

SOCIOCULTURAL INTEGRATION POLICY IN MULTI-ETHNIC SOCIETIES: UNDERLYING CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Maxim Popov

North Caucasus Federal University
ORCID: 0000-0003-4321-6920

<https://doi.org/10.36169/2227-6068.2020.01.00011>

Abstract. *The author conducts a comparative analysis of sociocultural integration policy's concepts in contemporary social theory. The article deals with the main directions of conceptual interpretation of sociocultural integration policy in competing theoretical paradigms. The theoretical tradition of sociocultural integration's analysis is associated with the conceptual confrontation of conflict theory, citizenship theory, multiculturalism, neofunctionalism, and normative concepts of sociocultural integration. The conceptual contradiction lies in the interpretation of sociocultural integration as a way of resolving ethnocultural conflicts in pluralistic societies. Conflict resolution theorists rely on the analysis of conflict nature of mobilised ethnicity; multiculturalists proceed from the normativity of cultural pluralism and hyper-ethnic identification; representatives of the neofunctionalist paradigm, theory of citizenship and normative concepts of integration interpret the status of cultural groups from the standpoint of political participation, equality of opportunity, and imperative sociocultural integration. This paper substantiates that sociocultural integration policy as conflict management strategy seeks to create constructive conditions for the conflict-free balance between cultural and ethnic groups. Sociocultural integration policy forms ethical-normative and structural forms of social interactions: ethnic and cultural groups integrate to avoid destructive cultural conflicts, save the integrity of social system and contribute to political stability, social justice, cultural pluralism, inter-ethnic consensus, and civil solidarity.*

Key words: *sociocultural integration policy, conflict theory, citizenship theory, multiculturalism, neofunctionalism, political integration, multi-ethnic society, social justice, cultural pluralism, civil solidarity*

Introduction

Today, the aggravation of cultural conflicts necessitates an integration policy that excludes assimilation and isolationist strategies, reduces ethnic and religious violence, and ensures a high level of civil solidarity. The dramatic events of recent years have demonstrated that destructive cultural conflicts go beyond domestic and regional ones. Peacekeeping becomes an attribute of democracy and global security: regions of ethnic and confessional instability are associated with potential actors of international

terrorism, which increases political desire to find constructive ways to resolve cultural contradictions. According to Jürgen Habermas, the clash of civilizations is simply a weak retouch on social Darwinism, which driven by interests and prevails in global politics as a result of the unequal global distribution of wealth and power. The image of a culturally divided and, therefore, not fully integrated world obscures the fact that interpretive conflicts at the level of cultural identity cannot be separated from political contradictions (Habermas 2010: 12–13).

The rapidly expanding boundaries of social, economic and cultural ties in the process of globalization improve the life chances of some groups and turn out to be destructive for others. Contemporary models of regional integration into global democratic politics are controversial: in the situation of structural demodernization and traditionalization of regional communities, neoliberal integration models can increase social instability, creating conditions for the escalation of ethno-religious tension. The multidimensional tension between ethnic and religious communities within contemporary nation states is today a deep obstacle to the consolidation of civil nation.

The implementation of sociocultural integration policy at the regional level is aimed at ensuring the political consolidation of multicultural communities. Social stability and modernization activity of such communities directly depend on the scale of integration policy. Structural factors determine the permanent turbulence of the regional cut of international politics and the fundamental impossibility of solving the problem of ensuring territorial consolidation — maintaining the latter requires constant conceptual efforts. Ethno-cultural diversity of contemporary nation states predetermines the fact that the territorial and political consolidation presents a serious challenge to the subject of management. In this regard, the study of the anti-conflict, normative-societal potential of the integration policy and the analysis of the adaptation mechanisms of cultural communities to the system conditions of regional modernization are the most relevant in the long-term national policy strategy.

