



EUROPEAN
CULTURAL
FOUNDATION

Governing urban diversity?

An exploration of policy tools for cultural
diversity in five European capital cities

Daide Ponzini

CCULTURAL
PPOLICY
RRESEARCH
AAWARD

European Cultural Foundation
CULTURAL POLICY RESEARCH AWARD 2009



EUROPEAN
CULTURAL
FOUNDATION

Governing urban diversity?

An exploration of policy tools for cultural
diversity in five European capital cities

Daide Ponzini

Daide Ponzini, PhD
Assistant Professor - Ricercatore
Department of Architecture and Planning
Politecnico di Milano
Via Bonardi 3, 20133 Milano, Italy

Tel +39 02 23995427
Fax +39 02 23995435
Email davide.ponzini@polimi.it



Riksbankens
Jubileumsfond

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
ABSTRACT	6
INTRODUCTION	8
1: MULTICULTURALISM AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, CRITICS AND POLICY QUESTIONS	11
1.1 Multicultural framework and its critics	11
1.2 Cultural diversity: new and old arguments	19
1.3 The international relevance of cultural diversity	22
1.4 Policy questions of multiculturalism and cultural diversity	24
2: URBAN AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN EUROPE AND BEYOND	26
2.1 Cultural and socio-economic relevance of diversity	26
2.2 Political relevance of cultural diversity in cities	28
2.3 Open questions regarding cultural diversity in cities	35
2.4 Culturally diverse cities in Europe	36
3: POLICY TOOLS FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN CITIES	38
3.1 Policy tools	38
3.2 Policy tools and cultural diversity in cities	44
3.3 Research method for the case studies	46
4: CULTURAL DIVERSITY TOOLS IN FIVE EUROPEAN CAPITALS	48
4.1 Direct government intervention in a community centre in Budapest, Hungary	48
4.2 Direct government intervention in a multicultural centre in Helsinki, Finland	51
4.3 Grant for the Russian House in Tallinn, Estonia	54
4.4 Grant-in-aid for multicultural programmes in Rome, Italy	58
4.5 A European grant for ethnically diverse population in Paris, France	60
5: CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES	63
5.1 Cultural diversity in European capital cities	63
5.2 Understanding urban and cultural diversity through its policy tools	66
5.3 Cultural diversity policy tools: further theoretical and empirical research in European cities	67

REFERENCES	68
LIST OF CPRA 2009 JURY MEMBERS	82
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: DAVIDE PONZINI	85

FOREWORD

Governing urban diversity? An exploration of policy tools for cultural diversity in five European capital cities by Dr Davide Ponzini is the result of the 6th Cultural Policy Research Award.

The CPRA International Jury, which gathered in Barcelona in October 2009, ranked this proposal the highest among the six best scored finalists, because of its solid academic and comparative approach to a highly relevant European issue. The research explores the origins, the design and the implementation of cultural diversity policies in European capitals, taking into consideration the evolution of public and policy discourse on multiculturalism in globalised societies.

Davide Ponzini is currently Assistant Professor of Urban Planning at Politecnico di Milano, Italy. Thanks to the award he was able to gather knowledge and perspectives from five capital cities in Europe for completing this research.

Ponzini's focus on policy tools evolves out of an impressive research of academic literature on the topic, across the social sciences. He describes cross-cutting theories and examples from Europe and North America, and tests them by analysing concrete policy tools and their impact on culturally diverse communities in Budapest, Helsinki, Paris, Rome and Tallinn. The research sheds light also on the decisionmaking behind those tools, while analysing their concrete forms - direct public intervention or project-based work by private organisations, incentivised at times by EU funding.

The [European Cultural Foundation](#) (ECF) and the [Riksbankens Jubileumsfond](#) set up the Cultural Policy Research Award (CPRA) in 2004 to encourage applied comparative research in the cultural policy area in Europe, by supporting a younger generation of cultural policy scholars.

The CPRA fosters original ideas and constructive approaches to contemporary cultural policy realities. The winners are encouraged to search for and to formulate policy proposals that could inform policymaking. The award and competition is based on the submission of a research proposal to be defended in front of the International Jury, and at the occasion of the annual Young Cultural Policy Researchers Forum. The winner is awarded a grant of €10,000 to accomplish the research project within one year. The annual CPRA competition and the Forum are developed in partnership with and managed by [ENCATC](#) (European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres).

We are grateful to Davide Ponzini for bringing his considerable knowledge from across sectors, to the expanding area of cultural policy research. We also sincerely thank the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond and ENCATC for their longstanding partnership in this initiative.

Isabelle Schwarz

Head of Programmes and Advocacy, European Cultural Foundation

ABSTRACT

The question of multiculturalism and cultural diversity has been approached in international debates and policymaking in different ways over the last 20 years. Today, amid a complex field of principles, decisions and interventions, the cloak of 'cultural diversity policy' covers a tangled mesh that includes the accommodation of cultural minority rights, individual freedom and emerging trends of collective culture, religious values and job market issues, artistic expression and social problems.

The expansion and restructuring of global economic trends, the dramatic social changes related to recent migration flows or to unresolved problems of different communities living together, the increasing worldwide tendency towards homogeneity in culture and communication, the crisis of the state as the dominant player in cultural welfare policies - all these have induced new cultural diversity issues that cannot remain insulated into one single policy field or dimension.

All these trends make their effects felt in the urban realm, since it is in cities where new economies are created and new ethnic and social conflicts and mixes come together; it is local governments and communities that often face the questions of policy implementation and actual effects. Most of all, urban life is the context where cultural identities and diversities meet and interact, and where challenges and opportunities of cultural diversity politics are to be found.

Research in cultural diversity policy that assumed cities as a field of analysis has typically encountered methodological problems as well as practical problems of transferring policy initiatives into different policy contexts. Indeed, the international comparison of entire programmes showed that cultural diversity policies vary significantly in national contexts, since they depend on differing institutional and legal frameworks. They may also vary in local contexts because they depend on existing social capital and local networks.

After discussing the concept of multiculturalism and the theoretical framework around it, looking at the emerging questions of cultural diversity policy in the urban realm and outlining the analytical unit and research method, this research explores distinctive policy tools that are used to address cultural diversity issues in different urban contexts. In particular the research analyses the policy instruments adopted to promote, create or sustain local cultural centres working in ethnically and culturally diverse neighbourhoods in five European capital cities: Budapest, Helsinki, Tallinn, Rome and Paris.

The comparative study showed how, in the five case studies, the selection of policy tools is a technical and political process that has a great effect on how a policy is conceived and implemented. Furthermore, the availability of abundant rich secondary data on urban cultural diversity policy at the European level suggests that there is an opportunity to expand and systematise policy tool

research in order to reveal emerging trends in this policy field, such as the increasing partnership with private and nonprofit actors and the adaptation of cultural diversity policies to contextual political, social, economic and urban conditions, under the direct and indirect pressure of national and international programmes.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between diverse populations, ethnic groups or subcultures and their integration is part of human history right up to the present. Groups may be hostile or well-disposed towards each other; similarly the ways in which they are defined in political terms or by law can also vary, as can the racial or cultural boundaries between them.

Today, in a complex field of principles, decisions and interventions, individual freedom and developing trends of collective culture, religious values and job market issues, artistic expression and social problems are often found entangled under the cloak of multicultural politics and cultural diversity policymaking. Contemporary economic, cultural and political trends have all affected cultural diversity and its forms. The expansion and restructuring of international and global economic flows, the dramatic social changes that have resulted from recent population migrations, the trend towards an increasing homogeneity of worldwide culture and communication, as well as the crisis of the state as the dominant player in cultural welfare policies have all given rise to new issues surrounding cultural diversity, which cannot be contained in one hard and fast policy field or dimension.

The term 'multiculturalism' and its implications have been at the forefront of all sorts of public debates since the early 1990s. In contemporary liberal democracies various perspectives have focused on the importance of diverse cultures living together. The spotlight has been variously and at different times on cultural rights, citizenship and political transformation, sometimes against a difficult background of accommodating specific cultural minorities or ethnic groups in national and international contexts.

The first section of this paper examines how the theoretical framework focuses on issues of intertwined political, social and economic aspects of multiculturalism, how the debates have evolved, both in the public sphere and in given policy measures and geographic contexts. The old and new perspectives provided by the debate on cultural diversity, show how, in most positions and arguments regarding multiculturalism, and cultural diversity, there is a more or less explicit underlying policy orientation.

Arguably, recognising and confronting cultural diversity and the problems that arise from it seems crucial today, especially in our cities, in both the benefits and the costs of trying to manage this process. Cities are where new economies are forged and new ethnic and social conflicts and mixes are experienced. Most of all, cities are the context in which cultural identities and diversities meet and interact, posing the challenges and opportunities of cultural diversity policy.

Several strands of study have developed in themes, such as 'cultural diversity and economic growth',

'creativity and innovation', as well as 'cultural diversity and citizenship' or 'urban diversity and cultural production'. Cities and regions are today facing directly the question of cultural diversity, because they are often called upon to implement not only cultural policies relating to cultural diversity but also linked policies, such as education, urban planning, health and social services. The second chapter of this paper discusses these issues.

Research in cultural diversity policy has been developed with limited interest in the urban environment and policymaking arena. Typically, cultural diversity policy has focused on the methodological problems of making international comparisons and the practical problems of transferring policy initiatives into different contexts. Diversity policy programmes significantly vary from country to country as they depend on differing institutional and legal frameworks; they also vary in local contexts, depending on the specific social capital and urban conditions. Some potential answers to these analytical problems were formulated by American and Canadian scholars with reference to different public policy fields, and have been recently discussed by European academics and policymakers. Looking at the policy tool as an analytical unit instead of at entire cultural diversity programmes allows researchers to identify and compare specific technical and political issues.

A tool, or instrument, of public action can be defined as an identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem. With this premise, distinctive policy design characteristics tend to 'structure networks' facing cultural diversity problems by positioning stakeholders and policy actors on the basis of the benefits and disadvantages in undertaking given policy actions. It is now clear that cultural diversity policies give rise to different amounts and forms of public involvement, depending on whether they are conceived as services, entirely provided by the public sector, a set of guidelines for cultural integration that are to be followed in certain urban situations, or take the form of financial support to non-profit organisation or tax deduction for individuals and private enterprises.

There is general international agreement among policy scholars that each type of tool has specific political and technical characteristics that can be evaluated and compared. The debate is still open, however, on the problems of implementing and integrating different policy tools in different contexts and on how they affect the building of different institutions. A basic overview of policy tool literature in the third chapter examines these questions more fully.

The fourth chapter explores how distinctive policy tools are used to address cultural diversity issues in different urban contexts. It analyses the policy instruments adopted to promote, create or sustain local cultural centres working in ethnically and culturally diverse neighbourhoods over the last 20

years in five European capital cities: Budapest, Helsinki, Tallinn, Rome and Paris. The objectives of the research were both theoretical and policy oriented.

The analysis adopted the same protocol for each city:

- describing the institutional and social characteristics of the policy context,
- examples and snapshots of institutions and ongoing experiments,
- analysis of the policy tool adopted for delivering services to a culturally diverse population (in one instance),
- discussions of the technical and political dimensions of the analysed policy tool,
- the policy tools' implications for the promotion of diverse culture,
- its institutionalisation and opportunities for cultural reproduction.

Where it is pertinent there is also an examination of how the policy tool is relevant to its specific context and how it is integrated with other policy tools.

The comparative study of the distinctive policy tools leads to the conclusions. On one hand the paper's exploration of cultural diversity problems in cities pays particular attention to how similar multicultural questions and rationales take different shapes; on the other hand it highlights research issues and perspectives.

Current policy and research challenges on the topic of cultural diversity have been picked up by the European Commission and the Council of Europe, OECD and UNESCO. The available data are abundant but comparisons are difficult because the information has been collected with different objectives and in incompatible formats, mainly dealing with entire policy programmes. The exploration proposed in this paper tries to respond to the methodological questions regarding the possibility of systematically using secondary data for analysing cultural diversity policy tools in cities and providing relevant research outputs and usable knowledge for European policymaking.

I was able to develop this research work and report, thanks to the support of the Cultural Policy Research Award, financed by the European Cultural Foundation and the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond in collaboration with ENCATC (European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centers), which I gratefully acknowledge. In 2010, I had the opportunity to be a visiting scholar at the Centre d'Études Européennes at Sciences Po, Paris, where I could carry out part of this work.

1. MULTICULTURALISM AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, CRITICS AND POLICY QUESTIONS

Since the early 1990s the term multiculturalism and its faceted frame of reference have been systematically present in the international public debate and in cultural policymaking. As mentioned in the introduction, in contemporary liberal democracies, this topic includes, among others, issues such as the coexistence of diverse cultures, cultural rights, citizenship and political transformation, the accommodation of cultural minorities or specific ethnic groups.

The concept of multiculturalism has cut across debates of different nature: political philosophy questioning the role of the modern state, international law and politics following post-colonialist debates, national and regional politics about official recognition of minorities, as well as policy debates about redistributing resources or compensating disadvantaged groups. This concept has seldom been explicitly applied to urban contexts. It is central to this research to understand the intertwined political, social and economic dimensions of multiculturalism and the issues that arise from them, to grasp how different aspects of multiculturalism have evolved in theoretical debates, in the public sphere or in specific policy measures and geographic contexts, even though the main focus of the research is on local cultural diversity policies.

This chapter discusses the multicultural theoretical framework and the old and new perspectives provided by the debate on cultural diversity. It shows that there are often more or less hidden assumptions and political positions underlying most perspectives on multiculturalism, as well as among its critics. These positions reflect how public action is organised through a range of policy tools.

1.1 MULTICULTURAL FRAMEWORK AND ITS CRITICS

In recent years criticisms surrounding the theoretical framework of multiculturalism have become broader and broader. In order to introduce the question of cultural diversity it is first essential to give some basic reference to multiculturalism and its critics. This provides not only a background to the literature, but also highlights the political and policy assumptions and positions that sometimes remains implicit in such arguments.

The introduction to Charles Taylor's pioneering publication (1994) describes how constitutional laws

generally support freedom of expression and of association; they do not necessarily guarantee survival to any specific subculture, while respecting a wide range of cultural identities. The demand for political recognition is related to the social meaning of collective identity, namely the way one group or subculture is perceived. The way in which modern institutions have, for the sake of universality, tended to sidestep the problem of recognising differences in gender, ethnicity and activities associated with specific cultural groups has in the last 40 years been thoroughly challenged.

Since recognising and respecting specific cultural identities or groups of citizens and disadvantaged minorities can potentially lead to a position that undermines the commitment to equal representation of all, the policy measures that this recognition could imply and its formal implementation are as politically sensitive and far-reaching as the principle of equality in which they are embedded.

Early expositions of multiculturalism deal with the politics of recognising minorities or lower status groups, showing the risks of treating different cultures in neutral and undifferentiated ways through top-down policies. One general answer was proposed and discussed: allowing institutions, public officials, and eventually communities to define particular cultural policies that are democratically accountable within the broad constraints of respecting individual rights and impartiality between various cultural identities. This is a clear orientation toward policy tools that are defined multilaterally and not by the state alone. Taylor (1994) was aware of the risk of inducing static and ethnocentric definitions of cultural and social groups that are recognised as such because they promote particular cultural policies.

If one recognises the assumption that stabilisation and cohesion of a polity can emerge from a strong and shared national culture, one may be able to acknowledge one way in which cultural assimilation has been spreading in modern states. In this sense the assimilation of minorities can be interpreted as a means for all groups to fully become part of a given national entity. Although the main issues surrounding multiculturalism came about from attempts to accommodate widely varying cultural behaviours in (mainly) Western universal and liberal states, one can find significantly different interpretations.

The notion of 'multiculturalism' appeared in the 1970s in Australia and in Canada in relation to the rights of aboriginal groups and immigrant groups that did not come from Europe. Multiculturalism in this form challenged the long-held nation-founding myths and raised the prospect of differently configured post-colonial societies made up of multiple cultures. In the USA it had a more evident orientation toward integration and assimilation of diverse and immigrant population (in the so-called 'melting pot'). In complex contemporary and pluralistic societies, however, cultural identity takes

form in different, overlapping contexts; it can seldom be addressed exclusively to clearly defined groups or national minorities.

Heller (1996) shows that multiculturalism, in the form that is driven by the perceived need for coexistence of various and fragmented cultures, generally refers to minorities and to the impact of immigration. This is a perspective that sees any move by the state towards making cultures more cohesive and uniform or discriminating against particular cultures as a danger and a challenge to the principles of this particular concept of multiculturalism. Granting equal public recognition of cultures can also be a challenge to established institutions and may eventually fuel certain ethno-cultural conflicts, if one or more particular cultures continue to predominate within a society (years later Kelly [2002] maintained this position).

Parekh (2001) describes how multicultural societies emerged in many cases after centuries of cultural uniformity within nation states. Public recognition of cultural minorities' rights drew attention to the potential contradictions of preserving cultural diversity and national unity at the same time.

Most contemporary societies are multicultural to a greater or lesser extent, but the question is how public policy is shaped to face the problems or to enhance the opportunities of multiple coexisting groups and subcultures. Kymlicka (1995) argued that multiculturalism is compatible with liberal politics, provided that there are enough essential resources to make a good cultural life for individuals. This perspective assumes a clear orientation toward constitutional and indirect policy tools.

Despite the severe problems that can and do occur in societies where the dominant national identity does not allow political recognition and inclusion of cultural minorities, and where individuals are discriminated against, Bhikhu Parekh (2001) notes that the idea of multiculturalism has now gone well beyond the discussion of recognition, pleas for tolerance, respect for and public affirmation of the importance of cultural diversity. It now touches a wide range of identity-related movements among parts of population which while broadly sharing the prevailing culture, have at the same time particular beliefs or lifestyles, that are critical toward central values in society and prevailing culture, but also those with particular family arrangements and so on. Such minorities demand that some prevailing norms be reconsidered. Their challenge to the prevailing culture adds to that being made by communities that do not share the dominant culture and which have their own culture, beliefs and practices.

The above perspective on multiculturalism has implications for public policy and even on issues of

economic redistribution. Micheline Labelle and Azzeddine Marhraoui (2006) trace back the issue of integration to earlier studies and discuss the tension between integration and multiculturalism.

In the late 1990s Steven Vertovec explored the variety of meanings of multiculturalism and its potential implications in different political contexts for different social actors (Vertovec 1998). He notes the intertwining of demographic factors, broad political ideology and moral challenges, socio-political measures (for example, in education, cultural accommodation and service provision), legal and institutional restructuring, cultural features of postmodernism and cultural expressions, politics of recognition and in/for immigrants and ethnic minorities, and new social movements.

