

REFUGEE INTEGRATION: GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND RESPONSES TO THE INTEGRATION PROCESS

KAROLINA ŁUKASIEWICZ¹

New York University

Fleeing conflict zones or prosecution is only the beginning of a long journey for those seeking asylum. Receiving international protection and adjusting to living in a new “safe haven” takes months, years or even decades. The process of settling in a new country is experienced by refugees in different dimensions of their lives, including economic, social, cultural and educational. The process itself involves both the newcomers and the members of hosting societies. In order to address their needs, the necessary immediate assistance offered by hosting countries and societies has to be followed by complex social policies addressing different dimensions of the integration process for all sides involved.

Historically, the immigrant integration process has been understood in various ways and different policies have been introduced to facilitate it. One of the first approaches towards integration used the notion of ‘assimilation’. It was based on a belief that migrants’ adaptation can be controlled and the mainstream culture is supreme over migrant culture (Park, Burges, 1921). This approach was reflected in policies such as the dispersal of migrants or their children to different regions and schools to avoid a concentration of newcomers, or allowing only the mainstream language to be taught at public schools (Castles, Miller, 2009). The assimilationist approach was replaced by the ‘differentialist’ turn (Brubaker, 2004), which created its new myths like multiple melting pots or multiculturalism (Heckemann, Schnapper, 2003; Kymlicka, 1995, 2005). In that

¹ Contact: kjl409@nyu.edu

spirit, policy interventions were introduced to recognize minorities living and cultivating their cultural differences. Following this approach, ethnic pluralism was developed. It addressed antidiscrimination policies (e.g. the British Race Relations Acts, the Canadian multiculturalism policy enacted in 1971) and policies encouraging the preservation of ethnic heritage in addition to the learning the mainstream one (Brubaker, 2004). According to some authors multiculturalism collapsed as a result of a lack of coherency of nation states (Favell, 1998; Brubaker, 2004; Joppke, 2004; Rex, 2005). In the European Union the paradigm of “integration” was developed to address the complex needs of migrants’ cultural diversity, incorporation of migrants into the host society and an active role of the latter in the process. Integration was defined here as a two-way process which included both the newcomers and the hosting society. It takes place in different dimensions of life, i.e. legal-political, socio-economic and cultural (Heckmann, D. Schnapper, 2003; Etzinger, Biezeveld, 2003). In the E.U. unified integration policies began to develop based on Council directives on Family Reunification, Long-term residence, and Racial Equality (Balch, Geddes, 2012). The integration approach was not the only one to answer to failures of assimilation. In the United States new assimilation theories became popular. On the one hand, holism and multidimensionality of old theories was recognized (Glazer, 1993; Alba and Nee, 1997; Brubaker, 2004; Morawska, 2004). On the other hand, some old assumptions were rejected, such as normativism, determinism, and the assumption that assimilation takes place to the cultural mainstream. Segmented assimilation theory, which represents this approach, identifies different upward and downward trajectories of migrants’ incorporation (Portes, Zhou, 1993; Morawska, 2009). Following each of these trajectories depends on the context of reception, i.e. (1) government policy (receptive, indifferent or hostile), (2) social reception (with prejudice or not) and (3) co-ethnic communities (weak or strong).

All of those approaches are challenged by the increasingly complex reality of integration of refugees. The year 2015 was declared by the European Union (E.U.) as the beginning of a “Refugee Crisis” (Refugee Crisis in Europe, European Commission, 2016) related to the humanitarian emergency at the borders of the E.U. and the dramatic increase in asylum claims. In 2015 the claims reached 1.3 million, which was a 52 percent point increase compared to 2014 (Eurostat, 2016). In response to this crisis, in September 2015 German chancellor Angela Merkel made a historical statement in inviting refugees to Germany and suspending the 1990 Dublin II protocol. While in October 2015, the President of the United States, Barack Obama declared that the U.S. will take 10 thousand Syrian refugees, the following November after terrorist attacks in France (attributed shortly to refugees), presidential candidate Donald

Trump spoke out against allowing Syrian refugees into the U.S. and described them as one of the greatest Trojan horses (CNBC, 2015). Similarly, the Polish parliamentary leader Jaroslaw Kaczynski warned Polish citizens that refugees can spread infectious diseases (Reuters, 2015). Already in July of 2015, British Prime minister David Cameron described migrants as ‘swarms of people coming across the Mediterranean’, in a country with the most hostile media coverage regarding refugees (BBC News, 2015; Berry, Garcia-Blanco, Moore, 2015). In public discourse migrants became divided into persons “deserving” and “undeserving” protection (Newton, 2008).