Theoretical Framework and Underlying Concepts

The theoretical tradition of sociocultural integration's analysis is associated with the conceptual confrontation of conflict theory, citizenship, multiculturalism, neofunctionalism, normative concepts of political integration. The conceptual contradiction lies in the interpretation of sociocultural integration as a way of resolving ethno-cultural conflicts in pluralistic societies. Conflict resolution theorists rely on the analysis of the conflictogenic nature of mobilized ethnicity; multiculturalists proceed from the normativity of cultural pluralism and hyper-ethnic identification; representatives of the neofunctional paradigm, the theory of citizenship, and normative concepts of political integration interpret the status of ethnic and cultural groups from the standpoint of political participation, equality of opportunity, and imperative sociocultural integration. According to James Fearon and David Laitin, a full-fledged theory of ethnic conflict should explain why, despite serious tensions, ethnic relations based on peace and integration are more typical than large-scale violence (Fearon & Laitin 1996).

The comprehensive theory of sociocultural integration seeks to combine the concepts of individual freedom and group loyalty as counter-narratives to forced assimilation. This combination can be seen as a movement towards pluralism and respect for cultural differences at the individual and collective levels. Sociocultural integration forms communicative mechanisms of civil consolidation based on the principles of equality and justice. Social justice, the creation of a “society for all,” is the overarching goal of integration. Justice refers to societal principles and values that allow social actors to receive a fair share of the benefits for a fair share of responsibility in the framework of life together in society. The concepts of social justice define civil society as the most desirable and attainable, provided that rights and obligations are distributed in accordance with the agreed principles of equality. It is an integrated society in which social actors can participate in social, economic and political life on the basis of equal rights and opportunities, justice and dignity (Kymlicka 2007).

The concept of sociocultural integration policy refers to constructivist categories that are currently widely used in the contemporary politics to describe the idea, the purpose of which is to facilitate the development of a sociocultural system in which stability, security, tolerance, respect for diversity, equal opportunities, social inclusion are necessary and attributive principles. Sociocultural integration is defined as the process of creating a stable, safe, fair society based on the principles of social inclusion and protecting human rights, anti-discrimination, tolerance, social equality, cohesion and solidarity (Chapman 2002). Citizens who participate in political decision-making and feel inclusion in the cultural life of society will be an effective result of the policy of sociocultural integration. Similarly, the legitimacy of political institutions and structures of democratic society is due to the high degree of cohesion and political participation of individuals and groups in the life of society. According to Jane Jenson and Paul Bernard, social cohesion as a normative result of sociocultural integration is based on the conscious and voluntary willingness of people to cooperate and work together at all levels of society to achieve common goals (Bernard 1999; Jenson 1998).

The need to stimulate and promote integration policy in multicultural community is determined by normative and instrumental reasons: from an ethical point of view, creating an integrated “society for all” is a self-evident societal goal; structural factors of sociocultural integration policy are associated with the need to reduce cultural and social inequalities that lead to political fragmentation and have a negative impact on conflict prevention. The development of common civil values requires the institutional coordination of antagonistic interests and cultural identities. According to Jean Tillie and Boris Slijper, there are two fundamental normative concepts of political philosophy that underlie sociocultural integration theory: “democracy” and “statehood”. Within the “concept of democracy”, the fundamental problem of sociocultural integration policy is related to the discussion of social inequality: the cultural and ethnic minorities are defined as foreigners who must become citizens with the preservation of a unique cultural identity. Within the “concept of statehood”, the issue of sociocultural integration policy is solved from the point of view of constructing the civic identity of migrants, who ultimately should become compatriots, members of the political community (Tillie & Slijper 2007).

These basic dimensions of sociocultural integration policy can be divided into “minimalist” and “maximalist” concepts of democracy and statehood. In the minimalist concept of democracy, the main result of an effective integration policy is the existence of equal civil, social and political rights. This concept is associated with the political philosophy of classical liberalism with the idea that the role of the state in the realization of social equality is limited to the realization of equality of opportunity. The maximalist concept of democracy refers to the political discourse of the “new left” and the theory of social liberalism, according to which equality of opportunity is too limited: “real” equality for cultural and ethnic minorities means that their values, interests and identities are equally taken into account in the political arena. The difference between the minimalist and maximalist concepts of statehood is based on different concepts of the nation. In the minimalist concept of statehood, a nation is perceived as a “moral community”. The main result of sociocultural integration policy is the minimization of social differences between the majority and ethnic minorities, which must adopt the procedures and norms of constitutional democracy, basic civil identity, specific to a particular political community and incorporating the values of “societal culture”. This concept is associated with the political philosophy of communitarianism. In the maximalist concept of statehood, the nation is interpreted in the perspective of republicanism, where cultural differences and ethnic identities are leveled based on the priority of “political loyalty”. This concept is associated with the political philosophy of neo-republicanism (Vermeulen, Slijper 2002). According to Tillie and Slijper, these theoretical differences lead to four concepts of the sociocultural integration policy: 1) social inclusion; 2) political participation; 3) acculturation; 4) assimilation. Although at the normative level there are “tensions” between these four concepts, they emphasize that “they are not empirically mutually exclusive”: for example, “formal integration” is not an opposition to “participatory integration”, but rather its prerequisite (Tillie & Slijper 2007: 39).

