

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies

Rheinische Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität Bonn



Frank Ronge / Susannah Simon (eds.)

Multiculturalism and Ethnic Minorities in Europe



Discussion Paper

C 87
2001

Contents

Frank Ronge / Susannah Simon

Foreword5

Sir Paul Lever

Opening Remarks7

Ludger Kühnhardt

Introduction.....9

Baroness Scotland

Creating a Multicultural Europe: the British approach..... 13

Cornelie Sonntag-Wolgast

Integrating Foreigners: a German view 21

Multiculturalism – Enrichment of Society or Cause for Conflict?

Dieter Oberndörfer..... 25

Trevor Phillips..... 31

Barbara John..... 37

**Combating Racism and Promoting Integration –
The Role of Government**

Josef Voß 41

Vural Öger..... 51

Gurbux Singh 57

Ethnic Minorities in the Light of European Integration

Pál Csáky 61

Elizabeth Meehan..... 65

Peter Fleissner..... 73

Biographical Notes..... 87

Foreword

In the past year immigration and asylum, multiculturalism and race relations have been high up the political agenda in Germany and the UK. Both countries are home to a diverse range of ethnic communities, religions, cultures and languages. These communities enrich our societies and are a source of strength and innovation. But multiculturalism also presents challenges. How do we give people the rights and status they require to integrate into society, while maintaining social cohesion? How can we ensure our institutions do not discriminate against minority ethnic groups? How should our societies combat the fears and anxieties amongst our indigenous populations about levels of immigration? What does it mean to be British or German?

The UK and Germany have traditionally taken different approaches to meeting these challenges. But it is important for us to co-operate increasingly closely, both bilaterally and within the EU. These issues have become all the more pertinent, in the light both of EU enlargement, which will extend freedom of movement to hundreds of thousands more people; and of demographic change throughout the EU, which is leading to increasing willingness on the part of governments to open up their labour markets to immigrants.

The British Embassy Berlin and the Center for European Integration, Bonn (ZEI) addressed these questions at a seminar held in Berlin on 1 December 2000. We focused particularly on what governments can and should do to combat racism and promote integration; on the lessons the UK and Germany can learn from one another; and on the role of the European Union and the impact of increasing numbers of ethnic minorities and foreigners in the EU on European identity.

The contributions to this seminar are reproduced here, with the aim of contributing to a deeper debate, of vital importance to Europe's future.

Frank Ronge / Susannah Simon

Sir Paul Lever

Opening Remarks

Traditional British Diplomacy has changed since my first posting to Helsinki in 1967. With the advent of the internet, e-mail and cheap international telephone calls, our role as information gatherers and reporters of events has diminished. We cannot hope to compete with Reuters, dpa or the Financial Times. Given the frequent face-to-face and telephone contacts between Ministers and senior officials, the function of mediators between governments is also no longer our exclusive preserve. Increasingly British diplomacy in a country like Germany is about public diplomacy. About presenting an up to date image of Britain to the German public; and about exploring jointly themes of common interest.

The new Embassy building was built precisely for that purpose. To be a showcase of modern British art and design and to provide us with the facilities for seminars, exhibitions and receptions. Its innovative design has already aroused considerable interest amongst the Berliners, who quickly nicknamed it "das bunte Haus" - the multi-coloured house. Over 7,000 of them came to our first open day in November 2000. The Conference on "Multiculturalism and Ethnic Minorities" on December 1, 2000, was the first conference of its kind that we have organised there.

In the EU, diplomacy is about comparing experiences, exchanging best practice and learning from one another. That was what we wanted to do with this conference. The approaches in the UK and Germany towards multiculturalism are not identical. It would be odd if they were, given our different histories and socio-political backgrounds. Even the vocabulary we use is different. In November 2000 Tony Blair gave a speech in which he said that "Britain's multicultural identity has become one of this

country's greatest resources". Not many German politicians would speak in this way. The word multicultural/multikulturell does not have the same positive connotations for many Germans. And the concept of integration is interpreted somewhat differently in our two countries.

Germany and Britain also have much in common. We are both liberal democracies. We both want our societies to be fair societies, where every individual is given an equal chance to fulfil their potential, whatever their ethnic or cultural background.

The purpose of the conference was not to prescribe solutions which may work well in one society, but not in the other. It was to discuss common challenges; compare experiences -good and bad; and to have a productive and fertile exchange of ideas in dialogue with many distinguished practitioners.

Ludger Kühnhardt

Introduction

I should like to express my sincere thanks to Paul Lever for allowing the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI) to co-organise this conference in the unique new British Embassy building in Berlin. We appreciate this honour. Perhaps it is attributable to the ZEI's role as a cutting-edge research institute (and a recent addition to the academic set-up in Bonn), conducting practice-oriented, truly European research throughout Europe.

The aim of our seminar was to make comparisons - to provide us with a better understanding of the questions which are being asked on both sides of the English Channel about the situation and status of ethnic and cultural minorities, issues that touch all Europeans. We also wanted to find out whether and to what extent different responses from Britons and Germans might stimulate new ideas.

Another of the key objectives of the seminar was to draw attention to the European dimension of this issue. Europe is by nature both multicultural and polycultural. The more we relate our national discussions to the general challenges facing our continent, the more it will become apparent how complex this subject is. Europe is discussing its identity, is moving towards a constitutional order, and has agreed, as a first step, the Charter of Fundamental Rights in the European Union. Article 22 of the draft Charter states quite rightly that, "The Union respects the diversity of cultures, religions and languages".

But of what use is even the most well intended anti-discrimination initiative so long as the Charter of Basic Rights has not been incorporated into the European Treaties and is not enforceable by law in the European

Union? The German and British governments and the governments of all other EU member states still have a lot of work to do if they want to avoid getting bogged down in empty declarations.

Summit results are one thing, real life another. Real life demands, at least as far as the Charter is concerned, decisive improvements to the agreements reached at the EU summit in Nice in December 2000 and, as a result, an increase in real political integration in Europe. Moreover, Europe will only make real progress once we have succeeded in developing a common asylum and immigration policy, with decisions taken by qualified majority voting. Consistent application of the principle of qualified majority voting is the most important step towards European integration, if the EU is to avoid becoming a self-paralysing institution, discriminating against the smaller European states.

In the final analysis, identity and culture are essentially political and constitutional questions. By adopting a political and constitutional approach, we can set standards for social cohesion, which both give a firm basis for the randomness of intellectual discussion and the overheated nature of some political debates, and also provide direction for disagreements about interpretation. The aim of integrating foreigners, of tolerant dealings with ethnic and cultural minorities and of making full use of all opportunities for cultural encounters and inspiration, should be of benefit to Europe. Thus the questions discussed at the seminar were not limited to identities, but also embraced politics; we did not just look at social questions, but also at the reasons for the concerns of a frightened and apprehensive public. We covered more than just British pragmatism and the German preference for theoretical principle. We were discussing a big and important European issue.

British-German dialogue is invariably characterised by an invigorating and thorough airing of views. A while ago, Oxford historian Timothy Garton Ash said he thought it strange that the English say “what on earth is the matter?”, whereas the Germans express the same frustration using the word heaven (“was um Himmels willen ist hier los?”). Is German thinking about multiculturalism also afraid of departing the realm of

speculative theory for reality? Incidentally, this applies to all spheres of thought, which sometimes interconnect more easily with the German approach of virtual discussion, than with the British pragmatic approach to everyday questions. Perhaps this difference is merely semantic. Just think of another great word: federalism. Most Germans are intuitively warmed by it. The word has a positive connotation, linked to cultural diversity; a variety of traditions; and division of powers.

The British jump as soon as they hear the word “federal”. They think of centralisation, loss of identity, an accumulation of power at the top - in short, a European super-state. Could it be that multiculturalism conjures up the opposite for them? Do the British simply associate with this word the reality of living together with people from other continents and cultural backgrounds? This is, after all, as natural for an old imperial tradition, as all the other idiosyncratic kindnesses and eccentricities in the British - and only in the British - culture.

Conversely, is it not so that the mere mention of the phrase multicultural society opens up to us Germans visions of heaven and hell? As we argue for and against, we soon end up with a theoretical analysis of the subject which only leaves space for ideological principles. We experienced just such an exercise in Germany in Autumn 2000.

The seminar in Berlin was an opportunity for us to give a European dimension to the debate about immigration and integration; to learn from each other and, in the light of developments within Europe, to talk about the sources of strength and renewal which are what cultural diversity is all about; and also to discuss the causes for the fear of the other; and beyond this, how to overcome xenophobia and racial discrimination for the benefit of Europe. Germans and Britons are predestined to create common ground out of their differences. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, a contemporary of Goethe and fan of German Romanticism, knew this. He deliberated on ways to incorporate the German prefixes “ver” and “zer” into the English language. “Why not verboil, zerboil, verrend, zerrend? I want the words verflossen, zerflossen, naturalised. As I look, my soul feels creative throes. And now all joy, all sense zerflows”.

With this in mind, our thoughts flowed and "zerflowed". They flowed together.

BARONESS SCOTLAND

Creating a Multicultural Europe: the British approach

Multiculturalism is an issue of direct concern to all our citizens and vital to the stability of all our societies. The great diversity of cultures within the EU has enriched our countries immeasurably. But it also presents significant challenges. To ensure that there is no discrimination against our citizens on race and faith grounds. And to afford the same opportunities to all.

Celebrating diversity

Policy making and co-operation within the EU today is about learning from each other's experiences and helping to solve each other's problems. The interpretation of the problem or its solution will not be the same in every country. But that does not mean that we cannot learn from each other's experiences - both our successes and our failures.

The purpose of this seminar is to encourage a robust exchange of opinion. There are no clear-cut answers. There is no monolithic British view about multiculturalism, though the word is not as controversial in Britain as it is in Germany. But our government's policies are clear. We see strength and enrichment in diversity. And we believe that one of our greatest responsibilities is to try to make Britain a fairer place; a place where people of every race and religion feel themselves to be an equal part of the whole; a society which makes a celebration out of the fact that we are multi-cultural, multi-religious and multi-racial; one which not just assimilates people but celebrates people's differences.

The multicultural nature of UK society is one of the first things that hits you when you arrive in the UK. Switch on the television and you will see people from our minority communities, newsreaders, political commentators and writers; comedians, soap opera stars and opera singers; fashion designers and models, footballers and dancers. Watch any arts programme and you will find that much of contemporary British culture is a hybrid, born of the talents and creativity of many different groups - White, Black, Asian and other minorities.

The result is a unique proof of how diversity enriches. To give one topical example. This week's Turner Prize - the UK's premier award for contemporary artists - had entries from Dutch and Japanese artists. And the winner, as you may know, was Wolfgang Tillmans, a German. In responding to criticism that the prize was being awarded to "foreigners", Nicholas Serota, the Tate Museum's director said that far from being bad news, he found it a compliment that so many artists saw London as a leading global art centre.

Germany's approach to multiculturalism is different from ours. You tend to focus more on integration in the sense of assimilation, and the preservation of German identity. It would be strange if our perspectives were identical. We have, after all, different histories and geographies.

Britain's History of Immigration

British society has been deeply marked by its island status, its long tradition as a nation state; its faith in its national institutions and its history of empire. Britain has always been a mongrel nation - by 1066, when we were invaded for the last time by the Normans, we had already been subject to invasion and settlement by the Romans, Danes, Vikings, Angles and Saxons. By the 16th Century there were already black africans living in the UK, and appearing in paintings of the time.

In more recent times, after the last war, we encouraged immigration to Britain from our colonies and former colonies to help rebuild our shattered economy. The first group of 492 Jamaicans arrived at Tilbury

Docks on the Empire Windrush in 1948. Tens of thousands more followed, from the Caribbean, India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. The 70s and 80s also saw the arrival of the Hong Kong Chinese and refugees from Vietnam.

As a result of our history of immigration, more than 3 million British people are from visible ethnic minorities - that is 5.5% of the total population. This does not include those of Irish, Jewish or Cypriot descent - all groups which add further to the ethnic diversity of the British population. The largest minority ethnic groups are Indian, Black Caribbean and Pakistani.

Most of these are British citizens with British passports. Some have passports of another country as well, since we allow dual nationality. In contrast to Germany, this is an uncontroversial concept. We believe it is easier for people to feel an integrated part of society if they are encouraged to retain their connections with their cultural roots.

Of course, since nearly half of Britain's minority ethnic population was born in the UK, many now identify with a variety of cultures. More and more people choose multiple identities. They call themselves Black-British or British Indian. Or Glaswegian Muslim or Welsh Jew. We've got a plethora of descriptions.

'Being British'

Recently there has been much public debate in the UK about what it means to be British. It is clear that the term embraces different things for different people. For some it is a narrow term suggesting white, English and Empire - thus excluding millions of UK citizens. For others, it conveys a much wider range of images reflecting the whole of our society - not just fish and chips, but also Chicken Tandoori and Sweet and Sour pork. Curry, you might be interested to know, is the UK's most popular restaurant food, and the industry is larger than the coal, iron and steel industries combined! There have been no impediments imposed on our minorities. And this is only to our benefit.

In a multicultural society we should remember two key points. Firstly, the term "British" is not a static one. As one commentator has pointed out, it cannot be preserved like a piece of antique furniture. It must take account of the changes in our society over the last thirty years, including devolution, globalisation, the end of Empire and Britain's much closer involvement in Europe. It needs to include all our citizens.

Secondly, underpinning the word must be a shared understanding of core British values such as respect for human rights, tolerance, fair play, and an outward looking approach to the world. This is essential for a cohesive and stable society. In general there are few conflicts between sharing these values and accepting cultural differences such as turbans, headscarves or dreadlocks. But it would be wrong to deny that there are some difficult issues.

Forced Marriages

One which is of interest to me in my job at the Foreign Office is that of forced marriages. A forced marriage is not the same as an arranged marriage. Arranged marriages are a successful and traditional method of parents taking a leading role in the future of their children. In an arranged marriage the consent of both parties is sought and given. In a forced marriage consent is not given.

Every year our diplomatic posts see over a hundred cases of British nationals forced to marry abroad against their will. Some of the victims are held against their will by their own family and violated in other ways. All have had their human rights abused and their freedom stolen.

The government is taking action to help victims of forced marriage. This has an overseas dimension and the Foreign Office, together with the Home Office, is taking action. The aim is to help young people whose fundamental rights are at risk; not to create more restrictive immigration rules.

The British government is devoting a lot of time and effort in other areas towards achieving good race relations, building on and developing existing anti-discrimination legislation and equal opportunities programmes.

We have made progress, but we have some way to go. People from ethnic minorities in Britain are still not sufficiently represented in public life, though we are trying hard to increase their participation in parliament, the civil service and other government bodies. They tend to be on lower incomes and live in poorer housing than those from majority ethnic groups. The unemployment rate for ethnic minorities is higher. The combination of these factors is also connected to higher rates of ill health.

Stephen Lawrence Inquiry

Equally worrying is the suggestion in a recent report that there is growing evidence that Black and Irish people are treated differentially at all stages of the criminal justice process and are disproportionately likely to be imprisoned. This issue has been highlighted in the UK as the result of the Stephen Lawrence inquiry.

Stephen Lawrence was a black youth stabbed to death by a group of white youths while waiting for a bus with a friend in April 1993. No one has been convicted of the crime, though the identity of the attackers is known.

On coming into power in 1997 the Labour Government established an inquiry into Stephen's death. It was heavily critical of the Metropolitan Police Force's performance. The inquiry talked of institutional racism within the police force. By this they meant "the collective failure of the police to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic minority."

