

**Myria Georgiou**

## Mapping diasporic media across the EU: addressing cultural exclusion

### Project report

**Original citation:**

Georgiou, Myria (2003) *Mapping diasporic media across the EU: addressing cultural exclusion. European Media Technology and Everyday Life Network (EMTEL) II*, Key Deliverables, Media@LSE, Department of Media and Communications, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK.

Originally available from [Media@LSE, London School of Economics and Political Science](#)

Funded by the [European Community's Fifth Framework Programme \(FP5/1998–2002\)](#), and [Sixth Framework Programme \(FP6/2002-2006\)](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/26420/>

Available in LSE Research Online: August 2014

© 2003 The Author, EMTEL II

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

**Mapping Diasporic Media across  
the EU:  
Addressing Cultural Exclusion**

**Key Deliverable  
The European Media and Technology in  
Everyday Life Network, 2000-2003**

Dr Myria Georgiou  
[Media@LSE](mailto:Media@LSE), London School of Economics and Political Science

## **Table of Contents**

General preface	3
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	8
1. The Context	11
2. Methodology: A Cross-European Transnational Perspective	22
3. Mapping Diasporic Media Cultures and European Diversity	29
4. Addressing Exclusion/Inclusion from a Cultural Perspective	55
5. Policy Implications	60
6. Conclusions	62
References and Appendix	

## **EMTEL - General preface**

The European Media Technology and Everyday Life Network (EMTEL) was funded by the European Commission (grant number HPRN ET 2000 00063) under the 5<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme. It was constituted as a research and training network within the programme, Improving Knowledge Potential and oriented towards “creating a user friendly information society”.

EMTEL conducted interdisciplinary social scientific research and training between 2000 and 2003. This report is one of 12 submitted to the EU in September 2003 as final deliverables for the project. Copies are available on [www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL) and a full list of the publications can be found as an Appendix to this report. Contributing partners were as follows:

- ASCoR, The University of Amsterdam
- COMTEC, Dublin City University
- IPTS, Seville
- LENTIC, The University of Liège
- [Media@lse](mailto:Media@lse), London School of Economics (co-ordinating centre)
- NTNU, University of Trondheim
- SMIT, Free University of Brussels
- TNO, Delft
- SINTEF, Trondheim.

EMTEL sought to bring together young and experienced researchers in a shared project to investigate the so-called information society from the perspective of everyday life. It undertook research under two broad headings: inclusion and exclusion, and living and working in the information society. It then sought to integrate empirical work and developing theory in such a way as to engage constructively with on-going policy debates on the present and future of information and communication technologies in Europe.

**Roger Silverstone**

**EMTEL Co-ordinator**

## **Acknowledgements**

Firstly, special mention needs to be made to the network of scholars across Europe that made the realisation of this ambitious and demanding project possible. Their contribution in the form of national reports and case studies has been invaluable. The scholars are: Susan Bink, Martina Bose, Leonor Camauer, Manuel Antunes da Cunha, Tsypylma Darieva, Alexandra Figueiredo, Berta Gaya, Regina Haberfellner, Sari Hanafi, Mustafa Hussein, Ralf Kauranen, Ayhan Koldas, Marie-France Malonga, Meghann Ormond, Ulrich Raiser, Isabelle Rigoni, Salla Tuori, Abel Ugba and Sara Wajid.

Special thanks to Ed Klute, Esther Lubenau and Susan Bink of Mira Media (The Netherlands) for their contribution with original data to this report, but also for their inspiring input and assistance in establishing links with minority media, NGOs and academics across Europe. Additionally, the contribution of the network *On Line/More Colour in the Media* to the report with original data – especially of Mira Media and COSPE – has been invaluable. The Groupement pour les Droits des Minorites (GDM, France) and the Institute for Jewish Policy Research (London) have also contributed with original data to this report. We are grateful for their help. Other organisations such as Panos (Paris), the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) and the Danish Refugee Council offered interesting feedback and input at different stages of this research's development.

We also grateful to the other members of the EMTEL 2 Network whose co-operation and feedback advanced this study.

**Myria Georgiou**

## **Executive Summary**

Peoples who at some stage in their history migrated from an original homeland and settled in a European country – that is, diasporic groups – is estimated to be between ten and 30 million across a total population in the European Union (EU) of about 380 million. In addition to that millions of members of the older diasporas – for instance, Jewish, Roma, Armenians – have been integral components of the European past and present. Almost five million out of the world's 20 million refugees are hosted in Europe for longer or shorter periods.

Cultural diversity has always characterised Europe, but growing potential for mobility and communication has led to new forms of inclusion and exclusion in transnational communities and multicultural societies. The quantitative and qualitative elements of cultural diversity give rise to important and timely questions for the Europe of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Does diversity threaten unity? How do cultural expressions of difference relate to questions of exclusion and inclusion? Can European culture(s) be inclusive? These questions are points of departure for this project, which has been structured along two main theoretical and methodological axes. On the one hand, it attempts to create a cross-European mapping of cultural diversity and on the other hand, it focuses on cultural questions about exclusion and participation - crucial points that are often overlooked in academic and policy discourse.

### **Focusing on the Cultural and Everyday**

The exclusion of diasporas and migrant minorities is at the core of many national and European academic and policy debates but little attention has been paid to cultural exclusion. That is, to the informal, ordinary processes that take place in everyday life and which can allow or restrict inclusion in local, national and transnational spaces. Media cultures are essential elements shaping and being shaped by everyday life and so this project investigates the significance of informal and communication processes and developments for our understanding of diasporic minorities' experience of inclusion and exclusion.

The local, the national and the transnational are the three crucial spatial and cultural contexts where the experience of diasporic groups evolves. The local is where the everyday is lived; the national is where citizens' (or residents') rights and obligations are formed and formal rules for political and cultural exclusion/inclusion are set; the transnational is the space where global diasporic networks expand and where diasporic communities are sustained. New information and communication technologies gain a growing role in

sustaining communication and networks in and across the three spatial positions; in representing diasporic groups to themselves and to the rest of the society; and in finding a voice and establishing visible presence for excluded groups.

This project studies the cross-European expression of these issues. The methodological choice of mapping allows the researcher to identify the large-scale and multiple geographical elements of diasporisation and media cultures as well as facilitates their examination at local, national and transnational levels. Thirteen national reports and a series of case studies inform the analysis. The mapping methodology enabled the to: (i) Draw the large-scale picture of the trends and flows of diasporic mobility and communication across Europe. (ii) Seek meaningful comparisons between different forms of media production and ICT appropriation. (iii) Cross-examine the macro and descriptive with the specific and qualitative based on a theme-based analysis.

## Main Findings

The theme-based analysis identifies six areas as the most important in addressing the relation between diasporic media cultures and exclusion/inclusion.

### Examining Exclusion from a Cultural Perspective

<b>The Local</b>	<b>The National</b>	<b>The Transnational</b>
The (Re-)construction of Urban Space <sup>1</sup>	The National and the Policy Context: Enabling or Restricting Minority Voices <sup>2</sup>	Satellite Television Map: The Transnational as the Alternative <sup>3</sup>
The Multicultural and Mediated Local – Multicultural Media Projects <sup>4</sup>	Minority Media as a Challenge to the Mainstream National Media <sup>5</sup>	The Internet: Active participation in a Community <sup>6</sup>

In the analysis of these themes, three main theoretical points emerge in relation to diasporic media cultures' role in processes of exclusion/inclusion.

- The triangular positioning of diasporic cultural experience. A consideration of exclusion/inclusion only in terms of formal political and economic processes – inevitably bounded within the nation – undermines an understanding of the processes that take place in the local and the transnational. These other dimensions can challenge the limitations set by the national context – for example, diasporic participation in transnational mediated networks while excluded from national networks.
- Representation and self-representation. All cultures are increasingly media(ted) cultures and as a result, mediated representation is of growing significance. Crucial questions with cultural and political implications include who is represented, by whom and how. As diasporic groups develop their own (self-) representations as an

alternative to the mainstream, they challenge their exclusion, stereotyping and homogenised representation in the mainstream media cultures.