Sociocultural integration policy has a normative goal of social cohesion and inclusion, implying equal opportunities and rights for all social actors. Social system becomes more integrated, which implies equality and improved life strategies. The civil identity, social and cultural capital that underlie social cohesion are components of sociocultural integration, as are the democratic institutions and pluralistic values that modern society is based on. Critics of sociocultural integration draw attention to its potential negative consequences, which conjure up a repressive image of assimilation policy and imposed cultural uniformity. Integration problems belong to the class of policy tasks that Jake Chapman described as a “disorder policy,” characterized by the absence of a clear agreement on how to solve the problems of cultural consolidation, uncertainty as to what methods sociocultural integration can be effectively implemented without time and resource constraints (Chapman 2002: 27).

The contradictory combination of integration and disintegration trends of regional development marks the beginning of the 21st century. Taken together, these trends provide the foundation for system integration. The definition of socio-cultural integration in the categories of system integration is associated with the works of David Lockwood, who drew attention to the need for a theoretical synthesis of alternative paradigms—normative theories of neofunctionalism of the 1950s and the theory of

conflict of Lewis Coser and Ralf Dahrendorf (Lockwood 1956). According to John Rex, the problems of resolving ethnic conflicts and the political integration of cultural minorities generate state responses in the form of ideology and practice of multiculturalism. Rex reveals neoconservative and neoliberal responses to the “demographic presence” of cultural minorities:

- 1) Complete exclusion of cultural minorities from the social and political sphere, the refusal to grant citizenship and the return of minorities to their countries of origin.
- 2) Isolation of minorities and non-recognition of the cultural differentness, when citizenship is granted in the process of naturalization.
- 3) Massive support for labor migrants and their children as temporary residents who are not eligible for citizenship.
- 4) Promotion of various forms of multiculturalism policy:
 - a) recognition of cultural minorities at the state level as part of the institutional structure;
 - b) the creation of a new “hybrid culture” with autonomy for minorities based on the priority of individual rights, while no ethnic group is privileged over another (Rex 1995).

The political participation of ethnic and cultural groups belongs to one of four basic dimensions of integration policy, along with:

- 1) The rights granted to migrants by the host community.
- 2) Personal and group identification with the host community.
- 3) Social inclusion, the adoption of democratic norms and civil values as a necessary condition for positive integration (Martiniello 2005; Levitt & Jaworsky 2007).

According to Ricard Zapata-Barrero and Ruby Gropas, integration policy involves the imperative participation of citizens in political life, which is central to democratic governance for the following reasons: firstly, participation in political life offers people the opportunity to influence the outcomes of decision-making processes (they can protect their interests or the interests of the cultural groups to which they belong); secondly, political participation has a systemic function of “political socialization” in terms of enhancing a sense of citizenship and the formation of a common identity. Both of these aspects are crucial for resolving regional conflicts, socio-cultural cohesion and the dynamic development of democracies characterized by cultural and ethnic diversity (Zapata-Barrero & Gropas 2012: 167–191).

In macrosociological theory, the main source of integration / disintegration of developed capitalist societies is the class system. In accordance with Max Weber's ideas about social stratification, the development of status systems is likely to lead to political solidarity and harmonious forms of integration, while class societies generate conflicting forms of disintegration. The modern theory of transformations tries to consider

sociocultural integration through a systemic prism: Lockwood notes that conflict theorists emphasize political conflict as the main engine of social change, while normative functionalists downplay the role of political actors and seek to emphasize functional or dysfunctional relationships between social institutes. For Lockwood, the task of integration theory is to overcome this theoretical dualism (Lockwood 1956).

