

UDC: 316.723-021.463:316.32]:316.4.063.3

(Review paper)

REVIEW OF POLICIES AND MODELS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF MINORITY GROUPS IN MULTICULTURAL SOCIETIES

Daniela, Koceva, Ph.D

Faculty of Educational Sciences, Goce Delcev University, Stip, Macedonia

daniela.koceva@ugd.edu.mk

Abstract: There is not a contemporary society which is not multi-ethnic and multi-cultural in its base and structure. This fact derives from the period of the old-world empires: Ancient Macedonia, the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, Russia etc. These empires were spread over large territories, some even on different continents, and lasted for centuries. Various ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic groups were part of these empires. The survival of the empires mostly depended on an established unity among the various groups. For these reasons, they had to find appropriate mechanisms for regulating the already complex multi-ethnic relations.

Contemporary multicultural societies face the same challenges: how to create coexistence among the various cultural and ethnic communities; how to create a feeling of mutual belonging in all members of the political community; how to fulfill all requests of cultural diversity; how to obtain a political unity; and how to preserve the society.

Kew words: culture, cultural diversity, cultural identity, cultural rights, multicultural societies, coexistence, political unity, social integration.

Introduction

A multicultural society is inclusive if it succeeds at the same time to be different, to acknowledge and practice these forms of diversity which are appropriately limited and aren't a threat for a social integration (Bennet, 2001: 35).

The question of multiculturalism is urgent because it has an important place in the political agendas in the contemporary democratic countries. The cultural differences, the right to be different and the need to fulfil the requests and the needs of the various ethnic communities, which are part of one legal and institutional system, are questions that go deep into the core of multiculturalism.

The modern understanding of cultural identity and cultural rights in Europe put an emphasis on multiculturalism and the affirmation of the dependency of the existing cultures. This is logically a positive political action. According to the Declaration of Multicultural Society and European Cultural Identity, this political action has three aims:

- to obtain an adequate consumption of the common cultural heritage for Europe's population and to motivate their participation in the development of that mutual culture;
- to create a social space for the individual and for all the collectives where the freedom for expression and in the lifestyle is obtained, so that the identity is released and the only limitation is the need to respect the others;

- the encouragement for actions so that there is a collaboration and a reciprocal enrichment of the various cultures.

Multiculturalism vs multiculturality

Encouraged by the complexity of the cultural phenomenon called multiculturalism, and by the need to preserve the social cohesion in the society, a question of vital interest for the survival of the country, many democratic governments have started to revise their official state policies with the aim to find the most suitable solutions for the needs and the requests of the different cultural and ethnic societies.

Speaking of multiculturalism and multiculturality, it is necessary to make a clear distinction between these two terms. The multiculturality refers to the multicultural structure of the population or i.e. the existence of various cultural groups in one political community, while the multiculturalism is chiefly a political concept that uses a certain legal frame to establish the ways and the mechanisms for acknowledgement and respect of the cultural differences, and also the realization of their cultural rights.

The term multiculturalism represents a constructed politically-ideological concept that seeks a political arrangement, and the emphasis is put on the ethnic differences. The multiculturalism does not refer to the differences and the identities themselves, but to those things that are part of the culture. It is chiefly a system of beliefs and practices in which a certain group of people sees itself and the world, and organizes its individual and collective life (Parekh, 2000: 2).

Political patterns of multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is an idea or an ideal for mutual coexistence of different ethnic and cultural groups within a pluralistic society. The basic meaning of the term multiculturalism refers to the ideology, as much as it does to the sum of cultural policies or cultural practices. The ideology of multiculturalism includes views such as the acceptance of the different ethnic groups, religions, cultural actions and linguistic differences in one pluralistic society. When it concerns the politics, the multiculturalism marks the explicit state politics that has two basic aims: 1) support of the harmonic relations among the different ethnic groups; 2) defining the relations among the state and the ethnic minorities.

There are a large number of theories about multiculturalism and about the different political types of multiculturalism. Some of the most characteristic are autonomous multiculturalism, in which the cultural groups seek equality with the dominant groups; adjusting multiculturalism, in which the dominant culture makes adjustments for the cultural minorities; and interactive multiculturalism, which seeks a common culture, instead of an autonomous life. However, starting from the fact that each country has its own specifications that are conditioned by the different ethnic communities that live within their borders, their distinctive cultural characteristics (language, culture, tradition, religion) as well as their history, it can be concluded that there is not a unified model of multiculturalism nor a unique and ideal model of the politics of multiculturalism. It has to be built in accordance to the specifications and the needs of each country. Hence, each country has to find its own model that will be in accordance to its history, tradition, culture, population structure and its historic origin of the present ethnic communities (autochthonous, aboriginal, immigrant or colonial character).

