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Abstract

Because of the reality of permanent immigration to Europe, the issue of integration of immigrants, particularly Muslim immigrants is of great importance and the direction and style of policies are the subjects of increasing debate and disagreement. Neither multicultural policies nor assimilation policies have led to a satisfactory level of integration and decreased social and ethnic tensions in France and the Netherlands. We found that often, the rhetoric, perceptions, and misinterpretations that go along with the labels of ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘assimilation’ serve to further polarize the debate and lead to more problems than they solve. The overall rhetoric and program label does not make a huge difference in, and often does not match the programs and policies that are implemented on the ground; the more important issue is having a consistent policy that emphasizes welcoming immigrants, helping them succeed socioeconomically, and finding their place within society. From comparing the cases of France and the Netherlands and looking at specific policies in each we are able to draw some conclusions about policies in education, labor market access, and access to citizenship and regarding what aspects are important in an integration program. In education it is important to account for immigrant status and culture in policies, not only socioeconomic status. In the labor market it is crucial to provide equal access to all parts of the economy and to have programs that help immigrants find professions that fit their skill sets. It is important to decrease barriers to citizenship so that immigrants feel as though it is possible to fully integrate, but not lower them to the extent that citizenship loses its meaning. Finally, there should be focus on religious tolerance, open debate, and intercultural education, as well as decreased demonizing of immigrants by politicians and the media to promote understanding and acceptance of diverse peoples.
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Preface

I was inspired to research the integration of immigrants and refugees because of my work last summer with the Refugee Assistance and Immigration Services organization in Alaska. Initially, the focus of my research was to look at one example of multicultural policies (the Netherlands) and one example of assimilationist policies (France) and see which was more effective and could be more successfully implemented in other states. However, as I conducted my interviews and research I decided that the focus should be somewhat different. Multiculturalism and assimilation are two terms that are thrown about by many people, sometimes even though they do not fully understand the meaning or implications of the programs and policies to which they refer. The stereotypes that go along with these policies can keep individuals from accurately understanding what they imply, thereby influencing public opinions relating to them. I learned that in order for progress to be made on a national scale, the focus of the debate needs to be shifted away from whether the overarching policy programs of multiculturalism and assimilation are working and focus instead on discovering and implementing specific on-the-ground policies that address specific aspects of integration.

The purpose of this paper is to look at and compare integration policies in two countries with historically very different approaches in order to gain a better understanding of where future policies should be focused and to address the necessity for the focus of the integration debate to move away from the overarching national rhetoric and instead focus on specific policies that are beneficial in promoting integration in any state.
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Introduction
“According to the OECD, at the end of the 20th century there was a total of more than 20 million ‘foreigners’ living in the countries of the European Economic Area”.¹ In 2007, 8.3% of the total French population were immigrants and in 2006, 19.3% of the population in the Netherlands had at least one foreign-born parent”.² Permanent immigration to Europe is a relatively new phenomenon as compared to traditional immigrant countries such as Canada, the United States, and Australia, but it is an issue that is here to stay. Because of that, the issue of integration of immigrants, and specifically of Muslim immigrants, is of great importance and the direction and style of policies are the subjects of increasing debate and disagreement.

Most European states only had guest worker programs until the 1970’s; integrating migrants into society and giving them the same rights as citizens was not seen as necessary because the idea was that migrants would eventually return to their original countries. As it became more obvious that many migrants would not return, adaptations in policy were necessary. Consequently, the idea of permanent settlement of migrants is relatively new in Europe, within the last fifty years. This has caused responses to immigration to be sporadic, defensive and not based on acceptance of immigration, so often a cohesive, successful immigration and integration strategy has not evolved. As stated by Penninx, “the consequence of such perceptions is that integration policies at the EU level have, up until now, mainly been expressed in a negative way: combating exclusion, racism, xenophobia and discrimination. In most member states, significant and comprehensive integration policies are absent”.

As migration has increased as a result of globalization and an increasingly integrated global order, views and approaches to dealing with immigrants within the host society have changed and evolved. The Netherlands initially decided that integration should include protecting cultures and languages and granting citizenship, and consequently pursued a policy program labeled as multiculturalism. France focused more on the preservation of its own culture and individual equality and rights over group rights, pursuing a program of assimilation in line with the focus on individuality and lack of ethnic groups as prescribed by its Republican model.

Recently there has been discussion and claims that both multiculturalism and assimilation have failed as strategies. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe said, “multiculturalism has failed in Europe”\(^4\). Others say that the November 2005 riots in French suburbs led to a “diagnosis of a so-called ‘failure’ of the French model [of assimilation]”\(^5\). Multiculturalism is seen as leading to polarizations in society and extremist activities from certain ethnic groups, while assimilation is seen as creating tensions because of immigrants’ reluctance to give up their cultures, while simultaneously not succeeding in its goals of creating equality, acceptance, and maintenance of perceived cultural norms of the host society. Some, including Kymlicka, argue that the retreat from multiculturalism is a result of distorted evidence, is not necessarily valid, and has only occurred in certain states, so making generalizations regarding multiculturalism from these few cases is irresponsible. Others, including politicians in traditionally multicultural European states, argue that multiculturalism has indeed created more ethnic tensions and segregation than integration\(^6\).

