

IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN EUROPE: Empirical Research

Terri E. Givens

Department of Government, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712;
email: tgivens@mail.utexas.edu

Key Words racism, discrimination, citizenship, multiculturalism

■ **Abstract** Most European countries are examining how they have sought to integrate immigrants in the past and how they might change their policies to avoid some of the problems exhibited in immigrant and minority communities today. Discrimination and issues of racism, including the rise of anti-immigrant radical right parties, have become important, as evidenced in part by the passage of the European Union's Racial Equality Directive in 2000. This essay reviews comparative research in political science on immigrant integration in Western Europe. It discusses multiculturalism and assimilation, party politics, antidiscrimination policy, and policy at the European Union level.

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of World War II, millions of immigrants from developing countries have settled in Western Europe. Immigration and issues related to the integration of those settlers have become highly salient political issues in Europe over the past two decades. During the postwar recovery, many European countries began to import temporary labor. These workers initially came from Southern Europe and later from former colonies and other developing countries. With the economic slowdown of the early 1970s, most European countries stopped importing labor. However, many of the temporary workers settled permanently, and owing to family reunification and asylum policies, large flows of immigrants and asylum seekers continued to enter Europe. The settlement of these populations, many from Muslim backgrounds, has led to the development of a variety of policies related to immigrant integration. Not all policies are specifically designed to address integration, but policies related to welfare, labor markets, and cultural policies, in combination with citizenship laws, have created at least the appearance of a set of European policy approaches to immigrant integration.

Policy makers began to reassess integration policies in the 1990s, in particular revisiting policies identified as "multiculturalism" and re-emphasizing "assimilation." This has meant an increase in emphasis on policies related to language

acquisition and on courses designed to teach the civic values and culture of the country of settlement, and a decrease in emphasis on accommodation of difference. A series of events since 2001 have pushed policy makers to more fully reconsider existing policies. The 9/11 terror attacks, the Madrid and London bombings, the murder of Theo Van Gogh, and the Paris “riots” (aka “uprising”), all focused attention on the lack of integration of not only immigrants but even citizens (particularly from Muslim backgrounds) from the second generation.

Discrimination and issues of racism, including the rise of anti-immigrant radical right parties, have become important, as evidenced in part by the passage of the European Union’s Racial Equality Directive (RED) in 2000. The RED was largely driven by calls for greater “social cohesion and solidarity,” but its passage was also a political response to the entry of the Austrian Freedom Party into government in 2000. The RED addresses racial discrimination in the areas of social protection, housing, education, and associations, as well as in employment. These policies are in the process of being implemented across Europe, providing new opportunities for comparative research.

Despite the important social and security implications of immigrant integration, the study of immigrant integration has yet to become a major area of research within political science. Although sociologists have written on these topics for quite some time, political science has an important voice to add to the debates. Political sociologists have played a key role, although not always getting a high profile in the sociological literature. For example, Pettigrew’s 1998 review of the sociological literature on new minorities in Western Europe fails to note several political sociologists, such as Favell and Joppke, who have written on this topic.

Political science can use existing theory to examine partisan politics, local and national policy developments, and transnational policy developments in immigrant integration. There is a great deal of fertile ground, particularly given recent developments in this area. Demographics is a key factor: Immigrants are having more children (who are gaining citizenship) than natives in most European countries. There are ongoing discussions of allowing more immigrants in, as countries in Europe begin to deal with declining birth rates and the need to increase the labor force to support the growing numbers of “baby boomers” who are retiring and putting a strain on pension systems. The issue of immigrant and minority integration will only increase in salience as these groups find their way politically.

Although the study of immigration politics is still a developing field within political science, several authors have engaged the topic of immigrant integration, conducting in-depth studies that explore the politics of integration in a comparative and systematic way. The comparative study of immigrants has been building on the work of authors such as Freeman (1979, 1995, 2004), Miller (1981), and Hollifield (1992) to develop an empirical literature. These authors came mainly from a political economy perspective and have focused particularly on labor market issues. They have developed theories, respectively, that address (*a*) the issues of

client politics, explaining the development of modes of immigration politics; (b) models of immigrant political engagement; and (c) the development of rights for migrants in liberal democratic regimes.

Another set of studies draws from the subfield of urban politics. Authors such as Katznelson (1976), Ireland (2004), and Nelson (2000), although not specifically focused on immigration as such, conduct detailed analyses of communities of color and their efforts to achieve political empowerment. Messina (1989) also uses this approach in his study of race and party politics in Britain.

Many basic texts provide information on integration policies by country in Europe. For example, Heckmann & Schnapper (2003) are the editors of a European Union (EU)-funded research project that examines immigration and integration policies in Western European countries. Each chapter outlines policy in a particular country with some comparison to policies in the other countries studied. The volume by Süßmuth & Weidenfeld (2005) provides perspectives on integration by country, proposals for an EU framework for integration policies, and country chapters on best practices. Other sources for background information on integration policies and racial discrimination include the European Union Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) and the Migration Policy Group. These organizations tend to provide descriptive analyses, which do not necessarily test a set of hypotheses, but they are useful for providing background material on the nature of integration policies in European countries.