As a model of state politics defined through clearly established legal regulation, multiculturalism first appears in Canada in 1971, then in Australia in 1982 and finally in the USA.

The questions concerning the multicultural circumstances in a society that many theoreticians and politicians have tried to answer are the following:

- how to find the right balance among the basic principles of the multiculturalism, and not to ruin the political unity of the community;
- how to maintain the cultural identity of various communities and simultaneously develop and maintain the feeling of mutual belonging;
- how to act inclusively and avoid assimilation;
- how to find the balance between the unity and the diversity.

One of the possible solutions for these complex, and at the same time tenuous, questions is to make a distinction between the public and the private sphere. The main institutions that constitute the public sphere are law, politics and economy. On the other hand, the private sphere constitutes of: moral education, primary socialization and adoption of religious beliefs among others. Many domains such as family, morality, religion and especially education are difficult to divide on a private and public sphere.

According to Rex, by making a clear distinction between the public and the private sphere you obtain four possible models of multiculturalism as a politic template:

1. A society can be unitary in the public sphere and simultaneously encourage the diversity of the private and municipal work;
2. A society can be unitary in the public sphere and to simultaneously encourage unity in private cultural practices and municipal work;
3. A society can allow diversity and differential rights for the groups in the public sphere, and it can also encourage or insist on diversity of the cultural practices of the different groups;
4. A society can allow diversity and differential rights for the groups in the public sphere, although there is a notable unity of the cultural practices of the groups (Atanasov, 2003:50).

It should be emphasized that, regardless of the model chosen from the four possible ones as basis for creating the political template of multiculturalism, the cultural communities in each model have freedom in the private sphere, but they have to accept the political culture of the wider society. These groups can ask the political society to give them the appropriate public affirmation in a collective sense of their identity. This affirmation will give them the status of a valued member of the community and it will help their integration (Parekh, 2000: 201 - 4).

The politics towards the immigrants

Immigration has become a reality around the world. The problem with the new immigrants is how to integrate them into communities where the dominant population is different regarding its culture and religion. The European economy starts to resemble more and more the American economy in its structure and its demand, because immigration created the need for a secondary sector on the labour market. From this aspect, it can be said that immigration builds a new world. It is not only European society that is divided, but throughout the world there are “the others” who have come with different religion and nationality and “us” that are the natives with different understanding of the world and different traditions. When there is this kind of division, people automatically connect through the religious tradition and all layers of their identity depends solely on their tradition. That is a “secular” identity that separates the European elite from the common people concerning the geographical borders for defining the domestic cultural identity of the EU in the constitutional process. The problematic debates during the potential integration of Muslim Turkey into the EU was the failure to

integrate the second and the third generation of Muslim immigrants into Europe, and many other problems that cause that the Islamic immigrants are seen as the “others” in the modern, liberal, secular West.

Since 1960, the growth of immigrant communities in Europe, Australia, the USA and Canada was followed by the appearance of different politics or public pressure that seemed to require the assimilation of the immigrants or the ethnic minorities. This assimilation was supposed to be a process of dismissing the traditional values and habits and to adopt the values and the way of life of the majority in the society. In different countries and in different contexts, this dismissal was pondered by many politicians, academics and supporters of citizen rights and movements. The dismissal of assimilation was the first topic on the newly created immigrant and ethnic movements and organizations. This was especially true in the 1970s when families searched for long-term solutions through unions and other strategies. In the meantime, the authorities made some frames through which the immigrant organizations should be consulted. From 1960 to 19970 the public discourse in the immigrant societies pointed to the ideas of tolerance, representation, participation, group and cultural rights of the minorities, including the freedom to gather, speak in their language and be hired in other cultural institutions. The promotional campaigns for such ideas within the ruling and the public consciousness started to be described as “an identity politics” or “politics of acknowledgement”, which is considered by many supporters as an essential counterpart of antiracism and anti-discrimination. Since the 1980s many of these problems concerning the immigrants (which are the ethnic minorities in many countries) and the increased cultural, language and religious diversity have brought multiculturalism to many societies.

