СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ДИНАМИКА
В КОНТЕКСТЕ МИГРАЦИОННЫХ ПРОЦЕССОВ

Assimilation and voluntary integration in France and in the United States of America: A comparative analysis

G. O. Manara[1], S. Starovoitova[2], U. Sh. Yakhshiboev[3]

[1] University of Tartu,
  18, Ülikooli, Tartu, 50090, Estonia;
[2] St. Petersburg State University,
  7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation
[3] University of Glasgow,
  8QQ G12, Glasgow, Scotland, United Kingdom

This paper analyzes the ethnopolitical regimes of assimilation and voluntary integration and their theorization in the past and current scholarship. Moreover, an in-depth investigation on these regimes applied to the cases of the United States and France will be conducted on how the regimes of assimilation and integration evolved through the years. The choice of these cases is justified by the fact that the USA and France faced big migration flows, which resulted in the need to integrate all immigrants into the social systems of these countries. In addition, a comparison will be made between the two country cases. As a result, the authors came to the conclusion that some groups of migrants integrate or assimilate better than other, and this outcome could be reduced to linguistic, religious, cultural, or even phenotypical factors. France and the United States have tackled their migrants and minority issues through the years in different ways. Indeed, it is necessary to keep in mind that the dissimilar history of the case countries has influenced the developing of the assimilation or integration approaches. In the USA, it is more of a political integration, since American identity was not a fixed category, but civic nationalism was the main driver; on the other hand, we can define the French strategy as one of cultural integration, since the country already had an established political identity.

Keywords: integration, assimilation, migration, melting pot, identity, France, USA.

Theoretical Background

Since the beginning of history, every group that has migrated has had to face the host culture. This process can go in different directions in accordance to the relationship established between the natives and the migrants. Scholars of social sciences have identified various set of processes that can lean toward a more inclusive or exclusive behavior in regard both of the host and the migrant: acculturation, accommodation, adaptation, adjustment, absorption, amalgamation and fusion [1, p. 18]. These phenomena have been studied from different fields, ranging from political science to social psychology. The process of assimilation and integration varies from group to group, as well as from individual to individual, and many factors should be taken into account for an analysis when discussing the specificities of the development itself. Indeed, we could individuate the most important of these features in the country of origin of the migrant and the new state into which he or she is migrating. That being stated, it is problematic to generalize the development of assimilation and integration throughout the years.

The aim of the study is to investigate assimilation and voluntary integration in France and in the United States of America. Main objective of this study is through the analysis of literature on the question of assimilation and voluntary integration in France and the USA to make a comparative analysis of integration processes in above mentioned countries. Speaking about the value of this paper to the Russian readers, it should be noted that this article represents foreign experience of France and the USA in the implementation of assimilation and voluntary integration policies as well as determines positive and negative sides of these policies. This experience can be successfully used in conducting the Russian integration policy for immigrants.

This paper will focus on assimilation and integration; nonetheless, in order to discuss these concepts, it is necessary to analyze the notion of acculturation in connection with the two aforementioned regimes. In society there are different cultures and therefore different worldviews [2, p. 97]. According to Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits [3, p. 149], "acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups." These regimes could be classified under an umbrella term of acculturation, and while some scholarship considers them interchangeable concepts, others treat assimilation as a more extreme type of acculturation. For these scholars, acculturation is a first step to obtain cultural assimilation, but at the same time, the two process can be considered as distinct that can co-exist. Raymond Teske and Bardin Nelson [4, p. 365] give a clear distinction between the two concepts. First, assimilation is a unidirectional process, instead of a two-way process; moreover, assimilation requires a change in values, while acculturation does not require it, even if values may be acculturated and as a consequence. In addition, assimilation requires a reference group change, while acculturation does not require this to happen. Finally, assimilation requires a change in the internal dynamics of the group that is assimilated, and it requires the outgroup acceptance of the in-group.

Teske and Nelson state that assimilation is the ethnopolitical regime in force only if all the requirements are fulfilled. Indeed, it is possible to have low levels of assimilation and high levels of acculturation, and the two scholars give the African-American and the Japanese-American communities as an example. Even if their study was conducted in the

70s, this statement may be considered outdated by some [4, p. 364]. Likewise, the scholar John W. Berry seems to follow this strand of literature and opposes the merging of the two concepts of acculturation and assimilation. Moreover, acculturation can occur voluntarily and forcedly. The first case it is common in presence of immigrants while the second one in respect to refugees or indigenous people [5, p. 7–8].