- Finding a Voice – *Global Commons*. There are power struggles among different groups, minorities and majorities in an attempt to gain a space in media cultures and to make their voice heard (issues of concentration of power and resources and sustainability are of particular relevance here). The decentralisation and deregulation of mediated communication through digitalisation – and especially with the Internet – has allowed some of those excluded groups a space of expression and possible empowerment. Although the “global commons” is not all-inclusive, it still destabilises old forms of exclusion.

### **Main Policy Implications**

The research findings raise the following policy implications: (i) Not all diasporic media cultures nor diasporic media are homogenous. This makes a theme-based analysis and approach in policy more useful especially if this takes into account the economic viability of minority media; representation/self-representation of excluded populations; and access to ICTs. (ii) European Information Society policies should go beyond the functional and linear perspectives of the significance of ICTs for inclusion. Not only do ICTs help with the development of skills, they also expand communication potential for excluded communities and thus have consequences for their cultural inclusion and empowerment. (iii) There should be more interconnection between national and European policies on exclusion, integration, communication and culture.



## Introduction

Three points need to be made at the outset. Firstly, the peoples who at some stage in their history migrated from an original homeland and settled in a European country – that is, diasporic groups – are estimated to be between ten and 30 million across a total population in the European Union (EU) of about 380 million. Secondly, there are millions of members of the older diasporas – Jewish, Roma, Armenians – that have been integral components of the European past and present. Thirdly, almost five million out of the world's 20 million refugees are hosted in Europe for longer or shorter periods.

Cultural diversity has always characterised Europe, but the growing potential for mobility and communication has led to new cultural and social experiences and formations.

This project is an attempt to map European diversity and interpret it. It maps cultural difference as expressed in media cultures and the process raises questions of inclusion, exclusion and participation in European societies and in transnational communities that cut across the European Union and expand beyond it. Cultural difference can lead to segregation and to the emergence and sustaining of communities that are distinct and separate from the mainstream, but differences can also give rise to the emergence of communities that are becoming an integral part of national and transnational European societies. These possibilities are of particular relevance in the debates around an inclusive, diverse and democratic EU. Diasporic groups – communities of populations that at some stage in their history migrated from another country to a new one – are some of the groups at the heart of these debates. However, how important is the recognition and support of cultural diversity for inclusive Europe? Can diasporic communities be culturally distinct and at the same time enable dialogue between different cultural groups? Can exclusion be tackled without addressing “the cultural”? This paper seeks to address these questions in relation to media and ICT, but goes on to argue that these become increasingly relevant for any debate on cultural diversity, processes of diasporisation and inclusion.

The argument for the centrality of diasporic media cultures in the debate around inclusion and diversity is grounded on two main points. On one hand, it relates to the increased role of media culture and of mediation. Everyday culture has become media culture (Silverstone, 1994; Alasuutari, 1999); representations, communication and information are all increasingly mediated, especially with the employment of ICTs. The position that different groups take in mediation processes – as producers, as receivers, as neither or both – has multiple implications for the possibilities for participation in media cultures and – in extent – to European societies. On the other hand, there is an acknowledgement of the

increasing globalisation of communication, which has consequences for inclusion in transnational and diasporic communities. The meanings of spatial and temporal restrictions and boundaries (Harvey, 1989) have been challenged through the media. This may be as images of a distant *homeland*<sup>7</sup> are disseminated on satellite television, as the image of the distant family is reinvented on a home-made web page, as the sound of a friend's new-born baby is mediated and heard on home video. New communication technologies, like developments in transportation, have allowed the local, the national and the transnational to actively interweave in emerging multi- and de-centred cultural spaces, where people experience everyday life (Morley and Robins, 1995). The immediacy of access to images and sounds that once would be unreachable, the mediation of the experience and the way both are appropriated allow diasporic media to become part of everyday culture, of emotional and communicational experience.

One of the consequences of the expanding communication globalisation is that geography and boundaries are challenged. As global communication networks allow dispersed populations across the globe to communicate constantly and simultaneously, they challenge the nation as the singular position where people live their lives and where identities and communities are singularly constructed. Cultural spaces have been expanding in mediated spaces, in spaces that are not only national, but also local and transnational and where multi-staged and disembedded dialogues and conflicts (Giddens, 1991) take place. These multi-centred spaces are full of tensions, inequalities and inconsistencies. They are spaces where information is neither linear or singular; where possibilities for inclusion, as in choosing not to belong or for combining belonging in multiple communities, emerge; where the struggles for inclusion and exclusion are not between the powerful and the subordinate but between different powerful and subordinate actors (Couldry, 2000).

This project examines how, in these highly mediated and global spaces (which include the local, national and transnational European), the diasporic media cultures become relevant to processes of inclusion and participation. Diasporic communities are transnational communities but at the same time, they often are among the most excluded populations in Europe. Have media and ICTs challenged these groups' exclusion? Have they furthered their participation in "diasporas" and multi-ethnic European and cross-European publics?

These are important questions for the future of multicultural Europe and for the European Information Society. They are questions that have not been adequately addressed in a European level in terms of research or policy. The research focus has predominantly been

on case studies, which do offer the understanding of the specific and particular experience of mediation, identity and community. The policy focus has been on states and interstate relations and, as regards media policy and ICTs, is concerned with social and economic exclusion. This research will try to bridge this gap between the macro- and the micro- and discuss the significance of the everyday, the particular and cultural in cross-European terms.

This is a unique attempt to map diasporic media cultures across the EU. Such an attempt is theoretically and empirically demanding. The methodology cannot provide an objective, quantified and complete map of mediation and diversity; it can only offer a cultural, suggestive and interpretative grasp of important dynamics in European diversity and mediation as these relate to processes of inclusion and participation. Diasporic media maps are constantly changing and are diverse in their production and consumption, especially if one studies them across states and across groups.

However, the proposed mapping brings out some of the elements that raise common issues and address questions of inclusion and participation beyond the particular and in relation to the experience of mediation and the appropriation of media and ICT. In doing so, the project draws from 13 national reports and from a series of case studies, either conducted for this research or drawn from secondary sources. The following reasons formed the basis of the focus on diasporic media production: (i) It reflects the cultural presence of different communities within broader local, national and transnational media cultures. (ii) It partly reflects the cultural identity of “diasporic” groups (for example, monolingual or multilingual media; local or/and global media). (iii) It allows us to investigate how media production interweaves with media consumption in complex relations that go beyond a conceptualisation of a “sender – receiver” relation.

This research is groundbreaking in scope and scale and thus it can only be an experimental and provocative starting point. The issues that are unfolded here confirm that diasporic media cultures can help us understand how everyday culture and mediation are crucial in thinking of inclusive Europe in more meaningful ways. This is just the beginning.

## **1. The Context**

### **1.1. Europe of Cultural Diversity**

The population of peoples who at some stage in their history migrated from an original *homeland* and settled in a EU country is estimated to be as high as 8% of the Union’s

population. One-seventh of all manual workers in Germany and the UK had come as immigrants, and in France, Belgium and Switzerland a quarter of the industrial workforce is formed by immigrants (Webber, 1991). Next to that, millions of members of the older “diasporas” – Jewish, Roma, Armenians– have been integral components of the European past and present, even if their experience of Europe has sometimes been of pain and prosecution. More recently, hundreds thousands of refugees have been settling in the EU and though these are minimal compared to the world refugee population, refugee mobility is central in debates over the future of Europe. Given that only 3% of the world’s refugees reach the UK (the Human Rights Watch, 2001) and that in most EU countries the migrant population does not exceed 2% of the population (COE, 1993), the interest in migrant and diasporic populations is not a mere reflection of a numerical phenomenon. In a total population of around 380 million, there are some 15 million non-nationals resident in Western Europe – that is, barely 4% of the total. In the countries of the EU, two-fifths of these come from other EU countries, Eastern Europe and other developed countries; three-fifths come from the countries of the South, such as North Africa, Turkey, Former Yugoslavia, Asia, Middle East, Africa and Latin America (Webber, 1991).

