IDENTITY, INTEGRATION AND ASSIMILATION: FACTORS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF MIGRATION

Otto Hieronymi
Head, Program of International Relations and Migration and Refugee Studies, Webster University, Geneva

The overall conclusions of the present paper can be summed up as follows:
1. The success of migration is not only in the interest of the individual migrant, but also in the common interest;
2. Successful migration implies integration, assimilation, loyalty and good citizenship but also diversity and multiple identities;
3. Migration in a globalized world cannot be considered as a purely national matter and its success depends on international cooperation in the same liberal spirit as is claimed in the field of trade and capital movements;
4. Migration will continue to shape the world also in the future – it depends on us whether it will be in freedom and solidarity or in a world of conflict, new iron curtains and discrimination.

THE NEW INTEREST IN MIGRATION

During the last fifteen years, migration has shifted from the periphery to the center of political debate. This has been true for the national level and for the international community as a whole. This is reflected not only by the growing role of international organizations like IOM and UNHCR and the involvement of ICRC with migration issues, but also by the creation of the Global Commission on International Migration under the sponsorship of the Secretary General of the United Nations. The organizers of this conference were pleased and honored to recognize the major intellectual contribution of these four international bodies to the planning and organization of the 10th Annual Humanitarian Conference of Webster University in Geneva.

As often with major shifts in political trends and debate, there are several converging factors responsible for the higher visibility and the more intensive international attention to the issue of migration in recent years.

To the present author three factors seem to be particularly important, while knowing full well that several others have been also at work both at the general and at the regional levels: 1. the end of the Cold War, 2. the humanitarian crises of the last fifteen years, and 3. the contrast between globalization and migration.

Refugee Survey Quarterly, Vol. 24, Issue 4
DOI:10.1093/rsq/hdi095

OBSTACLES TO EXIT AND TO ENTRY – YET MIGRATION HAS SHAPED THE WORLD

It is symptomatic that there is no reference in the Charter of the United Nations to the freedom to migrate nor to the benefits of migration to the cause of peace and integration.

The last hundred years saw the freedom of migration severely restricted – both at the exit and at the entry points. Also, the dominant realist-nationalist ideology imposed a narrow interpretation on loyalty to the state. The role of migration as a bridge between nations, continents and civilizations was often replaced by a perception of migration as a threat to national identity and security. The liberalism of the 19th century had become a distant memory also in the field of migration.

Yet, migration has been one of the key factors shaping the world. Migration is coeval with human history – written and unwritten. There was no period in the past when migration would not have played an important role in some parts of the world. We could not imagine what the world would look like today if there had been no migration. In fact, migration has been one of the principal engines of change in all societies. The great "mobility" of people is often associated with the extraordinary technological revolution in the field of transportation – on land, on water and in the air – during the last two centuries.

But migration has been as important before the industrial and technological revolution, and at times even more important, than it is today. In fact, migration has always been influenced as much by political, social, economic and religious and cultural factors – "human" or "societal" factors – as by the modes of transportation or by "material" factors.

In the 20th century, which saw its share of massive movements of population, migration was often seen as a problem, the result of man-made disasters – wars or persecution – rather than an opportunity for the migrants or the host countries. Also, despite the reduction in functional distance through the transport revolution, the 20th century also saw some of the most severe obstacles to migration: on the one hand, through the severe barriers to exit erected by the totalitarian regimes, and, on the other hand, by the reluctance of other countries to open their borders to temporary or permanent immigration.

FACTORS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF MIGRATION

Migration has been one of the great constants throughout history. In all parts of the world it could be a source of success or a source of failure for the host countries and communities, for the countries or communities of origin and last but not least for the migrants themselves.

The present conference was organized on the basis of the assumption that useful lessons can be learned about the factors responsible for the success or failure or migration if one considers the issues of integration, identity and assimilation in various historical contexts.

"Migration" has multiple meanings – in particular it has different time perspectives. It means the actual move, with a relatively short time perspective – and the process of integration and even assimilation that may take a whole generation. An immigrant is someone who has just arrived – but also one who may have come a long time ago. In the short-time perspective the "immigrant" has to be distinguished from the tourists and other travelers – in the longer perspective we distinguish between the "immigrant" and the "natives". When does a native cease to be an immigrant? When does a traveler become an immigrant – or vice versa when does someone who initially was an immigrant turn out to be a tourist?

