

Karina Horsti

Researcher

Department of Journalism and Mass Communication Studies

University of Tampere, Finland

<mailto:karina.horsti@uta.fi>

Celebrating multiculturalism:

European multicultural media initiatives as anti-racist practices

Multicultural media initiatives for more balanced reporting of ethnic minorities exist in most European countries. The most outstanding projects of the mainstream media are situated in the public broadcasting corporations with the public service principle. The first initiatives started in the 1960s in Britain, France and the Netherlands. The development has shifted from the early focus on educating migrants to host society's customs to more multicultural policies.

The contemporary initiatives aim at recognizing the viewpoint of marginalized minorities, recognizing minorities as equal sources for the media, and recognizing minorities as media professionals. Furthermore, multicultural media initiatives promote a multicultural self-definition of the host society. The initiatives are based on typical anti-racist rationalization in which racism is interpreted as a cultural misunderstanding which can be overcome through increased representation of difference and greater intercultural exchange.

This chapter takes a few steps back in the history of European multicultural journalism and draws a line from the 1960s to the present. In addition, the chapter analyses more closely an important arena where definitions of multicultural programming are constructed in Europe, the multicultural television award, Prix Europa Iris.

The chapter concludes that recognition of minority identities and status does not necessarily lead into inclusion. Both theoretically and empirically multicultural media initiatives have fundamental problems. Increased recognition and intercultural exchange do not solve problems of marginalization, instead marginalization and recognition of ethnic identities can co-exist.

Introduction

Media research on racism and ethnicity has taken note of unbalanced coverage of ethnic minorities and immigrants in the mainstream media in Europe. On the one hand, the media generally does not consider minorities as proper sources or actors. On the other hand, the media pays great attention to ethnicity, resident status or nationality in context of certain negative news themes, such as crime and disorder. The media seems to divide the coverage, first to invisibility, and secondly to stigmatisation. This division reflects the incapability of the mainstream media to recognize immigrants and ethnic minorities as full citizens in European societies. The media tends to either *non-recognize* or *mis-recognize* them. Media presentation of immigrants is considered important since the majority does not have direct contacts with new immigrants. Therefore, the cognitive frames of immigrants are basically based on media framing.

Group identities can be constructed and stigmatized in various social fields (Bourdieu 1991a, b), however, the journalistic field plays a central role in this respect. Many media research dealing with ethnic minorities have confirmed that certain nationalities, ethnic groups or resident statuses are stigmatized. For instance, researchers note that in almost every European country the media routinely contextualize certain groups with crime (ter Wal 2002). The deviant group shifts from country to country. E.g. in Finland, Russians and Estonians or in Italy, the Albanians and Sub-Saharan Africans are presented as the main deviant group. Historical, geographic, social, political, and demographic variables have an effect on a particular national or local ethnic hierarchy. As Zygmunt Bauman

(1997, 46) puts it 'all societies produce strangers, but each kind of society produces its own kind of strangers, and produces them in its own inimitable way'.

Goffmans (1963) concept of stigma which emphasizes the negative interpretations of difference is useful in analysing the recognition of strangeness. Goffman (1963, 2) defines stigma as an attribute that is deeply discrediting. 'While the stranger is present before us, evidence can arise of his possessing an attribute that makes him different from others in the category of persons available for him to be, and of a less desirable kind – in the extreme, a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak. He is thus reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one. Such an attribute is a stigma, especially when its discrediting effect is very extensive: sometimes it is also called a failing, a shortcoming, a handicap. It constitutes a special discrepancy between virtual and actual social identity.'

The media in its general reporting tends to stigmatize, to mis-recognize, certain nationalities, ethnicities, religious and other (imagined) groups. Multicultural initiatives aim at producing anti-stigmatizing identities. For instance the Finnish multicultural initiatives use a lot of counter-argumentation. Stories produced by migrant journalists at a local newspapers 'Immigrants page' very often are designed to argument against stigmas and beliefs the audience is believed to have (Horsti 2005).

According to Goffman (1963, 2) the society establishes the means of categorizing people and settings where people can encounter presumed people. These routines of social intercourse in established settings allow people to deal with anticipated Others without attention or thought. Categorized strangers fall out of these routinely organized settings and a disruption to the order follows. Journalists with an accent or a different appearance are interpreted as disruption from the order. Whiteness or national identity is constructed as a norm for public participation. The separate 'immigrant public spaces' such as time slots, pages etc. are safe forms of letting the marginalized into the journalistic field. These programs are *expected* to present lives and views which are out of the ordinary. They are organized (minority specialized) settings in the journalistic field. The initiatives

are often rationalized with anti-racist arguments of increased representation of 'difference'.

Media research points out that non-recognition is often carried out by two strategies. Firstly, the media does not recognise the plurality of the public or audience, instead they cover issues from the viewpoint of the majority. Secondly, the media does not recognise minorities as subjects or actors.

The initiatives aim at highlighting 'positive' representations of minorities as opposition to the general emphasis on 'negative' representations. Stereotyping and racism is encountered with greater 'positive' intercultural exchange and mis-recognition is encountered with positive identity politics.

Multicultural initiatives are presently being rationalized as a response to the imbalance and indifference of the mainstream media coverage of minorities. The aim of the initiatives is to recognize minorities and facilitate their access to the media. With this argument multicultural media initiatives are closely linked to the identity politics, specifically to the politics of recognition. National broadcasters have been the most salient actors and the multicultural programming of the BBC has been an example to most European broadcasters. The European Broadcasting Union (EBU) has taken multiculturalism as one of its key areas. One of the most prestigious arenas of celebrating multicultural journalism is the Prix Europa Iris awards which are given out yearly for the best selected multicultural television programmes.