The process of the inquiry itself was key in terms of opening people's eyes - particularly the eyes of the white majority population - to what it feels like in Britain to be entirely law-abiding and black or Asian.

The Government is determined to ensure that the recommendations of the Lawrence Report and the wider aspiration of achieving racial equality in our society are driven through.

Of particular importance was the recommendation that the government should strengthen race relations legislation and ensure that the full force of that legislation should apply to the police. I am delighted to say that today that legislation has completed its progress through Parliament. It will place a positive duty on public authorities to promote racial equality, to avoid discrimination before it occurs. I believe that this will significantly change the way in which public authorities approach the issue of race equality in the United Kingdom. It reflects our view that the public sector should lead by example.

European Cooperation

Within Europe we now have a further opportunity to improve anti-discrimination legislation. The United Kingdom and Germany worked very closely together to ensure that the new anti-discrimination Directives under Article 13 of the European Treaty were logical and workable. As a result, the citizens of both our countries will be assured of protection against discrimination on grounds of race and on grounds of religion throughout Europe.

And not just in the current Europe of the 15 - but also in an enlarged Europe. I hope that existing and prospective members of the EU can work together to share approaches on the treatment of ethnic and religious minorities.

Uk's Asylum And Immigration Policies

No country can reach the pinnacle of good race relations without sound immigration policies. We are making improvements to both the asylum system and to the immigration system. The UK has recently faced a sharp

increase in asylum applicants - and rising public concern as a result. We are still receiving large numbers of genuine refugees.

In those cases we must continue to meet our obligations under the Geneva Convention to provide protection. But we are also seeing an unprecedented increase in the number of economic migrants arriving in our countries. In many cases they are being facilitated by a highly organised people-trafficking criminal industry.

That has put a severe strain on our procedures for determining who is a genuine refugee. One important part of the changes has been to speed up the whole of the asylum process. It was absurd for it to be taking on average twenty months for a decision to be made about people who were seeking asylum in our country. We are committed to making most initial asylum decisions within two months and appeals within a further four months, from April 2001. We are already meeting that target for families with children.

Germany is also studying how to shorten its asylum procedures and that is one of the areas being addressed by your Immigration Commission. This is an area where Germany and the UK can work effectively together and where we are already exchanging ideas and experiences.

We need effective immigration controls but our immigration policy must also respond to the emerging needs of the 21st century. It must take account of the ageing populations in Europe and the need to tackle skills shortages. The development of the global economy means that controls on immigration - vital as they are - will not be enough. We need to manage the opportunities provided by globalisation.

As my colleague, the Immigration Minister, Barbara Roche said recently „We are in competition for the brightest and best talents - the entrepreneurs, the scientists, the high technology specialists who make the global economy tick. In order to seize the opportunities of the knowledge economy, and to play a constructive part in shaping these huge changes, we need to explore carefully their implications for immigration policy.“

Germany has recognised the new potential which globalisation provides and has taken action to benefit from it in the form of Green Cards for IT specialists from overseas. This is another area where we can learn from each other, and we await with interest the recommendations of your Immigration Commission next summer on possible immigration legislation.

Conclusion

Let me finish by saying that I'm very glad to have had this opportunity to clarify what British ideas about multiculturalism. We believe that integration is about enriching British society - through the blending in of new cultures and opening up our horizons. We believe in celebrating diversity. We believe that it is important for people to retain an affinity with their cultural roots as well as identifying fully with British society.

But British multiculturalism is also about strong laws against racial discrimination. It is about opening up our political and other institutions to more ethnic minorities - I suppose I, and those of us around the table, are good examples.

9% of the population in Germany are foreign nationals. You face many of the same issues as we do. But though we may have different starting points, we face many of the same challenges.

And we share a common goal - to achieve fair, inclusive societies across Europe, where, regardless of race or religion, people feel themselves an equal part of the whole.

Cornelie Sonntag-Wolgast

Integrating Foreigners: a German view

„Migration and the Integration of Foreigners“ is an issue most vital to the further development of British, German and indeed all European societies.

Having said that, I have to admit that this one short phrase alone already contains two major problems:

Firstly: Who is to be considered a foreigner, and thus, who is to be integrated?

Secondly: What do we mean when we talk of integration? What should it consist of? What should be the outcome of the integration process?

Legally speaking, defining foreigners is very easy. According to the German Foreigners' Act, everybody who is not a German according to article 116 of our constitution is regarded as a foreigner.

According to this definition we have about 7.3 million foreigners inside Germany at present.

But written law and real life don't always match.

A lot of these "foreigners" are not foreign to Germany at all. They have lived here for ten and more years and intend to stay for good. Some of them, again no small number, were born and raised in Germany. So they're not "foreign" in the true sense of the term. And a rising number of foreigners have become German citizens through naturalization, without losing or cutting off their roots and ties to both family members and the country they themselves or their ancestors once came from.

Given the future effects of the new German citizenship law, which introduced the basic elements of "ius soli" and has been effective since 1 January this year, we should start discussing new, more fitting definitions.

In a word: the concept of "foreignness" has become tricky in our Europe of collapsing borders, especially if you want it to be your starting point for any policy on integration.

Which leads to an even more severe conflict of definition: What do we mean when we talk about integration?

You all know the catch-phrases:

Integration is a two-way process!

Integration is not assimilation!

Integration is an important condition for becoming an integral part of the respective European society. I don't know anybody in German or European politics who would not agree that integration is the be-all and end-all of what we are talking about. But the moment you start talking about what you really mean by integration, there is ample space for disagreement. In Germany we have a bottom-line consensus that obeying each respective country's laws and learning each country's respective language are the cornerstones of any definition of integration. Any doubt about this is futile: in order to be an active part of the country, city or even neighbourhood you live in, you have to be able to communicate - in order to understand what others expect from you and in order to be able to express your own expectations.

But is that all? Isn't there anything beyond laws and language? What about basic common beliefs? What about common customs? What about a common German culture? These questions have been much discussed in Germany and all over Europe to much ballyhoo and with unpleasant results.

I have a feeling that they are for the most part a more or less desperate attempt to make a stand against a - if you like - multicultural, certainly a

multiethnic Europe. (For multiculturalism in the age of the world wide web and mass migration - the global village - isn't something you can demand, defend, define or destroy. It's just there and has very little to do with the cultural romanticism it is usually associated with.)

As complicated as coming to terms with the fast and totally changing fabric of our own societies might be, it would be downright easy if all we were talking about was how to integrate (again, whatever that may mean) the people who are already on the inside.

But we have to discuss all these difficult and sensitive issues - we will hear more than we all would surely like to about the need to combat racism - against an ever changing picture of worldwide migration.

Those who leave their native land for good and migrate to another are often, almost by definition, the boldest and most capable, able to imagine a new life for themselves and their families. Living in another country, at least at first, without the necessary language and cultural skills, frequently scorned by the "lucky ones" who have already made it, means living by seizing opportunities.

This is why migration is viewed upon by some as an adventure and a gain for the receiving societies - and by some as a threat. Both for the same reasons. Politics and politicians have to meet the challenge of explaining developments to both sides and of making sure that this remains a process they are still able to govern.

How many immigrants do our European societies need, if any? How many immigrants are they taking, how many can they take? Who is to be welcomed? According to which rules and conditions? Who is to name the criteria immigrants will have to meet? What kind of criteria are to be established? Who decides upon the quotas that have to accompany these criteria? What about the immigrants whose numbers cannot be predicted: asylum seekers, refugees from civil and other wars, family members?

Questions much easier to ask than to answer. That's why the Minister of the Interior has summoned a Commission whose job it will be to come up with some answers to these questions: both on migration and integration.

And once more things are getting more complicated in the face of our ongoing fight against racism, xenophobia, harassment and attacks.

The question is no longer whether we want to live together with people from other countries, other cultures or of other origin! It is how do we establish rules and ways to sustain a way of living together that leads to an understanding of each other and that decides conflicts by means of conviction and not of brute force?

We have to get along with one another! Which includes discussing our fears when it comes to the issues of migration and integration as openly and honestly as we discuss our hopes and expectations.

And as much as there is a German history to all this and a German framework and a German perception - the outcome is a European one.

Dieter Oberndörfer

Multiculturalism – Enrichment of Society or Cause for Conflict?

Every nation in Europe is now an immigration country. That includes Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece - once the classic countries of emigration. Demographic developments, declining and ageing populations and the related demand for labour will force Europe to open up its societies to further increased immigration.

That is particularly true for Germany. A statistical birth rate of 2.1 children per female is a prerequisite for maintaining population stability in industrial societies, where there are high standards of medical care. However, in Germany the average birth rate has been 1.34 per female in recent years: foreigners account for 13.3% of all births and German women only 1.26%. The indigenous German population has declined by approximately 4 million since 1970 as a result of the low birth rate. The increase in population, which currently stands at over 82 million, is two-thirds attributable to foreign immigration and one-third to the resettlement of ethnic Germans from eastern and southern Europe. The birth rate per foreign female has meanwhile fallen well below the 2.1 population stability factor to 1.6, and is still declining.

Germany is not alone. All European Union and eastern European countries have a reproduction shortfall. The birth rate for Spanish (1.15), Italian (1.22) and Greek women (1.31) has fallen behind the German average. The population of these countries will therefore grow older and decline more quickly than that of Germany's. Portugal (1.44) and the Netherlands (1.55) have a higher birth rate than Germany. The countries with the most favourable birth rate are currently Great Britain (1.70) and

France (1.72), Sweden, Denmark and Finland (1.61 to 1.74) and Ireland (1.91). Hungary, the Baltic States and Russia have extremely low birth rates comparable with those of Italy and Spain. The average for the Czech Republic (1.10) is even lower. Furthermore, this rapid population decline is accelerated by low life expectancy in eastern Europe. Life expectancy in Russia is now less than in India (60 years, 76 in Germany). In view of these demographic developments it is doubtful whether the former eastern bloc countries will have a sufficient reservoir of manpower to build competitive economies.

The migration within Europe typical of the sixties and seventies - of predominantly unskilled workers from Mediterranean countries seeking employment in the heavy industries of the north, in mining and in the service sector - has been at a low level for a long time. There was a great deal of coming and going until the beginning of the eighties. 24 million of the 30 million people who came to Germany have since returned to their home countries. Almost 8% of Greece's population worked for a while in Germany. On the other hand, there has been a significant increase in the migration of highly qualified engineers, scientists and top executives within Europe.

For many years the most important cause of immigration has been the reunification of families, not the recruitment of labour. The increase in Germany's foreign population from around 4 million at the beginning of the nineties to 7.3 million is primarily due to family reunification and natural reproduction. There are over two million Turks living in Germany, the largest group of immigrants in the country. Immigrants came and still come from the periphery of Europe, North Africa and a variety of third world countries and regions. The flood of immigrants from eastern Europe anticipated by many after the collapse of communism has so far failed to materialise. As a result of their low birth rate, eastern European countries will also have to rely on foreign workers to build their economies. Poland is already a country of immigration for workers from Belarus, Ukraine and Russia. Hungary too took in immigrants from Rumania and the former Yugoslavia and exports only an insignificant

percentage of its own workforce. It has been estimated that the European Union will require between 35-40 million immigrants to alleviate the economic and social impact of a shrinking and ageing population. According to a survey carried out by the distinguished migration expert Rainer Münz, net-migration from eastern Europe will not exceed 4 million in coming decades. Several studies suggest net-migration to Germany itself will be around 300,000 – 500,000 a year. With 300,000 new arrivals each year, the proportion of immigrants in the population would rise from currently 9% to 20% over a period of 35 years, i.e. to the same level of foreigners living in Switzerland at the present time. However, a fairly moderate increase in naturalisations, particularly now that children born in Germany of foreign parents (*ius soli*) can be naturalised, would reduce this figure to 13-15%. Since eastern Europe will cease to be an additional source of labour, Europe and Germany will in future have to depend primarily on immigration from non-European countries. The proportion of non-Europeans in the population will therefore increase considerably. Over half the population will be of non-German descent in large urban areas (already 32% at present in Frankfurt-on-Main).

In the long term, immigration alone will not be able to halt the decline in and ageing of the population as immigrants themselves grow old and also adopt the reproduction behaviour patterns of the indigenous population. Energetic birth promotion policies along the lines of the very successful ones adopted in France and the Nordic States are essential. These countries show that a high rate of female employment is compatible with a high birth rate. Spain and Italy have not only the lowest birth rate but also the lowest employment quota for women in Europe.

The birth rate in France is currently 1.7 and is expected to increase. As a result, the population in France will decline by only four million by 2050. Germany's population would fall by 17 million over the same period if there were no more immigration.

Socially acceptable and well-organised immigration coupled with an effective birth policy might give Germany time to postpone and cushion

the social impact of a decline in population which is inevitable in the long term. Even an increase of 10-15% in the birth rate would significantly slow down the ageing of the population. Large-scale immigration policies are urgently required. But in future the main problem will be finding the millions of qualified immigrants needed in many sectors of industry across Europe. The Green Card fiasco – in six months, just over 3,000 applicants have registered for 20,000 Cards – shows that the current debate in Germany is divorced from reality.

In future Germany will have to compete with other countries for qualified immigrants and this rivalry will very soon intensify.

This state of affairs has until now gone unacknowledged, despite the negative immigration balance in 1997 and 1998, when more people left than came to Germany. The small immigration surplus in 1999 was due solely to the arrival of about 80,000 ethnic Germans from eastern Europe, a phenomenon which will soon be a thing of the past.

At the same time, public debate continues to be determined by the petty protective strategies used by populist demagogy. Demands have been made for even stiffer restrictions on political asylum, even though the Federal Republic only holds eleventh place in Europe in relation to the size of its population. Germany has little chance against international competition with its recent Green and Blue Card initiatives - an attempt to repeat the earlier, extremely anti-integrationist, German "guest worker" model of recruiting for temporary stays only. Potential migrants will go to the countries offering the most promising long-term perspectives. Germany is certainly not one of those. Demands for immigrants to adjust to the German dominant culture (Leitkultur) and fit in with lifestyle and customs of the local population can have only a deterrent effect. They are a summons to harassment or cultural rape by the local population. In particular, such demands mean that members of what were once alien religions such as Muslims, Hindus or Confucians acquire the status of a "tolerated", non-German minority - as did the Jews in earlier times. Mosques have replaced synagogues as alien, non-German places of worship. Even if Tamils or Africans put on Lederhosen with knee-

stockings, yodelled and dyed their skin and hair the “right” colour, they would still be recognisable as “foreigners” and therefore deemed not to fit in. Anyone who insists that immigrants kow-tow to the views and customs of a provincial culture is in truth trying to hinder further immigration. Immigrants from India and China can become good, law-abiding citizens, but they will never metamorphose into Catholic-Bavarian farmers or Swabian pietists. It is high time that we stopped this embarrassing talk about Leitkultur. Article 3 of the Basic Law states inter alia that "nobody should be prejudiced or favoured because of their sex, birth, national origin or faith. " Some proponents of the Leitkultur maintain that the Basic Law is their yardstick. It would be logical if they applied this principle to immigrants too.

Trevor Phillips

Multiculturalism – Enrichment of Society or Cause for Conflict?

I want to make a few observations about the issue of multiculturalism in Europe and start from the point of view of London. It now has the largest and most diverse population of any city in Europe. It is significant that in the UK half of the ethnic minority population live in London and by 2011, one third of all Londoners will come from visible ethnic minority backgrounds.