As an answer to the fears concerning safety entailed by the separatism, which is an inseparable part of multiculturalism, were the extra efforts of the authorities in many countries for the integration and even for the total assimilation of the minorities. The best way to achieve this is by giving them citizenship. Each country allows their foreign residents to get citizenship by fulfilling various conditions and through various processes. Every country has its own criteria for giving citizenship, and these criteria are a confusing and changeable combination of different requests for place of birth, place of residence, language exams and temporary residence.¹

Politicians around the world are introducing measures which are believed to improve the integration of the immigrants, while the critics see these attempts as symbolic. Some countries take this problem more seriously than others, and implement the articles from The Racial Equality Directive of EU (2000) for establishing a system which will sanction racial and the ethnic discrimination. However, this does not mean that there are not any problems in the countries that have a system. For example, in France, employers continuously ignore or reject the job applications that contain Arab names or addresses from “bad” neighbourhoods.

After six years of negotiations with some interruptions, the framework agreement was signed by the ministers of justice in twenty-seven member-states which obliges them give judgements of 1-3 years for each direct act of violence or hatred towards the individuals defined by: color, race, religion, origin, nationality or ethnicity.

All over Europe there are various political decisions on how to adjust (or not) the cultural and the religious needs and interests of the immigrants and the ethnic minorities. These politics vary among different European countries, but also differ among the national borders of many regions.

¹ For example, from March 2006 all foreign applicants for long-term residence in Holland have had to pass the exam for the language and the exam for the structure of the society, except if they are citizens of another EU country. It is similar in France, Germany and the UK.

The studies done in Europe have shown that the institutional acknowledgement of the religious minorities and the official inclusion of the religious organizations in the negotiation about the differences has a positive influence over the integration processes (Sunier, 1999; Heitmeyer et al., 1997; Penninx, 2000). These studies have shown that the countries with an official policy concerning the ethnic minorities such as Holland, where the Islamic and other immigrant organizations are accepted as potential partners in the integration politics, have positive attitude towards the Muslims and their integration. On the contrary, in some countries as in Germany, there are less institutionalised initiatives for the inclusion of the immigrants, and attitudes are mostly internally-oriented (Penninx & Martiniello, 2004).

The increasing religious diversity and the threat for religiously political fundamentalism have created serious problems for the countries and represent serious challenge for political theory. The American political liberalism dominated at the debates and is characterised by limitations on the religious arguments in a public debate, secular interpretation of the liberally-democratic Constitutions and strictly separated interpretations on the relations among the organised religions in the country. Postmodern critics and the traditional religious organisations and leaders deny these solutions. It is believed that the mythical strict division should be rejected and research into different types of democratic institutional pluralism, especially the associative democracy should be encouraged.

The superiority of the associative democracy compared to the other models is that it acknowledges the religious diversity individually and organised; simulates a legitimate religious diversity; hinders hidden plurality and one-sidedness; obtains a legitimate role for organised religions when acquiring a wide spectre of services, including the education from one side and the political process on the other side. The organised religions should be informed, heard and consulted for problematic questions and to be the key component of the democratic participation. This could also help for preventing the development of religious fundamentalism. The most emphasized and consistent questions are if the rights of the minorities should be acknowledged in politics and how that should be done, and also how to keep the connections of the community in the different ethnic societies. The increased diversity of the national communities generates pressure to establish new moral forms for placement of the social cohesion and diversity. The countries are more and more certain that this is not enough to obtain "equality" for the ethnic, language and religious minorities that live in their own borders and also that the minorities have the right to different measures directed toward the improvement of their culture, language and religion.

It was relatively easy to come to a general agreement for prevention and sanction of genocide, as well as an elimination of the racial discrimination for the things that there are more important and widely ratified instruments. However, it was much harder to persuade those who still manifest the stance that the beliefs of the minorities are subversive and dangerous for the country's integrity, and that the rights of the minorities and the diversity should be on a second place in the list of imperatives for country's safety and unity.

It is a fact that the multicultural countries do not have final resolutions for the ethnic conflicts that became highly prevailing lately. However, it is always important to find legitimate democratic procedures that will be acceptable for most of the population.

