

From multiculturalism to discourse of cultural diversity: European public service broadcasting and challenge of migration

Karina Horsti

CEREN (Centre for Research on Ethnic Relations and Nationalism),

University of Helsinki

Karina.horsti@helsinki.fi

ABSTRACT

In past few years there has been a European wide shift from multiculturalism to focus on a more vague and depoliticising notion of “cultural diversity”. Simultaneously in the early 21st century social cohesion and integration of migrants have gained new importance in public and political debate. This is referred to as crisis of multiculturalism, and lack of willingness to recognise minorities’ needs unless they can be labelled integrative. The debate around social cohesion has culminated around Islam and European values particularly in Britain, the Netherlands and Denmark.

This paper will analyse the shift from multiculturalism to cultural diversity and its political implications by looking at European media policies and efforts to bring diversity into media production and content. The empirical analysis focuses on the Diversity Toolkit published by the European Fundamental Rights Agency in 2007 and on Public Service Broadcasters’ initiative, Diversity Show, that took place in Hilversum, the Netherlands in 2008. Cultural diversity discourse is used in more extensive and vague fashion than multiculturalism, and therefore it loses political power to bring change from below. As everyone has the right to be different, and as everyone is claimed to be unique in his/her unique way, the discourse overlooks power relations and marginalization of ethnic minorities.

Introduction

Looking back some 20 years in European media policy, which reflects issues of ethnic minorities and immigrants; there are significant developments in both policy and implementation. There are a variety of diversity toolkits, books of guidelines, journalism education projects, diversity projects, and policies to increase “cultural diversity” in both media content and workforce. In addition, minority media has developed due to new migration, technological and demographic changes. Nevertheless, this field is very much influenced by politics and policy shifts (Camauër 2003). Multicultural initiatives within mainstream media and ethnic minority media are interlinked, and the field can be defined as multi-ethnic public sphere following Charles Husband’s (1996) conceptualization. The initiatives to develop a multi-ethnic public sphere in Europe can be analyzed as anti-racist campaigns since their basis lies in multicultural policies, and more deeply in anti-fascist tradition in Europe. However, in current social setting in Europe, it is difficult to analyze racism – or anti-racism – since public discourse avoids using both concepts. In the early 1990s racism appeared as a general concern among European societies, although it was often limited to neo-Nazism, rise

of right wing parties, and racist personal attitudes (like Jörg Heider of Austria) rather than treated as structural problems of the whole society.

Multicultural policies faced "a backlash" in the early 2000s. For instance, Peter Hervik (2008) argues that in Denmark a new "end of tolerance" rhetoric signaled an understanding of immigrants, refugees, and descendants as being incompatible with Danish values and that raw uncompromising intolerance would be the only language they understand. Therefore, multicultural policies that recognize minority needs would not be acceptable. Although Denmark differs in its policy and discourse from other Nordic countries similar discursive changes have taken place. Racism became deleted from public vocabulary in Europe, and cultural diversity discourse took over in situations when plurality and difference is addressed with a more "enlightened" attitude. In contemporary Europe it is more favored to be "for diversity" than "against racism". Nevertheless, I will be talking about racism and anti-racism in this chapter, particularly to stress the roots and connections to discourses of multiculturalism, assimilation, segregation, racism, and anti-racism, and to treat discourses as shaping and being shaped by current politics in Europe.

This chapter begins with conceptual analysis of multicultural, anti-racist, and diversity discourses. How are the discourses related to one another? What are their roots? How are these discourses used in the socio-political fields in Europe?

These discourses are further analyzed through a case of Diversity toolkit and Diversity Show, which both are European collaborations of public service broadcasters to provide tools to implement cultural diversity policies. How do the toolkit and the material distributed through Diversity Show website define problems of mainstream media, and what type of policy and implementation they offer as medicine? How is Europe and European identity defined and constructed?

Public service broadcasters are particularly important in developing and implementing multicultural media policy since their license is based on "serve all" principle. For instance, the conditions for active membership of the EBU (European Broadcasting Union) are laid down in Article 3§3 of the Union's Statutes¹, which includes the following paragraph:

(b) they [members] are under an obligation to, and actually do, provide varied and balanced programming for all sections of the population, including programmes catering for special/ minority interests of various sections of the public, irrespective of the ratio of programme cost to audience.

¹ EBU Membership conditions retrieved September 30, 2008 from http://www.ebu.ch/departments/legal/activities/leg_membership.php

This statement requires a strong commitment from the broadcasters to include minority rights to communication “irrespective of the ratio of cost to audience”. However, they also have traditionally been nationalistic and protective, aiming to cultivate the national imaginary and contribute to nation building. Their particular role is to provide national programming to balance international and transnational productions. (Horsti & Hultén 2009). Due to strong public service broadcasting in most European countries, minority axis in programming has been more mission oriented, compared to, for instance, the United States where market orientation has dominated minority issues (Awad 2008).

