expressed in the Netherlands over their significant Muslim population, many of whom are from Morocco, in the United Kingdom over their significant Pakistani population, and in the United States with their large population of Mexicans and other Latinos. Samuel Huntington, who had warned against a future “clash of civilizations”, the civilizations concerned being Christian and Muslim, has more recently warned of a loss of American identity due to the very large numbers of Latin Americans in the country. And there are many other examples.

The general concern is that immigrants, if sufficiently numerous, may diminish social cohesion by holding beliefs and values significantly different from or even in active opposition to those of the host society, by not supporting, understanding, or by actively opposing the host society’s national projects or other expressions of the host society’s national identity. Social cohesion is perhaps most easily thought of with respect to a national project such as a war, an economic prosperity initiative, an election, a social justice initiative such as protecting equal rights for women or freedom of expression, or something as ephemeral as supporting a national team at an Olympic games. A failure to support, even minimally, such national projects can be seen as an indication that social cohesion in a society may be weak. (This is not to make a moral judgement but rather is to describe a feature of a society and the relations that obtain between its members. It is apparent that social cohesion can be manifest in national projects that are morally indefensible as we have seen in cases of state-endorsed genocide). Social cohesion can be threatened, again, just as easily by non-immigrant members of a society as it can by immigrants. Why we are considering social cohesion in this paper is because immigrant integration failures are seen as a risk to social cohesion, and less cohesive societies are, *ceteris paribus*, thought to be less successful, less resilient, and less prosperous than more cohesive societies, and, on the other hand, susceptible to civil unrest, civil war, or revolution.

It is important to notice that “social cohesion” is a stronger concept than that of “integration”. It is more difficult to satisfy than integration. For many countries, especially in the West, and of these, especially in the traditional migration countries, immigrant integration is most prominently thought of in economic terms: immigrants are often considered sufficiently integrated if they have reasonable employment in the host society. Employment is without question an important aspect of taking on societal membership, and it leads to a greater ability of the immigrant to take part in other facets of the society because of the social networks that are often created, the income that employment may produce that

allows the immigrant to live in neighbourhoods beyond an enclave and to engage in activities with others in the community, and in the ability to make contributions to the society such as paying taxes or being a community volunteer. Employment may be a result of other aspects of being integrated such as having a facility with the local language, having one's foreign education credentials and work experience accepted by the host society, and being able to communicate successfully including being adept at local behavioural norms, often a requisite of gaining employment in a competitive labour market. However, notice that it is possible that one be employed, share a language, and pay taxes without contributing to the social cohesion of a society. Integration in the labour market is neither a necessary condition nor a sufficient condition for contributing to social cohesion. It may be linked, but contingently only. In fact, when one thinks of the extreme of a lack of participation in a society's shared values or national projects, namely engaging in treasonous acts against the state in which one resides, we have seen that many of those who have committed such acts are integrated in these labour market-related senses. Terrorism, then, is not necessarily a consequence of integration failure, at least in these simple senses of "integration". Put another way, a society that has successfully integrated its immigrants with regard to the frequently cited desiderata of integration, language, employment, access to basic rights and services, may still be a society lacking in internal cohesion.

This illustrates that social cohesion is a stronger concept whose fulfilment is more demanding than that of "integration". Indeed, social cohesion is, at root, a concept linked to strong conformity amongst the members of a society. Some of those most concerned about social cohesion in Europe seek to maintain national identities that are based upon historical genealogy and traditional culture. In other contexts, social cohesion might be with regard to national projects such as that of supporting national unity in Canada between the province of Quebec and the rest of the country. Democracy is no pre-condition to a society being cohesive; in fact, a challenge that liberal societies face is to maintain both their liberalism and their social cohesion. This may hold especially for societies that espouse a policy of multiculturalism or that accept multiple citizenships. As we will see later, the phenomena of globalisation and transnationalism may present challenges to both integration and social cohesion that we have not yet developed our thinking on.

#### *4. Other Instrumental Reasons for Pursuing Integration*

But to return to integration, some additional reasons for its pursuit by societies and governments are the following:

*Social justice* might be said to demand a fair treatment of immigrants if not a treatment equal to that of the native borne. Successful integration would suggest an absence of significant societal barriers to the immigrant taking a place in the society. However, on this latter point, care must be taken in measuring or

assessing integration. Employment alone cannot suffice as an indicator of integration. Consider the obvious counter-example of someone who is marginalized and can find employment only in the grey or underground economy. Further, research shows that it is possible to be employed with a good income in a mainstream economy yet nevertheless suffer from discrimination to an extent that we would be reluctant to say there had been successful integration. On the other hand, a society concerned strongly with social justice as a national project will more likely be a society that integrates immigrants in a welcoming fashion.