Multicultural media initiatives can be divided into those made by the mainstream media, both local and national, and those made by ethnic minorities, enterprises which can be characterized as 'ethnic minority media'. These include media with a special national, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious etc. outlook as well as media targeted to immigrants or ethnic minorities at large¹. These media can be either national or transnational in their

¹ Ethnic minority media in the EU has been mapped in a European project.
[Http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html)

focus and audience. This chapter focuses on the first category: multicultural media initiatives in the mainstream media².

Multicultural media initiatives form a less researched area within the study of ethnic relations and the media. Although, studies on the representation of immigrants and ethnic minorities often conclude that the mainstream media should develop strategies to facilitate minorities access to the profession and increase the scope of representation in the media.

Multiculturalism and anti-racism

Analysing 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, colonialisation, apartheid and fascism as well as in the history of civil and human rights (Anthias and Lloyd 2002: 6). Anti-colonialisation 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 anti-colonialisation and anti-fascism 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: 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. He suggests that we may see multiculturalism as another conspicuous late 20th-century form of culturespeak. Hannerz (1999: 397) links

² Producers of multicultural media contents in mainstream media can be divided into 'insider' and 'outsider' producers (Cottle 1998). Insiders referring to producers and editors of terrestrial channels and well established organizations (such as public broadcasting corporations) and outsiders referring to independent production companies producing programs for mainstream channels.

multiculturalism to its American roots which define it from bottom-up. 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.

In addition to the American root there are the Australian, European, and Canadian roots of the concept which are based on a top-down policy where multiculturalism is a policy of a state inculcated into the citizens through programs for tolerance (Stratton & Ang 1994). In most social contexts these tendencies are interconnected. NGOs and minority organizations are aware of the policies. For instance, in Scandinavian countries multiculturalism is generally understood as a public policy of the state. However, identification of multiculturalism as a strategy of empowerment also exists, especially in the work of NGOs.

Multicultural discourses 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, which stressed structural and institutional racism and criticized the focus on individual prejudice, contrasted its politics to multiculturalism. It focused on the 'color' and 'race' in the contrast of 'ethnicity' focus in multiculturalist discourse. (Anthias and Lloyd 2002: 6.)

Both anti-racist discourses and multicultural discourses develop within various points in the continuum of proximity-to-distance from the public political culture of the nation state, and currently increasingly of the European Union. Anti-racist movements and organizations are positioned in diverse distances from authorities, nation-states and the EU as well as the 'grass roots' (Lentin 2004). Some of the organizations have maintained a strong institutional position and they are fairly well-funded by the national governments or the EU (e.g. SOS Racisme in France; COSPE in Italy). (Lloyd 2002: 69; Lentin 2004.) The activists in these organizations are typically from the majority ethnic group 'acting

for' the marginalized (e.g. immigrants, ethnic minorities, refugees). Within the European organizations there is a debate between a meritocratic approach which stresses knowledge of the 'system' and one which emphasizes a principle of black/ethnic representation, that is the experience of racism. However, more grassroots level and local movements exist and these are often the initiative of minorities themselves. These projects are generally less organized and therefore short term initiatives. There is a tendency that the more established organizations take over the more local and un-organized ones. (Lentin 2004: 249-275.)

There are different discursive tendencies in both anti-racism and multiculturalism. I will first discuss discourses of anti-racism and then discourses of multiculturalism. Both anti-racism and multiculturalism 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) (see Anthias & Lloyd 2002: 16). In addition, multicultural discourses have emerged as opposition to assimilationist policies.

Anti-racist discourses

Due to the manifold and transnational history of anti-racist movement there are various anti-racist discourses which emphasize diverse issues of difference, ethnicity, 'race' and power. Anti-racism has stressed that the biological notion of 'race' is unscientific. Contemporary forms of anti-racism note that racist discourse has shifted its logic from biological notions of 'race' to cultural forms of making the difference and hierarchy.

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. Other anti-racist movements claim exactly the opposite. They criticize the focus on culture and ethnicity and emphasize the social notion of 'race' and use the discourse of a 'unitary black subject'. This position has been especially prominent in the British context where

various ethnic groups have taken a unified position of 'Blacks' to make political, economic and social claims together. This anti-racist position was influenced by the Black pride movement in the USA and replaced the earlier also American influenced anti-racist discourse of the 1960s which claimed equality on the basis of civil rights. Modood (1997, 159) has identified the problems of the 'Black identity' strategy:

'Hence the 1980s anti-racism consisted of (in the case of white people, a solidarity with) an oppositional blackness based on an inversion of the racist white-black/ coloured divide, together with a celebration of the positive elements of the black diasporic African heritage of struggle, and of the achievements of the contemporary bearers of that heritage. There was tension between these two versions of blackness – political solidarity of all non-whites, and a black diasporic African ethnicity – but no real anti-racist criticism of what was perceived as a natural and benign conflation.'

The focus on a unitary Black subject was insensitive to concerns of many other groups and excluded especially many Asians who did not see their primary identity in terms of color.

Secondly, anti-racist discourses present interpretations of racism. Generally they agree that racism exists because 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. For instance, most media scholars claim that instead of personal 'racist' motives of individual journalists racist discourses in the media are due to journalistic practices such as economical strains, preference of organized sources, and the logics of objectiveness and factualisation.

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: 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: 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: 7; Bonnett 1997: 181).

Multicultural discourses

Stuart Hall (2003: 233-234) and Gregor McLennan (2001: 395) conceptualize multiculturalism in plural: it is more accurate to talk about multiculturalisms. 'Across the genre, a dazzling menu of possibilities appears, including pre-modern, conservative, assimilationist, liberal, left-liberal, managed, corporate, pluralist, nativist, left-essentialist, postmodern, poststructuralist, resistance, insurgent, reflexive and of course critical brands of multiculturalism', writes McLennan. However, he mentions four of these multiculturalisms as the most dominant ones: conservative, liberal, corporate and critical multiculturalism. Stuart Hall (2003: 233-234) 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). Hall writes about conservative, liberal, pluralist, commercial, corporate and critical or 'revolutionary' multiculturalism.