At this point, it is necessary to clarify the nomenclature of the ethnopolitical regimes taken into consideration; in fact, the scholarship is divided on this point. On the one hand, assimilation and integration are considered to be the same regime, but integration is thought to represent a politically correct euphemism that was introduced in the 70s. On the other hand, they can be considered two different social communication systems. For the scholarship that believes that integration is a separate concept from assimilation, integration is considered "not as flattening process but as equal opportunity, accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance" [1, p. 20]. Berry follows this strand of literature as well and individuates three different outcomes of the plural society: assimilation, separation, and integration. According this framework, assimilation is characterized by the absence of interest of the non-dominant group in maintaining their own cultural traditions. Separation happens when the two groups, dominant and non-dominant reject any sort of interaction. Finally, integration is determined by the willingness of interaction between the dominant and non-dominant group, but without giving prevalence to one or the other cultural system [5, p. 9].

The scholar Christian Joppke looked into the matter of assimilation and integration in the framework of European policies and compared the different cases of France, the Netherlands, and Germany. In the paper, assimilation is presented with a slightly negative inflection, and Joppke discuss the shift in naming the process of assimilation or integration by recalling the political liberalism scholarship's preference in using the second term over the first one. The reason that Joppke gives for this shift is the cultural imposition connotation that assimilation bears [6, p. 3–4]. The scholar then discusses the passage from a voluntary to a coercive (civic) integration more or less in every European Union country [6, p. 9]. This statement could seem to be in contradiction with the aforementioned definition of integration given by Berry since it infringes the willingness of interaction on both sides of the dominant and non-dominant group. Joopke concludes his study by recalling the different interpretations of assimilation and integration in the three countries of his analysis [6, p. 19]. This issue seems to be present in the French case, which will be discussed further on in this paper. Berry presents another pivotal differentiation between assimilation and integration: assimilation could be considered as an individualistic process and may be more easily pursued by the migrants that phenotypically resemble the host. On the other hand, integration could be seen as a collective process since it needs the active participation of both the migrant and the host [1, p. 11].

Finally, one could say that the two concepts of assimilation and integration grew one from another and overall complemented each other. The idea of integration was supposed to implement and expand upon that of the assimilation theory while giving it a subtle different connotation, approaching the process from a more liberal standpoint.

France

Among all European countries, France still has the highest immigration flows. Every tenth resident of continental France between the ages of 18 and 50 is an immigrant. France has a long history of migration flows, and it was one of the first Western European countries that began to import foreign labor [7, p. 121]. Already in the late 19th century, there were about one million immigrant workers residing in France. They were mainly immigrants from Germany, Italy, Belgium, Spain, and Switzerland. In the early 1920s, France ranked second after the United States in terms of the volume and rate of immigration.

Compared to other Western European countries, where emigration rather than immigration processes developed, France was an exception due to its political history, features of economic development, as well as very low natural population growth. Like the United States in the first decades of the twentieth century, France focused on an influx of immigrants primarily from European countries [8]. The admission of European workers from neighboring countries was due to two important circumstances: first, the ban on mass immigration of the "colored" populations from the colonies, in particular from Africa and Asia, and second, the need to cover a demographic deficit by increasing the number of working-age population through Francophone immigrants. The problem of ethnocultural pluralization at this time did not arise in political debates or public opinion since foreigners of European origin were relatively easily assimilated into French society [9]. The cultural proximity of European immigrants contributed to the fact that they quickly succumbed to assimilation by learning French language and accepting a French self-identity. European immigration did not represent a serious threat to the national identity of the French nation. The change of identity by immigrants was greatly facilitated in France by the fact that the ethnic specificity of culture and the ethnic origin of an individual in the country are socially significant.