Similar criticisms have been made of assimilation techniques, saying that they have not

---


created the equal societies that many hoped they would. One issue with judging success or failure is that the current objectives with which the policies are being judged are different than the goals of the policies at the time they were implemented. Consequently, it is hard to accurately judge the level of success.7

Puzzle, Hypothesis, and Methodology

Has either multiculturalism or assimilation been more successful, and if both have allegedly failed, where should states go from here? What policies are most effective for encouraging integration and helping non-EU immigrants succeed in their new home without creating social tensions, discrimination, and segregation? There is not one integration style and program that works best or that is the right answer for all states. Each state’s history, culture, values, and immigration strategy define how integration should take place. Both multicultural policies in the Netherlands and assimilation policies in France have seen some success in including immigrants economically and in terms of citizenship, but neither have been as successful in fully integrating them into the culture and society as we have seen in Canada, the United States, and Australia.

From comparisons between the Netherlands and France, I will argue that the overall rhetoric regarding the program does not have a major impact on either the on-the-ground policies or the level of integration of immigrants. Both countries have more of an integration framework than either multicultural or assimilation as they are defined and labeled. Both countries are experiencing similar problems in terms of extremists and violence between ethnic groups, so obviously more needs to be done in certain areas, including religious tolerance through education and interethnic interactions. The focus on the overall rhetoric and program, and the demonizing of immigrants by politicians takes away from the ability to

7 Anja van Heelsum, professor at the University of Amsterdam. Interview by author. Personal interview. Netherlands, March 21, 2012.
form cohesive policies that work and leads to inconsistent integration frameworks. Because of this, we need to get away from the obsession with defining states as multicultural or assimilationist, when in reality they are often neither, and determining whether the overall program has failed, and instead focus on improving policies to maximize integration, increase tolerance, and decrease economic segregation. States need to have a consistent policy that emphasizes economic and social inclusion, education, fights discrimination and anti-immigrant rhetoric on the part of politicians and the media, and creates space for open debate amongst all parties involved. By comparing the two very different approaches of France and the Netherlands to dealing with immigrants, and by looking at how their policies and strategies have changed over time, we can draw some conclusions about what is working, what needs to be changed within education, labor market access, and citizenship requirements, and what types of policies and areas of focus would be beneficial in the future.

In this paper we will start by looking at the debate surrounding multiculturalism and assimilation and how it has changed over time, as well as define important terms. We will then look at the individual cases of the Netherlands and France and explore how and why their immigration and integration policies have changed over the past fifty years and some of the successes and failures of specific policies. From there we will make comparisons between the two cases regarding certain aspects and indicators of integration, including education, labor, and citizenship, and draw some conclusions about what policies are beneficial. Finally we will look at the need to get away from the broad, overarching rhetoric regarding multiculturalism and assimilation and instead focus on specific policies that address necessary areas. To conclude we will make some suggestions about areas critical to a successful integration policy and recommendations for the future.
Literature Review

Chronology of debate

Discussions in Europe relating to the best techniques to deal with the domestic results of immigration in receiving societies started within the last fifty years with the explosion of migration and the major shift from temporary guest workers to permanent migrants. Originally, European states believed that residency and inclusion in the educational system would automatically lead to knowledge of the language and culture of the host country. As immigration increased after the 1960’s, there was a growing rejection of this idea, especially on the part of the migrants themselves. In the 1960’s and 1970’s many receiving societies focused on accepting immigrants and their cultural values. Public campaigns took place to promote cultural and minority rights and include religious and cultural considerations in policy. These “politics of identity [were] regarded by many advocates as a necessary counterpart to anti-racism and anti-discrimination”. This led to the emergence of multiculturalism and multicultural practices and policies in the 1980’s in receiving countries throughout Europe, North America, and Australia.

There has been an explosion in literature relating to multiculturalism in recent years as migration increases. Scholars have looked at methods of integration, including multiculturalism and assimilation, in broad terms of the concepts. However, not much analysis has been done on the specific policies that fit under each approach and the level to which these individual policies have been effective. Also, most of the focus of research has been on the political and economic sides of integration, not identity.

Definitions of approaches and theories of different approaches

In this paper we will be addressing the integration of non-European Union immigrants into Europe, looking specifically at the Netherlands and France. Throughout the rest of the

---

paper, any reference to immigrants can be assumed to be immigrants from states outside of the European Union unless otherwise stated. The use of the word “native” refers to citizens that were born, and whose parents were born, within either France or the Netherlands.

Within the literature, definitions of models and strategies to deal with immigrant populations differ. Most scholars, including Inglis, Vermeulen, Penninx, Hugo, and Rodriguez-Garcia, recognize multiculturalism and assimilation as the two main models, but some include a third model labeled as integration and others include a model at the more extreme exclusionary end. The first model is assimilation in which immigrants take on the values and culture of the host country at the expense of their own culture. A typical example of this approach is France. It is expected that immigrants will “abandon their distinctive linguistic, cultural and social characteristics and take on those of the dominant group. [The] role of the state is limited since change is viewed as the individual’s responsibility”. The ultimate goal is for it to become impossible to distinguish between immigrants and the local population.