Conditions of *national economic well-being* will, for some countries, suggest the desirability of integrating immigrants into the labour market and creating the conditions within which this is a likely outcome of their entry to the country. Labour market participation is a benefit for both the immigrant and the host society (so long as the employment of immigrants does not unduly disadvantage the native borne labour force either through reduced wages or higher unemployment). Employment provides the foundations for a decent and independent life for the immigrant, one wherein he can contribute to the host society's economic prosperity and government coffers through tax remittances. Further, employment relieves the host society of the financial burden of providing social assistance to an unemployed immigrant.

The *well-being of future generations* speaks to the advantages of immigrant integration. That immigrants are integrated should have financial and social benefits for their children, the so-called second generation, thus avoiding problems in the future of a persistent marginalized underclass.

Integration failures can lead to social instability and crime as we have recently witnessed for example in the 2005 riots in a number of French suburbs, attributed by many to the economic and social marginalization of those who lived there, large numbers of whom were young immigrants or the children of immigrants. In the United States, some argue that the marginalization of immigrants can lead to the formation of gangs. Therefore, integration can be desired out of a concern for *social stability*.

The concerns of social cohesion have, since the terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001 and subsequent attacks in Europe and other parts of the world, been associated with concerns over *national security*. Although terrorism threats are most conspicuously posed by extremist Muslims these days, the point can be made general. The example of extremist Muslims, however, illustrates the application of the issue to the integration of immigrants, given that some of the attacks and thwarted attempts at terrorism have been carried out by immigrants or their children. Many believe that these attacks are expressions of anger on the part of immigrants who have not integrated or have not been allowed to integrate. Although this is debatable, the response in some European countries has been to require immigrants to integrate by taking courses or other training, thus, it is

hoped, reducing the danger that they will radicalize and come to pose a security threat.

In some contexts, in the Netherlands for example, the requirement that immigrants integrate is presented as a remedial action to counter-balance the effects of a misplaced policy of multiculturalism that resulted in a dilution of a sense of national identity for the newcomer to the host country. Social cohesion is often presented as a means to shore up a sagging sense of national identity in a population. This might motivate an offer or requirement for language training, cultural orientation training, or other activities to promote conformity of belief, attitude, and behaviour with the host society. Some examples of the latter might include matters of etiquette, attitudes towards women, minorities, and other vulnerable people, forced and arranged marriages, and the wearing of religious symbols and clothing that may express a religious affiliation. Regarding beliefs and attitudes, it is usually expected that immigrants will support the basic political values (such as the principles of liberal democracy) and the fundamental ethical values of the host society which might, for example, require tolerance of difference in sexual orientation or religious belief or require adherence to the society's values regarding the treatment of woman (for example, forbidding honour killings or female genital mutilation).

##### *5. More Fundamentals: Social Integration and Social Capital*

In this section, I want to move us towards another discussion of fundamentals. We have looked at a number of reasons why governments might seek to secure the integration of immigrants. Let us now step even further back. One might ask why, at a more fundamental level, a society should want to promote social integration, especially to people who come to the society as immigrants? Assume that part of social integration is including the newcomers in the life of a society, including an offer of the good things that the society offers. Assume, too, that the good life, however a society should define it, is a thing of scarcity. Why would a society want to extend access to “outsiders” to something that is scarce? Doing so would seem to be irrational, and one would expect that a rational society would restrict access to the good life to those people who are, let us call them, “insiders”. Under this assumption that the good life is a scarce resource, one might think that a rational society would be inclusive only *of its members* and exclude those who were not among its members, those such as immigrants. To offer access to the good life to immigrants would simply make everyone worse off. Under this assumption, promoting social inclusion could be motivated only through a strong altruism that over-rode economic imperatives. There are people who are genuinely motivated by principles of social justice and human rights who would tolerate making everyone worse off for the sake of greater equality for all. But these people are in the minority, and one might want more widely compelling reasons for promoting social integration than remaining true to certain principles of social

justice. We also need to be pragmatic if integration is to be broadly supported by our societies.

The beginnings of a robust answer can be found in social capital theory. Social capital is a public good that resides in the relationships between members of a society and between members of a society and the institutions of that society, institutions such as government bodies, the police, business organizations, non-governmental organizations, and political organizations. Social capital is said to be at the root of the possibility of co-operation and facilitates the development of individual human capital, smoothly functioning communities, vibrant and stable economies, and an interesting and secure cultural life. Trust forms the most fundamental basis of social capital and, given the fragility of trust, social capital, too, is said to be fragile. Social capital is at the basis, some argue, of a society's prosperity and well-being and thereby grounds the very possibility of the good life.