During the revolution of 1789, the main idea of the French nation as a state-political community was formulated [10, p. 20–21]. Ethnicity, as well as the ethnic identity of the indigenous minorities in France, was excluded from the political lexicon, and the minorities themselves were not recognized as subjects of political law and, on this basis, were eliminated from the process of building a national state and forming a nation. An assimilation policy was applied to them. The two-century history of the French "melting pot" in relation to ethnic, cultural, and regional minorities also contributed to the emergence of the French model of social immigration. France accepts solely the individual, viewed not a member of a particular ethnic group. Belonging to French society is realized through adherence to the perceived universalistic values of the Republic and is defined through a civic national identity. Thus, the idea of ethnic community and the ideology of ethnic unity, *i.e.*, all possible historical claims of ethnic groups and minorities to create their own nation were minimized. Therefore, the task of integrating quantitatively significant and culturally distinct immigrant minorities may seem practically insoluble if approached from the perspective of French Republicanism. This method of political perception of the world is characterized by a desire for universalism, in particular, a tendency to smooth out or consistently ignore the existing ethnic and cultural differences within French society.

In 1920–1930, the policy and attitude of society towards immigrants began to change significantly. First, it is necessary to emphasize that immigration during this period acquired a state-controlled nature since the number of immigrants increased in a short time

frame from 1 to 3 million people. Immigration underwent an important change, as its structure includes quite numerous groups of immigrants from North Africa, brought to France by traders; Italians remained as the sole significant European immigrant group. Influxes of people from North Africa, distinguished not only cultural but also racial characteristics, could not but cause among the French national majority a xenophobia anticipating the difficulties that the society had to overcome in the "transformation" of black population into fully "French" citizens. The main difficulty of integration was that public opinion clearly recognized the impossibility of simultaneously assimilating numerous groups of immigrants and preserving French identity [11, p. 148].

The further development of non-European immigration in the post-war years led to the fact that the ethnic structure began to change particularly, noticeably skewed toward non-Europeans. By the end of the 1960s, total immigration from North African countries exceeded the immigration flow from European states, who before this had been traditional suppliers of labor. Only in the period from 1946 to 1964, the population of France increased from 40 to 50 million people, and non-Europeans made up a significant proportion of immigrants. According to the fair comment of the German sociologist R. Hoehne, "without immigration in the 20th century, the population of France would be not 57, but 45 million people" [7, p. 121]. By the beginning of January 1975, immigrants in France constituted 7.7 percent of the total population of the country, or, in absolute numbers, 4.205 million people. In ethnic breakdown, immigration was already dominated by immigrants from Algeria, who totaled in 871 thousand people. The non-European nature of immigration was intensified by the growth of the number of Moroccans and Tunisians, 302 and 162 thousand people, respectively. The share of "colored" immigrants was thus almost a third of foreign workers [12, p. 166]. However, in reality, their numbers were significantly higher. Thus, in the early 1990s, 1.5 million immigrants from Maghrebi countries already lived on a permanent basis in France. The number of immigrants from North Africa was estimated at 3 million. Due to such a large number of immigrants, the French view the Maghreb immigrants as a threat to French culture and identity because many of them did not want to accept the culture and values of French society, vice versa, they wanted to develop their own culture. The fact is that the families of immigrants very soon in the new socio-economic and cultural conditions of the host country in terms of numbers become very close in the number of children in the families of the "national majority." However, immigrants demonstrate a higher than European average fertility model. In a broader context, one can say that they bring with them into the host society not only their culture and religion but also a special variant of demographic behavior.

It is necessary to note that immigrants who arrived to France were clearly divided into two categories. Some of them, striving for gradual integration into French society, were positively perceived by public opinion, and others, who chose a strategy of separation, were considered as a personification of the threat potential competition for social benefits and, as a result, social instability and inter-ethnic conflict. The first group of "loyal" immigrants consists of people from different countries, including Maghreb states, who are in the second or third generation changed their language and identity to French, *i.e.*, took French citizenship [13, p. 214].

Some of them are intellectual elite from North African states, and they value education. They study, as a rule, the social sciences, culture of France, and only with this country they connect their future [13, p. 214]. Thus, this category of immigrants is tolerant and

understand the attitude to the socio-psychological characteristics of French society, specifics of intercultural and interracial interaction in multi-ethnic environments [13, p. 214].