One example of multicultural discourse within the dominant political culture is the case of Finland where multiculturalism is an official policy of the state. Though multiculturalism has a heterogenic variety of meanings in the managerial discourse in Finland, some principles seem to hold. Cultures are understood as being the components of a multicultural society in which the White Finns managerial role is not questioned. The state supports cultural activities and native language studies. To receive the support there needs to be groups - cultures or ethnic minority groups. Therefore, the construction of

cultural groups is a strategy for some immigrants and national minorities to cope within the society.

The multicultural initiatives tend to mix various multicultural discourses. In my study on the Finnish journalistic initiatives I found that the 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. The aim of these initiatives is to recognize and to manage these 'cultures' harmoniously. Therefore, multicultural journalism in Finland is especially suitable channel for action, visibility and claims making for those ethnicities and cultures which can define themselves as an 'ethnic group'.

Within multicultural discourses there is no consensus 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 recognising '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: 35.) On the other hand, however, multiculturalism means participating in many different cultures. Bernard Yack (2002: 109) asks: Is a multicultural society filled with multicultural individuals, individuals who regularly cross the boundaries of different cultures, or with a great variety of monocultural individuals? Both of these ideas, however, require both border-crossing and border-guarding. Cultural borders are needed for the border crossers to occupy.

Problems of multiculturalism in anti-racist action

Some researchers (e.g. Wieviorka 1997: 142-143, Guillaumin) 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 which see them made of essentially different cultures. Therefore, those discourses of anti-racism and multiculturalism which focus on culture carry weaknesses in struggle against the new racism.

Anti racism ought to take into account different forms of racism and that there never is any pure form of racism. Therefore, anti-racism should combine strategies and also take into account the social problems which exacerbate these fears, e.g. exclusion, poverty, and the interests of the better off. (Wieviorka 1997: 144.)

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 which 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: 25; Guillaumin 1993; Wetherell and Potter 1992: 128-139.) Moreover, multiculturalism is often associated with celebration of culture. Hannerz (1999: 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.

One of the basic dilemmas of multiculturalism lies in the notion of culture, especially since both new racism and multiculturalism highlight difference and culture. The hostility to the Other is no longer argued on the basis of the superiority of the white race, like it was argued during fascism or imperialism. Instead, new racist discourse claims that different cultures are irreconcilable. (e.g. Guillaumin 1993.) As Alain Touraine (2000: 116) argues the racism of cultural difference³ plays the same role in our culture that the racism of natural inferiority played in the culture of industrial society. The crucial

³ The 'new' cultural racism has been conceptualised as new racism (Barker 1981) and as terms of culture, like cultural racism and cultural difference (Guillaumin 1993).

difference between multiculturalism and cultural racism, of course, is equality.

Multicultural ideology claims all different all equal, but new racist discourse constructs a hierarchy between cultures, as racism did between races. The cultural form of racism also claims that other culture pose a threat to the dominant culture and cultural identity (Wieviorka 1997). The dominant culture is often 'a national culture', but also it can be a regional culture. For instance the current anti-Islam discourse in Europe claims that the Muslim presence in Europe poses a threat to 'European identity' and 'European values'.

An Australian anthropologist Ghassan Hage (2000: 18) argues that both racist discourse and multicultural discourse share a conception of a nation where the White dominate.

[This] 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.

The nation is a space structured around a White culture where non-White ethnics are national objects to be moved or removed according to a White national will. They are managed and governed according to either racist logic or to multicultural logic.

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 positions⁴ (Cottle 1998: 297). In the 1960s broadcasters

⁴ Simon Cottle 1998, 297 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).

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. 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.

These developments reflect dominant ideologies towards immigration, although Europe has never been unanimous in issues of migration and refugees. This is well illustrated presently in the difficulties and discussions on the harmonization process of asylum issues in the EU. In the 1960s and 1970s the guest worker scheme on the one hand and assimilationist policies on the other hand were dominant frameworks for dealing with immigrants. Germany, in the one end, with its '*Gastarbeiter*' aimed at keeping the contacts with the country of origin so that migrant workers could easily return after their labour was no longer needed. Sweden, on the other end, wanted to make a distinction to the German model and adopted the concept of *invandrare* (immigrant) instead of *utlänning* (foreigner) in the 1970s to emphasize that the people who came to work in Sweden were allowed to stay in the country (Hulten 2003: 17).

Ethnic minorities or immigrants were perceived either as non-assimilable guests or as Others who can be transformed into 'us'. In Bauman's (1997: 47) terms strangers were encountered with two alternative but also complementary strategies. One was anthropophagic: 'annihilating the strangers by devouring them and then metabolically transforming them into a tissue indistinguishable from one's own'. This was the strategy of assimilationist politics. The second strategy was anthropoemic: 'vomiting the strangers, banishing them from the limits of the orderly world and barring all communication with those inside.' This was the strategy of exclusion.

The assimilationist and segregationist approaches in both political discourse and in the media practices related to ethnic minorities began to shift towards multicultural discourses and practices from the 1980s onwards. Ethnic minorities had been recognized as audiences which especially the public broadcasters were expected to serve. The first

initiatives related to ethnic minorities therefore wanted to reduce non-recognition of minority audiences. The multicultural approach, however, highlights that the minorities ought to be recognized also as sources and producers for journalism of larger audiences. In addition to reducing *non-recognition* of minorities in the media, the new initiatives aimed at reducing *mis-recognition* of minorities in the eyes of majority audiences. The new shift was elaborated through various strategies of increasing recognition. I have divided these strategies to initiatives related to genre, guidelines and recruitment.