In 2009 Vertovec and Wessendorf identify a broad set of policy fields in which multiculturalism play a relevant role. These include public recognition of immigrants, ethnic and cultural minorities in consultative bodies, education, social services, public information, broadcasting and media, law (for example, exemptions or specific accommodations that take account of cultural or religious practices), religious facility location, and even food (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2009). Surprisingly, explicit mention of cultural policies for artistic or socio-cultural activities is not made in these discussions of multiculturalism, but they can of course be added.

Will Kymlicka (2009) proposes a limited classification of policy fields relating multiculturalism to new models of (indigenous) citizenship. The classification is based on the recurrent inclusion and combination of nine policies:

- “
1. *recognition of land rights/title*
 2. *recognition of self-government rights*
 3. *upholding historic treaties and/or signing new treaties*
 4. *recognition of cultural rights language; hunting/fishing, sacred sites*
 5. *recognition of customary law*
 6. *guarantees of representation/consultation in the central government*
 7. *constitutional or legislative affirmation of the distinct status of indigenous policies*
 8. *support/ratification for international instruments on indigenous rights*
 9. *affirmative action.*’

(Kymlicka [2009] page 36).

Furthermore he provides an insight into the policies targeting sub-state national groups:

- “
1. *federal or quasi-federal territorial autonomy*
 2. *official language status, either in the region or nationally*
 3. *guarantees of representation in the central government or in constitutional courts*
 4. *public funding for minority language universities/school/media*
 5. *constitutional or parliamentary affirmation of “multinationalism”*
 6. *accorded international personality.’*

(Kymlicka [2009] page 37)

as they are distinct from the ones for immigrants:

- “
1. *constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism, at the central and/or regional and municipal levels*
 2. *the adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum*
 3. *the inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing*
 4. *exemption from dress-codes, Sunday-closing legislation etc, either by statute or by court cases*
 5. *allowing dual citizenship*
 6. *the funding of ethnic group organisations to support cultural activities*
 7. *the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction*
 8. *affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups.’*

(Kymlicka [2009] page 37)

Lists such as these can be broadened and deepened in different directions. What these examples

show is how the ways in which multiculturalism is defined includes technical and political dimensions that are implicitly or explicitly related to the organisation of public action.

Multiculturalism is, however, a large umbrella concept - covering various debates, policies and politics. Its polysemy can be seen as one of the reasons for its success in spreading and adapting to different contemporary challenges in liberal and universalistic societies; but the same feature is also its weakness.

The fact that so many meanings, disciplines and perspectives can be attached to the banner of multiculturalism has led in some cases to its being misunderstood. It has also led to great difficulties in transferring the knowledge accumulated in 20 years of reflection, research and policy experimentation. One typical flaw in national and international debates is the treatment of multiculturalism as a single doctrine, without acknowledging the many varieties of its theoretical, political and practical dimensions and interpretations. Criticising this flaw is easy, but still one can see many such examples in current public debate repeating similar oversimplifications (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2009).

In my view, rejecting a one-dimensional concept of 'multiculturalism' is correct; it needs to be looked at more closely and in a more nuanced way that is specific to its context (Joppke and Lukes, 1999). Studies that examine not only the themes and questions to be studied, but also refer to the paradigm and perspectives from which policy measures are derived usually avoid this trap. Ideally, any evaluation of whether multicultural measures have or have not helped in the building of a more inclusive society need to step further back and to examine what perspectives underlie specific public policies, rather than to simply make general criticisms (Kymlicka 2009); thus the evaluation can investigate the instruments and mechanisms that shape public action and that are often implicitly related to one or another interpretation of multiculturalism.

Other criticisms of multiculturalism have been prompted by its originally having sprung from North America (the United States and Canada). Because of the configuration of these societies, the concept of multiculturalism began by addressing racial discrimination, moved on to the public recognition of ethnic and immigrant minorities, and more recently to coexistence and security in problematic regions, areas or even neighbourhoods. Once again, the risk of this multiform concept being imposed in radically different geographical and social contexts is that at the same time the underlying ideology is transferred wholesale from one place to the other, from one policy field to another. Transfers such as these reinforce among policymakers and the public opinion the beliefs and political concepts that are supposed to be rooted in practice, but evidently not in theoretical and analytical sense (Kelly, 2002).

For example, longstanding problems affecting immigrants and ethnic minorities in given European contexts - low educational attainment, poor housing conditions, high unemployment, and so on - cannot be blamed on the failure of 'multiculturalist' policies. Nor can broad social problems be rhetorically faced by multicultural policies. Similarly, the actual evaluations of economic, social and cultural effects are scientifically and technically questionable, but nonetheless individual studies have been used to justify entire programmes or political campaigns. Justifications of this type are in many ways as superficial as criticising a particular set of public initiatives as if they had been prompted solely by 'multiculturalism', and blaming such 'multicultural initiatives' for a wide range of problematic episodes that happen to involve members of minority communities, such as Islamic-inspired terrorism in London, riots in Paris suburbs, and so on.

In discussing these and other criticisms, Kymlicka highlights the sometimes simplistic discussion of assimilation, and of the ways in which cultural differences are trivialised and reduced to stereotypes; the outcome of this process is often that inequalities within minority groups are reinforced, discouraging national reformers. He also defends multiculturalism from the criticism that it

“ ... can encourage a conception of groups as hermetically sealed and static, each reproducing its own distinct authentic practices. Multiculturalism may be intended to encourage people to share their distinctive customs, but the very assumption that each group has its own distinctive customs ignores processes of cultural adaptation, mixing and *mélange*.’

(Kymlicka, 2009, page 34)

This point is of central importance. It is not because multiculturalism supposedly denies common values that it is responsible for nurturing the persistence of rigidly contained minority cultures, each frozen in its time-honoured traditions. On the contrary, accusations of that kind stem instead from the poor conception of cultural production and reproduction processes and a misunderstanding of how cultures relate and adapt to each other. The term 'mosaic multiculturalism' describes groups as separated entities to be preserved or promoted with respect to the mentioned cultural threads. In other words:

“ Mosaic multiculturalism is the negation of monoculture, that is, the nation as the locus of an individual's ultimate loyalties. Mosaic multiculturalism replicates at

the sub-state level the Modiglianesque demarcation of modern societies into sharply bounded blocs, each couched into its monochrome national (or cultural) color.'

(Joppke and Lukes, 1999, page 8)

Supposedly some of these subcultural blocs can become the main agencies of political organisations. In contrast to 'mosaic multiculturalism', Joppke and Lukes (1999) propose 'hodgepodge multiculturalism', which they describe as, 'intermingling and fusion of cultures, even within the same individual; "mosaic" is about the coexistence of distinct cultures held by separated groups' (Joppke and Lukes, 1999, page 8).

“ *Not providing an organisational alternative, multiculturalism behaves like a parasite, feeding upon elements of modern states – such as the universal language of citizenship as prerequisite for equality and recognition claims – while doing nothing to sustain and reproduce these elements.'*

(Joppke and Lukes, 1999, pages 8-9)

The contrasting concepts of mosaic and of hodgepodge multiculturalism can be looked at in a number of ways. Kymlicka (1995) argues that modern liberal states can endorse minority rights if respecting individual freedom and autonomy. The concept of cultures in society can have a range of meanings but probably 'cultural diversity' is usually interpreted as being concerned with minorities. Seyla Benhabib (1999) maintains that the problems contemporary societies face are not only about differences *per se*, but mainly about cultural differences that are embedded and sustained in the public sphere. In Benhabib's words: 'Kymlicka has conflated *institutionalized forms of collective public identities* with the concept of *culture*' (Benhabib (1999), page 54, italics original).

What one can broadly conclude from these debates about different forms and implications of multiculturalism is that cultures are integrated and organic wholes, evolving through time; they are not static, self-contained and recognisable units, distinct in their values, beliefs and practices, nor they are successful in imposing certain behaviours (cultural determinism). They are relatively independent of economic life and other systems of power. Generally, diversity among cultures potentially allows multiple individual and social identities to flourish.

To assume that one individual 'culture' is a coherent system of beliefs, embracing the full range of human activities, and to suppose that such an assumption also gives us a vision of clearly separated

societal cultures and subcultures is to risk the spurious notion that individuals cannot belong to and experience multiple 'cultures'; such a multiplicity of experience is, after all, a typical post-modern condition. 'Communitarian multiculturalism', interpreting strong ethnic or cultural identities can lead to self-assuring integration (Meer and Modood, 2009), falls into a similar trap of glossing over contradictions that may be contained within various cultures and of limiting individual autonomy even in the promotion and reproduction of one culture.

All the perspectives on multiculturalism outlined above tend both to be rooted on a specific interpretation of culture and to imply specific ways of organising public action to address issues of cultural diversity in society. For example, either expecting the state to preserve a monolithic national culture or expecting it to enlarge the range of publicly promoted cultural activities in order to include different communities will be bound to have very different outcomes from a policy that promotes the role of nonprofit organisations or the civil society in intercultural dialogues and activities, or a policy that empowers members of given cultural groups to expand and even redefine their culture and lifestyles. It is worth noting that these trajectories are perfectly compatible with the liberal-democratic state and with the dream of universal citizenship rights.

Although most multicultural studies and research activities implicitly refer to policy measures and ways of organising public action, most refer to general policy transformation at a national level. Rarely are the mechanisms of public action consciously considered or inquired into at a local level.

1.2 CULTURAL DIVERSITY: NEW AND OLD ARGUMENTS

The last few decades have witnessed dramatically increasing flows of migration and the fragmentation of cultures and subcultures in contemporary societies; these factors have contributed to a trend towards increasingly multicultural populations of citizens. The debates arising from these trends have led to countless arguments expanding and eroding the term multiculturalism.

Referring specifically to countries within Europe, Vertovec and Wessendorf (2009) note that use of the term multiculturalism has been declining in the public discourse. The essence of its questions and public problems clearly remains, as evidenced in a wide set of regulations, policies, practices and institutions that have been designed and implemented to address issues arising from cultural diversity. Looking likewise at the decline of discussion about multiculturalism, Appadurai simply explains that, 'globalization is not the story of cultural homogenization' (Appadurai 1996, page 11). At the same time it is true that many cultural practices are starting to disappear as a result of modernisation and potentially can be put at risk by states and institutions that are not aware of the coexistence of multiple cultures.

Bennet (2008) confirms that liberal forms of multiculturalism are criticised because they tend to depoliticise and to reify groups into precisely defined cultures without opening up the opportunity for new cultural mixes. Today the definition of 'critical multiculturalism' is referred to as a way to discuss contemporary social problems (migration, mixes, cultural hybridisation) and the fight against discrimination. Supposedly this definition can protect the collective nature of cultural production not only in the Western perspective, ensuring participation of minorities to cultural life without discriminations. When it comes to Europe, there are different conceptions of cultural diversity among European nations and of policies that, despite the fact that they use the same label, deal with various problems in the cultural realm that have been differently defined in the first place. Nonetheless, many criticisms of multicultural positions lead to the flourishing of a slightly different stream of research and public debate about 'cultural diversity'. A number of authors contest the fact that this is only a partially new label for multiculturalism. However, the term 'cultural diversity' is useful since, at the very least, it signifies a less naïve approach, which continues to reject potential reassertion of oppressive denial of distinct cultural identities.

Many of the criticisms of multiculturalism appear again and again when it comes to 'cultural diversity', since it is a similarly ambiguous term that can be used (in different contexts) to express several different meanings. The term nevertheless is taken to allude to the question of minorities, immigration of recognisable ethnic groups, subcultural and ethnocultural expressions.

However, it seems possible to unpack several old and new arguments about cultural diversity without continuing to carry the burden of the complex multiculturalism framework and its criticisms. Ulf Hannerz (1996) considers seven arguments showing general characteristics and limitations, providing innovative interpretations to the problem of cultural diversity. With an anthropological perspective Hannerz questions the importance and highlights potential disadvantages related to cultural diversity in contexts where there is a higher degree of sharing of material and living conditions among different cultural groups.

The first argument is that cultural diversity is relevant for its own sake, at least because of the attachment of each group to its own culture. Of course this perspective can be criticised by opponents of crystallised and 'mosaic' interpretations of multiculturalism. There is evidence, after all, that mixes of cultures evolve and adapt to different conditions and habitats, and that this process is apparently enhanced by globalisation. Cultural diversity could be taken to mean a more efficient use of different cultural resources in different niches. Similarly different flows of meaning can come together and generate innovative cultural processes, as long as they have access to more than one line of thinking and are not dominated exclusively by one or the other. Encounters of this kind lead, we know, to a creative potentially enhancing use of the resources of one single culture.

Culture can even offer a way of counteracting overwhelming dominance in economic and social relations.

“ *Cultural diversity [...] maybe cultural resistance [...]. Yet resistance to imported culture as a manner of resisting political and economic domination is not always a matter of elite strategy, but can be more widely based.*”

(Hannerz, 1996, page 60)

The reverse can also be true: a certain extent of preservation of given group's culture has been used as a social tie and a potential for political organising. In other words, since cultural flows go both from the governing to the governed and the other way round, they can be used in relationship with economic and political power (not only in the form of ideology) both for tying or for loosening these links.

Culture can also be regarded as a way of producing and reproducing tested knowledge about the world. Cultural diversity (to use a parallel with biodiversity) can be enhanced considering the existence of a great number of cultures, but it displays its beneficial effects more effectively through creolisation and evolution of existing ones. Globalisation in this context does not necessarily imply the decline of given cultures, its breeding by the global ecumene (see: Hannerz 1989). The presence and effects of state-designed cultural policy can be discussed under this perspective too.

Négrier and Bonet (2008) discuss the fact that, among the meanings cultural diversity policy can assume, is the idea of resistance to cultural homogenisation and to the hegemony of mainstream cultural industries. The term has also been deployed to highlight the risk of minority culture being weakened as a result of universalistic and 'equal treatment' in the modern state. Talking about cultural diversities makes more sense in this context, because there are different legitimate levels of public interventions in relation to cultural diversity and a single concept of diversity can lead to great misunderstandings. This uncertainty on the boundaries of the concept of cultural diversity leads also to see very different responses depending on field of application, which is eventually broader than cultural policy in the strict sense: for example, social, environmental, educational, linguistic, economic policy.

1.3 THE INTERNATIONAL RELEVANCE OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY

In modern times, the idea of having a cultural policy has been legitimised with reference to the vision of universal cultural rights and national democratisation. Négrier (2006) notes that originally the topic of cultural diversity was related solely to non-national cultures that were included in specific territory and only later, since the 1980s, focused on integration of immigrants.

Today the cultural diversity debate discusses the conditions of groups that are somehow specific in their cultural or ethnic identity and that could be associated with culturally specific policies. Kymlicka (2007) shows how multiculturalism and the questions of cultural diversity expanded from national arenas of policymaking to international ones. Indeed he enlarges the view from the nation-state policymaking and politics:

“ I am using multiculturalism as an umbrella term to cover a wide range of policies designed to provide some level of public recognition, support or accommodation to non-dominant ethnocultural groups, whether those groups are “new” minorities (for example, immigrant and refugees) or “old” minorities (for example, historically settled national minorities and indigenous peoples).’

(Kymlicka, 2007, page 16).

To take this theme further, the discussion of multiculturalism, cultural diversity and liberal states covers very different policy fields and policy target groups. In the aftermath of the end of the Cold War and the shift in geopolitics - no more the two battling superpowers - the attention of international organisations shifted from the assertion of universal rights to the recognition of minority rights, even if the actual policymaking techniques did not radically change. In this frame, Kymlicka (2007) maintains that there has been a multicultural revolution in the last 40 years. The nation-state models of cultural assimilation have been challenged and often displaced by multicultural models of citizenship. Often this shift has been caused by internal politics, the recognition of minorities (for example, ethnocultural and subcultural movements). Increasingly there has been a push in international and intergovernmental organisations (providing knowledge, expertise, funding) for the adoption of multicultural perspectives and actions. The global dissemination of the multicultural political discourse has been supported by international NGOs (non-governmental organisations), scholars and policymakers.

These perspectives have been codified by international institutions into norms and declarations of

minority rights. In 1992 The UN adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities and the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007. In 1995 the Council of Europe developed its Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Since 2005 UNESCO has concentrated on the protection and promotion of cultural diversity, mainly focusing on cultural expressions - both tangible and intangible - and fostering a deeper appreciation of their economic and social value.

Antoine Leonetti (2008) notes that UNESCO's adoption of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in 2005 made policymakers of different fields more conscious of the autonomy of culture as a right of citizens and of governments' obligations to respect cultural diversity and plural cultural and traditional identities. Of course, the effectiveness of the convention is constrained by its having no legal cogence; its implementation depends on the political will of individual national governments and the development of agreements and regulations.

The establishment of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity by UNESCO in 2005 was aimed at internationally interacting with cultural industries and economic production and providing a framework for the support of cultural expressions that were at risk of disappearing. The fund's targets are developing countries as well as non-governmental organisations and groups. Several similar initiatives dealing with intercultural dialogue and fighting against minority discrimination have been promoted internationally.

Since the second half of 2000s, these policies and the debates surrounding them have contributed to the internationalising of multiculturalism and cultural diversity. As the European Union built itself into a new supranational entity, it has paid significant attention to protecting minorities and their rights. The treatment of minorities has been a significant topic in European foreign affairs since the 1990s, prompted by rising concern and humanitarian feelings and by the complex hostilities in the Balkans. This led to developing 'European standards' in minority treatment. Respect for minority rights has been one of the criteria that would-be members of the EU have to demonstrate as a condition of joining the union; for example, minority rights have played a key part in consideration of the application by Turkey to the EU. Some countries that wanted to be EU members enacted pro-minority measures. Of course the effects and policy mechanisms that supranational institutions such as the EU can implement depends on their specific arrangements and constitutional distribution of powers.

In the European Union immigrants is a term that has been interpreted as denoting temporary residents (for example, guest-workers). According to Kymlicka (2007) European international organisations promoted three strategies since the 1990s:

- publicising best practices, identifying the success of countries that handled the claims of minorities well
- formulating minimum standards to enable the minorities to have their cultural autonomy
- case-specific interventions.

Kastoryano (2009) notes that, despite the ongoing formation of a weak European society and the huge uncertainties regarding its identity, the construction of a public sphere for the European debate can incorporate cultural diversity as a desirable value. The EU, which may be likened to the states that Kymlicka (1995) defines as 'multinational' - states that are composed of territorially and linguistically defined nationalities and multiethnic states that have different ethnic groups - can be expected to manage the development of this type of social identity. Recognition of cultural diversity as a desirable value, does not, however, on its own constitute a response to pressing problems concerning the recognition of groups or of multicultural citizenship or rights for migrant workers.

Even in these emerging international arenas, Kymlicka (2007) sharply noted the importance of structuring public action through specific policy tools:

“*The decision of these international organisations to formulate norms and standards regarding ethnic diversity, and to use various carrots and sticks at their disposal to promote certain models of governing diversity, is a fateful one, I believe, and raises [...] dilemmas and paradoxes.*”

(Kymlicka, 2007, page 10).