Another group of immigrants who are constantly experiencing discrimination in daily life, in public institutions, implements a strategy of intragroup mobilization and integration based on their own ethnic, religious values. The isolation of non-European immigrants is aggravated also by the fact that after contact with the French culture many of them are in a state of "cultural shock" and contribute to the development of religiosity. For them, the ethnic group and intra-group solidarity are one of the main tools to protect against the destructive effects of the external environment, upholding their social and ethnocultural rights. Moreover, one of the important consolidating elements of a groups is Islam. With the support of the religious community, one can assert one's rights and defend oneself against the assimilation pressure of the state, ethnic "dissolution" in French society [14, p. 174–175; 13, p. 212]. The most important functions of religion, therefore, consists not only in ensuring cultural identity, enhancing the mobilization potential of immigrants, but also in preserving their customs brought to French society from their homeland, lifestyle and morality. As a rule, the most radical part of immigrant population committed to Islam is made up of young people. Young people are ready to defend the future of their ethnicity and culture by force as integral but separate parts of the culture and identity of the French of society. Among the elderly people who belong to the first wave of immigration, few hold similar views. Most of those who could not integrate into French society do not accept French culture as his or her own [14, p. 174].

In the 1970s and 1980s, French intellectuals and politicians commonly asserted that assimilation should be rejected as a viable concept for immigration policies. Particularly, a concern for respecting and preserving differences has developed among left-wing French politicians, as well as in various French committees dealing with the inclusion of immigrants. In the policy consultations of such committees, concepts such as equality, solidarity, and social coherence were accompanied by extensive statements about the need to "preserve" the differences. However, large flows of immigrants in 1990s contributed to another, more assimilationist politics. French became a state where civic integration was more an "obligation" than a "right." France has moved from the initial voluntarism to a more obligatory and forced pole. The principle of civic integration, in which newcomers are asked to adopt a common standard of language and values, certainly fits in closely with the traditional "philosophy" of Republican assimilation [15]. Therefore, it is all the more surprising and personifies the former inaction of the state in the integration of immigrants, because the earliest incarnation of French civic integration appeared only in the late 1990s: the *plates-formes d'accueil* (introduction platforms), voluntary half-day instruction for certain categories of newcomers (originally only family migrants), which were introduced by the socialist Jospin government in 1998 [16]. In July 2003, the Gaullist government Raffarin launched a more ambitious program, *Contrats d'accueil et de l'integration* (CAI). It consists of one day of civics instruction, followed (when deemed necessary) by 500 hours of French language instruction. It is interesting to note that only about a third of the 150,000 expected newcomers in 2006 (the first expected year of the full work of the new policy) intended to enroll in the French language course. During the first year of CAI's existence, about 90 percent of eligible newcomers signed an integration contract, and only 65 percent of those who were assigned to the French language course followed up on this. This served as an incentive to make CAI mandatory. The track for this was in

principle set in the first *Loi Sarkozy* of November 2003, which drastically restricted access to legal permanent residence card [17, p. 59-60]. It is important to note that now family migrants (spouses and minor children) who previously had direct access to a ten-year residence card (or at least the same status as a sponsor) now receive only a temporary card for one year and only after two years could they apply for the all-important ten-year card. The next move occurred in 2006 when a new immigration law was passed. Regarding the comprehensive "law of immigration and integration," the grand purpose was to "fashion the face of France for the next 30 years," brought about a fundamental change from "unwanted" to "chosen" immigration. This implies an opening for high-skilled migrants and a parallel closing for presumably low-skilled family and asylum seekers. Moreover, Sarkozy created a new three-year (and renewable) resident card for migrants who are likely to foster "economic development" and to strengthen the "standing of France," while the entry and post-graduation stay conditions for foreign students are facilitated.

Despite the fact that the development of France as well as other states of the European Union proceeds in the direction of increasing ethno-cultural pluralism. This global process stimulates the efforts of the state authorities in the search for new models, technologies for the integration of multicultural and multi-ethnic societies. The main problem of French society can be formulated as: can French society accept the idea of a multiracial, multicultural society and what will be the consequences of this recognition for French national culture [9].

France has joined the group of those countries, which limit the family rights of citizens for the sake of more effective migration control. Non-French spouses of French citizens also, like all new entrants, have to fulfil the common "integration" requirements as set out by the new law. According to this third pillar of the new law, the CAI has been transformed from a "nice contract" into an "ardent obligation." It means that all new members over the age of 16 must enter the "integration" contract," and, having fulfilled its requirements.