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; Sreberny 1999; Leurdijk 2005). Television and radio are the main media in which special journalism with multicultural or immigrant orientation has been produced. European public broadcasters have been the first ones in the field to correspond to the changes in the society. In addition, community radios and television projects have been active in this respect. European Broadcasting Union (EBU) has been an important institution on the European level. In 1994 EBU adopted a 'Declaration on the role of public service broadcaster in a multiracial, multicultural and multifaith Europe' which points out that the member organizations have to:

'serve the entire national population, offering programming for all sections of the population' and 'make every effort to reflect to cultural, racial and linguistically diverse character of ... societies accurately in ... programmes and the workforce' (Etzler 2004).

As this definition exposes, multicultural initiatives aim at facilitating access of minorities as sources, subjects and professionals. In addition, though less saliently, they construct a multicultural definition of oneself. This 'oneself' can be a media organisation, national identity or European identity.

A new tendency seems to appear in the 2000s: the time of specific programming or publishing is being passed. The Swedish SVT quit the Mosaik magazine program in 2003 and established a Multicultural Centre. In Holland the NPS has taken a shift to 'cross cultural' programming (Leurdijk 2004). Arguments are, that the separate slots are marginalizing both the topics and professionals, and that these programmes do not attract large audiences. The aim of public broadcasters is to show multiculturalism on the screen, create a more multiethnic workplace and practice anti-racism in reporting and fiction. The present trend of broadcasters is to extend multicultural policies into all programming. How diverse the programmes really are, is a difficult quality to analyze, and these matters clearly need more research and methodology.

Genre, guidelines and recruitment

After the shift in the 1980s the mainstream media have pursued multicultural approach with three strategies. Firstly, there have been initiatives related to developments in genre, secondly recommendations and guidelines have been presented both inside media organisations and from outside them, and thirdly, there have been projects to assist journalists with minority background to get access to the profession.

Genre

The news genre has been the tightest of journalistic genres. The reporter and the anchor are presented as neutral observers who direct the gaze of the audience towards the outside world. While the news events may be distant or shocking, the editors offer these events within tidy and understandable frames. (Ridell 1998.) The multicultural media initiatives have directed attention to the conventions of journalism and developed journalistic genres and elaborated more flexible standards for the purpose of giving access to minority views, sources and professionals. In terms of recognition, this approach aims at solving the problems of both non-recognition and mis-recognition. The access of minorities is

increased and the power to define issues from minority viewpoint enables minorities to argue against the dominant frames, and therefore act against mis-recognition.

One central feature of European multicultural media initiatives is transnationalism. Especially EBU members have created transnational genres. NGOs are the main producers of transnational programmes along with public broadcasters. Many radio programmes distributed in the Internet have transnational NGO based producers.⁵ Transnationality is also a favoured quality in the Prix Iris awards which will be analysed later in this chapter. One of the criteria for the price is that the programme attracts a trans-European audience.

Mainstream media has taken initiatives in Europe in the form of special programming for and about immigrants. These initiatives focus on developments in genre and they vary from country to country and from time to time. The most prominent initiatives are special magazines produced by public broadcasters. This form has been used in most European countries. The early programmes in the 1960s and 1970s of this format generally had two main functions: to prepare guest workers to return to their countries of origin and/or to adapt to the majority culture. (Hargreaves 2002: 211.)

Experiments in genre have aimed at facilitating access of sources and media professionals. For instance a Finnish daily paper *Aamulehti* publishes childrens essays and poems to give access to often marginalized voices. The paper also participates in training programmes for journalists with immigrant background to assist them into the Finnish media system. These innovations in genre also give space to recognize viewpoints which are not possible in the more fixed journalistic genres. For instance the YLEs (Finnish Broadcasting Company) *Basaari* programme lets the interviewee speak through the personal portrait while the role of the journalist is not as visible.

Guidelines

⁵ Internet radio channels and their transnational connections are presented in www.mmc2000.net/partnereng.htm. EBU networks are presented in www.multicultural.net/ptelelevision.htm.

All EU countries have codes of ethics which give more or less specific guidelines for reporting on immigrants and ethnic minorities. These codes are generally prepared by journalist associations or NGOs. In addition legislation prohibits aggressive racist reporting. Many countries have a national council which attends how the media comply with the guidelines. For instance Finnish publishers and journalists founded in 1968 a self-regulatory body 'Council for Mass Media' (www.jsn.fi) which also deals with complaints related to ethnic discrimination.

The codes of ethics and the guidelines often focus on the use of language and sources. They encourage journalists to consider the necessity of mentioning ethnicity, skin colour or nationality. Especially, in negative news contexts, such as crime coverage, media should avoid stigmatizing specific nationality or ethnicity. Also certain everyday expressions, like 'second generation immigrant' should not be used since they tend to reproduce social distance and difference. Furthermore, the guidelines often encourage using sources with minority background. The strategy of guidelines and codes, therefore, focus on the mis-recognition aspect. They aim at producing instruments against routine stigmatization and mis-recognition.

In addition to written guidelines various other consulting practices have evolved in many European countries. The Swedish SVT for instance founded a *Multicultural Center* in 2003 to update a source bank and to assist all units with matters related to ethnicity. Various organisations and NGOs put up in 2002 a source bank *Perslink* for the use of media organizations in the Netherlands. In Italy a research centre *ISMU 83 (Iniziativa e Studio della Multiethnicità)* organises regular seminars with journalists and producers for the development of journalism in a multicultural society. In Sweden a daily paper *Göteborgs Posten* organises once a month a discussion group of minority representatives. In Sweden the Red Cross maintains *Quick Response*-group which reacts on un-balanced reporting in the media.