European collaboration, particularly through European Broadcasting Union (EBU) and/ or European Union (EU) finance, is both taking inspiration and ideas from national experiences and disseminating ‘good practices’ throughout Europe, and providing experience to National broadcasters. Not only that, there are also measures taken to implement and monitor these policies. New monitoring tools and sanctions are created – Diversity Toolkit being one recent example. This is a manifestation of managed multiculturalism, which is clearly becoming a more integrated and professionalized part of European media policy and practice.

In this chapter I examine with critical discourse and policy analysis how these European wide initiatives define and understand cultural diversity, multiculturalism, and anti-racism. The toolkit and show event are particularly relevant since they attempt to provide concrete tools to implement diversity policy at European level. Policy can be analyzed as a crystallization of values and definitions dominating the more general cultural and social level. More precisely, multicultural media policy can be analyzed as a crossroads of various more established policy fields. It is connecting more general law and policy of integration, discrimination, communication, and culture. As policy-making is a dynamic process, multicultural media policy is not only being influenced by these more general policies, but it is also contributing to their development.

The analysis in this paper is methodologically inspired by critical discourse and policy analysis, which both aim at tracing down the power relations behind the obvious. The discourse analysis tradition regards language as a socially constitutive element. Language use constructs, changes, and reproduces social reality. Therefore, it has consequences. Critical discourse analysis, in particular, studies the relations between language and power. Though being possibly important to the workings of power, connections between language use and the exercise of power are often not clear to people. Norman Fairclough (1995, pp. 54-5) suggests that the analysis of discourses should be multidimensional: texts are to be analyzed in their social (social practice) and discursive (both the production and interpretation) settings.

Fairclough (1995, p. 56) defines discourse as a language used in representing a given social practice from a particular point of view. Multicultural and anti-

racist discourses are used as tools to make sense of the diverse and changing society. Critical discourse analysis focuses on the social, political and economic needs and interests to these discourses.

Critical policy analysis has developed methods to identify problems in policy within various fields such as education, health care, administration, and culture. The aim of this research field is not only to critically discuss the policies but also to improve policy design and implementation. Multiple research methods and data are generally used: such as policy documents and interviews of policy actors. (See e.g. Stevens, 2003; McGuigan, 2002.) Critical policy analysis examines the purpose, fruition and other aspects of policy and focuses on the complex questions of inducements, rules, facts, rights and powers. Policy can simultaneously limit options and open up possibilities. (Stevens 2003, pp. 662-3.)

Anti-racism, multiculturalism, and now cultural diversity

Analyzing the discourses of multiculturalism and anti-racism in the European context is complex due to various historical and social circumstances. Anti-racist discourses in Europe are rooted in transnational history related to the international movement against slavery, colonization, apartheid, and fascism as well as in the history of civil and human rights (Anthias and Lloyd, 2002, p. 6). Anti-colonization was the earliest form of anti-racism in the first part of the twentieth century, and it was accompanied by anti-fascism particularly between the 1930s and 1950s. Both were tightly connected to the left movement. The more recent forms of anti-racism since the 1960s and 1970s have focused on the position of immigrants, refugees, and ethnic minorities. (Lloyd 2002, p. 64.)

Multiculturalism emerged in Europe firstly as a critique of assimilation policy and secondly as a critique of new racism. As the Swedish anthropologist Ulf Hannerz (1999) points out, multiculturalism is a heterogeneous concept, which is used to refer to various aspects of ethnically plural societies. For him it is essential to recognize the social activity and the questions of power and empowerment. He does not refer to cultural diversity as such, but to conscious construction of cultural difference and collective identity.

Australian (Stratton & Ang, 1994), European, and Canadian roots of multiculturalism are based on a top-down policy of a state inculcated into the citizens through programs for tolerance. This is different from the United States, which has taken a laissez-fair approach to integration of immigrants, and interventionist multiculturalism would be considered incompatible with American national identity.

Multicultural discourses in Europe are closely linked to the anti-racist discourses, which have longer historical roots. We could argue that

multiculturalism is one fairly recent form of anti-racism in Europe. However, the two discourses have not developed in harmony: anti-racist movements have also criticized multicultural discourses for their celebration of cultural difference. The British anti-racist movement of the 1980s for instance stressed structural and institutional forms of racism, and criticized the focus on individual prejudice, therefore contrasting its politics to multiculturalism. It focused on color and "race" in the contrast of "ethnicity". (Anthias and Lloyd, 2002, p. 6.)

Furthermore, the discursive landscape in Europe changed at the turn of the millennium when multicultural policies became severely criticized in public debate. The argument was that a number of events, such as terrorist attacks in Madrid and London, disturbances in French suburbs, the Prophet Mohammed cartoon crisis in Denmark, and a number of other "crisis" stories related to Muslims like wearing hijabs in schools, "honor killings", and "forced marriages" all were a proof that multicultural policies had failed and produced lack of social cohesion. This resulted that multicultural discourse lost its power (if it ever had any) as an anti-racist tool. Instead, discourse highlighting social cohesion and more vaguely "cultural diversity" became to replace multiculturalists approach.