Cultural diversity is a principle of promoting the coexistence of visible minorities without discrimination. Like multiculturalism, the notion of cultural diversity has a variable composition and it includes ethnic, religious, linguistic, cultural factors. International political and cultural conditions show that cultural diversity is interpreted in radically different ways when it comes to translating ethical principles in the design and implementation of public policies at national and supranational levels.

1.4 POLICY QUESTIONS OF MULTICULTURALISM AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

The multicultural framework introduces wide conceptual questions, together with their theoretical backgrounds. Even if the general discussion about multiculturalism is about beliefs, intentions and aspirations, these in themselves do not provide much insight into what has been actually going on

at the practical level; the discussion often conceals the policy implications that flow from the technical perspectives underlying one specific position.

Not surprisingly, both policies focusing on multiculturalism and cultural diversity are in themselves varied, often shaped by the political, socio-demographic and economic context. Even in conditions that are in some ways similar, the different overall context in which public policies are framed can be the deciding factor in shaping them. In the debates about national and supranational questions this point has not been considered thoroughly. 'Cultural diversity' is sometimes too broad a category to be really useful to describe common public problems and policy solutions. Furthermore, the specific contexts in which these principles and policy are under debate can lead to different practices arising out of the policies.

Western countries have been facing massive immigration and have taken a number of measures for integrating new minority communities. Integration of immigrants and their families has been mainly discussed within a national context and within specific national political traditions; the questions for including differences into new cultures could be more fruitful if it was discussed with a narrower focus.

Some of the problems in this area of cultural policymaking cannot be separated from local cultural communities if one refers to particular transformation and reproduction of different subcultures. The main risk of not grounding the policies in this way is to use the same category of cultural diversity (as it was always consistently the same in any context) for discussing cultural and social problems that cannot be compared, because they refer to radically different economic, social, political and cultural features. This seems true even when limiting the scope to Europe or to some of its member states.

This paper focuses on policymaking and in particular on the link between political and technical factors as they affect the shaping of public action. The research avoids attempting to build a broad taxonomy, but more modestly concentrates on specific policy measures providing culturally diverse populations with cultural services in selected cities.

2. URBAN AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN EUROPE AND BEYOND

International institutions and organisations generally develop framework strategies focusing and intervening on cultural diversity problems. National governments have lost the dominance that they used to have in the making of cultural policy (and also in some contexts in the creating of regulatory policy tools). But governments at national levels still have responsibilities that are relevant and crucial to cultural diversity, such as managing migration and the socio-economic integration of culturally diverse populations. City and regional governments also have to address the question of diversity, because they are often required to create and implement measures, not only in cultural policy, but in policy areas that have an impact on cultural diversity, such as education, urban planning, health and social services.

There are multiple reasons for looking at cities when discussing public policy for cultural diversity, besides the fact that it can be a way of facing the economic and social implications and impacts of cultural diversity. Some of the cultural, economic, social and political reasons for looking at cities when discussing public policy for cultural diversity are summarised in the following paragraphs, also highlighting, where possible, relevant questions for the structuring of local public action.

2.1 CULTURAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC RELEVANCE OF URBAN DIVERSITY

Louis Wirth (1938) investigates social diversity in cities, explaining that having a mixed population could benefit social and economic development when groups were organized and reciprocally useful. When diverse populations live in densely populated urban areas, for example, this can enhance specialisation; social relationships become more and more fragmented and complex touching different populations and can lead to the creation of routines and of specific urban cultures that enable reciprocally positive coexistence. Among these routines and cultures flourishing in metropolises, Simmel (1903) maintains that diversification derives from these multiple relationships and social stimuli, alluding to unexpectedness and a sense of spectacle. In modern times economic specialisation and development took place in cities where individuals and groups could find cultural alternatives and intellectual anonymity.

The cultural relevance of cities which increasingly connect with each other at an international level has been at centre of a lively debate for a long time. Redfield and Singer (1954) discuss potential roles of cities throughout history. Orthogenetic cities give rise to great and homogeneous traditions in specific and well-defined cultural practices, limiting their creolisation (namely the intermingling of several formerly discrete traditions). Heterogenetic cities foster original ways of thinking among their more mixed and shifting communities potentially sparking off creative innovation.

Today's cities, especially those most culturally connected to the rest of the world, tend to contain

shifting and mingling culturally diverse populations, making them places of recombination of cultural meanings and forms; Hannerz (1996) proposes a frame of reference to understand the cultural role of contemporary 'world cities'. World cities are places and nodes of transnational networks, welcoming flows of people in and out, goods and information, as well as cultural flows. This is true considering the fact that cities concentrate skilled and highly educated people providing them with the opportunity of encountering culturally diverse people (Amin, 2002).

In other words cultural innovation and diversity feed one another in the city, provided that these flows - of people and their cultural traditions - are not materially or symbolically impeded. Cultural reproduction and change can emerge from the intertwining of subcultures, but the environment and its contextual conditions can be crucial for cultural exchange and development to take place.

Places matter not only in physical terms, but for their social capital and symbolic capital. Individuals find local resources and limitations in specific locations. Different types of public policies and practice for promoting cultural diversity can have significantly distinct effects on community and subcultural capacity. Each tends to produce a typically different mode of interacting or recruiting social and subcultural groups or of providing specific types of actors (for example, local governments and bureaucrats, socio-cultural organisations) with resources and particular positions in the policy network.

In recent years the mobility of different kinds of population and the integration of subcultures and diverse groups of highly skilled workers fostered the debate of the so called 'creative class' (Florida, 2002 and 2005). This debate discusses how, to a great extent, the presence of culturally diverse populations and tolerance of them can boost economic development, although the effects of migrants in a given city or region can also lead to,

“ *lower wages and higher unemployment for unskilled natives, and on the rising costs of social security resulting from the inflow of relatively unskilled labour*’
(Ottaviano and Peri, 2004, page 2).

Access to cultural services is easier, however, in densely populated cities, where the contribution of culturally diverse populations is reachable, potentially enhancing the quality of city-dwellers' lives and their collective social capacities. Lacarrieu (2008) stresses the utmost importance of the production of signs and meanings at the local level, and therefore the survival of cultural differences, despite trends towards the increasing globalisation of culture and ecumene (see: Hannerz, 1989). Indeed encouraging cultural diversity not only allows preserving the traditions and customs of minority groups but it also gives individuals access to and the use of resources that his or her own

culture may not consider. Despite the fact that exploiting the tourist potential of some cultural diversity may run the risk of making it into rigid, 'marketable' stereotypes, it is fair to say that cultural distinction and differentiation of local communities can become a potential brand for inter-urban competitiveness.

If one considers the current demographic trends in Western countries and more specifically in 'global cities' (those that are an important node in the global economic system), then both highly or lowly skilled workers and immigrant communities are more and more needed to make these places function effectively and induce innovation at different levels. For these reasons cultural policies, and more generally policies that foster social cohesion in cities can be considered essential for integrating newcomers and allowing them to play a part in city life, not only with their work but also by bringing to their new communities their own traditions, cultures and innovation.

It is worth emphasising that the costs, both economic and social, of not promoting the existence and liveliness of cultural diversity are evident both in terms of social coexistence and urban security and in terms of lost potential, for example, in cultural services and production, and in innovation.

2.2 POLITICAL RELEVANCE OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN CITIES

Several studies in different urban contexts discuss the distribution of power and resources among diverse communities in cities (among others: Fainstein and Fainstein, 1974; Fainstein and Hirst, 1995). For example, urban political movements were described as started by disadvantaged communities in response to the underrepresentation of neighbourhoods containing minority communities in city governments. Urban social movements were seen as agents of urban change that could not be carried out by the political institutions (Fainstein and Hirst, 1995).

The Marxist structuralist perspective of these studies such as those cited above expected the social movements that they described would act as a counterbalance to what the authors saw as class exploitation within the urban space. Castells (1972) argues that such movements are the displacement of class struggle from the workplace into the city, limited by the fact that the movements do not transform into class relations.

In a later work (1983) Castells introduces culture as a motivating force for urban social movements to develop an alternative to structures of domination, outside the established political power structures of the city or the state itself. Castells rightly recognises that urban transformation and change can also derive from reasons other than social mobilisation, although he does not show how public action can be shaped through preexisting structures, since the belief of the oppressive character of the latter was widespread at that time.

In his renowned work *Who governs?* Robert Dahl (1961) describes various means of assimilation of immigrants in the socio-political system, the electoral advantages for diverse middle class in the case of homogeneous vote trends and its integration opportunities. Even today some immigrants groups in Western societies find that they are not always entitled to basic rights to take part in political life; today, however, the modern class stratification and original welfare system has disappeared in most local economies and societies. The reshaping of the modern state is resulting in pressure at many levels on the provision of public services and the acknowledgement and inclusion of minorities is often focused on the politics of city government. Combined with a lasting fiscal crisis and trends towards decentralisation of policymaking powers, it is fair to ask whether the inadequacy of traditional political and technical mechanisms is hampering the gradual process of absorbing local movements into the body politic and of providing broader population with cultural services. One can also ask if at the same time these very problems have prompted the use of more apparently inclusive institutional mechanisms.

Gilbert's words are pertinent:

“ *Cities are the locus where the challenges of living together first emerge. [...] the process of participating in the new society is usually realised at the local level of services, practices and activities. It is at the local urban level that the notion of access, rights, participation and consultation take on an immediate and everyday meaning. It is also at the urban level that the social tensions and spatial conflicts occur in reaction to societal and structural conditions.*”

(Gilbert, 2009, page 75)

Furthermore

“ *The urban and metropolitan region is an intermediary level between the national dimension of immigration and the local services delivery where the practices of diversity and interventions to recognise pluralism are increasingly present and significant.*”

(Gilbert, 2009, page 81)

The basic political reason for focusing on the urban level is that the city is the laboratory for diversity: conflicts and potentials are more in evidence, political mobilisation and the gradual struggle of diverse groups is today common at the local level even in societies which are not in any

way isolated and in which there is a great deal of mobility. After lengthy and exhaustive discussion, with a policy-oriented perspective, of all aspects of multiculturalism, in terms of cultural rights in liberal democracies, and of transformation of the state and cultural citizenship, international authorities finally recognised that cities are essential important political and socio-cultural arenas for these matters (Wieviorka, 2006). Generally in Western countries the recognition of cultural diversity happened at the national level and entails policy instruments (and ways of structuring public action) at levels higher than city government.

The fact that cities have been rather overlooked, together with the focus of most of the observers on cultural rights, may be linked to typical structure of government institutions in many Western countries. City governments seldom have the legal power to create alternative regulatory regimes for cultural diverse groups, and rarely are they empowered to determine affirmative action. There is a great deal that they can do at the local level, nonetheless, in providing services, in politically recognising diverse groups and in giving them a role and a way of contributing to public and economic life. To understand the ways in which cultural diversity policies have been shaped, we need to understand factors of this type. At the same time the typical modern models for describing political dynamics and transformation of contemporary cities are not viable anymore and require an effort for finding new meaning, as has been suggested by several scholars.

Lluis Bonet and Emmanuel Négrier (2009) ask whether Western countries can any longer be described as having national cultures and whether countries with strong regional differentiation can make this more visible. Another possibility, they suggest, is that national cultures can be regarded as having internal cultural diversity and as undergoing a blending of different cultures rather than simply assimilating minority cultures. Although some time ago the role of local level political arenas was recognised as relevant for incorporation of political minorities into the nation-building project (Kymlicka 1995), the fact that cities and regions can politically recognise cultural diversity with much more explicit and effective policies than can be brought about at national policy level is a more recent phenomenon and is not necessarily connected with blending in of minorities and their cultures.

“ By “political minorities” we mean groups of individuals sharing specific cultural and socio-political features based on identity claims (related to language, religious beliefs, ethnicity, gender relations, sexual orientation). Moreover, another significant common feature of these groups is the difficulty they have in gaining access to the political and/or economic system in liberal democracies.’

(Jouve and Gagnon, 2009, page 8)

Cities have witnessed dramatic changes, say Jouve and Gagnon above, not only in relation to immigration. Typical former segmentation of the industrial city and urban society are other less class-structured forms of political mobilisation and life.

Annick Germain and Martin Alain (2009) question what they see as the way in which urban studies are dominated by concepts of fragmentation on class and ethnic lines. By drawing on a possibly exceptional case study for North America - the city of Montreal, in the Canadian province of Quebec - the authors show how reforms that have reconfigured the pluralism in the political landscape (they defined it as 'adhocratic'), allowing ethnic officials to be elected at local levels (municipal, provincial), a partial devolution of powers to local boroughs, and making policies with a 'trial and error' attitude. The latter involves adjusting policies and practices in response to public feedback, such as planning where to locate places of worship, making adjustments to the way sport and leisure are organised (for example, arranging swimming pools' opening hours to accommodate certain cultural needs) and social housing.

Because immigrant or culturally diverse populations sometimes live in concentrated sections of a city, they tend to be visible. Providing services in ways that take account of cultural diversity (as well as more conventional services) can mobilise local politicians to put forward highly local agendas in order to ensure that they are elected as local political representatives (*Jouve and Gagnon, 2006*). The importance of recognising political minorities at levels below the national can be addressed by studying cultural diversity policy at the city level.

Political mobilisation and struggle of diverse groups is today widespread at the local level in many contexts, both in relation to recent immigration trends and to other reasons of cultural differentiation. This is connected to the fact that in urban life and in political interaction identity and its claims can be negotiated and integrated because specific policy measures affect only a limited area. As noted in the first part of this paper, at the urban scale the policy fields that might be relevant concern not only culture or cultural expression, but also housing, education, employment and representation in public institutions and in decisionmaking regarding urban planning issues. Broad regeneration and development issues are also implicated, not simply decisions about where to site places of worship or how to provide culturally sensitive local services.

A comparison of research conducted in the United States and in the United Kingdom also throws light on these questions. For example, in City Heights in San Diego, California, a process of redevelopment involved in a reduction of public spaces in favour of private housing development. Le Texier (2010) noted the proportionally lower presence of ethnic group representatives on the redevelopment committee. The creation of colour-blind neighbourhood organisation can be seen as the participation in building a common public and political space. This was in a way challenged, reducing the force of

potential urban movements that, by keeping separated the different components (for example by favouring the service providers that are organised on an ethnic or national-origin base), can be partially integrated in the political process. On the contrary, one might say local commissions for urban planning have started opening the floor to some ethnic leaders that could be co-opted and give higher legitimisation to the decisions because of the inclusion of minorities.

By studying a neighbourhood in the city of Bristol, Latour (2010) shows how policies for the management of cultural diversity in a port city with significant immigration were implemented. Latour analyses cultural diversity and inequality in the neighbourhood of St Paul and Easton in the period 1991 to 2008, under the lens of government strategies with reference to social and cultural associations. There were several ethnic- or religion-based (Caribbean, Somali, Muslim) associations in the area; because of persistent tensions between these groups they found difficulties in making a common alliance for facing the inequalities towards all the minority groups. St Paul Unlimited Community Partnership, a leftist association proposing to produce services that respond to multiple and diverse groups, embraced a continuous dialogue with the community through bimonthly public meetings. But in 2007, the partnership's grant of public money, which since 2001 had enabled it to function, was cut off.

The Bristol example clearly poses the question of institutionalisation of cultural diversity through different social, ethnic and cultural categories. The UK government at that time was attempting to promote community cohesion and citizen public representation in order to strengthen minority groups' sense of national belonging and was providing funding to cultural associations, which were sometimes defined on ethno-religious basis. In other national contexts and in other cities in Western countries the question of institutionalisation of cultural diversity can be differently posed.

Irene Bloemraad studied the integration in Toronto and Boston of groups of Vietnamese immigrants (Bloemraad 2002). Integration in Canada was at a faster pace, compared to Boston. She attributes this factor to a stronger multicultural policy rather than to, say, a more sensitive labour market and political system. A similar pattern was later found with Portuguese immigrants in the same cities (Bloemraad 2005). Other interesting findings linked communities' capacity for integration and for participating in the political arena as depending chiefly on: the mastery of local language, number of generations since immigration, integration in trade union structures, the local political culture and the presence and opportunity for developing social capital.

The impact of general multicultural policies, however, seems not to be central, nor is it crucial to have a policy model for including immigrants in the city's political life; there are so many varieties of contexts on which the debate draws and towards which such insight could be applied.

National governments' commitment and interest in cultural inclusion policies varies; it can be quite significant. Négrier (2006) highlights the French experience in the Projets Culturels de Quartiers in the second half of the 1990s, along the lines of the Contrats de Ville, which were broadly aimed at urban renewal. Although the Projets Culturels de Quartiers concentrated on improving access to established cultural works and facilities, it also had a stimulating affect on local cultural activities, independently from their recognition. Forums for cultural and art-related activities sprang up, sometimes claiming to be the representatives of a particular ethnic, religious or neighbourhood community. The devolution of powers and the weakening of the state are widespread contemporary tendencies that pushed researchers to focus on local level policies and on the role of cities in cultural diversity policymaking.

Different features can be identified between the kinds of policies that national governments design and implement with respect to the political, institutional and procedural management of political minorities and those that emerge at city level. The traditional concept of the structures that cities need to govern themselves needs to be examined. Formal policies and descriptions of various public programmes do not explain how general aims of allowing or even supporting cultural diversity is being put into practice.

One emerging hypothesis in literature is to explore such policies in the light of the organisation of political minorities and their access to public decisionmaking (Gagnon and Jouve, 2006). One critical point is that access means active participation in decisionmaking - assuming elected positions and taking part in executive bodies: it is not merely the absorption of minorities' political claims and expectations in the local political agenda.

The essential relevance of cities here is that:

“ *[a] great deal of innovation and experimentation with respect to cultural diversity is possible in cities because they are the political forums for new social movements [...]. Such movements can involve post-materialist aspirations and work towards recognition of cultural diversity and/or focus on participatory and deliberative democracy. However, this is not always the case, since the goals of political minorities are very often related to classical issues of redistribution of wealth and social justice[...]. Yet, the movements share the common feature of being carried*

through identity dynamics that do not fit into classical production-based social relationship. They are characterised by other identity markers, such as language, geographical or ethnic origin and religion.'

(Gagnon and Jouve 2009, page 128)

The trends among contemporary states to devolve and decentralise to the local level make the city important in the actual management of cultural diversity issues and immigrant integration. Germain and Alain (2009) show that part of Quebec's funding for cultural diversity has targeted community organisations in general, which sends a reassuring message to the local population (rather than simply 'helping immigrants'). The introduction of new forms of local clientelism could potentially jeopardise cultural diversity policies. Also, opposing what is perceived as the establishment's cultural elitism, based on the conservation and diffusion of existing and even dominant cultural values and expressions, and moving towards the recognising and supporting of minority groups and their cultural practices is a process that sometimes runs the risk of turning local discretion into ordinary cultural clientelism, or even to exploit cultural diversity policy for other social and political objectives (Négrier 2006).