Recruitment

One of the main problems of minority relations in European media is 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. For instance, in Finland *the National Broadcasting Company*, the *Aamulehti* regional daily paper and some NGOs have organised courses specifically for immigrants. These programs have been temporal, as equivalent programs in other European countries. On the European level a larger project *More Color In the Media* has recently opened up opportunities in many EU countries. For example, in Germany 20 women of immigrant decent studied practical journalism in media organisations during 1996-1998. Six of them received a full time job in the profession and six of them established a freelance contract after the training. (Trebbe and Köhler 2001: 142.)

In Britain the proportion of ethnic minorities in media profession is higher than in other European countries. The situation is particular because people included into statistics as 'ethnic minorities' are mostly people who have been born in Britain and therefore already have good language, cultural and social capital compared to those classified as 'immigrants'. In spite of this the studies show that the position of ethnic minorities in British media organisations is fairly low. Therefore, it seems that the possibilities of career development for minority members is lower than those of majority members (see e.g. Quaj 1999). Alibhai-Brown (1998) estimates that in 1995 less than 30 journalists out of 5000 journalists working in national newspapers had a minority background. There were no 'black' or 'Asian' editors or columnists. Since then there have been a few changes for more staff with minority background.

The recruitment initiatives have increased the recognition of minority journalists as professionals and therefore acted against non-recognition. However, it is impossible to evaluate the influence of training initiatives to the access of minorities into the profession. This aspect clearly needs more research. At this point it is possible to distinguish two scenarios from the existing literature on minorities in the media labour market. Firstly, multicultural media initiatives in general are interpreted by minority

members as a gateway to the profession. Training programmes are experienced rewarding and helpful. Secondly, however, there is a recurrent claim that the initiatives are useful only to a certain point. Journalists with minority background are trained and encouraged to work mainly on topics related to immigration and minority status, and they are continually unsatisfied with their career development.

Furthermore, the motivation for recruiting journalists with an 'ethnic' origin may be to represent the 'multiculturality' of the organization or programming. Multiculturalism is constructed not only in selection of themes, viewpoints, sources and journalists but it is also highly visual. Visual aspect of recognising someone as different or as a stranger is therefore important. In the print media the journalist cannot be identified not belonging as clearly as in the audiovisual media. Recognising someone different and strange is highly visual and connected to the body. Fixing differences into the body has increased envision of differences as natural and essential. (Rastas 2002, 6.) Although differences may be encountered with positive or negative attitudes, making the difference is often discrediting. Anna Rastas (2002) analyses interviews of Finnish children with the background of international adoption. She notes that those who have been looked at as different are aware of their body and learn to interpret gazes from a very early age. Pious gazes that say 'I accept you' are not always welcomed since also they *make the difference*: build a mental and social gap between the one who accepts and the one who is accepted.

The Prix Europa Iris as the climax of multicultural media initiatives

European multicultural television programming is celebrated, evaluated and discussed annually during the Prix Europa media festival which is the forum also for the Prix Europa Iris, Multicultural programme of the year. By giving a separate prize category for multicultural programming, the event recognizes multicultural programming as an

important category of programming. However, by doing this it is differentiated from other programming.

The prize with a European scale has its origins in the mid 1990s when four national prizes emerged to one Prix Iris in 1996⁶. Previously there had been media prizes in the Netherlands, Britain, Germany and Belgium for multicultural programs. In 2000 the Prix Iris joined with an acknowledged media prize and festival, Prix Europa. In this process also the evaluation system changed: Prix Europa uses open juries which discuss and evaluate the programs⁷. In addition, there are other activities like seminars and round table discussions on the themes of multicultural media. Furthermore the Intercultural Programme Group of the EBU holds its annual meetings during the festival.

This analysis focuses on the jury reports, speeches given during the event and other information material offered between the years 2000-2003. Additional material from the previous years (1996, 1997, 1999) has been used. The Prix Europa Iris event has received yearly 101-159 entries from approximately 20 countries which include countries outside of the European Union. The organizers have selected 17-25 programs each year for the catalogue and to be presented to the jury.

Winners of the Prix Europa Iris 2000-2003

Year	First broadcasted	Produced/ entered by	Name of the program	Genre, Theme
2000	NPS, NL	Holland Improvement	Urbania, a city tryptich	Non-fiction: Individual stories of people with different background

⁶The Dutch 'ASN-ADO Mediaprijs', the 'British Race in the Media Award' (CRE), the German 'CIVIS Hörfunk und Fernsehpreis' (ARD, WDR) and the Belgian 'Mediaprijs voor een Harmonieuze Samenleving' united in 1996. Note that in 1998 there was no prize.

⁷Television companies or independent producers may send two representatives each to the jury. The discussions are open for anyone who wants to participate, but only the representatives are able to vote.

	SVT, Sweden	Göta film for SVT (also co- producers)	The new country	Fiction: Road movie of two refugees in Sweden
	ZDF, Germany	M.W. Filmproduktion	Me boss, you sneaker	(Special commendation) Non-fiction: Asylum seekers and refugees in Germany
2001	Channel 4, UK	Insight News Tv Ltd (also co-producers)	Sorious Samuras Africa: Exodus	Non-fiction: 'Illegal' migrants in their way to Europe
	ZDF, Germany	Svarc.Film GbR	When grandpa loved Rita Hayworth	Fiction: Czech asylum seekers of 1969 in Germany
	Channel 4, UK	Lion Television Ltd	Bloody foreigners	(Special commendation) Non –fiction: Stand-up comedy/ documentary of asylum seekers
2002	SVT, Sweden	Tekevision- SVT	In an alien land	Non-Fiction: Elderly people from various backgrounds in Stockholm
	WDR, Germany	WDR, Germany	Pages in the factory of dreams	Documentary of the black extras in German films 1919-1945
2003	Channel 4, UK	October Films, UK	The last peasants	Non-fiction: Eastern Europe vs. Western Europe
	ARTE, France	Lapsus, France	Might is right	(special commendation) Non-fiction: Migrant youngsters in suburbs

Majority of the winners are Swedish, Dutch, German and British broadcasts and produces. National broadcasting companies of these countries have had programming for

ethnic minorities since the 1960s, and therefore they are the most established in the field of multicultural journalism and fiction.