In these critical times evidence on how integration processes take place, what the challenges to integration are and what are the responses to these challenges, are needed more than ever. Global experiences bringing evidence from different contexts are particularly desired. This special issue of Migration Studies-Polish Diaspora Review aims to address these challenges and responses using cases from different parts of the world and bringing perspectives of the refugees and of the hosting societies. The cases come from the E.U., Poland, Australia, United States, Canada and Sub-Saharan Africa. This volume consists of two parts. In the first part articles on challenges and responses to socio-economic integration are presented. The second part focuses on challenges and responses to the cultural, psychological and educational integration of refugees.

The first part begins with an article written by Barbara Franz, which is focused on the process of integration of refugees from the perspective of hosting societies. Ms. Franz uses four theoretical approaches to explain the E.U. response to the increased number of people applying for asylum in Europe. She uses Jürgen Habermas’s public sphere theory, Nancy Fraser’s post-Westphalian critique thereof, Ferdinand Tönnies’s *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, and M.R.R. Osenwaade’s study of the civil and civic society. Ms. Franz argues that the ‘refugee crisis’ forces the E.U. to question and redefine the direction in which it has been developing so far. On the one hand, European policies towards refugees reflect public opinion, on the other, a strong and open state is needed to facilitate the development of civic society. This article not only brings a much needed outlook on the current social and political transformation in the E.U., but also brings some ideas on possible solutions to these problems.

The second article by Ibolya Losoncz analyses Australia’s refugee resettlement programs. The article focuses on the economic aspect of refugee integration. Ms. Losoncz uses the analytical framework of Merton’s theory on goals and means to explain why refugees in Australia experience lower economic and social integration compared to other immigrants. Ms. Losoncz discovers that poor integration outcome among refugees can be explained by a lack of accessible

structural pathways to turn the personal resources of refugees into economic and social participation. This finding is critical for our understanding of refugee integration for two reasons. First, it is based on unique data unavailable in other countries. Ms. Losloncz used a longitudinal survey of humanitarian migrants in Australia and she triangulated the data with an ethnographic study of recently resettled South Sudanese refugees. Second, Australian experiences with refugee resettlement are particularly important since the country is among the top three in the world in terms of the number of resettled refugees. Also, it has a long experience with refugee resettlement dating back to 1977.

The third article authored by Karolina Lukasiewicz addresses asylum and social policies for refugees. Ms. Lukasiewicz compares asylum and social policies in the United States and Poland. She answers how the policies have been shaped and delivered historically and up to the 2015 and 2016 political shifts. Ms. Lukasiewicz argues that despite being shaped and delivered differently, in the current political context these policies are similarly framed and shaped, and can have parallel negative outcomes for refugee communities and organizations assisting them. According to Ms. Lukasiewicz, the chances for upward mobility for refugees may decrease and income and social inequalities may deepen. This article allows for a look at Polish and European asylum and social policies for refugees from a much needed Transatlantic distance.

The last article in this part of the journal is written by Michael Addaney. It addresses legal aspects of socio-economic integration of refugees in Sub-Saharan Africa. Mr. Addaney discusses the foundations of the protection system of refugees in the region, analyses the obstacles in protecting refugees in Sub-Saharan Africa and responses from Sub-Saharan countries. He convincingly argues that the only durable solution to the challenges experienced by refugees in Sub-Saharan Africa is their effective local integration. This study is valuable for bringing evidence on challenges and sustainable solutions to refugee integration from the Sub-Saharan region much unrepresented in the studies of refugee integration.

Second part of the volume is focused on the challenges and responses to cultural and educational integration of refugees presenting cases from Poland and Canada. The article by Witold Klaus addresses a critical and understudied challenge to integration processes, which is violence within refugee families. Mr. Klaus analyses a case of refugees originated from Chechnya living in Poland. He uses original data including interviews with survivors of violence to discuss forced marriages, rapes and honour killings. Mr. Klaus argues that refugee women are not only let down by their families, but also by Polish institutions

which fail to protect them from violence. In this way, women are trapped in a system perpetuating collective oppression.