These communities are not homogeneous. They range from well-established immigrants (reaching back one thousand years) to the children of newly-arrived refugees. Their origins are from across the world, with about forty-five different communities of more than 10,000 people each in London. There are religious and cultural differences - we have a large Muslim population as well as an historically large Jewish population. Refugees and asylum-seekers account for just under six per cent of the Greater London population - a very large number.

As in the rest of Europe, minority ethnic groups are overrepresented in UK statistics on deprivation. They are disproportionately concentrated in deprived areas. Many housing estates are becoming an island of difference within the city and populated largely by people of colour, people from refugee or asylum-seeking backgrounds. At the other end of the scale, 60 out of every 1000 people in the UK are from visible ethnic minority groups. But when we look at our representation in the democracy as a test of the issue of integration we find that of the 1000 or so representatives

who are elected in the UK - members of the House of Commons, European Parliament and devolved assemblies in Scotland, Wales and London, only 14 are people of colour, compared to the sixty or so that would be there if they were represented in proportion to their numbers. These statistics are cause for concern, demonstrating symbolically a worrying level of exclusion.

The issue of multiculturalism has vexed Britain since the war. In the last couple of years it has become newly controversial because of the killing of a young man called Stephen Lawrence in South East London. When the present British government came into power in 1997 it launched a major inquiry under the Judge Lord MacPherson into this death. The inquiry came up with a number of important findings. Two are particularly relevant to our thinking about multiculturalism in Europe.

First, we can become too focused on the issue of attitude and the question of whether we like people of a different race or not. As a result, we may miss the most significant factor in community and race relations in Britain, what MacPherson called "Institutional Racism". Loosely, this is a persistent characteristic of institutions such as government institutions, schools, courts, private companies etc. It leads to a situation where minority ethnic groups are underrepresented at the highest levels and consistently disadvantaged. This persistent discrimination seems to resist all kinds of individual efforts. This is an important point for Europeans. Discrimination and Disadvantage, integration issues and multiculturalism are not simply about whether you get on with your neighbours. They are about outcomes as well as the motivation of individuals.

Second, when we consider the issues of disadvantage and inequality, we need to bear in mind that treating everyone in the same way does not result in everyone having the same opportunity. People start from different situations. Refugees in the UK may not know English and so be at a disadvantage from the outset.

This is an issue which will concern Europe as a whole, not least because we are discovering that a healthy, growing economy needs to attract

immigrant labour. In post-war Britain this was essential. That's why my own parents came to Britain. My father spent some time on construction sites rebuilding London. My sister worked in the newly-created health service. In Europe, and especially London, we are seeing the restructuring of our economy, where we do not have the level of skilled labour and people with the right educational qualifications and backgrounds to meet our particular needs. Thus 10% of the 400,000 jobs in the UK's IT sector are vacant. This sector is growing at 30% a year, so we will need another 30,000 people every single year. Estimates suggest that by the middle of this decade there will be a shortfall of around 300,000.

In London, possibly the greatest threat to what is the most substantial, fastest-growing city economy in Europe is a critical labour shortage in the public sector. In some of our hospitals, one third of our nurses are from agencies, because we cannot recruit permanent staff. We are going abroad to recruit nurses and teachers. We have approximately 2000 fewer police than we need (26,000 instead of 28,000). These are all strong drivers for immigration.

If this is where we are going, how, in a multicultural Europe, do we ensure that we maintain social cohesion, while giving people rights and the status they require to integrate into society? As we move closer and closer together, Europe as a whole will need some common principles. It is easy for us to agree that we are against Haiderism, the National Front and similar movements. But we need to confront questions on cultural conflict and cultural freedoms. We need to begin to consider a contract of citizenship with those who are seeking to settle permanently in Europe. That contract would be a very simple thing. Those who come to Europe make a commitment to the country they are in and by extension to Europe itself. In return they are offered protection against discrimination and social exclusion.

It is right for us to begin to consider a formal relationship which gives people coming to live in Europe a sense of the right of their being here and establishes that the society into which they come accepts them - not

on sufferance, not as guest workers who may go back somewhere else, but as people who have come to contribute to the economic and social well-being of the country in which they are living. We might give people a guarantee of social rights but could expect them to work for voluntary organisations for a period - a very strong tradition in the UK which plays an important part in integrating people from abroad.

As part of the guarantee of rights against discrimination, the British government is taking steps to extend our race relations legislation. We have also now incorporated the European Convention on Human Rights into our legislation in the UK. This will have a huge impact on protecting people belonging to minorities. The race relations amendment will prohibit discrimination by public authorities in carrying out any of their functions and impose a statutory duty on public authorities to promote racial equality.

These things will not happen easily and simply. In the UK there is a strong groundswell of opposition to the idea of multiculturalism. The point is that the English are nothing else but a nation of immigrants. The original inhabitants of England now live in Scotland and Wales, where they were pushed out by the Vikings and Germans. Richard the Lionheart, who is represented as the quintessential English King, spent only one year in England and never learned to speak English. The English patron Saint, St George, was a Palestinian. Despite this, we have created a national identity which can exclude multiculturalism and there is a major country in the UK to define that - England.

This is mixed up with the issue of European integration and our position in Europe. And the arguments on Europe are now spilling over into the definition of Englishness and Britishness. This in itself is a territory where the issue of multiculturalism becomes extremely contentious.

A survey of British people showed that 6 million adults in Britain do not subscribe to British identity. This is important. A British identity is one which is inclusive. An English identity is exclusive. It is white, male etc. One third of those not subscribing to British identity admit to being

racially prejudiced, compared to 16% of those identifying themselves as British. They are also more likely to think that immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in Britain. One quarter of them say that equal opportunities for Blacks and Asians in Great Britain have gone too far. They are twice as likely as the average to say that people cannot be truly English unless they are white, born in England and have English parents, and they are the most eurosceptic part of the population. Three quarters think we should keep the pound. 22% think we should leave the EU altogether.

So this is very sensitive territory in the UK. It is not just about minorities, it is about who we are as people. We need to be careful when considering this issue not to fall into two traps. First, to think that multiculturalism is just about being nice to minorities. Multiculturalism is a much more fundamental issue to do with who we are as British people, as Germans, as Europeans.

Second, when we deal with the issue of racism, it is not just to do with how we treat each other as individuals. The issue of racism and discrimination is more than anything else about how we structure our society to ensure that people, whatever their colour, or background or tradition, have an equal chance to do well in the society. And the only way we can test this is by looking at the results. How many people are employed at what level in what companies? Who represents our people? Who is included in discussions about the future of our nation?

Barbara John

Multiculturalism – Enrichment of Society or Cause for Conflict?

Let me start with two different thoughts, which could mobilise people either for or against immigration.

First, there are more than 500,000 people living in Berlin whose mother tongue is not German. Second, inner city areas like Kreuzberg and Tiergarten, which were previously economically rundown, have been revived by immigrants.

In Berlin we have tried to exploit the strengths of immigration. Thus we have granted business permits to immigrants much earlier than after the normal eight years. We have also introduced examinations assessing a firm's suitability for training. That means that people who might be defeated by Germany's strict trading regulations can attend courses which qualify them to train apprentices. And we have also carried out a programme to encourage self-employment.

Integration of immigrants is made more difficult as a result of legal regulations. There are far fewer of these in Britain, but it is still a problem in Germany. For example, there is a regulation which says that foreigners, in contrast to Germans, can only work for wages set by collective agreement. Before they can get a work permit they have to prove that they are earning this level of wages. Otherwise they do not get the work permit.

In my view, however, work is one of the most important methods of integration, because work helps people to learn German, improve their qualifications, strengthens social contacts and leads to recognition by the

majority society. Advancement through education is a decisive factor for success in society. Trevor Phillips is right. The issue is not whether or not we like foreigners. Treating people kindly is a matter of course. It is about rights. It is about whether the institutions of education and the labour market and the laws governing them allow immigrants, with the help of support measures, to be as successful as the indigenous population - at least within two or three generations. That is crucial for their success in society.

Of course there are problems for the majority too, which we must understand. If the majority accept immigration, then it is in the expectation that it will not disadvantage them, but that at the very least everything should remain as it is. They do not expect that their children should suddenly form a minority at school. That is a situation which occurs frequently in Berlin. In Kreuzberg there are schools in which not a single child has German as a mother tongue. German children are not even in the minority there - they are simply not present at all!

As you can see, the majority here are struggling with their assumptions and fears that their own children's educational prospects are getting worse. A number of measures are being taken to lessen the fears of the German population, such as more all-day schools in the inner city areas. With the right combination of problem solving and problem analysis it is possible to achieve positive attitudes towards immigrant minorities and a greater pluralism - but also to make the wrong decisions.

It is essential that all institutions, from the cradle to the grave - incidentally, can immigrants be buried in Germany if they are Muslims? - must be carefully considered. And between cradle and grave there is a great deal that needs to be changed still. We must change things, so that immigrants feel included. They must also share responsibility for integration. We are trying to achieve that here in Berlin by giving direct financial support to many projects for minorities, which undertake integration measures. This includes giving minorities places to display their cultures. We have done this in Berlin in the House of Cultures and the Workshop of Cultures. It also means really resolving the everyday

conflicts which arise between the majority and minority, taking care not to rely on schematic solutions. For example, when a conflict flares up over housing. The commercial landlords write the normal letters, but they have to obey the tenancy laws. No one goes along to talk to the people, no one looks for arbitrators, there are no mediation programmes. Cities must of course try to manage these things better than has hitherto been the case.

I want to address the question of the dominant culture once more. In European societies and particularly in German society, it is crucial that there is not too wide a gap between national identity and democratic values, otherwise immigration will become a lasting conflict. If the national element dominates, if people are supposed to be initiated into obscure behaviour patterns, then it will only be possible to detect the deviations from the norm. People will notice that others look different, pray differently, go into different places of worship - and that will lead to constant irritations. But if we change our institutions and expand our national concept of German society so that every group is allowed to identify with its cultural origin, to develop it and to integrate it into this national concept, then we can make full use of our existing wonderful democratic system, which already functions well in bringing together societies from different cultural backgrounds.

Integration is not just about tolerating - it does not mean accepting with gritted teeth. It is about adopting a positive attitude, because immigration brings huge advantages - not just economic, though these are the first to be noticed - to every society.

Josef Voß

Combating Racism and Promoting Integration – The Role of Government

The difficulties that the German "majority" and the various ethnic minorities have living together should not be underestimated. The fact that these difficulties are acknowledged and discussed publicly should not be confused with xenophobia. Problems can only be tackled if they are talked about openly.

However, there is an obstacle - whether conscious or unconscious - to rational debate: one of the reasons for defensive xenophobic attitudes can be found in the disorientation the population feels in the face of the challenges to society presented by migration, integration and minorities. The oft-repeated phrase "The Federal Republic is not a country of immigration" disguises the fact that millions of foreigners have migrated to Germany and this is their home. Thus in a social and cultural sense, Germany has indeed become a new type of country of immigration. What this means has still not been appreciated. Migration can only be managed if it is generally accepted that it has become a permanent feature of and challenge to our society.

Essential elements for a permanent climate of co-operation

Oppose xenophobia, promote integration; this goal can only be managed if the necessary steps are taken to create a climate in which Germans and foreigners can live together in peace and freedom.

Responsible use of language versus simplistic slogans

Threats to make policy on foreign nationals into an election topic and calls to keep the subject of foreigners out of elections are out of step with reality. Migration policy is social policy in its broadest sense. Migration issues are no longer marginal problems, rather, they are a central policy challenge for society. They will probably gain in importance in Germany and in Europe generally. Migration policy can only be successful if it is supported by a very broad consensus. In a democracy, it cannot be enforced against the will of the indigenous majority, otherwise there will be dangerous consequences particularly harmful to ethnic minorities, but also to the political system as a whole. The indigenous majority must be courted over and over again for their acceptance of migration policy and immigrant minorities. That requires broad-based factual information and debate.

Speak out difficult truths

One of these difficult truths is the fact that immigration, migration, resettlement, expulsion and political asylum have become permanent facts of life in German society and the rest of Europe. We speak about the globalisation of the economy and the financial markets, about the globalisation of transport and communication: Germany is dependent on open borders for its exports. But it is illusory to imagine that borders can be hermetically sealed against people, especially in view of the growing gap between rich and poor which, in future, will also increase migratory pressures on prosperous Europe.

From the integration of expellees and refugees from former German territories in eastern Europe after World War II, to the recruitment of foreign workers begun in the fifties and the increasing number of asylum seekers and refugees from civil wars, there has never been a politically clear-cut and easily understandable programme for managing immigration through social and economic measures and for promoting

integration for immigrants who remain in Germany. There will never be a simple solution.

The immigrants include in their number German emigrants, predominantly from the former Soviet Union, who suffered from the late effects of World War II and have a constitutional right to return to Germany.

One of the bitter truths is that in the medium and longer-term, demographic development in Germany will require permanent immigration, going far beyond the recruitment of specialists. In the years ahead, the so-called generation contract that secures old age pensions will not only become a financial problem, given Germany's ageing population, it will also become difficult to find sufficient workers.

Whoever calls for a change to the political right to asylum in Germany's Basic Law, must explain why he believes this is necessary, given that an amendment to Article 16a of the Basic Law would bring about the collapse of the whole system of safe third-country rules. The Federal Republic will continue to be bound by the standards laid down in the Geneva Convention on Refugees, which are applied to the vast majority of applications for asylum. Furthermore, the precedence of European Law allows the Federal Republic relatively little leeway.

Whoever questions the right of an individual to political asylum as opposed to an institutional guarantee touches on Germany's recent history. The fathers of the Constitution formulated political asylum as an individual right in response to the bitter experiences under Nazi dictatorship. In substance, the difference between individual right to asylum and an institutional guarantee is minimal, since the Geneva Convention on Refugees takes precedence. However, this individual right is our contribution to the development of human rights. Our country and our society must continue to be aware of this historic responsibility. It is impossible to speak of fatherland and nation without acknowledging the fatherland's past.

Opposing xenophobia – promoting integration

When the German-Italian recruitment agreement, a precursor of state-organised recruitment of foreign labour, was introduced in 1955, many expellees and refugees had not yet been fully integrated into their new homeland in the West following the war. However, since that time there has never been a policy for the integration of immigrants. The economy needed workers and assumed that after a while they would return to their home countries and be replaced by new foreign workers. It was not part of the plan that people would want to bring their families to Germany, some of them permanently. Initially, the only interest was in integrating them into the labour market. There were no special efforts to integrate those who were not part of the labour market. One result was that many first-generation foreigner workers, and in particular the women, were scarcely integrated linguistically. We are still burdened with this legacy, especially with regard to the generation of guest workers from a different cultural background, for example Turkey.

What does integration mean?

Many talk of integration but have contradictory ideas about what the word means. It does not mean the greatest possible assimilation into German ways of thinking and life style.

The integration of immigrants who remain in Germany permanently is a long-term process that demands effort on the part of both immigrants and German society. It is therefore a reciprocal process requiring the active support and encouragement of state and social organisations as well as the media. Integration means that people who live in Germany permanently must also participate in our society with the same rights and responsibilities.

