



IMES

Instituut voor Migratie- en Etnische Studies

MPMC Project

Multicultural Policies and Modes of
Citizenship in European Cities

Working Paper

4

The MPMC Workshop in Zeist

March 2000

Amsterdam, Athens, Antwerp, Barcelona, Birmingham, Brussels,
Cologne, Liege, Marseilles, Milan, Oeiras (Lisboa), Paris, Rome,
Stockholm, Tel Aviv, Turin, Zurich



Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture

UNESCO - MOST PROJECT
Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities (MPMC)

4

The MPMC Workshop in Zeist

March 2000

The publication of this Working Paper is financially supported by the European Commission.

Foreword

In the MPMC project various workshops are organized to bring together social scientists, policy makers and representatives of migrant organizations to discuss research material and results and refine the MPMC framework (see Working Paper nr. 1). Three workshops have so far taken place; one in 1997 in Amsterdam, one in 1999 in Liege (Belgium) and one in 2000 in Zeist (the Netherlands). In the first two workshops research material was presented and the participating teams decided on the structure of future research. The third workshop was organised on an UNESCO-MOST conference.

On the 21st and 22nd of March 2000 UNESCO-MOST organised a large conference in The Netherlands (Zeist) entitled 'Social Science and Governance'. The major objective of the conference was to further the discussion about the various ways social science research and policy interact. It consisted of a combination of workshops and plenary sessions covering different topics for which the relation between research and policy is or has been important. The MPMC project took the responsibility of organising one of the workshops. The purpose of the workshop was to give concrete practices of the relationship or influence of social science research on policy. The workshop of March 20-21st 2000 followed up on a workshop organised by the IMES in Liege, 31st October-2nd November 1999.

The Steering Committee

Dr. Marco Martinielo

Prof. dr. Rinus Penninx

Dr. Steven Vertovec

The MPMC Workshop of 20-21 March 2000 in The Netherlands (Zeist)¹

Introduction.

The workshop of the MPMC project addressed the topic of multiculturalism and migration and was called; Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities (like the overall project). The central question of the workshop was how the relationship between researchers, local level policy makers and the population concerned (represented by migrant organisations) had developed over the course of the project in various cities included in the MPMC framework.

The workshop contained:

- a) a stage setting presentation by the workshop co-ordinator Prof. Dr. Rinus Penninx.
- b) three case studies: Amsterdam, (Oeiras) Lisbon and Zurich.
- c) a reflection on the case studies by Stephen Castles from the UNESCO-MOST APMRN network
- d) a closing session in which conclusions were drawn from the case studies.

To prevent the common mistake of discussing the relationship between two or three kinds of partners in the presence of only one of them the case studies were presented by a team; each case study had three speakers:

- a) a researcher involved. Amsterdam was presented by dr. Jean Tillie of the *Universiteit van Amsterdam*, Oeiras (Lisbon) by Prof. Maria Margarida Marques from the *New University of Lisbon* and Zurich by Hans Mahnig from the *Swiss Forum for Migration Studies*.
- b) a policy maker or politician from the local government. For Amsterdam this was Mrs. Debby Thé from *Diversiteitsbeleid* (diversity policy), for Oeiras David Justino, alderman of Oeiras municipality, and for Zurich Mrs. Johanna Tresp, director of the *Office for Intercultural Questions*.
- c) a representative of a relevant migrant organisation. For Amsterdam this was Haci Karacaer, a member of the *Turkish Advisory Board* and the *Milli Gorus*, for Oeiras this was Mr. Carvalho, founder of the *Cultural and Sportive Association of Pedreira dos Húngaros* and for Zurich Taner Hatipoglu, chairperson of *SERA; Foundation for Education, Formation and Integration*.

Introductory speech by Prof. Rinus Penninx.

In this workshop the three case studies of Amsterdam, Oeiras and Zurich regarding the relation between politicians, scientists and immigrants will be presented. In each the focus will be on the

¹ This Working Paper is based on notes taken by Karen Kraal at the Zeist Workshop and is therefore comprised of present tense statements.

content of the political participation and the co-operation between researchers, politicians/ policy makers and the ethnic minorities.