One of the dominating theories with academic debates in the last decades, which is concerned with studying the most suitable institutions for building the peace and the democratic transitions in the highly separated societies, is the theory of consociationalism. The supporters of this theory claim that the agreements for transcendence of the eventual inner conflicts in the multi-ethnic or multi-cultural countries can be easily achieved, if the interests of the ethnic, religious and racial communities are acknowledged by formal institutions of authority divisions

and the autonomy of the groups. The group autonomy here means having an authorization to manage their internal affairs, especially in the fields of education and culture.²

At the end of the 20th century Ronald Watts compared around 180 countries around the world from which around 23 were federations and 21 were decentralised unions. Some of the most populated countries are federations (such as India, USA, Russia, Indonesia, Canada, Germany, Nigeria) and it can be concluded that approximately 40% of the world population lives under this kind of ruling.

The decentralised unions are countries that have independent authorities in some constitutional units, but the ruling is made through common institutions of the central government, instead of double structures (as in the UK, China and Ukraine).

The theory of consociationalism emphasizes the federal system or i.e. the territorial division of the authorities, and its importance for the group autonomy in the plural societies where the ethno linguistic or the ethno religious communities are geographically concentrated and where the administrative borders for the politic units are withdrawn so that they reflect the distribution of the ethnic population. Lijphart recommends relatively small constitutional units for the federal countries, so that the federal units coincide as much as it's possible with the ethnic borders. The federations and the decentralised unions explicitly enable the space concentrated communities a free conduct of their work and a protection of their rights, especially in education and the cultural and linguistic politics.

2 According to the consocial theory, these heterogeneous societies need a consensus instead of a restless opposition, inclusion instead of exclusion, maximized ruling majority instead of simple majority. This system creates the members from all of the important players and makes them leave the official agreements or constitutional arrangements. In order to keep their positions in the Government, the leaders of the communities should promote the pacification among the various communities in the next phase of the process, and also to encourage the acceptance of the agreement. It is presupposed that these arrangements will help the religious, linguistic or national communities to feel heard and that the rules of the game are fair and legitimate.

The institutionalized arrangement that emphasizes the need for a common decision making of the ethnic communities is a sign to leave the model of a classic nation-state where the key meaning is the domination of one ethnic group, at least in the central institutions of the state. However, the concept of joined conduction of the ethnic communities also excludes the civil society that doesn't give an advantage to any other ethnicity. So the notes from some people who have experienced the functioning of this theory and that their human rights have been reduced to ethnic rights should be taken into consideration. The consocial model can be recognized in practice when there is a coalition of the ethnic parties in the government (with or without a proportional formula according to which the different groups need to be included in the government), when there is an allocation of the ministry's portfolios based on an explicit recognition of the main ethnic, religious or linguistic groups (somewhere exist a condition that every ministry has to have a deputy-minister), the presidency constituted by a committee of representatives of each nationality with rotating leadership or a division into the functions of the president, the prime minister and the speaker's function of different nationalities.

In those places where the communities (Ethnic, linguistic, religious groups) are geographically concentrated, the territorial autonomy might have different forms – to give authority and responsibility to the education, the taxes or the home safety divided among different levels of national and subnational units of authority.

Actually that frequency only gives a false pluralism, while the dominant people hold the politic process under their control. Also in a system without strong legal guarantee for the minority rights, the representatives of each separate community need to constantly negotiate those rights. The ethnic questions easily mobilize the election body, and sometimes there are additional measures for the acquirement of the influence so that is its positive for the parties to expand more in the sphere of the ethnic questions. This leads to ethnification of the political process that spans far over the borders of the close interests of the ethnic communities. At the same time, the protection of the communities through the political representation isn't positive for the smaller groups that aren't able to insist on their requests due to their small number and weaker politic mobilization. This is the case with the minorities from the three constitutive peoples of Bosnia, but also with the smaller communities in Macedonia that are often excluded from any kind of political negotiations.

The consociational model was always followed by controversy. It is true that there are cases when the countries divide the power of the authorities in order to decrease the conflicts among the communities and to create a long-term agreement, political stability and conditions that will enable the development of the good ruling. However, as the critics claim, those practices strengthen the group borders, heat up the latent identities and enable only a temporary pause from the conflicts among the communities, and consequently the democratic consolidation isn't made easier.