The "Contract for admission and integration" (CIA) was replaced by "Republic Integration Contract" (CIR) in 2016. According to new CIR contract, in order to obtain a document on integration into French society, which is necessary for obtaining a residence permit, immigrants need to take a French course and a citizenship course. Prior to the adoption of the law in 2016, the French language course program included 500 hours of classes. The 2016 law, designed to diversify and expand the program for the integration of immigrants, in reality has reduced language courses to 200 hours. According to the opinion of Roger Karoutchi — the French senator from the "Republicans" party — the effectiveness of these courses is low. As practice shows, immigrants come to classes, do not say anything, and do not participate in anything, but they complete the necessary 500 or 200 required hours (France: what is wrong with the state program of integration of migrants). It is believed that if at the very beginning the immigrants know how to say "Bonjour" and at the end of the course speak already "Bonjour Monsieur," then this is enough. Another serious problem is the absence of any tests and exams. There is no real control over the level of knowledge of French. Thus, it is necessary to note that French authorities spend a lot of money to teach immigrants speak French. For instance, in 2016, France allocated approximately 30 million euros for the organization of French language courses. However, the results of these courses are very low (France: what is wrong with the state program of integration of migrants). Obviously, trying to integrate immigrants

through the mandatory CIR program, France spends a lot of money on maintaining the courses. However, this money for the most part is sent for nothing, since these courses do not imply a high result expressed in a particular knowledge of French.

Currently, France is now exposed as simply following the increasingly coercive European line on the immigration and integration issues. The main instrument of the integration process is still the contract, which is mandatory for signing by the immigrants. If the immigrant will fulfill all requirements stipulated in the contract, he or she can get the residence permit and live in France. The main issue in the integration process is acquiring French language skills. From this, French authorities define integration through acculturation. Moreover, the French example shows that the desire of the state ideology to "cultural unitarism" with the aim to eliminate the organized forms of the cultural and religious life of immigrants from the French reality [18, p. 500, 505]. Thus, the state level of solving the issue of immigration and its consequences for society is reduced to ignorance and non-recognition. Non-recognition as a political principle refers to the culture, language, and religion of immigrants as integral, equal parts of the culture of French society. These actions of the French state indicate that France's central cultural system retains its integrative potential, but it is already not able to cope with cultural "otherness" of a significant part of the population.

The United States of America

This chapter tries to deal with an integrationist USA within a democratic setting aiming to preserve ethnicity. Considering the fact that the state formation in the US took a unique path, the consequences regarding identity construction harkening back to the 18th and 19th centuries along the lines of settlers' social-communicative values are important to mention. Samuel Huntington's widely criticized "Who are we? Challenges to America's National Identity" contains historical narratives that can be used to understand the evolution of American identity and the way that it has been transformed over time. There is a grain of truth that American identity was built on Anglo-Protestant culture — Christian religion, Protestant values and moralism, work ethic, the English language, British traditions of Law, and the limits of government power, and a legacy of European art, literature, philosophy and music [19, p. 106–114]. In regards to this point: "…*when other Europeans came to America and were accepted as full members of its political community, American identity was defined by race: to be an American was to be white, while African Americans, and even to some extent Asian Americans, were relegated to a subordinate status*" [20, p. 107].

In this vein, it is crucial to understand that American identity has little or no connection to ethnicity, depending how we define the term "ethnicity." For instance, "American ethnicity" is an elusive concept to justify, and it may be easier to do so with various European ethnicities such as French or German. Thus, being American was strongly defined by being white, certainly, entailing ideological and racial aspects adhering to the racial preferences [21, p. 32–34]. American Indians, blacks, and later Asians were excluded from this opportunity as the Naturalization laws of different periods show. American nationality was challenged with immigration influx from different European countries, certainly not confined to Europe only. The first half of the 19th century showed how a tide of Catholic immigrants was unwelcome because the earlier settlers had already managed to think of themselves as owners of the areas they incorporated. The beginning of 20th century marks

the inception of "melting pot" approach. It is often viewed as forced assimilation strategy that faced huge difficulties to succeed.