To go directly to the point, it can be argued that social integration and social inclusion generates increased social capital and social exclusion reduces social capital, reduces the levels of trust required for a vibrant economy and a well-functioning society. So although we may grant that the good life may indeed be a scarce thing, social capital theory would suggest that its quantity is variable and can be influenced by the extent to which people in a society, and this encompasses its immigrants, are included in its workings and its decision-making. The suggestion is that a society that promotes social inclusion will, all other things being equal, be a more prosperous society than one that does not. Promoting social inclusion, then, does not imply making everyone worse off for the sake of principles of social justice. Promoting social inclusion should make us better off because of the social capital dividends that it will pay.

#### *6. Policy Instruments for Achieving Integration: Multiculturalism*

I will now move the discussion to consider some of the policy instruments that governments have available to them to further the attainment of integration. I will keep the discussion at a high level, and although recognizing the undeniable importance of specific initiatives to support immigrant integration such as language training, access to housing, employment, health and social services, and programs to combat racism and discrimination, I will not cover them here.

At a very high level of generality, the normative concept of multiculturalism has provided a framework within which governments in many countries have conceived of the place of immigrants in their societies and the expectations of the native born population towards them. Some countries such as Australia and Canada have developed formal multiculturalism policies, legislation, and programs and others have used the concept less directly as a guide for their integration policies. This is commonly the case in European societies. The

concept is admittedly vague but might be set against the concept of assimilation where the latter is understood as expressing an ideal whereby immigrants adopt as much and as quickly as possible the culture of the native born population for their own. Multiculturalism, on the other hand, offers a competing ideal whereby immigrants can retain their homeland cultures while being members of another society. The basic idea is to create an environment within which immigrants can feel more easily at home in their new society, especially as they embark upon the process of integrating into it. How all this works out in detail, of course, differs according to the situation.

Multiculturalism policy has been offered as an answer to the question of how a society ought to respond to the fact of its own cultural diversity, especially as it arises from immigration and is “carried” by people who may not yet be citizens. From one point of view, multiculturalism policy is a way for a government to openly recognize the presence of cultural or ethnic or racial diversity and thereby give it a form of legitimacy if only by accepting the fact. Other societies will go well beyond acceptance to embrace diversity as an advantage, even, as in the cases of Australia and Canada, as a marker of national identity. Fundamentally it is a way of beginning the integration process by saying to the immigrant and the native borne alike that not only is the presence of different cultures in a society legitimate, even desirable, but so, too, is their retention. In this way, both immigrant and host are prompted to behave in certain ways that, in theory, are conducive to successful long-term integration.

Perhaps the dominant framework for integration policies over the past 35 years, multiculturalism has been subjected to strong scrutiny from those who feel that it has not gone far enough in including minorities as full members of a society, from those who feel that it has gone too far in promoting the retention of ethnic identities, and those who feel that it has been ineffective in building social bridges between the different ethnic groups including the native-born and thus ultimately ineffective in achieving a full measure of social integration. In Great Britain, the concept has been shaken by the analysis of Lord Bhikhu Parekh and others who have come to maintain that multiculturalism has often been used as a policy instrument that maintains the dominance of those cultures that are the products of liberalism, reducing other cultures to a subdominant role. Parekh offers a form of pluralism as an alternative that will allow an even greater respect for and recognition of the rights of minority cultures all the while allowing for a society to adopt and enforce certain core values. Parekh raises some of the key issues that multiculturalism has always faced, issues that have to do with how one settles or negotiates conflicts between majority and minority values. With the popularity of the post-modernist form of moral relativism in some academic fields, this issue has taken on an enormous importance in the immigration and integration debates.

Cultural conflicts have led others to argue that multiculturalism has failed miserably as a policy framework for integration. Rather than bringing immigrants into a society as full participating members, they charge, it has encouraged a form

of self-segregation that highlights difference and exacerbates tensions between groups, immigrant and native-born both. Recently, politicians in both the Netherlands and the United Kingdom have declared multiculturalism to have been a failure and have called for strong assimilationist policies to bring about social harmony and a return to prosperity in cities that have experienced what some refer to as “white flight” which removed not only people but also financial resources from cities such as Rotterdam with high immigrant populations. And in Canada, some in the media now argue that multiculturalism is responsible for social divisions, to the point of encouraging terrorism and the mistreatment of women.