Linguistic integration

Anyone who wants to participate in German life must master the German language, an essential prerequisite for communication within the community. This is a debt that will have to be discharged by those who live in Germany permanently, even if they retain their identity through their mother tongue and traditions. In order to achieve this goal it is our duty to ensure that integration policy differentiates between different groups of immigrants. German language teaching must be promoted for all ethnic groups. That requires comprehensive access to language courses across the country, with continued language study made dependent on successful participation in these courses. In this context, the indigenous population must also be made more conscious of the advantages of being able to speak several foreign languages.

Allegiance to our country on the basis of our constitution

Anyone who wishes to stay in Germany permanently should be required to swear allegiance to our free state on the basis of our Basic Law and the values which it represents. The constitution, which recognises people as individuals and acknowledges the inviolability of the dignity of each person, whether male or female, young or old, disabled or able-bodied, born or unborn, German national or foreigner, is the basis for living together in freedom, justice and peace. To achieve this goal, cross-cultural issues should be addressed in nursery schools and then dealt with in greater depth in schools, vocational institutes and universities. Language tuition should also include civics and information about job training possibilities.

Legal integration

Foreigners who live here permanently, especially the second and third generations who were born and belong here, ought, where possible, to be

able to help shape our political life with all rights and responsibilities, without having to give up their own identity and culture in the process. It is in our own interest and in the spirit of our constitution to ensure that the inhabitants of our country and the nation state do not fall apart, leaving a large part of the population permanently marginalised. Against this background, legal integration means naturalisation, and is the basis for immigrants to identify with our state and society, regardless of their own identity and culture.

Social integration

Integration into the labour market is important for social integration. It gives immigrants the means to care for themselves and their families and take on responsibility for others. The potential in immigrant groups and organisations should be harnessed for this purpose. Such organisations need the same support and back-up as indigenous associations.

Government offices and institutions catering for large numbers of immigrants must adapt their services and working methods according to the needs of immigrants. Staff working for government offices and institutions should be encouraged to acquire essential cross-cultural skills and given the necessary training. Appointing immigrants with cross-cultural competences, for example knowledge of foreign languages, should be considered as a criterion for employment with such organisations.

The unique contribution made by foreign language communities.

The Church has always been and always will look upon itself as a universal Church. From the beginning, there has only ever been one Church in the various languages, cultures and traditions, based on the gospel and one faith. Native language missions have proved themselves in the Catholic Church over past decades. The facilities provided in native-

language missions make it possible for individual groups to meet and communicate with each other. Many immigrants have found orientation, support and help from the gospel and community services celebrated in their native tongue and have also found a home in our Church. Religious and social services in foreign languages have been the Church's response to the fact that culture, tradition, customs and language influence the way faith is taught and practised, and in so doing have satisfied an elementary need for sanctuary and solidarity in a way that German-speaking parishes would be unable to fulfil satisfactorily.

The dialogue with Muslims

Approximately 2.5 million Muslims live in Germany. Most were recruited as foreign workers from Turkey, the former Yugoslavia and north African countries. It is not so well known that several thousand Germans belong to the Islamic faith.

Muslims are predominantly foreigner nationals and live in a minority religious and social group. This makes dialogue between Christians and Muslims difficult. There is also the problem of Muslim citizens concentrated in housing ghettos. The interfaith dialogue between Christians and Muslims is not just ambitious, it is also vital and there is a great deal more to be done. Mutual trust is essential.

Muslims benefit from the religious freedom guaranteed under the Basic Law in the same way as members of Christian churches and other religious denominations. They have the right to practice their faith freely and to organise and join in religious activities. Parents also have the right to pass on their faith and traditions to their children. It is part of their identity. Our foreign policy should also demand reciprocity and the same freedom for Christians in Islamic countries.

However, Muslims, like members of other religions, are also bound by the constitutional order, especially by the inviolability of human dignity, equal rights for the sexes and a criminal code governed by the rule of law. The preconditions for Islamic religious instruction should be

regulated in accordance with Section 7 Paragraph 3 of the Basic Law, i.e. in the German language, in accordance with educational provisions for schools and supervised by the state.

Meeting Places and experiencing life together

In the final analysis, the process of integration will only succeed if both sides trust each other. How this trust grows will depend on how the various immigrant groups are accepted in society, including the experience they have of Germans and vice-versa, which can become a basis for mutual respect and tolerance. We should not underestimate the role which immigrant associations and organisations play in this process. A vital condition for respect is the protection of marriage and family. This protection is sacrosanct and must be taken into consideration in all forms of legislation. Immigrants' freedom to live here and support our system and society out of conviction will only grow if this security is ensured.

Encouraging integration on a broad basis

Cornelia Schmalz-Jacobsen, the Federal government's third Commissioner for Foreigners, wrote that "integration is a right and an effort to which there is no alternative". The Federal government can look back on a tradition of very successful integration policy, not just for the 12 million expelled persons and refugees after World War II but also for the 4 million people who have resettled here since. Another important step is the reform of the nationality laws.

Dealing with the substantive task of integration remains a challenge. We live in a society with many different life styles and living standards. For this reason, integration cannot and must not mean assimilation, but a permanent process of reaching agreement on the basic principles and rules for living together. This necessitates a comprehensive choice of integration assistance and guidance, including mediation facilities and

social support. Realistic mechanisms for dealing with conflict, especially violent disputes between young people, are also necessary.

Social integration calls for mutual acceptance and tolerance between the various ethnic groups as well as equal opportunities in the key sectors of society and the economy. Training for this must commence in childhood.

As necessary as the discussion on banning the NPD may be, it does not give full justice to the problems ahead. Total loss of direction and a sense of the futility of life are also evident in right-wing extremist violence.

The idea that our political system needs an ethical foundation of basic values, which the state by itself cannot provide, is either being forgotten or has been suppressed. The preamble to the Basic Law assumes “responsibility before God and the People”. If this transcendental dimension is lost, if the sense of religious mystery in society disappears, then a sense of the inherent mystery of the individual will also disappear. Hans Jonas, a reliable contemporary witness, observed that a society which allows itself the luxury of holding nothing sacred and dismisses virtues such as respect, reverence, responsibility and loyalty as obsolete need not be surprised if violence is only one small step away.

Vural Öger

Combating Racism and Promoting Integration – The Role of Government

Over 50 years since the end of the Second World War all Western European countries are democratic states and set the highest standards of human rights. Xenophobia and right-wing extremism are no longer compatible with the conception European countries have of themselves. Human rights apply to all citizens, regardless of their origin, skin colour or culture. Due to its own past history, Germany in particular has a humanitarian obligation to combat xenophobia and right-wing extremism. There are also vital selfish interests, such as economic and demographic necessities, which mean that Europe and above all Germany are actually dependent on foreigners and immigrants. And a society which expects a significant section of the population to work, pay taxes and contribute to pension funds yet neither grants them any rights nor protects them from discrimination cannot live in peace in the long term.

Unfortunately, however, we cannot claim that governments are perfect in fulfilling their role in combating racism and promoting integration. We repeatedly see discrepancies between beliefs, words and deeds.

Let us stay with the example of Germany for the moment. As you know, the economic miracle of the 1960s required foreign labour. People recruited from various countries, including Spain, Italy, Greece and Turkey, made a major contribution to Germany's development. Both hosts and guests thought these workers would only stay for a limited period. But despite repatriation measures and a halt to further recruitment, the number of Turks in Germany rose to 2.3 million. Many of them are now third-generation immigrants. Yet the government at the time insisted that

Germany was not an immigration country. As a result, little effort was made to plan or implement programmes to promote integration. Foreigners became second-class citizens. Their work was not recognised. On the contrary, the boat was full. Some elements of the media and the “indigenous” population treated foreigners and the subject of foreigners in the same way as the government. They spoke of excessive foreign influence, foreign crime etc. It is therefore no wonder that this situation escalated in the early 90s to such an extent that hostels for asylum-seekers were attacked and foreigners physically assaulted. But the government of the day saw no reason to act against xenophobia and promote integration. They regarded events more as justification for changing the law on asylum.

Things did not start to improve in Germany until there was a change of government. The new government introduced a law on citizenship aimed at promoting legal integration. The wave of violence in the summer of 2000 was perceived as a very serious problem. Not only was public regret expressed at the attacks but specific measures were also introduced. For the first time there was a clear statement that Germany needs immigration for its own future. All this may not be enough. Some sections of society are certainly still against foreigners and the process of integration has a long way to go. But I can finally see some movement in society.

Ladies and Gentlemen, governments must take the fight against xenophobia and the promotion of integration very seriously and advance these causes consistently. In my opinion there are three essential goals:

Instigation to commit violence, the imitation and glorification of Nazi tyranny, all right-wing extremist acts of violence and criminal xenophobia must be systematically recorded, made public and punished. That applies in particular to ringleaders and those pulling the strings behind the scenes.

Thorough judicial investigation is essential so that immigrants become aware of the qualities of a state governed by the rule of law. The victims of discrimination and xenophobia must learn what their legal defence

possibilities are. They must know how and where they can file a complaint or report an offence. Many foreigners have no confidence in German authorities; the number of unreported offences is therefore likely to be high. An independent control body must be created.

People of foreign origin are still largely regarded as a threat to society. Their cultural and economic contribution remains unrecognised. This is due to the lack of support programmes since mass immigration began. This also applies to the call for immigrants to learn the German language which has now been voiced with delay. The authorities, the media and school systems need new, sensitive and constructive answers to the real issue of immigration. Germany needs an immigration law. But this law must not be employed exclusively as a bureaucratic instrument. It must be linked to a comprehensive integration programme.

Carefully considered and comprehensive programmes will be required to achieve these aims. I should like to make some specific proposals:

Victims of discrimination, xenophobia and right-wing violence often do not know how to defend themselves. The government must provide citizens of foreign origin with a manual to assist them in safeguarding their rights and to heighten their civic awareness.

German society must commit itself to a uniform programme against all forms of discrimination. The government can contribute towards ensuring that companies and trade unions, churches, authorities, schools and the media agree on a united approach and implement guidelines in their respective areas to combat incitement against foreigners and racial intolerance. I believe it is particularly important to fight everyday discrimination which is now accepted as normality. And politicians must finally stop conducting election campaigns on the backs of foreigners.

The state can work closely together here with industrial associations. Many entrepreneurs and trade unionists in particular know that right-wing violence can seriously damage the image of German industry and deal a major blow to the attractiveness of Germany as a business location.

I place special emphasis on information work in schools and universities. Changing society's attitude from xenophobic to xenophile is nothing less than a major cultural transformation. Our children and young people must learn from an early age that people of a different origin, a different culture and different way of thinking are an enrichment, that by being open and curious they can learn something from them and that differing ideas can multiply to produce a better result. Our children and young people will become more creative and flexible as a consequence, they will be better team players and gain a broader perspective on the world. I ask myself: what better thing could happen to them?

But teachers must be given instruments to combat negligent apathy and open or latent racism. In kindergartens, schools and universities, foreigners must be presented as valuable for Germany's culture, economy and future. The most modern media must be employed to bring our children and young people into contact with different cultures.

But that is just part of the tasks in the education sector. Foreigners, or rather immigrants, must have adequate command of the German language. They must know something about the history of their new country. They must also accept the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany as their constitution. Foreign children and young people must understand how they can achieve their desired professions and positions in society. They must accept above all that school studies are generally the path to success. The state must educate and train immigrants via kindergartens, schools and general courses. But children and young people should not be regarded as the exclusive target group. It is important also to target the parental homes, the fathers and mothers.

In addition to the education system, support must also be given to the cultural sector so that, for example, we experience Turks not only as conveyor-belt workers in headscarves but also as entrepreneurs, scientists, musicians, painters, writers, sculptors, film-makers or actors. The state should promote corresponding projects.

It is equally gratifying to see that at least the public broadcasting corporations are establishing editorial groups dedicated to the topics of right-wing extremism, xenophobia and immigration. Press freedom must naturally be respected but I think the state can also assume a supporting role here.

I advocate a network of local authorities to combat right-wing violence. In the past, a lack of funding has prevented them from establishing a shared database. But we have recognised that there are organised networks, international links and spiritual leaders behind right-wing violence. We must get used to the idea of building up our own democratic network of general vigilance. This network must register all the words and deeds of right-wing extremism and xenophobia. As recent cases in Germany have unfortunately shown, it must also examine what measures are taken against offenders by the people and authorities in charge.

Furthermore, the network must serve as a lever to enable individual committed people and organisations to strengthen the effect of their activities. Regrettably, there is too little cooperation in Germany.

The fight against right-wing extremism must be placed on a European footing. Most of what is occurring in Germany is also happening in other countries. That cannot serve as an excuse but must spur us on to broad cooperation.

I think it is essential also to cooperate with the USA, with organisations such as the Anti-Defamation League. In terms of practical experience in dealing with right-wing extremism and xenophobia, the USA is way ahead of us in some respects. However, the right-wing extremist influence on the Federal Republic emerging from the USA is also part of this picture.

I am aware that all these tasks cannot be fulfilled by the state alone. Only broad cooperation among all democratic organisations can help to ensure that xenophobia disappears and integration works successfully. I agree with the Federal Government that opposing xenophobia and working for integration cannot be left to politicians alone but requires efforts from all citizens. Nevertheless, politicians must support the work of the citizens.

They must initiate, delegate and provide the necessary resources. Above all, the government must achieve a strong alliance of all democrats. I am certain that many would gladly make themselves available for this purpose – including me.

Gurbux Singh

Combating Racism and Promoting Integration – The Role of Government

I want to address three issues:

- *the basic principles relating to multiculturalism, which are musts in the UK;*
- *the role of government in delivering a genuine equalities agenda within Britain;*
- *the role of the Equal Opportunities Commission, its responsibilities and the critical issues it believes should form the agenda for a real discussion.*

Basic principles

We in Britain believe in integration rather than assimilation. This means the co-existence of different cultures; communities with different languages; and different faiths. We do not believe in assimilation in the sense that people should become brown or black English people.

A modern state must be based on the principles of multiculturalism, diversity and pluralism.

Cultural, linguistic and colour differences are strengths, rather than problems.

Integration is a two-way process and it can lead to different cultures fusing as well as creating fluidity between cultures.

All citizens are equal, but may be different.

I would also like to make one simple point. We do not use the language of exclusion. We do not talk about foreigners, immigrants, migrants, guest workers, "these people". We believe in a Britain in which all peoples are genuinely equal in the eyes of society. Use of language is vitally important. If someone called me an immigrant, which I am - I was born in Punjab and came to Britain at the age of six - I would be mortified. That sort of language is unacceptable.

The Role of Government

The government has four basic responsibilities:

To create and set a vision of modern Britain, based upon the principles of inclusion, fairness and justice, where all its citizens have a sense of belonging, a stake in the country and are enabled to make a contribution to the social and economic well-being of the state. At the heart of that vision must be multiculturalism.

To provide leadership and commitment to that vision. Government should be able to deliver the vision across all the institutions of state at national, regional and local level. In this way, government creates the environment where racism and racial discrimination are unacceptable.

As an employer and a policy maker. As an employer it has the responsibility, enshrined in law, to ensure that all its institutions reflect the composition of Britain's communities. That applies to the whole hierarchy of state institutions, not just people at the bottom end of the organisation. Linked to that, as policy maker, all government policies should be developed to reflect all the needs of its citizens. These policies should not discriminate either directly or indirectly against certain sections of its communities.

To create a legal, anti-discriminatory framework, including the establishment of a formal law-enforcement agency. In the UK we set up the Commission for Racial Equality as a result of the 1976 Race Relations Act.

