A CRITICISM RELATED TO DISCUSSIONS ON CULTURAL

INTEGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM

Handan AKYİĞİT*

Abstract

Thinking about the concepts of culture, identity and ethnic group takes place in different societies by way of universal principles in studies focused on immigration and integration. Recently, multiculturalism makes up the universal principles of studies focused on cultural integration. All multiculturalists emphasize understanding cultural and social differences and to live with them. However, a debate on the nature of multiculturalism is ongoing behind this lifeless title. Because this perspective sets forth deep questions for studies on immigration and integration. The perspective we will define as "hystorophobia" and "instrumentalist" form the basis of these problems. The aim of this article is to deepen and enliven the discussion on the nature of public studies taken into consideration with a focus on integration and immigration. Emphasis will be on the ahistorical and asociological aspects of migration, cultural integration focused studies taken into consideration within the framework of multiculturalism.

Keywords: *Integration, Immigration, Multiculturalism, Chronofetishism, Tempocentrism.*

* Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, e-mail: hakyigit@sakarya.edu.tr

KÜLTÜREL ENTEGRASYON VE ÇOKKÜLTÜRCÜLÜK

TARTIŞMALARINA İLİŞKİN BİR ELEŞTİRİ

Özet

Göç ve entegrasyon odaklı çalışmalarda kültür, kimlik ve etnik topluluk kavramları üzerine düşünme farklı toplumlarda evrensel prensipler üzerinden ele alınmaktadır. Son zamanlarda ise kültürel entegrasyon odaklı çalışmaların evrensel prensiplerini çokkültürcülük oluşturmaktadır. Bütün çokkültürcüler kültürel ve toplumsal farklılığı anlama bununla yaşamaya vurgu yapmaktadır. Ancak bu cansız bağlılığın ötesinde çokkültürcülüğün doğası tartışılmaktadır. Çünkü bu bakış açısı göçmenlik ve entegrasyon çalışmalarının önüne derin sorunlar sunmaktadır. Bu sorunların temelinde ise "historofobi" ve "araçsalcı" olarak tanımlayacağımız bakış açısı yatmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, entegrasyon ve göç odaklı ele alınan toplumsal araştırmaların doğasına ilişkin tartışmayı derinleştirmek ve canlandırmaktır. Çokkültürcülük temelinde ele alınan göç, kültürel entegrasyon odaklı çalışmaların tarihdışılığın ve asosyolojikliğin yönü ele alınacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Entegrasyon, Göç, Çokkültürcülük, Kronofetişizm, Temposentrisizm.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Ethnic and cultural identity-based claims along with conflicts related to such claims make up the most important change/conflict points that the countries of the World have been experiencing since 1990. The post-modernization period that started during the 1980s and the globalization process that continued increasing its impact in social, cultural and economic areas since the 1990s played an important role in the increase of ethnic or cultural based identity

claims. Besides, the ethnic conflicts that ensued in Yugoslavia and Caucasia following the disintegration of the Soviet Union; the sudden increase in the population of immigrants following a large wave of immigration in Europe and the Middle East played a role in making identity claims more visible. As a result of all these developments, it is considered that finding permanent solutions to such ethnic, cultural, religious etc. based mobilizations and claims currently ongoing in nation states is one of the most important tasks of social sciences. Since it does not seem possible to talk about a safe and stable world order without finding permanent solutions to the aforementioned social issues. Hence, what should be the method used for developing solutions to the current problems experienced by the nation-states of today? How should we go about addressing the differences and the reasons for the emergence of claims due to these differences? How will we ensure a balance between equality and difference when such differences are respected in nation-states? (Akyiğit, 2017: 1-2). Such questions are frequently discussed in the social sciences. Recently, integration policies based on "multiculturalism" are presented as solution suggestions for such issues. However, the concept of multiculturalism that is presented as a solution suggestion has its own conflicts and problems. Because it especially attracts attention in studies focusing on immigration and integration and especially those with a basis on multiculturalism that historical analysis is considered as unnecessary or is excluded out of the study scope. Therefore, it can be indicated that studies taken into consideration with a focus on integration subject to multiculturalism discourse are "hystorophobic". Considered in the light of such criticism among the academics acting as "critical multiculturalists", Hall (1991) emphasizes that multiculturalism fails to generate a reference model with which differences can manage themselves subject to the essential conditions of all societies. According to Bennett (2015: 15), multiculturalism has an ahistorical discourse. Since it ignores the relational

rituals that develop over time between different cultures. Statistics related with groups defined based on the differences of ethnic characteristics result in the formation of racial borders. Thus, differences are reified. "Different categories of variation are the products of different histories and special approaches are necessary if it is desired that the policies display sensitivity equivalent to the specificity of the problems" (Bennett, 2015: 19). Thus, multiculturalism models developed for Canada or any European country cannot be explanatory for understanding or managing the cultural diversity of different nation-states. Because they do not correspond to the same social and historical context (cited by Hamilton,1999: 116) The aspect drawn attention to by the question "are we right when we place communities that are historically and geographically different under the same group claiming that they form a single type or that they belong to a single type?" is important. Because different nation-states are classified as "multicultural nation-states" due to their characteristics such as allowing immigrants and accommodating different ethno-cultural groups. This classification results in neglecting the differences in historical, geographical or cultural traditions. On the other hand, the multiculturalist discourse is inclined to explain today by weighing it down on the past. This further reinforces the "ahistoricity" problem of multicultural integration explanations. In order to overcome the ahistorical aspect of multiculturalism, it is important to emphasize that policies such as immigration and integration related with the management of cultural differences should be shaped not in relation with the unique state of Europe as in the case of "associative" historians but with the local institutional and geopolitical syntheses. Because the local institutional components of nation states reflect the 'cultural traditions' that display certain patterns. "Multiculturalism in the contemporary world indicates that people importantly different from one another are in contact with and must deal with each other. All multiculturalists focus on understanding and living with the

cultural and social differences" (Fay, 1996: 12). However, this effort to understand cultural and social difference presents an approach based on "sanctifying" that which is different in itself. It becomes apparent upon a closer reading that "an invisible center controlled by the *whites* determine, classify and examine the differences in cultures from an implicit perspective" which are evaluated in an "exaggerated fashion subject to a non-ethnic cultural understanding that should be tolerated" (Hage, 1998; Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998). Such evaluations bring forth definitions of cultural differences as a static, lifeless concept. Therefore, cultural difference transforms into an object of examination taken into consideration independent of its context. However, multiculturalism that feeds the understanding of multiculturalism does not represent an increasing awareness among the already existing ethnocultural groups. Multiculturalism contains within it a pluralist understanding of the culture that increases within itself. In short, the purpose of the present study is to analyze why multiculturalism contains deep questions in itself as well as its ahistoricism and asociologism by way of two fundamental and independent variables defined as "chronofetishism" and "tempocentrism". Finally, an evaluation will be made regarding the contributions of the methodological principles of historical sociology on integration studies.