In today's globalized world, with its powerful forces of competition and convergence, of standardization and atomization of society, of increasingly open and world-scale markets for goods, services, capital and ideas and technology, with its tendency towards shortening time horizons, the question is not so much why there is migration, what are the factors inducing people to migrate, but *what are the factors of success and what are the factors of failure of migration*?

COMMUNISM, MIGRATION AND THE END OF THE COLD WAR

So much seems to have happened since 1990 that many people tend to forget the epochal importance of the end of the Cold War not only in Europe but also for the world as a whole. If one has lived through the four and a half decades of the Cold War and if one has studied closely its origins and its nature and consequences, it is difficult to understand some of the younger generation, among the "revisionist" historians or political scientists, who tend to portray the Cold War essentially or even exclusively as a conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In fact, the Cold War was as much a European affair as one that opposed the United States and the Soviet Union. It started in Europe with the imposition of communist rule and ideology on the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and it lasted because of the persistence of this rule and because of the fear of its expansion through subversion, blackmail or outright use of force to the West of the Iron Curtain – i.e. to Western Europe.

The Iron Curtain was not only the most visible physical manifestation of the division of Europe and of the world into two parts, one free, the other unfree. It was also the ruthless tool that kept the inhabitants of the communist countries from trying to leave – as tourists, as economic migrants and last but not least as refugees. It was in fact the end of the Iron Curtain – the official cutting through of the barbed wire on the Austro-Hungarian border and the tearing down a few months later of the Berlin war that heralded the end of the communist system and the end of the cold war.

Today, no one who does not understand what the Cold War was about can understand the modern theory and practice of migration. The cold war was about the quality of political, economic and social systems: politically and socially oppressive and economically inefficient and unjust regimes produce actual or potential economic emigrants and refugees. Communism qualified eminently under all these negative labels.

To introduce the three key words in the title of the present paper – "integration", "identity" and "assimilation" – the record of the communist system was disastrous on all three accounts.

Identity and migration

Identity is a relatively new tool in international relations analysis. It has been obviously an important concept in the analysis of nationalism, racism, in the so-called ethnic or religious conflicts and of the various totalitarian ideologies and systems produced by the 20th century. It is also very useful in migration analysis. At the same time, it should be clear that one has to distinguish between "identity politics" and "identity analysis".

The first one, identity politics, aims at using (and often abusing) "identity" to create political constituencies, to exclude or include groups and to pursue specific (legitimate or illegitimate) goals. As often as not, identity politics tend to be disruptive rather than constructive and tend to weaken and even explode complex societies. "Identity politics" can be a tool of oppression – and of legitimate or not legitimate revolution.

The second one, identity analysis, is more neutral: it is a tool of understanding the multiple aspects of identity of groups and individuals and their role in the process of migration and in its outcome.

Identity or changing identity can be a tool of oppression or (often through migration) a tool of liberation.

The absolute form of oppression is when individuals or groups are identified by a single – real or imaginary – aspect of their identity. This is usually combined with punishment or discrimination against given identities and in general with trying to change one's identity by force and/or to impose a common unique identity with a very rigid definition and very strict rules to respect.

Destroying the "class enemies", "creating the Socialist man and woman" were, of course, the most important features of the Bolshevik revolution and of the Soviet State created by Lenin Trockij, Stalin and their comrades. The other totalitarian regimes of the 20th century – Italian fascism and German National Socialism in particular – followed an almost identical pattern, but of course with different "enemy identities" and different "new identities".

Political refugees – and the totalitarian regimes were the greatest producers of refugees of the last 90 years – are essentially people persecuted because of their identity (real or imaginary): political, religious, racial identity or social class. This is fully recognized by the definition of a refugee in the 1951 Convention.

Also political refugees are people not only whose identity is a source of danger for them, but people who are willing to abandon the numerous ties of identity that links them to their country of origin, home, family, friends, culture, language and work and to take the risk of searching for a new identity in their host countries. The sense of being a refugee is that while you may have to give up or change certain aspects of your identity – the protection and freedom from persecution means that your identity as a human being is better recognized and you will not

be threatened for the aspects of your identity that led to your flight from your home country.

Beyond the plight or luck of refugees to flee from the totalitarian systems, one has to consider also from another perspective the issue of identity in the wake of the collapse of the communist system. In some of the former communist countries this has proven to be one of the most fateful legacies of the previous regime through the sudden and artificial revival of violent nationalism and/or of religious extremism. In a number of countries – in particular in Yugoslavia and some of the former member republics of the Soviet Union – the end of the communist regime coincided with a flare-up of nationalism, ethnic intolerance and religious fanaticism. This phenomenon was essentially the result of exploitation by ruthless political leaders (many of them former Communist bosses) of the identity vacuum left by the collapse of the artificial socialist identity.

