

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Horsti, Karina

Title: The Cultural Diversity Turn: Policies, Politics and Influences at the European Level

Year: 2014

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Horsti, K. (2014). The Cultural Diversity Turn: Policies, Politics and Influences at the European Level. In G. Titley, K. Horsti, & G. Hultén (Eds.), *National Conversations? Public Service Media and Cultural Diversity in Europe* (pp. 43-60). Intellect Ltd..

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

3. The cultural diversity turn: Policies, politics and influences at the European level

Karina Horsti

Pre-publication copy of the chapter published in Karina Horsti, Gunilla Hultén and Gavan Titley (eds.) (2014) *National Conversations? Public Service Media and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Bristol: Intellect.

In the early 1990s, Europe experienced a wave of optimism for a borderless continent. The fall of the Berlin Wall became a symbol for the change. This euphoria soon came down as neo-Nazi movements and less organized incidents of xenophobia and racism were reported throughout the continent. Asylum seekers and undocumented migration were securitized. The war in the former Yugoslavia also revealed unhealed wounds of nationalism and ethnic tensions. Nationalist-populist movements emerged in the politics of several European countries. However, the rising xenophobia in the 1990s also resulted in anti-racist projects and sentiments that were expressed at the European level in different types of publicly funded campaigns and in the founding of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).¹

This is the sociopolitical background against which the European public service broadcasters in the early 1990s began to articulate their responsibility and role in multicultural societies more clearly. At that time, several initiatives for ‘multicultural Europe’ were launched as collaborative projects amongst European national media and NGOs (non-governmental organizations) such as Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe,² which was a network of public service broadcasters, a university and a migrant organization that produced recommendations

for the media in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Belgium. Public service broadcasters served as nodal points in these initiatives as they recognized their legal responsibility to ‘serve all’.³ Thus, European public service broadcasting collaboration offers an interesting case to scrutinize what is actually understood about multicultural media policy or cultural diversity media policy. This chapter analyses cultural diversity discourses cultivated in the context of European public service broadcasting collaboration from the 1990s until 2010.

National PSM in Europe very often has a legal responsibility to include ethnic and immigrant minorities into programming as topics and professionals. In addition, the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) states in its policies and regulations that minority inclusion is part of their public service duties. Although there are no legally-binding agreements at the European level of PSB policy concerning ethnic and immigrant minorities, the EBU, NGOs, journalist associations, universities and PSM have carried out projects and conferences which have resulted in recommendations for the media. For instance, the EBU has the Intercultural and Diversity Group that regularly advocates these issues, and in the yearly Prix Europa event, a multicultural prize, TV Iris, is awarded.⁴

I consider this type of collaboration sense-making for the media in a given historical, social and cultural context. Thus, my understanding of policy is broader and more cultural studies-oriented than just equating policy to legislation and regulation. Policy-making requires vocabularies that policy makers and practitioners use to define their policies and goals. It presupposes that problems exist and that these problems should be addressed by PSM. By drafting policies, PSM takes responsibilities for solving such problems. However, as with any discourse, the ‘problem definitions’ and the vocabularies associated with the policies also both open

and close options.⁵ They problematize certain issues, and these problematizations make other interpretations invisible or irrelevant. This approach is close to Carol Lee Bacchi's (2009) work on the 'what's the problem represented to be?' approach to policy analysis. She argues that 'it is important to make the "problems" implicit in public policies *explicit*, and to scrutinize them closely' (Bacchi 2009: x). This critical perspective to policy analysis identifies that the strategies for 'promoting multiculturalism and cultural diversity' should be treated critically; they can actually be part of the problem rather than the solution (Ahmed et al. 2006).

The chapter first gives a background to PSB principles, then moves on to analyse how vocabularies and problem definitions in initiatives and collaborative endeavours between PSM, NGOs, universities and associations have changed in the past 20 years in Europe.⁶ In the end, I discuss the focus of these initiatives and their idea of disseminating public funding.

Background: Multiculturalism, cultural diversity and the responsibility to 'serve all'

EU funding is a crucial driving force of cultural diversity projects, although there is no binding legal framework regarding the service of new minorities at the EU level. At the European level, cultural diversity is widely and vaguely understood as needed. Sometimes it refers to Europe as a unity of various national identities and languages; sometimes national minority identities such as Sami, Welsh or Catalanian⁷ are also recognized as crucial for 'diversity' and 'multiculturalism'. In addition, this notion can include 'immigrant' or 'ethnic' minorities, but they can also be ignored.

EBU membership regulations (EBU n.d.) demand that its members 'provide varied and balanced programming for all sections of the population, including

programmes catering for special/minority interests of various sections of the public, irrespective of the ratio of programme cost to audience'. This statement requires a commitment from the broadcasters to include minority rights in programming 'irrespective of the ratio of cost to audience'. However, in its official communications, the EBU remains unclear about the ways in which 'variety' and 'balance' of programming is to be monitored and advanced. The closest attempt to do this at the European level is the *Diversity Toolkit* (FRA 2007) published by the European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) and the EBU.