2. PUTTING FORTH THE "CHRONOFETISHIST" AND "TEMPOCENTRIC" PRINCIPLES OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF MULTICULTURALISM

It is first necessary to determine the "context variables" encompassing the definition of multiculturalism in order to focus on the problems presented by multiculturalist policies and practices as well as its ahistoricity and asociologicity.

"The multiculturalism application that was first put into effect in 1965 by a Royal Commission in Canada became popular

afterward. It was observed in the policies of states that openly desire to protect and sustain the cultural differences against *assimilationist* policies with a tendency to dilute the differences based on the idea that immigrant populations should adapt their beliefs, values, and cultures to the dominant national culture" (Bonet and Negrier, 2015: 12).

Multiculturalism that was later observed in the United States of America and European countries include "recognizing individuals or groups at a level of belonging, at a level of behavior, culture, religious practices and at a level of political mobilization". It is suggested that "groups may be different from each other completely and hence may be included in different ways to the social scenery" (Modood, 2007: 78). Recent discussions make use of the integration of immigrant workers and post-colonial peoples into European nation-states such as Germany for putting forth the rights of the French-speaking community in Quebec[1] to demand cultural, linguistic and political autonomy as well as to discussions on the teaching of the Western traditional "canon" in philosophy, literature and fine arts.[2] This issue penetrates the contemporary ethical-political and constitutional theory in America in a more direct and tangible manner. Multiculturalism in related academic literature emerges as a disagreement with the nature and position of the ethical bond in the public space or in other words as relative importance that should be given to formal rules of justice when compared with the more essential understandings on "common good". This disagreement transforms into a contradiction between the two main camps namely liberalism and collectivism. Liberalism puts forth the universal principles based on acceptance between individuals and the historically based opinion on

---

[1] It is located in the French region of Canada.
[2] For the discussion text related to this issue, see Seyla Benhabib "What is Culture?" Marjorie Garber (edt.) The Work of Culture, New York: Routledge.

the common good[3]. It is impossible here to take into consideration in detail the disagreements of the multiculturalism approach based on liberalism or collectivism. However, I would like to emphasize certain prominent characteristics before passing onto various claims that are enlightening concerning multiculturalism. The abstract and ahistorical characteristic of the fundamental themes comes to the forefront in discussions related to multiculturalism; both sides tend to evaluate multiculturalism as constant essences that can be exemplified or as ideal types. This purist tendency does not take into consideration multiple syncretisms or overlapping styles even though it is functional about polemics.[4] In conclusion, it is striking that the categories of multiculturalism presented as a solution suggestion to modern identity conflicts are based on a Western or European centered understanding of history; and that it presents itself as timeless and universal.[5] The fact that the categories of multiculturalism present themselves as timeless and universal bring forth definitions by nation-states related to multicultural society without taking into consideration their own sociologic, historical, geopolitical experiences and processes. In this regard, a multicultural public depiction that neglects history and the multiculturalism that is henceforth presented not only is unfair to the specific history of nation-states but also results in a problematic

---

[3] For comparative critical explanations of liberalism and the socialist approach in terms of identity and culture, see. Nafiz Tok, Kültür, Kimlik ve Siyaset, Ayrıntı Yayınları: İstanbul, 2003.

[4] For current comparisons see. David Rasmussen (edt.) Universalism vs. Communitarianism: Contemporary Debates in Ethics (Cambridge, Mass: MITT Press, 1990; Shlomo Avineri and Avner de-Shalit (edt.) Communitarianism and Individualism New York Oxford University Press, 1992; Will Kymlicka Liberalism, Community, and Culture, New York: Oxford York University Press,1989; Michael Sandel (ed.) Liberalism and Its Critics, New York: New York University Press, 1984.

[5] The most important indicators of this can be seen in the identity and culture policies applied as part of the united in diversity ideal of EU. For example, as is stated by Eker (2009), the current conditions and applications of EU related to language policies put forth that the Turkish language falls outside the scope of the 'diversity' concept in the official motto of EU which is *United in University*.

perspective about the current state of ethnocultural groups. The ahistoricity and asociological state of mainstream multiculturalism become apparent when the issue is evaluated from a historical-sociological perspective. It is possible to explain these fundamental tendencies that feed multiculturalism subject to the "cronofetishism" and "tempocentrism" conceptualization by Hobson (2002). In order to further elaborate the argument, the focus has been on Western European countries where multiculturalism emerged as a matter of debate for the first time. In this context, examples have been presented by touching upon certain differences. For example, the ways of defining cultural differences in these regions along with the relations of the individuals with other individuals (expressed traditionally under the titles of 'politics' and 'relation' in sociology). The focus has been on the "institutional/local history" of the regions with these examples and critical evaluations regarding how the special characters and their histories are reflected within their own geographical contexts have been made based on literature.

2.1. The First Form of Ahistoricity: "Cronofetishism"

The social structure idealized by multiculturalism based on the necessity to "sanctify cultural difference" brings with it "cultural fetishism"[6] as well. Because,

---

[6]It will be beneficial to take into consideration the concept of fetishism as a footnote here. As is known, the word *fetish* meaning "magic and tools of magic in Portuguese; artificial or man-made in Latin" is used in social sciences to represent an object or a person that is respected almost to the point of worshipping. Things or characteristics that are a *fetish* in social life are those that are believed to have an unchangeable impact on humans and social relations which are perceived as absolute or natural even though they are based on certain human relations and are completely subject to change. In other words, fetishism is the "objectification" of the relations between people established in certain social practices as well as the forms of communication and the reflection of the opinion that objects dominate humans and their relations instead of vice versa" (Edinsel, 2014: 272).

"when culture is considered as a united whole that is self-sufficient and unique, development can only be explained by concretizing culture and instilling in it a common soul with a mediator that has an independent and unique goal. Such an opinion makes culture an autonomous field of life thereby neglecting the fact that it is related to a wider economic and social structure" (Parekh, 2000: 101).