The second model is multiculturalism, which protects cultural diversity and preserves the cultural identity of immigrants within the host society while also providing equal rights. Typical examples are Sweden, Canada, and the Netherlands. This model believes that groups can be “fully incorporated into the society without either losing their distinctiveness or being denied full participation”. It necessitates that in order for there to be equality within society, the cultures of immigrants must be accepted and that some institutions may need to be modified in order to accommodate immigrants. Often political participation is seen as essential for the functioning of this model. Rodriguez-Garcia further distinguishes between weak and strong multiculturalism: in weak multiculturalism, freedom to retain a cultural

---

10 Inglis, “Multiculturalism”, 21.
identity is only in the private sphere while in the public sphere (schools, labor) assimilation is expected. In strong multiculturalism, cultural diversity is actively supported and recognized in the government and in public situations as well as private.\textsuperscript{12}

Some scholars, such as Hugo, include integration as a model in which the process is seen as a two-way street between the immigrants and the host society. Immigrants are expected to eventually give up most of their individual culture, but the host society is also expected to change, adapt, and welcome the immigrants.\textsuperscript{13} In reality this is what most countries today are. There are very few that are actually either multicultural or assimilationist according to the definitions; most are somewhere in between and focus on finding ways to integrate immigrants. Other scholars view integration as an implementation strategy that can be used under either assimilation or multicultural models to help immigrants become a part of the host society. The last model is labeled as segregationist, exclusionist, or differentialist and describes a society in which there is strong separation between ethnic communities, often resulting from government policies that restrict participation of minorities in society or create parallel institutions, or strict requirements for gaining citizenship that keep immigrants labeled as outsiders.

Many of the first integration programs in European states were based on the ideas of multiculturalism and the possibility of creating multicultural societies. Throughout the 1970’s, 1980’s, and early 1990’s, the attitude regarding multiculturalism was relatively positive and scholars, theorists, and politicians alike were optimistic about the ability of different cultures to coexist peacefully within the same society. The 1966 United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights asserted that, “in those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities should not be denied the right… to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own


\textsuperscript{13} Hugo, “Migrants and Their Integration”, 25.
religion, or to use their own language". Some scholars and politicians believed that this extended as far as accepting that ethnic groups did not need to integrate into society, but could instead function separately within their own group.

Recently, critiques of multiculturalism have come increasingly from both the far right and far left political parties. In some traditionally multicultural countries, including Denmark and the Netherlands, we have seen the emergence of “neo-assimilationist policies” as dissatisfaction increases. Several authors, including Vertovec and Wessendorf, discuss this shift away from multiculturalism, saying that many politicians and members of the public fear that policies and practices that promote multiculturalism have begun to create parallel societies and ethnic separation within society. Critics worry that social cohesion will be put in jeopardy and that common values and beliefs that define a society will no longer exist. Assimilation is also being questioned as a strategy because it is not occurring in the way that it was envisioned and “there is a growing sense of alienation among many of those ethnic minority backgrounds”. Even within assimilationist countries such as France, ethnic groups tend to live together and interact more with each other than with natives. Suburbs populated by ethnic groups tend to have higher rates of unemployment, lower education, and less economic opportunities available. Acts of violence are further evidence of the lack of success of the policy: in France in 2003, “there were 232 recorded acts of violence against Muslims; that number rose to 595 in 2004”. While some states, such as Canada, are seeing more success than others, neither multiculturalism nor assimilation is experiencing satisfactory outcomes in most of the countries in which they have been put into practice. Some scholars believe that this is the failing of each approach while others take it to mean that the debate

14 Inglis, “Multiculturalism”, 6.
15 Rodriguez-Garcia, “Beyond Assimilation and Multiculturalism.”
16 Vertovec, “Migration and Diversity”, 17.
17 Inglis, “Multiculturalism”, 32.
should be more focused on the history and culture of the receiving societies, as well as on specific policies and not just on the overriding discourse.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{Influences and Considerations}

There are several considerations that influence the extent to which immigrants integrate and that differ from state to state. It is important to look at the impact of colonial ties and history of both the sending and receiving state. The feelings of European citizens toward their former colonies and of immigrants toward their former colonial masters can impact how accepting the host society is and how well the integration process goes. Demographics are also important: in France there is an institutionalized lack of acceptance of the existence and impact of ethnic differences. This can lead to increased problems if immigrants feel like they have to completely give up their ethnicity and identity.\textsuperscript{20} The history of wars between European Christians and Muslims can lead to further complications with the increase in Muslim immigrants to Europe; there is more animosity and negative historical interactions between the two groups of states than between Muslim states and other receiving countries such as Canada or Australia.

Outside events are also important: how events are portrayed in Europe, what side European states take on issues, and what media sources immigrants use can all impact integration. Then there is the fact that integration is not just a political and economic process; it is also an issue of identity. Do immigrants see themselves first as Muslims or citizens of their European state? Identity crises of immigrants are one of the only logical ways to explain the violent extremism that we have seen on occasion in fully integrated migrants. Consequently, the French approach of not acknowledging ethnicities might further contribute to this phenomenon rather than reduce perceived differences.

Case Studies – Historical Background

Progression of Immigration and Integration Policy in the Netherlands: From Multiculturalism to Neo-Assimilationist

The government of the Netherlands has been involved in the creation of immigration and integration policy from an early stage. Its original focus was on multiculturalism, but in the past two decades, and especially since 2000, we have seen a shift toward increasingly assimilationist tendencies. From the creation of national immigration policy in the Netherlands in the 1970’s until the 1990’s, multiculturalism was pursued because policy makers and the country as a whole believed that accommodation of cultural differences and preservation of individuals’ original culture would be the best way to promote integration.21 “In 1984, the responsible State Secretary declared that for naturalization ‘identification with the Dutch people and history is not necessary’ nor ‘letting go of the own culture and no longer feeling especially involved with the weal and woe of his country of origin’”.22 Emphasis was on accommodation on the part of the host society and government, not on the part of the immigrants.