Although the issue of security and immigration has been an important development in the literature, I do not go into detail on the topic here. This area has included writings from the "Copenhagen school" (Wæver et al. 1993) in international relations, dealing with issues of security and identity. The general focus of my essay is on comparative politics literature, although there is a great deal of overlap between international relations and comparative studies.

There is a need for those who study immigration, race, and comparative politics to develop common ground for studying the phenomena that are currently developing in Europe. For political science, two key topics in the study of immigrant integration are how different policies affect racial and ethnic conflict and political engagement, and how (or whether) racial and ethnic groups are incorporated into the political structure of a country. Researchers who study race and ethnic politics in the United States have developed theories related to social incorporation, employment, the welfare state, and residential integration, which could be used in the European context. These issues also relate to the intersection between integration policy and antidiscrimination policy.

This essay reviews comparative research in political science on immigrant integration in Western Europe, particularly the politics surrounding issues of integration. I discuss the debates over approaches to integration such as multiculturalism, assimilation, antidiscrimination policy, and policy at the EU level. I also draw on the political sociology literature, on which many political scientists rely for secondary source material. My emphasis is on empirical research and ways that political science can expand on existing research. Although the main focus of most

of the literature reviewed is Western Europe, I also address some literature that is more broadly comparative.

THE CONTOURS OF IMMIGRATION AND IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN EUROPE

Immigrant integration has gained salience in Europe because of changes in the nature of immigration flows over time (for reviews of the determinants of international migration, see Meyers 2004, Cornelius & Rosenblum 2005). In Britain, a study by Castles & Kosack (1973) gave an overview of international labor migration to Western Europe from 1945 through the end of the 1960s, with an emphasis on immigrants as workers and their position in society. In the United States, Freeman (1979) and Miller (1981) were two of the pioneers in studying policy developments in relation to immigrant laborers and foreign workers. Miller compares the situation in Europe (particularly France, Switzerland, and Germany) to the “American Dilemma” as described by Gunnar Myrdal. He argues that the “European Dilemma” was based on the fact that short-term labor migration was incompatible with democratic values (Miller 1981). These countries would eventually have to recognize that these temporary workers were becoming settlers and developing a political voice. Miller tests the hypothesis that foreign workers are politically passive and demonstrates the various ways in which they influenced politics, both in their homelands and in the countries where they had settled. Miller’s argument is a precursor to the assertions of Hollifield (1992) and Soysal (1994) that liberal democratic values led to civic rights for noncitizen immigrants, as I describe in more detail below.

Freeman and Miller emphasize the role of immigrant workers in the economies and politics of Europe. However, Freeman also emphasizes the racial conflict inherent in the status of immigrant workers. Although Freeman claims that his book is not a hypothesis-testing exercise, he does set up a comparison that allows him to test how policy differences between France and Britain contributed to Britain’s greater degree of racial conflict (at least during the 1970s).

In his 1979 book, Freeman describes how governments in France and Britain depoliticized the racial aspect of immigration. He shows that France tends to be more assimilationist whereas Britain tends to acknowledge and emphasize racial differences, and he traces how this distinction affects governmental policies toward foreigners. Freeman concludes that the British developed an “elaborate race relations structure” whereas France decided that immigrants, particularly North Africans, could not be assimilated and instead focused on limiting immigration rather than implementing “race relations” legislation. The French relied on existing French law that gave equal protection to all citizens, while avoiding the issue of racial discrimination, particularly in housing. French officials also relied on the idea of a “threshold of tolerance” beyond which racial conflict might develop, in order to limit immigration from North Africa. Economics (i.e., contracting labor

markets) combined with elite belief systems led to more restrictive immigration policies over time.

Political economy continued to be a theme in the study of immigrants in the 1980s, but the issue of immigrant rights became an important topic as well. There was a growing sense that liberal states could not deny rights to immigrant denizens despite their lack of citizenship. Hollifield (1992) was one of the first political scientists to argue that states have difficulty controlling immigration because of their liberal values, although others, such as Miller, had argued that short-term labor policies were inconsistent with democratic values. In terms of immigrant integration, Hollifield finds that immigrants are gaining rights despite efforts to control immigration. Owing to the nature of liberal, rights-based regimes, immigrants are able to continue entering these countries, and once they are there, they are eligible for rights similar to those of citizens. This theme continued through the end of the 1990s, as authors found more evidence for increased rights for immigrants and the inability of liberal states to control immigration (Soysal 1994, Joppke 1999, Cornelius et al. 2004). Soysal argues that the evolution of democratic, liberal institutions and international regimes led to the declining value of national citizenship and the growth of international personhood. Soysal's evidence held up well during the 1990s, with the increasing impact of transnational organizations such as the EU. However, in the first decade of the new century, we have seen a resurgence in the importance of citizenship as countries have begun to restrict noncitizens' access to rights and benefits.