It is possible that in a long-term these institutions will create an unwanted effects over the good ruling, including the potential dangers of political paralysis or insufficient report towards the authorities.³

There is no doubt that the federation with a dominant culture, such as the USA, Australia and Germany, have faced less difficulties during their development. However the durability of the federations in Switzerland and Canada (over one century) or in India (over half a century) suggest that the multi-ethnic federations can be sustained under certain circumstances. The arguments against the multi-ethnic federalism are similar to the arguments against the division of the authorities that was explained previously with the consocial model and are derived from the process of establishing close relations among the ethno-nation, the territory and the politic power and with that strengthening the differences and limiting the identities. The possible consequences can be limitation of the mutual activities and prevention of the collaboration among the communities because of the absence of common identity, political plans and economic activities. Also by giving the institutional resources and the leader positions to the minorities, we leave them more room for pressure directed toward gaining independence. The ethno federalism can weaken the central authorities that will encourage the local leaders to enhance their power by engaging in the ethnic competition. Also it can urge the leaders that speak for the majority to use violence towards the minorities and to stop the democratic experiment. This was the case with the Ex-Socialistic Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. Valerie Bans beliefs that the examples of the post-communist countries, as well as the communist countries before them, show that the ethno federalism is not recommendable in a multi-ethnic context that characterizes the transition from dictatorship to democracy.

During the process of the collapse of the domineering ruling, the ethno federalism had generally negative effect over the multi-ethnic relations, the continuity of the state borders and the introduction of democracy. On the other hand, the conflicts in the unitary countries, derived from the post-communist countries, stopped when the rebels were given autonomy with some ethno federal characteristics. This was the case with Moldova and Ukraine. The probability for this kind of development in Macedonia, from the independence until today, has always been one of the questions in serious debates with equal number of valid for and against arguments.

Integration in multiethnic societies

The integration in the multi-ethnic societies is a process which includes the promotion of the human rights and the basic freedoms of the individual, as well as the acquirement of equal representation of all ethnic communities in the political, economic, social and cultural sphere that can lead to a peaceful coexistence of different cultural identities in one country. On

3 As one of the worst examples of using the consocial model is Lebanon, where the National pact in 1943 divided the authority among the religious communities. This system showed its weakness in 1975 when it erupted into a civil war. Other more important cases of failure include the consocial model in Cyprus before the civil war in 1973 and the later division between the Greek and the Turkish community. Also a potential unsuccessful model is the consocial arrangement for division of the authorities according to the ethnicity in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the Dayton agreement. The Czechoslovakia Republic has also experimented shortly with these arrangements between 1989 and 1993, before it was divided into Czech Republic and Slovakia.

the other hand, all members of the cultural and ethnic communities have to develop the sense of belonging and loyalty to the state as one of the basic preconditions for the establishment of unity and coexistence among the different groups. The social cohesion and the integration of the society, especially of those with a multicultural and multi-ethnic sign, mean achieving a high degree of stability and safety in the state and the region. The contemporary state represents a special political community of unified citizens regardless of their ethnic, cultural, religious or other type of belonging (Cvetanova, 2007:66-67). The differences among the cultures aren't causes of a conflict, because the emphasis should be put on the similarities and not on the differences (Petkovska in Cvetanova, 2007: 66-67). The process of social integration is additionally burdened in the multicultural and multi-ethnic societies due to the population structure and their different culture and ethnic communities, which contain different value systems and different norms for social behaviour. In that direction is also the definition for the social integration in the multicultural environments, where it is explained as a process in which the different elements are combined in certain unity by preserving their basic identity. The aim of this complex process is to strengthen the social cohesion and the integration of the members of the special groups in the society, and at the same time preserving their identity. These two seemingly contradictory processes can be synthesized if there is a climate of tolerance and intercultural dialogue (Dimitrov in Cvetanova, 2007:69).

One multi-ethnic society cannot be stable and long-term without the development of a mutual feeling of belonging among the citizens. The feeling of belonging can't be ethnic or based on certain cultural, ethnic, religious or other characteristics, because the multi-ethnic society is too diverse, too political in its nature and based on a certain natural devotion to the politic community. The contrary could be achieved only if they belong to the same political community or if that community accepts them as something that belongs to it (Pareh, 2000:341).

The process of social integration doesn't suggest only the affirmation of the rights of the communities, but also their obligations towards the state, the respect for the national legislature and the acceptance of the already established social norms of behaviour.