Gagnon and Jouve (2009a) warn against taking for granted the idea that urban level institutions are somehow open to minorities, and they stress the risk of exploitation of certain groups at the local level, while political organisation of groups and political pressure can go beyond the demographic proportional relevance of the groups or ethnic candidates tend to be elected to certain roles in 'community appointments'. Both the traditional study of government, and a generic call for repoliticisation of cultural policies can be criticised.

Most of the theoretical reflections in multiculturalism focus on cultural rights without reference to specific contexts in which such reflections might give rise to policies that could be put into practice. Worse still, most of the cultural diversity policy debates assume that policies are to be put into effect at national or international levels of governance.

There are a few researchers, however, who highlight the case for developing a city level insight. Discussing urban level dynamics in political terms seems interesting in order to consider urban movements promoted by diverse groups and their potential contribution to urban policymaking in the cultural field. Moreover, the variety of contexts and problems in Europe and its capital cities make the perspective of generalisation hard to develop.

2.3 OPEN QUESTIONS REGARDING CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN CITIES

Due to its socio-economic, cultural and political relevance, one can see that cultural policy can be instrumental in promoting urban cultural diversity. There may well be a danger of oversimplifying and exploiting cultural diversity and its manifestations in urban contexts, motivated by the objective of benefiting the economy. This sort of exploitation of culturally diverse urban areas sometimes draws in tourists, and may make such areas attractive to the creative class and industries (Clark, 2004; Fainstein, 2010). Urban planning measures can be oriented to foster cultural diversity in order to enhance its direct and indirect impact on the local economy. The complex debate about this factor already demonstrates that, besides the evident problems of cultural authenticity (Zukin, 2010), serious problems may result from the creation of niche, intra-urban competition, inefficient localisation of cultural amenities, congestion due to mass tourism and the like.

The objectives of cultural policymaking are a spectrum. At one end is the use of culture as a tool to further other goals; at the other the promotion of culture for culture's sake. But cultural and social policies that focus on cultural diversity have historically been conceived as a means for encouraging social cohesion and integration. Although multicultural theories are strongly grounded in ethics and political philosophy, nonetheless, the legitimisation of cultural diversity policies have been constructed within an operative policy frame (Bonet and Négrier, 2008).

Policymakers concerned with cultural diversity can sometimes face a paradox. The need to recognise minority groups using criteria such as their ethnic, religious, cultural, or national identities, as a starting point for encouraging group members to take part in the public sphere and in institutionalised political life, or to make their economic contribution visible, requires perceiving these groups as crystallised, discrete and contained, to some extent formalising their boundaries (who belongs, who does not?). Doing so, however, risks bypassing the problems of cultural reproduction and issues such as how discrete traditions or cultures come together, mingle and evolve, which are vital processes for the promotion of cultural diversity itself in the medium and long term.

Paradoxically, cultural diversity's contribution to the regeneration of a collective identity risks being hindered by practices that arise as a consequence of 'mosaic multicultural' policies (see page 17). Similarly the problem can be set with reference to policy that aims to institutionalise existing organisations that work with targets of numerous cultures in, for example, cities and neighbourhoods.

Investigating populations' cultural identities as well as recognising and promoting them is an essential underpinning for designing urban policy and is often undertaken in designing multicultural policies, while scoping area-based organisations is a less widespread activity. Considering technical dimensions and the organisation of public action can help to understand the opportunities for

supporting minority groups and subcultures as defined by their cultural features (or by their belonging to specific urban areas). What is the structure of public action? What types and how many policy actors have been involved? What is the role of different government levels and other aspects that are concretely visible in urban policymaking?

How policies towards cultural diversity are interpreted may differ from one urban context to another. Examining the context for a particular policy can show up minority groups' need for access to cultural services and institutions and how the complex phenomenon of recognising minority groups and the process of integration is concretely shaped in different cities. The traditional perspective of 'mosaic multiculturalism' or the political process-oriented one of analysing urban social movements are a necessary background for this paper but are not the focus for this analysis. One of the hypotheses of this research is that looking at the structuring of public action through its specific instruments can help in understanding the ways cultural integration or fragmentation works in specific urban contexts.

2.4 CULTURALLY DIVERSE CITIES IN EUROPE

Because of what prompted the original foundation of the European Union (EU) - genocidal Nazism and the 1939-45 war, the union fights against discrimination - new member states are required to meet the Copenhagen criteria for the respect and protection of minorities in employment, education, access to goods and services (Guiraudon 2009). Despite general regulation and basic citizens' rights, actual conditions for minorities in the EU's cities vary significantly.

Négrier (2006) brilliantly shows how cultural policy can be traced back to broad principles, legitimising different institutions and professional groups, as can multiculturalism. National ideologies and universalism influenced the early stages of such policies and the definition of its field as a part of the welfare state. However, in modern and contemporary cities culture has become an element directly or indirectly provided in response to increasing urbanisation and new needs of the population.

The role of European cities in this policy field seems increasingly important in the light of current trends such as decentralisation, related to the timid public intervention at the European level, and the development of cultural strategies that require the partnership of private and nonprofit actors. Although discussion of cultural strategies generally shares a common terminology, actual policies tend to vary greatly in their conceptions of contemporary culture and the practices that they lead to are very much context-driven.

Cities are the focus of significant recent international experimentation in Europe. In 2008, for example, the Intercultural Cities Programme was started as a joint pilot initiative of the Council of Europe and the European Commission, in eleven cities in eleven member states of the Council of Europe (see Woods, 2009). Its aims to analyse cultural diversity policy in these eleven cities and to define new strategies for positively promoting the inclusion of migrant and diverse population (through participation and community direct involvement in the implementation of the policies) and to see how such a policy could act as a lever for economic development. The programme analyses selected programmes in these cities, starting the development of a method for intercultural city policies.

Another important study, promoted by the Cultural Information and Research Centers Liaison in Europe (CIRCLE) led to the publication edited by Dorota Ilczuk and Yudhishthir Raj Isar (2006) analysing nine cities. This study raises questions about urban cultural diversity in different contexts by adopting a given research protocol, but not expecting to have common policy answers. This work stressed the importance of considering cultural processes such as hybridisation and institutionalisation of cultural diversity and the need to understand the underlying political processes in each context (Ilczuk and Isar, 2006).

The study of cultural diversity policymaking in individual cities has led to significant advancements through international comparison. Given this, it is clear that it is not possible to generalise the findings nor to create a static, monolithic model for cultural diversity policies, since conditions can radically change and depend on multiple actors, organisations and political agendas.

In this research five capital cities are selected in different quadrants of Europe, all of which have had different institutional history and developmental paths: northern, Continental, Mediterranean, Eastern and south Eastern Europe. This selection is fairly arbitrary and there is no suggestion that these cities, or the analysed policies are being proposed as models for local policymaking. The case studies focus on local cultural centres working in ethnically and culturally diverse neighbourhoods. Comparable variables of the local policy include: financial size, urban location and context, cultural service dimension, political and symbolic significance.

Most studies of multiculturalism and cultural diversity policy in European cities analyse entire programmes. Using such a broad analytical unit poses several problems for defining the boundaries between the observed phenomena and their contextual variables, as well as for comparing case studies across different countries. This research explores the opportunity of analysing urban cultural diversity policies through their policy tools. The latter refers to a consolidated body of literature that will be discussed in the next chapter.

3 POLICY TOOLS FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN CITIES

Research in policy about cultural diversity has been developed assuming an urban perspective. There are often methodological problems in making international comparisons of the results and practical problems in transferring measures and recommendations into different policy contexts. Indeed, the comparison of entire programmes shows that cultural diversity policies may significantly vary because they are shaped by national institutional and legal frameworks and at local level they depend on social capital and site-specific conditions.

Using the policy tool as an analytical unit allows researchers to identify and compare specific technical and political questions. A tool, or instrument, of public action can be defined as an identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem. Examples include direct government, regulation, grants, tax expenditure; there are many others.

Distinctive characteristics of policy tools have an impact on social networks facing problems of cultural diversity; we can show how actors might be affected by the perceived advantages and disadvantages of undertaking certain actions. It is now clear that cultural diversity policies encourage different amounts and types of public involvement and action depending on whether they are conceived as services entirely provided by the public sector, or as a set of cultural integration rules to be followed in certain urban situations, or as financial support to nonprofit organisations or tax deduction for individuals and private enterprises.

Scholars agree that each policy tool has specific political and technical characteristics that can be evaluated and compared: effectiveness, efficacy, equity, manageability, legitimacy and political feasibility. They continue to debate the problems of context and integration of different policy tools and how they become established as part of the social and institutional structure. Drawing on previous research (Ponzini, 2008; Ponzini, 2009; Palermo and Ponzini, 2010), this chapter provides a basic overview of policy tool literature, discussing questions for exploring the field of urban cultural diversity policy with a 'tool perspective'.

3.1 POLICY TOOLS

With a long history of philosophical and political reflections behind it, the study of governing instruments has seen a rapid expansion in the past decades, linking economic and social sciences, and branching off in different national contexts (Howlett, 1991). Tool analysis has been widely applied to American, Canadian and more recently European policies.

Based on Dewey's pragmatic approach (1927; 1935) and on the fundamental studies of Lindblom and Dahl of Yale University (Dahl and Lindblom, 1953; Lindblom, 1959 and 1965), referring to recent

implementation studies (Hargrove, 1975; Pressman and Wildawsky, 1979), Salamon (1981) argues that in order to understand government's action the required analytical unit is a policy tool, rather than entire programmes and policies promoted by the government. He poses two questions that are still of central importance in the debate, which goes beyond American political science: what factors influence the choice of policy tools, and what consequences does this choice have for the success of government's action? This focus has the premise that in tackling public problems it is generally possible to choose from a range of tools and that some are more effective than others.

The seminal study in the Canadian school is *The choice of governing instrument*, developed in 1982 by Michael Trebilcock, Douglas Hartle, Robert Prichard and Donald Dewees in order to provide the Canadian Economic Council with indications regarding regulation measures concerning various matters (Trebilcock et al., 1982). Trebilcock's research group, with economic, social and legal backgrounds argue that the Canadian government was using mainly regulative interventions in several economic and social fields, without considering other possible mechanisms. The study draws attention to the options - choices to be made - and says that the effects of different forms of action need to be evaluated. Government can then choose how to legitimately make use of its power and influence.

Regulation, the study shows, is just one possible useful choice, but not the only one, among others such as direct government, taxation or persuasion. Building on Salamon's groundbreaking 1981 work, the Canadian group argues that once the public problem and objectives are defined, not all instruments are equally useful, and that the government can choose the more appropriate tools on the understanding that tools are, theoretically at least, interchangeable.

Lowi's famous paper, showing that different public policies may lead to specific political interaction (Lowi, 1972), influenced the first generation of policy tool scholars. Trebilcock's 1982 group discusses the axiomatic supposition that instruments are chosen - rationally - with technical and efficiency criteria. The Canadian scholars argue that the choices leading to the use of a policy mechanism are games that can be empirically analysed, but, Howlett points out that in reality decisions are influenced by political factors and that governments prefer one instrument rather than another because of factors such electoral costs and benefits trade-off (Howlett, 2005). Twenty years later Trebilcock (2005) acknowledges the weakness of his team's instrument choice approach, opening the field to other theoretical hypotheses.

There is today a widely accepted position in policy tool studies, which challenges the rationalists' assumption of ideal conditions for selecting policy tools as a technical matter of optimising public benefits on the basis of chosen principles and criteria. As Hood explains:

“ Selecting the right tool for the job often turns out to be a matter of faith and politics rather than of certainty. Indeed, it is not uncommon to find that the choice of “instruments” attracts much hotter political debate than the ends being sought [...]. If the operation of the government’s tools were unproblematic, it could be left to “technocrats”, and the rest of us could concentrate on the purposes that the government should pursue.’
(Hood, 1983, page 9)

The first generation of political reflection over policy tools considers instruments as critical junctions of the political processes. It was explained that instruments were selected neither by following rational paths nor by aiming at maximising social benefits. Policy studies clearly explained that the tools of government are not neutral mechanics, instead they are a relevant part of the political process of defining public intervention:

“ ‘Policy instruments are not politically neutral, and the selection of one instrument or another for a policy intervention will generate political activity, and have political consequences. More importantly, political factors and political mobilisation affect the initial selection of instruments and the ultimate implementation of policy. Attempting, therefore, to assess policy outcomes without also considering the means to be employed to achieve those ends as well as the politics shaping tool choices is likely to result in potentially faulty policy decision.’
(Peters, 2002, page 552).

Acknowledging that there are choices to be made in selecting policy tools, but that typically the selection is political as opposed to simply technical, seems the first step to identifying how this interaction takes place and how it links distinctive features to a given tool and to the reasons underlying its choice (Peters, 2002).

In recent years public policy debate has shifted its focus from formal government activities and structure to the governance of public action. Salamon’s (2002) conceptualisation of policy tools

describes the variety of instruments available to policymakers to deal with complex problems. Scholars in a range of countries argue that the combination of the studies focusing on policy tools and those about governance have together produced clearer insights into the technical and political relationships between tool choice and implementation (Eliadis et al., 2005). They also suggest that multidisciplinary, integrated and systematic tool research should apply themselves to the contemporary design and management challenges of governing action in society. While the original focus of debate was on more on direct and substantial effects (with the well-known preference for command and control or market regulation tools), the second generation of scholars is more sensitive to indirect and procedural instruments, that is, the tools giving shape to mixed networks in order to tackle a public problem (Howlett, 2005).

Prominent French authors have developed the study of government tools in terms of 'dispositif' or a device that has the effect of shaping social action in certain directions, the government not necessarily having intended public action on specific public problems or opportunities to have that outcome (Lascombes and Le Galès, 2007). The French 'dispositif' concept, which points us to the observation of social practices and to the dimensions of political sociology, needs to be distinguished from the policy tool or tool of government, which focuses on the mechanism of governing and of pragmatically structuring public action. Investigating urban and regional policy tools without making such a distinction, could be misleading, especially if the 'dispositif' could also encompass techniques, quarters or districts, urban projects, cartographies, and administrative procedures, such as regulation or taxation (Lascombes and Le Galès, 2004; Estèbe, 2004; Pinson, 2004).

More recently, Lascoume and Le Galès' political sociology approach to instruments has prompted new research at the EU level (Kassim and Le Galès, 2010); this uncovers hidden aspects of European policymaking, revealing limits in organisational capacity and challenging established narratives of grants and public-private partnerships in various policy fields, such as gender, economic policy, environmental and regional policy.

As well as criticising the technocratic and functionalist approach to policy instruments Kassim and Le Galès (2010) set out a number of questions about the institutional dimension of the structures of public action and their own logics. They show the examination of the technical features of policy tools cannot avoid considering the political relevance of tool selection and the potential vested interests in these processes.

The metaphors used by policy scholars for categorising different types of tools have sometimes been simplistic and too overarching. The concept of the government trying to curb regulating behaviour that it regards as unacceptable has been labelled the 'stick' and rewarding what are seen

as virtuous actions have been termed the 'carrot'. This incentive/disincentive dichotomy has often been coupled with the concept of 'sermons', that is, persuasive or informative actions that the government undertakes to educate the governed (Bemelmans-Videc et al, 1998). This perspective suggests that generally citizens or specific parts of society act in response to certain positive or negative incentives or beliefs (Schneider and Ingram, 1990).

To understand relationships between the government and the governed in cultural policymaking requires a conceptual grid that is more nuanced than 'carrot, stick and sermons' or other generalised categories. Several policy tool debates at the European level are conducted with this level of generalisation, perceiving tools as merely technical devices (for example, excluding the possibility tools sometimes exist before of the goals of a policy are defined and that tools can shape policy networks and actions on the basis of vested interests).

The international debate focuses very strongly around the theme of the tools of government, adopting a range of positions. Agreeing largely with Vedung (1998), Salamon argues that, 'a tool, or instrument, of public action can be defined as an identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem', (Salamon, 2002, page 19). This definition helps us, once again, to consider that each instrument has its own distinctive policy design characteristics, which tend to structure networks facing certain public problems. Even though particular characteristics cannot predict specific outcomes with certainty, public action can be specifically understood in terms of tools of government: direct government, regulation, government sponsored enterprises or agencies, grants and many others.

There are important factors that the policy tool studies consider only marginally, despite the fact that they appear to shed light on the effectiveness of selected policy tools: these factors include political pressure by social interests and parties, incrementalism, political ideas and ideologies that sometimes dominates the public scene, and the application of policies conceived in one context and transferring them into a different context, even across national boundaries. These factors and questions seem to have explicative potentials that are not individually sufficient to exhaustively solve the current changes in public action.

Prominent scholars - such as Trebilcock, (2005) and Peters (2005a) - propose that in future policy tool studies should adopt analysis based on multiple criteria that can be derived from different fields in the social sciences. The idea that the choice among alternative tools and their success depend on the tools' own identifiable features is widely accepted (Salamon, 1989). What is still being debated concerns what might be the most relevant characteristics that it is possible to infer from these various characteristics.

The extensive and systematic work of the prominent internationally renowned scholars, guided by Lester Salamon of Johns Hopkins University (2002) proposes and deepens the categories and basic classifications of policy tools in several fields and develops an exhaustive analytical and interpretative set. In tool analysis and evaluation, effectiveness, efficacy, equity, manageability, legitimacy and political feasibility are the most important characteristics, so that each tool can be described and evaluated.

Although mainstream tool analysis argues that likely impacts of each tool are largely predictable, in complex policy fields, such as cultural policy, these criteria cannot always be thoroughly analysed, nor can their impact on the way a policy tool is implemented be clearly identified. This may be, for example because the effects of given policy tools are ambiguous or open to different actors' perspectives. Efficacy could be largely undetermined since the governmental costings do not take account of the number of social actors involved and collective benefits have multiple forms. Equity sometimes takes into account only a limited population. A number of contextual variables other than those of the tools are changing and affecting outcomes.

Furthermore, other key features of tools that may have been selected include: coerciveness, directness, automaticity, and visibility of the tools (see: Salamon, 2002). Tool features and dimensions do have an analytical, interpretative and predictive capacity that, as proposed in the following paragraphs, can be fine-tuned in accordance with a wider set of questions regarding tool choice and implementation.

A multitude of social factors make up the circumstances in which these policy tool decisions are made; they may include norms and values, symbolic systems, ideologies, and cognitive scripts, all of which influence political forces, which in turn have an impact on change, both in what they signify to individuals and how they define what individuals expect from the mechanisms of policy (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983 and 1991; March and Olsen, 1989). In this sense, the analytical and interpretative contribution of neo-institutional approaches to tool studies is considerable in organisational, social and historic terms (Hall and Taylor, 1998; Peters, 2005b).