The liberal states that most authors focus on in Europe include France, Germany, Britain, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries. France has a great deal of experience with immigration from former colonies. In general, France has focused on the assimilation of immigrants, so that immigrant integration was mainly defined by their ability to become "French." Germany, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries generally adopted a more multicultural approach, although Germany's policies were defined by the idea that Germany was "not a country of immigration" and that guestworkers were temporary, at least until the late 1990s.

Britain, faced with boatloads of immigrants from the Commonwealth countries, dealt with immigrant integration in the 1950s and 1960s. Immigration control and the integration of immigrants became partisan political issues and led to major policy initiatives (Freeman 1979, Hansen 2002, Bleich 2003). "Race relations" became the paradigm to describe a set of policies that were designed to deal with issues of discrimination but in the end did little to improve prospects for political engagement. Britain is considered a special case because Commonwealth immigrants had citizenship rights when they entered the country, as did many other colonial migrants.

Calavita (2005) adds an important dimension to the study of immigrant integration with her focus on Italy and Spain. These countries have moved from being major countries of emigration to countries of immigration, particularly from Africa, Asia, and Eastern Europe. Calavita analyzes immigrant integration and the

impact of laws and labor market segmentation in Italy and Spain. She finds that the niches filled by these immigrants, along with laws that often lead to their illegal status, contribute to their exclusion despite vigorous efforts to integrate them. Calavita identifies an important contradiction between laws that encourage immigrant integration and the nature of immigrant labor, in which immigrants are expected to take on dangerous and/or low-wage jobs that can only keep them in the underclass.

Many authors have focused on the situation of Muslim minorities in Europe and the special challenges they face in a Christian Europe. Fetzter & Soper (2005) examine why some European states are more willing than others to recognize the religious claims of Muslims. They argue that the traditional patterns of state-church relations have affected the regulation of religion in Britain, France, and Germany. Their analysis does not delve into the implementation of these regulations and their impact on the communities in each country. Modood (2005) has examined the situation of Muslims in Britain and the rest of Europe and argues that Muslims are often seen as the most "unassimilable" group of immigrants. Klausen (2005), having interviewed 300 Muslim leaders in Denmark, France, Great Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden, finds that most Muslims are interested in social integration and are trying to develop institutions and practice their religion in a way that is compatible with their host societies. These studies highlight the challenges faced by Muslim communities and the difficulties policy makers have in developing workable policies.

Who is targeted for discrimination and which groups are considered more "assimilable" than others is often a political issue. When analyzing the politics of immigrant integration, political scientists must consider how these groups have come to be in a country and who is targeted by particular policies. These factors also influence the ways that countries approach integration. In the next section, I examine differences in modes of immigrant integration.

MODES OF INTEGRATION: THE END OF MULTICULTURALISM?

What is meant by immigrant integration? It can be described as the processes that take place after an immigrant has moved to a new country. Therefore, this review is not particularly concerned with issues related to immigration control and asylum, although the means of immigration can ultimately have an impact on an immigrant's integration. As Freeman (2004) has pointed out, integration is often the intersection between migrants' strategies and regulatory frameworks that were not designed as immigrant incorporation mechanisms. Integration is also considered to be a two-way process, requiring accommodation by both the native and the immigrant populations. Ireland (2004, p. 15) has described it as a process directed toward overall social cohesiveness. Authors have used terms such as assimilation, incorporation, and multiculturalism to describe the processes that

lead to an immigrant becoming an integrated part of his or her adopted community. However, these are ambiguous concepts, mainly used by policy makers to describe a particular policy outcome, i.e., immigrants who can speak the language, are sending their children to school, and in general are not causing problems in a society.

Despite problems with defining integration, authors have focused mainly on two opposing modes of integration, multiculturalism and assimilation, with other variations that branch out from these two main modes (e.g., German “ethnocentrism”). Kymlicka’s (1995) distinction between national minorities and polyethnic communities has led to a great deal of theorizing in the area of multiculturalism, citizenship, and claims-making by immigrant communities, particularly in the fields of sociology and political theory (Taylor 1994, Modood 1998, Koopmans & Statham 1999, Brown 2000, Parekh 2000). Much has also been done empirically to determine the different approaches to immigrant integration across Europe and the outcomes of those approaches.

Much of the literature has focused on country comparisons designed to identify modes of citizenship and/or integration. Brubaker (1992) focuses on the issue of citizenship in France and Germany, finding that France’s territorial-based citizenship and Germany’s ethnicity- or blood-based citizenship policies are grounded in their different understandings of national identity. He demonstrates that these policies can be “a decisive instrument of closure” and that citizenship remains a major area of national difference. As Koopmans & Statham (1999) find in their empirical study of claims-making in Britain and Germany, national models of migrant incorporation remain important despite growing supranationalism and globalization in Europe.