The Netherlands passed the Ethnic Minorities Policy (EMP) in 1979, which was early in comparison to other European states. The EMP set forth explicit integration policies and “pleaded…to start an active policy aimed at the integration of what it called ‘ethnic minorities’ in society”.

become citizens and gain voting rights as a way to promote a multicultural society with equality for all people regardless of cultural considerations. Government aid programs were aimed at specific ethnic groups to help them succeed in the Netherlands within the context of their own cultural practices. There were policies requiring media broadcasting companies to provide programs of interest to immigrants and houses were built to accommodate cultural traditions. Government-subsidized religious schools have a long history in the Netherlands because of the religious pillarization system (see explanations by Penninx), and in the 1980’s the subsidization was extended to Muslim and Hindu schools. Funds were even set aside so that children of immigrants could be instructed in their own language and culture. The language aspect has been abolished, but is a good example of the extent to which the government of the Netherlands originally promoted multiculturalism and the right of immigrants to retain and practice their own culture, religion, and language rather than assimilate into society.24

In the late 1980’s the rhetoric began to shift. People believed that there was an “overemphasis on cultural aspects” and not enough focus on the economic side of integration. Plus, too much emphasis on aiding specific ethnic groups ended up leading to further segregation. Many people believed that the large amount of attention and aid given to immigrant groups actually hindered participation in the labor market. Further policies in the 1990’s began to focus on economic integration and more on individuals rather than cultural groups. Aid policies were determined by area (ie neighborhoods of a city) rather than by ethnic group. “Civic integration courses”, including language training and information about

---

Dutch society were created to help with the integration process.\textsuperscript{25} However, through these years the emphasis on multiculturalism and cultural preservation continued.

By the early 2000’s, many people were of the opinion that the Dutch multiculturalism approach had failed and the “the social cohesion of Dutch society was endangered”.\textsuperscript{26} Some argue that the access to equal rights and an acceptance and even promotion of cultural differences that characterized the multicultural approach in the Netherlands had unforeseen consequences and effects, leading to increased tensions relating specifically to ethnicity and religion. Multiple violent occurrences committed by immigrants, including the murder of filmmaker Theo van Gogh, and the demonizing of immigrants by politicians as a way to gain votes only served to increase this view and cause the public perception of immigrants to become increasingly negative. This, as well as overall increasing levels of violence in the Netherlands relating to ethnicity, led to attempts to decrease immigration and make certain integration measures mandatory. Political parties, specifically the Lijst Pim Fortuyn (LPF) party, began targeting immigration, and especially Muslim immigrants, as a major problem. A period of center-right governments in the early 2000’s reflected this rhetoric and led a move toward more assimilation-focused policies. A new integration policy style was instated that included mandatory civic integration courses and proof of knowledge of Dutch culture and society before entry into the Netherlands was allowed. Recently there has been a shift away from some of the extreme anti-immigrant policies and rhetoric, but the Netherlands has not returned to the multicultural policies for which it is known. The Netherlands is often classified as neo-assimilationist, or at least no longer multicultural, in its policies.\textsuperscript{27} However, even though the overall rhetoric of the central government has shifted, many of the policies that are actually implemented on the local level are the same multicultural policies from

\textsuperscript{25} Stotijn et al. “Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy”, 9
\textsuperscript{26} Bruquetas-Callejo et al. “Policymaking…The Dutch Case,” 16, 30.
\textsuperscript{27} Ersanilli, “The Settlement Country and Ethnic Identification…” , IMR.
previous decades. This might change over time if the rhetoric of the central government stays neo-assimilationist, but currently the local leaders and implementers do not see a reason to change what they have been doing for years.\textsuperscript{28}

\textit{Progression of Immigration and Integration Policy in France: the Influence of the Republican Model}

Integration policy in France is based on the French Republican Model, which emphasizes equality of individuals and focuses on individuals as the level of interaction with the state. Consequently, ethnic and religious groups do not get any special advantages or protection. In the French model, the acceptance of common culture and history, as well as adherence to both legal and cultural norms is important. Integration is promoted in several main areas: employment, education, access to services, and democratic participation. France has not seen a major shift in type of integration policy as was experienced in the Netherlands, but over time its policies have shifted toward a middle ground between strictly assimilationist and multicultural, trying to find a balance of requiring assimilation to French culture while also providing aid to immigrants.\textsuperscript{29} France has had several different periods of management of migration and integration. From the end of World War II until around 1974 immigration was barely controlled because there was a need for labor. Labor migrants were actively sought to help reconstruct the country and provide a sufficient workforce for the growing economy. After 1974 there was more control of migration and integration because of the oil crisis, recession, and economic concerns that led to lower growth rates and increased unemployment in many countries, including France. Since the events of September 11, 2001, immigration has been increasingly seen as a security issue, which means that there has been

more enforcement and strengthening of immigration policies and control. These increased controls to clamp down on immigration have led to tensions between immigrant populations and the local population.\textsuperscript{30} There have been many measures and laws clarifying immigration and integration regulations, including many dealing specifically with discrimination and some with assimilation and cultural issues, including the internationally controversial 2004 law on headscarves in public schools.\textsuperscript{31}

Today there is an increasing focus on integration of immigrants in France because of its viewed importance in decreasing ethnic tensions. In 2007 President Sarkozy created the French Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Cooperative Development. Within the Ministry, the Department of Reception, Integration, and Citizenship and its minister deal specifically with integration and reception of immigrants. A Reception and Integration contract is required for the first residency permit and requires the immigrant to participate in a course in citizenship and language training, provided and funded by the government.\textsuperscript{32} The relationship between the state and an immigrant is based on mutual duties: the immigrant has a duty to learn the culture and the language and the state has a duty to help improve access to housing and work. Regional integration programs focusing on access to employment, education, and health are required by federal law and are designed by regions according to their specific needs. The government has programs both to help immigrants find occupations, specifically within sectors with difficulty recruiting workers, and to support the business creation of immigrants and opportunities for young migrants. Citizenship is seen as an important way of promoting integration, so there are relatively lenient regulations.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{32} International Organization for Migration, *Compendium*, 87-88.
\textsuperscript{33} Secrétariat general a l’immigration…France, “The Organization of Policies”, 3-4.