The neo-institutional perspective explains the consensual norms which regulate choices and behaviours, including tool choices. The 'path dependency' concept usefully highlights how certain decisions and outcomes produce increasing returns for certain groups, which could gradually confirm their faith in a specific course of action (Pierson, 2000; Pierson and Skocpol, 2002). Path dependency explains the costs - economic, political and knowledge - that are incurred when an original policy tool being deployed is replaced by another. Such costs partly derive from

policymakers' expectations and the framing given by the use of the original tool.

Two analytical concepts are of particular interest for this paper: first, how a certain course of action becomes embedded in institutions and secondly, the use of instruments that have been tried out in different contexts (institutional isomorphism, Radaelli, 2000). With this perspective, tool study can explore how local, national and supranational institutions gradually get transformed, whether by subsidiarity - the assignment of policy competences to the smallest feasible units - privatisation or Europeanisation.

Identifying the features of individual tools can help showing what happens in very specialised policy arenas in which certain actors want to not only select the policy tools but also to take part in their fine tuning, in order to make them capable of channelling the public discretion. It is now evident that such political choices have an impact on the efficacy and efficiency of public measures in matters of urban cultural diversity.

3.2 POLICY TOOLS AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN CITIES

In the complex field of cultural diversity policy, merely technocratic approaches to selecting the most appropriate tools for given objectives are not satisfactory because they do not consider the complex political implications that were discussed in the second chapter. Nor should the idea that policy tools are predictor devices be maintained for evident technical and political reasons.

Such technical or political reasons might include, among others:

- the sometimes extreme complexity of decisionmaking processes,
- the asymmetric distribution of information among actors,
- the relevance of positive and negative external factors that are sometimes the core of public action (in the second chapter some of the socio-economic side-effects were considered),
- the ambiguity of public interests and the influence of contextual factors.

The enhancement of urban cultural diversity often results from an entangled set of public actions that are taken in a rather unambiguous univocal and technocratic manner by public, private and nonprofit parties.

In the first chapter the theoretical framework surrounding cultural diversity was outlined, identifying the tacit assumptions regarding given organisational structures for the promotion of multicultural policies and policies concerned with cultural diversity. At first measures taken to accommodate

cultural and ethnic minorities and to challenge national dominance of particular cultural or ethnic groups were mainly regulatory in character. Such kinds of tools are not the main focus of this research.

Many international bodies promote tools that are indirect and mainly rely in the diffusion of information (in various forms). Such types of measures are not discussed either. Of course, both the national and supranational level can target the urban and local level, and cultural diversity policy is sometimes designed targeting urban cultural diversity issues. The research concentrates on the provision of cultural services to support or enhance cultural diversity and discusses the use of specific policy tools in particular urban areas.

Some of issues mentioned above have been already analysed and they can be better discussed in this tool perspective. For example Barry (2002) assumes that there is a trade-off between recognition and support of cultural diversity and traditional and society-wide wealth redistribution. Clearly this question can be specified in terms of what are the policy tools to be adopted and on how cultural policy tools are integrated with other policy tools.

Liette Gilbert (2009) proposes two interesting examples that shed light on how simple tool analysis explains how public action is structured in urban cultural diversity policymaking. One can provide cultural diversity services by coordinating those that are already in place. First, in Montreal, the Bureau des Affaires Interculturelles (office of intercultural affairs) supports different public services, inter-community relations, and coordinates different administrative branches in matters of immigration and cultural diversity. More generally, Quebec developed a partnership between the Ministère des Relations avec les Citoyens et de l'Immigration (the ministry for the relations with the citizens and immigrants [MRCI]) - and a network of community-based service providers that typically mediate between the provincial government and immigrants. As an aspect of the institutionalisation of cultural diversity one can consider how grant in-aid to nonprofit bodies can systematically nurture the activity of intercultural organisations in cities.

Secondly, Gilbert describes how in the USA community-based services offering help with various legal and social issues are generally provided with the support of the federal Homeland Security's Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. In California, the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA) offers information and education to newcomers and liaises with a network of more than 125 immigrant organisations. Grants support a multi-ethnic organisation that advocates for immigrant groups and organising campaigns on civil rights and working conditions. The production of services and reproduction of sub-cultural (for example, workers' union) activities is contrasting the support that each organisation gives to specific ethnic groups.

These examples prompt further research questions for the cultural diversity policy debate. Close scrutiny, at the urban level, of specific cases of policy tools being implemented might demonstrate the problems that arise from large international programmes (for example, the EU's). It might show how such large programmes influence the range of tools in urban cultural diversity policymaking or how such tools become established as part of the social structure. Similarly the intermingling of formerly discrete traditions or sub-cultures and support for cultural diversity through policies that cut across fixed cultural categories and groups can be explored in its technical and political dimensions through policy tool analysis.

In other policy fields, it is argued that some governance issues stem from how governments select and implement policy tools. Governments, for example may assume that subsidiarity automatically implies the use of policy tools that facilitate local interventions by public or nonprofit bodies. Also, changing the policy tools being deployed or initiating new ways of structuring public action can apparently have an impact on the definition of urban problems addressed by cultural diversity policies in general, but there is little evidence as to how far this is so. A more general question arises, beyond the scope of this research report: is it possible to detect common trends of institutional isomorphism in Europe such as privatisation or nonproftisation? Are these policy tool changes appearing under direct pressure of supranational programmes or simply by imitation?

3.3 RESEARCH METHOD FOR THE CASE STUDIES

The first three chapters set out to define a theoretical framework for the policy instruments adopted in cultural diversity policy in Europe. Also a set of features and their characteristics (coerciveness, directness, automaticity, visibility, effectiveness, efficacy, equity, manageability, legitimacy and political feasibility) were exposed and thoroughly debated in literature (see: Salamon 2002).

The next chapter describes local cultural centres providing services to culturally diverse groups in five European capital cities in different contexts in the last 20 years. The fifth chapter draws some comparisons from the different case studies, focusing in particular the policy tools that were deployed and what changes the cultural diversity policies brought about on governance. It proposes recommendations about how urban cultural diversity policy tools are designed and put into practice and also gives suggestions for further research.

The research was based on case studies, policy analysis, tool analysis and comparison. The cases are not intended to provide general overviews or comments on the cultural diversity policy in the city in which they are located. Nor does the report provide multicultural histories of individual cities, which have been amply explored in other publications.

The cases do not constitute the basis for general conclusions but for critically reflecting upon the questions posed in the first three chapters in different contexts. They make the first step for exploring emerging problems in urban cultural diversity policy and they can reveal technical and political aspects of the structuring of public action in given situations.

The case studies consider local cultural centres working in ethnically and culturally diverse neighbourhoods in five European capital cities: Helsinki, Paris, Rome, Tallin and Budapest. After a general socio-economic and institutional analysis going back to the 1990s, for each city one programme is considered and analysed under the policy tool lens in order to highlight relevant political and technical features. In particular the research looks at how direct government intervention and grants are deployed in different ways and discusses both their selection and their implementation. A practical consideration in the selection of the five cases has been the availability of data, studies and the relevance the case has already acquired in the international debate.

The research is based on secondary sources. These include documentary sources about the cultural diversity policies and tools, official records, national and local governments' databases, press and literary reviews, as well as existing data collections including social and economic statistics. The sources are available and form part of public and scientific debates promoted, among others, by the European Commission's European Culture Portal, the UNESCO database, ESPON, Labforculture. Other resources that have been drawn on include materials that are easily accessible, thanks to the extensive work carried out by international research networks both in the cultural policy and in the urban policy fields (Eurodiv, Agenda 21 for culture, Eurocult21, Eurocities, ENCATC, European Urban Research Association). The research used secondary data both for policy and network analysis and for specific policy tool analysis. The use of the policy tool as a unit of analysis facilitates the subsequent step of policy comparisons across national boundaries.

4. CULTURAL DIVERSITY TOOLS IN FIVE EUROPEAN CAPITALS

The research adopts the same protocol for each of the five cities. There is a brief description of the policy context and its institutional and social characteristics, plus data about the historic and emerging problems of cultural diversity in the city. Examples and snapshot descriptions of institutions and experiments in the field are included.

After a description of the policy tool selected in one specific programme for delivering services to culturally diverse population the definition and discussion of the tool highlights: the connection between technical and political dimensions of the analysed policy, the implications of the technical and political dimensions of the policy for the promotion of diverse culture, its institutionalisation and the opportunities for local cultural reproduction. An analysis of the above processes opens up a discussion of the structure of the local networks facing cultural diversity problems and how different tools shape the various courses of action that social actors and groups see as advantageous or disadvantageous, depending on their political and material resources.

In each case tool features are assessed for their effectiveness, efficacy, equity, manageability, legitimacy and feasibility, coerciveness, directness, automaticity, and political visibility. Where it is applicable context of the policy tool and how it is integrated to other policies and tools.

4.1 DIRECT GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN A COMMUNITY CENTRE IN BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

In the early 1990s the Hungarian government began to pay more attention to ethnic and national minorities within its borders. Hungary's principal minority is Roma (Ericarts, 2010).

“ *In regard to Budapest's multicultural tradition, it can be observed that the structure of the city is rather a mosaic; there are parts where different ethnic groups and minorities are grouped. However, the total number of minorities is less than five per cent and it is mostly the Jewish and Roma cultures that represent the multicultural tradition.*”

(Keresztély and Szabo, 2006, page 101)

Precise figures are difficult to obtain. These minorities are not newcomers; they have been living in Hungary for centuries and to some extent think of themselves not only as Roma or Jewish, and so on, but also as Hungarians and have to some extent assimilated.

Including the suburban area, Budapest has about four million inhabitants.

“ Since the political transition, [of the last twenty years] then Budapest’s urban development has thus been characterised by the preponderance of private investment and the disintegration of local policies as a result of the decentralisation of public administration. Urban planning practically disappeared for almost the whole of the last decade, and urban development strategies that were implemented during the last few years are now being used to try to fill the gaps that had been left by the complete lack of regulation earlier.’

(Keresztély and Szabo, 2006, page 99)

Some of the emerging problems in urban infrastructures and local competitiveness lead policymakers to think that Budapest might no longer be as economically attractive as it has been in recent years. The proliferation of institutions at the local level, sometimes has the effect of creating problems for decisionmaking and the coordination of urban policies. The Budapest city government allows official institutional activities in each district, rhetorically supporting multiculturalism and acknowledging its contribution to the cultural attractiveness of Budapest, but rarely taking the lead in proposing new strategies and implementing them.

Because the city wants to retain its position as a main international investment and business hub, Budapest’s city government stresses the importance of tourism and cultural activity, claiming its place alongside many other cities in Europe. Its public statements on this topic frequently mention the city’s multicultural history and its varied cultural scene. Yet multicultural policy initiated by the city is very limited and there are not many opportunities for grassroots initiatives to obtain public support and to promote cultural diversity activities at the neighbourhood level.

Cultural programming pays little heed to the cultural diversity of Budapest and Hungary. Roma cultural activities (for example, music) in particular tend to be simply integrated in the mainstream cultural market and performing system. There have however been an increasing number of cultural centres set up since 1993 thanks to central government finance. These centres have attracted more attention since 2001, when a Public Foundation for Hungarian National and Ethnic Minorities was established and endowed with significant resources and Roma political parties and representatives gained space in the Hungarian public sphere.

Urban policymakers interpret cultural liveliness and multicultural ambiance as a 'must have' in making cities culturally successful and commercially competitive. In some cases flagship cultural programmes are seen as an essential ingredient in urban redevelopment; in problematic Budapest neighbourhoods this has meant new cultural centres for the local community, including minorities.

In the mid-2000s Budapest started a number of urban renewal projects in neighbourhoods with problematic socio-economic conditions. These include, in the 2005-2008 period -Ferencváros (in the 9th district), Dzsumbuj by Illatos út, Kőbánya (10th district) and Jyzsefváros (8th district) including the Magdolna Quarter.

About 12,000 people live in the Magdolna Quarter; about 20 per cent of the inhabitants are Roma. The area has the highest unemployment rate in the city, low education rate, high presence of run-down and sometimes overcrowded public housing estates. Crime and drug abuse have been stigmatising the area for years. The renewal programme aims to improve social conditions, renew the public housing stock, redesign public spaces and allow social uses (for example, Mátyás square has been transformed with EU funds, streetscaping in among the housing blocks that were being renewed) and to provide social and cultural services for local population, including educational programmes targeting Roma and other disadvantaged people.

Part of the strategy was gradually to attract a local higher-income middle-class population: a controlled process of gentrification. Since most of the housing is still owned by the public sector this is an economically rational objective, although potentially inducing social tensions in the medium term. Most of the interventions, although originating in a top-down manner, adopted participatory approaches and involved the local population and local organisation in their implementation.

In 2008 an abandoned glove factory in Mátyás Square was converted into a community centre, hosting educational and cultural activities (including drama, dance, basic internet training, counselling and conflict management). It is for the local community and the broader public. This centre is an interesting example of government intervention in a flagship facility for sustaining cultural diversity in a difficult neighbourhood, and also plays an important part in the second strand of intervention that supports the transformation of Magdolna Quarter (Rév8, 2008).

The Glove Factory (Kestztyűgyár) Community Centre can be described as a direct government intervention by the municipality, namely 'the delivery or withholding of a good or service by government employees', (Leman, 2002, page 49), which is a very direct policy tool using bureaucracy to mobilise resources and carry out decisions. The cultural programmes are largely tailored for the local community, but the local administration's underlying objective of gentrification can also be

seen in activities that target the Budapest middle-class and aim to attract people from other areas, such as the Csango Hungarian Tanchaz, a folk dance programme, taking place every other week (Nagy, 2010).

The advantage of this policy tool - direct government intervention - is that it gives the municipality greater control over the standards and contents of the service provided. They can also retain control of the budget, appoint staff and so on, although many agencies make use of indirect means of delivering goods or services sometimes creating special apparatuses. Another important feature of this tool is that direct government is very visible. Embodied in the community centre's building, the presence and support of local government in the problematic Magdolna Quarter's central square is also physically visible.

This project needs to be seen in the context of the wider urban renewal programme: the Glove Factory Community Centre is one among other measures of urban design, housing policy, educational policy targeting the same area. This helps the centre gain the consensus of a broader set of actors, limiting potential conflicts during the implementation and in the coming years.

The actual creation of a centre for collecting cultural activity and diverse groups in this socially fragmented area and its effectiveness are important too. This policy can be seen as a central part of the municipality's 'inclusion' strategy, aimed at improving the attractiveness of the area for the middle class, while preserving its multicultural background (Nagy, 2010).

4.2 DIRECT GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN A MULTICULTURAL CENTRE IN HELSINKI, FINLAND

Finland is social democratic country with a strong welfare tradition (Esping Andersen, 1990). Most of its five million inhabitants live in the central and southern areas, where Helsinki, the capital is located and has a population of one million.

Helsinki only began to witness a real urbanisation trend after the 1939-45 war. After having a neutral position between the East and West block during the Cold War, Finland joined the European Union and formed natural links with the countries around the Baltic Sea, where part of the immigration comes from.

Today Finland is a relatively homogeneous country: it has two main national groups that are recognised and structurally supported - Finns and Swedish-speaking Finns. Due to its active policy of welcoming and integrating refugees and immigrants in general during the 1990s a significant

inflow of foreign population took place. Immigrants are recognised as a positive economic, political and social presence in the country and supported through an extensive welfare system. Social services are generally jointly provided by the state and the municipal government, including specific policies for the promotion of immigrant and refugee cultures. This means both direct service provisions and the support of voluntary associations (which are minority or immigrant associations as well as multicultural groups, generally facing first-generation migrants' problems). About the half of these associations operate in Helsinki metropolitan area (Mitchell, 2006), since this is the main centre of immigration. But their significant presence is acknowledged in Turku and Tampere as well.

“ *The municipalities are responsible for regional and local performing arts and other cultural service provision, for which they provide two thirds of the operative funding. They also maintain the infrastructure as well as providing support to local cultural and arts activities; and they also receive central government subsidies for both of these purposes.* ”

(Ericarts, 2009, webpage)

Finland's institutional structure assigns local government a considerable political role and partial fiscal autonomy. Cities provide public services, including cultural services. In general terms the responsibility for the provision of such services increased from the mid 1990s, maintaining a corporatist political character (Giersig, 2008). Income inequalities and strong socio-spatial segregation in the metropolitan area have been targeted also by city policies.

Another significant feature of Finland is a very widely accepted political culture of social democracy, promoting universal and equal access to welfare; widespread attachment to these values is almost independent from whichever political party happens to be in power. Sometimes the agenda is heavily influenced if not structured by corporations and parties. There is a background of strong trust in public institutions and in the role of the state as a positive force for solving social problems. Government administration has a reputation of being generally competent.

Since the 1990s Helsinki decided on providing positive responses to its immigration, ethnic and cultural diversity problems and as a strategy for a cohesive economic and urban growth. About 10 per cent of Helsinki residents have a foreign background; the largest minority groups are Estonians and Russians (City of Helsinki, 2009). Foreign nationals in Helsinki represent around 150 different nationalities and they have equal access to municipal social, educational and cultural services. This

becomes more evident when considering that the national cultural policy strategy for culturally diverse population shifted in the second half of the 2000s, from a perspective of cultural assimilation to a focus on labour migration, targeting specific work skills and human capital.

“ *The city of Helsinki applied the same approach as the Finnish state, which incorporates immigrants’ services into the existing sectoral system. In the provision of services, the educational, social and health issues, and services of immigrants were dealt with in the respective institutions (education department, social services department, health centre).’*

(Saukkonen and Pyykkönen, 2008, page 56).

This approach - of not segmenting services for minorities in any distinctive way - is borne out by the role of culture and cultural policy in Finnish political life; culture and cultural diversity are intended as means of integration only and not as valuable per se (Mitchell, 2006).

Since the 1970s Helsinki has had multi-purpose cultural centres, targeting local communities and has also had a longstanding debate about their role. For a detailed overview and analysis of the Stoa centre see Silvanto et al. (2008) ; and for an extensive analysis of the Girls’ House - Tyttöjen Talo see Laurent (2004).

Probably the most notable centre providing cultural services for the culturally diverse population of Helsinki is the Caisa International Cultural Centre in the city centre. It was opened in 1996, targeting Finnish, minority groups and immigrants, and aiming to support multicultural activities and intercultural dialogue, and also to enhance the opportunity of encounters between the immigrants and the local Finnish population.

The programme includes educational activities, arts, craftsmanship and cultural performances (dance, movies, poetry) in order to allow diverse cultural identities to be maintained and reproduce themselves, and to develop contacts with cultures other than their own. The Caisa centre is run by the cultural office of the city government. It also provides a range of services for coordinating other immigrants’ or multicultural centres various other welfare services, such as residence permits, housing and employment advice (Mitchell, 2006).