Migration is largely the outcome of colonial, postcolonial and indirect colonisation relations between the sending and the receiving countries. According to Castles et al. (1984), the population in Western Europe increased by 10 million between 1950 and 1975 because of net migration. In the late 1940s and 1950s, Europe also exported migrants overseas and this number reached three million. According to the same source, in 1984 the migrant labour migrants surpassed 16 million in Western Europe. In the early 1950s, the estimated number of non-Europeans in Europe was less than 350,000 (Peach, 1987) but by the early 1960s, there were a million and by the 1970s about four million. By the early 1980s, this had risen to six million. But between 1974 and 1981, the overall number of foreigners living in Europe stabilised (Peach, 1987), only to increase again with the migration from Eastern Europe and the refugees’ movement in the late 1980s and 1990s.

### **1.1.1. Europe and the Inclusion of Diversity**

European identity is becoming increasingly identified with a capacity to tolerate considerable cultural diversity – at least of those values that European citizens consider to be most worth preserving (K.Reif quoted in Wintle, 1996, p.5).

The debate around the cultural richness of Europe is not new. In the European Union the differences between ethnic communities have been projected as an advantage of the continent’s pluralism (Gatling, 1989). Yet, this discourse of celebrating diversity has not always been significantly and meaningfully inclusive. Gatling argues (1989) that, although

there are discussions in the EU on diversity within unity, such unity can have racist overtones. This is often expressed in the idea of Europeanism, which is supposed to focus on the characteristics that are shared all over Europe, but which usually comprises the characteristics of mainstream and dominant cultures.

These dominant ideologies in Europe undermine the characteristic heterogeneity of all multicultural societies. Heterogeneity creates a tension in the whole of society, not because it is a negative condition in itself, but because it is pathologised as a condition. Hobsbawm and Ranger partly attribute the creation of this tension to “the invention of tradition is an integral task in the nation-state’s reproduction of its continuity. There is then an inherent tension between the invented “heritage” which roots national identity in history, and the change and heterogeneity that characterises the contemporary western Europe nation-state” (Husband, 1994, p.6-7). The invented “heritage” and the myth of the inherited culture characterising the ideology of the nation-state have largely influenced the way Europe has been imagined. In similar ways, Pieterse (1991) argues that European culture is mythologised as being characteristically an inherited civilisation based on the Judaeo-Christian religion, the Greek ideas of government, philosophy, art and science and the Roman views concerning law. He goes on to challenge this: “The problem is that, in addition to being chauvinistic, elitist, pernicious and alienating, it is wrong. This myth undermines regional cultures and subcultures; it represents elite culture as tout court, it denies popular culture, it defines culture in relation to the past and it ignores Europe’s multicultural realities” (Pieterse 1991, p.3). A crucial question is how Europe is or can be lived. From a pessimistic starting point, Morley and Robins highlight the role and the opportunities created through mediation:

“The danger is that an oppressive European tradition and history will re-establish itself, and that Europe will remain fixed in a ‘geographical disposition’ that has historically governed the relation between its sovereign identity and the world of the Other. The danger is that empire will reassert itself in new ways. It is in this context that we must consider the significance of new information and communication technologies. In what way might they contribute to the new geographical dialogue between communities of common interest and communities of difference” (Morley and Robins, 1995, p.5).

Diversity between different models of participation, integration or assimilation is extensive between different nation-states. This diversity relates primarily to definitions, citizenship rights, cultural rights and privileges. In Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden migrants have the right to vote in local elections. Most countries with the

notable exception of Germany (Raiser, 2002a) have established consultative systems for migrants. “Immigrant participation in European public spheres increasingly displays new patterns and new discourses beyond those afforded by the formalised consultative channels” (Soysal, 1999, p.67).

National governments are still the dominant force for control of migration and minority rights. Yet, the transnational context is becoming increasingly relevant and “immigrant organisations in Europe, over time, have adopted new strategies of participation. Partly thanks to the increasing interconnectedness of the world, immigrants have developed networks and constructed transnational communities between home and receiving countries” (Soysal, 1999, p.71). Interestingly, migrant associations operate more and more in a European level, establishing umbrella associations and forming Europe-wide agendas. Examples include the European Immigrant Women’s Organisation, the Black and Immigrant Women’s Association, the Migrant Forum (funded by the Commission and bringing together over 100 associations within the EU) (Soysal, 1999, p.71).

Diasporic minorities are by their nature transnational, but their experience is also framed within national contexts and this has consequences for their rights and inclusion. Different European countries use different terminology to refer to the same people or similar conditions and this terminology is often political. In Germany, people who have been living in the country for more than 50 years are still considered as *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers) while in the UK, the term “ethnic minority” is generally accepted. This, as Rex (1994) argues, tends to emphasise physical appearance or cultural difference. National legislation and provisions against discrimination vary as well. French and German law condemn only direct discrimination, unlike the UK, where the law recognises indirect discrimination and allows prosecution on this basis (Smith and Blanc, 1995).

### **1.1.2. Diversity Across and Within**

The concept of “hybridity” is also useful for addressing the unpredictable and multiple cultural dynamics in Europe. The term implies diversity in cultures that co-exist, compete, merge and emerge. These cultures may be the outcome of cultural meetings or of suppression, exclusion and domination. They may reflect different starting points, histories, journeys and (imagined) destinations within Europe. Furthermore, they do not imply the existence of a given original or pure (‘the European’) or a new impure and other (‘the migrant/the foreign’) (Hall, 1992, 1996; Bhaba, 1990, 1994; Papastergiades, 1998; Brah and Coombes, 2000).

Rather hybridity implies multiple points of departure and multiple destinations; it implies instabilities and inequalities, not only in the meeting of two different cultures or populations (like, ‘the Turkish’ and ‘the German’), but within any of those cultures, group and communities, as much as in-between. In this context, hybridity becomes useful for understanding: (i) How European cultures emerge in the uneasy meeting of the old and the new, the local, the national and the transnational. (ii) How diasporic minorities are characterised by internal diversity, especially within generations and how diasporic communities involve as internal conflicts of power, as well as conflicts with others. (iii) How diasporic (media) cultures are not homogenous, harmonious or singular expressions of community consensus but actually involve negotiations and conflicts within and outside the group.

Communication is deeply embedded in the processes of hybridity (Friedman, 1994). Naficy (1993) argues that the media assist people to construct hybrid identities, not by producing absences, but by producing “multiplying presences of the home and the past and of the here and the now” (Naficy 1993, p.121). Furthermore, communication technologies and the emergence of hybrid identities allow people to break out of the clearly defined boundaries of two nation-states: the one they came from and the one they settled into<sup>8</sup>. At the same time, diasporic media become a meeting point for the traditional and the hybrid where they play the communication role that word of mouth once used to have for communities (Riggins, 1992) and where they mediate, translate and represent the multiplicity of ethnic discourses. Media might celebrate essentialism, totality and a process of *smoothing the rough edges* of identities, or they might construct radical discourses of disengagement from the essentialist and hegemonic understandings of singular and holistic identification, instead celebrate diversity and hybridity. In both cases, media project scenarios that are negotiated and appropriated in everyday life and in the meeting of immediate and mediated experience in local, national and transnational spaces.

## **1.2. The Significance of Diasporic Experience for Europe**

“Life in exile is a partial life, you lose your identity: Words of a member of the Ethiopian diasporic demonstrating in London” (as reported at the Ethiopian Web site [www.newvision.org.uk](http://www.newvision.org.uk)).

“By the end of the twentieth century, it is likely that the membership of the United Nations will comprise about 200 states. However, the number of ‘nation-peoples’ (groups evincing a ‘peoplehood’ through the retention or expression of separate

languages, customs, folkways and religions) is estimated at 2000, ten times the anticipated number of recognised nation-states” (Cohen, 1997, p. ix-x).

Diaspora is a concept that is relevant to the present discussion even if it is a contested category. The notion originates from the Greek *speiro* (to sow) and *dia* (over). For the ancient Greeks, diaspora had more to do with migration as colonisation than with de-territorialization. But elsewhere, for the groups that historically became key examples of a *diaspora* like the Jews, Armenians, Palestinians and Africans, diaspora signified a collective trauma, a banishment, “where one dreamt of home but lived in exile” (Cohen, 1997, p.ix). As the Armenians and the Jews become the ultimate symbols of diasporic experience, so the concept captured both the academic and the popular imagination. Many other populations started identifying themselves (or have been identified by academics, politicians, policy makers) as diasporas, even if they were not necessarily victims of violence.