There are differing views on how successful assimilation policies in France have been. Some people cite the violence and riots in the past decade as evidence of continued ethnic tensions. There are still problems of xenophobia and discrimination, especially against Muslim migrants, and conflicts regarding how to regulate Islam in France. Others say that the conflicts are often overplayed and instances of successful interactions are not acknowledged. According to Gourévitch, the majority of the French population is accepting of immigrants if they follow the laws and most immigrants “see themselves as integrated and respectful of national values and culture, and they aspire to enjoy quiet and prosperous lives”.

Comparing the Policies: France and the Netherlands

MIPEX, the Migrant Integration Policy Index, is a tool put together to help compare and improve integration policies and assess the impacts of policy changes in 31 different states. It is produced by the British Council and the Migration Policy Group and includes NGO’s, universities and research institutes, think-tanks, and government organizations in its project. Using the data to compare outcomes in states with different types of policies can be instructive. We can look at the Netherlands in comparison with France to get a better sense of how well different approaches are working in certain policy areas.

---

In education, neither state does as well as the leaders of the international community at targeting the needs of immigrant children, but the Netherlands ranks considerably higher than France. France scores a 29 on addressing the needs of immigrants in education; the Netherlands scores a 51. In both France and the Netherlands immigrants score lower in terms of education achievement than natives. This is due to language considerations, socioeconomic standing of families, and immigrants’ distribution across schools. A study done by Schnepf looked at mean achievement scores for immigrants and compared them to those for natives. In France the mean achievement differences were -52 in math, -63 in science, and -54 in reading. In the Netherlands they were -65, -74, and -52 respectively. These are huge differences that show that neither state is doing as well as places like Australia, Canada, and the US. In both states, second-generation immigrants fared much better in the achievement tests than first-generation, showing that the educational programs are at least somewhat successful in addressing the needs of immigrants, but they still scored significantly lower than natives.³⁵ There has been some research done to try to determine if immigrant status affects academic achievement or whether it is simply a case of socio-economic level. Schnepf conducted another study in which they controlled for socio-economic level to see if immigrant status impacted educational achievement independent of socio-economic. The author found that immigrants still fared worse than natives within the same socio-economic group. This means that it is not enough to only have policies for socio-economically disadvantaged people; it is necessary to have policies that take cultural considerations into account and that address the specific needs of immigrants.³⁶ Consequently, the French approach that focuses mostly on helping socio-economically

disadvantaged members of society but does not widely recognize ethnic or immigrant-specific concerns is not satisfactory.

Another study done by van der Werfhorst et al found that in the Netherlands, immigrant status does not play as large of a role in academic achievement when you account for socio-economic status. This is because the government has instituted programs to deal with the potentially negative effects of being an immigrant, including extra funding for schools with high percentages of immigrants and decreasing residential concentration of immigrants so that there is less segregation within schools.\textsuperscript{37} In general, schools with higher percentages of immigrants tend to fair worse on achievement tests. “An immigrant child in a highly segregated school with a high percentage of low performing immigrants is very much likely to be pulled to the average of immigrants’ achievement, while the same child (with the same socio-economic background) integrated in a not segregated school with a high percentage of well achieving natives is less likely to fall behind in educational achievement”.\textsuperscript{38} This makes living, and correspondingly educational segregation, important issues to address.

The Dutch education system focuses on integrating students into Dutch society and culture through language programs, including in early childhood education, and also a focus on intercultural education for all that emphasizes mutual respect and tolerance, but there is less focus on teaching about immigrant cultures than in some other MIPEX states. More research has also been done on monitoring progress than in France. However, intercultural education is not a priority and is left up to individual schools and teachers to implement, so it is often neglected, especially in schools with low immigrant populations. There is support for minorities in higher education and in many schools immigrant children count as 1.5 children

\textsuperscript{37} Herman van de Werfhorst and Frank van Tubergen, “Ethnicity, Schooling, and Merit in the Netherlands,” \textit{Ethnicities} 7 no. 3, (2007), 434.

\textsuperscript{38} Schnepf, “How Different Are Immigrants?” 20, 34.
to allow smaller class sizes and increased funding. Another aspect of the Dutch educational system is the existence of public religiously affiliated schools. Throughout history the government has sponsored religious schools, expanding to include Muslim schools in the past couple of decades. This can lead to further segregation amongst immigrant and native children and can consequently impact academic achievement. Some research has shown that “ethnic minorities, especially those educated in the Netherlands are making progress in their schooling to the extent that some are closing the gap between ethnic minority and majority performance”. While this shows that the Netherland policies are having some impact, there is still room for improvement.