However, all these discourses discussed here can be defined as sets of polycentric, heterogeneous and overlapping discourses and practices which combine a response to racism and segregation (both biological and cultural logics of racism) (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002, p. 16). I will now go into more theoretical conceptual analysis of these three discourses.

Anti-racist discourses

Due to the manifold and transnational history of anti-racist movement there are various anti-racist discourses that emphasize diverse issues of difference, ethnicity, race and power. Anti-racism has stressed that the biological notion of race is unscientific. This campaign is still going on although the UNESCO (1976) declared already in 1967 that "*racist doctrines lack any scientific basis whatsoever*" and that "*all men [sic] living today belong to the same species and descend from the same stock*". Contemporary forms of anti-racism note, that racist discourse has shifted from biological notions of "race" to cultural notions of difference.

Firstly, anti-racist discourses in general aim at proving "race" and racism unscientific, but there is diversity in how racism is argued against. Some anti-racist movements with a pluralist multicultural orientation focus on culture and ethnicity instead of race. Others claim exactly the opposite. They criticize the former perspective and emphasize the social notion of "race" and use the discourse of a "unitary black subject"².

² See Modood (1997, p 159) for critical notions of the Black identity strategy.

Secondly, anti-racist discourses present interpretations of racism. We can differentiate two main observations of these interpretations: 1) one which explains racism to originate from distorted ideas and 2) second which explains racism more structurally as a result from unequal distribution of resources. From a perspective of critical discourse analysis one would tend to agree with both viewpoints: both structural context (resources and institutional characteristics) and cultural context (attitudes and values) produce racist motivated discourses and processes. (Richardson, 2007, pp. 27-8).

Generally anti-racist positions agree that racism exists because of the lack of cultural understanding. Some see racism first and foremost as a psychological and individual disorder: the lack of understanding and tolerance is due to personal circumstances and life histories. Others emphasize structural and institutional factors and see racism as a structural power relation in which institutional structures and practices produce and maintain racism. These interpretations call in various approaches to solve the problem of racism. Increased representation of difference and intercultural exchange are most often presented as strategies against racism (Lentin, 2004, p. 434). Furthermore, the more structural interpretation of racism calls in interventionist approaches, such as corrective action, quotas and claims for special needs (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002, p. 7). Education and increasing awareness are seen important within the anti-racist movement. Some aim at increasing awareness of cultures and ethnicities and therefore increase intercultural exchange. Others aim at increasing awareness of racism, its history and practices of racism (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002, p. 7; Bonnett, 1997, p. 181).

Multicultural discourses

Stuart Hall (2003, pp. 233-4) and Gregor McLennan (2001, p. 395) conceptualize multiculturalism in plural: it is more accurate to talk about multiculturalisms. McLennan mentions four most dominant discourses: conservative, liberal, corporate and critical multiculturalism. Hall (2003, pp. 233-4) makes a similar distinction between various multicultural discourses although he conceptually separates the concepts of multicultural (adjective to illustrate social characteristics of societies) and multiculturalism (substantive to indicate strategies used to manage social problems).

The multicultural initiatives tend to mix various multicultural discourses. For instance, in Finland where multiculturalism is a state and municipal policy, media understand multiculturalism in terms of pluralism, consumerism and managerialism. A general motivation is to recognize multiculturalism of the Finnish society and the specific "cultures" within it, and manage these cultures harmoniously. Therefore, multicultural journalism is a suitable channel for action, visibility and claims making for those who can define themselves as an "ethnic group". (Horsti, 2007.)

Within multicultural discourses there is no concession where the multiplicity locates. Is multiculturalism about a mosaic of monocultures within a society, or is multiculturalism about adoption of various traditions and values of different cultures into a personal identity of individuals? On the one hand, multiculturalism aims at recognizing other cultures and building a common ground for this mosaic. Some theorists (e.g. Kymlika, 1996) argue that citizenship should be this common nominator in pluralist societies. Citizenship therefore is considered as an overarching mode of identity and basis for societal solidarity (Kivisto, 2002, p. 35). On the other hand, however, multiculturalism means regular crossing of cultural boundaries (Yack, 2002, p. 109). Both of these ideas, however, require both border-crossing and border-guarding. Cultural borders are needed for the border crossers to occupy.

Some researchers (e.g. Wieviorka, 1997, pp. 142-3; Guillaumin, 1993) have argued that the change from biological racism to cultural/new racism has made it more difficult to fight against racism. The new racist discourse claims that cultures are essentially different and incompatible with one another. Pluralist multiculturalism also constructs such a view of "multicultural" societies and nation-states. Therefore, those discourses of anti-racism and multiculturalism which focus on culture carry weaknesses in struggle against the new racism.