France has recently gone through a series of debates and events that have brought integration policy to the fore and the continued role of its fundamental republican framework for integration including the policy of secularism or *laïcité*. Schools there as elsewhere are regarded as important environments for bringing about social integration. Part of this means promoting republicanism and its principle of secularism and, consequently, discouraging any ways of bringing religion into the classroom, including physical symbols. What has received most attention is the consequent ban on wearing Muslim headscarves although Christian and Jewish items of clothing and other symbols are also banned by new legislation set that came into effect in 2004<sup>3</sup>. The resulting debate shows just how fine the line can be between reinforcing national identities and encouraging the retention of cultural identities by immigrants. Of course, in France, Muslims are free to practice their religion, just not in the public school system. What is at stake here is how to negotiate between the rights of the native borne to maintain their cultural markers and the rights of the immigrant to maintain and promote their homeland values, including religious values. The riots in the suburbs brought forth debates concerning the marginalization of young people and the advisability of maintaining a strict republicanism which denies the importance or even public recognition of ethnic minorities. Some French thinkers advocated the adoption of a Canadian form of multiculturalism in response to the riots but the official position remains solidly behind the republican framework for integration under which all citizens are considered fully French and unequivocal members of French society.

Canada, where multiculturalism remains central to its thinking on integration, is seeing its share of critics who argue that the policy has encouraged cultural isolation, not harmony. This was especially evident following the arrest of a number of young people of immigrant families on charges related to terrorism. A

---

<sup>3</sup> Much of the public debate was over the *laïcité* principle (secularism) as a foundation of French democracy and how religious traditions could be accommodated. The ban of the headscarf was seen by many as an infringement of rights, by others as required by important French historic traditions. Much of the actual reasoning of the government-appointed commission had to do with more mundane matters of how to protect vulnerable young Muslim girls from pressure to wear the headscarf in school, the ban enabling them to avoid this form of pressure from older males.

number of well-known commentators argued that it was multiculturalism that was responsible for the radicalization of these young people. The solution was a form of integration that would emphasize not cultural difference but unity under the concept of being a Canadian. In its place, some see a rival concept, often known as “interculturalism” which emphasizes not only the maintenance of cultural identity but a strong effort to have these identities mutually understood, valued, and shared. Instead of encouraging cultural isolation through the retention of homeland identities, proponents of interculturalism advocate that we should be encouraging interaction between groups in the civic arena. In this way, integration would result from the co-operative action between minorities and mainstream and between minorities themselves that an interculturalism policy would promote or facilitate. In this case, the critics argue not that multiculturalism is fundamentally misguided but that it accomplished only half of the job that integration requires.

Countries that have been seeing large immigration flows are currently struggling with the role that multiculturalism ought to play as a framework for their integration policies. There is nothing resembling consensus at this time; what we have instead is a polarization of views, some of which hearken back to assimilationism, others which are trying to strike new directions. Although multiculturalism is a high level policy framework in most countries rather than a specific program intervention, it is one that sets the tone for specific programs. How this debate is settled will certainly matter to how immigrants find their way in the future.

#### 7. *Other Instruments for Achieving Integration: Framework Policy*

The efficacy of a democratic government in promoting social integration in a free and pluralistic society is always going to be limited – social engineering can be taken only so far. In full European welfare states the government’s role will be heavier by far than in the United States with its laissez faire democracy. Striking a middle ground, perhaps, Canada’s and Australia’s national governments play a somewhat background role of *creating conditions within which the rest of society and its institutions can flourish*. Neither is a full welfare state, and they leave the management of a great many aspects of our society to individuals, to non-governmental organizations, and to the business community.

Their national policy frameworks in the immigration field cover such specifics as the selection of immigrants, settlement assistance, integration assistance, an offer of citizenship, law enforcement including against hate crimes, and finally and perhaps most importantly, constitutional and other legal instruments and various anti-discrimination provisions that guarantee the rights of newcomers and establish certain expectations for both newcomer and native-born. This set of initiatives with their attendant policies, laws and regulations, comprises a framework within which immigrants enter and settle. Importantly in these countries, the first step in integration is careful selection. It is through this

evolving framework that the national governments affect diversity in cities and the degree to which people of different ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds become integrated into the life of the cities. It is a mix of measures to provide incentives, to promote certain behaviours and attitudes, and to provide the force of law where this is appropriate and necessary. This sort of framework is the primary instrument of the Canadian government for promoting the social inclusion of the diverse peoples in the country; *to a large extent it is a framework within which people in Canada integrate themselves.*

#### 8. *Other Instruments for Achieving Integration: Empowering the Non-Governmental Sector*

While governments can have a major role in promoting social integration, in some countries the work on the streets tends to be done through non-governmental actors. In other countries, especially fully developed welfare states, the government itself might carry out the work at street level, too. Canadian government programs, for example, often work by offering funding, grants and contributions, to non-governmental organizations who submit proposals for local activities to promote social integration, to settle immigrants, help them find housing, work, and schools for their children. The best ideas, in principle, receive the funds. This approach transfers ownership of the integration effort to the people and their communities, and this transfer of ownership creates more social capital, it is argued, than were the government to retain exclusive responsibility. This, some feel, creates conditions for more effective integration.