The basis of research discussion on the problems of contemporary integration policy is the question of the nature of the relationship between the level of migrant participation in the political life of host communities and their homeland. According to Samuel Huntington, the maintenance by migrants of relations with countries of origin and the particular identities of ethnic enclaves prevents full assimilation and political integration into the mainstream community (Huntington 2004). Ewa Morawska casts doubt on the idea that transnational practices and integration are opposite and mutually exclusive processes (Morawska 2003). According to Peter Kivisto and Thomas Faist, the policy of socio-cultural integration is characterized by a relationship between assimilation and transnationalism (Kivisto & Faist 2010). Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut note how transnationalism provides an alternative resource for promoting integration and social mobility in host communities, as transnational practices create skills that migrants can use in destination countries (Portes & Rumbaut 2006). Peggy Levitt talks about the false dichotomy between assimilation and transnationalism in modern integration policy and believes that transnational practices contribute to de-escalation of ethical tension and strengthen sociocultural integration, as they generate professional skills that can be useful for the political participation of migrants (Levitt & Jaworsky 2007: 129–156).

A key issue of contemporary integration theories concerns the relationship between the political participation of migrants and political consolidation. Sociocultural integration of migrants is related to the macro-political factors: firstly, group identification with the political system; secondly, active migrant participation in political life through voting or participation in the public sphere; thirdly, the realization that the authorities hear them. The effectiveness of integration and participation in the political process depends on the country of origin and the host country, the personal qualities of migrants, changes in the structure of political opportunities that arise in the host community (Zapata-Barrero & Gropas 2012: 167–191).

Within the concept of cultural citizenship, civil integration is an “inventory of opportunities” and a “tool for regulating everyday life”. Sociocultural integration policy becomes an instrument of cultural liberalization and a path of promoting civil unity and cultural diversity in a pluralistic society in a way that does not concentrate personal and group self-awareness on their own “otherness”, but position the “other” as a full-fledged a bearer of civil identity, politically motivated and socially inclusive, making an individual contribution to the cultural and political life of society (Stone et al 2008: 106).

A study by Roland Paris devoted to a political analysis of the consequences of peacekeeping missions launched between 1989 and 1998 noted that peacekeepers in the 1990s underestimated the destabilizing effects of democratization and liberalization in post-conflict countries that recently completed ethno-religious and civil wars (Paris

2004). Despite support for the transformation of crisis and unstable states into liberal market democracies, Paris proposes a new integration model “institutionalization before liberalization” based on the following principles:

- a) delay in the large-scale implementation of democratic and market reforms until a rudimentary network of national institutions capable of effectively managing liberalization processes is created;
- b) rationalization of liberalization processes in combination with the implementation of democratic values, the construction of civil identities, the construction of social and government institutions that manage political and economic reforms (Paris 2004: 8).

Will Kymlicka suggests that the accelerated and revolutionary introduction of neoliberal politics and the integration model of multiculturalism (“interculturalism”, “diversity policy”) in a non-democratic society can carry conflicting risks and threats of destabilization. He notes that liberal multiculturalism is easier to accept where liberal democracy is already well known and where the rule of law and human rights are protected. In countries where the basic values and principles of liberal democracy are not yet integrated into the social system and collective identification, it becomes necessary to slow down the process of democratization until the integration model of liberal multiculturalism is fully implemented. Despite the fact that the integration policy of multiculturalism brings political freedom, social equality and democracy, Kymlicka encourages to understand the sociocultural context of integration—minority rights, cultural values, and self-identity of ethnic groups (Kymlicka 2007: 19).

Laura Morales and Miruna Morariu point out that not only the political structures, but also the structures of discursive opportunities in the host countries are a decisive factor in an effective integration policy: this is a regional policy regarding migrant associations; openness of government bodies and formal institutions; local government configuration; the predominant migratory discourse (Morales & Morariu 2011: 140–171). According to Tillie and Meindert Fennema, access to naturalization makes it possible to vote and stand for election: citizenship has been repeatedly defined as a fundamental indicator of sociocultural integration in democratic societies. After naturalization, citizens can expand their political inclusion by voting, through which groups of migrants become a political community and, thus, can change the political system with elected representatives (Tillie & Fennema 1999: 703–726).