Public service media in Europe has come up with various strategies to fulfil their legal and democratic principles. In the 1970s up until the 1980s,⁸ many broadcasters had addressed the service of ethnic minorities and new immigrant communities either through segregationist or assimilationist paradigms, depending on the more general immigration and integration politics of a country. For instance, Germany adopted the concept of 'guest workers', workers that are in Germany only temporarily and thus are expected to need programming from 'home' (Hargreaves 2002: 212). Other countries like Sweden adopted the concept of 'immigrant' (*invandrare*) and believed that the migrants were in Sweden to stay. This resulted in programming that was assumed to aid integration – or assimilation – into a 'host' society. In the 1980s and 1990s, public service broadcasters in most countries, such as Britain (British Broadcasting Corporation – BBC), the Netherlands (Nederlandse Publieke Stichting – NPS), Ireland (Radio Telefís Éireann – RTÉ) and Sweden (Sveriges Television – SVT), shifted programming to the multicultural paradigm and 'niche' programming for and about ethnic minority communities (Cottle 1998: 300; see also chapters in this volume). Today, such programmes as *Mosaik* (*Mosaic*) (1987–2003) on the Swedish network SVT and the Asian (1965–95) and Afro-

Caribbean (1982–95) departments at the British BBC have been closed as the general trend of national policies has shifted from multicultural paradigms to mainstream cultural diversity. Within the Nordic countries, only Norway continues to have an immigrant-specific television programme, *Migrapolis* (1997–). The NRK (Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation) has actually extended the concept to a radio programme in 2005 (see Bjørnsen, this volume), thus taking a different strategy to Denmark, Finland and Sweden.⁹ During the past ten years, ‘cross-cultural’ and ‘intercultural’ programmes (Leurdijk 2006; Malik 2002: 71) have become a popular format to bring diversity into the mainstream programming. Television shows such as *Goodness Gracious Me* (BBC, 1998–2001) and *De Meiden van Halal* (*The Girls of Halal*) (NPS, 2005–06)¹⁰ entertain while they introduce and discuss cultures and identities.

The EBU, in its recommendations and reports in the past decade, has discouraged niche programming targeted to immigrant minorities. It considers these programmes to be ‘ghettoizing’ and accentuating differences rather than inspiring dialogue. This paradigm shift from multicultural niche programming to mainstreaming diversity reflects the wider shift in politics of managing differences in European societies.

For instance, in 2002 an EBU report argued that:

A special obligation to public broadcasters of today's Europe is to reflect our increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural societies. This must not, on the other hand, take the form of unduly accentuating differences or 'ghettoising' different social and ethnic groups by locking them into 'walled gardens' of programme services, dedicated solely to them. (EBU 2002: 39)

This example highlights the concerns over multiculturalist media policy that emerged in the new millennium in European policy collaboration. Here, I refer to

multiculturalism as a policy paradigm that aims to manage and organize difference. Multiculturalism classifies different ‘cultural’, ‘religious’ and ‘ethnic’ groups and recognizes their particularity and rights, particularly in terms of culture and language (Hall 2000: 209–11. Multiculturalism served as a ground to political claims-making on the basis of group identities. However, it is often accused of focusing attention to preserving culture and language and leaving economic and political participation to the background. Whereas multiculturalism talks about groups; *social cohesion*, *integration* and *assimilation* discourses focus on the individual’s adaptation to a majority culture (Vasta 2007: 725; Faist 2009: 173), assuming there is a coherent ‘culture’ and values – a ‘standardized pattern’ (Ahmed 2000 96) – into which one should integrate.

Debates on immigration and cultural complexity have intensified in Europe during the past decade. There has been a so-called backlash against the multicultural policies or ‘end of multiculturalism’ (Back 2007: 133) of the 1980s and 1990s, which was fuelled particularly by terrorist attacks in the United States and Europe at the beginning of the new century. Populist political movements that build their discourses and politics around neo-assimilationist and anti-immigrant or anti-Muslim arguments have risen again in recent years across Europe (see, for example, Vasta 2007; Hervik 2006). In addition, mainstream politicians and parties have taken stronger positions against ‘non-integration’ and ‘illegal immigration’. France and Denmark banned wearing burkhas in public places, Switzerland banned the building of minarets in city centres, and Roma begging and camps have been criminalized in several countries. There is a discourse that considers non-integration as a threat to European societies. Multiculturalism is claimed to be too ‘idealistic’, and it is argued that separate group rights have actually bred terrorism and gendered and sexual violence. Popular

concepts now in European politics and policy-making, also within PSM, are integration and 'social cohesion', which are often interpreted as a demand that minorities accept majority values and traditions.