The case studies can be placed in the broader context of the MPMC project. The framework of this project takes as key concept citizenship. First as juridical/political status; in how far do immigrants have formal rights that differ from those of natives in relation to formal political structures? Secondly, as socio-economic dimension; what are the social and economic rights of immigrants? And thirdly citizenship is placed in a cultural dimension; what are the cultural/religious rights of immigrants?

The advantage of this analytical distinction is that we are able to cover both the formal system of rights and its practice, and the way participation in one domain relates to participation in another domain. The practice of political participation is studied in two ways: top down (the inclusion of immigrants versus exclusion) and bottom-up (the mobilisation of immigrants). The interaction between these two is studied systematically. The three key questions asked are:

- (1) How do local authorities activate immigrants and ethnic minorities to participate in political decision making in general, and in relation to their position in particular?
- (2) How do immigrants and ethnic minority mobilise to improve their position and to influence policies relating to that position?
- (3) How do activation policies of authorities and mobilisation of immigrants and ethnic minorities interact?

The framework for understanding the relation between the partners assumes that co-operation is not self-evident and the practice is very much bound by institutional settings. It is important to identify the players and basic rules and that the three actors agree that most elementary rules derive from the political context of liberal democracies.

The case of Amsterdam.

The researcher, Jean Tillie.

Jean Tillie presents a) the situation of Amsterdam regarding the various ethnic groups, b) the studies regarding the political participation and trust of the various groups and c) the collaboration with the City and ethnic minorities.

A) In Amsterdam the most important ethnic minority groups are; the Surnamese, Moroccans, Turks, Antilleans and Ghanese. These groups all have voting rights on the local level. Further the municipality has installed so called advisory councils for the various groups. These councils can give asked and unasked advice to the municipality.

The concrete policies regarding minorities are formulated and implemented on the level of the city district (there are 13 city districts in total). These districts are very autonomous within the city and therefore huge variations can be observed.

B) In several studies and papers that Jean Tillie has conducted and written with Meindert Fennema they argue that the political participation of ethnic minorities is positively linked to democracy; the more people participate the better the democracy will be. Further, participation is considered to be influenced by the trust people have in institutions; the more people have trust the higher the quality of democracy will be. In their studies Tillie and Fennema therefore focus on the political participation and trust of the different minority groups.

Research has shown that Turks have the highest voter turn out and participate most. Democracy therefore works better for Turks. The question is then asked; why do Turks vote more and have more trust? The higher voter turn out and trust is correlated to the degree of ethnic community of these groups. The more ethnic community, the more participation and trust. The indicators to measure the density of the (ethnic) community are the number of (self) organisations and the relations between these (especially those established through the overlapping of board members). The more organisations and relations, the more community there is. Through these networks people can build social capital and trust can travel within the community. Participation is therefore explained by looking at these communities and the networks.

C) The network studies were done in collaboration with the local government. The data were also used by the municipality for practical purposes; it gave them information on the various groups in the city. After the earthquake in Turkey in August 1999 the network study was used by the Turkish community to mobilise itself.

Migrant groups were approached as respondents for the researches but the co-operation between the research teams and migrant groups was restricted to the collaboration with a service organisation for migrants in Utrecht (Forum). The IMES is a research institute; it only works together with others when there are overlapping interests.

The politician, Debby Thé.

Since 1999 the City of Amsterdam has adopted a new policy. Minority policy is considered out dated and is replaced by diversity policy. The stimulation of political participation is no specific target of diversity policy. Participation is considered as an interconnection of social, political and administrative participation. The main goal is to bring the city administration to the public by having citizens intensively involved in the policy decision making. All people from Amsterdam should be able to participate and take part in discussions and decision making. This means that people should be

stimulated to be active in neighbourhood work, boards of associations, advisory councils, political structures etc. Diversity policy is not only aiming at solving problems but also at chances and the incorporation of all groups. The municipality approaches people by residence panels, formal structures for boards of migrant organisations (also on district levels) and by going to the people themselves. More efforts are made for certain groups that are harder to reach and incorporate like allochtonous people.