The basic and most important obligation for the members of the ethnic minorities is the loyalty towards the state in which they live. The state is obligated to eliminate the divisions among the first-class and second-class citizens, and it mustn't consider the rights of the minorities as a gift that is generously gifted to the members of the minority. On the other hand, the members of the minority need to respect the territorial integrity and the national sovereignty of the state where they live, and to respect the national legislature and the rights of the other citizens that are confirmed in the international documents: "Each member of a national minority will respect the legislature and the rights of the others, especially of the members of the majority and the other national minorities"⁴. The obligation to respect the rights of the others is especially present in those situations where the minority is part of the majority on a national plan in a certain area in the country. This obligation protects the members of the majority and the other minorities settled in that area from any kind of discrimination.

Although the multiculturalism – as an ideology and explicit state policy – implies the integration of the members of the minorities in the wider social system through the acquirement of an equal approach toward the public goods and an equal distribution of the rights, and it is as fair as to obtain equal social possibilities of expression, communication, status and success for all the cultural groups or to all people. This refers especially to those that have suffered some kind of institutional discrimination or repression in the past. The equal possibilities don't mean same privileges regardless of their skills. The state and the government institutions in the

4 Article 20 from the Frame Convention for protection of the national minorities from the European Council

multicultural model of politics have the leading role in the formation of the politics and its implementation. The successful conducting of this process depends not only on their willingness, but also on the degree of consciousness of those political subjects regarding the complexity and the needed attention of the question of multiculturalism.

It has been already mentioned that the globalization process, the fast politic, social and economic changes, the unequal approach toward the public goods and the unequal distribution of the labour can be the reasons for certain frustrations and unsatisfactions. The usual reaction to that unsatisfaction is relying on the ethnic identity that is a way through which the individual sees a tool for the realization of some aims whether they are political, economic, social or cultural. In these cases, and especially in the multi-ethnic societies, the result is fragmentation or ethnicization of the political tissue.

On the surface of the multi-ethnic societies appear problems that don't have a parallel in history. They should find ways to fulfil the legitimate claims for unity and diversity, to achieve politic unity without cultural uniformity, to be inclusive but not assimilatory, to maintain the feeling of belonging and simultaneously to respect their legitimate cultural differences, to value the plural cultural identities, but not to weaken the valuable identity of mutual citizenship (*Parekh, 2000: 343*).

In his thoughts about multiculturalism, Parek noted that it is a difficult political task and that none of the multicultural societies has succeeded to deal with it (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Canada, Sudan, Nigeria, USA, Great Britain and France). However, he believes that although it is difficult to conduct a multi-ethnic society, it doesn't have to become a political nightmare. Actually, it could be a real challenge if we reject our traditional obsession with cultural homogeny and the limited ruling system, and to enable their realization through appropriate institutional forms, conducting models, moral and political virtues.

It was concluded on the meeting of the Ford foundation, which was organized with the aim to answer the question of the cultural development in the context of the world instability and unsafety that derive from the process of globalization, that the cultural diversity, the multiculturalism and the dialogue to other cultures in the beginning of the 21st century have to be accepted by every country as its own basic development context. This means an affirmation and a promotion of the different cultural and social groups on an internal level, while the cultural models, that enable the preservation of the cultural differences during the uniformity of the globalization, will be developed on an international level.

Integration policies for minority groups

In contemporary Europe, the new minority groups that come from the migration process are mostly with non-European origin and there is much singularity and difference regarding their culture, language and especially their religious beliefs.

The accommodation, the diversity and the cohesion in the contemporary society is much more problematic and uncertain nowadays than it was a few decades ago, when the conducting of the multicultural policies was made easier by the optimistic attitude toward diversity. Until now, we can confirm different integration models for the minorities such as the following:

1. Repressive, nationalistic or model for exclusion of the minorities and the migrants;
2. Assimilation model that can have two variants, radical or interactional;
3. Multicultural model, also called pluralistic or intercultural.

Europe faces much more complex dilemmas, than the ones of the traditional immigrant countries – Canada, Australia, USA, in the period between 1970 and 1980 when they adopted the multicultural policies. In the states of America where the immigrant groups had European descendants, and even those they came from the rural and economically digressed parts of Europe were able to integrated, because their European roots made them culturally similar to

the existing basic groups which were mostly from some northern and western European countries.