Theorists of multicultural issues often criticize the emphasis on culture. When culture is defined in terms of tradition, when it is understood to be something from the past that needs to be preserved, it becomes hard to change. Another danger is that the difference of a group can be limited to a certain stereotype from which no deviation is allowed. An ethnic group may exist, but only as a preserved creature. Racism sees difference as static: Social race, ethnicity, or culture cannot be changed. (Castoriadis, 1997, p. 25; Guillaumin, 1993; Wetherell and Potter, 1992, pp. 128-39.) Moreover, multiculturalism is often associated with celebration of culture. Hannerz (1999, p. 399) connects this aspect of multiculturalism with cosmopolitanism, and states that multiculturalism and celebrationism may at times form a kind of symbiotic relationship. Certain parts of a culture may be celebrated from a distance, safely.

Ghassan Hage (2003) argues that both racist discourse and multicultural discourse share a conception of (an Australian) nation where the White dominate: "White belief in ones mastery over the nation, whether in the form of a White multiculturalism or in the form of a White racism, is what I have called the White nation fantasy. It is a fantasy of a nation governed by White people, a fantasy of White supremacy." (p. 18.)

Cultural diversity discourse

There are various discursive debates, 'diversity politics', which incorporate different views and pulls how to solve the problem of non-recognition and mis-recognition of ethnic minorities and immigrants. Lentin and Titley (2008) argue that *"diversity has become a ubiquitous and widely adopted notion and framework not because it synthesises and furthers an array of political projects and critiques, but because it provides a gently unifying, cost-free form of political commitment attuned to the mediated, consumer logics of contemporary societies (p. 13)."* They see the increased use of 'diversity' as a fluid phenomenon, which is prevalent in socio-political work of various international institutions and NGOs. As multiculturalism has received criticism from various directions, and it has gained a negative connotation, diversity is an attempt to re-brand it. Nevertheless, the discursive shift is not just re-naming but it lays stress on certain aspects more than others.

Firstly, the diversity paradigm is taking a wider scope than multicultural paradigm attempted, treating ethnic and racial difference similar to disability, gender, and sexual orientation. This means that diversity politics could create greater pressure towards the dominant 'majority' groups. From the ethnicity perspective, there are also many 'natives' in disadvantaged position, who in theory would support their demands. However, the weakness of this unitary position is that minority front is so diverse that there is no power in claiming recognition.

Secondly, diversity politics aim at mainstreaming where as multicultural policy typically was interested in preserving cultures. Diversity is celebrated to the ultimate extent that everyone should realize they are different from one another, highlighting the individualized consumer culture of contemporary European societies. It generally remains vague, what is different enough to count as 'diversity', and what is the limit of diversity.

Thirdly, diversity is more clearly an issue of competence; everyone's duty and opportunity. Diversity is treated as a fact of life; something inescapable everyone needs to cope with. Where as multicultural was generally a quality people were born with or gained through practicing multicultural activities, diversity is particularly a skill people should learn.

The discursive shifts are not empirically clear, but should be analyzed as overlapping processes both in time and space. The recent shift is not solving the main weakness of multicultural paradigm. The recognition of ethnic/racial identities happened simultaneously with unequal positioning and marginalization. Although as the Council of Europe anti-racist campaign says "all different all equal"³, multicultural policies are managed by a group, typically the majority ethnic group within a nation. Diversity discourse attempts to deal with equality aspect by embracing everyone (to recognize

³ <http://alldifferent-allequal.info/> (referred July 15, 2008).

their own uniqueness), but so doing fails to acknowledge the hierarchy and power structures within societies, and thus may depoliticize anti-racism.

Development of multicultural media initiatives in Europe

The mainstream media in Europe has reacted on the demographic and social changes since the 1960s - earlier in larger countries with a colonial past, such as France, Britain and the Netherlands. The reactions vary from country to country. Generally speaking the motivation for the recognition of ethnic minorities, migrants and immigrants in the media has shifted from assimilationist and integrationist positions towards pluralist, multiculturalist and anti-racist positions (Cottle, 1998, p. 297)⁴. In the 1960s broadcasters aimed at educating the host-society's customs to the new immigrants in the spirit of assimilation policies and later less obviously in the spirit of integration policies. This is what Sarita Malik (2002, p. 57) calls classic "public service broadcasts" designed to help integrate the newly arrived immigrants. Furthermore, some broadcasters wanted to present news from the countries of origin to maintain ties with the previous locations. This demand, however, ceased since the access to satellite television increased in the 1980s.

European situation in multicultural media production differs significantly from the situation in the United States where the market logic instead of state intervention has been the major force in increasing diversity. However, this might be changing in the near future as Isabel Awad (2008) suggests in reference to general media commercialization, privatization, and concentration of ownership - trends which are currently getting stronger in all European countries. Therefore, the way cultural diversity is now incorporated into European media system might face pressure and changes in the near future.