Anti-racist discourses of the 1990s: Neo-Nazism as a problem

The current public debate and success of populist movements stand in contrast to the early 1990s when, after the fall of communism, European politicians were concerned about racism, neo-Nazis and populist far-right political movements. Anti-racist discourses were expressed at the European level, for instance, in different types of publicly funded campaigns. The Council of Europe (1993) stated in its *Vienna Declaration* in 1993 that the heads of states in Europe are

alarmed by the present resurgence of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, the development of a climate of intolerance, the increase in acts of violence, notably against migrants and people of immigrant origin, and the degrading treatment and discriminatory practices accompanying them. (Council of Europe 1993)

Amongst the five points in their plan of action, the Council of Europe in 1993 acknowledged the role of the media in their anti-racist initiatives. The plan of action instructed the committee of ministers to 'request the media professions to report and comment on acts of racism and intolerance factually and responsibly, and to continue to develop professional codes of ethics which reflect these requirements'. Rising journalists' awareness and portrayal of minorities in the media were considered key components in the fight against racism, and the Council of Europe distributed funds to carry out media initiatives. Following the *Vienna Declaration*, the EBU declared in 1994:

We public service broadcasters, [...] are fully aware of the important role that we have to play in a multiracial, multicultural and multifaith Europe. [...] We, as broadcasters, should ensure that our services defend the equal rights and dignity of all human beings, reject trivialization of violence and act against xenophobia, racism and destructive nationalism. [...] we are concerned at the rise of racism and fascism in Europe and believe it is our duty to combat these attitudes. (EBU 1994)¹¹

Similarly, a booklet of recommendations ‘for broadcasting on fair portrayal of ethnic minorities’ produced as a European collaboration in 1995, argued for the need of such recommendations as the following:

Are they [public service broadcasters] inadvertently reinforcing racism, prejudice, and xenophobia through the content of their programmes? These issues are not about special treatment for ethnic minorities but about the professional practice of public service broadcasters – their duty to serve a diverse public and reflect it as accurately and as fairly as possible. (PBME 1995: 3)

Both the declaration and the booklet take an anti-racist position. They consider rising xenophobia, racism and extreme nationalism as problems that public service broadcasters in particular need to address and take ethical responsibility for. Their position is to combat these ‘attitudes’. Both of these examples from the mid-1990s fall into the period when several Council of Europe-funded projects on media and multiculturalism were under way, and most of the initiatives used the discourse of anti-racism and were concerned with rising xenophobia. For instance, in the 1994 and 1995 issues of *Spectrum: The Magazine of Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe*,¹² nearly all articles begin by outlining the situation of rising racism. A good

example of this is an article entitled ‘A responsibility to respond’ that begins with the following sentence: ‘As we move towards the 21st century the continuing rise of racism and xenophobia is a matter of great public concern in many countries’ (Forde 1995: 17). In addition, titles of stories in the 1994 *Spectrum* issue reflect well the kinds of problems that were considered important: ‘The rise of racism in Europe: The role of school TV’; ‘The BOMB IS ticking ... ! – A new television co-production between German, Dutch and Austrian broadcasting attempts to challenge the growth of the neo-Nazi movement by getting inside the lives and thoughts of right wing youth in Germany’. However, complexities of addressing and dealing with racism and neo-Nazism in Europe were also acknowledged and discussed at the time. For instance, Europe Singh (1994) writes in the editorial of the 1994 issue of *Spectrum* magazine:

There is no simple formula for the programme or the programming strategy that will tackle racism and xenophobia. [...] We have to inform and educate not to moralise and condemn and we have to be critically aware that our programmes are not broadcasting into a vacuum.

In the 1990s, several conferences amongst PSBs and committed journalists and activists produced recommendations and action plans.¹³ The main targets in these policies were equal representation of minorities and raising cultural diversity awareness, in addition to the goal of training journalists of minority backgrounds. These training programmes were not organized or funded by public service broadcasters specifically, but were run by NGOs, media educators or professionals with European funding. However, broadcasters participated by taking interns and broadcasting the programmes. The need for recruiting media professionals was acknowledged, but nevertheless, it received much less attention than anti-racist awareness building. One example of a Europe-wide initiative and set of

recommendations at the time is the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) that developed an international strategy to deal with the rising intolerance. Their international media group on racism concluded that the problem of racism should be challenged by (1) producing a manual for European journalists; (2) establishing a media unit for this topic; (3) developing training and education; (4) setting up a European network of media professionals active in this field and representing minority communities; (5) examining the impact of codes of practice; and (6) creating a television project focusing on the role of media in racism (White 1995).

Some of these goals were achieved over the years. *A Diversity Toolkit for factual programmes in public service television* was published in 2007. However, it seems that the toolkit became a reality somewhat too late as the discourses have changed. The kinds of discourse it is based on: the focus for ethical recommendations and raising awareness, are no longer popular. I will discuss this argument further in the next section. What have not been realized after the IFJ recommendations in 1995 are methods of examining policy implications or a media-specific European resource centre for multiculturalism. A Dutch NGO, Mira Media,¹⁴ is closest to these IFJ aims, as it has become the nodal point for directing EU-funded projects across Europe. Yet, its position depends on project funding.