Some people believe that due to the critics of multiculturalism, such as the cultural relativism, it should face “graceful retirement”⁵. In many European countries, the diversity frame is placed further from the integration policies of multiculturalism. This isn’t only a terminological change, but it also has theoretical and practical consequences.

The integration model in this paper that might be the most suitable for our multicultural society (that is why I will explain this model) is a variation of the pluralistically-multicultural model or the post multiculturalism. This model – for the human rights and the integration of the minorities or the “tree model” – is based on the supposition that on one hand, the affirmation, the protection and the promotion of the minorities are elements of the Constitution of one country and constitute the basic values, while on the other hand, the minority and the majority expect to share some basic universal principles in the private and the public spheres such as: human rights, democracy, ruling of the law, equality of the sexes and rights of the minorities. These essential values constitute the basis of a stable and prosperous society and the standards against the minorities are acknowledged and promoted. This is why this model encourages that the members share the mutual values which will help them create the needed solidarity and feeling of belonging. This integrative model aims to create a stable community not by emphasising the differences between the individuals and the groups, but conducting and emphasising the core of the widely accepted values.

The “tree model” represents a continuous dialogue between the minority and the majority groups that are present in the society: in the model, the roots symbolise the different groups in the society, while the green branches symbolise the result of the society in which the different groups harmoniously coexist in unity and diversity. The crown of the tree – in a diverse, but integrated society – represents a catalogue of the human rights that all of the European countries are obliged to respect, and it represents a “filter” through which pass all the minority claims, practices or traditions that are compatible with the standards for the human rights and which will be applied and affirmed in the society.

This model has two strong elements:

- a) The acknowledgement of the diversity or the acknowledgement of a religious, ethnic, linguistic and cultural identity and groups that identify with it through the increase of the usage of certain articles that are typical for protecting the historic minorities as those from the European Council, The Frame Convention for national minorities, all minorities and including the new minorities that result from the migration;
- b) The perseverance of unity and cohesion through protecting the core of the mutual values based on the universal human rights.⁶

According to this model, only those minorities that are devoted to the standard human rights and the rights of the minorities will be acknowledged as valuable for creating a stable and peaceful community. The two elements of the “tree model” – the human rights and the rights of the minorities – represent a legal frame that will possibly be used in creating the base of the ‘tree model’ for the integration of the minorities, which will consist of various concrete and many common principles. Besides, this framework consists of the rights and the freedoms, and also of the limitations and in that way obtains a warranty that the pretensions of the minorities won’t go over the limitations.

5 Trevor Phillips (Chairman, Commission for Racial Equality UK), Presentation at the Multicultural Futures Conference, Monash Centre, Prato, 22-23 September 2004.

6 Art. I-2 of the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe lists among the founding values of the European Union ‘human rights’ including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.

The model for the integration of the minorities, suggested in this paper – the so called “tree model” – is based on the belief that the minority groups (new or old) have some basic mutual requests such as: the right to exist, an equal treatment and non-discrimination, perseverance and development of the identity, an effective participation in the public life and the maintenance of an identity. As a result of this suggestion, the general definition for the minorities includes the historic minorities and the new minorities that derive from the migration. In this definition, the citizenship, that is usually needed in order to limit the personal area for the usage of the many international instruments for the minorities, is replaced with place of residence or legal residence.

The identity and the diversity of the minorities are important tools in the integration process, so that through their acknowledgement and protection might develop the feelings of loyalty and common belonging, without being endangered by the assimilation.

“The tree model” is an integration model that, according to the wider definition of multiculturalism, has a wide spectre of interaction forms in the societies that contain different cultures. Consequently, this model strictly stands for respect and devotion to the group of basic principles contained in the European instruments for the human rights such as the European convention of human rights and precedent law, and also for the amplification of the usage of old and new minorities for the protection of the minorities that are contained in the Frame convention. The new European statutory agreement uses a set of principles that are essential for the creation of a cohesive society, because the absence of common minimum of basic values for the community cause the inability to make the formulation for solving the differences and to convey the common aims.