Debby mentions various researches that have been conducted in collaboration with researchers, for example; the network studies mentioned by Jean Tillie; a research on the representation of women and allochtonous people in advisory boards and councils of the municipality. In the future a so-called *Diversiteitsmonitor* will be set up to measure the effects of the diversity policy.

The representative of a migrant organisation, Haci Karacaer.

Haci gives us first general information on the Turkish Advisory Board; the *TDM*.

The *TDM* exists in its current state since 1991 and stemmed from an initiative of the City. The installation of several advisory boards for the minority groups should inform the City on the needs and eventual problems of these groups. About 30 Turkish organisations were actively involved in the formation of the *TDM*.

The *TDM* has as most important aim to improve the position of the Turks in Amsterdam by consulting and informing the Turkish community and advising the municipality. Every Turkish self organisation with democratic principles can partake in the activities of or be represented in the *TDM*. Representatives of self organisations and Turkish professional workers are the core of the *TDM*. The self organisations remain independent functioning institutes.

The *TDM* further organises discussion platforms, makes use of the existing networks and collaborates with other advisory boards and institutions. They aim at influencing the municipality policy, in which they have not fully succeeded since there is not enough participation yet. A second goal is co-operation between the various Turkish organisations, in which they have succeeded since organisations that were not able to work together in the past are now attending the same meetings. Haci still thinks that the participation of the Turkish organisations in the Amsterdam society has a long way to go.

For the advisory boards the 'new' diversity policy is a point of discussion. They prefer to be approached by the alderman in an earlier stage of policy making and not at the end of the process. On the main items though they agree and the new structure towards advising is seen as beneficial.

Haci concludes that the unwritten rules of Amsterdam must be learned by the ethnic minorities and the quality of the board members must be improved.

The case of Oeiras.

The researcher, Margarida Marques.

The Oeiras case is definitely not the same as the case of Amsterdam. The institutional setting is completely different and there is a huge difference in the status of immigrants; they are now still in a survival stage from which the first wave is slowly coming out.

In the presentation on Oeiras Margarida will give:

1. a brief description of the research team
2. the substantive results that have been achieved
3. an overview of the policies in Portugal
4. a reflection on the experience of researchers with politicians/ stakeholders.

1) In 1996 the research team started working on minority issues. In Oeiras the level of education is higher than the average Lisbon population and the largest high tech corporations are situated there. It is a very special and dynamic municipality and has changed from a tourist resort to a low economic and then to a high tech area.

2) During a re-housing project in a low class residence area in Oeiras the research team 'discovered' a huge African population from the Portuguese speaking countries. This was the first contact with the minority issue. The research team was invited by the municipality to conduct further research on the ethnic minority groups in this residence area. They did not look for correlations between the civic community, the political participation and trust like Tillie and Fennema did in the case of Amsterdam. Though formal co-operative organisations exist, informal links are much more important in Portugal. No municipal organisation exists to deal exclusively with migrants, nor any association stemming exclusively from immigrants and ethnic minorities. During the rehousing projects a number of these informal networks developed into residents' organisations or strengthening previously existing local associations- which was also a way of complying with the demands of local authorities in order to be granted subsidies and other sorts of municipal support.

3) Regarding integration policies in Portugal/Oeiras immigrants are not seen as a topic of problems. Propositions to improve the position of immigrants from former colonies found enthusiastic defenders in all parties. Measures seldom stemmed from mobilisation but most of the times from top down initiatives.

4) The research team is stimulated by the municipality to publish all their findings regarding minority issues. They have established contacts with migrant organisations by way of interviews and seminars.

The politician; David Justino

In the municipality of Oeiras there is an internal debate on social policy. Most important issues are structural and societal differences and inequalities on the national and the local level. These problems should lead to problem oriented policies. David expresses his concern that the emphasis on group oriented problem solving can reproduce mechanisms of discrimination since you cease to treat people as local citizens equal to other local citizens.