Sociocultural integration correlates with the basic principles of socio-political interaction, due to which the subjects are connected with each other through the common civil identification. The concept of system integration characterizes the functional relationship between the structural and institutional elements of the sociocultural system. However, the very use of the concept of “integration” does not mean that the described sociocultural relations and interactions are harmonious. The conditions of system integration can include both a social order and a group conflict. The fact that society has become pluralistic (multicultural) has been elevated to an ideal in which groups of different cultural backgrounds live together in peace and harmony. Two types of multiculturalism were formed: factual and political (ideological). Political

multiculturalism extols the existence of various cultures in our society and treats it as “enrichment”. However, no one heeded Shakespeare’s warning: “Excessive familiarity breeds contempt”. Such a “threat of contempt” was even more serious due to the sharpening of differences combined with the neglect of the commonality of the cultures involved.

Sociocultural Integration Policy as Conflict Management Strategy

Sociocultural integration policy as constructive conflict management strategy in multicultural communities requires not only special sensitivity to the cultural context and ethnicity, but also requires a high degree of rationalization and confidence in the need to intervene in the ethnic sphere in order to transform it and post-conflict transformation. The motives for the participation of ethnic groups in identity conflicts will largely affect the prospects for their outcome; in order to satisfy their material interests, people are unlikely to consciously risk their lives. In conflicts of identities, the participation of the parties has a pronounced character of sacrifice, and not an inevitable risk: the willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of identification and value ideals is emotionally experienced, realized and verbalized by the parties to the conflicts. Ethnic tension escalates when an ethnocultural group tends to perceive itself as a “victim” of value claims from “other” groups. According to Jay Rothman, if we want to succeed in researching the causes of identity-based conflicts, we must start with a definition that will lead to constructive conflict resolution methods. We consider identity as a self-perception filled with a cultural formula. Cultural formula is based on internal needs and preferences, group characteristics and collective values” (Rothman & Alberstein 2013: 650).

In cultural conflicts, an identity can be personal, group, or intergroup, but it is always a source of perception of a contradiction and a catalyst for conflict. Parties can perceive themselves as “personal maximizers” (Rothman), protecting individual values, pursuing their own interests and expressing individualistic needs; they can be sociocultural groups and feel part of a collective whole; they may feel themselves to be carriers of multiple identities and enter into conflict at the intergroup level, but all these perceptions are generated by the “cultural formula”, identity. Cultural identity becomes the “ideological base” of the parties to the conflict, filled with personal, group and intergroup emotions, values and meanings (Rothman & Alberstein 2013).

Cultural conflict has its own unique characteristics, and in different contexts, some of these elements will be more visible than others, but they are all common denominators of conflict genesis. The primordialist approach helps explain the conflictogenic nature of ethnic identity. The concept of political entrepreneurs explains how institutional factors and ethnic stereotypes interact. Ethnicity embodies an element of powerful emotional tension that can be re-politicized and reactivated if groups recognize the threat to cultural identity, values, and security, which leads to ethnification, escalation of ethnic intolerance, and ultimately violent ethnic conflict (Blagojevic 2009; Horowitz 1985). The specificity of cultural conflicts lies in the fact that they proceed against the backdrop of a clash of competing collective values and cultural identities. The concept of “value

contradictions” clarifies the concept of cultural conflict as a conflict of identities, emphasizing the systemic and genetic nature of this explanatory model. According to Joan Esteban, Laura Mayoral, and Debraj Ray, intra-state conflicts acquire a pronounced ethnic character. More than half of civil conflicts after World War II are classified as ethnic or religious. One of the grounds for classifying a regional ethnic conflict is its identification as an anti-state rebellion on behalf of an ethnic group (Esteban et al. 2012: 70). Brubaker and Laitin, examining the history of intra-state conflicts of the second half of the 20th century, concluded that the bipolar ideological axis disappeared against the backdrop of large-scale ethnicization of violent clashes (Brubaker & Laitin 1998).