Kastoryano (2002) downplays the difference of approach between France and Germany. In her comparison of the relationship between immigrants and the state in these two countries, she focuses on the nature of identities in each country, in contrast with the United States. She finds that immigrant associations that are supported by the state help to accentuate cultural differences, but she argues that the instrumental nature of these identities can still lead to political assimilation. Each country has created an “ethnic market” formed by state-recognized associations. She argues that the policies of both France and Germany reflect an “applied multiculturalism” that contradicts the rejection of multiculturalism displayed in public discourse. Kastoryano’s approach emphasizes both the similarities and particularities in dealing with immigrant associations, but it does not necessarily provide a complete picture of how governmental policies play out in terms of policy implementation and outcomes for immigrants.

Sweden and the Netherlands have also been put forward as examples of multiculturalism. In a comparison of the Netherlands and Germany, Thränhardt (2000) finds that the politicization of immigration politics in Germany has led to the perception that Germany has been less proactive in the area of immigrant integration, but when one looks at outcomes, the Netherlands actually has had less success than Germany in improving employment and educational prospects for immigrants.

During the 1980s, the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands were identified with multiculturalism and policies favoring cultural pluralism. Favell (2001) finds that these countries moved away from a multicultural approach and returned to a nation-building idea of integration during the 1990s.

Favell also examines the difference in approach to ethnicity, multiculturalism, and citizenship in France and Britain. He argues that French policy emphasizes the requirements of citizenship, whereas in Britain policy tends toward a more *laissez faire*, ad hoc approach. The debate in France has focused on issues related to integration and citizenship, whereas in Britain the emphasis has been on managing race relations and multiculturalism.

Favell's analysis, along with the others described above, indicates that there are major variations in policy making across Europe. Nevertheless, several authors have argued that a new form of transnational denizenship is developing in which national citizenship is losing its value (Bauböck 1994, Soysal 1994, Jacobson 1996, Sassen 1998). Other authors argue that a clear trend has developed toward the reevaluation of citizenship and emphasis on immigrant assimilation. Even before the terror attacks of 9/11 and the bombings in Madrid and London, many countries were reconsidering their integration policies and moving away from multicultural policies.

Joppke & Morawska (2003) are rather vehement in their argument that the development of multiculturalism has been exaggerated, and that many countries that did have multicultural policies have abandoned them. Brubaker (2001) argues that a "return to assimilation" is occurring in countries such as France, Germany, and the United States, and Ireland (2004) provides empirical support for this claim. Ireland's in-depth study of immigrant incorporation and the restructuring of welfare states in Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands provides clear examples of a move away from cultural pluralism to policies that can be called "liberal multiculturalism."

The idea of liberal multiculturalism as developed by Penninx & Slijper (cited in Ireland 2004) falls in the middle of a range of perspectives from liberal nationalism, which stresses complete assimilation of immigrants, to communitarian pluralism, which enshrines the principle of "sovereignty in one's own circle." Liberal multiculturalism ensures equality for minorities but works toward leveling the playing field so that policies targeted at specific groups can be phased out. However, Ireland's work shows that one cannot generalize broadly, since the actions of local officials have a clear impact on the nature of the implementation of integration policies. This idea is also supported by work on the newer immigration countries of Spain and Italy.

Calavita's (2005) analysis of immigrant integration in Spain and Italy also emphasizes the move away from multiculturalism. Calavita argues that integration policies in these countries seek a happy medium between assimilation and multiculturalism. However, Calavita makes it clear that despite the efforts of politicians and nongovernmental organizations to integrate immigrants, their status is also influenced by their position in the work force. Immigrants tend to work in jobs that

natives are unwilling to do. The jobs provide low wages and are often dangerous. Such employment keeps immigrants in an economically precarious situation, and employers have every incentive to keep it this way. Even when immigrants get job training and high levels of education, they may not be able to find employment in anything but low-wage jobs. So regardless of the mode of immigrant integration, immigrants will have difficulty truly integrating as long as they are stuck in the type of jobs that do not provide them the work contracts they need to gain or maintain legal status. It is that legal status upon which many immigrant rights hinge.

The literature on immigrant integration is aiming at a constantly moving target. Policies at both the national and local levels are constantly changing. For example, Ireland (2004) notes that the retrenchment of welfare policies has also had an impact on policy, although it has not reduced the amount of money going toward integration projects. Policy development will continue to be a fruitful area of research, particularly as more immigrants naturalize and become more involved in politics, both as voters and representatives. Politics will clearly play a role in determining the forms of policy that will replace multiculturalism.

PARTY POLITICS AND IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION

There are two sides to the issue of party politics and immigrant integration. The first is the actual involvement of immigrants and racial minorities, briefly described above. Messina (2006) has also done an analysis of immigrant voters, both citizens and noncitizens, as a form of incorporation into formal institutional politics. The second aspect is political parties' use of race and immigration to attract voters, either immigrants or those who are anti-immigrant.