Government funding for NGOs appears to be an effective instrument for creating social capital within immigrant communities. Instrumentally, they can empower the immigrants in their settlement and integration in ways that direct service delivery by government cannot. Symbolically, these programs indicate a willingness of the government and of mainstream society to trust the newcomers and to regard them as members of the host society. That the programs are usually administered locally allows for direct contact between the newcomer and the official face of their new society, the government representative whose job it is to assist and empower the immigrants. Herein, too, lies a major benefit of *framework* legislation as opposed to direct government intervention. Ideas for promoting integration are developed in greater number, are targeted to the particular situation of a community, and are deployed by people with a vested interest in the outcome. Frequently the government funding programs require that the organizations work in partnership with others, including the business community, and this very requirement will stimulate greater trust, greater social capital, and more effective integration.

Notice, too, that government framework legislation provides guidance to the community actors for the types of actions to take. The government does not only offer funds. In general, the institutions of society, however well-meaning,

committed, and willing to promote social inclusion, require guidance from government on the objectives to be achieved and the sorts of activities that years of community-level experience tell us might be effective. So framework legislation also provides a roadmap to promoting social integration as well as the legitimacy, grounded in the democratic processes, for its pursuit.

#### *9. Some Threats to Successful Integration*

A transfer of responsibilities to the community would suggest that, in general, governments should intervene more directly in the life of communities only when problems surpass their abilities to solve them with their existing resources. Therefore, it is imperative that governments watch for danger signs, signs that point to a breakdown of trust, of social capital, signs that point to a significant weakening of social integration. Danger signs might include the emergence of pockets of poverty among immigrant groups, significant disparities in employment, especially when they are correlated with membership in certain racial or ethnic groups, similar disparities in educational outcomes, in health status or access to health and other social services, access to affordable and adequate housing, disparities in criminal behaviour, in being a victim of crime, in having equal access to the justice system, or even declines in volunteer activities.

From an economic point of view, the labour market is the key to integration. The experience of many countries points to a strong correlation between economic outcomes for immigrants and the conditions of the labour market at the time that they entered their new country. A labour market unable to absorb immigrants may result in long-term scarring for the immigrants, for example those with high skills that can go out of date if not used in the labour force. Countries with immigrant recruitment and selection programs need to consider the long-term impacts of unemployment and underemployment of immigrants, impacts that can include entrenched poverty. The issue of a labour market's ability to recognize and accept foreign qualifications and experience is of perennial interest to those who examine integration. Other frequently reported barriers to labour market integration are language deficiencies, cultural awareness, and racism or other forms of discrimination.

A public's readiness to accept immigrants and refugees and to extend a sincere offer of integration can be strongly affected by economic conditions. Public opinion towards immigrants often runs in parallel with economic prosperity and employment levels. Other factors that can determine public opinion include the prevalence of illegal and mixed flows of newcomers to a society. Often, host populations that are very willing to accept and welcome newcomers will react differently when the newcomers enter illegally or under false pretensions. It is, then, incumbent upon governments that manage regular migration programs to guard against irregular or illegal entry. Support for the regular program may be eroded by large numbers of illegal entries. Media often reports illegal entries

widely with what some regard as a disproportionate effect upon public opinion. This has been particularly the case in some countries following the terrorist attacks of 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2001.

#### *10. Globalization, Transnationalism, and the Incentive Structure of Integration*

The challenge to integration that I want to emphasize, however, arises from globalization and some of the technologies that have allowed the current “wave” of globalization to be so powerful. Without going into detail whatsoever, consider some of these features and effects of modern globalization. The flow of capital today favours large urban centres. As a result, it is in large urban centres that human capital is most rewarded either in terms of higher wages or in more interesting work and lives. Hence, the rewarding of large urban centres is accelerating urbanization, and those moving to the city are both national and international migrants. Although international migration remains highly controlled, with the availability of visas far below the demand for entry to another country, the overall number of immigrants is now sufficiently high for the development of large and strong ethnic enclaves in a great many of the world’s cities. Further, many in these enclaves are members of what social scientists call “transnational communities”, communities whose members reside and live in more than one country and maintain strong family, business, cultural, and other ties to the countries in which they live. Because of the low cost of transportation, members of transnational communities are able to travel between their homes frequently in order to maintain business relations and maintain their family ties. Modern communications technologies allow them to remain in frequent if not constant contact with the homeland from their society of destination through the telephone whose international use is less and less costly, the internet, satellite television, and print material that is produced simultaneously in many countries in the world. One can be living in Vancouver but be fully abreast of events in Hong Kong daily, and in a tangible sense be participating in life in Hong Kong. And the point can be generalized. The presence of transnational communities within the enclave has the potential effect of strengthening the enclave both financially and culturally.