This phenomenon – leading to great losses of human life, destruction of economic resources and infrastructure and of the very fabric of complex multiethnic societies and massive movements of forced migration (refugees as well as internally displaced people) – was an illustration not only of the shallowness of the common socialist identity, but also of the missed opportunities over the preceding decades to overcome the pre-communist prejudices and nationalist tensions that had led to two world wars in Europe. This sin of omission is particularly glaring if one thinks of the results of reconciliation and tolerance – and the acceptance of the identity of others – in Western Europe and other parts of the Western world.

Integration and disintegration

The communist regime was based on the theory and practice of destroying, of breaking down society and all inherited structures, of aiming at achieving the disintegration of all "old structures" at all levels, to proceed then to constructing a new socialist or communist society.

The reality was that the destruction was much more effective than the construction: there was no real integration that could survive without the actual or threatened use of force. Once the threat of force was lifted – as was done to his great credit by Gorbachev – the system collapsed without the intervention of any exterior force. This was illustrated by the domestic disintegration of the communist regimes and by the disintegration of its international structures (COMECON, Warsaw Pact, the whole "Socialist camp"). It was also illustrated by the disintegration of countries that had been integrated before communism (including much of the Soviet Union) such as Russia and Ukraine and the 20th century new nations of Slavic people: Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Anyone familiar with the principles and functioning of the system knew that the whole system was built on trying to control and if necessary suppress and punish any attempts at natural, organic integration of people, groups, companies, universities, etc. within the countries and between the member states of the socialist camp. There is no strength and resilience in integration created under fear and oppression – this is a lesson that in the long run all oppressors and colonial powers have to learn at their own expense.

The contrast between the artificial integration within the communist world (the fragility of which was not evident to most outside observers) and the success of the integration – domestic and international – within and among the countries of the "Western world" became increasingly evident even to the Communist leaders. This model of successful integration in the broadest sense of Western society was what impressed Gorbachev when he said that he wanted to see the end of the Cold War so that the Soviet Union could also become a "normal country".

The issue of assimilation

In the literature on migration, the term assimilation has both a positive and a negative connotation – and rightly so.

On the positive side, assimilation means that the newcomers are welcome to become full members of their host community. Their foreign origin will fade – it may remain a fond or dark memory – and will not affect their place in the community that will turn from "host community" to their "own community". This is the true sense of the "melting pot" of countries of immigration – with the United States the largest and most successful example.

Assimilation has two key dimensions: adopting the fundamental political values of the host society and adopting some of the basic common cultural components, in particular the language of the host country. Assimilation has two objectives: to serve the interests of the newcomers and to strengthen the host society.

Assimilation works best in open liberal societies. The reasons for this are quite obvious. The strength and resilience of liberal societies depends on the support of responsible citizens and on a fundamental consensus on basic principles, rather than on the iron hand of an authoritarian ruler. Also, in a liberal society it is quite easy to reconcile assimilation with diversity and to maintain many features of one's identity that are different from the other identities that can be found in the community. This diversity may include diversity of religion (religious freedom), diversity of political views (within the consensus of the community), as well as diversity of ancestry and finally the use of a second language used at home or in a smaller community or region of the country.

In the sense used here, the United States has been a liberal society for more than two hundred years – beyond the terms of the liberal-conservative debate – the upholding of the Constitution and the universal use of the English language (with greater or lesser fluency) having represented the cornerstones of assimilation at the national level, and the condition for the acquisition of the right of full participation in the affairs of the Republic.

Beyond this, America has been and remains a society characterized by a vast number of intersecting and partly overlapping circles (with most of us, naturalized or native born Americans, belonging to a variety of different "circles") rather than by uniformity, despite the tremendous power of competition and conventional wisdom. America is not, and will not be in the foreseeable future a "homogenous" society, as some of the "older" societies have claimed or still claim to be. Assimilation in America does not promise and does not threaten the newcomer to become a member of a homogeneous, one-dimensional society.

The word assimilation, however, also evokes negative reactions as mentioned above. Two examples can be mentioned here, one that can be considered historically ill-founded and the second one legitimate.