The developments that have taken place in the European media space since the 1960s reflect dominant ideologies towards immigration, although Europe has never been unanimous in these issues. The assimilationist and segregationist approaches began to shift towards multicultural discourses in the 1980s. Ethnic minorities had been recognized as audiences, which particularly the public broadcasters were expected to serve. In addition the new initiatives aimed at reducing mis-recognition of minorities in the eyes of

⁴ Cottle characterizes the political shifts in the history of BBCs multicultural programming with these positions. Similar results can be drawn from report of the Swedish televisions (SVT) multicultural programming (Andersson, 2000).

majority audiences. The new shift was elaborated through various strategies of increased recognition focusing on genre, guidelines and recruitment.

Firstly, initiatives have directed attention to the conventions of journalism and elaborated more flexible genres for the purpose of giving access to minority views, sources and professionals. Secondly, all EU countries have codes of ethics, which give more or less specific guidelines for reporting on immigrants and ethnic minorities. Journalists' associations or NGOs generally prepare these codes. In addition, legislation prohibits aggressive racist reporting. Thirdly, recruitment has aimed at solving one of the main problems of minority relations in European media - the access into the media profession. Training journalists of immigrant or ethnic minority background has been one of the most important attempts to facilitate access into the profession. Though there are multicultural media initiatives using at least one of these strategies in all European countries, there is an obvious lack of research in this area. Some studies focus on multicultural television and specifically on the producers and editors viewpoint (see e.g. Cottle, 1998, 2000; Sreberny, 1999; Malik, 2002; Leurdijk, 2006).

A new tendency appeared in the 2000s: the time of specific programming or publishing is being passed. In Britain Black specific programming has gradually begun to decrease in the mid 1990s and the programming has taken ethnicity and race in a more playful way. The programs embrace new multiculturalism based on broad based socially inclusive "cross cultural" appeal. (Malik, 2002, p. 71.) Similar shifts have taken place for instance in Sweden, Finland, and the Netherlands (see e.g. Horsti & Hultén, 2009; Leurdijk, 2006). Arguments are that the separate slots are marginalizing both the topics and professionals, and that these programs do not attract large audiences. The present trend of broadcasters is to extend multicultural policies into all programming and recruitment. In addition, policy documents on cultural diversity have become a necessity in public service broadcasting in the 2000s. However, as public service broadcasting itself is facing economic difficulties, new recruitment policies are more talk on paper than actual practice.

Discursive transitions from multiculturalism and anti-racism to cultural diversity discourse

The European Broadcasting Union (EBU) has been influential in shaping multicultural policies and initiatives also at national level. There seems to be a shift in discourse within the EBU from openly anti-racist position to more vague support on *cultural diversity*. The multicultural discourse of the 1990's claiming for special rights for minority audiences has been passed. Moreover, racism and anti-racism are not mentioned. For instance, the Diversity Toolkit and information material of the Diversity Show⁵, a European wide event organized by the Dutch public service broadcaster NPS, avoid using these

⁵ <http://www.diversityshow.nl/> (referred July 15, 2008).

terms. Another recent example in which the European public service broadcasting union EBU was involved with is the *UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity*, which entered into force in March 2007. It stresses protection of cultural values in trade agreements, and the worry in this document is focused more on the majority “national” cultures than minority or Diaspora cultures. These recent discourses were not present in the 1990s when for instance the EBU was much more concerned about the rise of neo-Nazism and racism than loosing “national” cultures. The statements like the following example are rather difficult to find in the documents produced in the 2000s.

In 1994 EBU adopted a *Declaration on the role of public service broadcaster in a multiracial, multicultural and multifaith Europe* which states the following:

We public service broadcasters, noting that freedom of expression, including the freedom of the media, is one of the fundamental conditions of a genuine democratic society, are fully aware of the important role that we have to play in a multiracial, multicultural and multifaith Europe. ...

We, as broadcasters, should ensure that our services defend the equal rights and dignity of all human beings, reject trivialization of violence and act against xenophobia, racism and destructive nationalism. ...

*In concert with the 1993 Vienna declaration of the heads of state and government of the member states of the Council of Europe, we are concerned at the rise of racism and fascism in Europe and believe it is our duty to combat these attitudes.*⁶ (Underlining by K.H.)

In this declaration the EBU declares its role in recognizing the rights and needs of minority populations: [...] *are fully aware of the important role*. In this sense this is an example of pluralist and managed multicultural discourse. This position is legitimated through 1) freedom of expression, 2) democracy and 3) public service principle. The EBU is explicitly taking an anti-racist stand: [...] *reject trivialization of violence and act against xenophobia, racism and destructive nationalism, [...]we are concerned at the rise of racism and fascism in Europe and believe it is our duty to combat these attitudes*.

This statement offers a standing point from which I will now analyze in detail the discourse of 2007-2008 as it appears on the Diversity Toolkit and Diversity Show website.