The concept behind such trend was that immigrant communities that arrived in the US in huge numbers in the first decades of the 20th century was supposed to mingle and shape American nationality with a distinct new world identity. However, in practice, such an approach encountered difficulties because it became hard to assimilate various immigrant groups. It is important to mention the Americanization movement where the Anglo-Saxon values the country was founded upon stood opposite to cultural pluralism. Left with such competing and contrasting directions in immigration, it is obvious that the United States had to try to incorporate Americanization and Anglo-Saxon racialism into this melting pot before reaching cultural pluralism. The Second World War in turn influenced hugely to the unity of different peoples residing in the United States. Franklin D. Roosevelt's Executive Order 8802 gave chance for African Americans to occupy jobs in defense industry in 1941, and President Truman's Executive Order 9981 to end discrimination in the military in 1948 paved the way to the Civil Rights Movement that followed. Horace M. Kallen in his "Democracy Versus Melting Pot" illustrated how multiplicity goes together with democracy by bringing the unity and harmony such as in symphony containing different tonalities [22].

While touching the concept of Civil Rights Movement, it is important to mention that slavery existed in American society prior to the Civil War. Although slavery was abolished in the second half of the 19th century, racial segregation within American society persisted along the years to come. United States Census Bureau reports that Black or African-American alone accounts for 13.4 percent, the second biggest minority after people of Latino or Hispanic origin, at 18.7 percent. The percentage of white population stands at 76.6 percent, while non-Hispanic white population accounts for 60.7 percent. Asians are the smallest minority in this regard with 5.8 percent [23]. After the Second World War, the integration of racial minority was inspired through a decade long Civil Rights Movement. As a result, Jim Crow Laws became inactive from 1965. It was another attempt to bring together different ethnicities and introduce them to equal opportunities regardless of their differences. Interracial organization such as National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was functional with its activism to end segregation and discrimination in housing, education, employment, voting and transportation [24]. This association actively promoted the interest of colored peoples, namely African-Americans, through court cases focusing on national issues. One of these cases was *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* that resulted in public school desegregation ruling in 1954 as the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits states from segregating public school students based on race [25]. In 1896, the US Supreme Court advanced a preceding law case *Plessy v. Ferguson* that promoted "separate but equal" treatment of schools.

Unsurprisingly, separate schools for white and black children differed significantly. For example, black schools were underfunded and did not have those proper conditions that white schools enjoyed. Institutional discrimination was continued by separate schools in the country. After *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka,* there were actions taken by some fractions of white population to avoid enforcement of social integration in schooling. For example, many white families, in order not to participate in school desegregation, moved from urban areas to suburban ones; predominantly white private schools were another option not to take part in school desegregation [20, p. 96, 109]. Including the back-

lash, there was a considerable improvement to end institutional discrimination. Two very important events (the civil rights act and immigration law eliminating national origins as a principle of selectivity) became symbolic indications in country's reorientation to emphasize universalist principles to improve intergroup relations and create a better social order [21, p. 52]. The year 1988 became notable with high point of desegregation for black students in terms of the share of students in majority white schools [26, p. 3]. Although desegregation policy was constrained by Supreme Court decisions from 1991 to 2007, extreme isolation of white student has decreased and enrollment in public schools changed positively in terms of racial composition [26, p. 1]. Bearing in mind that the United States is a large country consisting of diverse States, situations differs from one end to the other. However, there is a striking rise in double segregation by race and poverty for African-American and Latino students in schools with less successful results with largely white and Asian student population [26, p. 1].

Throughout the whole period of American history, there have been several immigration tides that influenced enforcement of different policies to guard American identity. On the other hand, the perspective on American Indians and African-Americans gives us another angle to explore the same issue. Certainly, while talking about ethnopolitical regime type in the US, it is important to understand that the African-American minority has a different historical path if compared to the Latinos. Based on that, narratives for equal opportunities and tolerance may change from time to time. For example, if one talks about the term cultural integration, then this particular issue may be not so relevant to African-American community as they have owned their distinct culture intertwined with American life. Furthermore, cultural integration has been continuously used in American context to understand how immigrant communities have integrated into the American way of life. A research that illustrates the trajectory of cultural integration over the period between 1900 to 2007 states that, in spite of radical shifts in immigration policy, cultural assimilation has changed little over this time period meaning that modern immigrants are more integrated upon arrival than their predecessors [27]. However, according to Sheryl Cashin, segregation seems to be still an issue in American society for African-Americans and Latinos including the hurdles of integration, which she brings up in her "The Failures of Integration."