The winning programs are mostly based on binary oppositions. They tell the story of the marginalized Other to ‘us’, the majority. Using binary oppositions the programs recognize the divisions European societies construct between Europe and the outside as well as between certain communities within Europe. However, by concentrating on the binary oppositions multicultural programming remains attached to the divisions and borders constructed in the mainstream journalism. These special initiatives aim at showing the ‘Other side’ and telling the ‘Other story’ which is not present in the mainstream media coverage. The structure of dividing the multicultural theme between ‘us’ and ‘them’ is however repeated.

Binary oppositions in the winning programs between 2000-2003

Them	Us	Program
Africa	Europe	Sorious Samuras Africa: Exodus
illegal	legal	The new country Me boss, you sneaker Sorrious Samuras Africa: Exodus Bloody foreigners The last peasants
Eastern Europe	Western Europe	The last peasants When grandpa loved Rita Hayworth
Immigrants in suburb	‘normal’ neighborhoods	Might is right

These binary oppositions become evident in the jury reports and characterizations of the programs, therefore these oppositions are central to the structuring idea of the programs. Three programs do not reflect binary oppositions according to the jury reports (Urbania, a city tryptich 2000, In an alien land 2002, Pages in the factory of dreams 2002). Some programs reflect more than one binary opposition. The most used opposition tends to be the illegality-legality opposition. The programs deal with questions related to the right to enter Europe and to remain as well as questions related to social life and civil rights. Other oppositions can be incorporated within the illegality-legality dimension: the programs construct oppositions between Africa and Europe, between Eastern Europe and Western Europe as well as divisions within Europe, such as the opposition between 'immigrant suburbs' and 'normal' neighborhoods.

Definitions of multiculturalism and anti-racism

Prix Europa Iris offers a viewpoint to major definitions and discussions on multiculturalism within the context of European television. The emphasis is on public broadcasters since they seem to be the main actors involved with the organization of the event. Submissions are received from independent filmmakers, public broadcasters and commercial television. In the following analysis I examine how the jury reports and speeches define and signify multiculturalism and anti-racism. What kinds of discourses of multiculturalism and anti-racism are expressed? What types of social orders and positions are created in the texts?

The prize is defined in various phrasing in annual jury reports, in calls for entries, in speeches and statements, and in the information material such as the website (<http://www.omroep.nl/nps/tv/00/prix/>). For instance the prize has been characterized with the following phrases:

'The Prix Iris is the first European media award that celebrates television programmes which promote tolerance and equality in our multi-ethnic societies. The Prix Iris embodies the spirit of the idea that the media should be used to

promote a better understanding of the European tradition as shared by all of Europe's citizens'. (Statement by H.R.H. Princess Margriet of the Netherlands, 1996.)

'This is the great and noble task of the Prix Iris: to facilitate the unification of the continent using the powerful medium of television. There will be no united Europe until its people learn to live in harmony with each other.' (Welcome address by Peter Leonhard Braun of the Prix Europa organization, 2000.)

'IRIS stands for equality and tolerance. IRIS seeks to be an incentive for programme practitioners to devote their attention to the multicultural spectrum of European societies. In ancient Greece, IRIS was the messenger of the gods who carried their messages to the four corners of the world. She appeared as a radiant rainbow. The IRIS is also the part of our eye that enables us to see the richness of the colours surrounding us. IRIS stands for an open and clear view of the multicultural colourfulness in our modern society.' (Rules and regulations, Prix Europa Iris, 2005.)

The main definition which is published in the introductory website and in the rules and regulations of the call for entry (2005) is the following:

'IRIS invites programmes that tackle the multicultural character of European societies and contribute towards understanding and tolerance between people of different origins, cultures and religions.' (Rules and regulations, Prix Europa Iris, 2005.)

The analyzed texts present Europe as one society, on the one hand, and as a mosaic of various national societies, on the other. In both cases, the definition of the 'host society' is multicultural. It is typical that the speaker positions him/herself into the (host)society, and therefore speaks about 'our society' or 'our culture'. This position however demands that there is 'the Other society/culture/religion etc' against which the 'our culture' is

being constructed and defined. However, since we are dealing with multicultural discourses, these Other cultures can be positioned both outside and within the 'our culture'. Multicultural self-image is a recurring theme in the texts. Multiculturalism is the term used most often, but other terms, like *colourfulness of European societies*, *multi-ethnic*, and *multicolored* are used synonymously.

Multiculturalism in the texts is defined within pluralist, managerial, and cosmopolitan multicultural discourses. The texts understand multicultural society as a mosaic of various separate ethnicities, cultures and religions. Since it is 'natural' to divide 'Other cultures' within 'Our societies' to various individual entities it is also natural that these cultures are somehow managed. The idea that cultural consumption, that is viewing multicultural programming, would increase harmony in society reflects cosmopolitan multiculturalism which emphasize consumption as a way to perform multiculturalism.

It is important to note here that one of the main criteria for the quality of the programs reviewed is that they address a large audience: not only a majority national audience but also a European audience. The goal is that a multicultural program would increase the understanding of a certain ethnic group, culture or life situation among the wide audience. As Roger van Boxtel, Dutch minister for Urban Policy and Integration of Ethnic Minorities states in his presentation of the 2001 Iris awards:

'... by searching for the human stories behind the ethnic groups that enrich our societies; stories that invite us to look again at our neighbours and ourselves; By making the unknown known to us'.