Diversity Toolkit and Diversity Show: depoliticization of anti-racism

⁶ EBU declaration on the role of public service broadcasters in a multiracial, multicultural and multifaith Europe, adopted by the EBU television programme committee at its 66th meeting in Geneva on 25 and 26 October 1994. Declaration reprinted in Diffusion EBU. 2001/4. https://www.ebu.ch/CMSimages/en/publications_automne_2001_tcm6-12444.pdf [Referred 9 Oct 2007.]

As described and analyzed above, media policies and initiatives in many European countries began with clearly anti-racist position aiming to develop particularly the public broadcasting output and production towards more inclusive media scape regarding particularly the new immigrants. In addition, the aim was to offer the majority population experience and knowledge to relate to the cultural and demographic changes in their society. Therefore, the aim was to recognize minority identities, avoid mis-recognition and construct multicultural self-presentation of the societies.

However, the discourses have changed. The most recent example is the Diversity Show, a continuation of two preceding large meetings focusing on cultural diversity among European public service broadcasters. These meetings offer a gateway to the thinking of ethnic minorities and multiculturalism in current European context. First of all, why do the broadcasters see diversity policy and practice important? Behind every policy there is a need – often a socially shared perception of a problem. What is the perceived problem and how are the broadcasters solving it? And more importantly, how come this policy area has become increasingly relevant among those in leading positions in the early 2000s?

The problem definition is stated in the information sheet of the 2007 event organized by France Télévisions and UNESCO in Paris: *Migration and Integration, Europe's big challenge: what role do the media play?*⁷

This title presupposes that migration poses challenges to Europe, more precisely integration of the new immigrants. Furthermore, it suggests that media plays a key role. Integration is often described as a "two way process" in which both the immigrant and the receiving society need to change. This thinking is bound to the idea of the national, and not adequately identifying transnational life worlds and increasing mobility of people, between, to, and out of European countries. Furthermore, the increasing concern of non-integration has brought assimilationist arguments back to the public sphere. Various citizenship and language tests in many European countries try to measure the ability to integrate or assimilate to majority values.

The Diversity Toolkit refers to particular key events in Europe and argues for support in cultural diversity policies. The director general of the German public service broadcaster WDR and the president of European Public Service Broadcasting Union Fritz Pleitgen refers to "*disturbances in the French suburbs, the Danish cartoon row and terrorist attacks in several European countries*" as "*clear warning signals showing us that integration, equal rights and a peaceful dialogue between cultures do not happen automatically*". These events are brought into discussion as signs of failure of multicultural policies. More integrative and selective policies are claimed to be the answer. The constructed problem

⁷ The French website of the event retrieved August 7, 2008 from <http://www.integration-media2007.com/> News from UNESCO retrieved August 7, 2008 from http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=11668&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

therefore is the immigrants and their lack of integration and sharing European values – not segregative policies and practices in societies.

These extracts illustrate that the problem is defined as lack of social cohesion, lack of collective identity (particularly European identity), and lack of integration. Since the problems are perceived to be recent, the assumption is that previously (before the rise of immigration) Europe had cohesive and integrated societies, overlooking the diversity and heterogeneity of the societies that have always existed but have been marginalized. Although events are presented in a positive and celebrative light, they socially construct and define a certain problem. For instance, the Diversity Show ad in the website claims: “So let’s face it, media makers. Multiculturalism is a fact of life. Let’s get on with it”.

Cultural diversity policies are therefore predominantly a response to a disruption in (national) harmony, a fact that needs to be addressed and corrected. The answer is two fold as they state in both Diversity Toolkit and Diversity Show: Diversity should be visible on the screen and part of the newsroom. Such a stress on diversity in the media practitioners is a step, which has become clearer in the last few years compared to the earlier phase of the 1980s and 1990s. However, as Gunilla Hultén (2008) points out in the Swedish case, clear statements and policies for culturally diverse newsrooms does not translate into reality of journalists with migrant background would have an equal share of the profession. Sweden, being one of the most supportive of such policies in Europe, and holding the highest number of prizes delivered at the European Prix Iris event for the best multicultural programming (Horsti 2009), still has a significant divide between minority population and share of journalists with a minority background in journalistic profession.

According to this two fold policy addressed in both initiatives analyzed here, the aim is to recognize cultural diversity – or multiculturalism – of European societies in both media texts and productions. If this aim is not met, the initiatives claim that “*this absence creates feelings of indifference or rejection*” (retrieved July 15, 2008 from <http://www.diversityshow.nl/>).

Diversity Toolkit offers practical tools for journalists to deal with multicultural themes, like coverage of immigration, visibility of ethnic minorities, extending source networks to minority communities, and to pay particular attention to balance and perspective. It is structured around a DVD collection of examples from different programs broadcasted in different European countries. Each program is accompanied by an introduction to the particular country and case related to the example. There are both more general and exact questions to guide interpretation.