It is crucial to understand that anti-racist discourses cultivated in the initiatives of the 1990s also produced interpretations of racism. First, racism in these initiatives was understood to originate from distorted attitudes of some members of European societies, which is typical reasoning in anti-racist campaigning in general (Lentin 2004; Anthias and Lloyd 2002 7). The word ‘some’ is crucial here. Although the idea of training implies that ‘some’ within the PSB institutions have racist ideas and therefore need training, the focus is on the marginal ‘some’ of the society – that is, the

neo-Nazis and ‘xenophobes’, which are rather unclearly referred to in the texts produced in the initiatives. The responsibility of the broadcasters was then presented to recognize these ideologies in the society and offer balanced and fair reporting. Second, racism is understood to grow out of structural conditions; mainly the lack of representations of cultural differences on-screen and amongst media professionals. However, the aim to recruit more professionals of minority backgrounds and increase their visibility on-screen boils down to individualizing the solution rather than fully addressing institutional and structural issues such as the distribution of decision-making power, distribution of resources, connections to communities and different routines and ways of making programming.

Mainstreaming discourses of the first decade: Non-integration as the problem

The picture that I have described so far of European PSB collaboration looks very different today. The discourses began to change after the turn of the millennium. The EBU does not openly mention racism as a problem any longer, and words like ‘racism’ and ‘xenophobia’ have been avoided in European public service broadcasting events of the past decade. What we now find in a variety of initiatives and policy papers in this policy area is, first, concerns that some ethnic minorities and immigrants do not fit into mainstream society and, second, celebration of individual integration into majority values when they do. The concerns of non-integration are particularly focused on Muslim minorities.

For instance, *A Diversity Toolkit* mentions Muslims 27 times, and 13 out of 31 extracts of programmes presented in the DVD that comes with the toolkit are about Islam or Muslims. In addition, Fritz Pleitgen, the director general of the German public service broadcaster WDR and the president of the EBU, addresses the need for

the diversity toolkit by referring to ‘disturbances in the French suburbs, the Danish cartoon row and terrorist attacks in several European countries’ as ‘clear warning signals showing us that integration, equal rights and peaceful dialogue between cultures do not happen automatically’ (Pleitgen 2007: 8). These events are raised as ‘warning signals’ of failed (implicitly Muslim) integration. Another example is the yearly Prix Europa Iris that is awarded to the ‘best multicultural programme of the year’, which offers an opportunity to analyse celebrative discourses in the cultural diversity policy context. Celebrating and accentuating something presupposes a problem. In recent years, themes related to integration have gained more importance in the media prize. Programmes that deal with immigrant roots and diasporic identity, namely themes related to generational differences in families with a history of migration, have been winning the competition after the turn of the millennium. The celebrative discourse in the Prix Iris juries creates a dichotomy between majority tradition (‘advanced’) and minority tradition (‘archaic’). The new country is often celebrated, like in the case of a winning programme in 2007 entitled *0032 Gorcha*, (VRT, 2007). The jury reported that the story was of a Kurdish woman, Gorcha, who left Kazakhstan, ‘left the whole family and turned away from her Muslim culture, fleeing to Belgium in search of a better future’ (Horsti 2009). Celebrating integration and the adoption of ‘European values’ also presupposes radical differences from ‘us’ as a problem, and thus, cultural diversity discourses cover only consumable and acceptable differences. Although cultural diversity recognizes transnational and diasporic lives (Faist 2009: 173), the celebratory connotations attached to the term accept only the types of differences that are accommodated in European societies.

As a response to the constructed problem of non-integration, a discourse of cultural diversity has emerged. The policies that are based on the cultural diversity

discourse aim to cover a wider scope of differences than multiculturalism. Ethnicity and race are combined with gender, disability, sexuality and sometimes lifestyle. This very broad understanding of cultural diversity claims that as everyone is equally different, no one is specifically different enough to make claims for resources or special rights. Furthermore, cultural diversity discourses promote the mainstreaming of differences. In PSM policy, this means that instead of niche programmes or special resources, differences are to be included throughout programming. The aims of European initiatives began to stress arguments for recruitment and the visibility of talented minority agents in journalism and in entertainment. Using young, culturally diverse talents to make the broadcasters' image more appealing and to broaden PSM audiences to 'ethnic' communities has been celebrated in recent cultural diversity conferences. One such example is the *Diversity Show* conference (2008), which was organized by the Dutch broadcaster NPS for European media producers. It altogether avoided the issues of racism and discrimination that had been so prominent in such collaborations in the 1990s. During the event, only once was racism touched on in references to nationalist populism. Images of right-wing European politicians whose golden days were over by then, such as Jörg Haider of Austria and Jean Le Pen of France, and headlines of political populism were screened in the conference site accompanied by sounds from horror films. This exhibition remained distant and excluded from the other issues discussed at the conference. First, they were images without explanation or discussion, and second, these images do not appear on the DVD that was produced for the event. The conference was unable to discuss racism and discrimination in its celebrative context. The event focused on the visibility of people of minority backgrounds. The main constructed problem at the *Diversity Show* was that people of minority backgrounds are not adequately recruited into European

PSM and that they are not visible enough on the screen. There were no claims for specific programming for minorities but for the visibility of minorities throughout programming. The successful examples presented at the conference included Saira Khan, the runner-up for the UK version of the reality TV show *The Apprentice* (BBC, 2005), and a commercially successful public service radio station, FunX (2002–), in the Netherlands, which started as a response to the fact that young people were no longer listening to public broadcast radio stations. Mezen Dannavi (2008), producer of FunX, argues:

Authenticity is more important than quality. [...] People were just picked out from the streets. They were true. You get that realness factor. [...] People have cultural surplus, use it. You can teach him how to do it and you can use his surplus. [...] FunX is a success. You can make people socially relevant but also be economically relevant.