The term “diaspora” has made a dynamic comeback in contemporary discourses on migration and mobility across the globe. Limitations in the earlier conceptualisation of the term have been addressed and, according to Safran (1991, p.83), the word is now deployed “as a metaphoric designation” to “describe *different categories* of people” – “expatriates, expellees, political refugees, alien residents, immigrants and ethnic and racial minorities *tout court*”. But scholars like Cohen who adopt such a flexible understanding of diaspora have been criticised for diluting the significance and the uniqueness of the concept. The term has also been criticised as assuming the continuous significance of an original *homeland* and the continuing attachment of dispersed populations with each other and the *homeland*. As this project indicates, the diasporic condition has shifted and the centrality of concepts like the “nation-state” and the “*homeland*” have been challenged, partly because of the possibilities for decentralised and participatory communication that ICTs enable. However, if diaspora is a contested and challenged concept, why is it still relevant in this debate?

A defining characteristic behind diaspora is a strong and continuing sense of sharing collective identities among dispersed populations (Cohen, 1997). This collective identity does not imply similarity, instead it recognises a necessary heterogeneity and diversity. “Diaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference” (Hall 1990, p.223). Gillespie notes the changes to diasporas as a result of globalisation: “A diasporic perspective acknowledges the ways in which identities have been and continue to be transformed through relocation, cross-cultural exchange and interaction. The globalisation of cultures is deeply implicated



in this process” (1995, p.7). Another characteristic of diasporic experience is that of de-territorialisation and settlement away from an original *homeland*. “A member’s adherence to a diasporic community is demonstrated by an acceptance of an inescapable link with their past migration history and a sense of co-ethnicity with others of a similar background” (Gillespie, 1995, p. ix).

Furthermore, diasporas are those communities dispersed to more than one country. This is particularly relevant when studying transnational diasporic communities across Europe. Some of the essential elements of a diasporic condition are those of a collective memory and myth about a homeland, a sense of empathy between people sharing the same ethnicity and an uneasy relation with the host country<sup>9</sup> (Gillespie, 1995, p. ix). This definition of diaspora offers a useful means to discuss the experience of cultural groups, which are transnational and settled within the EU and which share a distinct sense of commonality and community.

Cohen (1997) also suggests a categorisation of “diasporas” to include “victim diasporas”, such as the African and the Armenian, “labour and imperial diasporas” like the Indians and the British, “trade diasporas”, in the case of the Chinese and the Lebanese and “cultural diasporas” for instance people from the Caribbean. This categorisation is drawn on for the mapping in this project of multicultural Europe. However, a problem with Cohen’s analysis is a definition of diaspora that is broad. His operationalisation includes practically every established community of people who left a distant *homeland* in the past but excludes most communities of new migrants. The result is the emergence of certain definitional and operational problems.

This research project, in examining the diasporic condition in the EU, considers the sense of uneasiness with (and exclusion from) the mainstream in a host country as significant for the preservation and continuity of the sense of commonality among diasporic populations. Tense relations of power that involve the anxiety of belonging in more than one ethnic/national/transnational community; the attachment to different places, the historical, contemporary and/or imagined sense of exclusion; discrimination and disempowerment are all crucial components of the imagination and the politics of diaspora.

This project also views the concept of “*diasporas*” as more useful than “*diaspora*”. On one hand, diaspora implies a long experience of settlement in a host country, but this does not characterise many of the populations who have migrated more recently. Yet, the essential characteristics of diasporic condition – that is, transnationality, a sense of ethnic

commonality, myth and memory of a common original *homeland* – are present and significant for those populations that have migrated to the EU and who experience exclusion due to their ethnicity. On the other hand, the concept of “diasporas” rather than “diaspora” challenges any attempt of closure that would assume that the populations in question are by definition and forever attached to a homeland and to certain identity. The diasporic condition is contextual (Dayan, 1998) and the possibility of change and challenge to diasporic identification is always present.

The increasingly decentralised relation of the diaspora to the country of origin and within different factions of within the diaspora (Marienstras, 1988), made possible with the development of decentralised networks of people and communication, is crucial for understanding the diasporic condition within the context of this research. Similarly, Brah (1996) suggests that the concept of diaspora “offers a critique of discourses of fixed origins while taking account of a homing desire, as distinct from a desire for a ‘homeland’” (Brah, 1996, p:16). ICTs have played an important role in different diasporic communities in developing communication within local and transnational spaces and with the country of origin. Mediated images and imagination have been central to sustaining a sense of belonging and a sharing of diasporic cultures. Diasporic communities have been changing as the possibilities for communication, virtuality and mobility increase. New communications and increased possibilities for mobility allow the members of a group and of an imagined community to co-exist in virtual and real spaces: in the locality, in the nation, in transnational places.

### **1.3. The Diasporic Spatial Positioning**

Both place and space are important elements for understanding diaspora, diasporic dislocation (Dayan, 1998), relocation, the processes of de-territorialization and re-territorialization that characterise the real and the imagined diasporic experience. Diasporic minorities live within specific locales – usually urban places – national and transnational spaces.

The social interaction and communication within the diasporic communities, among dispersed sections of the same diaspora and beyond the limits of a diasporic community, all take place in spaces. Some of those spaces (also defined as ethno-scapes and media-scapes by Appadurai, 1990) are grounded in very specific places – such as the neighbourhood – while others exist virtually and in non-places (Urry, 1999). Social interaction and relations no longer depend on simultaneous spatial co-presence as relations develop with the “absent other” through new communications and when this happens our experience of time and

space becomes “distanciated” (Giddens, 1990). At which point diasporic communities can break off the specificities of space and extend their communication potentials. In this context, there is less possibility for a neat equation between culture, community and geography (Gillespie, op. cit.) and more space for “imaginative geography and history” (Said, 1985). The connections and relations of “absence” between places are greatly strengthened by modern communication systems, which have augmented a sense of diasporic awareness.

Diasporic communities sustain and partly depend for their shared sense of identity on transnational communication. However, the national and local context where diasporic populations live is equally important for our understanding of the meanings of community and identity, especially as inclusion, exclusion and participation in the broader societies are largely grounded in the national and local space. However, it is important not to underestimate the existence of general and global trends while taking into account the significant characteristics of each nation-state and each local space. O’Loughlin (1987) grounds his analysis in space before going on to argue that there is a need to study the experience of migrants in relation to geographical trends and patterns of their mobility and settlement.

#### **1.4. Media, ICT and Cultural Exclusion/Inclusion**

The concept of social exclusion needs to be seen within a discourse that goes beyond static and singular definitions of poverty. Instead, the concept reflects a shift in both academic thinking and policy making from a focus on “being” poor and from poverty alleviation policies to a recognition of the complex processes that underlies poverty. Instead, the concept of social exclusion has opened up a broader agenda that highlights the different mechanisms of inequality and links poverty to social divisions such as gender, ethnicity, age, etc. (Anthias, 2001). It also reflects the revaluation of the welfare state paradigm, and the idea that everybody should be able to fully participate in a modern democratic society.

Diasporic and migrant minorities experience economic deprivation and are considered to be among the groups with high levels of social exclusion. Relevant data suggests that these groups are often victims of exclusion from employment and quality housing. Thinking of social exclusion is the first step in considering inequality and discrimination as complex conditions rather than a singularly defined set of economic relations. More recently, debates on exclusion have highlighted its complexity but there is still an underestimation of *the cultural* and the everyday. The dimension of the cultural highlights the need for a discourse for tackling exclusion that considers formal and institutional processes – like

employment, education – as well as informal and communication processes that take place in everyday life. The elements that we want to highlight here are those that should involve cultural particularity of diasporic people and the struggle between dominant and alternative cultures, identity as well as issues of multiculturalism and racism (Anthias, 2001).

Social exclusion and participation are constrained within a range of parameters including the following: (i) The legislation that frames migration and the legal status of migrants are of essential relevance to the economic, social and cultural integration of migrants (Boecker and Havinga, 1998). (ii) Exclusion and marginalization as they relate to citizenship rights and ascribed identities (Husband, 1993). So for instance, migrants with EU passports are privileged by free access to the job market and social benefits, while non-EU citizens are excluded. (iii) These formal types of exclusions can lead to informal and cultural forms of exclusion, like restricted access to education, to quality housing and to new technologies (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001).