The first most important area where the questions direct attention is the personal mindset of professional journalists. The toolkit encourages to recognize journalists’ own attitudes. For instance, there are questions like

"How far does your own mindset influence your choice of stories to cover?" (p.43)
"To what extent do you use music and sounds to achieve a certain impact on the audience?" (p.19)

Secondly, the toolkit guides attention to professional skills, standards, and newsroom composition. It poses questions like *"Do you actively try to recruit colleagues who will bring a diversity of perspective into the newsroom?" (p. 51)* *"Do I consult more experienced colleagues – and those from different backgrounds – when necessary?" (p.61)*

The first focus stresses personal level, and therefore builds on the conception that racist discourse is a result of distorted individual attitudes. The second focus does recognize structural racism by giving attention to recruitment and background of practicing journalists. Nevertheless, individual definition of racism remains stronger since it is individuals that would bring "diversity" into the newsrooms. Practices and structures are not directly addressed.

In the first focus, the problem is identified to exist in personal attitudes; therefore the solution is education of journalists. Cultural diversity is perceived as competence gained through learning. Therefore, the goal is an enlightened journalist with an anti-racist agenda. As an example of this type of reasoning, I quote Frans Jennekens, chairman of Eurovision Intercultural and Diversity Group: *"In my view diversity is something between the ears. It has to do with opening the mind to other opinions and taking one's own background into account."* (p. 6)

As some journalists can be benchmarked as having "cultural diversity competence", it might justify other journalists as not required to have such competence, but specialize in other areas (economics, foreign affairs, home and gardening). Ghettoization, which was one critique against multicultural orientation, is still inherent in cultural diversity paradigm.

The second focus stresses recruitment of journalists with minority background. Therefore, the competence is not gained through learning but living in a particular position in the society. This goal of the Toolkit and Diversity Show is approaching an understanding of racism as a product of persistent patterns, practices, and structures rather than distorted personal attitudes. Still, the focus is on the individual, and structures and practices do not play such an important role. Both objectives, the education of journalists and recruitment of more diverse workforce, boil down to same results: more competent people needed to media practice.

Conclusions

The recent European initiatives to increase cultural diversity in the media at high institutional level stress that ethnic minorities and new immigrants should get access to both screen and newsroom. The increased policy and activity in this domain is a result of perceived threat of non-integratedness of

minority population in Europe. Signs of "lack of social cohesion" are interpreted from key events which have been heavily mediatized: disturbances in French suburbs, Danish cartoon crisis, and terrorist attacks in Europe. Particularly the public service broadcasting is now taking responsibility for social cohesion in terms of "cultural diversity". This is not just a mission oriented policy, but increasingly a market issue, since public service needs to attract audiences also from increasingly relevant minority population. However, the new discourse of cultural diversity, which has emerged to replace multiculturalism in many ways, tends to depoliticize ethnic minority issues. As cultural diversity is used in more extensive and vague fashion than multiculturalism, it loses all political power. As everyone has the right to be different, and as everyone is claimed to be unique in his/her own unique way, the discourse overlooks power relations and continues to marginalize ethnic minorities.

The analyzed cases see problems at the level of 1) integration of new migrants and ethnic minorities, and also of at the level of 2) personal perceptions and attitudes of individual journalists. Therefore, the aim is to educate journalists about minority cultures and customs, and integrate journalists with minority background into the newsrooms. These policies support a position in which social conflicts are perceived to originate from lack of communication and understanding.

Social responsibility is increasingly transferred to the migrant: suitability is measured and difference is managed. At the same time diversity discourse has increased. Particularly public service broadcasting companies are required to mainstream diversity throughout content and structure. However, it still remains unclear what counts as diversity. Current initiatives, such as the toolkit and Diversity show go around this issue as much as they can. It seems that suitable difference is preferred and too radical difference is excluded to reach "social cohesion". Furthermore, new tools of measurement and monitoring have been applied, which reflects a shift towards "professionalism". Diversity is seen as competence, something which can be gained either through learning or experience.

During the past 20 years the media scape has become more aware of minority issues, and multiculturalism has become an area of expertise within media and communications. However, exclusion of many migrants and ethnic minorities is still a fact. Diversity and social cohesion are discourses which reflect the latest incarnations of mechanisms which both recognize minorities and exclude them from the more powerful positions within the media scape.

References

Andersson, M. (2000). *25 Colourful Years in Television*. Stockholm: SVT.