The first one has to do with the (voluntary) assimilation of foreigners, and in particular of Jews in the 19th century in Europe. In fact, the assimilation of immigrants in America was not the only example of a liberal society assimilating newcomers. The emancipation and assimilation of Jews in Central Europe – many of whom had come from Russia or from Poland under Russian rule – in Germany and Austria-Hungary during the decades preceding the Great War of 1914-1918 was an example of assimilation as an expression of the opportunities offered by a liberal society. The reason that this example is so often rejected as a proof of the success and attractiveness of assimilation is of course that under National Socialist rule (in Germany and the territories under German occupation) assimilated Jews were persecuted and exterminated as systematically as the non-assimilated ones. The persecution of the Jews was, of course, not caused by assimilation (or lack or refusal to assimilate) and was not the consequence of the liberal society, but of the fragility and breakdown of the liberal order.

What gives rightly a bad name to assimilation of immigrants and more frequently of "minorities" is forced assimilation. This means the eradication by force of differences and the imposition by force of language, culture, values, customs and world views – *"Weltanschauung"*. While instances of forced assimilation may also occur in liberal societies, totalitarian "*Gleichschaltung*" is counterproductive and as a rule leads to the rejection of what had been imposed by force. In fact, forced assimilation implies not only a "superiority" of what is being imposed (language, values, etc.) but also oppression by those who impose it. The failure of "forced assimilation" through the Russian language and culture and of a secular view of the world can be witnessed throughout the territory of the former Soviet Union – or in Kosovo through the Serbian culture and language.

THE HUMANITARIAN CRISES OF THE LAST FIFTEEN YEARS

Throughout history individuals and groups, entire nations or races were oppressed or persecuted because of some real or imaginary aspect of their identity.

The explosion and persistence of so-called "humanitarian crises" throughout the world during the last fifteen years has been probably the single most important factor responsible for the international interest in the issue of migration. These crises were the expression of political failures. As the Cold War demonstrated the failure of a regime that had to keep its citizens within its borders by force – the humanitarian crises of the last fifteen years showed the failure of political regimes that were expelling or exterminating their own fellow citizens.

These crises, where attacks on civilian populations and where the destruction of their homes, infrastructure and the basis of their livelihood were not incidental effects, "collateral damage", but the very objective of the conflict, have resulted in massive forced migration – millions of refugees and internally displaced.

These mostly "internal conflicts" were essentially centered around identity: ethnic, religious or territorial. In most cases these differences were relatively small,

hardly visible or understandable to outside observers, and certainly not justifying the kind of hatred and devastation that has been carried out under the pretext of these differences. In fact, the communities that had been torn apart through these "ethnic" conflicts had been living together for many generations.

The twentieth century – the century of all records and excesses – has also witnessed new dismal records also in this respect: wars, persecution, going all the way to genocide because of race, religion, political views or belonging to a real or imagined social class. Whether it was Jews or Tutsis, bourgeois exploiters or enemies of the State, there have been endless variations of the real or invented aspects of identity that deserved implacable hatred and eradication by the agents of the State or by righteous volunteers.

The so-called "ethnic conflicts" that spread so much suffering and destruction at the end of the millennium blurred the perception and understanding not only of the general public but also of many so-called experts who should have known better. Faced with the violence and the apparent irrationality of these largely "internal" conflicts, more and more people in the world began to accept the explanation that these murderous and criminal conflicts were somehow the logical (or even legitimate) outcome of some basic "ethnic incompatibilities". Despite all the contrary evidence furnished during the preceding eight decades by the Lenins, Stalins, Mussolinis, Hitlers, Maos and Pol Pots and their regimes, even the most liberal and rational people began to accept the thesis that so-called ethnic, racial, religious or "class" differences were the cause and not the pretext for some of the most murderous policies carried out by governments against their own fellow citizens.

"Ethnic cleansing" was not the inevitable consequence of different ethnic identities, but the objective of evil political designs.

The "ethnic cleansing" of the 1990s had as little to do with genuine "ethnic" differences, as virulent anti-Semitism, the deportation and murder of the Jews had to with genuine differences between religions.

The "kulaks" who were expropriated, deported by the millions and murdered by the thousands under Soviet Communism did not even know their "kulak" identity – most of them did not know that they were "kulaks" and that as kulaks they deserved to be treated like vermin. In fact, nor did the alleged "victims" of the kulaks, i.e. their fellow (but landless, hence progressive) peasants know much about the sinister role of the kulak in Russian agriculture until they were enlightened by political commissars from the cities with the help of "educational violence". The lesson did not fully sink in even after the famine killed millions as a result of the destruction and destitution of the backbone of Russian agriculture. In fact, Soviet agriculture and food supply never recovered from the persecution of *"kulakhood"*, as one has to wonder whether Zimbabwe's agriculture will ever recover from the "identity" drive farm policies of President Mugabe.