Caisa has a prominent role in multicultural services and activities for culturally diverse groups. Its

importance is underlined by its participation in decisionmaking at city level, for example, on the Helsinki Advisory Board on Immigration and Integration (Saukkonen and Pyykkönen, 2008). The undoubtedly positive impact of this cultural centre both on immigrants and people of Helsinki, however, led to significant political tensions in the second half of 2000s. Part of the reason for the tensions lay in the way local government had chosen to define the role of culture and of cultural policy - an approach that found itself criticised by some local politicians. However, looking at the way in which this specific policy tool influences public action can give us a deeper insight into this situation.

At Caisa, as at the Glove Factory in Budapest, one can see a very direct tool deployed by the local government, using bureaucracy to mobilise resources, carry out decisions and implement policy measures both in terms of producing given public goods and services and facilitating the functions of other institutions (for example, other social services for immigrants) or even enabling other institutions or individuals to carry out their mission.

Direct government sometimes implies a 'command and control' rationale. Nonetheless such an approach can have advantages because it can rely on existing administrative structures in managing, accounting and evaluating. But such directly provided services are vulnerable to politicians' who may decide to change policies and to cut a service, however successful, because of attempt in partial autonomy of the service itself. The creation of a subculture of employees sometimes clashes with more innovative interpretations of the public role, and this can be especially true in a policy sector such as multicultural services.

The case of Helsinki shows how in a context where moderate cultural diversity problems have been historically addressed by providing general welfare and social services and simply integrating such services with explicitly cultural diversity programme, that latter programme makes use of an existing policy mechanism such as direct intervention, leaning on the well structured local policy network and helping its coordination. The example shows the legitimacy of such interventions, but paradoxically how the city government's attempt to control because of its political visibility.

4.3 GRANT FOR THE RUSSIAN HOUSE IN TALLINN, ESTONIA

Estonia is small and heavily forested: it has a population of about 1.3 million, with more than 100 different ethnic groups, of which two predominate: Estonians (about 70 per cent) and Russians (25 per cent). Multiple immigration flows have characterised the country's history. When Estonia was part of the Soviet bloc there was a wave of immigration from Russia and as a result by 2000 this ethnic and linguistic component had risen to about one third of the population. When the Russian

Federation's strong linguistic, cultural and economic support of Russians in Estonia disappeared, a difficult process of recognition of citizenship started (including tests for knowledge of Estonia's language, history and legislation). About 10 per cent of the population were left without official citizenship: people who were born in Estonia of parents of non-Estonian origin and did not acquire citizenship are defined 'stateless'.

Since national independence in the early 1990s cultural policies have been increasingly including private actors.

“ Since 2000, state policies towards non-citizens and ethnic minorities have been formulated in a general action plan entitled *Integration in Estonian Society 2000-2007*. The programme is coordinated by the quasi-governmental *Non-Estonians' Integration Foundation*, established in 1998. The programme discusses integration in Estonian society as being shaped by two processes: firstly, the social harmonisation of society, around “a strong common national core”, based on knowledge of the Estonian language and Estonian citizenship; and secondly, the opportunity to maintain ethnic differences, based on the recognition of the cultural rights of ethnic minorities.’

(Ericarts, 2009 webpage)

Since the early 2000, integration policies were implemented also thanks to a newly created quasi-governmental agency. The Non-Estonian's Integration Foundation, cited above, has been operating directly in the fields of education and language training for adults, as well as supporting minority cultural centres that promote cultural activities and provide stateless citizens with advice and guidance about applying for citizenship. It is local government that is responsible for most cultural activities in Estonia, and there is significant inequality of provision between more affluent cities, such as Tallinn and those with more limited budgets for culture.

Furthermore,

“ civic cultural organizations and private cultural establishments of a non-profit nature [...] are, however essentially dependent on support from the state budget, from which their main resource requirements are received as subsidies’

(Lagerspetz and Joons, 2006, page 192).

With a population of about 400,000 people, about 54 per cent of Tallinn the population is Estonian, 36 per cent Russian and 10 per cent people of other origins. Tallinn has the largest number of non-EU nationals of all the capital cities of the EU (CLIP, 2010) mainly because of the Russian population. Second-generation Russians face significant problems in integrating in the social and economic structure in Tallinn as well as in enjoying their own cultural heritage (for an extensive discussion of these points see, among others, Vetik and Helemge, 2010).

Ethnic Russians are highly concentrated in some districts of Tallinn. There are some problems of spatial segregation and of concentration in public housing (Lagerspetz and Joons, 2006). Russians experience higher unemployment rates, lower education attainments and proficiency in Estonian. There does not seem to be any obvious political campaigning about this minority's inequality, nor are there apparent conflicts in the city. Some commentators maintain that two parallel communities live in Tallinn; others argue that the system of education, institutional information and media consumption tend to perpetuate such a divide. Nonetheless there are stable cultural activities and organisations that are common to different groups.

An increasing commitment to intercultural dialogue is in evidence. In Tallinn the programme Kodurahu ('peace in the community'), was designed and implemented aiming at improving the relationship between Estonians and non-Estonians, at improving common cultural activities and values as the basis for a better coexistence among the two communities. In the city government cultural diversity is evidently an important topic.

“ *The city mayor of Tallinn is the leader of the Council of Minorities, the platform for discussions and the consultative body for the decisions on minority issues. The City Office of Tallinn is responsible for the cultural diversity policy. The main person responsible in this field is the city secretary who is appointed by the city mayor. In the city council, 20 out of the 61 seats belong to representatives from national minorities who are active in the committees in the areas of culture, education and social affairs, and present the point of view of the Russian-speaking minority.*”

(CLIP, 2010, page 13).

The main tool adopted by the city government to support cultural services and more particularly those concerned with multicultural and minority activities is the grant (Lagerspetz and Joons, 2006).

In the city government the heritage department is in charge of cultural diversity policy, along with preservation of heritage buildings, supporting artistic production and promoting international cultural cooperation. The department supports the activity of many cultural centres, including those that provide cultural services targeting culturally diverse population, such as Tallinna Toomklubi in the city centre, Culture Centre of Pelgulinna (Pelgulinna Rahvamaja), which specialises in music, the popular Culture Centre of Salme (Salme Kultuurikeskus), and the Culture Centre of Lindakivi (Lindakivi Kultuurikeskus), which promotes multiculturalism in Lasnmae district where a high percentage of the Russian speaking population lives.

The Russian Culture Centre (Vene Kultuurikeskus) is probably the main centre for the Russian minority cultural life. It acts as an umbrella organisation for other cultural associations for other Slavic, Ukrainian and Belorussian minorities. Its main activity is related to theatre and music.

“ *The city of Tallinn has supported activities undertaken by minority organisations that contribute to the development of national culture or cooperation between different groups living in the city. An outstanding example of the financial support obtained by the Russian-speaking community is the renovation of the Russian House and sponsorship of its activities [...]. This prestigious building is located in the centre of the city and since its restoration has become a renowned concert hall. According to the city authorities, this is the only Russian culture centre outside Russia entirely sponsored by local authorities. The centre hosts a variety of events such as concerts, theatrical performances and workshops for children.* ”

(CLIP, 2010, page 11)

The Russian House building is provided by the direct intervention of the state, but the tool adopted here for providing culturally diverse services is the grant. This makes the Russian House an interesting case:

“ *Grants are payments from a donor government to a recipient organization (typically public or nonprofit) or an individual. More specifically, they are a gift that has the aim of either “stimulating” or “supporting” some sort of service or activity by the*

recipient, whether it be a new activity or an ongoing one.'

(Beam and Conlan, 2002, page 341)

Grants can take various forms, from cash payments to in-kind resources, such as land or equipment.

The shift from a state-centred system to one basically relying on nonprofit organisations to provide cultural services made it possible for a wide range of cultural policy actors representing diverse political constituencies to take part in cultural activities, even if they still depend mainly on local or central government resources. The operation of a grant programme generally starts with the legislative creation and establishment. In the case of the Russian House getting such a mandate involved several sessions of discussion in the city council and also in a special commission for national minorities.

The process of budget-setting and of redistribution of resources among cultural organisations targeting minority groups is a form of political recognition. Nonetheless a limited competition among programmes probably curbed the innovation in programmes and the opportunity of sub-cultural hybridisation. More importantly the selection of appropriate recipients and awarding or allocation of funds for providing cultural services to the Russian minority firmly identified this particular ethnic group as the dominant minority even though different Slavonic groups were entitled to take part in the centre's activities and to be represented in the Russian House programme of events and activities. The pattern is repeated in other centres in Tallinn.

In this case, the definition of grantees - which is a specific characteristic of the technical function of this policy tool - is determined by the existing conditions. The distribution of resources is a political process which on one side allows higher recognition of minorities to have an important role in building and maintaining local cultural identity in Tallinn, and which, on the other side, is not interpreted as a chance to induce cultural innovation and cultural hybridization through (at least partial) redefinitions of cultural groups and activities.

4.4 GRANT-IN-AID FOR MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMMES IN ROME, ITALY

In Italy the Constitution has recognised the rights of cultural and linguistic minorities to be adequately represented since the end of the Second World War. Recent Italian governments have addressed the effects of immigration in different and sometimes contradictory ways (Ericarts, 2010), depending on the orientation of the political coalition in power at the time.

The immigrant population in Italy is about 7 per cent, one of the highest proportions in Europe;

immigrants live mainly in large and middle-size cities. Generally the recognition of temporary permits has been interpreted as work permits. The government led by Silvio Berlusconi made illegal immigration a crime carrying penalties of detention and mandatory repatriation. There has been a great deal of public debate about the problems related to illegal immigration and temporary detention camps (for example, the one on the island of Lampedusa).

There is evidence that even legal immigrants have poor access to social services; cultural services for minorities are limited and mostly depend on decisions at the level of local government. Recently some regional governments promoted social and cultural services explicitly devoted to the recognition, protection and integration of culturally diverse population, such as first and second generation immigrants. Regional governments often provide support for cultural organisations. County level governments (provincial) and city governments also provide various cultural services.

In Rome, a metropolitan city of about 2.6 million inhabitants, with approximately 330,000 foreigners, is divided into 20 municipalities (Municipi), each with their political representatives and specific policies, including the cultural field. Since the mid 1990s and after the enlargement of the European Union in 2004 Rome has witnessed significant numbers of newcomers from north Africa and from eastern Europe. There are more than 190 different ethnic groups living in Rome and an overall percentage of foreigners of 8.5 per cent (Bodo and Bodo, 2006). The central area of the Municipio I has a significantly high percentage (about 25 per cent) of immigrants.

The city of Rome has been a forerunner in integration policies, since immigration was to a great extent linked to the city's need for a service sector workforce. A city councillor for multiethnic policy was established in 2001 coordinating different policies that are relevant for integration (for example, social services, education, health).

In the Esquilino neighbourhood of the Municipio I, the lively Intermundia Festival started in the early 1990s (Bodo and Bodo, 2006) and in 2006 began to set up pilot multicultural centres in public schools, known as Intermundia centres. The centre in Municipio I was among the first five to be opened; it was promoted by the students' parents and supported with grants-in-aid by the municipal, city and provincial governments.

The Intermundia centres promoted the mutual understanding of different cultures through language courses, ethnic and multicultural art performances and exhibitions, conferences. The overall budget for each year was about €1m. This small structure using public school personnel and facilities together with volunteers provided a very diffused and effective intercultural service among schoolchildren and their families. It reached not only children and families in the schools where the

centres were based, but those in more than 300 Roman schools. The festival showcased the multicultural work to a still larger public.

In 2009, however, the new right-wing city government discontinued its grant and suspended the festival. Despite this blow, the festival and the network of Intermundia centres survived, thank to the support of the Municipi, the provincial government and nonprofit associations such as Arci Solidarieta, providing grants and support. In 2011, after one year's break, the festival moved to the Municipio XV and reopened.

The high level of 'transparency' of grants stems from that grant-givers stipulate activities and benchmarks that grant recipients must be seen to comply with. The transparency increased the legitimacy of such multicultural policies and motivated the voluntary intervention of other organisations than the City. This transparency and visibility could prompt debates and discussion over the appropriateness of the funding and its actual use, but nonetheless can be a clear political target for opponents.

The fact that the grant-in aid is a 'light policy tool' for government bodies, in that it makes use of existing structures - in Rome it used the public schools and local community associations - for delivering public services makes it relatively easy to set up the grant and the programme but equally easy to cut the grant, regardless of the practical and political relevance it may have. Because the Intermundia centres and the festival were managed by the public schools and by the local community associations made it possible for local level institutions to keep the activities going and for the whole programme to be promoted, on a smaller scale, by regional level institutions and social actors.

The development and maintenance of the structure of local public action for providing a diverse population with cultural services would have looked very different if other policy tools had been deployed (if the service had been provided directly by the city government, with its own directly employed staff, for example, then probably the multicultural service would have simply disappeared).

4.5 A EUROPEAN GRANT FOR ETHNICALLY DIVERSE POPULATION IN PARIS, FRANCE

France is an interesting context in matters of immigration and multicultural policymaking. It has developed a centralised system in providing both social and cultural services. In 2006 there were about 3.5 million foreign citizens in France - 5.7 per cent of the overall population of 61.5 million (Ministère de l'Immigration, de l'Intégration, l'Identité Nationale et du Développement Solidaire [MIIC], 2009). The major groups come from EU countries (1.2 million) and those from north-west Africa (1.1 million, mainly Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia). However if one also counts people born

outside France who have become French citizens the total figure for minority groups goes up to about five million.

There are several public institutions with the task of addressing the problems experienced by immigrant population, such as the National Agency for Social Cohesion and Equal Opportunities (Agence nationale pour la cohésion sociale et l'égalité des chances), whose the mission is to fight against discrimination and to targeting problematic urban areas with integrated programmes (combining social service, education, health, employment, cohesion, security and cultural services).

Also non-territorial institutions have been working against discrimination and for the equal economic and cultural opportunities, such as the Haute autorité de lutte contre les discriminations et pour l'égalité (High Authority of Combat against Discrimination and for Equality) and more recently the Committee against Discrimination.

Recent national policy has been trying to limit immigration. For example in 2007 President Sarkozy established the Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and co-Development (Ministère de l'Immigration, de l'Intégration l'Identité Nationale et du Développement Solidaire). Its task is to promote French national identity and integrate culturally diverse populations; it is also attempting to restrict immigration by supporting the development of those countries from which immigrants tend to come. The centralised character of the French system of government has tended to result in city governments having a marginal role in decisionmaking in this policy field.

Immigrants concentrate in the metropolitan areas (they make up about 18 per cent of the population in Paris and more than 10 per cent in Lyon and Marseille) and in the wider Parisian region, which historically has consolidated and problematic dense localisation of low income and immigrant population, typically in the neighbourhoods in which public housing predominates. The Chinese community, for instance, which since the 1980s has risen to an estimated 100,000 people, is mainly concentrated in the 3rd and 11th arrondissements (districts) and in Belleville.

In its 20 arrondissements, the city of Paris has been a laboratory for cultural diversity in the last decades. The centralised policymaking have always granted the equality in the treatment of immigrants. For example affirmative action was experimented with by setting a quota of pupils living in designated 'priority zones' to be admitted to higher education institutions, without regard to the students' countries of origin. The issue was considered important enough for the city of Paris to create a special unit, called 'Mission Integration'.

Mission Integration submitted an application to the co-financed EQUAL programme promoted by the

European Union, for a programme called 'European Chinese and integration'. The grant covers 50 per cent of the budget and poses specific requirements for applicants. The goal of the programme was integration, specifically targeting work-oriented services to young and in particular female members of the Chinese community. The grant called for partnership with the local community, such as local associations and actors, but not explicitly mentioning representatives of the Chinese community.

Fourot (2007) explains that although this programme typified several traditional characteristics of French national policymaking and included a typical set of participants, in part the way in which it was to be implemented induced some innovation and potential criticality. The typically French tradition of making policy applicable to every citizen and equal in its treatment of different populations was under stress because the programme was shaped for one specific ethnic group, the Chinese community (ethnic origin as such has no legal validity in French law). The hierarchies in public action are not different from the traditional ones since it is the public sector dealing with other agencies. Direct participation of the target community is limited.

This case shows how the definition of the policy target in international policy arena and its local implementation through non-coercive instruments can lead to conforming the policy contents, even if the latter are in partial contrast with universal principles of a given policy context.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

The conclusions of this exploration into policy tools for urban cultural diversity are two-fold. First the main findings and their implications for problems of urban cultural diversity will be summarised and discussed in the light of the comparison among the cases in the five European cities. The section will pay particular attention to how similar multicultural questions and rationales took different paths, as a result of different policy instruments having been deployed. Secondly, I will focus on the research issues and perspectives that have emerged from this theoretical and empirical research.

5.1 CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN EUROPEAN CAPITAL CITIES

The first chapter discussed the multiple faces of multicultural and cultural diversity debates. In each of the five selected cities there are countless problems and policy opportunities that could have been investigated; and in each one could find different interpretations of the meaning of multiculturalism and cultural diversity. The common elements in the five cities does not imply that there is a common definition of cultural diversity there or elsewhere in Europe; nor that this lack of agreed definition should be perceived as a problem. My deliberate selection of cases and the use of the same research protocol and type secondary data tend to render the kinds of policies analysed through their tools comparable but, at the same time, all rather similar. This may make comparison easier but it offers only a limited view on the variety of cultural diversity policies. A more systematic and ample development of case studies has not been possible in this work, but evidently it can lead to more detailed findings in this policy field.

The limited number of cases considered implies that the following considerations cannot be generalised. In the multicultural services that were observed, selected as they were from among the most studied ones in longstanding international debates, there are substantially different definitions of cultural diversity.

In Helsinki the main goal of the policy that led to Caisa was the structural social integration of Helsinki's migrants and minority groups. Cultural activities were not directly intended as a means to promote assimilation of cultural minorities. Minority groups were enabled to create, take part in and enjoy seeing a range of cultural events and activities and cultural reproduction. Nonetheless in this interpretation, cultural diversity policy is clearly envisaged as a means for reducing social problems that are attributed to the presence of culturally diverse populations in Helsinki.

A similar pragmatic logic to that of the Finnish authorities lay behind the cultural diversity services provided in Paris. In Paris the approach also implies a 'mosaic multiculturalism' perspective. Yet one can say that giving cultural, educational and social services to help one particular community to better integrate into the economic and social system does not imply that other minority group is in

any better condition or more integrated, nor that eventual distance between groups is bridged.

An interpretation of mosaic multiculturalism focusing more on art can be seen in the case of Tallinn. Art and cultural expression are at centre stage in the Russian House. Of course the significant presence of the Russian minority in the city and in Estonia legitimates an intervention for culture's sake.

In the two other cases - Budapest and Rome - the idea of promoting cultural activities for a culturally diverse population relied more on a 'hodgepodge' interpretation of multiculturalism. The authorities' intention was to support the community of the stigmatised neighbourhood in Budapest, whatever ethnic or cultural background residents came from. Encouraging cultural liveliness (and its attractiveness for the middle class) was also seen by the city government as a means of regenerating and potentially gentrifying a neighbourhood with currently a high percentage of publicly-owned housing.