A first characteristic of Oeiras is therefore that the municipality adopted the problem oriented approach since a) too much problems need to be solved (like vandalism, drop-outs in schools and young pregnancy) and b) a person living in Oeiras for 15 years is effectively a resident. Why should you treat him differently?

A second characteristic of the case of Oeiras is the problem of the slums. This development began in the 50/60's. In this time the first inhabitants were in majority Portuguese. In 1985-1990 there was a peak of immigrants from Cape Verde. The municipality started to tackle the problem of slums and rehousing in the 1980's and has almost succeeded to solve the problem of the slums.

The question now is; how do we structure the problem oriented policy? Policies are meant to solve problems and to bring solutions and results. It is therefore important to evaluate policies. (Good) results of policy can be measured by looking at the voting turn outs and the strategy (short term versus long term). To be able to develop a long term strategy the municipality encourages research on social policies in Oeiras. The need to evaluate policies leads to the interaction between politicians and social researchers.

The representative of a migrant organisation; Mr. Carvalho.

He is speaking as a representative of a local organisation *Cultural and Sportive Association of Pedreira dos Húngaros* founded in the beginning of the 90's. The main objective of this organisation is to guarantee activities for youngsters (like sports and culture) to preserve and promote the cultural memory of Cape Verde, to prevent child- and youth marginality and to improve the self esteem and thus avoiding involvement in deviant behaviour and child prostitution. The youngsters make one third of the population in the residence area *Pedreira dos Húngaros* in Oeiras and live under very specific conditions due to adverse social, cultural and economic circumstances.

The organisation was initially formed for youngsters in the age of 12 to overcome the problems they had in free time. The organisation has grown and organises many sports activities like soccer on the national and international level.

Contacts have been established with the Town Hall and national political structures, with various sports associations, churches, the ministry of youth and the administration for minority issues. The latter gives them financial support but the association does not actively participate in local decision making. Contacts with researchers have been established by the invitation of Professor Margarida Marques to collaborate in the MPMC project.

The case of Zurich.

The researcher Hans Mahnig.

In his presentation the question of the socio-economic and cultural participation will be the focus, since ethnic minorities can not participate politically in Zurich. Hans will a) give general information on the city of Zurich, b) give information on the policies regarding ethnic minorities and c) conclude on the interface between social science, politicians and immigrants.

A) Switzerland is one of the European countries with the highest immigration rate; 6% of the Swiss population was foreign in 1950 and 19% by now. This is partly related to the very restrictive naturalisation policies. The immigration to the city has for a long time been the same as immigration to the country. However, in the 1980's the concentration of immigrants in cities grows due to social polarisation; middle-classes move from the centre to the agglomeration. This development has led to a high number of immigrants in the inner city. One can speak of economic in stead of ethnic segregation.

Swiss statistics distinguish only between nationals and foreigners; there are no data on the number of ethnic minorities inhabiting the country and city of Zurich; the most important foreigner groups are Italians, people from former Yugoslavia, Germans, Spaniards and Turks.

Zurich has not been confronted with problems as unemployment and residential segregation. There are very strict migration laws and during the economic crisis of 1972/73 Switzerland succeeded to use immigrants as an "economic buffer".

B) Switzerland does not recognise itself as being an immigrant country and has therefore not created a real integration policy. Integration is seen as a task of the local authorities.

Switzerland is divided in 26 so called cantons which are the basic territorial units and have a large autonomy in several fields. Integration is regarded relevant in three areas: schools, citizenship and religion, all organised or basically defined on the canton level.

Initiatives for more open policies in Zurich were made by individual persons, associations and also by migrants themselves. These initiatives never found the real support of mainstream political parties, but did lead to the setting up of some immigrant related institutions and policies. On the other hand there is a xenophobic party which succeeded several times to use the referendum in order to block a more open policy to immigrants.