Therefore, for instance 'ethnic media' does not fall into the scope of the Prix Europa Iris if it is uncomprehensive to the wide European audience. Uncomprehensive is unconsumable.

According to the texts the goal of multicultural programming is to show, recognize and celebrate the multicultural structure of European societies. The texts claim that Europe

and the national societies are multicultural, but that there is a possibly dangerous segment of the population which is not giving enough recognition to the 'other cultures' or is giving the wrong kind of recognition. Especially in the earlier speeches and jury reports, it is emphasized that racism is a danger in Europe and that the media construct an essential arena for the fight against neo-nazism and xenophobia.

The discourse of anti-racism that is inherent in the texts is based on the idea that racism is the result of cultural misunderstanding and mis-recognition. The task of the Prix Europa Iris therefore is to encourage program makers and broadcasters to make programs which '*show a greater awareness of the colourfulness of the society they live in*' and '*stimulate mutual understanding and challenge xenophobia, bias and racial discrimination*'. These types of anti-racist statements are clearly uttered in the texts and therefore it is justified to define the event as anti-racist campaign.

European identity is described in terms of multiculturalism, though not necessarily always a harmonious multiculturalism. The longing for harmony reflects the idea that pure multiculturalism should be harmonious. Multicultural self identity is especially emphasized, because it is imagined to be an essential feature of European identity and unification of the continent. National identities and cultures are strong in Europe and the EU has pursued for a unified European identity to facilitate the deepening of the Union. Therefore, the self image of multiculturalism instead of mere multi-nationalism has been important for the EU. Hence, dissemination of multicultural and anti-racist discourses, is envisioned valid for the European political, economical and military processes of unification.

Conclusions

Multicultural initiatives are engaged with identity politics: they aim at recognising minority identities equally important to majority identities, and they aim at recognising the multiculturalism of one-self. However, it is not only identity which is at stake here. In addition to the practises of identity politics, the initiatives have also done work in the area

of social capital and social status. There is a clear European wide ambition to increase the proportion of media professionals with minority background in media organisations, which reinforces the professional identity of these members and increases their status in the society.

However, all research findings on professionals working in multicultural initiatives set the initiatives in a critical light, especially on the question of recruitment and career development. Though in some cases this special journalism may work as a stepping stone to the profession, it seems more likely that the access is limited to a marginal area inside the journalistic field. The initiatives are generally marginal in terms of genre, time slot, and organisational resources. In newspapers multicultural pages and series of stories tend to get less attention than the most valued genres of domestic news, big international events or economics or the most popular genres of sport and personal news. Furthermore, the initiatives tend to get marginalized inside the media organizations in terms of resources and collegial appreciation (Cottle 1998, Suihkonen 2003, Anderson 2000).

The 'success' of multicultural media initiatives is often measured by the attractiveness of large (majority) audiences, as is the case with other media performance. This is also the case with the Prix Europa Iris, which emphasizes the address of European wide audiences. European wide comprehensiveness is required, but it is not explicitly stated from what point of view the story should be comprehensive. It is naturally assumed that the (white) European majority values should be touched upon. This is one of the major problems in minority programming: the initiatives exist because they have the minority axis, but they are appreciated when they succeed in attracting the majority audience.

The social order that is being produced and reproduced in multicultural initiatives reflects discourses of pluralist, managerial and cosmopolitan multiculturalisms. White European culture is presented as the norm, the one which manages other cultures. Europe is divided into various ethnic and national groups, but the goal of multiculturalist and anti-racist policies in the reporting is a harmonious European multicultural identity. Pure multiculturalism is perceived to be harmonious, without conflicts. Prix Europa Iris related

texts define this as a goal and future of European identity. The present situation is characterized in terms of celebrative multiculturalism on the one hand and un-welcomed racist and xenophobic phenomena on the other. The strategies of harmony are presented with typical anti-racist and multiculturalist discourses. The media is understood as a gateway to increasing cultural interaction and mutual understanding.

The stagnation to the idea of harmonious multiculturalism carries certain dangers. The order needs to be managed by someone and therefore it is likely that only certain values and customs are perceived dominant. Other not so harmonious conflicts, debates and definitions are left out from the journalistic field and therefore they remain in the margins of public life. For the development of a more equal society it would be necessary to give access to more controversial difference and perhaps to more 'un-comprehensive' and less consumable representations. The journalistic practice could prompt and orchestrate debates rather than present consumable differences for the majority audiences.

The question of representation is central in anti-racist campaigns. Alana Lentin (2004: 246) makes a conceptual division between symbolic and concrete representation. As discussed in the context of multicultural media initiatives they aim to concretely give access for minority journalists representing either their 'ethnicity' or more political position of an immigrant, Black or minority. This representation is allowed in the form of access to the labour force, to the sources and viewpoints. However, it is important to ask what the initiatives are symbolically representing. Multicultural and anti-racist discourses are used as vehicles to construct a multicultural self-identification of Europe, its nation states and its public service broadcasting. This is necessary for the persuasion of international elite workforce to the localities. The new liberal global market creates the need for 'zoo-like' localities where safe and domesticated otherness is available for consumption (Hage 2003: 111). Multicultural media initiatives in the mainstream media are therefore to be treated not only as development of journalism but also as manifestations of tokenism which construct a multicultural self-understanding of European identity. Multicultural and anti-racist discourses in this context underpin economical, political and military unification of Europe.