The enclave matters increasingly to the extent to which immigrants will integrate into their host society. And it poses a theoretical challenge to the dominant way of thinking about integration, that it is the *natural* desired outcome for immigrants to become fully recognized and participating members of their society of destination. The standard view of integration is that it would happen naturally if the host society did not impose barriers to its taking place. Enclaves have been seen as places of temporary residence, where an immigrant would live with members of his co-ethnic group, likely in relative poverty, until he was able to secure a standard of living that would allow a further migration out of the enclave to the neighbourhoods of the host society. So convinced were we that that this was a

natural state that we would regard this secondary migration as an indication of the success of the migrant, to be able to live amongst the rest of us. Yes, the enclave provided the benefits of a relatively lower cost of living and the society of one's co-ethnic group if not of relatives and friends. But the benefits of leaving the enclave for the higher incomes available outside and the promise of a bigger share of the good life was thought to be incentive enough for many to leave. This, however, is changing.

Note first that leaving the enclave often meant acquiring additional human capital in the form of, for example, the language of the host society, the educational qualifications that would be recognized by the host employers and their institutions, some of the basics of the host culture, not to mention some social capital with the host society that would facilitate employment. This additional human capital came at a cost, the cost of language training and skills upgrading, a cost to be measured in financial terms, in terms of time spent, and in terms of opportunity costs. There were also emotional costs to be paid in leaving the enclave, not only leaving the social comforts of friends and family, but occasionally the reactions of those left behind that the leaver was disloyal to the group. If the benefits of integrating into the host society were sufficient, then these costs could be regarded as investments that would pay the dividends needed to justify them. Frequently this was the case as the acquired human and social capital led to much higher incomes and standards of living than would never be possible within the enclave. However, accumulated immigrant populations concentrated in cities, many of which participate in lives in more than one country as members of transnational communities whose financial effects have helped to create the establishment of middle class enclaves with high levels of institutional completeness, mean that increasingly the immigrants have more options regarding the community into which to integrate. Once a guarantee of a lower standard of living or poverty, the enclave is beginning to offer higher standards of living, including careers, without the high cost of acquiring additional human and social capital. In such an enclave, the incentives to integrate into the host society will be lower as the relative payoff of the investment will be lower. This possibility, I want to argue, poses a significant theoretical challenge to the standard view of immigrant integration and a serious practical challenge to societies that value social integration and social cohesion.

And the situation gets worse when one considers a recent argument by the economist Oded Stark from considerations of relative deprivation. Not only does moving from the enclave require an investment of time, money, and emotion, it might have the effect of increasing one's experience of relative deprivation. The argument is simple but powerful. Living with others who are in the same economic condition induces no feelings of relative deprivation if these others are one's reference group. One may be poor, but relative to the others with whom one associates in life, one may be just as well off as they are. *Ceteris paribus*, this is a comfortable social situation. If one were to increase one's human capital and

remain in the enclave, one might be able to raise one's social standing provided that the enclave provided a payoff for this additional human capital. This would put one in a position of superiority within this reference group, again, a comfortable social situation. However, if one takes the additional acquired human capital outside the enclave to the host society, it is highly probable that one's employment and social situation would be lower than that of the new reference group; immigrants are frequently underemployed, unable to take full advantage of their education and other personal assets. Therefore, the move from the enclave might well result in being in a position of relative deprivation, even with an income higher than that available within the enclave because of the shift in reference group. This is, *ceteris paribus*, not a comfortable social situation and will serve as a disincentive, even a decisive disincentive to leave the enclave. As the incomes available within the enclave climb, the risks of relative deprivation from leaving the enclave grow in importance for how we understand the calculus of integration.

What this implies for our thinking on integration is that we ought no longer to consider integration into the host society as the natural progression for immigrants and the removal of barriers to such integration as the primary business of a society or a government in this regard. The new realities of the enclave that result from some aspects of globalization and transnationalism force us to consider the incentive structures of integration into the host society. We need to look carefully at not only the barriers to integration but to the incentives that immigrants have to integrate into the host population. With the wealthier and institutionally complete enclave comes an integration alternative to the host society. This means that we need to think through two things: how we in the host might offer more powerful incentives to join us and, should we fail, how we are going to come to regard the contemporary middle class and institutionally complete enclave. More generally, however, we are going to have to confront the reality of those who will resist integration. The attractions of the enclave are but one source of resistance.

### *11. The Enclave as Idea*

In this discussion, the enclave could be taken as if it were a physical area with a high proportion of its population being from a specific ethnic group different from that of the mainstream population, an area within which the social and economic activities discussed here take place. But there is a wider sense of "enclave" as idea rather than as a unit of geography, as a community of people united not in space but by an ethnicity or religion where membership in the group is so highly valued that its members resist being part of the social mainstream.