Conclusion:

However, this legal frame and the incorporation of the tree in our country, or the “tree model” for integration of the minorities has to be filled with other measures as well, which will help the development of the feeling of belonging, the loyalty and the trust that are essential for having an effective integration of minority groups, and simultaneously respecting their identities during the acquirement of cohesion and stability of the wider society. In other words, the “tree model” represents the basis of one process, a long-term dialogue between the majority and the minority groups: established limitations and stages, so that the majority doesn’t ruin the minorities and their important requests. At the same time, this frame is relatively new and it is supported by series of measures and policies, with the aim to make the integration of the minorities easier and to enable them keep their identities, such as financing the associations of the minorities, language, scholarship, citizen orientation, professionalism on the labour market, the right to vote, urban renovation...

Although the “tree model” is shown as more appropriate for creating cohesion, it can’t be taken as a detailed model for all of the societies. Each society has to start by choosing a model that best suits its history, traditions, self-understanding, moral and cultural resources, level of economic and politic development, nature, number and requests of the minorities, as well as the cohesion level among the main actors in the country, from individuals to politic parties, from society with national authorities to a society with local authorities. The “tree model” with its combination of human rights and minority rights, and with the addition of the common and the special integrative measures, it can represent as Libniz said: “the best of all the possible worlds” or i.e. the best of all the possible minority integration models in Europe. However the “tree model” for integration doesn’t lack difficulties. It is based on the vision for a society in which the different communities communicate with each other in the spirit of equality and openness, and create one tolerant society. The process is difficult for the parties as well. The minorities need to learn how to negotiate in one often unknown or even hostile

environment, where their minority status made them vulnerable to marginalization and segregation. The majority group on the other hand, has to deal with the diversity in the schools, the work places, the public places and the settlements, and it needs to show tolerance. In the heart of every successful model is an honest readiness of both sides – the minority and the majority – for a long-term interaction, mutual adjustment and functioning.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alba, Richard, & Nee, Victor (2003) *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [2] Атанасов, П., (2003), *Мултикултурализмот како теорија, политика и практика*, Скопје: Евробалкан Прес.
- [3] Article 20 from the Frame Convention for protection of the national minorities from the European Council.
- [4] Art. I-2 of the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe lists among the founding values of the European Union 'human rights' including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.
- [5] Bean, Frank, & Stevens, Gillian (2003), *America`s Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*, New York: Russell Sage.
- [6] Bennet, J., (2001), *The Enchantment of modern life*, UK: Princeton University Press.
- [7] Brah, A., (1999), *Global Futures: Migration, Environment and Globalization*, Houndmills: Macmillan.
- [8] Цветанова Г., (2007), *Културните разлики и општествената интеграција: Македонија пред и по Рамковниот договор*, Охрид: Институт за економски стратегии и меѓународни односи.
- [9] Parekh (2000), *The future of multi-ethnic Britain*, the Parekh report, London: Profile books.
- [10] Бејл, Т., (2009), *Европска политика: компаративен вовед*, Скопје: Академски печат.
- [11] Kymlicka, Will and Sapiro, Ian, (1997), *Ethnicity and Group Rights*, N.Y. University Press.
- [12] Latin D., (2002), *Culture and National Identity: The East and European integration*, West European Politics 25, no.2.
- [13] Heitmeyer, W., J. Müller, and J. Schröder. 1997. Verlockender Fundamentalismus: Türkische Jugendliche in Deutschland. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- [14] Penninx, R. 2000. "Het Dramatische Misverstand," in Bij Nader Inzien: Het Integratiebat op Afstand Bekeken. Edited by J. E. Overdijk-Francis and H. M. A. G. Smeets, pp. 27-49. Bohn: Infoplus Minderheden, Stafreus and Van Loghum/Koninklijke Vermande, Houten/Lelystad. Penninx, R., K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, and S. Vertovec. Editors. 2004a.
- [15] Penninx, R. and M. Martiniello. 2004. "Integration Processes and Policies: State of the Art and Lessons," in Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies. Edited by R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, and S. Vertovec, pp. 170. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- [16] Sunier, T. 1999. "Niederländisch-Islamische Staatsbürgerschaft? Ansichten über Islam, Bürgerschaft und Bürgerrechte unter Türkischen Jugendlichen in den Niederlanden," in Der Fundamentalismusverdacht: Plädoyer für eine Neuorientierung der Forschung im Umgang mit Allochtonen Jugendlichen. Edited by W. D. Bukow and M. Ottersbach, pp. 85-97. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- [17] Trevor Phillips (Chairman, Commission for Racial Equality UK), Presentation at the Multicultural Futures Conference, Monash Centre, Prato, 22-23 September 2004.