The politics of integration has mainly been the domain of left parties who are interested in attracting immigrant voters (Money 1999, Givens & Luedtke 2005, Messina 2006). Research on the development of antidiscrimination policy has emphasized the path-dependent nature of such development and the link to party politics, particularly negotiations between left and right parties (Favell 2001, Hansen 2002, Bleich 2003). For example, in Britain, it is clear that the Labour Party has implemented antidiscrimination and "race relations" policies and that race relations policies were the price that Labour extracted from the Conservative Party for acquiescence to more restrictive immigration and citizenship policies (Bleich 2003).

On the right, we have seen the rise of radical parties that have demanded the deportation of immigrants. The rise of radical right parties has been well documented (Betz 1994, Kitschelt 1996, Hainsworth 2000, Ignazi 2003, Givens 2005, Norris 2005). Radical right parties have had an impact, particularly in countries such as Denmark and Austria where they have directly influenced government policy. The radical right is seen as a manifestation of anti-immigrant sentiment, and not only changes in immigration policy but also new measures impeding naturalization of immigrants (particularly Muslims) are considered the result of the influence of

radical right parties on governments. This is particularly true in places such as Denmark and Austria, but also in France where the radical right party has not been part of national government.

Radical right parties are more likely to be successful at the national level when mainstream parties are willing to go into coalition agreements (Givens 2005). Thränhardt (1995) has argued that in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, both left and right parties have shifted to the right on immigration because of the influence of radical right parties. However, this is true only on the issue of immigration control. Particularly in countries where immigrants can easily become voters, left parties are more likely to take a progressive stance on immigrant integration (Money 1999). Conservative parties are the only parties that have gone into coalitions with radical right parties, and left parties still tend to be the ones that promote immigrant naturalization, antidiscrimination policies, and other measures related to integration.

Some authors have focused on the effect of other institutions in connection with partisan politics and the implementation of policy, often at the local level. For example, Schain (1985) looks at the role of local institutions in French policy and finds that the left opposition managed to keep the right from implementing their racist labor market policies at the national level during the 1970s but at the same time were developing integration policies at the local level that were based on a similar racist assumption. Ogden (1991) describes French policy since 1945 and notes that policy became gradually harsher under Giscard, but the left government under Mitterrand, elected in 1981, altered both the tone and the substance of policy. In Germany, Esser & Korte (1985) point out that policies were administered at the *Länder* level, and the ideology (conservative versus social democratic) of the *Länder* government determined how government policy was implemented. These studies indicate that both national-level party politics and local politics affect the implementation of integration policy.

Although there has been a great deal of research on radical right parties, and several authors have examined the impact of partisan politics on immigrant integration, clearly more work is needed on the interaction between national and local partisan politics. In some countries, radical right parties have had more success at the local level, and to the extent that integration policy is decentralized, this could have a major impact on the way local party politicians deal with issues of integration.

IMMIGRANTS, RACISM, AND ANTIDISCRIMINATION POLICY

There is no lack of evidence that racism exists in Europe. From the heckling received by black football (soccer) players, to violent attacks on asylum seekers in the former East Germany, to the institutional racism uncovered by the Stephen Lawrence murder investigation in Britain, racism is an ongoing issue. There have been some direct studies of racial attitudes. Pettigrew & Meertens find that blatant prejudice is clearly on the decline in Europe but that subtle prejudice plays an

important role in people's attitudes toward ethnic and racial minorities (Pettigrew & Meertens 1995, Pettigrew 1998). Subtle prejudice is linked to indirect discrimination and attitudes that would tend to limit an immigrant's access to citizenship.

What is clearly lacking in political science is a comparative theoretical approach that combines the analysis of racism and its effects on immigrant integration. In a 2004 review essay, Hanchard & Chung advocate the use of comparative politics to develop a literature they call "comparative racial politics," which overlaps with the study of immigration, particularly in the U.S. and European contexts. There is an ongoing debate over terminology and the impact of the use of the term race, with authors such as Banton (2002) arguing for a new language of human rights. In general there is controversy over the use of the terms race and racism in Europe, but I would argue that one of the areas most in need of comparative research is racial politics in Europe. Hanchard & Chung (2004) develop a strong argument for the study of racial politics, moving away from "race as a social construction" and instead focusing on how race informs the politics of groups with differing interests. Ideas of racial difference can impact both the material life of various groups and the crafting of state policies (Hanchard & Chung 2004).

According to Hanchard & Chung, Katznelson's *Black Men, White Cities* (1973) marked that transition from a "race relations" paradigm to a comparative racial politics approach. Katznelson's work examines the nature of racialized politics in British and American cities. He finds that British officials created institutional structures that limited immigrants' political participation, cutting them off from political power. This led to difficulties in race relations, as confirmed by Freeman (1979). Katznelson found similar results in his comparison with Chicago, where machine politics ruled, and New York, where white party politics dominated and blacks were left without access to the main levers of power. Katznelson's and Freeman's findings are echoed in the work of Messina (1989) on race and British partisan politics. Despite the parties' efforts to depoliticize race, the issue increased in political salience, and racial conflict ensued.