For the first time, the term “identity-based conflict” appears in the works of John Burton and Rothman in the 1990s. Burton considers cultural identity as one of the basic human needs, while the threat of identity is perceived by the group as one of the main threats to their security. Burton identifies two needs as key: the need for identity and the need for security (Burton 1996). According to Rothman, the most important attributes of identity-based conflicts are their irrationality, subjectivity and uncontrollability (Rothman 1997). Analyzing the status of ethnicity in the dynamics of cultural conflicts, it is necessary to point out the connection of group identities with the primordial values of traditional societies, in which civil identity and individualism do not play a significant role. According to Rothman and Michal Alberstein, when conflict mediators deal with ethno-religious clashes, appeal to individual interests is not able to smooth out the crack that arose as a result of the conflict; attempts to manipulate groups can lead to an intensification of the conflict of identities (Rothman & Alberstein 2013: 657).

All of these issues would merit further analysis though complementary methodologies offering a more independent perspective on ethno-regional conflict dynamics. In particular, the findings gathered here call for more in-depth research on the boundaries between sociocultural integration / conflict management strategies and different forms of cultural conflicts; on the internal dynamics and decision-making involved in shifting goals and strategies; and on their various implications for the processes of ethno-religious radicalization and political instability. There also needs to be more interdisciplinary investigation on the linkages between conflict management strategy, social cohesion, political integration, negotiations, democratic transitions, and post-conflict institutionalization. Finally, such analysis might offer useful lessons for constructive international engagement to support the conversion of state challengers into active peace-builders, as long as these actors are politically motivated movements, which enjoy strong social legitimacy and aspire to take part in democratic politics. Indeed, our findings call for a rethinking of conventional intervention in cultural conflicts, promoting the social cohesion and sociocultural integration policy during negotiations; offering assistance to support democratic transitions in multicultural communities that possess a future role within a peaceful environment, in contrast to criminalization strategies (e.g. through anti-terrorist measures such as proscription and counter-insurgency) which prevent ethnic groups from expanding their civil capacities.

Conclusions

Sociocultural integration policy has a normative goal of social cohesion and inclusion, implying equal opportunities and rights for all social actors. The civil identity, social and cultural capital that underlie social cohesion are components of sociocultural integration policy, as are the democratic institutions and pluralistic values that modern society is based on. The need to stimulate and promote integration policy in multicultural community is determined by normative ethical and instrumental reasons: from an ethical point of view, creating an integrated “society for all” is a self-evident societal goal; structural factors of sociocultural integration policy are associated with the need to reduce ethnic tensions and social inequalities that lead to political fragmentation and have a negative impact on conflict management. Cultural conflicts are the consequences of the radicalization of social inequalities and politicized hyper-ethnicity. Sociocultural integration, which is associated with a high level of civil and political solidarity, a weakening of ethnic mobilization, and a reduction in the negative stereotyping of “others” as “cultural enemies”, can substantially reduce ethnic tensions.

In contemporary social theory and political discourse, sociocultural integration policy can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Sociocultural integration has normative ethical imperative and structural goal, consisting in social progress towards a more just and equal society.
- 2) In the process of sociocultural integration, the conflictogenic factors of social inequalities and economic polarization must be mitigated by the social inclusion of individuals and groups previously excluded from political activities.
- 3) In the pursuit of inclusion and universalism, the integration policy can transform the values of multiculturalism and the principles of cultural diversity.
- 4) Maximum concentration on the normative goal of sociocultural integration can impede political transformations.

Conclusions regarding the creation of a universal theoretical model of sociocultural integration policy may be premature; nevertheless, it is necessary to supplement the existing conceptual approaches:

- 1) Integration policy should be systemic, multifactorial, multidimensional, taking into account the role of political, economic, social, ethnic, cultural factors in promoting consolidation, solidarity, cohesion and inclusion.
- 2) Sociocultural context of the integration policy within multicultural community must be taken into account in order to guarantee the manageability and effectiveness of integration measures.
- 3) Sociocultural integration is a structurally transforming process that provides positive results of political, social and cultural changes.

Comparative conceptual analysis allows to explicate the basic determinants of the value-inclusive model of sociocultural integration:

- 1) The higher the degree of integration and solidarity in society, the higher will be the state support in such areas as education, health insurance, social programs.
- 2) The higher the degree of cohesion and solidarity, the more stringent will be the observance of social norms, social loyalty, support for civic institutions and democratic values such as social trust, moral responsibility, political consolidation, human rights, tolerance, and compromise.
- 3) Social institutions based on inclusive civic values make group collaboration reflective, rational, politically and ethically necessary.
- 4) A higher level of political participation increases the level of consolidation, which not only promotes integration, but also increases social capital. Sociocultural integration policy seeks to create optimal conditions for harmonious and conflict-free interaction of structural elements of the socio-political system, the balance between social and ethnic groups.