In France, the focus on individualism over ethnic groups and the anti-affirmative action stance of the government means that there is not much targeted support or positive emphasis on diversity throughout the schooling program. Affirmative action is seen as a type of discrimination in France and is even translated as “positive discrimination” in French. Consequently it is viewed in a pejorative way and is not encouraged as part of government policy. Students can utilize the general support that has been put into place for all socio-economically disadvantaged students, but there often is not specific aid for immigrants, including language. Historically, schools and the educational system in France have been used as a medium for cultural values with the same curriculum for all children. Immigrant education received little attention; they were expected to assimilate into the French educational system and be treated equally. In the 1970’s, separate classes with slightly more focus on French language were instated, but were often taught by beginning teachers and not

---

40 van Heelsum, interview.
42 Ibid, 61.
adapted to the specific language needs of immigrant children, decreasing their effectiveness. In the 1980’s there was more focus on specialized programs and aid for immigrants and lower socio-economic students, even including courses taught in immigrants’ first language. However, these were not successfully implemented on a large scale because of lack of teachers and dissent among the general public regarding the idea. Since then, more focus on results, competition among schools for the best students, and focus on the public image of schools has caused them to get rid of some of the specific immigrant-focused programs.44

Today the French education system is centralized in determining curriculum and testing so it is hard to adapt to the needs of different areas and students; cultural and linguistic diversity is not accounted for. Although the focus in France is on equality, there are disparities in allocation of resources to different regions and certain schools and areas are better equipped and have more qualified teachers. “The current strikes and demonstrations led by teachers and parents of Paris suburbs and other secondary schools around France continue to make headlines as the disrepair, danger and inadequacy of schools in disadvantaged suburbs remains problematic”.45 There are some pilot programs that have been started in certain areas of France to help address issues specific to immigrant education, but they are not widespread. These include mainstreaming, which helps teachers target specific needs of students, “Ouvrir l’école aux parents”, a program that focuses on helping parents improve their French skills and learn more about the school system, and grants to immigrant students pursuing higher education.

The previously mentioned research, along with the experiences of both France and the Netherlands, shows that it is important to provide language aid to help immigrants learn the local language and decrease segregation in schools between locals and immigrants to increase the overall achievement of immigrants, at the same time as promoting all students with lower

44 Agnes van Zanten, “Schooling Immigrants in France in the 1990s: Success or Failure of the Republican Model of Integration,” Anthropology and Education Quarterly 28, no. 3 (1997), 359-360.
socio-economic backgrounds. The Netherlands has started on this path with its language aid programs and additional funding for schools with immigrants, but more needs to be done. France needs to acknowledge the different needs of immigrant children from those of native socio-economically disadvantaged families. Both countries need to address living and educational segregation to further eliminate the additional challenges currently faced by immigrant youth. Education should also be a place to distill myths about immigrants. Open, honest debate about migration is needed from an early age to help cool the rhetoric.\textsuperscript{46}

\textit{Labor Market and Access to the Economy}

Labor market mobility evaluates the access of immigrants to the full labor market, including level of access to all sectors of the economy, targeted support programs to address specific needs, working conditions, and access to social security. Under the MIPEX evaluations, the Netherlands scored 85, while France scored 49. In the Netherlands, all immigrants regardless of country of origin have full access to all parts of the economy. This serves to promote economic inclusion. There are also targeted measures to help immigrants find work once they arrive in the Netherlands and to help improve their job skills. Most of these measures are done on a local scale, including projects that help women set up businesses and find jobs and specific language aid programs for youth to help them in school and eventually in the labor market. However, this does not mean that the policies in the Netherlands are completely effective. In the late 1990s and early 2000s the non-EU migrant unemployment rate was at least three times that of native Dutch.\textsuperscript{47}


In France, immigrants from non-EU countries do not have full access to all areas of the labor market. Certain sectors of the economy are shut off to immigrants and they do not have full trade union rights. Out of all MIPEX countries, France denies access to the highest number of jobs, estimated at 30% of all jobs in France, risking social and economic exclusion of migrants.48 A study done by Algan et al found that both first and second generation immigrants in France are less likely to be employed than natives, both for men and women. The employment rates for African and Eastern European immigrants were particularly low with “a 18.1 percentage point and 15.7 percentage point difference relative to Native French men”.49 This shows that economic integration has not been as successful in France as other places in Europe. The Integration Office helps migrants find jobs and the government has certain programs for training, but the issue of access to the full labor market is not addressed and often the work that immigrants do manage to find does not match their skills. In 2006, an equal opportunities bill was passed which states that employers with at least fifty employees cannot look at any identifying information (name, gender, country of origin) for hiring. The idea behind this is that it will lead to increased opportunities for migrants in the workplace.

From these comparisons we can make some policy recommendations. The most important aspect for states to address in terms of economic integration of migrants is equal and open access to the whole economy, as we see in the case of the Netherlands. There should not be any parts of the economy that are restricted. Further, as part of the initial integration process, the government should provide job-training opportunities for immigrants that want to improve their economic position. It is important for migrants to be employed in work that uses their skills so that they are more likely to want to integrate fully into the country. Unemployment hinders integration because it decreases the necessity of learning the language, decreases interactions with locals, makes migrants disenchanted with their new
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country, and provides immigrants with lots of free time in which they might be more susceptible to extremist thought.