What of those who resist being included in the host society, who want no part of integration? Does their presence, and they most assuredly are in our communities in numbers that may surprise us and perhaps bring us to despair, imply that the discussion so far has been naïve wishful thinking? Those who have, for years,

written of the dangerous instances of bonding social capital formation within groups could point to no more powerful example than that of the Islamic extremists who have captured the media's attention through their planned and actual terrorist attacks. The emergence of the so-called "home-grown terrorist", one might suggest, points to the ultimate emptiness and naivety of those who believe that immigrant integration is the answer to social cohesion and to preventing home-grown terrorism. One might urge that those who want to be included in a liberal democracy will, countervailing factors being absent, include themselves and those who do not want to be included will resist regardless of what we in liberal democracies enact as policy and law. Call it the resistance to integrate, call it rebellion or treason, or call it the "clash of civilizations", liberal democracies are now struggling with the integration of those who, for whatever the reason, want to remain separate, even as enemies of the West.

My analysis of integration is largely grounded in a legislative and political framework that may be itself rejected by extremists and terrorists. Our theory of integration and inclusion is, perhaps, in need of a new grounding, not only in the face of enclaves that are for the most part peaceful, but in the face of extremism and terrorism. Are there other theoretical avenues to explore through which to form a common ground of trust or discussion, or is there left only an appeal to our security forces to preserve our social harmony? Is an effort to bring about social inclusion, integration, and social capital formation of any utility in dealing with terrorism? Groups that are willing to act violently in the name of an ideology are rare, but their existence and recalcitrance pose an exceptionally difficult test case for the utility of integration, a case where the call for integration amounts to little more than a weak plea not to oppose us, a reminder that social inclusion will never be universal, that social capital will never unite all in a common enterprise. We are left with hoping that its pursuit will help make our societies the better societies in an imperfect world.

### *12. The Incentives to Integrate*

The effects of globalization and transnationalism and the experiences of relative deprivation lead us to conclude that integration may not be the natural order of societies, a natural order that will come about if only the obstacles to it were removed. These considerations force us to look at integration more carefully from the point of view of the immigrant, from the point of view of what the immigrant has to gain and what the immigrant may well have to lose by integrating into the host society. We need to consider the possibility that the incentives to integrate into the host society are becoming insufficient in the globalised, transnational environments that often characterize our major cities, the preferred destinations of most immigrants. And this possibility, should it hold today, will most assuredly hold with even greater power in the future, if the forces of globalization continue to exert themselves. Globalization will reward the cities that can create institutions

for managing the flow of goods, services, and capital, and it is in the world's large cities that these benefits are most pronounced. Immigrants will see their human capital best rewarded in the world's large cities and, therefore, they will continue to choose them as their destinations. And as this process continues, so too will the growth, complexity, and institutional completeness of enclaves.

I want to conclude, not with prescriptions, but by looking at what are the incentives to integrate into the host society and under what conditions can they be realized.

### *Financial incentives*

In many western societies including Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, integration is often thought of in large measure in terms of employment, be it self-employment or being in the employ of another. This is evident from the emphasis on language acquisition and the removal of such barriers to employment as the non-recognition of foreign education credentials and foreign work experience and discrimination in the labour market. Employment at a level consistent with one's human capital acquired through education and work experience is considered to be a major aspect of becoming integrated and able to live a life on par with the native borne. Having an income is a pre-condition to many other aspects of participation in a society and it is therefore appropriate that so much emphasis in integration policy and programming be placed on employment.

The conditions that make it possible for becoming integrated in this regard normally include a certain level of competence in the language of the host society, that being the language of the workplace, having the educational background that the job requires, and being able to behave in ways that reflect to a certain degree the cultural norms of the workplace and society. Many speak to the utility of having a degree of social capital, perhaps conceived in terms of social networks that enable one to secure employment. These are conditions brought by the immigrant. However, these conditions are not sufficient. The labour market must exhibit certain conditions as well such as available job openings for the immigrants, receptivity to the educational and experience credentials that the immigrant offers to prospective employers, and an absence of discrimination against immigrants or members of certain demographic groups. (One might add, too, among the incentives that the host society not offer welfare supports so generous that the incentive to work diminishes below a threshold of efficacy).