The link between migration and identity is the closest in the case of forced migration, in the case of refugees. Refugees are people who were deprived of the protection of their governments, who were persecuted by those who were supposed to protect them because of a particular aspect of their identity. But refugees

are also those who are willing to sacrifice aspects of their identity linking them to their country, culture, language and community of origin and willing to seek and accept a new identity in their country of asylum.

The flow of victims of the forced migration in the last fifteen years led to great movements of international solidarity, but also to perplexity and defensive reactions in the host countries.

The question was raised directly or indirectly: are these refugees true refugees? The true meaning of this legalistic and fundamentally senseless question was: are these people persecuted the right way and for the right reason, in order to qualify for the full benefits of asylum?

That they were persecuted and suffering: there was no question about it. But are they feeling individually or as a group, are they being persecuted for one dimension of their identity (i.e. their political views) or are they persecuted for their entire being of who they are?

Strangely enough the answer given to this senseless question has been that total persecution rates at best only temporary protection – no right to integrate, no right to adapt your identity to the requirements of the host country (since on the essential issue of why they were persecuted, they could not adapt their identity) and as for assimilation, the debate never reached this stage. (Avoiding this issue was made relatively easy by the perverse logic of some of the defenders of the cause of refugees, who claim that "assimilation" of refugees, and of other immigrants is contrary to their human rights.)

The solution of choice then to deal with the victims of forced migration in the last fifteen years has been voluntary repatriation – with the emphasis on repatriation, rather than on the voluntary.

No doubt, this has had to do with the large numbers of refugees, with the real or alleged difficulty to integrate them and the unwillingness of the host countries (but also of the refugees, or rather of their spokesmen) to further the adaptation of the newcomers' identity to the identity of the locals.

However, truly successful repatriation has often encountered an obstacle that is so obvious that it is often covered by cautious silence – especially but not only in the case of conflicts in Europe.

This obstacle is that most of the internal conflicts succeeded in seriously weakening and even destroying the very structure, the intricate human fabric of the societies over which the fighting took place. In many cases ethnic cleansing was successful beyond the hopes of the worst perpetrators.

Thus, repatriation of refugees is not just a question of a change of government or political regime. It is a question of reintegrating complex societies. Yet experience has shown that it is often easier to integrate newcomers into a strong, resilient society, than to reintegrate the different components of a society that had been systematically destroyed by its own people and leaders.

GLOBALIZATION, IDENTITY, SOVEREIGNTY AND MIGRATION

The third factor for the increased concern about migration that should be mentioned in this article has to do with the relations between globalization and mi-

gration. There is legitimate concern that immigration policies – to the extent that one can speak of coherent immigration policies – of them, have become less rather than more liberal in recent years.

Today, with the impressive reduction of obstacles to trade and financial flows, barriers to migration have not come down. There is a contrast between the progress of globalization and migration: i.e. between the systematic reduction of the scope of government interference with trade in goods, services, money and capital and of intellectual property and technology, on the one hand, and the largely undisputed sovereign right of government to control the entry and the residence of foreigners on their national territory and the restrictive character of most national immigration regimes, on the other hand. In an increasingly integrated world economy – labor markets seem to become internationally less rather than more integrated.

There is also a significant contrast to the multilateralism and reciprocity of trade negotiations and liberalization: immigration policy is firmly based on the interests of the potential host country, and in most cases represents unilateral, and at best bilateral policies. With the exception of the free movement (and migration) of the citizens of the European Union within the EU, there is no significant example of states delegating or reducing part of their sovereignty with respect to immigration.

There is, at the same time, widespread realization that a globalized world cannot function without successful migration.

The question is raised what are the best forms of migration – temporary or permanent, free or managed, skilled or unskilled and is what is the role of (national) identity and personal integration in a globalized world?

Two successful countries or regions of the world in terms of migration – the United States and Western Europe – seem to give different answers to these questions and seem to be changing places.

EUROPE AND AMERICA: CONTRASTS AND CONVERGENCE?

The United States and Europe for a long time represented two sharply contrasting traditions with respect to both forced and voluntary migration, and also with respect to identity and integration as well as assimilation of immigrants.

The United States – moving from the model of a country of immigration to a system of guest workers?

The United States represents the largest, the most complete and also the most successful model of a "country of immigration".