**Citizenship Requirements and Access to Nationality**

Access to nationality is defined by ease and conditions of gaining citizenship and existence of language or other required exams. Under MIPEX, France scores a 59, while the Netherlands scores a 66. In both states once citizenship has been gained immigrants have the same rights as citizens. In the Netherlands the requirements for citizenship are relatively straightforward. However, while citizenship was originally a first-step in the process, it is now a reward for successfully integrating and involves various exams, courses, and fees before it can be attained. There is increasing focus on language and culture exams both for naturalization and in the sending country when initially applying for a visa for family reunification. There are not any preparation courses offered through Dutch embassies for the integration tests abroad, so the tests serve to prevent immigration. The 1998 Newcomer Integration Law requires a 12-month integration course, including 600-800 hours of Dutch language classes and civic and labor preparation classes for all non-EU migrants. Originally this program was government-run and subsidized until the Fortuyn murder in 2002 and increased right wing pressure led to a revision in 2006 that made immigrants responsible for paying for their own courses and tightened regulations and enforcement. Lack of government funding for courses to help pass the tests combined with high fees to take it makes it more difficult for certain types of immigrants to initially gain access to the Netherlands and then to eventually gain citizenship.\(^{50}\)

In France, citizenship is easy and straightforward to gain and while there are language requirements there are not extensive fees or conditions. After five years of residency
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immigrants can apply for citizenship; the wait is decreased to two years if they have completely two years of higher education in France. Children that have one French parent and that are born in France are automatically French and children born in France to non-French parents can apply for citizenship when they turn 18. Spouses can apply after three years and then the process takes another year to complete. However, power is increasingly being given to prefectures to decide citizenship requests without oversight from the central government and conditions are not the same in each prefecture, hence the lower score on MIPEX. In some cases, “immigrants with the same background may be accepted in one prefecture but rejected in another”. The policy was put into place to try to decrease waiting times, but might actually result in unequal treatment.

These comparisons and observations lead to several conclusions. Giving citizenship too freely can be a problem because it has the potential to increase numbers of immigrants and give the perception that not much initiative to integrate is needed on the part of the migrants, but having too many hoops to jump through can make migrants feel less welcomed and even resentful, decreasing their motivation to integrate. Striking a balance is key – language requirements are useful, and even civic values and cultural introduction courses can be beneficial if administered successfully and not aimed in a negative, attacking way at the cultural practices of immigrants. Extensive fees and complicated processes as we see in the Netherlands can present challenges and should be avoided.

**Getting away from the Discourses**

From our comparisons we can see that neither France nor the Netherlands has had an extraordinary amount of success with their approaches to integration of immigrants and
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neither state actually completely follows the multicultural or assimilationist label that it has been given. Rather, they are both somewhere in between and fall more in line with the integration model and framework. France’s approach of ignoring cultural identities and making assimilation obligatory has not been successful in integrating immigrants and decreasing social tensions and there is “a widely held view in France that its Muslim community has not been well-assimilated”. In the Netherlands, the widespread discontent with multicultural policies, the claims by many that they have failed, the shift in national discourse away from multiculturalism, and the continued levels of violence in society relating to immigration all show that the levels of success are not much different from what was seen in France. It is unreasonable and irresponsible to simply wish away migration or the influx of new cultures and belief systems into Western European states because those are realities that are here to stay. In order for integration and immigration policy to function effectively we need to get away from the overriding rhetoric and discourses of assimilation and multiculturalism and focus instead on the actual policies that are being put in place.

Politicians and theorists are too worried about whether a country is multicultural or assimilationist and whether or not that overriding style of integration is working that they do not take the time to look specifically at the actual policies. In reality states are often a combination of the different frameworks or fall more into the integration model. Focus needs to be put on creating policies that function effectively to decrease ethnic tensions and increase inclusion, and the debate needs to be shifted toward addressing these specific policies rather than on deriding frameworks and forcing labels on states that are often not actually accurate. When you look at the on-the-ground policies of France and the Netherlands, they are not that different and neither one fits perfectly into the definition of multiculturalism or assimilation. Both France and the Netherlands have language tests required to gain residency
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status, citizenship requirements are similar, both states provide labor aid to immigrants and both have at least some programs to help with education, the Netherlands just provides these services through the ethnic groups of immigrants while France bases it on the socio-economic standing of individuals. In France the government is investing in the banlieues. This is not considered a multicultural form of support because it does not explicitly target certain ethnic groups, but the disadvantaged people living in the banlieues that are helped by the policies tend to be immigrants. So while the label of the policy is different, it has a very similar goal to the policies labeled as multicultural in the Netherlands that aid specific immigrant groups.

Consequently, labeling certain countries as “multicultural” or “assimilationist” does not help the situation and does not have as large of an impact on integration as many would believe as long as certain aspects are being addressed: education, access to the labor market, consistent policy, anti-discrimination, and open, non-accusatory debate on immigration and integration. The rhetoric regarding the programs often simply serves to polarize the debate because of peoples’ perceptions about what the terms mean when the reality of the policies might not even match their expectations. What needs to be done? We need to change the focus of the debate from whether multiculturalism or assimilation is more beneficial and focus instead on a combination of policy objectives that can be addressed in all societies, taking lessons from the policies of both France and the Netherlands, as well as other states.

Areas Where we Need to see Improvement and Policy Recommendations

Besides the policy recommendations specifically addressing education, labor, citizenship, and entry exams that have already been discussed, there are several areas and issues that are worth mentioning.
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Perception of Welcome and Consistent Immigration Policy

Many scholars agree that the most important facilitating factor for integration is to make migrants feel welcomed into the country. Most immigrants integrate pretty completely after the second or third generation as long as they feel welcomed by the host country and like they actually have a chance of being accepted and not always viewed as a foreigner. This is an area that can be addressed in all states regardless of what their specific take on immigration and integration policy is. If immigrants feel like they are always going to be considered outsiders and not completely welcome in their new host society, they lose the motivation to try to integrate. If migrants feel like they have nowhere to voice their concerns and feel powerless to change or improve their position in society they are more likely to become disenchanted with society and could even ultimately be more likely to engage in extremist behavior. Consistency in immigration and integration policies is one way to address this issue. If immigrants know ahead of time what to expect, they feel more in control. Even with France’s more assimilationist style policies it has a high number of immigrants that want to enter. Its policies and expectations are not secret and migrants know what to expect.