In a similar vein, the diversity manager of the Dutch broadcaster NPS, Frans Jennekens, argued at the *Tuning into Diversity* conference in 2010 that ‘diversity is a business case, something you can win with’ (Jennekens 2010). As a good example of cultural diversity programming, Jennekens mentioned a children’s programme called *Het Klokhuis (The Core)* (NTR, 1988–) that has a policy of recruiting ‘culturally diverse’ young people as presenters and incorporating children of minority backgrounds on-screen. He argued that the existing children’s-programme formats such as the long-running *Het Klokhuis* do not have to change, but that ‘new faces will bring new audiences’ (Jennekens 2010).

As these examples show, cultural diversity is presented as a win-win model that does not require changes in the institutional structures or routines. Cultural diversity is a ‘surplus’ (Dannavi 2008) and a ‘business case’ (Jennekens 2010). The examples

here come from Dutch producers and we could argue that there can be conflicting discourses in other European contexts. However, these examples demonstrate the popular discourses that are explicitly celebrated and admired within European collaborative contexts. They are presented as good practice that others should learn from. Clearly, the Dutch are driving forward cultural diversity discourses and the market-oriented positions as examples for other PSM. Particularly, Nordic PSM endorses the Dutch media as advanced in cultural diversity issues. Ed Klute, the director of the NGO Mira Media, which is the most established agent of European-funded projects, said that ‘we (the Dutch) are a little bit ahead of other countries’ (Klute 2010).

As the current initiatives are occupied with making cultural diversity more ‘visible’, we need to ask, how is it possible to show and see diversity? It oftentimes boils down to showing different skin colour or other physical features, sometimes an accent in speech, the kind of difference that for instance Frans Jennekens referred to in his example of *Het Klokhuis*. Sara Ahmed et al. (2006: 43, 72) direct attention in their research on cultural diversity policy-making in education to this very same demand of including those ‘who look different’. They argue that this idea keeps institutional whiteness in place. Whiteness is understood here as a normative and invisible¹⁵ (Dyer 1997: 45) rule into which cultural diversity brings colour, but does not change the grammar of how things are managed. In this case, we can extend the idea of whiteness to an idea of white Europeanness, as skin colour is not necessarily the main issue in all European countries when cultural diversity is considered. Regardless, the idea of whiteness allows us to consider the naturalness and invisibility of these institutional norms that cultural diversity is not able – and is not expected or allowed – to question.

Although the commercial discourses and the question of visible diversity prevail in the cultural diversity policy field at large, the NGOs have been pushing forward also a more participatory discourse. The *Tuning into Diversity* conferences (2004 and 2010) that have mainly been organized by Mira Media have set the aim of finding ways of collaboration between civil society and various media ‘to make the media more diverse’ (Mira Media 2010, author’s observation). This approach, which not only understands diversity as a quality *in* media output and recruitment but also as diversity *of* the mediascape, is a rare one in the discourses cultivated in the initiatives of the new millennium. The conference in 2004 drafted a list of recommendations and a European manifesto for supporting community media that was believed to strengthen communication within ethnic minority communities. Furthermore, one of the aims of the Mira Media activities is to generate media competence amongst minority organizations. Ed Klute (2010), the director of Mira Media, refers to increasing multimodality and the changing media landscape when he describes the current media landscape as more ‘equal’ towards minorities. He stresses the ‘responsibility of minorities’ to train ‘spokespeople who can fight back’. Training minorities and NGOs as well as talented ‘culturally diverse’ individuals is a strategy the initiatives are taking in their approach to ‘think forward’.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have demonstrated a shift in European collaborative media initiatives with regard to approaches to new immigrant minorities. The vocabulary has shifted from anti-racism to a discourse of cultural diversity that seems to depoliticize differences by overlooking power inequalities and histories of racism. Whereas the policies of the 1990s considered rising racism and xenophobia as problems of

European societies, the initiatives of the past ten years have identified non-integration of migrants as the main problem. The vocabulary of the 1990s included words like 'xenophobia', 'racism', 'equality', 'discrimination', 'awareness', 'fairness', 'balance' and 'recommendations'. The vocabulary of the new millennium uses words like 'business sense', 'new audiences', 'talents', 'consulting', 'inclusion' and 'social cohesion'.