Conclusion

This paper, in the first place, investigated the concepts of assimilation and integration, and in the second place gave an overlook on the history and the development of these process in the case countries of France and the United States. The approach to these concepts is often centered on the state-level, while it would be necessary to look into different immigrant groups separately. Indeed, some groups of migrants integrate or assimilate better than other, and this outcome could be reduced to linguistic, religious, cultural, or even phenotypical factors. This issue constitutes an obstacle to a successful generalization on these types of ethnopolitical regimes. While integration or assimilation could be an incredible successful strategy with the Asian minorities in the USA, it does not render the same accomplishment with the Latino community.

France and the United States have tackled their migrants and minority issues through the years in different ways. Indeed, it is necessary to keep in mind that the dissimilar his-

tory of the case countries has influenced the developing of the assimilation or integration approaches. France, especially in the last couple of years, has intensified the supposed coerciveness in the integration of migrants. This feature seems actually to go toward a more assimilationist direction, especially if we take into consideration Berry and Joppke's definition of the two concepts. If compared to the situation in the United States, France started facing immigration waves later on and from former colonies.

Finally, the following comparative points emerged during this study. In American society, there is not an established North American ethnicity, while the belonging to the American "race" is more a phenotypical marker that can originally be traced back to the first Anglo-Saxon settlers. On the other hand, France has a specific ethnic composition made up by the Gauls. There are different conditions of integration: in the USA, there are many minorities and communities where the migrants could live and work with co-nationals while keeping alive their language, traditions and religions. In France, most migrants are from former French colonies, what distinguishes them from ethnic French is mainly religion (Islamism over Catholicism), and consequently, they could have less obstacle to integrate, especially if one takes for granted that they speak the language.

In addition, we individuated that different types of integration looked for. In the USA, it is more of a political integration, since American identity was not a fixed category, but civic nationalism was the main driver; on the other hand, we can define the French strategy as one of cultural integration, since the country already had an established political identity.

References

1. Bagley C. Immigrant Minorities in the Netherlands: Integration and Assimilation. *The International Migration Review*, 1971, vol. 5 (1), pp. 18–35.
2. Gonashvili A. S. Understanding value orientations in sociology. *Society and Economics*, 2019, no. 12, pp. 97–102. (In Russian)
3. Redfield R., Linton R., Herskovits M. Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 1936, vol. 38, pp. 149–152.
4. Raymond H. C., Teske Jr., Bardin H. Nelson. Acculturation and Assimilation: A Clarification. *American Ethnologist*, 1974, vol. 1 (2), pp. 351–367.
5. Berry J. Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology: an International Review*, 1997, vol. 46 (1), pp. 5–68.
6. Joppke C. Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 2007, vol. 30 (1), pp. 1–22.
7. Hoehne R. Crisis of integration process in France, Immigration: threat or enrichment? *Contribution to Immigration and Integration in selected countries of Western Europe and North America*. Ed. by H. Dippel. Münster; Hamburg, Lit., 1994.
8. Wende C. Antagonism and Imperative: Perspective of French and European Migration Policy. *Social Science Open Access Repository*. 1991. Available at: https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/13128 (accessed: 20.10.2019).
9. Kuropyatnik A. Immigration and National Society: France. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 2005, no. 4, pp. 137–165. (In Russian)
10. Le Bon G. *Psychology of peoples and masses*. St. Petersburg, Maket Publ., 1995.
11. Lenzen D. Multiculturalism as a monoculture. *The Stranger*. Ed. by O. Schaeffler. Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991.
12. Gebauer G., Taureck B., Ziegler T. *Hostility to foreigners is a threat to the future supplication for a culture-integrative society*. Frankfurt am Main, 1993.
13. Sraleb N. Immigration or emigration: the question of identity. *Migration and State*. Ed. by R. Leveau. Münster, Lit., 1991.
14. Leveau R. Crisis of the veil or crisis of the society? *Laicism and Multiethnizitaet in France Migration and State*. Ed. by R. Leveau, R. Werner. 1991.