The Commission for Racial Equality (CRE)

The CRE has three basic responsibilities:

To aid legally and financially individuals who believe that they have been victims of discrimination. To enable them to take their cases to court and to employment tribunals.

To promote good policies and practices and promote change, both within the public and private sectors. To ensure that institutions within those two sectors genuinely deliver equal opportunities.

To conduct legally-based formal investigations, where the CRE believes discrimination exists. Thus we have just launched two significant investigations. One into the Crown Prosecution Service and the other into the Prison Service. A law enforcement agency must enforce the law and use the powers it has.

Britain faces a number of key problems in relation to race discrimination:

There is considerable discrimination in the labour market. Employers exclude black, Asian and other minority communities from securing access to employment. Black and Asian graduates leaving universities will find it three or four times more difficult to find the same job as their white peers.

Education is a real problem in Britain, with significant underachievement by sections of our school population. Afro-Caribbean males have been failed by the education system for the last 30 years and leave school having done significantly less well than others. This has a serious impact on their life chances when they seek employment. That also applies to Bangladeshi and Pakistani children now.

Racial violence is on the increase. Most recent figures in London alone show over 63 cases a day. There are 23,000 cases reported and recorded by the police annually.

People from minority communities are underrepresented within politics and public life. In the UK's premier democratic institution, the House of Commons, there are only 9 people drawn from minorities. In the House of

Lords there are over 20. In the most recently established democratically-elected institutions there is a massive failure - the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly and London Assembly have failed to reflect their communities adequately.

Despite these problems, there is at present a very positive environment in the UK where we can achieve some substantial change. That particularly applies to the new race relations act, which has the potential to lead to significant change in the public sector.

Pál Csáky

Ethnic Minorities in the Light of European Integration

I am myself an elected MP representing the community of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia, currently executive of the Slovak Government. As an elected member of Parliament from as far back as 1990, I have been involved in the solution of multi-ethnic issues in the Slovak Republic, as well as in the former Czechoslovakia. I worked in 1991 and 1992 as a member of the political group led by Václav Havel, President of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, seeking a political solution to the crisis that occurred in Czechoslovakia at that time. I was also a member of the group of legal experts which, headed by Alexander Dubèek, prepared the new Constitution of the Federative Republic. To complete this historical review, I should also say that my party was in opposition until 1998, as our Hungarian Coalition opposed certain actions taken and solutions chosen by the Government at the time, but we had been unable to avert them for lack of sufficient political power. Allow me to quote a specific case in this connection: we were the strongest opposition to the government between 1994 and 1998 and disagreed with a policy resulting in the isolation of our country - the time which was lost in that period is still very regrettable. The adverse approach towards minorities was one of the unresolved issues of those years.

Living at a time which forms the milestone between two millennia, we are trying to establish a European architecture for the 21st century. I am sure that the cultural variety of Europe is a precious asset well worth maintaining for the future. Clearly, integration must proceed in those fields where the global competitiveness of Europe is at stake. These are

primarily the monetary, financial, economic, political and security fields. In other fields, those of national identity, culture, language, regional traditions, it is their preservation that makes Europe stronger. Multiculturalism makes people more open, increases their creativity, and amplifies their ability to listen to different impulses.

We are discussing here today minority rights in individual countries as well as in a European context. In the future, the same principles will perhaps be applicable to the co-existence of nations in Europe, where even the largest nations will de facto be in a minority position. We can already foresee the necessity for a certain degree of compromise between diversity and expediency. A functioning European Parliament simultaneously using 20 or 25 languages is difficult to imagine. Bilingual or multilingual skills are already a requirement for the citizen of Europe, but just because one is able to communicate in some global languages does not mean that one should forget his or her own, even if less utilised, mother tongue. A reasonable balance should offer a solution to this problem as well.

Indeed, while being a member of a minority and at the same time the Deputy Prime Minister responsible for my country's policy towards minorities, I consider the present situation a model for the future. Those solutions discussed here today may also offer solutions for the future. Decentralisation, regionalism, balanced global and regional interests may represent those principles most suitably applied for our purposes. In this respect, very many benefits could be provided by funds and institutions supporting the research and development of minority cultures and languages, both financially and in terms of organisation. Autonomous systems, allowing for implementation of the principle of subsidiarity, would be very helpful. We are trying to apply those principles today in Slovakia. There is a legal foundation for these efforts in Article 34 of the Slovak Constitution, guaranteeing fundamental rights and liberties in their entire range, from political to cultural ones. Unfortunately, we have not yet succeeded in enacting an extensive statute providing for implementation of those rights; however, partial laws and governmental

decrees are, in effect, ensuring the satisfactory exercise of those rights by all of the 11 officially recognised minorities.

I must admit that my present considerations have been concentrating on issues of the traditional and indigenous minorities of Europe. We should not, however, forget those relating to immigrants and to the European Romany communities which, in my opinion, are in a specific situation requiring a special approach.

In our country this issue mainly concerns the Romany community. This complicated problem presents a quest for a comprehensive model of co-existence between two substantially different cultures, rather than a classic minority issue. I am glad to be in a position to declare that a very fertile European co-operation is appearing in this field, to a certain degree resulting from the activities of the Government of Slovakia. I consider it an honour to reconfirm our efforts for the widest possible co-operation, and to express my belief that our common experience within the PHARE programmes and with joint projects, as for instance with the British Know How Fund, represents an excellent beginning of such co-operation. We currently have a biannual action plan running in Slovakia against all forms of intolerance, racial and national prejudice and xenophobia. Within this project, we will propose to Parliament an anti-discrimination law protecting citizens against all forms of intolerance. I have sought technical assistance from the British Know How Fund relating to this issue, and I am hopeful that this draft law, scheduled for enactment in the first half of next year, will represent a very positive example of our mutual collaboration.

Nearing the conclusion of my presentation, I would like to refer to yet another sensitive issue, which is the need for unification of the European Union asylum policy. To avoid any misunderstanding, I wish to state that the right to asylum is considered inviolable not only by myself but also by all members of the Slovak Government. However, we are not happy with the abuse of that right by certain members of our population groundlessly seeking asylum in order to obtain economic advantages.

We are also deeply unhappy that the response to such activities has been in the form of the introduction of visa requirements for our citizens. The Slovak Republic is a free country, guaranteeing free movement for each Slovak citizen. The problem of Romany migration, a phenomenon lasting for several centuries, cannot be unilaterally resolved; its successful resolution is only possible by consistent international co-ordination.

By way of conclusion, I should like to emphasise that a positive attitude toward minorities brings a calm conscience but it is not enough: it also requires a systematic approach, since it is an issue forming the foundations of our future common Europe.

Elizabeth Meehan

Ethnic Minorities in the Light of European Integration

Introduction

Ethnic minorities in the EU may be nationals of member states and, hence, citizens of the Union. They may be third country nationals residing in the Union but who, not being nationals of a member state, are not citizens of the Union. They may be refugees and asylum-seekers. In my remarks, I shall concentrate on the situations of the first two categories and measures intended to improve them. 'Migrant' was among the words mentioned by an earlier speaker as having overtones of 'labelling' but I shall have to use it since it is a regular feature of EU documents.

The situations of minorities, either EU citizens or non-citizens of the Union

A 1998 survey of five ethnic minority groups in five member states shows that most respondents - nationals, dual nationals, or long-term residents - believe that they have access to a satisfactory range of rights (1). But there are exceptions and substantial proportions of all five ethnic minorities have experienced racial threats and abuse. This finding was strongest in Germany, the UK, Belgium and France and lowest in the Netherlands. Such racism was reported as more likely to be displayed by fellow citizens than by institutions, except the police and courts where

institutionalized racism, referred to earlier by Trevor Phillips, is most experienced.

Since the Schengen Agreement, ethnic minority nationals of member states have experienced discriminatory treatment at borders because officials assume that they must be third country nationals with unlawful intentions. In general, the flanking measures for external frontiers enabling control-free internal borders to exist are said to 'securitize' the issue of immigration and, in so doing, to reinforce a sense that minorities, whatever their national status, are undesirable. (2).

From the 1980s until the mid-1990s, there were attempts to bring about EU-wide anti-discrimination standards for both national minorities and nationals of third countries residing in the EU (3). These attempts were either disputed, consultative or declaratory and non-binding. In 1995, The European Migrants' Forum submitted proposals for consideration by the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference that third country nationals be protected under what was to become the Amsterdam Treaty.

New Provisions Relevant to Minorities

The Amsterdam provisions which are most relevant to minorities include:

(a) An expanded and more forceful restatement of the general principles underlying the EU. This includes respect for human rights, as well as liberty and democracy. The Treaty also confirms that the EU as a whole respects the 1950 European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the 1961 European Social Charter and the 1989 Community Charter.

(b) A new Article 13 which provides, for the first time, a legal basis for action, going beyond employment, to be taken to combat discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin and religion or belief, as well as sex, disability, age or sexual orientation.

(c) The transfer to the Community Pillar, from the inter-governmental Schengen Agreement and Justice and Home Affairs Pillar, matters

relating to the crossing of external frontiers and internal borders. A New Article 63(3) and (4) allows for:

- (i) the development of common minimum standards in matters relating to asylum, refugees and short-term visas for third country nationals crossing an external frontier into one member state or another;*
- (ii) freedom for them to travel within the territory of the EU as a whole within a period of three months;*
- (iii) conditions of entry and residence and procedures for the issue of long-term visas and residence permits, including those for the purpose of family reunion; and*
- (iv) measures defining the rights and conditions under which third country nationals lawfully resident in a member state may reside in another member state.*

Just before the entry into force of the Amsterdam Treaty on 1 May, 1999, the Expert Group on Fundamental Rights reported in February. It noted a prior proposal by the Commission that Regulation 1408/71 on social security be extended to third country migrants and proposed that all future consideration in the EU of fundamental rights must address non-citizens of the EU (4).

Human rights in general and the particular question of justice for third country migrants having been brought into the sphere of common policy-making, the subsequent Cologne and Tampere summits of June and October 1999 acknowledged the need for concrete measures. At Cologne, it was noted that the proposed Charter of Rights could not be wholly exclusive to Union citizens. At Tampere, it was accepted that there was a need to harmonize national legislation on admission and residence and to bring about fair treatment for lawfully resident third country nationals. This was defined as offering them rights and obligations comparable to those of Union citizens.

(i) The main actions initiated so far relating to freedom of movement

These are:

(a) Still on the table is the 1997 proposal to amend Regulation 1408/71 on social security to extend its coverage from intra-community migrants to nationals of third countries. This was communicated to the Council in January 1998. Social security is referred to in a proposed, as yet unagreed, Directive on the right of family reunification. I shall say more about this in a minute. Let me just note here its proposal that member states may still require evidence of sickness insurance covering all risks so that the incoming family will 'not become a burden on the host state'. But the Directive also states that there must be no discrimination between nationals of member states and third country nationals in the application of social security regulations.

(b) In addition, there is a related proposal, dating from 1998, similarly to amend Regulation 1612/68 on assistance for migrant families to integrate into host countries. Again, the proposed Directive on family reunification states that, following Tampere, all family members must enjoy access to primary and secondary schooling, vocational training and university education (5). These are amongst the services covered for intra-Community migrants in either in Regulation 1612/68 or jurisprudence arising from it.

(c) And there is the aforementioned 1999 Proposal for a Council Directive on the right to family reunification. This was communicated to the Council in December 1999 [COM (1999) 638 final 1999/0258 (CNS)]. It aims to give effective protection for the family life of lawfully resident third country nationals, with a residence permit of at least one year, who have left their families behind (6). Third country migrants who wish to form a family by bringing in a spouse will still fall within the purview of member state legislation. But the Directive, if agreed in its present form, would apply to persons enjoying subsidiary protection for humanitarian reasons and to refugees regardless of the length of their permit. But it will not

apply to asylum-seekers 'since the outcome of their applications cannot be predicted in advance'.

The definition of family covers descending and ascending lines of dependants, equalizing the situations of intra-Community and third country migrants. Unmarried partners are regulated by existing standards of equal treatment with member state cohabitants and evidence of stability in the relationship. Reunification for polygamous families is ruled out but public authorities are to be sympathetic to a second spouse, on for example the death of the first, when it is in the interests of children.

This Directive has not yet been agreed because of opposition to its to inclusion of refugees and because of disputes about its definition of family.

(ii) Actions to combat discrimination which are relevant to minorities who are Union citizens and/or those who are not.

These include the two Directives, based on Article 13, discussed earlier by Baroness Scotland. These Directives do not cover discrimination based on nationality (as do the proposed measures on freedom of movement) but they do apply to migrants from third countries, as well as minorities who are citizens of the Union, if they have been subjected to discrimination based on race or ethnic origin. They are:

(a) A Council Directive 2000/43/EC to implement the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin. This covers employment and goes beyond it into vocational training, education, social protection, social advantages, and access to goods, facilities and services.

(b) A Council Directive establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation (7).

These two Directives are accompanied another measure. This is:

(c) A 1999 Proposal for a Council Decision to establish a Community Action Programme, 2001-2006, to combat discrimination based on race

or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation [COM (1999) 567 Final 1999/0251 (CNS)] (8). Its particular aim is the transnational dissemination of good practice; for example, in access to goods and services, participation in decision-making, methods of mainstreaming and monitoring, the promotion of non-discrimination in the administration of justice, health and social services and the media.

The Programme will co-ordinate its work on racial and ethnic discrimination with relevant initiatives on migration arising from Justice and Home Affairs (nationality-based discrimination and non-EU citizens) and will make use of research by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia the work of which we are about to hear. The Programme will also be open to participation by candidate member states to support their ability to meet the entry criteria on democracy and human rights and to introduce the two Directives just mentioned.

Conclusion

In 1995, the European Migrants' Forum pointed out that, since EU citizenship does not replace nationality of a member state and, hence, coexists with a variety of nationalities, it is difficult to see the logic of not granting EU citizenship rights to nationals of third countries. The Forum proposed doing so to those who have been resident in the EU for five years - the normal period required in member states before naturalization or the granting of permanent residence. The idea that, in a régime based on a transnational market, place or residence are more rational activators of rights has also developed among people such as myself and my colleague Antje Wiener (9), who started our analyses by focusing on EU, not non-EU, nationals. We both argue that an incipient acknowledgement of this is giving rise to a new paradigm of citizenship - pushing against what is, after all, a rather recent overlap in the meanings of nationality and citizenship. More generally, there is a growing renewal of intellectual interest in the old Stoic theory of cosmopolitan citizenship. Carlos Closa (10), while talking about a continent rather than a cosmopolis, argues

that supranational citizenship is more capable than national citizenship of being democratic and inclusive. This is because it cannot be based on interpersonal bonds formed under pre-democratic conditions and, hence, must be based on universal human rights norms. His reasons for thinking that the EU is not yet ready for a limited form of cosmopolitan citizenship would take me beyond our subject. Suffice it to say that he sees EU, for the time being, as a sphere for the exercise of private rights relating to market activity. Even so, if this albeit limited conception of rights were extended to third country nationals, it would go some way to meeting the aspirations of the European Migrants' Forum.