The reasons behind this shift in policy language are complex. First, the problem of rising racism was primarily restricted to a focus on neo-Nazi activity, and nationalist-populist politics. Racism was not understood in terms of everyday racism (Essed 1991), institutional racism (Better 2008: 26–27) or educated racism (Ahmed et al. 2006), which would have opened majority society and dominant institutions to criticism. It declared overt racism unacceptable, but this exclusive focus excused society and state from examining racism. Therefore, when the immediate threat of extremist movements in Europe was contained and the broader polarization between the West and the Muslim world emerged, the problem definition turned its focus to minorities, and the 'non-integrated' and 'radicalized' Other was constructed as a social threat.

Second, policy-making, by definition, involves constant re-writing and re-making. Pragmatically, the same policies and the same vocabularies cannot be repeated, as they become tiring and boring. By the end of the 1990s, racism had accumulated a burden of negative connotations. Cultural diversity, on the contrary, sounded more promising and positive. It does not accuse anyone of being racist, but instead, it embraces everyone. It seems like a true win-win format that all parties can agree on and it makes the adopting institutions, including PSM, look solution-oriented and energetic.

The discursive shift I have discovered in the research material relates to a wider paradigmatic shift in public administration policies, from public administration and regulation to management and entrepreneurialism (Ahmed et al. 2006). Similar to other public-policy fields, also in media policy, the responsibility of inclusion has shifted from PSM institutions to individual journalists who are expected to ‘open the mind to other opinions’ (Jennekens 2007), to individual migrant activists who are required to train themselves in media logic (Klute 2010) and to ‘culturally diverse’ talents who are expected to bring in new audiences with their new faces. Thus, the new policies avoid making any organizational or institutional changes or identifying discriminatory practices in the PSM organizations. Instead of that, they dilute organizational responsibility and transfer it to the individual level.

It is necessary to consider some critical dimensions of this discursive change. First, the cultural diversity discourse silences the narrative and history of racism and colonialism. By erasing ‘racism’, the policy makers end up erasing the ideology of racism and history of white European domination and subordination. Second, the shift directs attention away from discrimination that exists in European societies and media systems. Celebration of cultural diversity in a consumable format dilutes and makes it easier to deny the experiences of discrimination. Third, while the vocabulary has changed, the grammar of media production and media institutions has not necessarily shifted in a more inclusive direction. The ‘whiteness’ of the organization still exists as the norm into which culturally diverse ‘colour’ is added, as several studies of the policies and practices of national PSM indicate (see for instance Chapters 7, 8 and 9 in this volume). Fourth, the initiatives are focused on diversity and difference *in* media output. They do not consider that advancing the diversity *of* the media field is important. As Glasser, Awad and Kim (2009: 63) argue, both diversity in journalism

and diversity of journalism are crucial for inclusive journalism: ‘a decentred democracy includes a communication infrastructure capable of sustaining multiple levels of robust public expression.’ Diversity of journalism refers to a structurally mixed system of public communication, including various minority media. Any newsroom can pursue diversity in journalism through recruitment and openness to various perspectives, but no newsroom can achieve diversity of journalism alone. Thus, diversity of journalism promises more than sensitivity to cultural differences. In the case of European public service media, we can extend Glasser, Awad and Kim’s (2009) argument of inclusive journalism to cover other media genres such as fiction and entertainment.

It is very clear that European diversity initiatives focus on diversity *in* media. There is little attention to more profound institutional and social inequalities that shape the framework for media production. Access to education, distribution of public funding, alternative ways of doing media and connecting resources of mainstream and minority media are not seriously addressed in current initiatives related to cultural diversity. Yet, NGOs such as Mira Media in the Netherlands and Cospe in Italy organize media projects that take steps in this direction to find ways of collaboration between media and civil society. However, the real policy silence in European PSM cultural diversity initiatives today is that they are not making efforts to find new public policies that are able to counter the kinds of racism and discrimination that have not disappeared from Europe, but that have taken and are constantly taking new shapes.

References

Ahmed, S. (2000), *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*, London: Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2004), 'Declarations of Whiteness: The non-Performativity of anti-racism', *Borderlands*, 9: 2, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/ahmed_declarations.htm. Accessed 25 October 2010.

Ahmed, S., Hunter, S., Kilic, S. Swan, E., and Turner, L. (2006), *Race, Diversity and Leadership in the Learning and Skills Sector* [Final report], Lancaster: Lancaster University.

Anthias, F. and Lloyd C. (2002), 'Introduction: Fighting Racisms, Defining the Territory', in F. Anthias and C. Lloyd (eds), *Rethinking Anti-racisms: From theory to practice*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–21.

Bacchi, C. (2009), *Analysing Policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Back, L. (2007), *The Art of Listening*, Oxford: Berg.

Better, S. (2008), *Institutional Racism: A primer on theory and strategies for social change*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bink, S., (2002), *Tuning into diversity: European report*, Amsterdam: Dutch Foundation for Ethnic Minorities and Media STOA/Mira Media. www.socsci.kun.nl/maw/cw/jeanm/Binkdive. Accessed 11 October 2010.

Cola, M. (2010), 'Cultural diversity in a "diverse" country: How public service media promote cultural diversity in Switzerland', In ECREA (European Communication Research and Education Association), *3rd European Communication Conference*, Hamburg, Germany, 15 October.