15. Favell A. *Philosophies of Integration*. Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1998.

16. Joppke C. *Selecting by Origin: Ethnic Migration in the Liberal State*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2005.

17. Lochak D. 'L'intégration, alibi de la précarisation'. *Plein Droit*, 2004, pp. 59–60. Available at: http://www.gisti.org/doc/plein-droit/59-60/alibi.html (accessed: 22.10.2019).

18. Thadden R. *Development of national identity. Comparison of Germany and France. National and cultural identity. Studies on the development of collective consciousness.* 1991.

19. Holloway C. Who Are We? Samuel Huntington and the Problem of American Identity. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 2011, vol. 40 (2), pp. 106–114.

20. Clotfelter C. *After "Brown"*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2011.

21. Thernstrom S. *Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups*. Cambridge, Mass., London, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1980.

22. Kallen M. Horace. Democracy versus the Melting Pot. A study of American Nationality. *The Nation*, 1915, Feb. 25.

23. *US Census Bureau*. 2017. Available at: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045217 (accessed: 21.10.2019).

24. *Britannica, NAACP.* 2005. Available at: https://www.britannica.com/topic/National-Association-for-the-Advancement-of-Colored-People (accessed: 21.10.2019).

25. Justia Legal Resources, US Supreme Court, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483. 1954. Available at: https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/347/483/ (accessed: 20.10.2019).

26. Orfield G., Ee J., Frankenberg E., Siegel-Hawley G. Brown at 62: School Segregation by Race, Poverty and State. *UCLA: The Civil Rights Project, Proyecto Derechos Civiles*, 3, 2016. Available at: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5ds6k0rd (accessed: 22.10.2019).

27. Vigdor J. Cultural Integration in the United States. *Cultural integration of immigrants in Europe*. Ed. by Y. Algan. Studies of policy reform. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 285–300.

Authors' information:

Ginevra Orti Manara — Student; ginevra.ortimanara@gmail.com
Snezana Starovoitova — Student; snezka3703@gmail.com
Utkurjon Sh. Yakhshiboev — Student; yaxshiboyev.utkur@mail.ru

Ассимиляция и добровольная интеграция во Франции и в США: сравнительный анализ

Дж. О. Манара[1], С. Старовойтова[2], У. Ш. Яхшибоев[3]

[1] Тартуский университет,
Эстония, 50090, Тарту, Юликоли, 18
[2] Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9
[3] Университет Глазго,
Великобритания, Шотландия, Глазго, 8QQ G12

В данной статье анализируются этнополитические режимы ассимиляции и добровольной интеграции, а также их теоретизация в прошлом и настоящем. Данная работа представляет собой детальное исследование эволюции вышеупомянутых режимов применительно к США и Франции. Выбор данных кейсов объясняется тем, что Соеди-

ненные Штаты и Франция столкнулись с большими миграционными потоками. Это привело к необходимости интеграции иммигрантов в социальные системы этих государств. Кроме того, в данной статье проводится сравнительный анализ между кейсами двух стран. В результате авторы пришли к выводу, что некоторые группы иммигрантов интегрируются или ассимилируются лучше, чем другие. Это объясняется множеством различных факторов — лингвистических, религиозных, культурных или даже фенотипических. На протяжении многих лет Франция и Соединенные Штаты по-разному решали проблемы иммигрантов и национальных меньшинств, так как каждая страна обладает своей уникальной историей, которая в той или иной степени оказывает влияние на развитие ассимиляционных или интеграционных процессов. Применительно к кейсу Соединенных Штатов представляется возможным говорить о политической интеграции, так как американская идентичность не являлась фиксированной единицей, а гражданский национализм играл роль главного двигателя интеграции. Исследуя французскую модель, авторы пришли к выводу, что ее можно определить как культурную интеграцию, поскольку в стране уже была сформирована устоявшаяся политическая идентичность.

Ключевые слова: интеграция, ассимиляция, миграция, плавильный котел, идентичность, Франция, США.

К о н т а к т н а я   и н ф о р м а ц и я :

Манара Джиневра Орти — студент; ginevra.ortimanara@gmail.com
Старовойтова Снежана — студент; snezka3703@gmail.com
Яхшибоев Уткуржон Шамсиддинович — студент; yaxshiboyev.utkur@mail.ru