The question of the relation between exclusion, media and ICTs in this context relates to: (i) Considerations of access beyond a strictly functional perspective (for example, skills for employment). (ii) Considerations of *human strategies* that take into account group, community and identity dynamics and differences that shape differentiated interests, agendas and ways of getting involved in the use of ICT and the media. (iii) Considerations of how strategies that focus on ICT use also need to take into account cultural exclusion in terms of communication, information, ideologies.

Thus, this project considers the discussion on the development of alternative media – diasporic media in this case – as centrally relevant to the debate around ICTs and exclusion. The development of minority media, facilitated by ICTs, also raises issues of social and cultural exclusion, access and cultural production as well as access and content. The debate around exclusion and the media highlights the continuous and everyday character that exclusion can take and suggests that the informal mechanisms of communication and cultural engagement in everyday life are necessary for tackling it.

#### **1.4.1. Media and Exclusion: Shaping an Agenda**

The social divisions based on ethnicity, gender, disability etc. relate to both material and symbolic processes (Anthias, 2001). This means that ICTs and the media have a dual role as mechanisms that enable or obstruct participation in economic processes and as mechanisms that tied to ideas, ideologies, stereotyping and cultural procedures that directly or indirectly maximise or minimise boundaries around groups. Legislation on citizenship,

culture and communication is also then relevant to the processes of recognition and inclusion.

Solomos (1995) argues for recognition of the need for co-ordinated public policy aimed at the political, cultural and social integration of ethnic, or diasporic minorities. This is not far from popular imagination in multicultural societies – at least where a multicultural model is more dominant. A recent survey in the UK (The Guardian, 2002) shows that the majority of the British population is aware of discrimination against diasporas (and religious) minorities and, interestingly enough, they recognise some of the central elements of an inclusive and participatory multiculturalism. Eight out of ten respondents believe Muslims and non-Muslims can live peacefully together despite cultural differences and they reject the idea that people settling in Britain should abandon their (diasporic) ethnic cultures.

There are a number of crucial questions to pose in framing the research agenda that brings together exclusion, media and ICTs.

- A dimension of social exclusion is symbolic exclusion (Couldry, 2001). If minorities do not have access to media, ICT and media production are they even more excluded?
- If we accept that mainstream media are currently major agents in the everyday construction of dominant cultures, are minorities more disempowered because they are under-representation in mainstream media?
- Do diasporic minorities become more active as participants in an increasingly mediated culture when they develop their own media and so do diasporic media empower minorities?
- Since diasporic minorities and their media often extend beyond national borders, should our understandings of social exclusion extend beyond the nation? Does the growing globalisation of communication flows challenge exclusion as we understand it?

### **1.5. The Policy Context**

Questions of diversity and culture are often in the background of European and national policies in the area of media and ICT. The policies of the European Information Society tend to focus on economy and competitiveness. Much is argued about the development of skills and the inclusion in the labour market, but less mention – and even less specific mention – has been made of the cultural element of inclusion and exclusion. Policy actions, such as the *eEurope* action plans, focus on developing the infrastructure and furthering access to new technologies.

This research touches on the meanings and significance of broader access and of participation in the Information Society from a cultural perspective. This raises questions as to what do people and communities do with ICTs? How do communication technologies and the media change relations of exclusion and inclusion in European societies? What is the meaning of inclusion – if one goes beyond the strictly defined economic zone? These questions are addressed in relation to diasporic populations and contention made is that understanding the cultural significance of media and technologies is a crucial step in discussing and building a more inclusive Information Society in Europe.

However, first, this paper highlights some of the problematic areas in the European policy of multiculturalism, minorities and the media:

- The dominant trend is the lack of connection between cultural, including media, policies and migrant, or diasporic, exclusion policies. Migration is usually considered either a phenomenon or a problem and policy often undermines the integration and participation of diasporas and migrant groups in the European and national societies. The result is that many policy documents exclude minorities from mainstream cultural projects on national and European level. Policies that integrate migration, minorities and cultural and socio-economic issues are rare and inconsistent.
- Policy tends to deal with minorities as one homogenous group or as a phenomenon; the particularities of different groups are rarely addressed (unless if there is a question of very visible *otherness*, like the issue of headscarfs and Muslim women).
- Diversity within minority groups, for instance between generations and genders, is acknowledged even more rarely.
- EU policies on free movement and employment, as seen in the Treaty of Amsterdam and the Treaty of Rome, do not offer the EU residents who do not have one of the EU nationalities, the same opportunities for mobility. These kind of restrictions may have consequences for the exclusion of minority populations from the project of united Europe.
- Policy documents are never published in minority languages, even when they refer to minorities. European multi-lingualism is still strictly framed on a national level.
- The policy discourse, when addressing issues of minority integration and participation, focuses on majorities when it looks at issues of racism, representation of minorities in the media and on informing the wider public about minorities, their needs and rights. This approach contributes to the image of minorities as voiceless, or as a problem, and undermines the fact that these diasporic groups actively construct cultures and identities and experience exclusion from public and cultural projects.

- The national agendas of assimilation (until the late 1970's) and integration (in the 1980's onwards) have usually assumed that the host society is not only culturally dominant, but also a stable reference. Migrant/diasporic groups have to integrate by adapting to the economic, political and cultural mainstream system. It is rare that culture and society are viewed as evolving and it is rare for documents to acknowledge the role of diasporic cultures in enriching and renewing national and European cultures. These contributions are seldom welcomed as a positive element of contemporary European reality.
- There is also the issue of who represents diasporic groups in national and European bodies. Even if minority members have the right to vote their representation in the mainstream is still limited and minority representatives in policy bodies are usually appointed by the government rather than elected by the minorities themselves.
- Policy agendas have rarely recognised that issues of integration, inclusion and exclusion are not only formal (political, economic and cultural initiatives) but also informal, especially when they relate to groups of people with distinct cultural identities and alternative to the mainstream everyday cultures.

## **2. Methodology – A Cross-European Transnational Perspective**

This project investigates the relation between media, ICT and exclusion from a cultural perspective. As such, it moves away from an economic approach and focuses on how diasporic communities, who tend to experience high levels of social exclusion, use media and ICTs<sup>14</sup> to further inclusion (or selective inclusion) in distinct communities and, or, multi-ethnic publics. The focus on participation and inclusion in communities and publics implies that this is an investigation of the role of communication and mediation in everyday informal processes of inclusion rather than a discussion on the role of ICTs in formal economic and political inclusion<sup>15</sup>. The scope and scale of this project are innovative<sup>16</sup> and the theoretical and methodological design of the project reflects this challenge.

Theoretically, the research draws on a rich and diverse range of literature in addressing the main research question, that is, whether and how communication and mediation can facilitate further (selective) inclusion. Literature on migration studies offers a framework for understanding the social exclusion of diasporic/migrant groups, as well as issues of formal and informal, political and legislative discrimination within Europe. EU and COE publications offer additional analysis and data. Diaspora and trans-national theories and research offer a complementary and significant contribution to understanding diasporic

exclusion, inclusion and participation, not only within the national context but beyond and across national borders. As communication and diasporic groups move beyond geographical boundaries, issues of globalisation become relevant in thinking about (old and new) potentials and experiences of inclusion in communities and publics.

Furthermore, literature on the Information Society as well as national and European policy documents that address exclusion with specific reference to ICT, provide some interesting perspectives on information and communication exclusion. However, they also expose the gaps in recognising the significance of the informal and everyday uses of ICT and the media. Thus, theories on everyday life, mediation and media cultures become a necessary and significant reference for understanding the meanings of diasporic media cultures in relation to exclusion and inclusion.

Our methodological choices primarily relate to the scope of the project – cross-European, cross-group – and the requirement to investigate the relation between media, ICTs and inclusion beyond formal processes. The method of mapping was chosen as the most appropriate to address: (i) Quantitative and cross-European and cross-community dimensions of the diversity in production and appropriation of media and ICTs across Europe. (ii) Qualitative characteristics of diasporic media cultures, which relate to specific national, diasporic and media qualities and which go beyond the scope of a large-scale comparison. This dual approach was a fundamental element of the methodology of mapping.