Council of Europe (1993), *Vienna Declaration*, 9 October, Vienna: Council of Europe, <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=621771&Site=COE>. Accessed 11 October 2010.

Cottle, S. (1998), 'Making Ethnic Minority Programmes Inside the BBC: Professional pragmatics and cultural containment', *Media, Culture & Society*, 20: 2, pp. 295–317.

Dannavi, M. (2008), 'Presentation of FunX Radio', *Diversity Show* (NPS, Netherlands Public Broadcasting), 6 November, Hilversum, the Netherlands.

Dyer, R. (1997), *White*, London: Routledge.

European Broadcasting Union (EBU) (1994), 'EBU declaration on the role of public service broadcasters in a multiracial, multicultural and multifaith Europe', *EBU Television Programme Committee's 66th Meeting*, Geneva, Switzerland, 25–26 October [Repr. *Diffusion EBU 2001/4*, p. 39, Grand-Saconnex: EBU,

https://www.ebu.ch/CMSimages/en/publications_automne_2001_tcm6-12444.pdf.

Accessed 23 January 2013].

European Broadcasting Union (EBU) (2002), *Media With a Purpose: Public Service Broadcasting in the digital era* [report], Digital Strategy Group, European Broadcasting Union, Grand-Saconnex: EBU, http://www.ebu.ch/CMSimages/en/DSG_final_report_E_tcm6-5090.pdf. Accessed 23 January 2013.

European Broadcasting Union (EBU) (n.d.), 'EBU membership regulations', http://www.ebu.ch/departments/legal/activities/leg_membership.php. Accessed 30 September 2008.

Essed, P. (1991), *Understanding Everyday Racism: An interdisciplinary theory*, London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1995), *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold.

Faist, T. (2009), 'Diversity – a New Mode of Incorporation?', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32: 1, pp.171-190.

Forde, G. (1995), 'A responsibility to respond', *Spectrum: The Magazine of Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe*, 3, London: PBME, p. 17.

European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) (ed.) (2007), *A Diversity Toolkit for*

Factual Programmes in Public Service Television, Vienna: FRA.

Glasser, T., Awad, I., and Kim, JW. (2009), 'The Claims of Multiculturalism and Journalism's Promise of Diversity', *Journal of Communication*, 59: 1, pp. 57–78.

Hall, S. (2009) 'Conclusion: The Multicultural Question', in B. Hesse (ed.) *Un/settled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions*. London: Zed Books, pp. 209–241.

Hargreaves, A. (2002), 'France', in J. Ter Wal (ed.), *Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media: An overview of research and examples of good practice in the EU member states, 1995–2000*, Vienna: EUMC/ERCOMER.

Hervik, P. (2006), 'The Emergence of Neo-nationalism in Denmark, 1992–2001', in A. Gingrich and M. Banks (eds), *Neo-Nationalism in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from social anthropology*, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 92–106.

Horsti, K. (2009), 'Anti-racist and Multicultural Discourses in European Public Service Broadcasting: Celebrating consumable differences in Prix Europa Iris media prize', *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 2: 2, pp. 339–60.

Jauert, P. and Lowe G. F. (2005), 'Public service broadcasting for social and cultural citizenship: Renewing the Enlightenment Mission', in G. F. Lowe and P. Jauert (eds), *Cultural Dilemmas in Public Service Broadcasting*, Gothenburg: Nordicom, pp. 9–12.

Jennekens, F. (2007), 'Preface', in FRA (European Agency for Fundamental Rights) (ed.), *A Diversity Toolkit for Factual Programmes in Public Service Television*, Vienna: FRA.

Jennekens, F. (2010), 'How diversity is implemented in European media?' [panel contribution, K. Horsti notes], MiM (MiraMedia) *Tuning in to Diversity 2010, Media and Diversity European Conference*, Budapest, Hungary, 25–26 February.

Klute, E. (2010), 'How diversity is implemented in European media?' [panel contribution, K. Horsti notes], MiM (MiraMedia) *Tuning in to Diversity 2010, Media and Diversity European Conference*, , Budapest, Hungary, 25–26 February.

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

Leurdijk, A. (2006), 'In Search of Common Ground: Strategies of multicultural television producers in Europe', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9: 1, pp. 25–46.

Malik, S. (2002), *Representing Black Britain: A history of Black and Asian images on British television*, London: Sage.

NPS (Netherlands Public Broadcasting) (2008), *Diversity Show*, Hilversum, the Netherlands, 6 November.

Mira Media (2004), *Tuning in to Diversity Conference*, Noordwijkerhout, the Netherlands, 23–25 September.

Mira Media (2010), *Tuning in to Diversity 2010, Media and Diversity European Conference*, Budapest, Hungary, 25–26 February.

Pleitgen, F. (2007) Quotation, *Diversity Toolkit for Factual Programmes in Public Service Television*, Vienna: FRA.

Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe (PBME) (1995), *Recommendations for Broadcasting on Fair Portrayal of Ethnic Minorities in European Societies*, London: PBME.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2001), *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*, London: Routledge.