In the 1990's there was a change of situation, caused by an increase of unemployment (which strongly hit the migrants), stronger residential segregation (following socio-economic lines), mounting xenophobia (climate became harsher) and a rise of a new political actor; a right wing party (neo-conservative) used migrant questions as topics to gain votes. Recent years the City Council and the Major have tried to find a strategy of consolidation which resulted in a 'Design for Integration' (see Johanna Tresp on the text written by Professor Muller).

C) The lack of a comprehensive policy is not the result of unwillingness of politicians but of the right wing using direct democracy. In such a situation what can social science do? Hans sketches the co-operation between social scientists, politicians and representatives of migrant organisations by describing the collaboration with Johanna Tresp and Taner Hatipoglu. This co-operation is still at the beginning. The Swiss UNESCO commission supported the studies conducted by Hans Mahnig. By doing interviews he came in contact with politicians (he sends them the material). This also led to the visits of political representatives to the office of the FSM during a large debate.

Hans Mahnig further established contact with Taner Hatipoglu. Hans was invited on a conference on Islam in Bern. This conference had some positive echo's in the press.

The politician; Johanna Tresp.

In Zurich there live about 150 nationalities. Until the end of the eighties most ethnic minorities were quickly integrated in the labour market. In the beginning of the 90's the social situation had become harsher, the future bleaker and the integration policy politicised. This was very specific for the city. Till the 90's there was no real integration policy in Zurich. In the beginning of this decade initiatives were taken to set up such a policy to solve the various problems that emerged (like unemployment and mounting xenophobia). In 1996 professor Muller was invited by the city to write a paper on integration which was published in 1998 and discussed with politicians.

The Major decided to make a new paper in 1999. The city supported the idea to develop an integration policy. Concrete measures for all inhabitants of the city should be taken in six domains: language; socio-economic integration; public security; living together in neighbourhoods; education; participation in the public space.

The paper and its accompanying measures had their influence on the aims and work of different institutions: the Office for Intercultural Questions; the Intercultural Commission for

Integration; the Intercultural Forum and a group of people within the administration who work together and try to implement recommendations.

The experiences of co-operation with migrants and representatives of migrant organisations are used in the work of mentioned institutions above. In collaboration with migrant organisations the city runs a meeting centre for all people. The city further mediates between various groups. In the future the co-operation shall be reinforced. They have to think about the strategy they will use. There will be a revision of the canton constitution, in which new local voting rights and places for other religions should be integrated. Financial support will come for new projects. Different cities will work closer together and be partners towards the federal level.

Contacts with research(ers) are established through the following developments:

- 1 Professor Muller and the papers he has written
2. exchange with FSM has begun
3. sometimes the Intercultural Forum supports students and helps them with their research
4. office for education on the canton level is very innovative on education of migrant children and has made several studies
5. members of the commission are doing their own research
6. co-operation with the faculty of law

In the future policy and research material as well as the theoretical concepts used by scientists must be understandable for everyone. The relation between politicians and researchers should be improved.

The representative of a migrant organisation; Taner Hatipoglu, member of SERA (foundation for Education, Formation, and Integration) and the platform for Islamic organisations, a partner of the canton.

SERA is a Turkish organisation; an independent political NGO. It includes all Islamic currents but is not only focused on Muslims. They have Turks and native Swiss in the board. They want to be an important partner for the authorities and work together with them and with Swiss citizens. It is hard to do this since Turks come from low social classes with few capital. They must finance their own activities.

On the participation of migrants in Zurich Taner tells us the following. Migrants have no voting right, but there are individual initiatives of politicians and efforts of migrant organisations of different platforms to improve the participation of migrants in the Zurich society. Regarding the contacts with politics and politicians, SERA has established contact with the group Islam, opinions are asked of the migrants and they receive advice from the Department for Education. At the municipal level they have

contact with the municipal governor, FIF (advisory authority for intercultural questions), the foreigners' synod and there exists a so called 'multipliers project'. Contacts with scientists are incidental and established through relationships, but there are no formal links. SERA also helps students when they want to conduct research in Turkey. Further SERA has contacts with churches and education activities.