### **2.1. Mapping Diasporic Media Cultures in the EU**

Mapping as a methodology is useful for studying the main parameters of diasporic media cultures and their relation to issues of inclusion and participation. It recognises the large-scale and multiple geographical elements of diasporisation and media cultures and examines their development in national and transnational levels. As a methodology, it aims to collect descriptive data about the populations addressed and the kinds and numbers of media and ICTs to be studied. Descriptive data is a necessary starting point, especially in this area where there is lack of such data. Such data might not answer all relevant questions<sup>17</sup>, but it can provide a starting point for illustrating European cultural diversity.

Mapping as a methodology also makes possible the study of large area and is thus appropriate for studying cross-European and cross-community experiences. Furthermore, unlike a map, it is open-ended and so signifies the constantly changing nature of diasporic presence and diasporic media cultures in the EU. The process cannot be complete and



stable, which means the output is not an objective map, but a cultural one. These features makes it important to study not only the descriptive, large-scale elements, but also in the details and themes that emerge. Elements of the large cross European and cross-community become more meaningful when cross-examined and further investigated in terms of specific small-scale components. The two dimensional approach has influenced the design of the project.

## **2.2. Thinking Comparatively**

The use of a mapping methodology implies a comparative perspective across Europe and across diasporic groups. In designing this project we critically engage and learn from cross-national comparative research. Comparative research allows comparisons across two or more geographically or historically (spatially or temporally) defined systems and examines phenomena that are embedded in interrelations that are relatively coherent, comprehensive, bounded and distinct (Blumler *et al.*, 1992a). A focus on cross-national comparative research can expand understanding of social phenomena by acquiring comparative knowledge of how common and transnational processes operate under specific conditions in different national context (Livingstone, 2001).

Blumler *et al.* highlight some significant advantages of comparative research, especially as far as communication is concerned:

“At the level of observation, comparative inquiry cosmopolitanizes, opening our eyes to communication patterns and problems unnoticeable in our spatial and temporal milieu. It helps us to see our communication arrangements in a fresh light, enriches the raw material sources of communication theory building, and deepens appreciation of communication policy issues, learning how they have arisen and been dealt with in other places and periods” (Blumler *et al.* 1992a, p. 30).

Cross-national comparative research tends to assume that the unit of comparison is the nation-state. However, this research project examines diasporic media cultures across three spatial contexts – the local, the national and the transnational – and so it can only critically engage with cross-national comparative research. In the process it exposes the problems of taking for granted the boundaries of the nation-state (which imply assumptions about what is uniquely *British* or what is uniquely *French*) and tendency in much comparative research to remain at the level of separate national reports. Instead, this paper contends that there is a need to think comparatively across and beyond nations and to analyse data around themes rather than to narrow down analysis to the singularity of national significance.

An examination of themes rather than a comparison of stable units, as in the nation-states, enable the researcher to make different kinds of comparisons on different scales. So for example, to examine the relation between multicultural policy and diasporic media production this project drew on experience in three or four countries rather than from all 13 in the EU. This approach, which suggests multi-positionality, is compatible with the condition of the diasporic communities and their communication and with the cultural perspective of this approach.

### **2.2.1. The Specific Context of the Diasporic Experience and Diasporic Media**

Diasporic communities live within nation-states and across them and their media are local, national and transnational. On one hand, information and communication technologies increasingly challenge the bounded-ness of the nation and spatial boundaries overall. Thus, the limits of media production, distribution and consumption are not singularly defined by national boundaries. On the other hand, the cultural, political, legislative and social dimensions of the bounded state are not undermined by trans-national to the extent of becoming irrelevant.

However, nation-states often are of greater importance than transnational trends, especially when it comes down to legal frameworks and socio-historical experience of exclusion, participation and integration. For example, the British history of migration, multiculturalism and media policy has both commonalities and differences when compared to other European countries. Studying the importance of national legislation, history and cultural experiences are important for understanding some of the processes of exclusion and inclusion of diasporic groups; at the same time, the national elements are not the singularly important. This national dimension versus the local and the transnational are reflected in our approach and analysis.

## **2.3. Data Gathering**

### **2.3.1. The National Reports**

The first method of data collection was that of the national reports. Scholars, recruited through an existing and expanding academic network, across Europe produced thirteen national reports corresponding to the EU member-states. Communication between London and the researchers was regular and mostly on-line. All EU member-states are represented<sup>18</sup>, apart from France and Luxembourg (in these two cases it was impossible to recruit scholars for the task<sup>19</sup>).

The national research was carried out in line with guidelines provided and these stipulated that the reports had to address three areas: (i) Migration, ethnicity/diasporisation and multiculturalism in each country in the context of socio-historical features, inter-ethnic relations and relevant policies. (ii) The development of diasporic media cultures, including relevant policies and, ideally referenced to a case study. (iii) A map had to be produced of the different communities in terms of their main diasporic characteristics and of the media, in terms of group, language, technology and space.

As those reports were conducted by scholars living (or who have lived) in each of those countries, they offered an insider's perspective, which is desirable to comparative research (Livingstone, 2001). This input provided a viable cross-European mapping and a rich range of descriptive data on diasporic mobility and settlement and diasporic media cultures<sup>20</sup>. The national reports became a viable and successful methodological choice, but could not have been the singular method for data gathering, as the focus of research was not national.

### **2.3.2. The Case Studies**

In order to gain an understanding of the diverse spatial positioning of diasporic groups and a qualitative comprehension of the specificities of diasporic experience and media cultures, we have drawn from a series of case studies. The case study reports were either produced for this project or drawn from as secondary sources.

Long familiarity with this area of study meant: (i) The researchers had a broad knowledge of qualitative research taking place in the area from which we could draw. (ii) Networks provided access to both published and unpublished case studies. (iii) The personal direct involvement of the researchers in the past with in-depth qualitative research and case studies in this area implied first-hand familiarity with the qualitative and mundane characteristics of diasporic media cultures and their nuances.

The result was that the case studies became a rich and diverse source of data and analysis. They also played a crucial role in triangulation of the spatial points of reference – the local, the national and the transnational – where they enabled the cross-examination and illustration of the main arguments emerging from the analysis in national reports. The studies also served as a reminder that the national only partly defines diasporic media cultures and provided examples of the production and appropriation of media and ICTs in the locale and across locales. Furthermore, they facilitated a deeper explanation of the meanings of diasporic media cultures and which were not reflected in quantitative and descriptive data.

As already argued, the combination of the national reports and the case studies enabled the spatial triangulation of the study and this made possible the addressing of a wide range of questions. For example, the numerical comparison between different satellite television channels, the differences between diasporic national media production in the case of six countries, the development of multicultural neighbourhoods around media cultures and the use of the Internet in processes of community building.

To sum up, the mapping methodology allowed us:

- To draw the large-scale picture of the trends and flows of diasporic mobility and settlement across Europe and of their media production (national reports).
- To seek meaningful comparisons between mobility and settlement of these populations across the EU and between different media production and ICT appropriation (analysis of national report – see following section).
- To cross-examine the large and descriptive with the specific and qualitative based on a theme analysis (analysis of national reports and case studies – see following chapter).

#### **2.4. Limitations of the Study**

However, the study also had a number of limitations, which mainly related to its cross-European and cross-community focus and the consequent methodological choices. These were as follows:

- Collecting extensive cross-European data meant that this study could provide a cultural mapping – albeit incomplete – of diversity and communication in the EU. At the same time, the extent of this study implied that extensive qualitative data, which would allow more articulated and in-depth analysis of the relation between communication and community, communication and exclusion was limited.
- The descriptive national data could provide material for understanding the correlation between media and community, exclusion and integration and for identifying trends across a range of relationships. For instance, between settlement, integration and the development of minority media cultures; local, national and transnational production; new media and expansion of communication flows; and policy context, inclusion and media production. The methodology did not make it easy to address questions of identity.
- The national reports are not as comparable as desired, though they do provide extensive descriptive data that could serve as a starting point for a deeper analysis

of European diversity. Limitations in comparability often characterise comparative research, especially as researchers come from different cultural and research traditions and their techniques and interpretations vary (Livingstone, 2001). Furthermore, the inconsistencies reflect the real diversities within the EU and across different communities. The following sections will show that it might be difficult to draw comparisons across all the countries and across all communities, but it is possible to draw comparisons between some countries and some communities. This is also a reminder that not all European countries or all diasporic” communities are *equal* units. Sometimes it proves more relevant and valid to think through subcategories and themes.