In a study similar to Katznelson's, Nelson (2000) compares black political empowerment in Boston and Liverpool. He argues that electoral strategy has failed to produce black political incorporation on both sides of the Atlantic. Nelson draws on the work of Katznelson and focuses on the relationship between black communities and local government. He concludes that the interests of blacks in Boston and Liverpool are systematically organized out of the policy process through the actions of the white governing coalitions.

Katznelson and Nelson fall into the category of urban politics, but they are also cross-nationally comparative, which lends weight to their analyses. Studlar & Layton-Henry (1990) boil these arguments down to issues of agenda setting in the British case. They argue that nonwhite minorities have little access to the agenda-setting process. They also examine the salience of race and immigration issues and find a general attitude of indifference among both elites and the masses.

Many authors have focused on the British case, partly because of the similarities with the U.S. case but also because the issue of race has played a more dominant role in the discourse in Britain than in other countries. France, in particular, has

avoided the discourse of race, and the fact that data on ethnic, religious, and racial minorities are not collected in France has made it difficult to conduct empirical analyses of these groups. One approach has been to focus on elite perceptions and actions, as in the work of Bleich (2003).

Bleich presents an in-depth historical account of legislative developments in Britain and France in relation to antidiscrimination and race relations policy. He argues that the differences in approach are mainly due to differences in the way race is framed in each country. Bleich considers ideas or “frames” to be critical to understanding the differences in policy development in the two countries. In Britain, the frame for race policy is based on a multicultural approach, which emphasizes racism based on color and identifies with problems of racism in North America. In France, the frame is based on the country’s experiences with anti-Semitism and rejects any comparison with North American issues. Bleich provides a useful outline of policy developments, but the analysis fails to distinguish between the different types of race discourses in each country as suggested by Bovenkerk et al. (1991). Also, Bleich’s focus on elites downplays the role of the media, public opinion, or electoral concerns in the development of race frames.

Similar to Ireland’s 2004 study of immigrants and welfare policies in cities in Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium, discussed above, Lieberman (2005) compares racial incorporation in the United States, Great Britain, and France, mainly at the national level. Focusing on welfare and employment discrimination policy, Lieberman examines political institutions and the development of strategic coalition politics. He argues that ideas and institutions combine at specific historical moments to shape the nature of race policies. This historical institutionalist approach attempts to demonstrate that the development of antidiscrimination policy and incorporation of minorities varies across the three cases because of political opportunities that developed over time. This very detailed analysis provides a good basis for understanding the differences between the cases, but doesn’t take a position on best practices in integrating racial minorities.

Although several authors explicitly include race and immigration in their research (e.g., Freeman 1979, Bleich 2003), there has been little movement to incorporate theories related to immigration with those related to race. These literatures tend to be separate endeavors: Americanists and comparativists on the one hand, and those who study immigration and race relations on the other. Recent attempts to examine these issues cross-nationally should be expanded and an interdisciplinary dialogue developed to address a broader range of countries and issues.

ANTIDISCRIMINATION POLICY AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

European integration has led to an increasing role for the EU in the development of immigration policy. In the area of immigrant integration policy, the most important development has been the passage of the EU’s Racial Equality Directive (RED) in

2000. This directive relates to many of the issues discussed in previous sections. For example, the passage of the RED was clearly linked to the rise of the radical right Freedom Party in Austria and the fact that more left than right parties were in power in 2000 (Geddes & Giraudon 2004).

Bell's (2002) analysis of antidiscrimination law in the EU notes that the objections of specific countries, such as the United Kingdom, held back action by the Council on antidiscrimination law during the 1990s. This changed prior to the conclusion of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 with the change from a Conservative to a Labour government in the United Kingdom (Bell 2002). Article 13, which created the legal basis for the RED, allowed the European Council to "take appropriate action" on antidiscrimination measures related to race, gender, religion, age, disability, and sexual orientation. Bell's account clearly indicates that national-level preferences played an important role in the development of antidiscrimination policy at the EU level. However, real action was not taken until a political opportunity arose—a majority of left parties in power and the success of the radical right Austrian Freedom Party—allowed antidiscrimination policy to be placed high on the agenda in 2000.

An account of the adoption of the RED by Geddes & Giraudon (2004) emphasizes the differences between the antidiscrimination policies of France and the United Kingdom. The authors argue that despite these differences, both countries were supportive of the RED and its "world record adoption," mainly because Jörg Haider's Freedom Party entered the Austrian government in 2000. The end product of the negotiations in 2000 was an antidiscrimination directive that drew heavily on the "Anglo-Dutch" experience, as well as the fight against xenophobia and the directive on equal treatment for women (Geddes & Giraudon 2004).

Geddes & Giraudon also point out that Turks and Moroccans in France and Germany who were working with the European Union Migrant's Forum called for EU citizenship rights for third-country nationals, rather than focusing on antidiscrimination policy. This approach focused on national-level policy rather than EU policy, thus leaving these groups without much input into the process at the EU level. Although many groups were involved with the development of the RED, there is little evidence of immigrant organization at the transnational level. Geddes & Favell (2001) find little evidence of transnational cooperation between immigrant groups and associations. It would appear that transnational mobilization has not yet developed, and elites still play the most important role in the development of transnational policy.