The role of immigration, the attitudes towards immigrants and the policies of immigration have evolved, but throughout its history – before and since independence – America has been a country of immigration. This has meant essentially the following:

- America, and since the late 18th century the United States, has never ceased to exert an attraction on potential immigrants;
- Americans never denied their origin as a "nation of immigrants" and even during the most restrictive periods there was a regular flow of immigrants into the country;

– While clearly America was of "European origin", America has also received large numbers of immigrants from Africa, Asia and most recently also from Latin America;
– Finally, and this is possibly the key point: the most important criterion for selecting among potential immigrants was and remains "would they qualify to become future American citizens". In the more or less recent past the number and categories of "temporary immigrants" (students, etc.) has increased. But the bulk of the legal immigrants come to become, and are considered as future American citizens.

If you do not qualify as a future citizen – you cannot become an immigrant either. This also applies to refugees. In most other countries, applying the protection of the 1951 Geneva Convention to refugees gives them a relatively privileged status compared with the situation of other foreigners. In the case of the United States granting the status of ordinary immigrants – i.e. of beneficiaries of the "green card" – puts them on the path towards full citizenship in five years, i.e. a much more favorable situation in terms of integration and identity than the one enjoyed by refugees in most other countries.

In the case of the United States temporary immigration or residence are the exception and naturalization the rule for all immigrants. Yet recently the Bush administration seems to be moving towards a system of temporary rather than permanent immigration.

Europe – from a continent of refugees and emigration to a continent of asylum and immigration

The European tradition is exactly the opposite of the United States: for five centuries, through the middle of the 20th century, Europe never ceased to be a producer of refugees and of a constant flow of emigration.

Since the second half of the 1940s, this trend underwent a sharp change – for the better – with the successful development of the new Western and European liberal political, economic and social order. *De facto* Europe became a continent of asylum and of immigration.

Yet, all European countries have been reluctant to translate into their immigration policies this profound change in political, economic and social realities. This dichotomy, the belief or the pretense that immigration is a "temporary phenomenon" and that either immigrants will leave on their own or can be sent home once they serve no useful purposes, led to the adoption of the guest worker model of temporary immigration, to the zero immigration policy since the 1970s, to the temporary protection regime in the 1990s – all factors that did not stop the inflow of foreigners but resulted in essentially two developments: the foreigners with a legal status were not integrated, which began to show its negative impact e.g. through the "lost second generation", and the large and growing population of so-called illegals, with the increasing threat of a divided society. The recurring racial riots it Britain and the revolt of the young in the high-rise ghettoes of France are an expression of this situation.

Integration, changing identity, let alone assimilation, were neither encouraged nor facilitated. In fact, the objective of the "temporary protection" policy of recent years was to prevent integration: integration would dilute the deterrent effect of the restrictive immigration and asylum policies and open a breach in the wall of fortress Europe.

The contrast is striking between the elimination of all barriers to migration for the citizens of the EU – who do not need or want to migrate – and the keeping out or down those who would want to come, integrate and even assimilate. In Europe there is still a fear of being invaded or diluted by foreigners who want to become full members of their host communities.

While in Europe traditionally a "good foreigner" was one who stayed a foreigner, sometimes through several generations in the same country and city, in the United States a "good foreigner" is the one who becomes a "full-blooded" American.

Traditionally Americans would be concerned about immigrants not changing their identity (culture, language and political values) fast enough. This is the fear expressed by the famous theoretician of the "clash of civilizations", i.e. of the fear of the different, in his latest book on "Who Are We?". In this book he raises the specter of a multilingual or at least of a bilingual America.

IDENTITY AS LIBERATION – IDENTITY AS OPPRESSION

The Annex contains a series of table-boxes summarizing the various aspects of the issue of "identity" from multiple points of views, with a main emphasis on migration. The list of factors and aspects is far from complete and there was no room to develop in the present article the full theory of "identity and migration". This has to wait for a future publication.

Two key points should be mentioned here, however. The first one is that identity is not a constant for anyone – nor is it the same or perceived the same way by everyone, members of small or large communities, groups or nations. Our identity evolves, changes under the impact of individual or collective, external or internal, personal factors. The second one is that identity can be a factor of liberation and a tool of oppression. While this has been true throughout history, the 20th century offers particularly sharp contrasts between the positive and the negative political and social use of identity. What is new today is not that identity can liberate or that identity can be used to oppress and to start wars and to murder, but that the positive and the negative trends are affecting new and different countries and groups of population.

SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN THE FUTURE: PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

Migration and its success or failure can be considered from three points of view: the host country or community, the country or community of origin and the migrant himself or herself (or migrants themselves).

Migration involves important trade-offs. What is successful from the point of view of the migrant, may not appear to be a success for the host country or the country or community of origin. Also, there is a contrast between "temporary" and "permanent" migration.

As in all analyses and debates about the success or failure of policies or actions there are different perspectives. To what extent do the interests, real or perceived, of the three main parties involved clash or converge is one of the principal questions that has to be raised by all analyses of migration movements.

The global "success" or "failure" of migration is the result of a large number of partial failures and successes. Also, what is a success for some maybe a failure for others – as the objective costs and benefits of migration are not equally distributed among all those concerned.

Success or failure, are broad concepts and no single or uniform definition can be given for them. Migration can be a success from some points of view and a failure from others. The definition of what is considered to be success or failure varies not only among the three main actors, but will also change with time or with changing circumstances:

1. Economic and social conditions – jobs, social progress – are essential factors of success, as much for the second and third generations as for the first generation of immigrants. However, resentment against the economic success (usually achieved through hard work) of the migrants or former migrants has often been a pretext for persecution, xenophobia, ethnic cleansing, etc.
2. The success or failure of migration may be due to "objective" or "material" factors, as well as to "subjective" and "voluntarist" attitudes and policies.
3. The success or failure of migration is the combined result of the conditions and policies in the host country or community and in the country or community of origin, and of actions and attitudes by the migrants themselves; there is a common interest between the host county and the migrants in the success of migration – often, but not always, shared by the country of origin;
4. There is a close connection between these conditions, policies, actions and attitudes, on the one hand, and the issues of "identity", "integration" and "assimilation", on the other hand, and finally,
5. Also the success or failure of an individual or collective migration experience is not given once and for all; while there is a recognized difference between short-term (or temporary) and long-term (or permanent) migration, and between forced (refugees) and voluntary (economic) migration, in practice there is often an overlapping or a transition from one category to another, with the three concepts "identity", "integration" and "assimilation" as a useful tool for understanding this process,

ANNEX
IDENTITY AS LIBERATION – IDENTITY AS OPPRESSION

Table 1. Identity – Levels – Types

Global
State
Nation
Region
Community
Other groups
Family
Individual
Gender, age, physical and intellectual characteristics

Table 2. Aspects of identity

Citizenship – nationality
Language
Political values and traditions
Culture
History
Social conditions
Profession
Religion
Economic conditions
Race
Ethnicity
Friends – enemies

Table 3. Origins of identity

Born with
Family
Upbringing
Education
Environment
Economic conditions
Social conditions
Imposed – chosen
Inclusion – exclusion
Sought – rejected

Table 4. Nature and use of identity and of its various aspects

Inclusion
Exclusion
Distinction – identification
Control
Rights
Duties
Oppression
Liberation

Table 5. Combination of different aspects of identity

Common
Individual
Hierarchy of various aspects
Traditional
Evolving
Radical changes
Culture
Ethnicity
Friends – enemies

Table 6. Migration as a factor of change of identity Factors or agents of change of identity

State
Education – culture
Political parties – leaders
External factors – circumstances
Time – ageing
Demagogues

Table 7. Relations between different identities and various aspects of identity Multiple identity

Acquired – born with
Acceptance – rejection of multiple identity
Inherent – interdependent
Convergent
Complementary
Incompatible
Opposing
Mutually exclusive
“Enemies”

Table 8. Responsible citizenship

Rights and duties
Freedom and responsibility
The sense of community

Table 9. Examples of the different

Citizenship
Political ideas and objectives
Interests
Culture
Religion
Economic conditions

Table 10. Dealing with the different
Accepting the different – Changing the different – Rejecting the different

Nature of the differences
Values
Institutions
Attitudes, preferences, rules, laws, policies
Source of weakness – source of strength
Consequences: ***fear***
Consequences: ***harmony***
Tolerance – intolerance
Exploiting – benefiting
Force – violence

Table 11. Integration – Assimilation

Different dimensions of integration
Economic, social, cultural, political
Concept and practice of assimilation
US melting pot – Jews in pre-1914 Europe

Table 12. Identity – Community – Citizenship – Migration

Immigration
Emigration
"Multi-ethnic societies"
Individual identity
Community as a source of support and constraints
Multiple communities
Individuals and communities
Diasporas
The concept of intersecting circles
(example USA)
Citizenship – ties to the State
Definition of the individual in terms of the State
Privilege or bondage
The right to escape or to change
Migration – whichever category or duration
Redefinition of existing community ties
New community ties
Migration: to what extent does the individual identity change?
Temporary or permanent migration