In Budapest one can see how a hodgepodge interpretation of multiculturalism and cultural diversity policy can be instrumental to urban planning goals that go beyond initiatives for attracting tourists and promoting the city. It is difficult to say if the programme of the centre contributed to eliminate the stigma of the Magdolna Quarter, or even to have significant impact other than symbolic.

The programme of Intermundia in Rome, in the culturally diverse area of Municipio I, seems aimed at enhancing mutual understanding between indigenous Italian residents and immigrant populations; it also has general educational goals.

With all these varying interpretations of the meaning of cultural diversity policy in cities, even in a fairly narrow policy arena, the problems of making comparisons is self-evident and confirms the need of clearly defined analytical units. Some of the programmes and of the urban contexts mentioned have already been subjected to attempts at comparison (Ilczuk and Isar 2006). Policy tool analysis revealed other insights into technical matters and political dynamics thrown up by such a range of cultural diversity policies.

The roles of the local government and of the public sector and their partnerships with nonprofit organisations, cultural associations and social actors was synthesised through the definition of the adopted tools (for example, in terms of direct government intervention and of the use of different types of grants). Significant dilemmas and paradoxes faced by public bodies can easily be highlighted: the double roles and interests, for example, of the local Budapest administration in the Magdolna neighbourhood.

Another evident dilemma is exemplified by the clash (or correspondence) between the political goals of the party currently in power and the relative stability of the structure of public action that is being taken in response to what are seen as cultural diversity problems. Tighter control by local government through an effective administrative system may paradoxically produce structures that are difficult to dismantle. Support to nonprofit or voluntary organisations through grants coming from different institutional sources can make the voluntary organisations more resilient if the political orientation of one of the institutions changes, as happened in Rome to the Intermundia centres and the festival. Focusing on these mechanisms of public action and their effects is of course an analytical device; it does not offer a predictor of governance effects, since many governance dynamics depend on contextual conditions that are virtually impossible to model.

Considering both the five analysed cases and those mentioned in the first three chapters, one can say that there is not any peculiarity in the selection of cultural diversity policy tools, except for the regulation that may have been made for accommodating minority cultural needs, which was beyond the scope of this research. Policy tools are selected because they already exist, because decision makers in the party in power can easily envisage the structure of public action that flows from choosing them, and can - supposedly - foresee the political advantages that will be gained by one or more of the actors in the decisionmaking game.

Analysing the use of policy tools at the urban level led to another consideration. There are evident technical implications in the selection of policy tools for supporting cultural diversity, which are sometimes more important than the general prevailing interpretation of multiculturalism, although the latter can implicitly (and ideologically) suggest certain types of tools, as was argued in the first chapter. Also the technical ability of the local government to respond to political goals, legitimacy problems and to particular constituencies may completely depend on what type of policy tool is chosen for a given cultural service.

In this sense decision makers should thoroughly consider the different options that are available in terms of urban policy tools for supporting cultural diversity and cultural services. Of course the analytic grid proposed here is one of the ways of understanding the structure of public responses to cultural diversity problems and opportunities at the urban level. It is difficult to expect a systematic improvement without a broader research effort, since policy tool analysis is not widespread and poses specific problems, which will be discussed briefly in the last section of the chapter.

5.2 UNDERSTANDING URBAN AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY THROUGH ITS POLICY TOOLS

The different interpretations of multiculturalism and cultural diversity have a strong influence on the shaping of local cultural diversity policies. The structure of public action can be described in terms of the policy tools selected; this structure helps explain technical and political links in the provision of cultural service and how cultural diversity policies become embedded in existing institutions.

The five examples showed that diverse communities and socio-cultural groups were labelled as such in order to face a set of urban problems, sometimes related to immigration, sometimes related to artistic production or to education. These labels were partly a technical measure for shaping the policy problem and tackling it with a specific intervention. Yet the decision to target a specific minority population or preferring to support particular providers of cultural diversity service is a political choice, implemented through a specific policy tool.

The degree of control over service provision in problematic neighbourhoods is also a political question that is often dominated by tool selection, since it can, at least to some extent, harness processes of cultural reproduction and diversification (as for the case of Rome) or perhaps be an attempt to destigmatise the way in which neighbourhoods are perceived, as the middle-class cultural activities in the low-income Magdolna neighbourhood exemplify.

An examination of grant mechanisms helps to illustrate how much tool selection can shape the control over service provision. The final target population is often defined in ethnic, religious or national origin terms. Similarly the kinds of cultural activities that are included are somewhat determined by the design of the grant as a specific policy tool. It would be difficult to attribute this to an explicit ideological orientation towards any particular interpretation of multiculturalism or cultural diversity. Nonetheless the opportunities of intervention structured by one policy tool in particular clearly has a more direct effect than some other tools in how cultural service provision and public action become embedded in existing institutions.

The fact that a grant from a European programme (together with the grant's conditions) led the Parisian local government to target the Chinese population only is a meaningful example if seen in the context of the universalistic French system. More generally one can say that focusing on policy tools for cultural diversity and the context in which they are selected and deployed can explain the public recognition and promotion of cultural diversity in given circumstances, more effectively than focusing on multicultural approaches as a whole or on entire policy programmes for cultural diversity.

The advantage of preferring to focus on policy tools can be seen when it comes to investigating how cultural policy tools are selected in different urban contexts. In cities where there has been a thorough political debate about the problems and potential policy for culturally diverse population, where the national legal and institutional framework has developed a solid context and there are existing regulations, designed to be inclusive as well as explicit measures for accommodating cultural diversity, then individual urban and cultural diversity policies tend to have less impact on the social exclusion that is implicitly being addressed by cultural diversity policies. The mechanisms selected for deploying cultural diversity policies can be less charged with political implications and value. Indeed one might consider the lower pressure exerted by social and urban movements and more simply by diverse political constituency over policy measures, as it was discussed in the second chapter.

It is important to say that the design of urban cultural diversity policies can be based on a fairly fixed notion of ethnicity - targeting one particular sub-culture or discrete groups - or it can envisage a mixture of minorities engaged in intermingling their respective cultural heritage and activities. Whatever the original approach final outcomes are part of a more complex and unpredictable process that is only partially structured by policy tools. How the policy problem is perceived and set, how the proposed solution is decided on can depend on the tools that are available or that decision makers prefer, for the reasons that were set out in the fourth chapter.

5.3 CULTURAL DIVERSITY POLICY TOOLS: FURTHER THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL RE-SEARCH IN EUROPEAN CITIES

I believe the problems, analyses and findings of this research can contribute to improving the design of further empirical research about cultural diversity policy with specific reference to the urban environment. Besides being expanded and used in single-city policy evaluation, the approach selected for this paper can lead to a better understanding of cultural diversity policy trends through a more systematic data collection in European cities and beyond.

The research discussed and documented why the understanding of cultural diversity policy tools at the urban level is important but needs further improvement. A number of research problems derived from the use of secondary data only. First of all there was the challenge of detecting and reducing biases introduced by the documents' original authors, since these resources and data were collected for different purposes and through both different quantitative and qualitative methods. Secondly the information was limited to that available in Italian, English and French - the languages I know - which restricted the scope of the research especially for Tallinn and Budapest.

Nonetheless the richness of materials available in this policy field may push researchers and policymakers to undertake the effort of better organising and interlinking the information that international organisations and states already produce. In my opinion, international and local policymaking promoting cultural diversity can benefit from this knowledge. Of course, there are many possible ways of organising the data and making them accessible for research and governing institutions, local public and private actors and NGOs. The scope of this research was too narrow to produce results that could be generalised and applied at the European level, but it has tested the feasibility and potentials of such systematic organisation of secondary data and analysis through the policy tool unit of analysis.

One theoretical contribution of this research is to show that the analytical unit of the policy tool can fruitfully be adopted not only in studying urban cultural diversity policies but also in comparing them across different countries. The available data can be easily be matched with different primary sources of information (such as semistructured interviews with decision makers and privileged observers of the cultural policies, or on-site inquiry and urban mapping and so on). Of course this integration would require longer and more costly research.

The expansion of policy tool research in the field of cultural diversity and with reference to the urban environment and its international comparison can provide the evidence of current trends of cultural diversity policy, such as non-profitisation or privatisation, and can usefully contribute international debates and decisionmaking processes. Even if the interpretation of multiculturalism and cultural diversity varies from context to context, the change in the toolboxes in this policy field can be detected by longitudinal collection of data and can be referred to broader national reforms, or the pressure of European institutions.

REFERENCES

- Amin A** (2002) 'Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity', *Environment and Planning A*, 34(6), 959-980
- Appadurai A** (1996) *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Barry B** (2002) *Culture and equality: an egalitarian critique of multiculturalism*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press
- Beam D R, Conlan T J** (2002) 'Grants', in Salamon L M (ed) (2002) *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 340-380
- Bemelmans-Vidéc M L, Rist R C, Vedung E** (eds) (1998) *Carrots, sticks, and sermons, policy instruments and their evaluation*, New Brunswick: Transaction
- Benhabib S** (1999) "Nous" et "les autres": the politics of complex cultural dialogue in a global civilization', in Joppke C, Lukes S (eds) (1999) *Multicultural questions* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 44-62
- Bennet T** (2008) 'Culture et différence: le défis du multiculturalisme' in Bonet L, Négrier E (eds) (2008) *La fin des cultures nationales? les politiques culturelles à l'épreuve de la diversité*, Paris: La Découverte, 19-31
- Bloemraad I** (2002) 'The Naturalization Gap: An Institutional Approach to Citizenship Acquisition in Canada and the United States' *International Migration Review*, 36(1), 194-229
- Bloemraad I** (2005) 'The limits of de Tocqueville: How government facilitates organizational capacity in newcomer communities', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31, 865-887
- Bloemraad I** (2006) *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press
- Bodo C, Bodo S** (2006) 'Cultural diversity and cultural policies in the metropolitan area of Rome', in Ilczuk D, Isar Y R (eds) (2006) *Metropolises of Europe. Diversity in urban cultural life*, Warsaw: CIRCLE, 134-183
- Body-Gendrot S, Martiniello M** (eds) (2000) *Minorities in European cities: The dynamics of social integration and social exclusion at the neighbourhood level*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Bonet L, Négrier E (eds) (2008) *La fin des cultures nationales? les politiques culturelles à l'épreuve de la diversité*, Paris: La Découverte Grenoble, PACTE

Bosswick, W and Lüken-Klaßen, D (2010) *Diversity policy in employment and service provision. case study: Tallinn, Estonia*,
retrieved from: <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2010/3817/en/1/EF103817EN.pdf>

Castells M (1972) *La question urbaine*, Paris: Maspéro

Castells M (1983) *The city and the grass roots: A cross-cultural theory of urban social movements* Berkeley CA: University of California Press

City of Helsinki (2009) *Arts & culture in Helsinki*, accessed, 25 February 2012 at
http://www.hel2.fi/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/05_02_17__askelo_vb6.pdf

Clark T N (ed) (2004) *The city as entertainment machine*, Oxford: Elsevier

CLIP (2009) 'Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)' retrieved from <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef091712.htm>.

CLIP (2010) 'Intercultural policies and intergroup relations Case study: Tallinn, Estonia' retrieved from <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2010/3817/en/1/EF103817EN.pdf>

Dahl R A (1961) *Who governs?* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961

Dahl R A, Lindblom C E (1953) *Politics, economics and welfare*, New York: Harper

Dewey J (1927) *The public and its problems*, New York: Henry Holt & Company

Dewey J (1935) *Liberalism and social action*, New York: Putnam's Sons

DiMaggio P J, Powell W W (1983) 'The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields', *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-60

DiMaggio P J, Powell W W (eds) (1991) *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Eliadis P, Hill M M, Howlett M (2005) 'Introduction' in Eliadis P, Hill M M, Howlett M (eds) (2005) *Designing government: from instruments to governance*, Montreal and Ithaca: McGill Queen's University Press, 3-20

ERICarts [Council of Europe] (2009 and subsequent years) *Compendium of cultural policies and trends in Europe*, 2009 edition and subsequent years, retrieved from www.ericarts.org

Esping Andersen G (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Oxford: Polity Press

Esping Andersen G (1999) *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Estèbe P (2004) 'Les quartiers, une Affaire d'Etat, un instrument territorial', in Lascoumes P, Le Galès P (eds) (2004) *Gouverner par les instruments*, Paris: Les presses de Sciences Po, 47-70

Fainstein S S (2005) Cities and diversity: Should we want it? Can we plan for it? *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(1), 3-19

Fainstein S S (2010) *The just city*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Fainstein N I, Fainstein S S (1974) *Urban political movements: The search for power by minority groups in american cities*, Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall

Fainstein S S, Hirst C (1995) *Urban social movements*, in Judge, D., Stoker, G. And Wolman, H. (eds) (1995) *Theories of urban politics*, Newbury Park: Sage, 181-204

Florida R (2002) *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books

Florida R (2005) *Cities and the creative class*. London: Routledge

Fourot A C (2007) 'Gouvernance et apprentissage social au niveau local : la mise en place d'un programme d'initiative communautaire à Paris', *Politique européenne* 2007, 22, 197-220

Gagnon A G, Jouve B (2009) 'Political minorities in urban centers: Strategies and resources' in Jouve B, Gagnon A G (eds) (2009) *Facing cultural diversity: cities under stress*, Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon, 123-138

Gagnon A G, Jouve B (eds) (2006) *Le métropoles au défi de la diversité culturelle*, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble

Gagnon A G (2009) 'Cities, cultural diversity and political change', in Gagnon A G Jouve B (2009) *Facing cultural diversity: Cities under stress*, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 7-23

Germain A, Alain M (2009) 'On the virtues of adhocrcy: Managing diversity in metropolitan Montréal' in Jouve B, Gagnon A G (eds) (2009) *Facing cultural diversity: cities under stress*, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 105-122

Giersig N (2008) *Multilevel urban governance and the "European City": discussing metropolitan reforms in Stockholm and Helsinki*, Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften

Gilbert L (2009) 'Negotiating diversity: Tensions between national discourses and urban practices in North America' in Gagnon A G, Jouve B (2009) *Facing cultural diversity: Cities under stress*, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 67-83

Guiraudon V (2009) 'La diversité en Europe: une évidence?', *Raisons politiques*, 35(3), 67-86

Gutman A (1994) 'Introduction', in Gutman A (ed) *Multiculturalism. Examining the politics of recognition*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3-24

Hall P, Taylor R C R (1998) 'Political science and the three new institutionalisms' in Soltan K E, Uslaner E M, Haufler V (1998) *Institutions and social order*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 15-43

Hannerz U (1989) 'Notes on the Global Ecumene' *Public Culture*, 1(2), 66 – 75

Hannerz U (1996) *Transnational connections: culture, people, places* London: Routledge

Hargrove E (1975) *The missing link: The study of the implementation of social policy*, Washington DC: The Urban Institute

Heller A (1996) 'The many faces of multiculturalism' in Baubock R, Heller A, Zolber AR (1996) *The challenge of diversity: integration and pluralism in societies of immigration*, Brookfield: Avebury, 25-41

Helsinki [City of Helsinki, Statistics] 'Foreigners in Helsinki 2008', retrieved from http://www.hel2.fi/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/09_04_30_Tilasto_9_Tikkanen.pdf

Hill M M (2005) *Tools as art: observations on the choice of governing instrument*, in Eliadis P, Hill M M, Howlett M (eds) (2005) *Designing government: from instruments to governance*, Montreal and Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 21-30

Hood C (1983) *The tools of government*. London, Macmillan, Chatham House

Howard C (2002) 'Tax expenditures' in Salamon L M (ed) (2002) *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 410-44

Howlett M (1991) 'Policy instruments, policy styles, and policy implementation: National approaches to theories of instrument choice', *Policy Studies Journal*, 19(2), 1-21

Howlett M (2005) 'What is a policy instrument? Policy tools, policy mixes, and policy implementation styles', in Eliadis P, Hill M M, Howlett M (eds) (2005) *Designing government: from instruments to governance*, Montreal and Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 31-50

Ilczuk D, Isar Y R (eds) (2006) *Metropolises of Europe. Diversity in urban cultural life*. Warsaw: CIRCLE

Integration Foundation (2007) *Tallinn Conference on Conceptualising Integration*, retrieved from www.meis.ee/raamatukogu?action=download2&book_id=171

Joppke C, Lukes S (1999) 'Introduction: multicultural questions' in Joppke C, Lukes S (eds) (1999) *Multicultural questions* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-24

Jouve B (2005) 'La démocratie en métropoles: gouvernance, participation et citoyenneté' *Revue française de science politique*, 55(2), 317-337

Jouve B, Gagnon A G (eds) (2006) *Les métropoles au défi de la diversité culturelle*, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble

Jouve B, Gagnon A G (2009b) 'Political minorities in urban centers: Strategies and resources' in Jouve B, Gagnon A G (eds) (2009) *Facing cultural diversity: cities under stress*, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 123-138

Kassim H, Le Galès P (2010) 'Exploring governance in a multi-level polity: A policy instruments approach', *Western European Politics*, 33(1), 1-21

Kastoryano R (ed) (2009) *An identity for Europe: The relevance of multiculturalism in EU construction*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Kelly P (ed) (2002) *Multiculturalism reconsidered. Culture and equality and its critics*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Keresztély K, Szabo J Z (2006) 'Budapest: Regaining multiculturalism?' in Ilczuk D, Isar Y R (eds) (2006) *Metropolises of Europe. Diversity in urban cultural life*, Warsaw: CIRCLE, 98-133

Kettunen P (2001) 'The Nordic welfare state in Finland', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 26(3), 225-247

Kymlicka W (2007) *Multicultural odysseys: navigating the new international politics of diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kymlicka W (2009) 'The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies' in Vertovec S, Wessendorf S (eds) (2009), *The multiculturalism backlash: European discourses, policies, and practices*, New York: Routledge, 32-49

Kymlicka W (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

Laakso S, Kostiaainen E (2008) "European Metropolises. Helsinki 2008. The Baltic Sea Cities in the European Context", retrieved from http://www.hel2.fi/Tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/08_12_30_Tilasto_45_Suokas.pdf

Labelle M, Marhraoui A (2001) 'Intégration et multiculturalisme: discours et paradoxes', in Y. Resch (ed) *Définir l'intégration, Actes du colloque de l'Association Internationale d'Études Québécoises et Institut d'Études Politiques*, Montréal: XYZ éditeur, 19-31

LacARRIERE M (2008) 'La construction des imaginaires locaux et des identités culturelles dans le cadre de la mondialisation' Bonet L, Négrier E (eds) (2008) *La fin des cultures nationales?: les politiques culturelles à l'épreuve de la diversité*, Paris: La Découverte, 33-52