Footnotes

- 1. Smith, David and Wistrich, Enid, with the assistance of Aybak, Tunc, 1998, 'Rights, Citizenship and Ethnic Minorities in the European Union: A Study of Migrants and their Views'. London: Citizenship and Public Policy Group, Middlesex University.*
- 2. Kostakopoulous, Dora, 1998, 'Is there an Alternative for „Schengenland“?', Political Studies, 46(4), pp. 886-902.*
- 3. It should be noted that some third country nationals always did have rights; for example: under Community law on social security (Regulation 1408/71) and assistance (Regulation 1612/68) if they were the families of a Union citizen exercising his or her right of free movement within the EU (but third country family members remained governed by national law if the Union citizen spouse was not an intra-Community migrant); through the inclusion of comparable provisions in some Community agreements with non-EU states; and under national law, if there were bi-lateral agreements covering comparable protection.*
- 4. Consistently with the growing trend to incorporate human rights clauses in agreements with third countries.*
- 5. the draft Directive also specifies the right of immediate members of the nuclear family (not adult children) to employment.*
- 6. It also extends this right to EU citizens who are not intra-Community migrants. Sometimes they are governed by national laws which are more restrictive than Community law as it applies to intra-Community migrants - see (3) above.*

7. Sex discrimination is dealt with elsewhere, though the Directive will take account of the interaction of gender and race and the fact that race discrimination is often experienced differently between men and women. The Directive was agreed with exemptions for Northern Ireland relating to the police service and maintained schools.

8. The Action Programme will not deal specifically with sex discrimination but gender issues will be incorporated where it is necessary to draw on previous experience and where they interact with other forms of discrimination and inequality.

9. Meehan, Elizabeth, *Citizenship and the European Community*. London: Sage; Wiener, 1998, *'European' Citizenship Practice: Building the Institutions of a Non-State*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

10. Closa, Carlos, 1996, 'A New Social Contract? EU Citizenship as the Institutional Basis of a New Social Contract: Some Sceptical Remarks. Florence: Robert Schuman Centre, European University Institute, EUI Working Papers RSC No. 96/48; Closa, Carlos, 1998, 'Some Foundations for the Normative Discussion on Supranational Citizenship and Democracy', in Preuss, Ulrich K. and Requejo Ferran (eds.), *European Citizenship, Multiculturalism and the State*, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. Baden-Baden; Closa, Carlos, 1998, 'Supranational Citizenship and Democracy: Normative and Empirical Dimensions', in Torre, M. (ed.), *European Citizenship: An Institutional Challenge*. Deventer: Kluwer Law International.

Peter Fleissner

Ethnic Minorities in the Light of European Integration

Today we are confronted in Europe with certain demographic and economic problems, and the issue of immigration continuously is on our agenda.

A recent study of the United Nations ends up with the conclusion that the European population would have reached a maximum by the year 2000 and would continuously decline in the five following decades, at an increasing rate. From currently 730 million people all Europe would have lost 100 millions by 2050, despite a rise in fertility (the total fertility rate would have increased from 1.42 in 1995-2000 to 1.77 in 2045-2050), a prolonged life expectancy at birth (from 73.3 to 80.1 years) and some immigration. Ageing would be the other major feature, with a decline in the proportion of children below 15 (from 17.6% in 2000 to 14.4% in 2050) and a rise in the proportion of elderly people aged 65 or more will double from 14.7% to 27.6% (!). At the moment, one 10 persons of working age have to finance the pensions of about 2 persons, in fifty years from now one can expect 10 persons of working age have to take care of nearly 5 retired persons. Although those figures just represent averages, it is evident that under the assumption that pension systems in Europe will not change dramatically, it will become increasingly difficult to finance them in the future.

In addition to the decrease in population, Europe is facing a situation where in some sectors of the economy there will be (and in some regions already is) considerable shortage of labour – paralleled by high regional unemployment rates. For the moment, this is reflected by nation wide

campaigns in some Member States of the European Union to attract qualified labour from countries outside of the European Union, from Far East or from the Enlargement Candidates, in particular in the field of computer science, electronics and biotechnologies, and genetic engineering. However, this is just the beginning of an increase in demand for more people even in other branches of the economy. The European work force is ageing, and it becomes increasingly difficult to find enough specialists and qualified labour for having them started in the new jobs of the knowledge based society on the one hand and to replace the retired people on the other. The fear of Europeans expecting large waves of immigrants flooding into the European Union Member States should be counteracted by the acknowledgement of the fact that there is an increasing necessity to have more immigrants doing necessary jobs in the European industries.

Consequently, for the coming decades this may mean for the Europeans that they have to face even more interaction at the workplaces and in their neighbourhoods with people of other ethnicities, religions and cultures. By no means, we should view this development as a negative one. It represents a challenge for politicians and for the citizen. Under the appropriate political and economic framework conditions, examples in history show the possibility of an increase of cultural wealth, and the advent of periods of economic and social well-being, combined with accelerated progress in arts and sciences.

Nevertheless, preventive measures to counteract latent or open racist and xenophobic tendencies have to be considered also.

Let us have a short glance at the actual situation. The following empirical results we have found by means of a Eurobarometer survey in May of this year. They are based on 17000 interviews in the European Union Member States.

On the average four fifth of the EU citizens do not find 'different' people disturbing. "Different" here means different "by nationality", "by race", and "by religion". However, since 1997 there is a slight increase of those

who find different people disturbing: 2.2% in terms of nationality, 0.8% in terms of race and 1.2 % in terms of religion.

If we break the results down by country, there is evidence for rather big differences between the various countries.

While only 6% of the Spanish population sample told the interviewers to be disturbed by people of another religion, it is interesting to note that nearly one third of the Danish population sample is disturbed (see table above). When the Danish people are asked about disturbance by another race the level of disturbance is much lower than in the case of religion. Only one quarter of the persons interviewed felt disturbed (see table below).

If it comes to the attitudes of the EU citizen towards people of the Eastern Countries, one can see a rather big variety of acceptance. I think we have to be aware that there is some reluctance to welcome the new citizens in an enlarged Europe (see table below).

The Governments of the Member States of the EU and the European Union itself are already prepared and dedicated to fight against racism and xenophobia. As we can see on the level of the European Council and the European Parliament, legal means are already undertaken to fight against discrimination on the basis of race, religion or culture. The European Council has adopted a sound package against Racism:

In June the so called "Race Directive" passed the Council, (Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000). This new Directive provides a tool against discrimination on grounds of racial and ethnic origin and challenges the Member States to go beyond those minimum requirements.

Recently, in October 2000, political agreement could be gained on a Directive against discrimination on the Workplace, and on an Action Plan to fight many kinds of discrimination in the European Union.

Probably at the Nizza Summit the latter two will come into legal force also. Within three years time the member states should implement these Directives into their national legislations.

Activities of the EUMC

We at the European Monitoring Centre are assisting these activities on various levels:

The EUMC is a tool, which provides the Governments and the European Union with facts and experience, which will contribute to make this fight successful.

We hope to make it more difficult for extremist tendencies and forces to rely on false information and evil prejudice.

We will assist in making it difficult to promote a policy, which does not take into account good practices, which have shown positive results in our countries.

By offering reliable information we will make it easier for those governments, which sincerely want to eradicate the stigmatization of ethnic groups.

We will make it more cumbersome for those groups or parties, who for their own political profit wish to stimulate the strongest feelings amongst human beings: fear and hatred – based upon lies and hate-speech and who promise solutions, which sacrifice our moral allegations.

Let me give you a short review what the EUMC is doing to meet these goal and how we try to fulfil this role in practice:

All our activities base on the Council Regulation 1035/97 that established the EUMC. It sets out the prime objective, which is to:

“Provide the Community and its Member States with objective, reliable and comparable data at the European level on the phenomena of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism in order to help them take measures or formulate courses of action within their respective spheres of competence.”

The EUMC is also required to:

“Study the extent and development of the phenomena and manifestations of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, analyse their causes, consequences and effects, and examine examples of good practice in dealing with them.”

A Networking Organisation

In order to meet the objectives given by the Directive the EUMC had to find an adequate organisational structure. Being a small organisation on the European Union level, the EUMC can be most efficient by becoming a networking organisation. We are in fact concentrating our efforts on establishing new and co-operating with already existing networks active in combating racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, and to strengthen them in handling knowledge and experience available.

Through networks, the EUMC is able to identify negative developments (early warning system) and positive approaches operating within each Member State of the European Union. This enables the EUMC to bring together the different networks in order to establish a “think tank” for analysis and new initiatives. The most important networking activities are:

RAXEN, a European Information Network set up by the EUMC,

Assisting national and organising European-wide round tables, and

co-operation with other networks on global and European level, like

ECRI, the European Commission against Racism, founded by the Council of Europe, and

ENAR, a European Network of NGO’s, supported by DG Employment and Social Affairs.

RAXEN

One of the major goals given to us is to establish a European Information Network on Racism and Xenophobia (RAXEN). RAXEN consists of three integrated activities:

Establishing National Focal Points

Linking them to the EUMC on a high level data security and privacy

Complementing the Focal Points with RAREN, a global expert network

After a public Call for tender published in the Official Journal of the EU the EUMC is in the position to contract National Focal Points in seven countries, who will be the entrance point at national level for EUMC as regards data and information collection. The British focal point is the well-known Commission for Racial Equality; the German one is the RAA Berlin, (Regionale Arbeitsstellen für Ausländerfragen, Jugendarbeit und Schule). The National Focal Points will be the key players in the RAXEN network for the collection and collation of information, data and statistics, and the initiation of research in the broad field of racism at the local, regional and national level in the Member States. Their first task is

to perform the so-called “mapping exercise”. This exercise should help to find out on a national level “what is known where and by whom”.

Early in 2001 a second Call for tender will be published to establish the missing National Focal Points and to start regular monitoring activities with all the fifteen Member States. Details of the Call for tender may be downloaded from the EUMC homepage <http://eumc.eu.int/>.

IDA (Intergovernmental Data Acces)

In September 2000 the EUMC published a Call for Tender on two studies for the design and planning of the electronic and data security aspects of the RAXEN Network. DG Enterprise of the European Commission is assisting the EUMC with the financial means and organizational for the physical implementation of a high security network with encryption, identification and authentication procedures of the users. The reports will be available in the first half of 2001.

RAREN

The Rapid Response and Evaluation Network (RAREN) enables the EUMC to establish world-wide links with experts and researchers in the fields of racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intercultural issues on a contractual basis. The members of the network react at short notice to requests made by the EUMC via email. RAREN is charged with three tasks:

To provide expertise, information and data in the fields of racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intercultural issues

To react to specific requests from institutions of the European Union or the Member States

To assess and improve the quality of written output of the EUMC

The first task will take place in the first half of 2001. Thereafter the additional National Focal Points already established at that time will take

over responsibility. The second task will require rapid responses to requests at short notice normally within a few days. Task three will be a permanent task for RAREN.

Contracts were sent out last week to 16 experts and their deputies. (German member: Ms Dimitria Clayton). The contracts will end by May 2001. A new Call for tender will be published immediately after this expiring date.

Round Tables

The EUMC, in particular the members of the Management Board, are involved in initiating Round Tables in the Member States. National Round Tables should convene at least once each year. EUMC facilitates and encourages the regular holdings of Round Tables with the participation of social partners, research centres and representatives of responsible public authorities, as well as, persons and NGO's concerned with the struggle against the phenomena of racism and xenophobia.

The mission and modalities of National Round Tables are

To engage the representatives of civil society and the public authorities in a dialogue and to make them work together;

To collect national information coming from different sources on the nature of racism as well as on the means to fight it;

To undertake studies and to make proposals; and

To communicate their work to the EUMC, especially the RAXEN network

In 2000 to date, France, Denmark, Germany, Austria and Portugal have held national Round Tables, or equivalent meetings. The second German Round Table was held in October and the fourth UK Round Table met this months. The third Irish Round Table is scheduled to take place before the end of the year.

In June this year the EUMC has invited the National Coordinators to Vienna for the first European Round Table Conference. The Conference

offers a platform to discuss projects of mutual interest, and to exchange 'good practices'. This year proposals in the field of education were presented and discussed.

Co-operation with EU Institutions and other International Organisations

To improve co-ordination and increase the focus of the struggle against racist phenomena, the EUMC is further developing its relations with the EU institutions, in particular the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers and the European Commission. The aim is to seek ways to strengthen and build on the European Union's initiatives in the areas of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism. A draft Memorandum for Co-operation between the European Commission and the EUMC is currently discussed.

The EUMC held meetings with ECRI, the European Commission contra Racism and Intolerance, of the Council of Europe, and also with ENAR, the European Network against Racism, a network consisting of non governmental organisations, to discuss mutual co-operation. EUMC staff has actively participated in international conferences including the EU Human Rights Conference in Venice, the International Consultation on Roma Refugees and Asylum Seekers, Warsaw, and the European Preparatory Conference on Human Rights in Strasbourg.

Other activities

As you could already see, networking in various areas is our main instrument to co-operate with other institutions of the European Union. However, although networking is necessary, it is not sufficient for the success of the fight against racism. Networking has to be complemented by a good understanding of what is going on in the realm of research on racism and xenophobia and in good practice to fight these phenomena. For this reason, the EUMC initiated also a series of studies. Here is not

the place to give a complete list of these activities, but let me mention only a few examples:

As part of the exercise to establish RAXEN, the EUMC needs to collect comparable and reliable data and statistics from Member States. To support the future work of the National Focal Points a pilot project 'Data on racial crime and offences' was launched earlier this year to collect data on racial crime and offences in Member States. Its goal is to present a statistical overview of crimes and offences against citizens on racial, ethnic or religious grounds in the Member States, specifying types of crimes, victims and perpetrators, defining criminal behaviour, during the period 1995 to 2000

As special study on the attitudes of the citizens in the European Member States on immigrants and minorities is in progress. The EUMC has added a set of specific questions to the Eurobarometer survey of the European Commission done in May this year.

Socio-economic data on ethnic minorities and migrants: A study to present a statistical overview of official data in the Member States regarding the living conditions of the population as a whole and differentiated for ethnic minorities and immigrants, in the areas of labour, housing, education and health, during the period 1995 to 2000 has been outsourced and is underway.

Cultural diversity and mainstreaming: In order to promote cultural diversity in a positive way in the fight against racism and xenophobia the EUMC is evaluating mainstreaming and good practice to support cultural diversity in Europe.

Racism and cultural diversity in the mass media: The EUMC developed a project to present an overview of mass media studies in Member States, regarding the way racism, anti-racism and multiculturalism have been covered, and the way the mass media has worked to promote cultural diversity and integration during the period 1995 to 2000. All the studies mentioned before will be ready in the beginning of 2001.

Recently the EUMC has completed a joint study on the Community's legislative initiatives taken under Article 13 of the EU Treaty. As part of this project we have received 15 national reports on national legislative measures to combat racism, anti-Semitism and xenophobia in the 15 Member States, and a study to compare them.

Monitoring the Implementation of the Charter of Political Parties for a non-racist Society: The Charter has been signed by a number of political parties in Europe. The work to be done is to establish a monitoring system in order to verify implementation and to measure the impact and efficiency of the Charter.

Not all of the studies mentioned are already available. They are still in progress. But I can present also one piece of work we have published quite recently. I proudly can announce the Annual Report 1999, which we published last week at the occasion of a press conference in the European Parliament in Brussels. While the full report is available in three languages, the summary can be read in all the eleven languages of the European Union. In a few days you may also download the full text version from our website <http://eumc.eu.int>.

At the end of my presentation and would like to come back to my basic message. I think that there is hope for the establishment of a multi-faceted society, enriched by diversity. There is hope for conviviality in peace. Let us co-operate in finding the pathways for a non-violent future, by bringing together all our efforts.