Outside of the legal field, little work has been done to examine the development and impact of antidiscrimination policy at the EU level. The study of ethnic minority groups and organizations at the transnational level is in its infancy as well. This is an area where theories from international relations would be useful, particularly in combination with political psychological approaches. Examples of the latter include Sidanius & Pratto's (2001) social dominance theory, which attempts to create a broad approach to the study of intergroup relations, or Lauren's (1996) historical approach to the "politics and diplomacy of racial discrimination."

CONCLUSION

The influence of politics on immigrant integration policy will remain an important area for research in the coming years. There is a small but developing comparative politics literature on how politics influences the debates on immigration and integration, and ultimately integration policy outcomes. I have outlined five areas where political science could push forward the research on the politics of immigrant integration:

- Examining in more detail the politics of which groups (e.g., ethnic, racial, and/or religious) are targeted by particular policies, such as labor market policies, welfare policies, etc.
- Analyzing the role of politics in the development of policies that are replacing multiculturalism.
- Looking at the influence of party politics at the national level and the local level. How do these levels interact in the development of policy? How do coalition politics impact the actions of parties on the left and right?
- Combining theoretical approaches from American politics and comparative politics with methods and theories developed by researchers who study immigration and those who study race politics.
- Looking to transnational regimes that are influencing human rights policies as well as antidiscrimination policies. These may eventually influence national level policy.

This essay does not delve into the area of public opinion. Very little comparative research has been done on the attitudes of and toward immigrants and minorities. Studies such as Eurobarometer, which do ask questions related to race and antidiscrimination, are often criticized for their methodology and are considered flawed instruments. Transatlantic research cooperation would be useful in this area to marshal the resources needed to develop the kinds of survey instruments that have found some success in the United States. As policy continues to change and develop, it will be important to make sure that the voices of minorities are included.

The intersection of integration policy and antidiscrimination policy is often ignored by policy makers in Europe. Integration policy focuses primarily on immigrants' need to learn the language and become educated in the culture and values of the host country. Policy makers also need to take into consideration inequities in education, inadequate housing, lack of mobility in employment, and other factors that impede the ability of immigrants to pay for courses and/or pass increasingly punitive naturalization tests. Integration without effective antidiscrimination policies has the potential to create the kind of communalism that policy makers claim they want to avoid.

This examination of research on immigrant integration in Europe has found many avenues of research that need to be pursued and extended. There is reason to

believe that something can be gained from comparative study of these issues. Both intra-European and transatlantic exchanges would be useful in understanding and developing common ways of studying issues related to immigrant integration. Although immigration histories differ widely, many of the issues are common to both settler countries (e.g., the United States, Canada, Australia) and new immigration countries. As the twenty-first century unfolds, the political salience of immigration and immigrant integration may wax and wane, but it will clearly remain an important political issue, creating both opportunities and difficulties for the minority groups who will be affected by the policies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to Peter Katzenstein, Gary Freeman, and Bryan Glass for comments on an earlier draft.

**The Annual Review of Political Science is online at
<http://polisci.annualreviews.org>**

LITERATURE CITED

- Banton M. 2002. *The International Politics of Race*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
- Bauböck R. 1994. *Transnational Citizenship: Membership and Rights in International Migration*. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar
- Bell M. 2002. *Anti-Discrimination Law and the European Union*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Betz HG. 1994. *Radical Right Wing Populism in Western Europe*. New York: St. Martin's
- Bleich E. 2003. *Race Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Bovenkerk F, Miles R, Verbunt G. 1991. Comparative studies of migration and exclusion on the grounds of 'race' and ethnic background in Western Europe: a critical appraisal. *Int. Mig. Rev.* 25(2):375–91
- Brown D. 2000. *Contemporary Nationalism: Civic, Ethnocultural, and Multicultural Politics*. London: Routledge
- Brubaker WR. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Brubaker WR. 2001. The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic Racial Stud.* 24(4):531–48
- Calavita K. 2005. *Immigrants at the Margins: Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Castles S, Kosack G. 1973. *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Cornelius WA, Rosenblum MR. 2005. Immigration and politics. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 8:99–119
- Cornelius WA, Tsuda T, Martin PL, Hollifield JF, eds. 2004. *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Esser H, Korte H. 1985. Federal Republic of Germany. In *European Immigration Policy*, ed. T Hammar, pp. 165–205. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Favell A. 2001. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. New York: Palgrave
- Fetzer JS, Soper JC. 2005. *Muslims and the State in Britain, France, and Germany*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