Taner concludes with the remarks that in the future the established contacts between migrants, social scientists and political institutions must be maintained and improved. The solution for minority policy lies in objectivity and an improved process of participation of citizens and not in party politics.

Reflection on the case studies and concluding session.

The external advisor; Stephen Castles

The case studies are three very different ones; how can we still make a good comparison?

The point of making a comparison is to come to a better understanding of the character of the dynamics between the partners, and to find the best practice. There are some common features. Stephen will look at differences and similarities of the three cases presented.

The broad context of the three case studies.

1. In the Netherlands there is an interplay between a welfare structure and a social structure that tends to co-opt minority leaders and a social structure characterised by pillarisation.

There is a shift from minority to diversity policy similar to developments in Australia. What is the place of minority organisations in this context? There is a contradiction between diversity and individuals on the one hand and pillarisation and groups on the other.

2. In Portugal one can speak of a pragmatic approach. There is an absence of clear policy principals. The policy is problem oriented which is rather similar to the diversity approach. There is a lack of established institutions and practices. This is linked to the fact that immigration is still in such an early stage. But is this the only possible explanation?

3. In Switzerland the role of direct democracy has clearly a negative effect. This questions the way the public sphere works. One can see the continuation of an exclusionary model; even the second and third generation of migrants are regarded as guest workers.

Specific aspects of the three case studies; differences and similarities.

1. Historical traditions in each country in dealing with immigrants;

Analysis of differences:

In the Netherlands an assimilation attitude towards immigrants is linked to pillarisation and the history of former colonies. In Switzerland there is a long tradition of not allowing minorities which has led to an exclusionary model. In Portugal it is not so clear in the long term what to expect since the experience of immigration is still very new.

Analysis of the similarities:

All countries have experienced a rapid change, a massive immigration and forced change. Ethnic communities were formed and transnational communities have developed.

2. Institutional structures.

Analysis of the differences

The Netherlands has a strong welfare state and a participation model which gives access to political rights. Switzerland has a strong public order, a weak social integration and has an exclusionary model for migrants. Portugal is characterised by a weaker state and a far less developed institutional structure. How decisive is it in this context to have formal citizenship; what advantages could it bring?

Analysis of the similarities

Diversity of policies in Europe is far less than in Asia; all states are variations on the liberal democratic state model. Political leaders can therefore not hold their positions and implement policies when they totally exclude immigrants.

3. The immigration process.

Analysis of the differences

The Netherlands and Switzerland are in the same stage of the process. In Portugal they are in a much earlier stage and are mainly dealing with the first generation while a second generation is emerging.

Analysis of the similarities

In all three case studies one can observe a long term trajectory of settlement in the community.

4. Social position of immigrants

Analysis of the differences and similarities.

The differences between the three cases are much smaller in this context. Immigrants have similar positions in all three countries. In all three cases there is also the issue of hierarchy of groups. This is related to the succession in the migration process as well as the cultural differences between the receiving and the coming groups and finally the characteristics of the receiving society and their eventual need for marginalised groups.

5. The role of immigrant organisations.

Analysis of the differences

The role is very similar in all three case studies. Immigrant organisations are characterised by the same developments and have the same aims. It is hard to see important differences. When immigrant organisations start working for the state their function for the group is undermined.

The strategies of the local authorities towards immigrant organisations and their eventual role are in the Netherlands determined by decentralisation. In Switzerland the point of departure is less interference with immigrant organisations.

Analysis of the similarities

The similarities lie in the type of problems; the dialectic of support versus control. First, funding of migrant organisations can make them into quasi-state bodies. Secondly, the term activation has a top-down characteristic and a manipulation aspect by implying surveillance strategies towards migrants.

6. Relation between the partners.

Research has an important role in policy making in the Netherlands. It seems much weaker in Zurich and very different in Oeiras.