## **2.5. Analysis**

The research pursued two objectives in the analysis of the data. The first was to map diasporic presence and communication across the EU, and the second, to develop an analysis of the qualitative dimensions of diasporic media cultures.

These twin objectives are reflected in the national reports and the emergent commonalities and differences between different experiences of migration, diasporisation and settlement across Europe; different kinds of diasporic communities; and different trends in diasporic media cultures.

The second kind of analysis is theme-based. Key themes that emerged from the national reports and the case studies do not necessarily draw from and apply to all European countries and to all diasporic groups. However, they are still relevant to the drawing of a cultural mapping and the reaching conclusions on the relationship of media production, ICT, exclusion and participation. Here the national reports were valuable sources of information on participation, the success of diasporic production, mainstream vis-à-vis alternative production. However, they made less of a contribution as units for cross-national comparative analysis. Despite this, the report argues that the national reports play a significant part in drawing a cross-European cultural mapping, even if this deconstructed de-unitised.

The following section will outline the empirical findings and it is divided into two components. The discussion and analysis reflect the quantitative or descriptive elements of diasporic media cultures, the context of their existence and development as well as the qualitative dimensions of participation and exclusion.

Finally, Part 4 comprises a theoretical discussion, which provides an interpretative analysis of the implications of the development of diasporic media cultures across Europe as they relate to policy in particular.

This is a groundbreaking project in scope and methodological choices but the hope is that it will provide a first step in mapping and analysing diasporic media cultures in Europe that is sufficiently productive to generate further questions and further research.

### **3. Mapping Diasporic Media Cultures and European Diversity**

#### **3.1. Mapping Multicultural Europe**

European history is a history of population mobility and settlement, of cultural meeting and mixing. Migration and diversity within modern Europe are conditions that involve struggles of power between majorities and minorities, struggles for inclusion and exclusion. Mapping the distinct phases of migration, the diasporic categories and the national trends for the integration/assimilation of minorities is the starting point for understanding the scale and characteristics of cultural diversity in the EU and for contextualising diasporic media cultures.

European history of migration and settlement is not homogenous. Instead diversity arises, on the one hand, out of the cultural variety of different diasporic groups and the reasons for their migration and, on the other hand, to the politics and policies in host societies, which initiate and shape immigration and settlement. Sometimes the reasons behind diasporisation and immigration coincide; at other times, they conflict<sup>21</sup>.

For operational reasons, we draw two distinctions between diasporisation, that is, the reasons for leaving one's home country and settling in another, and immigration in the context and the politics of the country of settlement. These two distinctions enable us to map the similarities and differences between different groups and between different national experiences of migration and settlement. Drawing these lines will allow us to understand the relevance of the national context and of the diasporic distinct characteristics for the relation between exclusion and media cultures.

##### **3.1.1. Mapping Diasporic Communities - The Transnational**

Our categorisation of the main groups that settled in the EU follows the lines of the proposed categories of diasporas as provided by Cohen (1994). His proposed categorisation

is useful as it covers the major reasons behind people's experience of migration and settlement and so Cohen's framework is adopted critically<sup>22</sup>. Furthermore, we need to emphasise again that not all groups of migrants are diasporas; the groups included here have essential diasporic characteristics<sup>23</sup> that make them diasporic communities. These are grouped according to the main reason for their de-territorialization/re-territorialization<sup>24</sup>. The categories we draw include:

- Victim diasporic communities (groups that were forced to migrate – fleeing violence, famine and prosecution).
- Labour and (post) colonial diasporic communities (many of whom these originated in the former colonies, but migrated to the (ex-) colonial centre in order to find employment and better conditions of life).
- Post-communist diasporic communities, which have migrated from former Socialist states to the west. This migration is recent and these diasporas are in the making but these groups develop diasporic characteristics very rapidly (Iordanova, 2001).
- Cultural diasporic communities, that is, communities where arts, images and language form essential characteristics of shared imagination.
- Political diasporic communities, which constitute groups of people who are exiled or flee political prosecution.

For some of the transnational diasporic communities, the reasons for migrating are multiple and this has been taken into account in mapping these communities. When there is more than one major reason behind a group's diasporisation, then this group is included in more than one category. The mapping of the communities (see Table 1) is not exhaustive and each category is not exclusive and closed. However, it does provide a relatively accurate picture of cultural diversity in the EU and indicates that differences not only exist between the mainstream and the diasporic minorities, but also between minorities. The groups included here have at least 1,000 (and up to a few million) members in one or more EU countries, according to national and European statistics and the national reports prepared for this project<sup>25</sup>.

As it appears from the table, cultural diversity across Europe is immense. These communities, which represent cultures from across the globe, have been crossing geographical boundaries for centuries, establishing transnational networks and forming communication flows. All these groups have been forced in one way or another to leave their original *homeland* but what unites them is the historic experience of de-territorialisation; what unites them in a second level is their settlement in the European geographic and cultural space.

Cultural diversity within Europe has always existed with much mobility and settlement over its long history (Cohen, 1997). However, the 20<sup>th</sup> century has surpassed past mass migrations (COE, 1993; Castles *et. al.*, 1984), especially by those communities that crossed continents and once distant cultures. The numbers of migrants and members of diasporic communities are not always as large as public discourses assume; often it is the visibility of other-ness and politics of difference and assimilation that define the content of debates around minorities and not the overwhelming quantitative population changes.

**Table 1: Mapping Diasporic Communities**

Victim	Labour(Post-colonial)	Post-Communist	Cultural	Political
Jewish	Indian	Albanian	Caribbean	Algerian
Armenian	Pakistani	Rumanian	Iranian	Congolese
Palestinian	Caribbean	Czech	Roma	Rwandan
Irish (post-famine)	Latin American <sup>26</sup>	Slovak		Ethiopian
Kurdish	Central American	Polish		Eritrean
Iranian	Turkish	Former-Yugoslavian		Berber
Lebanese	Greek	Bulgarian		Sierra Leonean
Roma	Spanish	Russian		Nigerian
Afghani	Portuguese	Ex-USSR countries		Russian(pre-1989)
African (slavery)	Italian	Hungarian		Former-Yugoslavian
Somali	Irish	Roma		Latin American
Rwandan	Korean			Iraqi
Ethiopian	Chinese			Iranian
Eritrean	Thai			
Angolan	Sri-Lankan			
Congolese	Bangladeshi			
Kosovan	Filipino			
Bosnian	Indonesian			
Cypriot(post-1974)	Syrian			
Polish (post-WWII)	Egyptian			
	Libyan			
	Algerian			
	Moroccan			
	Tunisian			
	Ghanaian			
	Tanzanian			
	Nigerian			
	Kenyan			
	Mauritian			
	Angolan			
	Mozambique			
	Sudanese			
	South African			
	Ivory Coast			
	Senegalese			
	Cameroon			



A COE report (1993) identifies three main categories of groups that settled in Europe (especially in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century)<sup>28</sup>: (i) Large numbers: N. Africa, Turkey and the Indian Subcontinent – each of them with more than two million people around the EU. (ii) Two medium-sized groups – Yugoslavia and the Caribbean with about 700,000 and one million people in the EU. (iii) Four relatively small sources with a few hundred thousands: Black Africa, the Middle East, southern Africa and South-East Asia.

Diversity between experiences of migration and diasporisation indicate that diasporic groups and minorities cannot be discussed as if they were homogenous or singular vis-à-vis the mainstream. Furthermore, diversity characterises each group separately as much as different groups. “The main societies sending migrants to Europe (Turkey, the Maghreb, the Indian sub-continent, Africa and the Caribbean) are themselves relatively complex, and marked by internal political and religious conflicts. Such conflicts will continue among migrants, and it is likely that the emigrant community will provide bases for political activity which is illegal in the homeland” (Rex, 1997, p.162). Acknowledging diversity within and between these groups is significant for this project, which cannot be exhaustive but can outline a series of themes relevant for media cultures and the experience of exclusion/inclusion of many groups.