Negative Discourse from Politicians and the Media – Using Immigrants as Scapegoats

A related issue that needs to be addressed is the approach of politicians and the media to the topic. Immigrants have been increasingly used as scapegoats and targeted negatively by politicians as a way to garner votes. This obviously makes immigrants feel less welcome. Yes, there have been instances of violence on the part of immigrants, but also on the part of local citizens. While there are obvious difficulties and challenges associated with migration in general and integration in particular, the extent to which only the negative aspects are discussed must change. After the end of the Cold War, “the world needed another enemy”
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and recently immigrants, specifically Muslim immigrants, have been brought up to fill that position.\(^{58}\) The rhetoric of fear that is created facilitates people feeling threatened; they look for difficulties resulting from immigration that they are expecting to see. Some neighborhoods do legitimately face challenges from immigration, but many others do not. The discourse on cultural enrichment does not even make the political agenda.\(^{59}\)

*European Strategy versus the US, Canada, Australia – The Issue of State History and Identity*

Some states and citizens in Western Europe worry that immigration will threaten the identity of their own state that has been around for hundreds of years. Western European states have a shorter history of immigration than states such as Canada, the United States, and Australia, and a longer history of state identity. However, it is important to emphasize the fact that national identity is always changing and has changed considerably throughout history, especially in the past one hundred years. Issues such as equality for women that are now seen as an integral part of the cultural identity of many Western European states have only really come about since the end of World War II. States need to look at themselves more critically and at their history to realize how many of these changes are recent and realize that the national identity that they are trying to preserve is not something that has been static for hundreds of years, but rather is something that is constantly changing and adapting. Adding immigrants to the mix and the cultural considerations that they bring with them is just another part of the process. It is a two way street – many Muslim immigrants are changing Islam to fit more easily into Western societies, so the host states and citizens need to be willing to adapt as well and accept new people.\(^{60}\)

*Religious Tolerance through Education and Interethnic Interactions*

Religious tolerance is crucial with the increasing numbers of Muslim migrants. Promoting education regarding different religions from a young age is one way to dispel
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myths and promote tolerance. Increasing diversity in neighborhoods is another way to promote understanding. In the Netherlands they are combining multiple apartments into larger homes in traditionally lower-class neighborhoods in order to encourage people of different socio-economic levels to live together. There is also a policy in some neighborhoods in the Netherlands through which the government provides funding for neighborhood gatherings and social events to promote interactions between people who might not otherwise socialize. An expansion of this program to other neighborhoods and states, along with other local initiatives would be beneficial to increasing intercultural understanding.

**Partnership with Community Leaders**

An important way to help immigrants integrate successfully into a new society is to utilize resources within their own community. Government partnerships with community leaders can be especially beneficial. We can borrow strategies that United Nations organizations such as OHCHR have used to combat issues such as female genital mutilation. Going through community leaders to slowly influence the values of groups changes the perception of the process and makes it less of a form of attack. Distributing information about cultural practices of the new society through members of the ethnic community is critical to enhance integration.

**Conclusion**

As we have established, neither multicultural policies nor assimilation policies have led to a satisfactory level of integration and decreased social and ethnic tensions in France and the Netherlands. Often, the rhetoric, perceptions, and misinterpretations that go along with the labels of ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘assimilation’ serve to further polarize the debate and lead to more problems than they solve. The overall rhetoric and program label does not

---

61 Poppe, interview.
62 Poppe, interview.
van Heelsum, interview.
make a huge difference in the policies that are implemented on the ground; the more important issue is having a consistent policy that emphasizes welcoming immigrants, helping them succeed economically, and finding their place within society. From comparing the cases of France and the Netherlands and looking at specific policies in each we were able to draw some conclusions about policies. In education it is important to account for immigrant status and culture in policies, not only socioeconomic status. In the labor market it is crucial to provide equal access to all parts of the economy and to have programs that help immigrants find professions that fit their skill sets to further facilitate and motivate integration and decrease disenchantment with the host society. Regarding access to citizenship and citizenship exams, it is important to decrease barriers to citizenship so that immigrants feel as though it is possible to fully integrate, but not lower them to the extent that citizenship loses its meaning. Language exams are okay and even encouraged, but there should not be excessive fees on the part of the migrant, and programs to help learn the language should be available. Finally, there should be focus on religious tolerance, open debate, and intercultural education, as well as decreased demonizing of immigrants by politicians and the media to promote understanding and acceptance of diverse peoples.

As we move forward and states and politicians continue to reinvent and adapt their immigration and integration strategies, they need to remember that often the policies that benefit immigrants also benefit the state overall. If there is a consistent immigration and integration program that makes immigrants feel welcome and able to become functioning members of society, they are less likely to become disenchanted and resort to violence or extremism. Politicians play a major role in this and need to find other ways of garnering votes than by demonizing immigrants. More studies should be done regarding the actual impacts of specific policies in different states to continue to improve our understanding of what works and does not work for integration. Studies should also look at the identity crisis issue of
immigrants and integration, not simply focus on the economic and political sides.

Immigration is here to stay and consequently finding effective ways to integrate immigrants into society that work for both the host country and the immigrants is critical to the future functioning of our societies.
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