7. Racism/xenophobia.

People are disadvantaged according to ethnic origin. In the Netherlands and especially in Switzerland immigrants are in disadvantaged socio-economic positions. In Portugal it seems to be absent but one can be sceptical regarding the poor housing conditions etc. Racism is a major factor of marginalisation. There is a rise of extreme right parties in Switzerland and in the Netherlands. It may happen in Portugal.

Concluding session

In all three case studies presented one can observe first of all the dilemma between a top-down or bottom-up approach. We see evidence of both. They can come together in a positive way or clash. Secondly, there is the important issue of mainstreaming; problem oriented policies versus group specific policies. We are in need of a situation in which ethnicity is not a case of disadvantage and we would cease to treat ethnic minorities as a group and thereby weakening their position and marginalising them. Although diversity policy is not exclusively aimed at minorities anymore it is still not really an individualistic policy. Thirdly, there is the issue of participation; we see declining participation and really need to study this. What is the best practice? The various models that have increased participation (against marginalisation) and communication are beneficial but must not be

controlling instruments. How can we reach participation without losing self-determination of groups? Perhaps social trust plays a crucial role and being member of an organisation (even right wing) can help making good democracy.

The MPMC Project

The Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities (MPMC) project is an international comparative research programme on the participation of immigrant and minority groups in 17 large European cities: Amsterdam, Antwerp, Athens, Barcelona, Birmingham, Brussels, Cologne, Liege, Marseilles, Milan, Oeiras, Paris, Rome, Stockholm, Tel Aviv and Turin. In 1996 the project was adopted by UNESCO's Management of Social Transformation (MOST) programme for international policy-oriented social science. In the research project social scientists from a variety of disciplines undertake research and comparative analysis within selected urban contexts characterised by a substantial presence and activity of immigrant and ethnic minority groups. Working with policy makers and members of local organisations, their task is to assess the development and interplay of both 'bottom-up' (community led) initiatives and 'top-down' (municipality created) policies aimed at better integrating immigrant and ethnic minorities in public decision making processes. The key-questions to be answered by all research teams can be summarised as follows;

- *how do local authorities activate immigrants and ethnic minorities to participate in political decision making in general and in relation to their position in particular;*
- *how do immigrants and ethnic minority members mobilise to improve their position and to influence policies relating to that position;*
- *how do activation policies of authorities and mobilisation of immigrants and ethnic minorities interact.*

In order to ensure international comparative research each research partner has detailed the socio-economic and the political structures of the city and basic data on the minority groups (composition, socio-economic position etc.) in a city-template.

The MPMC project is co-ordinated by Dr. Marco Martiniello (CEDEM, Liege), Prof. Dr. Rinus Penninx (IMES, University of Amsterdam) and Dr. Steven Vertovec (Oxford University). The secretariat of the MPMC project is founded at the IMES under co-ordination of Mrs. Karen Kraal.

Following documents can be found on the website of the IMES (www.pscw.uva.nl/imes) or UNESCO (www.unesco.org/most):

- **Working Papers:**

- Nr.1** *MPMC-project restatement, December 1997*
Nr.2 *Immigrants' Participation in Civil Society in a Suburban Context*
Nr.3A/3B *Ethnic associations, political trust and political participation, Creating Networks within the Turkish Community in Amsterdam*
Nr.4 *The MPMC Workshop in Zeist, 2000*
Nr. 5 *Ethnic minorities, Cities and Institutions*

(Hard copies can be requested at the secretariat)

- **The city templates of the 17 cities**
- **The Newsletters of the project**
- **A flyer of the project**
- **Reports of the workshops**
- **Key notes of Prof. Dr. Rinus Penninx**

Further information on the project can be found on the website of Unesco or Imes or obtained from:

*Mrs. Karen Kraal or Prof. Dr. Rinus Penninx
Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES)
Rokin 84
1012 KX AMSTERDAM, The Netherlands
Tel: + 31- (0)20-525 3627
Fax: + 31 -(0)20-525 3628
E-mail: Kraal@pscw.uva.nl*