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

Singh, E. (1994), 'Editorial', *Spectrum: The Magazine of Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe*, 2, London: PBME, pp. 5–6.

Vasta, E. (2007), 'Accommodating Diversity: Why current critiques of multiculturalism miss the point', *Centre on Migration, Policy and Society Working Papers*, 53, Oxford: University of Oxford.

White, A. (1995), 'The multicultural challenge', *Spectrum: The Magazine of Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe*, 3, London: PBME, pp. 16.

Notes

¹ Some examples of the anti-racist concerns at high political level in the early 1990s in Europe are the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), founded by European Commission in 1993, European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), founded by the EU in 1997. EUMC became the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) ten years later. This name change illustrates the shift from anti-racism to cultural diversity.

² A European initiative supported by BBC Education and BBC Television-Equal Opportunities (UK), Belgian radio and television network BRTN (Belgium), Netherlands broadcasting foundation NOS (Netherlands), Dutch Foundation for Ethnic Minorities and Media STOA (Netherlands) and University of Luton (UK) to promote the role of public broadcasting in the development of a multicultural Europe.

³ About the ideology of public service broadcasting in Europe see e.g. Jauert and Lowe (2005).

⁴ The TV Iris prize originates from 1996 when four national prizes of the Netherlands, Britain, Germany and Belgium merged into one, the Prix Iris. In 2000, this prize joined an acknowledged entity, Prix Europa, and was called Prix Europa Iris between 2000 and 2007 (Horsti 2009).

⁵ In this work I understand the concept of discourse from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (e.g. Reisigl and Wodak 2001; Fairclough 1995) that refers to discourses as language in use. Crucial is analysis of linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures in the context of power and historical trajectories (Richardson 2007: 26).

⁶ Collaboration is approached here as interaction between interested European PSB companies, other media professionals, European agencies and NGOs like Media in the Netherlands that lobby for minority rights and run various projects on diversity. The European Commission, the European Union and the Council of Europe have been important funding bodies for the realization of these initiatives and projects. The research material consists of publications produced between 1994 and 2010 (see the list of references) and participant observation at two European events where PSBs and NGOs have shared 'good practices' and discussed the role of various media in multicultural European societies. The first event *Diversity Show* was organized by the Dutch PSB NPS in Hilversum, the Netherlands, 6 November 2008 and the second one, *Tuning in to Diversity 2010* by a Dutch NGO Mira Media together with other partners, 25–26 February 2010.

⁷ Marta Cola (2010) analyses that the Swiss cultural diversity policies focus on the national linguistic minority issues rather than new immigrant minorities.

⁸ As early as the 1980s there were some European collaborative projects such as the conferences of a research project called *The role of information in the realisation of the human rights of migrant workers* in Tampere in 1983 and Lausanne in 1988. In addition, the Council of Europe organized a conference titled *Migrants, Media and*

Cultural Diversity in Noordwijkerhout in 1988. All these conferences produced recommendations and plans of action and brought together academics, media professionals, migrant organizations and journalists' associations. These earlier conferences, particularly the one in Noordwijkerhout, generated ideas and networks for the activism that took off in the 1990s (Bink 2002).

⁹ Denmark never had a specific niche programme like Finland, Sweden and Norway.

¹⁰ *Goodness Gracious Me* is a radio (BBC Radio 4, 1996–98) sketch and a TV comedy (BBC 2, 1998–2001) which played with stereotypes of the British and the Indian. *Meiden van Halal* (NPS, 2005, 2006) is a Dutch show that featured three hijab-wearing Muslim sisters as hosts. This programme inspired the Swedish SVT in its *Halal-TV* show in 2008.

¹¹ The declaration adopted by the EBU television programme committee at its 66th meeting in Geneva on 25 and 26 October 1994. Declaration reprinted in *Diffusion Diffusion* EBU 2001/4, https://www.ebu.ch/CMSimages/en/publications_automne_2001_tcm6-12444.pdf. Accessed 9 October 2007.

¹² The two issues (*Spectrum* 1994 and 1995) have been studied here as examples of the discourses circulated in the 1990s among European PSB collaborations.

¹³ Examples of conferences: *Media and Minorities*, Utrecht, 1991 serves as an example of the early collaboration when BBC representatives were invited to the Netherlands to present their actions and good practices as an example for Dutch future policies. The conference presented ideas for the Dutch parliament; *Public Broadcasting for a Multicultural Europe*, Noordwijkerhout, 1992 was a pioneering conference between the Dutch and British PSBs, academics and NGOs that set the frame for future broader European collaboration; the second PBME conference, Solingen, 1994 and the final PBME conference, Strasbourg, 1995; other conferences in Amsterdam, 1995; Strasbourg, 1995; Hilversum, 1998; Cologne, 1999; and Berlin 2000 (Bink 2002).

¹⁴ Mira Media is an independent cooperative body founded in 1986 by the major national migrant organizations in the Netherlands.

¹⁵ Sara Ahmed (2004) points out that whiteness is invisible to those who inhabit it, but those who are positioned 'non-white' see whiteness everywhere.