- Anthias, F. & Lloyd C. (2002). Introduction. Fighting racisms, defining the territory. In Floya Anthias and Cathie Lloyd (eds.) *Rethinking Anti-racisms. From theory to practice*. (Pp. 1-21). London: Routledge.
- Awad Cherit, I. (2008). Cultural Diversity in the News Media: A Democratic or a Commercial Need? *Javnost – the Public*, 15(4): 55-72.
- Bonnett, A. (1997). Constructions of whiteness in European and American anti-racism. In Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. (Pp. 173-192). London: Zed Books.
- Camauër, L. (2006). Mediearbetare med utländsk bakgrund och majoritetsmediers diskrimineringsmekanismer. In Camauër & Nohrstedt (eds.) *Mediernas vi och dom. Mediernas betydelse för den strukturella diskrimineringen*. (Pp. 35-88). Retrived 28 August 2007 from <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/6155/a/58634>.
- Castoriadis, C. (1997). Ajatuksia rasismista. Teoksessa: C. Castoriadis (ed.) *Magma. Tutkielmia yhteiskunnan imaginaarisista instituutioista*. Juva: Hanki ja jää.
- Cottle, S. (1998). Making ethnic minority programmes inside the BBC: professional pragmatics and cultural containment. *Media, Culture & Society*, 20, 295-317.
- Cottle, S. (2000). Between rock and a hard place: Making ethnic minority television. In Simon Cottle (ed) *Ethnic minorities and the media* (Pp. 100-117). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Guillaumin, C. (1993). La `différence culturelle'. In Michel Wieviorka (ed.) *Racisme et modernité*. Paris: Éditions la découverte.
- Hage, G. (2003). *Against paranoid nationalism: searching for hope in a shrinking society*. London: Merlin.
- Hall, S. (2003). Monikulttuurisuus. In Mikko Lehtonen & Olli Löytty (eds.) *Erilaisuus*. (Pp. 233-278). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Hannerz, U. (1999). Reflections on varieties of culturespeak. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 2, 393-407.
- Hervik, P. (2008) *Original Spin and Its Side Effects. Freedom of Speech as Danish News Management*. In Elisabeth Eide, Risto Kunelius, Angela Phillips (eds.) *Transnational Media Events. The Mohammed Cartoons and the Imagined Clash of Civilizations*. Göteborg: Nordicom.

- Horsti, K. (2007). Managed multiculturalism in Finnish media initiatives. *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*, 9, 113-130. Retrived 12 June 2008 from www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol9/issue1/art6
- Horsti, K. (2009) Anti-racist and multicultural discourses in European public service broadcasting: Celebrating consumable differences in Prix Europa Iris media prize. *Communication, Culture & Critique*. Forthcoming in Vol 2, issue 3 (August 2009).
- Horsti, K. & Hultén, G. (2009) Diverse directions: Multicultural media policy in Finnish and Swedish public service broadcasting. Paper at the International Communication Association (ICA) conference, Chicago 22-26 May, 2009.
- Hultén, G. (2008). Diversity drive: ethnicity and newsroom cultures. Paper presented at the IAMCR World Congress, July 20-25, 2008 Stockholm.
- Husband, C. (1996). The right to be understood: conceiving the multi-ethnic public sphere. *Innovation: European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2): 205-16.
- Kivisto, P. (2002). *Multiculturalism in a global society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lentin, A. (2004). *Racism & Anti-Racism in Europe*. London: Pluto Press.
- Lentin, A. and Titley, G. (2008) More Benetton than barricades? The politics of diversity in Europe. In Gavan Titley and Alana Lentin (eds.) *The politics of diversity in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing
- Leurdijk, A. (2006). In search of common ground; strategies of multicultural television producers in Europe. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9, 25-46.
- Lloyd, C. (2002). Anti-racism, social movements and civil society. In Floya Anthias and Cathie Lloyd (eds.) *Rethinking Anti-racisms. From theory to practice*. (Pp. 60-77). London: Routledge.
- Malik, S. (2002). *Representing Black Britain. A history of Black and Asian images on British television*. London: Sage.
- McGuigan, J. (2002). Cultural Policy Studies. In *Critical Cultural Policy Studies. A Reader*. Justin Lewis & Toby Miller (eds.) (Pp. 23-42). Oxford: Blackwell.
- McLennan, G. (2001). Can there be a 'critical' multiculturalism? *Ethnicities*, 3, 389-422.
- Modood, T. (1997). 'Difference', cultural racism and anti-racism. In Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. (Pp. 154-172). London: Zed Books.

Richarson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers. An approach from critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sreberny, A. (1999). *Include me in. Rethinking ethnicity on television: audience and production perspectives*. London: Broadcasting Standards Commission in conjunction with the Independent Television Commission.

Stevens, L. P. (2003). Reading first: A critical policy analysis. *Reading Teacher*, 56, 662-669.

Stratton, J. & Ang, I. (1994). Multicultural imagined communities: Cultural difference and national identity in Australia and the USA. *Continuum: The Australian Journal of Media & Culture*, 8. Retrived 9 December 2003 from <http://wwwmcc.murdoch.edu.au/ReadingRoom/8.2/8.2.html>.

UNESCO (1976). Background paper II of the Committee of governmental experts to prepare a draft declaration on race and racial prejudice, 26-30 January 1976. Retrived 5 October 2007 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0001/000156/015642eb.pdf>.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the Language of Racism. Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wieviorka, M. (1997). Is it so difficult to be an anti-racist? In Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. (Pp. 139-153). London: Zed Books.

Yack, B. (2002). Multiculturalism and the Political Theorists. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 1, 107-119.