Integration policy forms institutional-normative forms of social interactions: cultural groups integrate to avoid destructive conflicts and disrupt the integrity of the system, and thereby contribute to macro-social stability, political consolidation, pluralism, cultural dialogue, ethnic consensus, and civil solidarity.

Bibliography:

- Bernard, Paul. (1999). *Social Cohesion: A Dialectical Critique of a Quasi-Concept?* Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Department of Canadian Heritage and Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Blagojevic, Bojana. (2009). Causes of Ethnic Conflict: a Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Global Change and Governance* 3: 35–51.
- Brubaker, Rogers & Laitin, David. (1998). Ethnic and Nationalist Violence. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 423–452.
- Burton, John. (1996). *Conflict Resolution: Its Language and Processes*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.
- Chapman, Jake. (2002). *System Failure: Why governments must learn to think differently*. London: Demos.
- Esteban, Joan et al. (2012) Ethnicity and Conflict: Theory and Facts. *Science* 336: 70–93.
- Fearon J., Laitin D. (1996). Explaining Interethnic Cooperation. *The American Political Science Review* 90(4): 57–74.
- Fennema, Meindert & Tillie, Jean. (1999). Political participation and political trust in Amsterdam: Civic Communities Ethnic Networks. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 25(4): 48–77.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (2010). Religion, Right and Politics. Political Justice in Multicultural World-society. *Polis. Political Studies* 2: 7–21.
- Horowitz, Donald. (1985) *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Huntington, Samuel. (2004). *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Jenson, Jane. (1998). *Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research*. Ottawa: Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate, Department of Canadian Heritage and Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Kivisto, Peter & Faist, Thomas. (2010). *Beyond A Border: The Causes and Consequences of Contemporary Immigration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Kymlicka, Will. (2007). *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levitt, Peggy & Jaworsky, Nadya. (2007). Transnational migration studies: Past developments and future trends. *Annual Review Sociology* 33 (1): 129–156.
- Lockwood, David. (1956). Some Remarks on «The Social System». *The British Journal of Sociology* 7(2): 38–61.
- Martiniello, Marco. (2005). Political participation, mobilization and representation of immigrants and their offspring in Europe. *Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations, School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations*. Malmö: Malmö University.
- Morales, Laura & Morariu, Miruna. (2011). Is 'Home' a Distraction? The Role of Migrants' Transnational Practices in Their Political Integration into Receiving-Country Politics. In: *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe: Marking Multicultural Democracy Work?* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morawska, Ewa. (2003). Disciplinary Agendas and analytic Strategies on Immigrant transnationalism: Challenges of Interdisciplinary Knowledge. *International Migration Review* 37(3): 611–640.
- Paris, Roland. (2004). *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Portes, Alejandro & Rumbaut, Ruben. (2006). *Immigrant America. A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rex, John. (1995). Multiculturalism in Europe and North America. *Nations and Nationalism* 1 (1): 25–48.
- Rothman, Jay. (1997). *Resolving Identity-Based Conflict In Nations, Organizations, and Communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rothman, Jay & Alberstein, Michal. (2013). Individuals, groups and intergroups: Understanding the Role of Identity in Conflict and Its Creative Engagement. *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution* 28(3): 650–678.
- Stone Marjorie et al. (2008). *Immigration and Cultural Citizenship: Responsibilities, Rights and Indicators*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Tillie, Jean & Slijper, Boris. (2007). *Immigrant Political Integration and Ethnic Civic Communities in Amsterdam. In: Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vermeulen, Hans & Slijper, Boris. (2002) Multiculturalism and culturalism. A social scientific critique of the political philosophy of multiculturalism. *Nationalism, Regional Multiculturalism and Democracy. Center for European Integration Studies* (2): 7–42.
- Zapata-Barrero, Ricard & Gropas, Ruby. (2012) Active Immigrants in Multicultural Contexts: Democratic Challenges in Europe. In: *European Multiculturalisms: Cultural, Religious and Ethnic Challenges*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.