Footnotes

1. *United Nations Population Projections, revision 1998, medium variant*
2. *Patrick Festy, Institut National d'Etudes Demographiques, France; Looking for European Demography. Desparately?; see <http://www.un.org/esa/population/festy.pdf>*

Biographical Notes

Pál Csáky

Deputy Prime Minister of the Slovak Republic for Human Rights, Minorities and Regional Development

b. 1956, Šahy, Czechoslovakia. Ethnic Hungarian. 1976-1980: University of Chemical Technology, Pardubice, Czechoslovakia - Dipl. Ing. 1981-91: chief technologist, LEVITEX Levice. 1990-98: Member of National Council (parliament) of Slovak Republic. One of founders of Hungarian Christian Democratic Movement in March 1990 and Deputy Chairman from 1992-98. 1996-98: member of permanent delegation of Slovak Parliament to European Parliament. Since 1998 Deputy Chairman of Hungarian Coalition Party. Since 1998 Deputy Prime Minister of Slovak Republic for Human Rights, Minorities and Regional Development. Married, four children.

Peter Fleissner

*Head of Unit "Research and Networking",
European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia*

Professor Peter Fleissner is Head of the Unit “Research and Networking” of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, an Agency of the European Union. He is full professor with tenure (since 1997 on leave to work for institutions of the European Union) of the Vienna University of Technology, chair: “Design and Assessment of New Technologies“.1997- 2000 Head of the Unit “Technology, Employment, Competitiveness and Society” of the Seville based Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (Joint Research Centre of the European Commission). Before he had worked for the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Institute for Socio-economic Development Research) and for the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria. He was research scholar at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and head

of the economics department of the Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna, Austria. He did research in Germany, Poland, Slovakia, Vietnam and USA. His areas of interest are econometrics, social cybernetics, economic modelling, labour theory of value, socio-economic aspects of electronic communication, xenophobia. Recent books include *Philosophy of Culture and the Politics of Electronic Networking Volume 1 – Austria and Hungary – Historical Roots and Present Developments. Volume 2 – Cyberspace – A New Battlefield for Human Interests* (with J. C. Nyíri, StudienVerlag and Áron Kiadó, 1999), *The Transformation of Slovakia: The Dynamics of Her Economy, Environment, and Population* (Kovac, 1994), *Input-output analysis* (Springer, 1993), and *East German economy in transition - computer simulation by means of a system dynamics model* (with U. Ludwig, Vieweg, 1992).

Barbara John

Commissioner for Foreigners, Berlin Senate.

b. Berlin, 1938. 1958-1961: Teacher training studies in Lüneburg. 1961 - 1966. Teacher in Hamburg. Second course of studies: political science and the economics of education in Berlin and London. Several years as a research assistant for teaching training in the sector "German as a second language" at the Free University in Berlin. Since December 1981: Berlin Commissioner for Foreigners (appointed by Richard von Weizsäcker). Various publications on topics relating to language teaching and aliens' policy, inter alia "Language learning manual for Fatma, Jannis and Branko" (Cornelsen Verlag, 1982/83). Co-editor of "From immigrant to indigenous status: Huguenots, Jews, Bohemians and Poles in Berlin". Speaker at conferences and congresses on integration and minorities policy at home and abroad.

Professor Dr. Ludger Kühnhardt

Director at Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI), Bonn.

*b. Münster-Westphalia, 1958. Since 1997 Dr. Kühnhardt has been Director at the Center for European Integration Studies at the University of Bonn (Germany). Dr. Kühnhardt was a Visiting Professor at the College of Europe in Bruges, at Cape Town University, at the University of Jena, at the Graduate School of Economics and International Relations (ASERI), Milan and at Dartmouth College, N.H. He served as Chair in the Department of Political Science at Freiburg University between 1991 and 1997, where he was also Dean of the Philosophical Faculty in 1994/95. From 1987 to 1989, he worked as Speechwriter for the German Federal President, Dr. Richard von Weizsäcker in the German President's Office. He has published some 20 books, on history of ideas and political theory, international politics and Europe. Most recent among them are: *Revolutionszeiten. Das Umbruchjahr 1989 im geschichtlichen Zusammenhang*, Munich 1994; *Von der ewigen Suche nach Frieden. Immanuel Kants Vision und Europas Wirklichkeit*, Bonn 1996; *Beyond divisions. Essays on democracy, the Germans and Europe*, Frankfurt/New York 1996; *Zukunftsdenker. Bewährte Ideen politischer Ordnung für das dritte Jahrtausend*, Baden-Baden 1999; *Von Deutschland nach Europa*, Baden-Baden 2000.*

Sir Paul Lever

British Ambassador to Germany

Sir Paul Lever (56) has been British Ambassador to Germany since December 1997. Educated at St Paul's School and The Queen's College Oxford, he joined the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in 1966. He served as Third, later Second, Secretary Helsinki from 1967-71. He was then Second, later First, Secretary at the UK Delegation to NATO from 1971-73. He returned to the FCO in 1973 and served as Assistant Private Secretary to the Foreign Secretary from 1978-81.

From 1981-85 he was seconded to the European Commission as Chef de Cabinet to Mr Christopher Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. Returning to the Foreign Office, he was successively Head of United Nations Department, Defence Department and Security Policy Department. From 1990-92 Sir Paul was Ambassador and Head of the UK Delegation to the Conventional Arms Control Negotiations in Vienna. He then returned to London and served as Assistant Under Secretary of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (1992-94), Deputy Secretary at the Cabinet Office and Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee (1994-96) and Deputy Under Secretary of State and Economic Director in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (1996-97).

He is married with no children. His wife Patricia is also a member of the British Diplomatic Service and works in the Political Section of the Embassy in Berlin.

Professor Elizabeth Meehan

b. Edinburgh, 1947 British. 1964-65 Edinburgh College of Art. 1965-73 HM Diplomatic Service, including spells in Private Office, BHC Lagos, Eastern European and Soviet Department. 1973-76. University of Sussex (BA (Hons) Politics, 1st Class) 1976-79 Nuffield College, Oxford University (D-Phil). 1976-78 Ad hoc PPE tutoring, various Oxford Colleges. 1978-79 Part-time Lecturer, St Hugh's College, Oxford. 1979-90 Lecturer in Politics, University of Bath (and between 1984-89 Director of Studies, Degree in Economics and Politics). 1989-90 Hallsworth Fellow, Manchester University. Since 1991 Professor of Politics, The Queen's University of Belfast. Since 1992 Jean Monnet Professor of European Social Policy. 1994-99 Commissioner, Fair Employment Commission, Belfast. 1995-97 Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Social Science. Since 1996 Deputy Chair, Social Science Research Council, Republic of Ireland. 1998-99 Visiting Research Fellow, The Policy Institute, and visitor, Political Science Department, Trinity College Dublin. Since 1999 Founding Academician, Academy of Social Sciences. Since 2000 Member,

*Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences, Republic of Ireland. Research Areas: (i) Women and Politics: equal opportunities policies; feminist politics, equality and citizenship; (ii) European Citizenship; EU; EU and Northern Ireland, the UK; EU and the state; (iii) Citizenship, Participation and Accountability in the UK; (iv) The EU and British-Irish Relations: Northern Ireland; new relations in the context of devolution in the UK; freedom of movement between Ireland and the UK v. freedom of movement in the EU. Recent Publications include: 1997 'Political Pluralism and European Citizenship' in P. Lehning and A. Weale and (eds) *Citizenship, Democracy and Justice in the New Europe*. Routledge, 69-85. 1997 'Citizenship and Social Inclusion' in M Roche (ed) *European Citizenship and Social Exclusion*. Ashgate (incorporating Avebury) Press, 23-34. 1999 'Citizenship and Identities' in I Holliday, A Gamble and G Parry (eds.), *Fundamentals in British Politics*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 231-50. 1999 'British Decline and European Integration' in R English and M Kenny (eds) *Rethinking Decline: Britain Towards 2000*. Macmillan. K Larres with E Meehan (eds and conts), *Uneasy Partners: British German Relations and European Integration since 1945*. Oxford University Press. 2000 *Free Movement between Ireland and the UK: from the "common travel area" to The Common Travel Area*. Dublin: The Policy Institute, Trinity College, *Studies in Public Policy* 4, in association with the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, pp(I)-(xv) and 1-98 (refereed by academics and practitioners in Ireland and outside Ireland.)*

Professor Dr. Dr. h.c. Dieter Oberndörfer

Professor of political science at the Albert-Ludwigs-University, Freiburg. Director of the Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institute for Cultural Research. Chairman of the Migration Council Board.

b. 1929. 1949 Abitur (= A-Levels) at the Wilhelmsgymnasium in Munich. Studied theology, philosophy, history and sociology in Munich, at Davidson College N.C./USA and the University of Erlangen. 1955

Doctorate at Erlangen University. 1959 Lecturer at Erlangen University. 1963-96 Professor of political science and Director of the Institute for political science at Freiburg University. 1975-78 Head of the social science research institute of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation (subsidiary duties). 1991-94 Founding Dean of the economics and social sciences faculty at Rostock University. Deputy Chairman of the structural commission for the renewal of tertiary education in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania. 1989/90 Bosch guest professor at the Political Science Foundation in Ebenhausen. 1994/95 Visiting professor at Dartmouth College N.H./USA (Harriett Chair for Distinguished Professors). 1995-97 First holder of the Steven Muller Chair for German Politics at the Bologna Center of John Hopkins University. Chairman and member of numerous associations and bodies as well as recipient of major awards, inter alia honorary member of the German UNESCO Commission, Academic Adviser to the Foundation for Development and Peace, Chairman of the Federal Council for Migration, holder of the Grand Federal Service Cross with ribbon. Main topics of academic research and publications: political theory/ideological history, political opinion research, development aid policy and research into developing countries (numerous field trips to Latin America, Africa and Asia since 1968), migration research. Publications: 26 books, 17 as editor, 140 magazine articles, research reports and over 40 expertises. Editor and co-editor of academic periodicals.

Vural Öger

Managing Director, Öger Tours

Born in Ankara on 1 February 1942 into an officer's family. Attended primary school in Ankara and then a renowned grammar school in Istanbul, where he passed Abitur (A-levels) with distinction. Moved to Germany in 1960, where he first attended the Goethe Institutes in Grafing and Bad Reichenhall and then the Technical University in Berlin (joined the faculty for mining and metallurgical engineering in 1961). Graduated

as engineer in December 1968. Worked during his studies in the Student Travel Service of the Technical University where he gathered experience in the tourist trade. In 1969, at the age of 27, he founded his own travel service in Hamburg for trips to Turkey. Offices in Berlin, Hanover and Bremen followed. In the early 70s, his company launched the first non-stop flights from Germany to Turkey. In the mid-70s, the first German charter holidaymakers flew to Turkey with ÖGER. In 1982, he founded the company ÖGER TOURS GmbH which is now Europe's biggest tour operator for trips to Turkey. Other destinations include Egypt, Tunisia, Cuba and the Caribbean. The ÖGER group consists of three companies: ÖGER TOURS GmbH, ÖGER TÜRK TUR GmbH and ATT Touristik GmbH. Since December 1995, Condor Flugdienst GmbH has held a 10% share in ÖGER TOURS GmbH. As owner of 10 hotels in the MAJESTY and VISTA chains (a total of 9,000 beds), the ÖGER group has one of the largest capacities in Turkey. ÖGER's Turkish agency, Great Jolly Tur, in Antalya has received awards from the State President for several years running as Turkey's most successful agency. In 1998, the German-Turkish Foundation (DTS) was established to promote understanding between the two nations. It counts several prominent personalities from both countries among its members. Vural Öger speaks six languages, is married and has three children.

Trevor Phillips

Trevor Phillips is a broadcaster and journalist and chair of the Greater London Assembly. He runs the independent production company Pepper Productions. He writes regularly and contributes to a variety of national newspapers. He has produced several television series and won a number of awards for his work, including three Royal Television Society awards (for the London Programme and Windrush). He was awarded an OBE in the 1999 New Year Honours List. Trevor Phillips is a former Chairman of the London Arts Board , a trustee of the Runnymede Trust, the race relations think-tank and a Council member of the Royal Television Society.

Dr. Frank Ronge

Zentralstelle für gesellschaftliche und soziale Fragen der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz.

Senior Fellow at the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI), Bonn

Dr. Frank Ronge, born 1968, has been a departmental chief of social order and European Union at the „Zentralstelle für gesellschaftliche und soziale Fragen“, German Bishops‘ Conference, and Senior Fellow at the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI) since 2000. He earned a Diplom in Catholic theology in 1993, and concluded his studies of philosophy, Catholic theology, economics and political science in Frankfurt (Sankt Georgen), Paris, Münster and Freiburg with a doctorate in political science. From 1997 to 2000 Dr. Ronge was Research Associate at the ZEI. Dr. Ronge specializes in the issues of value and religion in connection to European Integration, with legitimacy, the subsidiarity principle and the basic law of the EU and in Christian ethics. He is married with two children. Recent publications include: Die Charta der Grundrechte – Legitimierender Eckstein einer Europäischen Verfassung, in: Frank Ronge (Hrsg.), In welcher Verfassung ist Europa – Welche Verfassung für Europa?, Baden-Baden 2001, 333-342; Europa und das Christentum – Die Einigung Europas als Herausforderung für die christliche Sozialethik, in: Walter Fürst / Martin Honecker (Hrsg.), Christenheit – Europa 2000, Baden-Baden 2001, 93-102; Art. „Subsidiarität, politisch“, in: Evangelisches Soziallexikon Neuausgabe 2000; Legitimacy Through Subsidiarity, in: Dirk Rohtus/Robert Verschooten (Ed.), Challenges and Perspectives for Europe, Ten Years after the Fall of the Wall (1989), Antwerp 2000; Legitimität durch Subsidiarität. Der Beitrag des Subsidiaritätsprinzips zur Legitimation einer überstaatlichen politischen Ordnung in Europa, Baden-Baden 1998 (Schriften des Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung, Bd. 1)

Baroness Scotland of Asthal QC

Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

Baroness Scotland of Asthal was appointed Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State on 29 July 1999. She has Ministerial responsibility in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office for: North America; Caribbean; Overseas Territories; Consular; Information (includes BBC World Service); British Council; FCO Central Administration; Personnel and Resources. After graduating with an LLB (Hons), Baroness Scotland was called to the Bar at Middle Temple at 21. At 35 she was appointed a QC. She is a member of the Bar of Antigua and the Commonwealth of Dominica. She became a working Peer in 1997. She was appointed an Assistant Recorder in 1991 and is approved to sit as a Deputy High Court Judge of the Family Division. She is a former member of the Bar Public Relations Committee, Race Relations Committee, professional Conduct Committee, Judicial Studies Board Ethnic Minority Advisory Committee, house of Commons Working Party on Child Abduction, Legal Advisory Panel on National Consumer Council, the Independent Committee for the Supervision of Standards of Telephone Information Services and the national Advisory Committee on Mentally Disordered Offenders. She was formerly one of Her Majesty's Commissioners for Racial Equality. She has specialised in family and public law and has chaired and represented parties in a number of major inquiries relating to Child Abuse, Mental Health and Housing. She was voted Black Woman of the Year (Law) 1992. Baroness Scotland was a founder member, and is now Head of Chambers at 1 Gray's Inn Square. In 1997 she was elected to the Bench of Middle Temple. She has served as a member of the Millennium Commission, Chairman of HMG Caribbean Advisory group, a member of the BBC World Service Consultative Group, Vice-President of the Family Mediators Association, the Dominican Representative of the Council of the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League, a member of the Lawyers' Christian Fellowship, a patron of the Women and Children's Welfare Fund. She is an Honorary Fellow of Wolfson College, Cambridge.