Accordingly, the cultural fetishism that emerges in nation-states brings with it "cronofetishism". Because ethnocultural difference is perceived independent of its historical and social context thereby leading to the neglection of the dynamic fluid processes it contains, the essential differences and pluralities it harbors thus resulting in popularizing the understanding that the current state can be explained only by focusing on the present. This perspective that feeds cronofetishism brings with it three different illusions as expressed by Hobson (2002: 18):

"*i) reification illusion:* where the present is effectively "sealed off" from the past, making it appear as static, self-constituting, autonomous and reified entity. *ii) naturalization illusion:* where the present is effectively naturalized on the basis that it emerged "spontaneously" by "natural" human imperatives, thereby obscuring the historical processes of social power, identity/social exclusion, and norms that constitute the present. *iii) immutability illusion:* where the present is eternalized because it is deemed to be natural and resistant to structural change, thereby obscuring the processes that reconstitute the present as an immanent order of change."

The "reification, naturalization and immutability illusion" of Hobson (2002) is reflected in multiculturalism that feeds the integration and immigration-focused studies as such:

Reification illusion ignores the ethno-cultural differences taken into consideration within the context of time and space in a tangible manner as well as the *relational relationships* that may change subject to group relations that are ongoing through historical epochs. However, it is the relations between different groups that determine the immigration practices and the states of immigration. Because immigration is a product of history. Comarofflar (1992) implied this when mentioning the 'reification process'. The most fundamental explanation on this subject was as follows:

> "Reification is the apprehension of the human phenomena as if they were things, that is the apprehension of the products of human activity as if they were something else than human products (...) Human as the producer of the world is perceived as its product and human activity is perceived as the side effect of a non-human process" (Berger and Lucmann, 1967: 106).

With this reification, Rosenberg (1994) states that the simple assumption indicating that we can compare the contest between Athens and Sparta with the stand-off between United States and the Soviet Union regarding the nature and management of cultural differences results polemically in a 'giant optical illusion' (cited by Buzan ve Little, 2002: 290). Leveau (1988) who has been working for a long time on the Muslims in France has put forth that even an 'objective' truth such as the presence of a mosque can gain on new meaning when conditions change (cited by Baumann, 1999: 74). These debates that we have presented in short indicate that the objective (race, religion, traditions etc.) and subjective (belonging/identity perception) factors that make up the

cultural elements have a relative characteristic and that they may change during the course of history subject to new contexts.

Naturalization illusion ignores the *dialogical* aspect of the ethno-cultural differences that take place in the lives of individuals through periods of social change and transformation. Thus, the tendency of culture and identity to differ among itself with a pluralist perspective is ignored. However, the ethno-cultural identity of an immigrant gains meaning subject to the different groups, political-economical processes that they are faced with. Thus, the process of adaptation to new settlement areas requires a continuous re-reading of the structure-subject relationship. However, "naturalization illusion" occurs spontaneously since multiculturalism "sanctifies differences" in itself. Hence, the causalities of the factors that feed migration cannot be fully explained in the studies that are carried out. In the meantime, the process of bi-directional cultural interaction that plays a role in the acceptance of the changes in their identity perceptions and social exclusion cannot be revealed. Criticizing this tradition, Barth has made use of Weber's analyses to put forth statements indicating that the presence of ethnic identities and groups can be explained not by their distinctive characteristics but with a social position. According to Barth, it is their manner of social interaction that determines their characteristics not objective ethnic categories (such as religion, style of dressing, skin color, language...). This emphasizes that the positions and boundaries of ethnic groups are actualized in the manner with which the people who generate this network of social interaction interpret the different ethnic categories they encounter. Hence, the manner with which someone that migrates from Syria is positioned as an 'immigrant', generalizing discrimination in Western Europe or Turkey results in a misreading and the development of erroneous integration policies. Moore (1987) states that racial association in Western European countries is outside the scope of politics and is considered as a network of political

relations. He emphasizes that this visible paradox is typically resolved by embodying political relation. Thus, a sense that they are different by nature is instilled in racified people (cited by Smaje, 2017: 223). The racism that we see/read about in is predominant primarily in Western European countries. When considered with the illusion of the principle of reification, Western European based readings are conducted by ignoring the fact that racism surfaces differently in different countries. Authors such as Hobson and Hobden (2002), Reus-Smit (2002) and Linklater (2002) have put forth that the statements specific to identity and culture with the focus being on Eurocentric social structure and change have continuously ignored the Afro-Asia system that was present way before Europe spread out all over the world. As an example "The French may be prejudiced against the individuals considered as black by the United States and they may hold a discriminating attitude against them. This prejudice may this time encompass not the 'Blacks' but the 'Brazilians', 'Africans', 'Antilleans' or 'Americans'. However, what is indicated in this example is not racial prejudice but ethnocentrism and xenophobia" (Schnapper, 2005: 158).

Finally, the *immutability illusion* is problematic because it obscures the understanding of the intended and non-intended action practices due to the generalized perspective regarding the integration processes of immigrant communities to their new settlement areas. It prevents the continuous observance of the relationships of the immigrants that are "subject to change" between structural contexts and actions. Because, "when the nation state settles in as the fundamental political form of modern society, it seems as if *the power of things remains the same as things keep on changing* and as if nothing is changing in reality or radically" (Fine ve Chernilo, 2017: 392). Hence, the process of revealing the *unique* and *variable* conditions is ignored which has an

impact on the immigrants with ethnocultural diversity in social structures and their interaction processes. "It is frequently ignored in the 'power mechanisms' that one appeals to (assumes as real) and the 'power poetics distinction' that is assumed to be ideological that the 'poetic' is built on a special ontological approach related with the communal" (Howe, 1991 cited by Smaje, 2017: 222). As an example, discrimination and prejudice are observed to acquire stability within the context of colonial expansion specific to 'class' in Western European countries and within the context of status closure specific to 'caste' in India.[7]

Therefore, the invariance adopted by policies focused on immigration and integration necessitates that multiculturalism should be developed not by way of the invariance it has adopted and illusions of cultural absoluteness but by taking into consideration the ontological context of the 'poetic'. As emphasized by Baumann (1999: 87), multiculturalism is not about *absolute/essentialist* cultural differences; but rather about an effective consciousness on the *intersecting* cultural diversities and a concept of culture that can cope with these. "Integration policies that will be developed subject to cultural diversity at the scale of states depend on the framework generated by the national problem at each country" (Kymlicka, 1989: 87). Ultimately, we cannot even begin to estimate which differences can be considered as ethnic and which as social class issues. This is the reason for the significant differences in the policies of the same state; the difference between the metropolises of France or the heterogeneity of the practices among the autonomous communities or congregations in Great Britain can be indicated as examples of this (Bennett and Butler, 2000). The fact that the Latin-other and the African-other are not recognized in the education programs in America; the absence of the ethnic

---

[7] For a detailed discussion on this topic, see. Chris Smaje (2017) "Kurumsal Tarih: Irk ve Kast Konusunda Karşılaştırmalı Bir Yaklaşım", *Tarihsel Sosyoloji*, (edt.) Gerard delanty ve Engin F. Işın, (çev. Ümit Tatlıcan), İstanbul: Islık Yayınları.

racial component in statistical evaluations prohibits the emergence of differences subject to ethnic identities in the preparation and implementation processes of social policies (Hopenhayn, 2015: 141). These indicators are related with 'how countries integrate' the social and cultural diversity issue. At this point, the expressed illusions can be overcome by taking as reference the Eisenstadt (1963) 's principles of historical sociology method:

> "(1) All political activities are organized in roles; but the extent to which this occurs, as well as the extent to which political roles are differentiated from other types of roles, varies among societies. (2) All political activities are institutionalized, but the degree and manner of this institutionalization varies; some societies have special organizations that attend to special types of political activities, such as legislative, administrative, judicial and party activities, whereas other societies have these activities embedded in other institutions, such as those relating to family and other types of ascriptive groups. (3) All political systems have goals, but these goals differ according to their content, to whose interests they serve, to the criteria governing their definition, and to the degree that different groups in society participate in their definition. (4) All political systems attempt to legitimate their exercise of power, but they differ by "the type of legitimation sanctioning a given political system and its rulers." (cited by Hamilton, 1999: 111)

In conclusion, the status of culture being influenced by ideological, political and dominant benefits should not be taken into consideration in any of the cultural integration policies based on multiculturalism. Undoubtedly, each cultural difference tends to represent different human relations and social order on its

own. As is stated by Parekh (2000: 101), "since culture itself is a power system, it is connected with other power systems and can never be politically objective. Ignoring the policy and economy of culture leads to *cultural autonomy illusion*".[8] Rothschild explained this process that started to take shape during the 1970s with the concept of 'ethnopolitics'. He uses the term to describe the process of mobilizing ethnicity from a psychological or cultural or social datum into political leverage for the purpose of altering or reinforcing systems of structured inequality between and among ethnic categories (Rothschild, 1981). Castells (2006: 14) has drawn attention to the issue emphasized by Rotshschild by indicating that identity can be defined as legitimizing identity, resistance identity and project identity; and that the cultural rights and freedoms, integration policies in the state discourse can vary. Thus, the distinctive elements of ethnic groups can be transformed into ideology over time, sometimes concretized or sometimes recreated virtually.

2.2. Second Form of Ahistoricism: "Tempocentrism"

Tempocentrism is a methodology used by theorists to view history with a "chronofetishist lens". In other words, it grays out all historical systems when restructuring not to conform to a reified and naturalized present but all systems as analogous and isomorphic (e.g. having the same structure)" (Hobson,2002: 22). In this context, it causes the evaluation of the impacts of different immigration processes in the countries of the world within the context of analogous principles resulting in the search of the traces of the present in the

---

[8]Actually, it can be added that identities do not frequently develop by themselves but contrary to this they are developed by people or assumed by them in line with their benefits only to be filled with norms that become determinative over time. For this reason, multiculturalism does not consist solely of the blooming of a thousand flowers and the issue of ensuring that no culture is more advantageous in comparison with others. This is also an issue of critical thinking. See Baumann, Gerd (1999) The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic And Religious Identities, Routledge: Taylor & Francis Books.

past and a self-actualizing prediction. In this perspective, the elements that trigger the immigration process are taken into consideration separate from the social context thereby graying out the relationship between the *subject-structure* with the neglection of the *subjective* experiences of the individuals experiencing the immigration. Thus, the general state observed in integration policies which are tried to be developed without taking into consideration the immigration process and immigration experiences together with the disparate aspects of the discontinuities experienced within the historical process is the emergence of studies with explanations regarding the fact that the cycle determining/affecting the immigration experience and the orientation period is the same and what changes is only the actors who experience immigration. Such studies result in the concretization of the immigration experiences corresponding to the experiences of the different actors involved thereby leading to a repetition of the integration policies standardized for sustaining the national structures. Tempocentrismmay also transforms the position of the actors in the integration process into an "analytical subject" by feeding on the identification process established by the social scientist with his/her nation-state. Therefore, it causes the evaluation of identification criteria such as ethnicity, identity, and religion which direct the subjective experiences of immigrants "independent from their socio-cultural context".[9] For example, Baumann (1999: 139-142) indicates that the institutional representation of cultural difference is the best known form of multiculturalism in the West. He also indicates that multiethnic passage or in other words a stage show

---

[9]Related with these issues, the Torino example of Luca Dal Pozzolu, the France and Spain example of Emmanuel Negrier, the studies by Joan Manuel Garcia and Jordi Cais based on the Catalonia example on the necessity of reevaluating the waves of immigration, cities, policies and cultural lives can be taken into consideration. For more detailed information, see Bonet, Lluís ve Négrier Emmanuel (Ed.) (2015), End of National Cultures? Culture Policies in a Test of Diversity (Translated by) Işık Ergüden, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Publications.

'celebrating diversity' is the best loved approach. For him, the actual assertion of such shows is the elimination of cultural obstacles. Even so, such activities redraw the cultural borders and affix them as if they are natural. However, multiculturalism should render a new understanding of culture and identification necessary. This understanding should develop on the basis of an idea based on multirelation which may reveal the dialogic aspect of identity. This methodological criticism emphasized by Baumann can be overcome with the method principles of historical sociology. As put forth by Skocpol (1999: 2)

> (…) the world's past is not seen as a unified development story or as a set of standardized sequences. Instead, it is understood that groups or organizations have chosen, or stumbled into varying paths in the past."

Thus, as Moore has tried to emphasize with the concept of "comparative analysis", clarifying our knowledge on the contexts is among the principal issues here. Because not having a thorough knowledge of contexts result in making causal generalizations (cited by Skocpol, 1999: 425). As is the case in Moore's concept of comparative analysis, Polanyi presents a holistic perspective thus drawing attention to the importance of indicating the structural relation between all parts of a social whole in any – and especially humane – subjects (cited by Block and Somers, 1999: 71).

In conclusion, this deception that shows all historical actors and systems as isomorphous or analogous has been popularized to depict that the nation-state model is the only model that may enable the actualization of the "unity in diversity" ideal of the multiculturalist nation-state "in peace". The "tempocentric conflicts" that make up the content of multiculturalism that feeds integration and immigration-focused studies result in *isomorphic illusion* (Hobson, 2002: 20). In clearer terms, multiculturalism presents an "isomorphic"

political system and "analogous" socio-cultural system structure while discussing the integration process implemented for immigrants by nation-states which are subject to many different waves of immigration. However, it is required to investigate the historical roots of the analysis categories present in the integration processes for the immigrants accommodated by nation-states and to take into consideration the essential experiences and characteristics of the immigrants within the context of different historical conditions and social contexts. Because even though the nation-state governance system has similar characteristics with the "state" order, the nation under the roof of the state and the individuals that make up the nation do not contain a social and socio-cultural context. Contrary to what is expressed by multiculturalism, culture and identity never have static, closed and consistent structural characteristics. Turner (1993: 411-412) has made the following observations with regard to the condition of the United States:

> "Multiculturalism tends to become a form of identity politics, in which the concept of culture becomes merged with that of ethnic identity. However, from an anthropological standpoint, this move of multiculturalism becoming a form of identity politics faces both theoretical and practical risks. It risks essentializing the idea of culture as the property of an ethnic group or race; it risks reifying culture as separate entities by overemphasizing the internal homogeneity of cultures in terms that potentially legitimize repressive demands for communal conformity."

In order to overcome the aforementioned illusion, Swedish anthropologist Hannerz (1997) preferred to express the overtly organic and integrated network of relations between culture and society by using the concept of "habitus of senses" shared by social groups and individuals to a certain extent and at

certain moments (cited by Curti and Pozzolo, 2015: 112). Taylor (1994: 74) explains such illusions by setting forth as an example that the demands for recognition of the Quebecans, local Inuits and Asian Muslims and (different than the Middle Easterners) the Asian Muslims differ with regard to political approach, philosophical thought and cultural assumptions even in Canada which was the first country where multiculturalism was taken into consideration. We can see another enlightening example on this issue in the study by the German anthropologist Schiffauer in which the difference with regard to religiosity was taken into consideration between the Muslims in the village of Subay a Turkish village in Turkey and their relatives and acquaintances who have migrated to Germany. Schiffauer puts forth four different phases of transformation with regard to rituals, political opinions, religious choices and awareness for the Muslim and religious Turkish communities working at different regions and living spaces. He attributes this transformation mainly to the nature of Islam that is dependent on congregation and the migration of Muslims to a secular foreign society (cited by Baumann, 1999: 75). According to the befitting statement by Fay (1996: 317) "cultures should be considered not as individual things but as interactive areas of activity." Hence, the experiences of the local settled public when engaging and confronting with the immigrants during the integration processes should be read within subjective spatial and social contexts. In conclusion, the *configurational analysis* method put forth by Hamilton (1999: 108) centering on the historical sociology concept of Eisenstadt presents the most idealized way for overcoming the tempocentric conflicts in multicultural integration policies:

> "(…) configurational analysis is the attempt to isolate and describe the essential qualities of patterned actions that are assumed to occur naturally. The analysis is ideally encompassed in three steps. First is the differentiation of a bounded pattern of action (a

configuration) from other similar but different patterns; this step is the process of classification. Second is the internal examination of the pattern with the goal of developing generalizations about its essential characteristics; this step creates a theory about the form and nature of the pattern. Third is the analytic use of this pattern to predict and explain any empirical case that can be similarly classified; this step is empirical interpretation. Throughout, configurations are the fulcrum of analysis. They are the objects of classification, the subjects of theory, and the sources of empirical interpretations."

The analysis techniques put forth in the configuration model present a method of 'how to handle' the unique multicultural integration policies of nation states subject to historical sociology. We need to overcome the Europe centric perspective first in order to actualize the principles of configurational analysis. In addition, careful attention should be drawn to the *interaction* capacity of cultural differences at the national scale, the migration *processes* of immigrants and the *structural* characteristics that affect the immigration experience. [10]

3. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSİON: IS IT POSSIBLE TO ELUDE THE ILLUSION OF MULTICULTURALISM?

---

[10] At this point, it encompasses the interaction capacity that I am suggesting by adhering to the method principles of historical sociology, the commodities incorporated in nation states and the system mechanisms that inspect the levels of intercultural interaction between the ethno-cultural groups. Hence, the primary aspect of interaction capacity includes the permeability between the mobility difference/boundaries at the places of settlement, speed of communication, diversity, moral norms and institutions. Whereas the process includes the form of actualization (conflict, tolerance, reconciliation, prejudice, discrimination etc.). Whereas the structure encompasses the diplomatic relations that determine the national and international system, socio-politic, economic context and normative principles.

The *isomorphism* illusion of multiculturalism together with the illusions of *naturalization, reification,* and *immutability* that feeds its fundamental perspective towards ethnocultural differences results in the emergence of various dualisms. These dualisms force immigration practices and local public practices to be evaluated as alternatives to each other. These result in the emergence of single-sided approaches that are based on considering the local public and the immigrants who are subjects as me-other, our culture-their culture, similarity-difference, understanding others with our terms-understanding others with their terms, inside-outside, maintaining order-disrupting order. It is essential in such an approach to put forth an active practice that provides options. In the multiculturalist approach, the immigrant considered away from an *interactive* context on the social basis and state order is sanctified thereby creating an isolated space for itself or it will be tried to ensure that the society making up the majority will be individuals who comply with the socio-cultural, financial and political structuring of the society. However, the immigrant-local public dilemma can be overcome a comparative historical sociology and dialectic holism principle in itself in addition to the universal integration policies (Wagner, 1994). Because of historical sociology:

> "fundamentally raises questions on social structures or processes that are understood to be settled concretely in time and space. Secondly, they consider the processes over time in addition to taking temporal succession when explaining the reasons for the results. Thirdly, many historical analyses pay attention to the interaction between important actions and structural contexts for making sense of the intended and unintended results in individual lives and social transformations. Finally, historical sociological analyses shed light on the particular and different characteristics

of specific social structures and patterns of change" (Skocpol, 1999: 2).

The efforts to put forth the similarities and differences between the method principles of historical sociology and the dialectical holism principle at the level of *separation* of social facts and secondly their autonomy and independence at the *internal-dependence* and *unity of opposites* level shall present opportunities for multiculturalism to be freed of the reification, naturalization and immutability, isomorphism illusions together with the sanctification of the cultural differences. Therefore, the temporal, spatial and social contexts in a dialectical holism along with the differences that emerge fall into the fundamental field of research. The relations between immigrants and the local public are not taken into consideration within the context of opposites since the principles put forth by historical sociology and the principle of dialectical holism do not consider societies subject to immigration and their inherent differences tangibly and statically. Thus, the essential understanding of identity lies at the center of multiculturalism will have been replaced by a *processual, interactive identity* understanding. The *structure-subject* relationship is assessed in the studies carried out in auni-directional manner separate from the temporal and social context[11]. Hence, the means of sustaining their lives by making a selection between assimilation and autonomy/discrimination are presented in multicultural integration policies to immigrants in minority groups with the accompaniment of universal principles. Because multicultural integration

---

[11]The following references can be examined for a critical reading on the problematic handling of the structure-subject relationship in migration and immigration experiences: Yeung, H.W. (1997), 'Critical realism and realist research in human geography: a method or a philosophy in search of a method?', Progress in Human Geography, 21(1): 51-74; Arango, J. (2000), 'Explaining migration: a critical view', International Social Science Journal, 52(165): 283-96. Pratt, A.C. (1995), 'Putting critical realism to work: the practical implications for geographical research', Progress in Human Geography, 19(1): 61-74.

policies put forth a uni-directional causality for explaining social facts. [12]For example, discussions on the relationship that Afro-Americans should establish with the white public also guide discussions on the relationship that should be established between Syrian immigrants and the dominant Turkish public. According to this understanding, the groups that represent the minority have two options: their unique experiences, cultural patterns will gray out as they try to fit the majority (assimilation) or they will be able to continue their cultural patterns in autonomous areas (marginalization). However, an *interaction[13]* based integration policy can be developed within the context of the methodologic understanding of historical sociology. Because each social fact is historical subject to the principle of dialectical holism and is interactive within social-cultural contexts subject to space. As put forth by Fay (1996: 321);

> "Interactionism as history and opinion of humanity focuses on the contact between different groups and individuals and the direct mutations resulting from this contact. It indicates that one of the primary duties of social sciences is to put forth how networks of

[12]Similarly, Dirlik tries to put forth in a critical context the general opinion of "overcoming the philosophical literature based on European colonialism" that emerged with the recent popularization of post-colonialism. It is especially indicated that the post-colonial theory is structured based on the ideologies of Marxism and nationalism and hence the development of a European centralism criticism based on this results in a conflict. Historicity indicates that a factual state such as passivation develops in the hegemony of secondary theories developed as criticisms in Europe when alienation and hegemony are discussed. Therefore, it is indicated that the social scientists who defend post-colonialism transform into "rhetoric communities" that do not realize they are involved in the alienation process. For further details, see Dirlik, Arif (1997) *The Postcolonial Aura Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism,* Westview press.
[13]Many defenders of multiculturalism in our day prefer to act as "critical multiculturalists" in the light of such criticism. According to this interpretation, the challenge put forth by multiculturalism consists of feeding the different relations that do not create a reference model in which no culture is granted privilege over others or in which differences can arrange and manage themselves. For further details, see *Stuart,* Hall (1996) *"Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies",* Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies (edt.) Kuan-Hsing Chen and David Morley, London: Routledge.

thought and practice in history internalize what was once foreign or perhaps even stronger, how it adapted to and made use of them or how it reevaluated them. Interactionism as ethics encourages people to interact with each other differently to devise new ways of learning positive things from each other…this learning does not consist solely of learning something about themselves and others. New opportunities for themselves and others will emerge during this contact".

In conclusion, studies with a focus on immigration and integration require the development of integration policies based on dialectics, the methodologic principles of historical sociology and interactionism. Of course, the present article does not assert that it is the only possible method. However, it is aimed to attract attention to the necessity to break through the ahistorical and asociological aspects of the studies with a focus on central European based multiculturalist integration. It is only in this context that we can carry out studies in which integration policies can be developed with which the "unity in diversity and in peace ideal" specific to nation-states.

REFERENCES

Akyiğit, H. (2017) "Ethnic Identity in the Transition of the Nation-State in Turkey: Case of Sakarya Province", Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sakarya: Sakarya University.

Arango, J. (2000) 'Explaining migration: a critical view', *International Social Science Journal*, 52(165): 283-96.

Avineri, S., Avner de-Shalit (edt.) (1992) *Communitarianism and Individualism,* New York Oxford University Press.

Baumann, G. (1999) *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic And Religious Identities,* Routledge: Taylor & Francis Books.

Benhabib, S. (2013) "What is Culture?" Marjorie Garber (edt.) *The Work of Culture*, New York: Routledge.

Bennett, T. (2015) "Kültürel ve Farklılık: Meydan Okuyan Çokkültürcülük", *Ulusal Kültürlerin Sonu mu?* (der.) Lluis Bonet-Emmanuel Negrier, (çev. Işık Ergüden), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bennett, S., Butler, J. (Ed.) (2000) *Locality, Regeneration & Divers[c]ities,* Intellect Books.

Berger, P., Thomas L. (1967) *The Social Constructionof reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, England: Penguin Books.

Bonet, L., Négrier E. (Ed.) (2015) Ulusal Kültürlerin Sonu mu? Çeşitlilik Sınavında Kültür Politikaları, (Çev.) Işık Ergüden, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Block, F. , Somers, Margeret R. (1999) "Ekonomist Yanılgının Ötesi: Karl Polanyi'nin Holistik Toplum Bilimi", *Tarihsel Sosyoloji*, (edt.) Theda Skocpol, (çev: Ahmet Fehmi), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Blommaert, J., Verschueren, J. (1998) *The Diversity Debate*, London: Routledge.

Buzan, B., Little, R. (2002) "International Systems in World History: Remaking The Study Of International Relations", *Historical Sociology of*

International Relations, (edt.) Stephen Hobden and John M. Hobson, Cambridge University Press.

Castells, M. (2006) *Kimliğin Gücü,* (çev. Ebru Kılıç). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Comaroff, John ve Comaroff J. (1992) *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*, West Press.

Curti, I. ve Pozzolo L. (2015) "Çokkültürlülük ve Kültür Politikaları", *Ulusal Kültürlerin Sonu mu?,* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Dirlik, A. (1997) *The Postcolonial Aura Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism, Westview press.*

Edinsel, K. (2014) *Sosyolojik Düşünme ve Çözümleme.* Etkenler, *Oluşum Süreçleri ve Etkiler.* İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

Eker, S. (2009) "Avrupa Birliği'nin Yeni Mottosu 'Farklılıkta Birlik' ve Türkçenin 'Farklılıkta Birlik'teki Yeri", *bilig*, 49 (1): 35-58.

Fay, B. (1996) *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: A Multicultural Approach* MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Fine, R. ve Cherlino, D. (2017) "Yakın Dönem Tarihsel Sosyolojide Sosyal Sınıflar ve Uluslar", *Tarihsel sosyoloji*, (edt.) Gerard Delanty ve Engin F. Işın, (çev. Ümit Tatıcan), İstanbul: Islık Yayınları.

Hall, S. (1996) "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies", *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (edt.) Kuan-Hsing Chen and David Morley, London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1991) "Old and New ıdentities, Old and New Ethnicities", *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, (edt.) A.D. King, England: Macmillan.

Hamilton, Gary G. (1999) "Tarihte Konfigürasyonlar: S. N. Eısenstadt'ın Tarihsel Sosyolojisi" *Tarihsel Sosyoloji*, (edt.) Theda Skocpol, (çev: Ahmet Fehmi), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Hage, G. (1998) *White Nation*, Sydney: Pluto Press.

Hobson, J. M. (2002) "What's at Stake in 'Bringing Historical Sociology Back into International Relations?', *Historical Sociology of International Relations*, (edt.) Stephen Hobden and John M. Hobson, Cambridge University Press.

Hobson, J. M, Hobden, S. (2002) "On The Road Toward An Historicised World Sociology", *Historical Sociology of International Relations,* (edt.) Stephen Hobden and John M. Hobson, Cambridge University Press.

Hopenhayn, M. (2015) "Sorun Önceleyen (Proaktif) Çokkültürcülük", *Ulusal Kültürlerin Sonu mu? Çeşitlilik Sınavında Kültür Politikaları,* (Çev.) Işık Ergüden, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kymlicka, W. (1989) *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, New York: Oxford York University Press.

Leveau, R. (1988) "The Islamic Presence in France", *The Islamic Presence in Western Europe*, (ed.) T.Gerholm ve Y. Lithman, Londra: Mansell.

Linklater, A. (2002) "Towards a Critical Historical Sociology Of Transnational Harm", *Historical Sociology of International Relations*, (edt.) Stephen Hobden and John M. Hobson, Cambridge University Press.

Modood, T. (2007) *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*, Cambridge: Polity*.*

Parekh, B. (2000) *Rethinking Multiculturalism Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, Palgrave.

Pratt, A. C. (1995) "Putting Critical Realism to Work: The Practical Implications For Geographical Research", *Progress in Human Geography*, 19(1): 61-74.

Rasmussen, D. (edt.) (1990) *Universalism vs. Communitarianism: Contemporary Debates in Ethics*, Cambridge, Mass: MITT Press.

Reus-Smith, C. (2002) "The Idea of History and History with Ideas", *Historical Sociology of International Relations*, (edt.) Stephen Hobden and John M. Hobson, Cambridge University Press.

Rothschild, J. (1981) *Ethnopolitics: A Conceptual Framework*, Newyork: Columbia University Press.

Sandel, M. (ed.) (1984) *Liberalism and Its Critics*, New York: New York University Press.

Schnapper, D. (2005) *Sosyoloji Düşüncesinin Özünde "Öteki" ile İlişki*, (çev. Ayşegül Sönmezay), İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Skocpol, T. (1999) "Sosyolojinin Tarihsel İmgelemi", *Tarihsel Sosyoloji*, (edt.) Theda Skocpol, (çev: Ahmet Fehmi), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Skocpol, T. (1999) "Tarihsel Sosyolojide Yeni Gündemler ve Yinelenen Stratejiler", *Tarihsel Sosyoloji*, (edt.) Theda Skocpol, (çev: Ahmet Fehmi), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Smaje, C. (2017) "Kurumsal Tarih: Irk ve Kast Konusunda Karşılaştırmalı Bir Yaklaşım", *Tarihsel Sosyoloji*, (edt.) Gerard delanty ve Engin F. Işın, (çev. Ümit Tatıcan), İstanbul: Islık Yayınları.

Taylor, C. (1994) "The Politics of Recognition", *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, (ed.) A. Gutmann, Princeton: Princeton Universty Press.

Tok, Nafiz (2003) *Kültür, Kimlik ve Siyaset*, Ayrıntı Yayınları: İstanbul.

Turner, T. (1993) "Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology That Multiculturalist Should be Mindful of it?" *Cultural Anthropology*, 8 (4): 411-429.

Wagner, P. (1994) *A Sociology of Modernity Liberty and Discipline*, Routledge.

Yeung, H. Wai-Chung (1997) 'Critical realism and realist research in human geography: a method or a philosophy in search of a method?', Progress in Human Geography, Sage Journals, 21(1): 51-74.

GENİŞ ÖZET

1990'dan buyana günümüz dünya ülkelerinin yaşamakta olduğu en önemli değişim/çatışma noktalarını, etnik ve kültürel kimlik temelli talep ve bu taleplerin beslediği çatışmalar oluşturmaktadır. Etnik veya kültürel temelli kimlik taleplerinin artmasında 1980'lerde başlayan post-modernleşme süreci ile 1990'lı yıllardan itibaren sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik alanlarda etkisini giderek arttıran küreselleşme süreci önemli rol oynamıştır. Bununla birlikte, Sovyetler Birliği'nin dağılmasının ardından eski Yugoslavya'da ve Kafkasya'da yaşanan etnik çatışmalar; Avrupa'da ve Ortadoğu'da büyük bir göç dalgasının yaşanması sonucunda göçmen nüfusunun hızla artması da kimlik taleplerinin görünür hale gelmesinde etkili olmuştur. Tüm bu gelişmeler sonucunda ulus devletlerde yaşanmakta olan mevcut etnik, kültürel, dinsel vb. temelli hareketlenmelere ve taleplere kalıcı çözümler bulunması, özellikle sosyal bilim yazın alanın en önemli görevi olarak görünmektedir. Bu gelişmeler ışığında özellikle çokkültürcülük ve çokkültürcü kimlik politikaları en sık tartışılan konu başlıkları arasında yer almaya başladığı görülmektedir. Ancak bu kültürel ve toplumsal farklılığı anlama çabası kendi içerisinde farklı olanın "kutsanmasına" dayalı olarak bir yaklaşım sunmaktadır. Biraz daha dikkatli bir okumayla bu tür değerlendirmeler kültürel farklılıkları statik, cansız bir olgu olarak tanımlamaları beraberinde getirmektedir. Böylelikle kültürel farklılık tarihsel ve toplumsal bağlamından kopuk olarak ele alınan inceleme nesnesine dönüşmektedir. Oysaki çokkültürcülük anlayışını besleyen çokkültürlülük mevcut etno-kültürel grupların sayısında çoğalan bir farklılığı temsil etmemektedir. Çokkültürlülük kendi içinde çoğalan ve çoğulcu bir kültür anlayışını içerisinde barındırmaktadır. Kısaca değindiğimiz eleştirilerin ışığında bu çalışmada çokkültürcülüğün kendi içerisinde neden derin sorunlar barındırdığı, tarihdışılığı ve asosyolojikliği "kronofetişizm" ve "temposentrisizm" olarak adlandırılan iki temel bağımsız değişken üzerinden analiz edilmiştir. Son olarak çokkültürücülük tartışmaların

yaygın bir şekilde devam ettiği günümüz dünyasının ivediklerine tarihsel sosyoloji anlayışının göç ve entegrasyon çalışmalarını nasıl zenginleştirebileceğini ve yeniden şekillendirebileceğini gösteren uygun bir görüş sunulmuştur.

Bu kapsamda öncelikli olarak çokkültürcü politika ve pratiklerin ilk bakışta sundukları sorunları ele alabilmek; tarihdışılığı ve asosyolojik yönünü açığa çıkartabilmek için çokkültürcülüğün tanımını çerçeveleyen "bağlam değişkenleri" açığa çıkartılmıştır. Bu bağlamda günümüzde yaşanmakta olunan kimlik çatışmalarına çözüm önerisi olarak sunulan çokkültürcülüğün kategorilerinin Batı veya Avrupa merkezli bir tarih anlayışına dayanması; kendisini zamansız ve evrensel olarak sunması üzerinde durulmuştur. Çokkültürcülüğün kategorilerinin kendisini zamansız ve evrensel olarak sunması ulus-devletlerin kendi sosyolojik, tarihi, jeopolitik deneyimleri ve süreçleri dikkate alınmadan yapılan çokkültürlü toplum tanımlamalarını beraberinde getirdiğine yönelik kuramsal tespitler yapılmıştır. Tarihin göz ardı edildiği bir çokkültürlü toplum tasviri ve bu bağlamda ortaya koyulan çokkültürcülük ulus-devletlerin özgül tarihine haksızlık etmekle kalmayıp etno-kültürel grupların şimdiki zamanına dair problemli bir bakış açısına sebep olduğuna yönelik çıkarımlarda bulunulmuştur. Problemli bakış açısının özellikle kültürel fetişizm beraberinde "kronofetişizm"i doğurduğundan bahsedilmiştir. Etno-kültürel farklılık tarihsel ve toplumsal bağlamından bağımsız olarak algılanarak içerisinde barındırdığı dinamik akışkan süreçlerin, özsel farklılıkların, çoğullukların göz ardı edilmesine, sadece ana odaklanarak içinde bulunan sürecin açıklanabileceği anlayışının yaygınlık kazanmasına neden olduğuna yönelik çıkarımlarda bulunulmuştur. Ayrıca çokkültürcü entegrasyon politikalarının göçmenlerin yapısal bağlamlar ile eylemler arasındaki "değişkenlik gösteren" ilişkilerin sürekli gözetilmesini engellediği; bundan dolayı toplumsal yapılardaki var olan etno-kültürel çeşitliliğe sahip göçmenlerin ve bunların etkileşim süreçlerini etkileyen

özgün ve *değişken* koşulların öne çıkartılması göz ardı edildiği ifade edilmiştir. İkinci bir ana tema olarak "temposentrizim" konusuna odaklanılmıştır. Bu başlık altında göç sürecini tetikleyen unsurlar toplumsal bağlamından kopuk olarak ele alınarak göçmenlik deneyimini yaşayan bireylerin *öznel deneyim*lerinin göz ardı edilmesiyle *fail-yapı* arasındaki karşılıklı ilişkiyi silikleştirdiğine yönelik açıklamalarda bulunulmuştur. Dolayısıyla göç sürecini ve göçmenlik deneyimlerini tarihsel süreç içerisinde yaşanan süreksizliklerin benzeşmeyen yönleriyle birlikte temel faktörlerini ele almadan geliştirilmeye çalışılan entegrasyon politikaları söz konusu olduğu vurgulanmıştır. Buda beraberinde genel durumun göçmenlik deneyimini ve uyum sürecini belirleyen/etkileyen döngülerin her aşamasının aynı olduğu, değişenin sadece göçmenlik deneyimini yaşayan aktörler olduğu yönünde açıklamalar içeren çalışmaların doğmasını getirmektedir. Çokkültürcülüğün etno-kültürel farklılıklara yönelik temel bakış açısını besleyen *doğallaştırma*, *somutlaştırma* ve *değişmezlik* yanılsamasıyla birlikte *eş biçimlilik* yanılsaması aslında kendi içerisinde bazı ikiciliklerin doğmasına neden oluyor. Bu ikicilikler temelde göçmenlik pratikleriyle- yerli halkın pratiklerini birbirlerinin alternatifiymiş gibi değerlendirilmesine zorluyor. Bunlar toplumsal yapıda fail konumda olan göçmen ve yerli halkı ben-öteki, bizim kültürümüz-onların kültürü, aynılık-farklılık, ötekileri kendi terimlerimizle anlamak-ötekileri onların kendi terimleriyle anlamak, içerideki-dışarıdaki, düzen sağlayan-tehdit eden gibi ikiliklerin temelinde ilerleyen bir takım kalıp yargıların tekrarını içeren kısmı-tek taraflı yaklaşımların doğmasına neden olmaktadır. Bu tür yaklaşımda tercih sunucu bir eylem pratiği çizilmesi esastır. Çokkültürcü yaklaşımda toplumsal tabanda ve devlet düzleminde *etkileşimse*l bir bağlamdan uzak okunan göçmen kutsanarak kendisine yalıtılmış bir alan yaratılacaktır ya da çoğunluğu oluşturan toplumun sosyo-kültürel, iktisadı ve politik yapılanmasına uygun bir birey olması için çaba sarf edilecektir. Tarihsel sosyolojinin yöntem ilkeleriyle birlikte diyalektik bütünsellik ilkesinin toplumsal olguların ayrışma

düzeyinde benzerlik ve farklılıklarını, ikinci olarak iç-bağımlılık ve karşıtların birliği düzeyinde özerklik ve bağımlılıklarını ortaya koyma çabası çokkültürcülüğün kültürel farklılıkların kutsanmasıyla birlikte somutlaştırıcı, doğallaştırıcı ve değişmezlik, eşbiçimlilik yanılsamalarından kurtulmanın imkanlarını sunmuş olacaktır. Sonuç olarak göç ve entegrasyon odaklı çalışmalarda diyalektik, tarihsel sosyolojinin yöntemsel ilkeleri ve etkileşimselciliğe dayalı bir entegrasyon politikaları geliştirilmesine ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Elbette bu makalede bunun tek bir yöntem olduğu iddia edilmemektedir. Ancak dikkat çekilmek istenilen konu Avrupa merkezci gelişen çokkültürcü entegrasyon odaklı çalışmaların tarihdışı ve asosyolojiklik yönünü kırmaya ihtiyaç duyulduğudur.