### *Social Incentives*

Most of us want to be part of a group, part of a society. Few of us want to be on the margins or entirely excluded or otherwise separated from our fellow human beings. For most of us, being part of a community, having friends and connections with neighbours, co-workers or fellow students is a natural tendency. Furthermore, some might welcome the experience of adapting to a new culture, particularly if the homeland culture was violent, repressive, dysfunctional, or

otherwise inhospitable to the immigrant or, in this case perhaps, refugee. Again, it is sharing a language that is the key to establishing social relations and being part of a community. In addition, behaviour sufficiently in accordance with the cultural norms of the society can make a difference as can having a sufficient income to participate in the activities of one's new neighbourhood or other form of community. For immigrants to be able to fit into a community, the society must be sufficiently welcoming of their presence and willing to allow them to become part of the community in a meaningful way. In other words, the society cannot provide barriers if social integration is to take place.

There may also be *moral or political incentives* to integrate, incentives such as the desire to make a contribution to one's host society or simply to one's fellow community members. The acquisition of citizenship can be another form of incentive to integrate as this status allows one to vote, to seek elected office, and to receive the right to hold a passport and to enjoy the other benefits of being a naturalized citizen of one's new country of residence. Here, too, sharing the language of the host community is a very significant condition to make these forms of integration possible as is being part of the social networks through which the communities function. The society must itself be open to the participation of the immigrant. Its laws must allow for immigrants to take up citizenship and the political system's rules must be open to immigrants participating as voters or as candidates.

What I am suggesting here is that there are fundamental incentives for immigrants to integrate into the mainstream society of the country to which they have migrated and taken up residence. They are of course others, but it is financial, social, and cultural or political incentives that are the mainstays. In order for someone to act on these incentives, he or she must possess certain forms of human capital, the most important being a facility in the language of the mainstream society, having the requisite education, and possessing the basic cultural norms to take part in some of a society's workings, and having the necessary forms of social capital required to be part of a political process or other form of community activity. An immigrant's possession of these forms of human and social capital is not, however, sufficient. The society, its communities, and its institutions must be open to the immigrants' participation in a number of ways. This means that it is welcoming of the presence and participation of immigrants, that its laws, rules, and social structures enable that participation, and that it does not present countervailing disincentives.

But, as we are witnessing, these incentives, at least in the way that they are presented to increasing numbers of immigrants and their children, are insufficient for them to act accordingly.

### *13. Concluding Remarks*

Integration failures are no longer seen only as lost opportunities for the immigrant who may be marginalized and financially and socially impoverished. Integration failures are now seen in more and more countries as endangering social cohesion, as leading to social fracturing, and, in their most extreme forms, as presenting dangers to national security. Most spectacularly today, the presence of Islamic terrorists in the West is often attributed to failures to integrate immigrants and their children. The rise of the home-grown terrorist is seen by many as an indication that integration has failed. But it is not only the spectacular integration failures represented by terrorism and the support of terrorist ideologies that we need to confront. These are rare situations, but the attention afforded them might cause us to ignore the far more prevalent form of resistance to integrate, the attractions of the modern enclave. Our analyses must take into account the incentive structures of integration. We can say that integration fails either because the opportunity for an immigrant to integrate is not present, in other words, the society has erected barriers to its taking place, or integration fails because the immigrant has insufficient incentives to become integrated, to carry the expense of developing the required human and social capital to make integration possible. Where enclaves are present and offer a complete range of opportunities for a good life, the incentives to leave the enclave and become a member of the mainstream host society will be low. And where transnational ties are strong in institutionally complete middle class enclaves, the incentives will be lower still.

Will we, then, be forced to accept the existence of independent enclaves in the future? If incentives sufficient to counterbalance the hold of the enclave are not forthcoming, then it appears clear that this will be a significant direction of immigrant integration in the future: immigrants integrating into the enclave instead of into the mainstream host society. This can be regarded as an intractable defeat for integration and immigrant-host relations, or it can force a different way of thinking about these relations, one that takes its cue from social capital formation. The task will shift from integrating immigrants into the host population to negotiating social capital building relations between mainstream and enclave that takes into account the new strength of the members of the enclave. This recognition will move us closer to the prescriptions of Bhikhu Parekh whose version of multiculturalism demands that those of us in host populations pay more serious regard to the legitimacy of the immigrants (always within the context of national law). The task becomes that of creating new frameworks for the creation and enactment of national projects, frameworks that include the new enclaves as equal stakeholders in the project, as members of society whose contributions are going to be needed if the projects are to succeed. In the future, host populations will no longer be asking the members of enclaves to shift their allegiances to the host. Rather, it will be a future where the host and the enclave work together as partners towards a shared vision for the society. If we do not move in this direction, the result will be fragmented societies with diminishing social cohesion

and an ever-present threat of violence. The dystopia that many commentators foresee is avoidable, but it will take a shift in how we in host populations regard the immigrant communities in our countries. We will need to move from the position where they are potential members of *our* communities to one wherein they become full partners in the common enterprise of society building, the definition of which will be developed through a conversation among equals guided by the principles of liberal democracy.