The next article is authored by Halina Grzymała-Moszczyńska, Adam Anczyk and Anna M. Maćkowiak. The authors address the cultural integration of refugees using a case of attitudes of the Polish hosting society towards Islam. They identify stereotypical features of the Other and analyse its sources. It turns out that the negative attitudes towards Muslim refugees are grounded in emotional negative media discourse combined with minimal knowledge about religion.

The last article by Tanya Aberman, Philip Ackerman and Francisco Rico-Martinez addresses the educational integration of refugees in Canada. It presents challenges experienced by irregular migrant youth in their access to Canadian education systems. The added value of this article is a community-driven, humanitarian and activist solution at all levels of education that it offers. It presents the needs-based approach to alternatives to education, using a case of a Toronto-based organization called the FCJ Refugee Centre.

This special edition of *Migration Studies-Polish Diaspora Review* closes with a report by Małgorzata Różańska-Braniecka describing the International Cities of Refuge Network (ICORN). This initiative provides a response to the challenges experienced by refugee artists. Derived from a sanctuary movement, ICORN assists refugee artists around the world. Each ICORN city provides assistance for one writer/artist at a time by offering him/her a safe place to stay and economic security for two years.

The articles published in this volume are based on presentations given during the 2016 Conference of the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM), *Rethinking Forced Migration and Displacement: Theory, Policy, and Praxis*. The conference took place in Poznań, Poland from July 12–15, 2016. It was hosted by the Centre for Migration Studies, the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, and the Faculty of Law and Public Administration at the Adam Mickiewicz University.

REFERENCES

- Alba R., Nee V. (1997), Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. "International migration review", Vol. 31, Issue 4, pp. 826–874.
- Balch A., Geddes A. (2012), *Connections Between Admission Policies and Integration Policies at EU-Level and Given Linkages with National Policy Making*. PROSINT Comparative Reports.
- Brubaker R. (2004), *Ethnicity without groups*. Harvard University Press.
- Castles S., De Haas H., Miller M. J. (2009), *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- CNBS (2015), *Donald Trump: We should attack terrorist oil, bank resources*, <http://www.cnbc.com/2015/11/16/donald-trump-we-should-attack-terrorist-oil-bank-resources.html> [Accessed: 01.12.2016].
- Etzinger H., Biezeveld R. (2003), Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration, European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER), https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/documents/policies/legal-migration/pdf/general/benchmarking_final_en.pdf [Accessed: 12.01.2016].
- Eurostat (2016), *Asylum and Managed Migration*, <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/asylum-and-managed-migration/data/database> [Accessed 9.05.2016].
- Favell A. (1998), *Philosophies of integration: immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain*, New York: Palgrave.
- Glazer N. (1993), Is Assimilation Dead? “The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science”, Vol. 530, Issue 1, pp. 122–136.
- Heckman F., Schnapper D. (2003), *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies. National Differences and Trends of Convergence* (Stuttgart, 2003).
- Joppke C. (2004), The retreatment of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy, “The British Journal of Sociology”, Vol. 55, Issue 2, pp. 237–257.
- Kymlicka W. (1995), *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka W. (2005), The uncertain futures of multiculturalism. „Canadian Diversity”, Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 82–85.
- Morawska E. (2004), Exploring Diversity in Immigrant Assimilation and Transnationalism: Poles and Russian Jews in Philadelphia, “International Migration Review”, Vol. 38, Issue 4, pp. 1372–1412.
- Morawska E. (2009), Badania nad imigracją/etnicznością w Europie i Stanach Zjednoczonych: analiza porównawcza, “Studia Migracyjne – Przegląd Polonijny” Vol. 1. Issue 35, pp. 7–26.
- Newton L. (2008), *Illegal, alien, or immigrant: The politics of immigration reform*. New York & London: New York University Press.
- Park R., Burgess E. (1921), *Introduction to the science of sociology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Portes A., Zhou M. (1993), The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. “The annals of the American academy of political and social science”, Vol. 530, Issue 1, pp. 74–96.
- Refugee Crisis in Europe, European Commission (2016), <http://ec.europa.eu/echo/node/4115> [Accessed: 12.02.2017].
- Reuters (2015), *Polish opposition warns refugees could spread infectious diseases*, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-poland-idUSKCN0S918B20151015> [Accessed: 01.12.16].
- Rex J. (2005), *Multiculturalism and Political Integration in Modern Nation State*, Revista HMIC-2005, <http://ddd.uab.es/pub/hmic/16964403n2005p249.pdf> [Accessed: 20.04.2009].