- Freeman GP. 1979. *Immigrant Labor and Racial Conflict In Industrial Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Freeman GP. 1995. Modes of immigration politics in liberal democratic states. *Int. Mig. Rev.* 29(4):881–902
- Freeman GP. 2004. Immigrant incorporation in western democracies. *Int. Mig. Rev.* 38(3):945–69
- Geddes A, Favell A. 2001. Immigration and European integration: new opportunities for transnational mobilization? In *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics: Comparative European Perspectives*, ed. R Koopmans, P Statham, pp.407–28. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Geddes A, Giraudon V. 2004. The emergence of a European Union policy paradigm amid contrasting national models: Britain, France and EU antidiscrimination policy. *West Eur. Polit.* 27(2):334–53. Spec. iss. ed. V Schmidt, C Radaelli, *Opening the black box: Europeanisation, discourse, and policy change*
- Givens TE. 2005. *Voting Radical Right in Western Europe*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Givens TE, Luedtke A. 2005. European immigration policies in comparative perspective: issue salience, partisanship and immigrant rights. *Comp. Eur. Polit.* 3:1–22
- Hainsworth P, ed. 2000. *The Politics of the Extreme Right: From the Margins to the Mainstream*. London: Pinter
- Hanchard M, Chung EA. 2004. From race relations to comparative racial politics. *Dubois Rev.* 1(2):319–43
- Hansen R. 2002. Globalization, embedded realism, and path dependence: the other immigrants to Europe. *Comp. Polit. Stud.* 35(3):259–83
- Heckmann F, Schnapper D. 2003. *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies: National Differences and Trends of Convergence*. Stuttgart, Ger.: Lucius Verlagsgesellschaft
- Hollifield JF. 1992. *Immigrants, Markets, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Ignazi P. 2003. *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Ireland P. 2004. *Becoming Europe: Immigration, Integration and the Welfare State*. Pittsburgh, PA: Univ. Pittsburgh Press
- Jacobson D. 1996. *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
- Joppke C. 1999. *Immigration and the Nation-State*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Joppke C, Moraska E. 2003. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kastoryano R. 2002. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Katznelson I. 1976. *Black Men, White Cities: Race, Politics and Migration in the United States, 1900–30, and Britain, 1948–68*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Kitschelt H. 1996. *The Radical Right in Western Europe*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Klausen J. 2005. *The Islamic Challenge: Politics and Religion in Western Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Koopmans R, Statham P. 1999. Challenging the liberal nation-state? Postnationalism, multiculturalism, and the collective claims making of migrants and ethnic minorities in Britain and Germany. *Am. J. Soc.* 105(3):652–96
- Kymlicka W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon
- Lauren PG. 1996. *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Lieberman RC. 2005. *Shaping Race Policy: The United States in Comparative Perspective*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Messina AM. 1989. *Race and Party Competition in Britain*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon
- Messina AM. 2006. The political incorporation of immigrants in Europe: trends and implications. In *The Migration Reader*, ed. AM Messina, G Lahav, pp. 470–93. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner

- Meyers E. 2004. *International Immigration Policy: A Theoretical and Comparative Analysis*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan
- Miller MJ. 1981. *Foreign Workers in Western Europe: An Emerging Political Force*. New York: Praeger
- Money J. 1999. *Fences and Neighbors: The Political Geography of Immigration Control in Advanced Market Economy Countries*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Modood T. 1998. Anti-essentialism, multiculturalism and the "recognition" of religious groups. *J. Polit. Phil.* 6(4):378–99
- Modood T. 2005. *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Nelson WE. 2000. *Black Atlantic Politics: Dilemmas of Political Empowerment in Boston and Liverpool*. Albany: State Univ. NY Press
- Norris P. 2005. *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Ogden PE. 1991. Immigration to France since 1945: myth and reality. *Ethnic Racial Stud.* 14:294–317
- Parekh B. 2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Pettigrew TF. 1998. Reactions toward the new minorities of Western Europe. *Annu. Rev. Soc.* 24:77–103
- Pettigrew TF, Meertens RW. 1995. Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 25:57–75
- Sassen S. 1998. The de facto transnationalizing of immigration policy. In *Challenge to the Nation State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*, ed. C Joppke, pp. 49–85. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Schain M. 1985. Immigrants and politics in France. In *The French Socialist Experiment*, ed. JS Ambler, pp. 166–90. Philadelphia: Inst. Stud. Hum. Iss.
- Sidanius J, Pratto F. 2001. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Soysal YN. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Studlar DT, Layton-Henry Z. 1990. Nonwhite minority access to the political agenda in Britain. *Policy Stud. Rev.* 9(2):273–93
- Süssmuth R, Weidenfeld W, eds. 2005. *Managing Integration: The European Union's Responsibilities Towards Immigrants*. Gütersloh, Ger.: Bertelsmann Stiftung
- Taylor C. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Thränhardt D. 1995. The political uses of xenophobia in England, France and Germany. *Party Polit.* 1(3):323–45
- Thränhardt D. 2000. Conflict, consensus, and policy outcomes: immigration and integration in Germany and the Netherlands. In *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics*, ed. R Koopmans, P Statham, pp. 162–86. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Wæver O, Buzan B, Kelstrup M, Lemaitre P. 1993. *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter