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Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to analyse national integration policies in Estonia during the last 5-6 years. In the first section background information about the ethnic issues in Estonia will be given. In the second section multiculturalism as a theoretical idea and a possible conceptual base for handling the ethnic issue will be discussed. The third section will focus on the model of multiculturalism adapted by the Estonian authorities in the policy document ‘Integration Programme of Estonian Society 2000-2007’. The final section is devoted to further integration challenges in the context of the Estonian membership in the EU.

1. The ethnic issue in Estonia
After regaining independence in 1991, Estonia resumed its nation building project, aiming to restore her lost statehood and damaged cultural heritage. Due to historical, demographic and other reasons, implementing of the project proved to be problematic and controversial. In purely economic terms, Estonia figures among the most successful post-communist countries. But the social costs of the transition have been painful. One of the most difficult current problems in Estonian society comes from heterogeneity and separation between ethnic Estonians and Russian-speaking population of Estonia (non-Estonians). The state has developed a political system, which is exclusive for a majority of the non-Estonians. They do not have the status of Estonian citizens, are denied the right to run for office, form political parties and vote in national elections.

In finding solutions it is important to bear in mind demographic background to such a situation. Before the Soviet occupation, according to the 1934 census, Estonians comprised 88%, Russians 8% and other nationalities 4% of the population of Estonia. Russians lived mainly in the border regions of Narva, Peipsi and Petseri. In 1945 the Moscow authorities changed the border, giving Russia the regions of Estonia inhabited mostly by native Russians. This made Estonia a very homogeneous country where Estonians formed 97.3% of the population. During the ensuing Soviet period, the number of non-Estonians increased 26-fold, from 23,000 in 1945 to 602,000 in 1989. At the same time the number of Estonians decreased from about one million in 1940 to 965,000 in 1989 (Vetik, 1993).

These dramatic demographic changes are due to migration and differences in fertility rates as well as Soviet political and military measures. Estonian birthrates remained lower than those of non-Estonians throughout the Soviet period. The absolute number of Estonian births dropped by about 20% during this period. A very important factor affecting the decrease of the Estonian population was the series of catastrophes of the 1940s. During this period Estonia lost about 20% of its pre-occupation population (Kirch et al 1992). In June 1940, 10,157 people were deported; in 1944 about 80,000 people emigrated to the West; about 100,000 were killed in the war; and 20,702 were removed in another deportation in March 1949. The number of non-Estonians has risen mainly because of immigration. Post-war immigration into Estonia resulted from Moscow policy aiming to mix different nations in order to strengthen control over peripheral regions, as well as from the logic of socialist industrialization which tended to concentrate labor resources in certain regions.
The population of Estonia has decreased remarkably in 1990s. Due to both negative net migration and negative natural increase it dropped to the level of the early 1980s by 1995 (Demographic Data Collection 1996). Since the mid-1980s, net migration has decreased steadily. It used to be 6000-7000 people per year, but reached zero-level in 1989. Emigration reached its peak in 1992, when 33,700 people left the country. This number exceeds the average of the previous decade by nearly three times. However, in the following years emigration dropped considerably and has been about 3000 in the last years. In the period 1990 to 1994, 88,000 left the country, 90% of whom moved to the CIS countries.

It is not a surprise, in such a context, that the ethnic factor informs a number of societal conflicts in Estonia. Analytically, one can differentiate three types of controversies. In the first place, there is the antagonism between the integrity of the public sphere and the desire of national minorities to preserve their distinctive features. For instance, the establishment of the status of the state language and expansion of its sphere of use has been indispensable to build up a new Estonian state in 1990s. Deplorably, the minority groups have perceived in it the encroachment upon their rights jeopardizing the status of the Russian language.

The antagonism of the second type arise of and from the need to reform a number of social structures, in the process of which, the old ones must be pulled down. For instance the setting up of the unified educational system presumes dismantling of the two parallel school systems in Estonia stemming from the Soviet period. This is absolutely indispensable, to provide for the coherence necessary for the society and to create prerequisites to the youth, not only for a successful job career, but also for making ‘good citizens’. Standardised school education has historically been instrumental for modernisation of all European nation-states, as the essential factor furthering the equality of opportunities. Unfortunately, the position of non-Estonians as regards the reforms in Estonian school system is predominantly negative, because the system dating from the Soviet period had more appeal to them, culturally and psychologically. Transfer to the Estonia-centred system calls for a strenuous effort and the making of certain allowances, which however are inevitable for the minority living in a nation-state.

Finally, there is an antagonism between different value orientations and identities, primarily concerning the attitude to Russia. For many Estonians, Russia is an embodiment of not only the past injustices but also of a continuing danger to security. For Russians, however, Russia is continuous wellspring of traditions and culture as well as the information space in which one understands both itself and the outside world. That is why the positive marking of Russia is an inevitable prerequisite for their dignity and spiritual balance.

The core challenge of national integration is to build up, while involved in a tangle of controversies, the identity common to all people who have tied themselves with Estonia. The major formal obstacle to that is related to the citizenship issue. The laws of the Republic of Estonia do not consider ethnicity in determining a person’s legal status. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Estonia, “all persons shall be equal before the law. No one may be discriminated against on the basis of nationality, race, colour, sex, language, origin, creed, political or other persuasions, financial or social status, or other reasons.” However, the majority of non-Estonians still do not have the status of Estonian citizens. Such a situation results on one side from the occupation of the Estonian Republic by the Soviet Union, and on the other from liquidation of the consequences of the occupation after the reinstitution of Estonian independence.
using restrictive citizenship policy as a primary tool. The citizenship law of 1992 defined only those who possessed Estonian citizenship before June 16, 1940 and their descendants as citizens. The citizenship law currently in effect was adopted in 1995. The bulk of the contents reiterate the previous law. The primary change from the previous one is that the two-year residency requirement for naturalization is increased to five years. This applies to those who have moved to Estonia after the new law went into effect. The second change is that applicants for citizenship are required to possess besides a basic knowledge of the Estonian language also knowledge of some important Estonian laws and to give an oath of loyalty.

2. Multiculturalism as a theoretical idea and a new model of democracy
In May 2004 Estonia became a member of the European Union. This means that the ethnic issue as well as possible solutions to it should be situated in a broader European context.

In many European states the whole post-World War II period can be characterised by extensive economic migration from the third world countries. As a consequence, new policy problems emerged. To put it simply, the problem is that West European countries are based on democratic principles and wish to remain democratic, but the explosive growth in their cultural heterogeneity has made accomplishing this aim problematic within the framework of traditional liberal-democratic model. Democracy emerged in historically different situation being a result of modernization and individualist ideology, which brought along remarkable social homogenization. However, after the World War II analogous homogenization was impossible and that is why new ways to handle the ethnic divergence had to be found.

The idea of multiculturalism represents one possible strategy for that. In recent years multiculturalist policy is increasingly accepted as the most effective and morally most desirable way of managing the ethnic diversity in the EU. It has, however, various meanings and this can give rise to contradictory policies. It can also lead to hidden assumptions that can undermine its effectiveness, when taken out of the context where it works well. In order to explain the concept of multiculturalism used in this paper, I would like to link it to the wider conception of society. Subsequently I shall differentiate two forms of liberalism – procedural and substantive – and show that the first one tends to support and the second one to reject multiculturalist policies.

Immanuel Kant’s concept of individual’s autonomy, according to which every person has a right to define for himself or herself what is good, can be considered the basis of procedural theory of society. It derives from this principle that state should not formulate the one substantive viewpoint that ought to be followed by everybody. Liberalism based on Kant presumes individualism, homogeneity of the society and neutrality of the state. Due to that the co-existence of different cultures on one territory is problematic already on its own. One can refer to a classical author of liberalism John Stuart Mill, according to whom ‘free institutions are next to impossible in a country made up of different nationalities’. Thus, with culture being a group phenomenon in its essence, multiculturalism is inevitably an uncomfortable notion for classical liberalism.

However, there is also another trend in liberal theory that does not rest upon procedural, but substantial definition of social good. This has emerged during the last decades precisely in connection with the above-mentioned problem – the inability of classical liberalism to adequately
conceptualize the problems concerning group rights. This trend is exemplified by an approach of Charles Taylor. In the article ‘The Politics of Recognition’ he maintains that the identity of one culture depends on its dialogic relations with the others (Taylor, 1994). He distinguishes between monologic and dialogic ideal of culture and opines that not only culture but also a single individual is dialogic in its nature.

Dialogic approach to culture places the phenomenon of ethnic diversity on new grounds. If one assumes that any culture is dialogic, then pluralism of cultures is the only way of existence of culture. So, multiculturalism is not an exception but a rule, i.e. without pluralism of cultures there is no culture. It is important to notice that such an interpretation, if compared to the monologic one, brings potential policy problems related to ethnic diversity into a principally new light. It turns out that it is not a phenomenon that should or could be eliminated. In the framework of the monologic approach multiculturalism is regarded a deviation from the norm and the striving is to eliminate it. But not so in the dialogic approach, which constructs ethnic diversity as a normal state of affairs. It holds that even if there are problems and conflicts caused by the ethnic factor, the phenomena of ethnic diversity as such should not and could not be eliminated. As a result, dialogic approach is much better suited for accommodation of conflicts related to ethnic diversity.

There are examples of both procedural and substantive approaches in actual life. Procedural orientation is most obvious in USA that is an archetype country of individualism. USA is historically an immigrant country and the process of americanization has also taken place mainly through individual assimilation. In literature the most critical attacks against multiculturalism as a model of society often come from American authors, one famous example being Arthur Schlesinger’s controversial book ‘The Disuniting of America’ (Schlesinger, 1992). One of the example of substantive orientation would be Quebec, which is the society with strong collective goals and liberal values at the same time. According to Charles Taylor ‘it is axiomatic for Quebec governments that the survival and flourishing of French culture in Quebec is a good’ (Taylor, 1994). On the other hand, in Quebec also diversity is respected and certain safeguards for fundamental rights are created. It is not denied that there are tensions and difficulties in pursuing these objectives together, but according to Taylor, ‘such a pursuit is not impossible, and the problems are not in principle greater than those encountered by any liberal society that has to combine, for example, liberty and equality, or prosperity and justice’ (Taylor 1994).

3. The Estonian model of multiculturalism
Smallness of the ethnic Estonian population, geopolitical location of the country and its bitter historic experience make many Estonians to fear that the nation’s long-term survival is being under a threat. This is the reason why the Estonian language and culture are regarded as a good that the state should stand for. Estonia is similar to Quebec in that respect. In both cases substantive approach to the society is brought in by a number of political documents. For example, the special role of the Estonian culture is formulated not only in the laws on language and education but also in the Estonian constitution.

The question for further analyses is, what group rights exactly the Estonian model of multicultural democracy supports? This issue has been discussed, for example, by Heidmets and Lauristin (Heidmets&Lauristin 1998). These authors differentiate between political
multiculturalism and such political integration of ethnic minorities that takes place through the process of individual and free cultural identification. The difference between these two forms of multiculturalism is a matter of principle. The model of political multiculturalism is supported, for example, by Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan who claim, in connection with Estonia and Latvia, that democracy and the logic of nation state are in conflict (Linz&Stepan, 1996). In their opinion the solution is in recognizing the minorities as subjects possessing collective political rights together with resultant possibilities for territorial autonomy, dual-language governance etc. The contrasting model of cultural identification argues that the immigrant population does not form a national minority but a culturally different ethnic group whose members should be guaranteed equal participation in social life together with the possibility of preserving their cultural peculiarity. Multiculturalism in the latter approach does not mean collective political rights but the right for cultural diversity in a common societal space that is supported by the majority (see also Kymlicka, 1995 in this respect).

Proceeding from the ideas of Lauristin and Heidmets, a pair of analytic categories ‘unity-difference’ can be taken as the starting point for defining the notion of integration of Estonian society. This has actually been done by a group of experts, when formulating the conceptual basis for the Integration Programme of Estonian Society 2000-2007, adopted by the Estonian Government in March 2000. Achieving an optimum coherence of society was stated as the objective of national integration in Estonia. Such an approach is based both on classical nation building literature (Deutch, 1963) and contemporary theories of multiculturalism. John Rex’s theory that is based on differentiation between public and private spheres is of particular importance for such an approach. According to Rex, in order to grasp multiculturalism as a form of social organization, it is important to look how homogeneous or different are the main cultural groups of the society in these two spheres and what kind of policy does the state implement in this relation. By combining these two distinctions four logical possibilities come into being:

(a) society that is unitary in public sphere but tolerant regarding differences in private sphere;
(b) society that is unitary in public sphere and promotes unity also in private sphere;
(c) society that promotes difference and differential rights both in public and private sphere;
(d) society that promotes difference and differential rights in public sphere but unity in private sphere (Rex, 1996).

Version (a) represents multiculturalism, (b) represents the French model of assimilation, (c) depicts colonialism and (d) is characteristic to the southern states of USA before the civil rights movement, according to Rex.

Thus, the proportion of unity-difference both in public and private sphere is the basic variable in defining multiculturalism. Differences are welcome in private sphere, because they enrich the overall cultural arena. In public sphere homogeneity is more important, as this provides the coherence necessary for normal functioning of the society. The problem with such an approach, however, is that certain phenomenon belong to the both spheres. For example, education gives a person instrumental competence on one hand, but on the other teaches moral values that are characteristic of a certain type of culture. The same applies to language – on one hand, it is an
instrument that is needed in order to manage in society, while on the other, it is a bearer of certain intellectuality.

Thus, although public and private spheres are analytically distinguishable, they nevertheless influence one another in reality. Therefore, no single recipe exists for all multiethnic countries for creating the model of democratic multiculturalism. As different problems arise in different countries, the proportion between unity and difference in public and private spheres should be defined differently as well. In the Estonian Integration Programme the proportion between unity-difference has been defined as follows:

Two processes shape the essence of integration of Estonian society: on one hand, social homogenization of the society based on knowledge of Estonian language and acquiring Estonian citizenship, and on the other, opportunity to preserving ethnic differences through recognizing minority cultural rights. Homogenization of the society is a two-sided process – the integration of both Estonians and non-Estonians around a strong common ground in Estonian society. Enabling the preservation of ethnic differences means creating conditions in society that promote ethnic identity by individuals who belong to ethnic minorities and are interested in it (Governmental Programme 2000).

It is important to note that the proposed concept of integration contains elements that under certain circumstances can contradict. Homogenization of society and preserving ethnic differences are more often than not contradictory processes. That is why the further description of integration processes is needed, which would specify what kind of unification of the society and preservation of which differences is regarded as a part of integration. For that purpose three spheres of integration are distinguished in the Estonian Integration Programme:

1. Linguistic-communicative integration, meaning reproduction of a common space of information and an Estonian language environment in Estonian society under the conditions of diversity and tolerance;
2. Legal-political integration, meaning molding a population that is loyal to the Estonian state and diminishing the number of people without Estonian citizenship;
3. Socio-economic integration, meaning achieving an equal opportunity in competition and social mobility of members of Estonian society irrespective of their ethnic or cultural background (Governmental Programme 2000).

At last, the Integration Programme outlines the Estonian version of a multicultural society. Its elements are the principles of strong common ground, cultural pluralism and preserving the Estonian cultural space. The model can be illustrated by the following figure:
The first element of the model presumes that a multicultural society can function effectively only if its members share a sufficient common ground. A common ground creates a basis for mutually enriching communication and apprehension of common interests in society. It contributes to a situation where individuals from different nationalities feel themselves secure in Estonia. Strong common ground of Estonian society is territorially defined with Estonia and rests upon a common language – Estonian language that is the basis for the functioning of the institutions of the public sphere. Besides language, a strong common ground consists of the following elements of the public sphere: democratic values, common social institutions, common education system and mutual tolerance.

The principle of cultural pluralism means that non-Estonians living in Estonia have been guaranteed possibilities for preserving their language and culture through receiving mother-tongue education and promoting the activities of ethno-cultural societies. The approach to the Estonian culture presumes that all cultures existing in Estonia are equal in the public debate. However, in relations with the state the status of Estonian culture differs from that of minority cultures as one of the aims of Estonian statehood is the preservation of totality of the Estonian cultural space. Estonian society is multicultural and due to that that state has to create conditions
for the cultural development of ethnic minorities, but in the sense of a common societal space Estonia is and will remain Estonian (Governmental Programme 2000).

The approach presented in the integration programme forms the core of the Estonian model of democratic multiculturalism. Its essence can be further explained by a comparison of its essential similarities and differences to liberal, consociational and ethnic models of democracy. Liberal democracy is the original form of democracy in which power belongs to the people, human and political rights belong to individuals, while the state is a neutral arbiter and guarantor of these rights. Civil society lies between citizens and the state in the form of various interest groups from which the state is independent. Ethnic groups belong to civil society and are in no way bound to the state power that officially supports none of them and does not recognize them as important entities in the society.

The notion of consociational democracy was introduced by Arendt Lijphart to denote the system of several multinational countries like Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Austria and Lebanon (Lijphart, 1977). Its peculiarity lies in recognition of the principle of collective representation and proportional distribution of society’s resources between officially defined ethnic, language or religious groups. Offices in public institutions are distributed according to the same principle, although by definition the state is neutral towards the different groups. People in consociational democracy are not only recognized as citizens, but also as members of concrete national groups, because their rights and duties depend on it to a certain extent.

The notion of ethnic democracy was introduced by Sammy Smooha to mark those multiethnic countries that do possess most of the characteristics of liberal democracy, but besides that also institutionalize political and cultural domination of one ethnic group in a given territory (Smooha, 1990). The notion of ethnic democracy is constructed based on the example of Israel, but according to Smooha, it is also applicable in some other cases. Thus, in ethnic democracy the state is not neutral but intended to protect the culture and traditions of the main nationality and to realize its political aspirations. That means the state is seen as belonging to this group.

Where can multicultural democracy be situated in the spectrum of forms of democracy described above? It can be argued that it lies somewhere between liberal and consociational democracy. The following table illustrates the idea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recognition of general principles of democracy</th>
<th>Recognition of group rights</th>
<th>Political institutionalization of group rights</th>
<th>Recognition of political privileges of one group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal democracy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural democracy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consociational democracy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic democracy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the forms included in the table recognize general principles of democracy and that is why they are called democracies. Their most important differences in respect of supporting group rights can be outlined as follows:

1. The multicultural democracy differs from liberal democracy as it recognizes ethnic heterogeneity and group rights in multiethnic states. One group is the titular nationality of the state, whom the state is named after. The titular group’s language forms the basis of a common communicative field as well as societal cultural space of the state. In all other respects the multicultural democracy is similar to liberal democracy.

2. The multicultural democracy differs also from consociational democracy. Both recognize ethnic heterogeneity of the state, but in the multicultural democracy it is institutionalized only culturally, not politically, as in consociational democracy. Ethnic difference can, for instance, lay grounds for cultural autonomy for ethnic minorities, but not for their territorial autonomy or federalism.

3. Finally, the multicultural democracy is similar to ethnic democracy in the sense that both recognize the existence of group rights. They differ, however, because multicultural democracy does not institutionalize political domination of one national or ethnic group and does not claim that the state belongs to that group (which would give political privileges to it). Recognition of certain substantive rights of the titular national group in multicultural democracy does not mean discrimination of ethnic minorities or privileging the national group. It simply reflects the fact that in a modern nation state certain group rights of different national and ethnic groups vary stemming from their different connection to the state.

4. Further national integration challenges in the context of membership in the EU

In the context of enlarged EU the issues of governance of ethnic diversity are becoming far more important to the EU politics than they used to be. Already the Maastricht Treaty signalled the willingness of the member-states to see the EU developing in this direction and promote ‘the flowering of the cultures of the member-states, while respecting their national and regional diversity’ (Art. 128). Thus the EU’s basic constitutional document clearly recognises the value of cultural diversity. Given the growing salience of the issue as the EU ‘widens and deepens’, much more attention will be committed to tackling its many and complex problems. Particularly, the Amsterdam Treaty emphasised the need to take appropriate action to combat discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin (Art. 6a).

The ‘Integration Programme of the Estonian Society for 2000-2007’ adopted by the Estonian Government in March 2000, distributes the integration-focused activity and integration processes into three domains. The conceptual part of the programme does not present the domains and activities hierarchically, i.e. they all are considered equally important. The applied side of the programme has, however, focused primarily on the cultural-linguistic integration, while other domains have receded relatively in the background. Such an approach was justified in the initial period of integration policies. In order to secure the success of political and socio-economic integration, the proficiency in Estonian and the embedding of people in the Estonian society was of primary importance. It may be claimed that by creating motivation for language learning and by acquiring language skills, major success has been achieved. However, it is a common understanding in Estonia shared by many experts that by now there is an urgent need to focus
also on political and socio-economic goals of integration. The continuing effacing themselves of a large share of non-Estonians from social and political life of Estonia is detrimental not only to themselves, but to the state as a whole. Consequently, there is a need to develop the Estonian integration policies along the lines provided in respective EU documents.

There are several hard questions in respect of the state of affairs of political integration on non-Estonians. What exactly are the opportunities and needs of non-Estonians for participation in political and social life of Estonia? Are those political rights and obligations in equipoise? How much is the institutional environment, created by the Estonian state conducive to give rise in them of Estonia-centred political notions and attitudes? What are the chances to direct, by political devices, the processes linked to the legal status of non-Estonians? What is the role of ethnic Estonians in reaching the goals of political integration?

While seeking solution to the issues of political integration, a specific social-psychological and historical context to the problems should be considered. There is a major and historically deeply rooted conceptual difference regarding the notion of citizenship between West and East European countries. The majority of West European countries do not make difference between the concepts of ‘nationality’ and ‘citizenship’, which are used as synonyms. The persons having nationality or citizenship are considered as fully fledged nationals. Nationality or citizenship is attained through naturalisation process, upon grounds of a shorter or longer period of residence and some other additional criteria defined by the law. The situation of many Eastern European countries is different, however. Here, the person may consider himself a member of a certain nationality or ethnic group, while having the citizenship of the country of his actual residence. Under such a model, the citizenship is a contract between the country and a particular citizen, while nationality is rather the feeling of belonging to one’s own ethnic group. Hence, acquisition of a citizenship is a formal procedure, which is possible to everyone, in principle, while the nationality is something into what one is born. In Estonia, as a typical Eastern European country, the nationality and the citizenship are standing clearly apart, which sets up a specific social-psychological background to the naturalisation issues. They are often perceived in the existentialist dimension, in the first place, making hard to use the rational arguments.

In such a context, what should be done to advance political integration in Estonia? The point of reference would be an unconstructive fact that about one fourth of the Estonian population lack the citizenship of Estonia, while about one sixth has no citizenship whatsoever. Seeking a solution to the citizenship issue is one of the basic domains of the whole integration-focused activity, because when that problem is unravelled, many other problems would clear up of themselves. It is important for the state to create a situation when the non-Estonians desirous to obtain citizenship can fulfil the respective conditions, under the law. As regards the non-citizens, the condition precedent for naturalisation should be that they are to accept the premise that Estonia as a sovereign state has established its requirements of citizenship, which are to be fulfilled.

An important aspect of political integration is participation of non-Estonians in political life. Unlike the national elections, on the local level the non-citizens too are eligible to vote, which has been a vital channel for their incorporation into political life of Estonia. However, one can argue that consolidation of democracy in Estonia presumes the increase of the share of non-Estonians also in the national political life. Essentially for politics, the goal might be to attain a
situation where in the political landscape of national and local level, a similar political pluralism would develop among Estonians and non-Estonians, so that at elections, votes would be given, not basing on ethnic identity, but on other personal (for instance economical) preferences. One can argue that this has been the case in the last national elections of 2003, which supports the development where the ethnic identity will recede from the public sphere and will take its natural place as a safeguard of culture and traditions.

Further advancement of political integration presumes the increase of tolerance and openness in respect of ethnic minorities on behalf of ethnic Estonians. The integration monitorings carried out during the last years suggests that although there have been positive shifts in that area in the recent decade, we cannot as yet talk about the open tolerant society in Estonia (Lauristin & Vetik 2000). Consequently, one of the directions of integration-focused activity should be the programmes and projects which are aimed at decrease of ethnocentrist attitudes. This means that also ethnic Estonians should be the target groups of the integration-focused projects carried out by the Integration Foundation. Until now the target groups of integration projects have been only non-Estonians, but it seems to be high time for a reversal of this policy. Accepting by ethnic Estonians of the multiple cultures in the society will mean that integration will no longer be regarded as assimilation, and the cultural idiosyncrasies of the minorities will be accepted as an element of aggregate culture of the society. Inasmuch as the difference of cultures may be a source both of collision and richness, the particular integration projects should develop the understanding of ethnic diversities as a wealth yielding benefit to all.

Finally, new ideas are needed to better conceptualise the integration-related fundamental notions. It is essential that theoretical concepts develop insofar as the life surrounding us develops, and as its requirements and challenges develop. For instance, in keeping with the current international trend, there are on the rise the treatments of citizenship of a new type, not relating to countries but also to other institutions. Ever more often, one stumbles across the terms like ‘corporate citizenship’, ‘global citizenship of states’ etc. Proof to the conjecture that the citizenship need not be related to a state only is the introduction by the EU of the concept of European Union citizenship, which does not replace the citizenship of the home country of a given individual, however would give certain additional rights. Hence the policy problems related to citizenship and the concept of citizenship are the phenomena transitional in time. Consequently the promotion of political integration presumes the readiness for new citizenship-focused discussions also in Estonia.
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