Recognition and understanding of other cultures necessarily does not lead into inclusion. Both theoretically and empirically, multicultural media initiatives and the politics of recognition have fundamental problems. Although non-recognition clearly is a problem in European societies since it promotes inequality and ghettoization, increasing recognition and intercultural exchange does not seem to solve the problems of marginalization. Unexpectedly, marginalization and recognition can co-exist. The minorities can be recognised and marginalized at the same time.

Bibliography

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

Anthias, Floya (2002) Diasporic hybridity and transcending racisms. Problems and potential. In Floya Anthias and Cathie Lloyd (eds.) *Rethinking Anti-racisms. From theory to practice*. 22-43. London: Routledge.

Anthias, Floya & Lloyd Cathie (2002) Introduction. Fighting racisms, defining the territory. In Floya Anthias and Cathie Lloyd (eds.) *Rethinking Anti-racisms. From theory to practice*. 1-21. London: Routledge.

Bauman, Zygmunt (1997) The Making and unmaking of strangers. In Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. 46-57. London: Zed Books.

Bonnett, Alastair (1997) Constructions of whiteness in European and American anti-racism. In Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. 173-192. London: Zed Books.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991a) *Language & symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991b) *Televisiosta*. Helsinki: Otava.

Brune, Ylva (2004) *Nyheter från gränsen. Tre studier i journalistik om 'invandrare', flyktingar och rasistiskt våld*. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Castoriadis, Cornelius (1997) *Ajatuksia rasismista*. Teoksessa: C. Castoriadis (toim.) *Magma. Tutkielmia yhteiskunnan imaginaarisista instituutioista*. Juva: Hanki ja jää.

Cottle, Simon (1998) 'Making ethnic minority programmes inside the BBC: professional pragmatics and cultural containment.' *Media, Culture & Society* 20:2; 295-317.

Etzler, Inger (2004) *Ethnic and Cultural Diversity at SVT – then and now*. Presentation at the Nordic Research Network for Media, Migration and Society -conference, 16-17.4.2004, Stockholm.

Goffman, Erving (1963) *Stigma. Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Guillaumin, Colette (1993) *La 'différence culturelle'*. Teoksessa M. Wieviorka (toim.) *Racisme et modernité*. Paris: Éditions la découverte.

Hage, Ghassan (2003) *Against paranoid nationalism: searching for hope in a shrinking society*. London: Merlin.

Hall, Stuart (2003) *Monikulttuurisuus*. Mikko Lehtonen & Olli Löytty (toim.) *Erilaisuus*. pp. 233-278. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Hannerz, Ulf (1999) 'Reflections on varieties of culturespeak.' *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. 2(3) 393-407.

Hargreaves, Alec G. (2002) France. In Jessika Ter Wal (ed.) *Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media. An Overview of Research and Examples of Good Practice in the EU Member States, 1995-2000*. Vienna: EUMC/ERCOMER.

Horsti, Karina (2005, forthcoming) *Managed Multiculturalism and the White Nation Fantasy: Frames of Finnish multicultural media initiatives*. Thomas Tufte (ed.) *Re-Imagining Europe. Media Discourse, Diasporic Minorities and Cultural Change*. Göteborg: Nordicom.

Hulten, Gunilla (2003) *Främlingen under press*. Paper presented at the Nordic Media research conference, 15-17.8.2003, Kristiansand.

Kivisto, Peter (2002) *Multiculturalism in a global society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kymlicka, Will (1996) *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lentin, Alana (2004) *Racism & Anti-Racism in Europe*. London: Pluto Press.

Leurdijk, Andra (2004) *In search of common ground; strategies of multicultural television producers in Europe*. Unpublished manuscript.

Lloyd, Cathie (2002) *Anti-racism, social movements and civil society*. In Floya Anthias and Cathie Lloyd (eds.) *Rethinking Anti-racisms. From theory to practice*. 60-77. London: Routledge.

McLennan, Gregor (2001b) *Can there be a 'critical' multiculturalism?* *Ethnicities* 1(3): 389-422.

Modood, Tariq (1997) *'Difference', cultural racism and anti-racism*. In Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. 154-172. London: Zed Books.

Rastas, Anna (2002) Katseilla merkityt, silminnähdet. Lasten ja nuorten kokemuksia rodullistavista katseista. Nuorisotutkimus 20(3):3-17.

Ridell, Seija (1998) Tolkullistamisen politiikka. Tampere: Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 617.

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

Statham, Paul (2002) United Kingdom. Jessika Ter Wal (ed.) Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media. An Overview of Research and Examples of Good Practice in the EU Member States, 1995-2000. Vienna: EUMC/ERCOMER.

Stratton, John & Ang, Ian (1994) 'Multicultural imagined communities: Cultural difference and national identity in Australia and the USA'. Continuum: The Australian Journal of Media & Culture, 8(2) [9.12.2003]

<http://www.mcc.murdoch.edu.au/ReadingRoom/8.2/8.2.html>

Suihkonen, Minna (2003) 'Kukaan ei halua elää semmoista elämää, jossa omaa ääntä ei kuulu'. Haastattelututkimus etnisten vähemmistöjen omasta mediasta ja vähemmistötaustaisten toimittajien pääsystä valtamediaan. (pdf) Tampere: Journalismin tutkimusyksikkö, Tampereen yliopisto. <http://www.uta.fi/jourutkimus/julkaisu.html> [10.11.2004].

Ter Wal, Jessika (2002) Introduction. Jessika Ter Wal (ed.) Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media. An Overview of Research and Examples of Good Practice in the EU Member States, 1995-2000. Vienna: EUMC/ERCOMER.

Trebbe, Joachim & Köhler, Tobias (2002) Germany. Jessika Ter Wal (ed.) *Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media. An Overview of Research and Examples of Good Practice in the EU Member States, 1995-2000*. Vienna: EUMC/ERCOMER.

Wetherell, Margaret & Potter, Jonathan (1992) *Mapping the language of racism. Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

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

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