Lagerspetz M, Joons S (2006) 'Tallinn as a multicultural city: Structures, initiatives, debate' in Ilczuk D, Isar Y R (eds) (2006) *Metropolises of Europe. Diversity in urban cultural life*, Warsaw: CIRCLE, 184-221

Lascombes P, Le Galès P (2007) 'Introduction: Understanding public policy through its instruments – From the nature of instruments to the sociology of public policy instrumentation', *Governance*, 20(1), 1–21

Lascombes P, Le Galès P (2004) (eds) *Gouverner par les instruments*, Paris: Les presses de Sciences Po

Latour V (eds) (2010) 'Un multiculturalisme moribond. Bristol' in Le Texier E, Estèves O, Lacorne O (2010) *Les politiques de la diversité. Expériences anglaise et américaine*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 133-150

Laurent L (2004) 'What more can we do? Multicultural girl work in practice developing a multicultural action plan for the Girls' House, a meeting place for girls and young women in Helsinki'
retrieved from http://www.hel2.fi/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/04_12_23_Laurent_vj38.pdf

Lauristin M, Heidmets M (2002) *The challenge of the Russian minority: Emerging multicultural democracy in Estonia*, Tartu: Tartu University Press

Le Galès P (2002) *European cities: Social conflicts and governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Le Texier E (2010) 'Le modèle multicultural à l'épreuve. City Heights San Diego, California' in Le Texier E, Estèves O, Lacorne O (eds) (2010) *Les politiques de la diversité. Expériences anglaise et américaine*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 33-50

Le Texier E, Estèves O, Lacorne O (2010) 'Introduction' in Le Texier E, Estèves O, Lacorne O (eds) (2010) *Les politiques de la diversité. Expériences anglaise et américaine*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 13-29

Leman C K (ed) (2002) 'Direct government', in Salamon L M (2002) (ed) *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 48–79

- Leonetti A** (2008) 'Diversité et droits culturels: l'épreuve conventionnelle de l'Unesco' in Bonet L, Négrier E (eds) (2008) *La fin des cultures nationales?: les politiques culturelles à l'épreuve de la diversité*, Paris: La Découverte, 83-95
- Lindblom C E** (1959) 'The science of "Muddling through"', *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), 79-88
- Lindblom C E** (1965) *The intelligence of democracy. Decision making through mutual adjustment*, New York: Free Press
- Lindblom C E** (1980) *The policy-making process*, Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Lindblom C E** (1990) *Inquiry and change. The troubled attempt to understand and shape society*, New Haven: Yale University Press
- Linder S H, Peters B G** (1989) 'Instruments of government: Perceptions and contexts', *Journal of Public Policy* 9(1), 35-58
- Lowi T J** (1972) 'Four systems of politics, policy and choice', *Public Administration Review*, 32(11), 298-310
- March, J G, Olsen J P** (1989) *Rediscovering institutions. The organizational basis of politics*, New York: The Free Press
- Meer N, Modood T** (2009) 'The multicultural state we're in: Muslims, 'multiculture' and the 'civic re-balancing' of British multiculturalism', *Political Studies*, 57(3), 473-497
- Ministère de l'Immigration, de l'Intégration, l'Identité Nationale et du Développement Solidaire** (2009) *Immigration et présence étrangère en France en 2008*
retrieved from www.immigration.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/SOPEMI_09.pdf
- Mitchell R** (2006) 'The promotion of cultural diversity through integration policies in Helsinki', in Ilczuk D, Isar Y R (eds) (2006) *Metropolises of Europe. Diversity in urban cultural life*. Warsaw: CIRCLE, 296-315
- Nagy Z** (2010) *Glove actually: Integration and gentrification in a community center in Budapest*, Master of Arts essay, Central European University,
retrieved from http://www.etd.ceu.hu/2010/nagy_zsuzsa.pdf

- Négrier E** (2006) 'Politique, culture et diversité dans la France urbaine contemporaine' in Gagnon A G, Jouve B (eds) (2006) *Le métropoles au défi de la diversité culturelle*, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 136-157
- Négrier E, Bonet L** (2008) 'Introduction générale' in Bonet L, Négrier E (eds) (2008) *La fin des cultures nationales?: les politiques culturelles à l'épreuve de la diversité*, Paris: La Découverte, 9-16
- Ottaviano G I P, Peri G** (2004) 'The economic value of cultural diversity: Evidence from US cities', retrieved from <http://www.feem.it/userfiles/attach/Publication/NDL2004/NDL2004-034.pdf>
- Palermo P C, Ponzini D**, (2010) *Spatial planning and urban development. Critical perspectives*, Dordrecht and New York: Springer
- Parekh B** (2001) *Rethinking multiculturalism : cultural diversity and political theory*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Perrone C** (2010) *DiverCity. Conoscenza, pianificazione, città delle differenze*, Milan: Franco Angeli
- Peters B G** (2002) 'The politics of tool choice', in Salamon L (ed) (2002) *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 552-564
- Peters B G** (2005a) 'Conclusion: The future of instruments research', in Eliadis P, Hill M M, Howlett M (eds) (2005) *Designing government: from instruments to governance*, Montreal and Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 353-364
- Peters B G** (2005b) *Institutional theory in political science: The 'New Institutionalism'*, London, Cassells
- Pierson P** (2000a) 'Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics', *American Political Science Review*, 94(2), 251-67
- Pierson P** (2000b) 'The limits of design: Explaining institutional origins and change', *Governance*, 13(4), 475-99
- Pierson P, Skocpol T** (2002) 'Historical institutionalism in contemporary political science,' in Katznelson I, Milner H V (eds) (2002) *Political science: State of the discipline*, New York: Norton, 693-721

Pinson G (2004) 'Le projet urbain comme instrument d'action publique', in Lascoumes, P, Le Galès P (eds) (2004) *Gouverner par les instruments*, Paris: Les presses de Sciences Po, 163-198

Ponzini D (2008) New Italian perspectives on urban planning: A policy tool approach', *Planum*, December 2008, 1-31

Ponzini D (2009) 'Policy tools sustaining cultural quarters: multilateralism, spatial integration', in Legnér M, Ponzini D (eds) (2009), *Cultural quarters and urban transformation: International perspectives*, Gotlandica Forlag, Visby, 62-81

Ponzini D (2010) 'Planning theory and urban policy tools: Challenges and possible advancements', conference paper Annual Congress of the AESOP (Association of European Schools of Planning), Helsinki, July 2010

Pressman J L, Wildavsky A B (1979) *Implementation: how great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland: or, Why it's amazing that Federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation of ruined hopes*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press

Putnam R (2007) 'E pluribus unum. Diversity and community in the twenty-first century', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137-174

Radaelli C M (2000) 'Policy transfer in the European Union: Institutional isomorphism as a source of legitimacy', *Governance*, 13(1), 25-43

Redfield R and Singer M (1954) 'The cultural role of cities', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 3, 53-73

Rév 8 (2008) *Regeneration program in Budapest - Jòsefváros, Magdolna Quarter Program 2007*, retrieved from http://www.rev8.hu/csatolmanyok/eng_dokok/eng_dokok_2.pdf

Salamon L M (1981) 'Rethinking public management: Third party government and the changing forms of government action', *Public Policy*, 29(3), 255-275

Salamon L M (ed) (1989) *Beyond privatization: The tools of government action*, Washington DC: The Urban Institute

Salamon L M (ed) (2002) *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*, New York: Oxford University Press

- Saukkonen P, Pyykkönen M** (2008) "Cultural policy and cultural diversity in Finland", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(1), 49-63
- Schneider A, Ingram H** (1990) 'Behavioral assumptions of policy tools', *Journal of Politics*, 52(2), 510-529
- Silvanto S, Linko M, Cantell T** (2008) 'From enlightenment to experience: cultural centres in Helsinki neighbourhoods', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(2), 165-178
- Simmel G**, (1971) [original 1903]. 'The metropolis and mental life', in. I D N Levine (ed) (1971) *On Individuality and Social Forms*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Smelser N J, Alexander J C** (eds) (1999) *Diversity and its discontents : cultural conflict and common ground in contemporary American society*, Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Taleb M** , (2004) 'Culture(s) e Territoire(s): ré-enchanter le local' *Territoires*, Novembre 2004, 13-15
- Taylor C** (1994) 'The politics of recognition' in Gutman A (ed) (1994) *Multiculturalism. Examining the politics of recognition*, Princeton : Princeton University Press, 25-74
- Teillet P** (2003) 'La politique des politiques culturelles' *L'Observatoire*, 25, 4-10
- Tikkanen T** (2009) 'Foreigners in Helsinki 2008',
retrieved from http://www.hel2.fi/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/09_04_30_Tilasto_9_Tikkanen.pdf
- Trebilcock M J** (2005) *The choice of governing instrument: A retrospective*, in Eliadis P, Hill M M, Howlett M (eds) (2005) *Designing government: From instruments to governance*, Montreal and Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 50-76
- Trebilcock M J, Hartle D G, Prichard R S, Dewees D N**, (eds) (1982) *The choice of governing instrument: A study prepared for the Economic Council of Canada*, Ottawa Supply and Services, Canadian Government Pub. Centre
- UNESCO** (2005) Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, accessed 10 June 2012 at http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31038&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

United Nations (1992) *Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*, accessed 25 February 2012 at <http://www.ohchr.org/documents/publications/guideminoritiesdeclarationen.pdf>

Vedung E (1998) 'Policy instruments: Typologies and theories', in Bemelmans-Videc M L, Rist R C, Vedung E (eds) (1998) *Carrots, sticks, and sermons, policy instruments and their evaluation*, New Brunswick: Transaction, 103-128

Vertovec S (1998) 'Multi-multiculturalisms' in Martiniello M (ed) *Multicultural Policies and the State: A Comparison of two European Societies*, Utrecht: Utrecht University, European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations, 25-38

Vertovec S, Wessendorf S (2009) 'Introduction. Assessing the backlash against multiculturalism', in Vertovec S, Wessendorf S (eds) (2009), *The multiculturalism backlash : European discourses, policies, and practices*, New York: Routledge, 1-31

Vertik R, Helemäe J (eds) (2010) *The Russian second generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve: The TIES study in Estonia*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

Wieviorka M (2001) *La difference*, Paris: Balland

Wieviorka M (2008) *Rapport à la ministre de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la recherche sur la diversité*, Paris: Robert Laffont

Wieviorka M (2006) 'Préface', in Jouve B, Gagnon A G (eds) (2006), *Les métropoles au défi de la diversité culturelle*, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 9-12

Wirth L (1938) 'Urbanism as a Way of Life', *American Journal of Sociology*, 44, 1-24

Wood P (ed) (2009) *Intercultural cities. Towards a model for intercultural integration Insights from Intercultural cities, joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe

Woods P, Landry C (2008) *Intercultural Cities. Planning for diversity advantage*, London: Earthscan

Zukin S (2010) *Naked city: The death and life of authentic urban places*, New York: Oxford University Press

WEBSITES

<http://ec.europa.eu/culture>
<http://exchange.baltmet.org>
<http://www.budapest.hu>
<http://www.budobs.org>
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/CWE/default_en.asp
<http://www.culturalpolicies.net>
<http://www.ericarts.org>
<http://www.espon.eu>
<http://www.eukn.org>
<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu>
<http://www.immigration.gouv.fr>
<http://www.international3c.org>
<http://www.jozsefvaros.hu>
<http://www.labforculture.org>
<http://www.meis.ee>
<http://www.meis.ee/library>
<http://www.rev8.hu>
<http://www.susdiv.org>

LIST OF CPRA 2009 JURY MEMBERS

Milena Dragičević Šešić, President of the Jury (Serbia)

Ritva Mitchell, Jury member (Finland)

Lluís Bonet, Jury member (Spain)

Veronika Ratzenbuck, Jury member (Austria)

Michael W. Quine, Jury member (UK)

Mikko Lagerspetz, Jury member (Estonia)

Milena Dragičević Šešić, President of the Jury (Serbia)

Professor at the Faculty of Drama of the University of Arts in Belgrade (Cultural Policy and Cultural Management, Cultural studies, Media studies); Chair-holder of the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policy and Management University of Arts Belgrade; President of the Orientation Board of the European Diploma in Cultural Project Management (Marcel Hicter Foundation, Brussels); Board member of ELIA (European League of Institutes of the Arts, Amsterdam). Former Rector of the University of Arts in Belgrade; Member of the Art & Culture Sub Board, Open Society Institute (Soros fund), Budapest. Lecturer in Moscow School of Social and Economical Sciences, MA-AMEC, Utrecht School of the Arts, CEU Budapest, Lyon II, Jagiellonian University Krakow, etc. Expert, consultant in cultural policy and management for the European Cultural Foundation, Council of Europe, UNESCO, Marcel Hicter Foundation, Pro Helvetia, British Council, etc. Published 15 books and more than 100 essays. Translated in over 10 languages all over the world.

Ritva Mitchell, Jury member (Finland)

Director of Research CUPORE (Finnish Foundation for Cultural Policy Research), Lecturer at the University of Jyväskylä, Faculty of Social Sciences. former President of the Cultural Information and Research Centres Liaison in Europe (CIRCLE), the European Research Institute for Comparative Cultural Policy and the Arts (ERICArts) and of the Orientation Board of the European Diploma of Cultural Project Management (Marcel Hicter Foundation, Brussels). Lecturer at the Sibelius Academy of Music (MA Programme in Arts Management) in Helsinki. She is involved in a number of research projects in Europe. Member of the editorial board of the Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift (Nordic Cultural Policy Journal). She has published articles and papers on youth cultures, artists, cultural policies, new technologies and European issues in Finland and in Europe.

Lluís Bonet, Jury member (Spain)

Professor of the University of Barcelona, and former President of the European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centers (ENCATC). Vice-President of the European Association of Cultural Researchers (ECURES), board member of the Association of Cultural Economics International (ACEI), and member of the Board of Trustees of Abacus (the largest Spanish cooperative on education and culture). External advisor in cultural policies, statistics and economics at the Council of Europe, the European Union, the Inter-American Development Bank, UNESCO, and the Organization of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture (OEI). Director of a large number of research studies in cultural economics and cultural policies. Teaching: Director of the Graduate Programmes on Cultural Management of the University of Barcelona. Professor undergraduate courses at the same university (Schools of Law, Economics, Documentation and Librarianship) on Political Economy Cultural Economics, Cultural Industries, Cultural Management and Policy. Research fellow and Assistant Professor on Cultural Policy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1991-1992). Guest Professor in different graduate programmes on arts and heritage management, and lecturer in courses and seminars in more than 20 countries in Europe, Latin America and USA.

Veronika Ratzenböck, Jury member (Austria)

Director of the "Österreichische Kulturdokumentation, Internationales Archiv für Kulturanalysen" a non-university institute for applied cultural research and cultural documentation founded in 1991 (www.kulturdokumentation.org). Research projects on culture, economic and social history of the 20th and 21st century; Visiting professor at the Institute of Philosophy of Law at the University of Salzburg (subject: "the European project"). Lecturer in cultural studies and cultural policy at the University of Vienna. Since 1998 consultant to the Council of Europe, Programme: Evaluation on national cultural policies (Croatia and Bosnia&Herzegovina). Research and advisory work in Comparative cultural policy, European cultural and media policy and cultural aspects of European integration, cultural and creative industries, urban cultural policy, culture and employment, EU cultural policy, cultural studies (e.g. the "Exploitation and development of the job potential in the cultural sector" 2001, commissioned by the European Commission, DG Employment and Social Affairs, project: "Cultural Competence. New Technologies, Culture & Employment" 1999, study "The potential of Creative Industries in Vienna" commissioned by the City of Vienna (www.creativeindustries.at))

Michael W. Quine, Jury member (UK)

Senior Lecturer in Arts Management at London City University. Acting Head of Department, Department of Arts Policy & Management, City University London. An extensive career in managing arts organisations, in educating arts managers and in research. Initially from a theatre background, his interests range from the economics of the arts to arts marketing and financing, and into international comparisons. His international teaching experience includes countries as diverse as the US, Greece, Finland, Moldova, Spain and Russia (St Petersburg). Founding member a multi-university exchange programme, funded by the EU SOCRATES programme, encouraging staff and student mobility as well as annual conferences. During the last three years, as a Vice-Chair and Board member of ENCATC (European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres), he organised the first non-Francophone AIMAC conference, in London in 1995, and also works within the Scientific Committee for successive conferences (e.g. in Australia, Helsinki, San Francisco and Milan) into international comparisons of these and a range of wider policy issues. President of the Thomassen Fund in support of the mobility of educators and trainers in arts management.

Mikko Lagerspetz, Jury member (Estonia)

Professor of Sociology at the Estonian Institute of Humanities. Born and educated in Finland, and since 1989 he resides in Estonia, currently a Professor of Sociology. Rector, 1998-2001. Docent of Sociology at the University of Turku, since 1997. President of the Estonian Association of Sociologists, 1998-2003 (re-elected twice). Member of the Board, Open Estonia Foundation, 2001-2004. Honorary Member, Wind Orchestra of the University of Turku, 1991. Involved in research and evaluation of Estonian cultural policies. Research on cultural policies, social problems, and civil society. Publications (among others): *Constructing Post-Communism* (Turku, 1996); *Estonian Cultural Policy and Its Impact, 1988-1995* (with Rein Raud; Strasbourg, 1996); recent article: "How many Nordic countries? Possibilities and limits of geopolitical identity construction". *Cooperation and Conflict*, 2003.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

DAVIDE PONZINI

Davide Ponzini (PhD in Urban Planning) is Assistant Professor of Urban Planning at Politecnico di Milano, Italy. His research focuses on planning theory, policy tool analysis, urban and cultural policy. He has been a visiting scholar at Yale University, Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University and Sciences Po Paris.

Davide Ponzini has received several scholarships and research grants from universities, foundations and public institutions. His research work has been published in international scientific journals (Urban Studies, Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, Cities, European Planning Studies, International Journal of Heritage Studies and others) and in edited books. It has been presented in international congresses, invited lectures and seminars.

BOOKS THAT DAVIDE PONZINI HAS AUTHORED OR EDITED INCLUDE:

- Il territorio dei beni culturali, Rome: Carocci, 2008
- Cultural quarters and urban transformation - (co-editor: Mattias Legnér), Visby: Gotlandica Forlag, 2009
- Spatial planning and urban development Critical perspectives (coauthor: Pier Carlo Palermo), Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London and New York: Springer, 2010
- Starchitecture. Scenes, actors and spectacles in contemporary cities (coauthor: Michele Nastasi), Turin, Allemandi 2011.

COPYRIGHT

Author: Davide Ponzini

Davide Ponzini is hereby identified as the author of this work in accordance with Dutch Copyright and asserts his moral rights.

Editor: Janet Hadley

EAN 9789062820566

Published by the European Cultural Foundation

Jan van Goyenkade 5

1075 HN Amsterdam

The Netherlands

t +31 20 573 38 68

f +31 20 675 22 31

www.eurocult.org