Susannah Simon

First Secretary, British Embassy, Berlin

Susannah Simon, b. 1964, has been First Secretary at the British Embassy in Germany, first in Bonn, then in Berlin since 1999. Educated at St. Hilda's College, Oxford University and Göttingen University she joined the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) in 1988. She served as Assistant Desk Officer, Soviet Department (1988-89), Second Secretary, British Embassy Bonn (1989-92), Deputy Head of Mission, British Embassy Almaty (1992-93), Internal Review Officer/Consultant, FCO (1994-1996), Head NATO Section, Security Policy Department, FCO (1996), Head OSCE Section, OSCE/Council of Europe Department, FCO (1997-1998). From June - October 1989 she was seconded to the Auswärtiges Amt, Bonn. Susannah Simon is married with one son.

Gurbux Singh

Chair of the Commission for Racial Equality

Gurbux Singh began his career in 1972 with the former Community Relations Council as a housing specialist. He progressed to a senior position in Housing and Local Government under the newly established Commission for Racial Equality. In the early eighties Gurbux went into local government, working in Housing Services for the former Greater London Council. He moved to the London Borough of Hackney, then Brent, before joining Haringey in 1987. He was Director of Housing for two years before being appointed Chief Executive in 1989.

Gurbux speaks Punjabi, Hindi and Urdu. He lives in North London with his partner and three young sons. He is a passionate supporter of Wolverhampton Wanderers and the Indian Cricket team.

Dr. Cornelia Sonntag-Wolgast

Parliamentary State Secretary, Interior Ministry

b. Nürnberg, 1942. Married. Went to school in Hamburg and completed Abitur in 1962. Studied Literature and music and German at Hamburg and Erlangen. 1969, Hamburg doctorate. Started as a journalist at "Hamburger Morgenpost". 1972 freelance journalist, North German Radio. Since 1995 editor at North German Radio, presenter of and commentator for political programmes. Member of Media Trade Union. 1971 joined SPD. 1979 became member of government team of SPD candidate for Minister President in Schleswig Holstein. 1987 Stood for election for Steinburg-Dithmarschen-Süd constituency. Member of Bundestag since 14 June 1988. Since October 1998 Parliamentary State Secretary, Federal Minister of the Interior.

Dr. Josef Voß

Suffragan Bishop in Münster

Born in Langenberg-Benteler in 1937. 1958 Studies in Rome. 1963 Ordination to the priesthood in Rome. 1968 Chaplain in St. Marien, Steinfurt-Borghorst. During this period also religious instruction teacher at the local vocational training and grammar schools. 1970 Principal of the Collegium Borromaeum in Münster. 1973 Spiritual director within the Caritas Association (Catholic welfare organisation). 1974 – 1988 Chairman of the Caritas Association for the Münster diocese. During this period also chairman of the federal association of Catholic facilities for assisting the homeless. 1981 Chairman of the Catholic Hospitals Federation Germany. 1988 Ordination as Titular Bishop of Thisiduo and Suffragan Bishop of Münster, Regional Bishop for Coesfeld-Recklinghausen. Appointed Canon. Member of Commission VI of the German Bishops' Conference for "social and charitable issues". 1992 – 1996 Chairman of Commission XIII – Caritas – of the German Bishops' Conference. 1997 Chairman of Commission XIV – migration - of the German Bishops' Conference. Member of the working group "social

affairs” of the COMECE – Commission of the Bishops’ Conferences of the European Community. Member of the Papal Council “Spiritual Counsel for people on the move”. Continued membership of Commissions XIII and VI. 1998 Member of the Papal Council for pastoral care of the sick and health assistance.

ZEI DISCUSSION PAPER: Bisher erschienen / Already published:

- C 1 (1998) Frank Ronge (Hrsg.)
Die baltischen Staaten auf dem Weg in die Europäische Union
- C 2 (1998) Gabor Erdödy
Die Problematik der europäischen Orientierung Ungarns
- C 3 (1998) Stephan Kux
Zwischen Isolation und autonomer Anpassung: Die Schweiz im integrationspolitischen Abseits?
- C 4 (1998) Guido Lenzi
The WEU between NATO and EU
- C 5 (1998) Andreas Beierwaltes
Sprachenvielfalt in der EU – Grenze einer Demokratisierung Europas?
- C 6 (1998) Jerzy Buzek
Poland's Future in a United Europe
- C 7 (1998) Doug Henderson
The British Presidency of the EU and British European Policy
- C 8 (1998) Simon Upton
Europe and Globalisation on the Threshold of the 21st Century.
A New Zealand Perspective
- C 9 (1998) Thanos Veremis
Greece, the Balkans and the European Union
- C 10 (1998) Zoran Djindjic
Serbiens Zukunft in Europa
- C 11 (1998) Marcus Höreth
The Trilemma of Legitimacy. Multilevel Governance in the EU and
the Problem of Democracy
- C 12 (1998) Saadollah Ghaussy
Japan and the European Union
- C 13 (1998) Walter Schweidler
Bioethische Konflikte und ihre politische Regelung in Europa
- C 14 (1998) Wolfgang Ischinger
Die Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik nach Amsterdam
- C 15 (1998) Kant K. Bhargava
EU – SAARC: Comparisons and Prospects of Cooperation
- C 16 (1998) Anthony J. Nicholls
Die deutsch-britischen Beziehungen: Ein hoffnungsloser Fall?
- C 17 (1998) Nikolaj Petersen
The Danish Referendum on the Treaty of Amsterdam
- C 18 (1998) Aschot L. Manutscharjan
Der Konflikt um Berg-Karabach: Grundproblematik und Lösungsperspektiven
- C 19 (1998) Stefan Fröhlich
Der Ausbau der europäischen Verteidigungsidentität zwischen WEU und NATO
- C 20 (1998) Tönis Lukas
Estland auf dem Weg aus der totalitären Vergangenheit zurück nach Europa
- C 21 (1998) Wim F. van Eekelen
Perspektiven der Gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der EU
- C 22 (1998) Ludger Kühnhardt
Europa in den Kräftefeldern des 21. Jahrhunderts.
- C 23 (1998) Marco Bifulco
In Search of an Identity for Europe
- C 24 (1998) Zbigniew Czachór
Ist Polen reif für die Europäische Union?
- C 25 (1998) Avi Primor
Der Friedensprozeß im Nahen Osten und die Rolle der Europäischen Union
- C 26 (1998) Igor Leshoukov
Beyond Satisfaction: Russia's Perspectives on European Integration
- C 27 (1998) Dirk Rohtus
Die belgische „Nationalitätenfrage“ als Herausforderung für Europa

- C 28 (1998) Jürgen Rüttgers
Europa – Erbe und Auftrag
- C 29 (1999) Murat T. Laumulin
Die EU als Modell für die zentralasiatische Integration?
- C 30 (1999) Valdas Adamkus
Europe as Unfinished Business: The Role of Lithuania
in the 21st Century's Continent
- C 31 (1999) Ivo Samson
Der widerspruchsvolle Weg der Slowakei in die EU.
- C 32 (1999) Rudolf Hrbek / Jean-Paul Picaper / Arto Mansala
Deutschland und Europa. Positionen, Perzeptionen, Perspektiven
- C 33 (1999) Dietrich von Kyaw
Prioritäten der deutschen EU-Präsidentschaft unter Berücksichtigung des
Europäischen Rates in Wien
- C 34 (1999) Hagen Schulze
Die Identität Europas und die Wiederkehr der Antike
- C 35 (1999) Günter Verheugen
Germany and the EU Council Presidency
- C 36 (1999) Friedbert Pflüger
Europas globale Verantwortung – Die Selbstbehauptung der alten Welt
- C 37 (1999) José María Gil-Robles
Der Vertrag von Amsterdam: Herausforderung für die Europäische Union
- C 38 (1999) Peter Wittschorek
Präsidentenwahlen in Kasachstan 1999
- C 39 (1999) Anatolij Ponomarenko
Die europäische Orientierung der Ukraine
- C 40 (1999) Eduard Kukan
The Slovak Republic on its Way into the European Union
- C 41 (1999) Ludger Kühnhardt
Europa auf der Suche nach einer neuen geistigen Gestalt
- C 42 (1999) Simon Green
Ausländer, Einbürgerung und Integration: Zukunftsperspektive der
europäischen Unionsbürgerschaft?
- C 43 (1999) Ljerka Mintas Hodak
Activities of the Government of the Republic of Croatia in the Process of
European Integration
- C 44 (1999) Wolfgang Schäuble
Unsere Verantwortung für Europa
- C 45 (1999) Eric Richard Staal
European Monetary Union: The German Political-Economic Trilemma
- C 46 (1999) Marek J. Siemek
Demokratie und Philosophie
- C 47 (1999) Ioannis Kasoulides
Cyprus and its Accession to the European Union
- C 48 (1999) Wolfgang Clement
Perspektiven nordrhein-westfälischer Europapolitik
- C 49 (1999) Volker Steinkamp
Die Europa-Debatte deutscher und französischer Intellektueller nach dem
Ersten Weltkrieg
- C 50 (1999) Daniel Tarschys
50 Jahre Europarat
- C 51 (1999) Marcin Zaborowski
Poland, Germany and EU Enlargement
- C 52 (1999) Romain Kirt
Kleinstaat und Nationalstaat im Zeitalter der Globalisierung
- C 53 (1999) Ludger Kühnhardt
Die Zukunft des europäischen Einigungsgedankens

- C 54 (1999) Lothar Rühl
Conditions and options for an autonomous „Common European Policy on Security and Defence“ in and by the European Union in the post-Amsterdam perspective opened at Cologne in June 1999
- C 55 (1999) Marcus Wenig (Hrsg.)
Möglichkeiten einer engeren Zusammenarbeit in Europa am Beispiel Deutschland - Slowakei
- C 56 (1999) Rafael Biermann
The Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe - potential, problems and perspectives
- C 57 (1999) Eva Slivková
Slovakia's Response on the Regular Report from the European Commission on Progress towards Accession
- C 58 (1999) Marcus Wenig (Ed.)
A Pledge for an Early Opening of EU-Accession Negotiations
- C 59 (1999) Ivo Sanader
Croatia's Course of Action to Achieve EU Membership
- C 60 (2000) Ludger Kühnhardt
Europas Identität und die Kraft des Christentums
- C 61 (2000) Kai Hafez
The West and Islam in the Mass Media
- C 62 (2000) Sylvie Goulard
Französische Europapolitik und öffentliche Debatte in Frankreich
- C 63 (2000) Elizabeth Meehan
Citizenship and the European Union
- C 64 (2000) Günter Joetze
The European Security Landscape after Kosovo
- C 65 (2000) Lutz Rathenow
Vom DDR-Bürger zum EU-Bürger
- C 66 (2000) Panos Kazakos
Stabilisierung ohne Reform
- C 67 (2000) Marten van Heuven
Where will NATO be ten years from now ?
- C 68 (2000) Carlo Masala
Die Euro-Mediterrane Partnerschaft
- C 69 (2000) Weltachsen 2000/World Axes 2000. A documentation
- C 70 (2000) Gert Maichel
Mittel-/Osteuropa: Warum engagieren sich deutsche Unternehmen?
- C 71 (2000) Marcus Wenig (Hrsg.)
Die Bürgergesellschaft als ein Motor der europäischen Integration
- C 72 (2000) Ludger Kühnhardt/Henri Ménéudier/Janusz Reiter
Das Weimarer Dreieck
- C 73 (2000) Ramiro Xavier Vera-Fluixa
Regionalbildungsansätze in Lateinamerika und ihr Vergleich mit der Europäischen Union
- C 74 (2000) Xuewu Gu (Hrsg.)
Europa und Asien: Chancen für einen interkulturellen Dialog?
- C 75 (2000) Stephen C. Calleya
Is the Barcelona Process working?
- C 76 (2000) Ákos Kengyel
The EU's Regional Policy and its extension to the new members
- C 77 (2000) Gudmundur H. Frimannsson
Civic Education in Europe: Some General Principles
- C 78 (2000) Marcus Höreth
Stille Revolution im Namen des Rechts?
- C 79 (2000) Franz-Joseph Meiers
Europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungsidentität (ESVI) oder Gemeinsame Europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik (GESVP)?

- C 80 (2000) Gennady Fedorov
Kaliningrad Alternatives Today
- C 81 (2001) Ann Mettler
From Junior Partner to Global Player: The New Transatlantic Agenda and Joint Action Plan
- C 82 (2001) Emil Minchev
Southeastern Europe at the beginning of the 21st century
- C 83 (2001) Lothar Rühl
Structures, possibilities and limits of European crisis reaction forces for conflict prevention and resolution
- C 84 (2001) Viviane Reding
Die Rolle der EG bei der Entwicklung Europas von der Industriegesellschaft zur Wissens- und Informationsgesellschaft
- C 85 (2001) Ludger Kühnhardt
Towards Europe 2007. Identity, Institution–Building and the Constitution of Europe
- C 86 (2001) Janusz Bugajski
Facing the Future: The Balkans to the Year 2010
- C 87 (2001) Frank Ronge / Susannah Simon (eds.)
Multiculturalism and Ethnic Minorities in Europe
- C 88 (2001) Ralf Elm
Notwendigkeit, Aufgaben und Ansätze einer interkulturellen Philosophie
- C 89 (2001) Tapio Raunio / Matti Wiberg
The Big Leap to the West: The Impact of EU on the Finnish Political System

Das **Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI)** wurde 1995 als selbständig arbeitende, interdisziplinäre Forschungseinrichtung an der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn gegründet. In Forschung, Lehre und Politikberatung sowie im Dialog zwischen Wissenschaft und Praxis beteiligt sich das ZEI an der Lösung bisher unbewältigter Probleme der europäischen Einigung und der Gestaltung der Rolle Europas in der Welt. Weitere Informationen finden Sie auf unserer Homepage im Internet: <http://www.zei.de>.

ZEI – DISCUSSION PAPERS richten sich mit ihren von Wissenschaftlern und politischen Akteuren verfaßten Beiträgen an Wissenschaft, Politik und Publizistik. Jeder Beitrag unterliegt einem internen Auswahlverfahren und einer externen Begutachtung. Gleichwohl gibt er die persönliche Meinung der Autoren wieder. Die Beiträge fassen häufig Ergebnisse aus laufenden Forschungsprojekten zusammen. Die aktuelle Liste finden Sie auf unserer Homepage: <http://www.ZEI.de>.

The **Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI)** was established in 1995 as an independent, interdisciplinary research institute at the University of Bonn. With research, teaching and political consultancy ZEI takes part in an intensive dialogue between scholarship and society in contributing to the resolution of problems of European integration and the development of Europe's global role. For further information, see: <http://www.zei.de>.

ZEI – DISCUSSION PAPERS are intended to stimulate discussion among researchers, practitioners and policy makers on current and emerging issues of European integration and Europe's global role. Each paper has been exposed to an internal discussion within the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI) and an external peer review. The papers mostly reflect work in progress. For a current list, see the center's homepage: <http://www.ZEI.de>.

ISSN 1435-3288

ISBN 3-933307-87-2



Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung

Center for European Integration Studies

Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Walter-Flex-Straße 3
D-53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-73-1880
Fax: +49-228-73-1788
<http://www.zei.de>