Table 13. Identity, Oppression and Rootlessness

Being identified by a single aspect of identity (e.g. race, religion, citizenship, class, etc.)
Arbitrary identification by a single aspect of identity
Oppression by State or other groups
Not sharing any important aspect of identity with others
Being deprived of significant dimensions of identity
Rootlessness and alienation
Legitimate and unjustified rejection of features of identity
Persecution
Refugees – persecuted because of real or imaginary aspects of identity

Table 14. Freedom and order

Liberal and authoritarian concept of community and identity
The value and role of freedom
The role of order
Creative tensions between freedom and order

Table 15. Values and interests

The concept of values
Different categories of values
Shared values and individual values
Individual and common interests
Hierarchy of values and interests
Preferences and the degree of freedom of choice

Table 16. The Challenge of Identity, Integration and Migration

Migration experiences and policies
Temporary migration
Guest workers
Workers and families
The second generation
Skilled or unskilled
Renewal or stability
Social mobility of the nationals
The lessons of the guest worker experience
Guest workers stayed
Second generation: the lost generation
The role of economics
Permanent migration: conscious decision or evolution

REFERENCES

Urs Von Arb: "Return and Reintegration: the Swiss Experience in Kosovo", UNHCR *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, Volume 20, Number 2, 2001, Oxford University Press, pp. 135-140

Gérald et Silvia Arlettaz: *La Suisse et les Etrangers. Immigration et Formation National: 1848-1933*. Editions Antipodes, Lausanne, 2004

European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE): *Position on the Integration of Refugees in Europe*, London 1999

Andrew Geddes: *Immigration and European Integration. Towards fortress Europe?* Manchester University Press, 2000

Global Commission on International Migration, Final Report: *Migration in An Interconnected World: New Directions for Action.* Geneva, October, 2005

Yann Golay: "La Protection Temporaire: un Provisoire Appelé à Durer?" UNHCR *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, Volume 20, Number 2, 2001, Oxford University Press, pp. 151-158

Any Gutman: *Identity in Democracy*, Princeton University Press, 2003

W.K. Hancock: *Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs. Problems of Nationality, 1918-1936*. Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1937

Otto Hieronymi and Chiara Jasson (Editors): *Europe, Refugees and International Migration*. UNHCR Refugee Survey Quarterly, Volume 20, Number 2, 2001, Oxford University Press

Otto Hieronymi : *La Crise Internationale et la Sécurité de la Suisse*, Georg Editeur, Genève, 1988

Geert Hofstede: *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind*, McGraw Hill, 1997

Samuel P. Huntington: *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. Simon & Schuster, New York, 2004

Chiara Jasson: "The Challenge of European Identity", UNHCR *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, Volume 20, Number 2, 2001, Oxford University Press, pp. 151-158

Charles King and Neil J. Melvin (Editors): *Nations Abroad. Diaspora Politics and International Relations in the Former Soviet Union*. Westview Press, 1998

Will Kymlicka: *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford University Press, 1995

Local Integration, Global Consultations on International Protection, 4th Meeting, 25 April 2002

Amin Maalouf: *Les Identités Meurtrières*, Grasset, Paris, 1998 (in English : *On Identity,* The Harvill Press, London 2000)

1905, La Séparation des Eglises et de l'Etat. Les Textes Fondateurs. Présentation de Dominique de Villepin, Collection Tempus, Editions Perrin, Paris, 2004

Alejando Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut: Immigrant America: A Portrait. 2nd Edition, California University Press, Los Angeles, 1996

Peter Riesenberg: *Citizenship in the Western Tradition*, The University of North Carolina Press, 1992

Traité Etablissant une Constitution pour l'Europe, La Documentation française, 2004

Peter J. Van Krieken: *The Consolidated Asylum and Migration Acquis*. T.M.C. Asser Press, The Hague, 2004

Vincent Viet: *La France Immigrée*. Paris, Fayard, 1998

Patrick Weil : *La France et Ses Etrangers*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 2004

Patrick Weil : *Qu'est-ce Qu'un Français*? Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 2004

Hans-Rudolf Wicker, Rosita Fibbi, Werner Haug (Editors): *Les Migrations et la Suisse: Résultats du Programme National de Recherche "Migrations et Relations Interculturelles"*, Editions Seismo, Zurich, 2004