### **3.1.2. Mapping Immigration - The Cross-National**

Minority diasporic communities are characterised by cultural and numerical differences between and within them, similarly the European experience of immigration is not homogenous. Immigration is primarily the outcome of the economic development and the political restrictions in host countries and the transnational links between countries of settlement and countries of emigration (especially colonial/postcolonial relations, as well as political and cultural links).

Most of the diasporic communities that established themselves in Europe – apart from the groups who have inhabited Europe for centuries (like the Jews and Roma) and some other small communities (for instance, the Chinese merchants and former slaves from Africa) – have migrated during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Immigration across Europe varies, though there are some distinct commonalities and differences between countries and historical periods. We draw upon these commonalities and difference in order to draw meaningful categories and trends.

In terms of historical period – and based on relevant literature and the national reports – European migration can be categorised as follows:

- Pre-WWII European Emigration (1900 – 1939) – European Emigration Overseas (Americas, Australia, etc.).
- WWII Refugees (1940 – 1945) – Jews, Poles within Europe and to the Americas
- Post-WWII Labour Migration (1946 – 1974, but interrupted during 1973 – 1975 by economic recession). This includes migration from Third World or former colonies to Europe.
- European Migration Overseas continues, but declines (three million).
- Post-Labour Migration (1975 – present). This mainly consists of family reunification, that is, family members of migrants join their relatives in host countries.
- Refugee – Asylum Seekers Migration (1970 – present).
- Post-Communist/Second Labour Migration (1989 – present)

New movements and new forms of transnational mobility increasingly replace the economic migration that once responded to the needs of the host European countries and was behind the largest migration movements in modern European history. Recent migration movements, such as refugees, skilled migrants and global elites, signify changing patterns in migration, which have an impact across Europe (Wrench and Solomos, 1993).

These new processes of migration indicate that the world is entering a new phase of mass population movements, in which migration to Europe and the conditions of life among ethnic minorities can only be fully understood in a global context (Castles and Davidson, 2000). Many of these new groups are either privileged in terms of economic capital (for example, elites or skilled migrants<sup>29</sup>) or in terms of cultural capital (for example, highly educated refugees).

The shift in migration implies certain qualitative changes: (i) Some of these groups benefit from economic and cultural capital, which eases their integration. (ii) Some people within the new communities have the know-how to develop their own political, cultural and media projects. (iii) Some have the cultural capital that allows them to benefit from new technologies in order to establish networks of communication with their *homeland* and with other communities across the diaspora.

A distinct and large group among the new migrants, is that of the refugees and asylum seekers. The changes in forms of mobility and settlement do not undermine the proposed categorisation presented above, as the flows of recent migration do not compare in extent to

those of the period 1945 – 1975. What is often considered – especially in the popular press – as a refugee crisis in the EU, is relatively limited. Between 1985 and 1994<sup>30</sup>, three million asylum applications were filled in the EU member-states (Boecker and Havinga, 1998), which according to UNHCR represents only 7% of all world refugees.

At the same time, the applications that have been accepted are much more limited. *Fortress Europe* is becoming a reality.

“In Europe as a whole, the percentage of asylum-seekers granted asylum has gone down from about 65% in 1980 to around 10% in 1990. (West) Germany – in the 1970’s one of the most liberal nations – now accepts only 3% of those who apply. The late 1980’s has also seen the growth of the RIO (refugees in orbit) phenomenon – asylum-seekers being shuttled from one European airport to the next and back again, as states argue about whose responsibility they are’ (Webber, 1991, p.15).

### **Mapping the (Cross-) National Context for Diasporic Media Cultures across the EU**

The analysis in the two previous sections enables us to draw a cross-European mapping of the national experiences of migration and of the political context that enables or obstructs formal (citizenship rights) and cultural/informal (cultural model; media policies) forms of inclusion. Based on the data provided in the national reports, we present four significant categories that contextualise diasporic experience in European host societies and minority media cultures (See Table 2).

This mapping focuses on the national context – in particular national legislation – as these contexts are still framing and restricting rights, mobility, participation of diasporic groups in large extent (for example, education, vote, housing, employment). The table introduces the connection between the formal policies on inclusion and citizenship and those on cultural integration and participation. Though citizenship rights still dominate the basic demands in political action by migrant minorities (Webber, 1991), the development of cultural projects (including the media) among diasporic groups indicates the de facto growing significance of the cultural dimension of inclusion.

The presentation of the main elements of the minority media legislation next to citizenship and cultural legislation on the table above indicates the continuities and discontinuities between political rights and cultural rights legislation. The inconsistencies and contradictions between the two areas (for example, official ideologies promote assimilation while media policies of pluralism allow the development of rich minority media production)

indicate the potential for production and participation beyond restrictions. However, it also highlights the difficulties that minorities might face as a result of the inconsistencies in policies on inclusion and participation.

Another point illustrated in the above table is the insistence of assimilationist ideologies across Europe. Many policies of integration are actually policies of assimilation and assume that minorities should adopt and confirm the dominant values of the host society. (See for example the Danish, German, Austrian, Greek and Spanish national reports.) Often, there is a requirement for one-sided obligation – on behalf of the minorities – to show evidence of their “integration” and “willingness for integration” (for example, Austria, Spain).

**Table 2: Mapping the Context for Minority Media Cultures**

Country <sup>31</sup>	Immigration Experience <sup>32</sup>	Citizenship Rights <sup>33</sup>	Cultural Model <sup>34</sup>	Minority Media Policy <sup>35</sup>
<b>Austria</b>	Industrial Develop.	High Restrictions	Assimilationist	Resistant/ Restrictive
<b>Belgium</b>	Industrial Develop./ Democratic Host	Medium Restrictions	Multi-positioned	Pluralist
<b>Denmark</b>	Industrial Develop.	High Restrictions	Assimilationist	Resistant/ restrictive
<b>Finland</b>	Periph. Transition	Medium Restrictions	Multi-positioned	Pluralist and accommodat-ing
<b>France<sup>36</sup></b>	Industrial Develop./ Democratic Host	Low/Medium Restrictions	Assimilationist	Pluralist
<b>Germany</b>	Industrial Develop.	High Restrictions	Assimilationist	Pluralist
<b>Greece</b>	Periph. Transition	High Restrictions	Assimilationist	<i>Alegal</i>
<b>Italy</b>	Industrial Develop.	Medium Restrictions	Multi-positioned	Resistant/ Restrictive
<b>Ireland</b>	Periph. Transition	Medium Restrictions	Multi-positioned	<i>Alegal</i>
<b>The Netherlands</b>	Industrial Develop.	Low/Medium Restr.	Multicultural	Accommodat-ing (but restrictive)
<b>Portugal</b>	Periph. Transition	Medium Restrictions	Multi-positioned	<i>Alegal</i>
<b>Spain</b>	Periph. Transition	Medium Restrictions	Assimilationist	<i>Alegal</i>
<b>Sweden</b>	Democratic Host	Low Restrictions	Multicultural	Accommodat-ing
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Industrial Develop.	Low Restrictions	Multicultural	Accommodat-ing (but restrictive)

Ideologies of domination and exclusion raise questions about how multicultural Europe is to be re-imagined in order to expand participation; they also highlight the significance of alternative cultural/media projects, which develop as counter-points (not always in progressive terms) to excluding mainstreams. The following section will discuss these

hypotheses in terms of a series of themes, which also highlight the challenges of the national (restrictions) by media and communication projects that take place in the local and the transnational.

### 3.2. Mapping Cultural Exclusion/Inclusion and Diasporic Media Cultures

European diasporic media are numerous, extremely diverse and include nationally circulated newspapers, locally produced pirate radio stations, transnational satellite television and fast-growing web sites of semi-professional character. This mapping highlights the cultural, political and linguistic diversity of groups, as well as the extreme variety of the viability and success of the media. The main contention here is that the development and success of these media is directly related to the diasporic experience – trans-national – and the experience of settlement and integration of these populations in the European societies.

The main research question that frames the mapping and analysis of the diverse and rich diasporic media cultures is whether media and communication are involved in processes of the exclusion/inclusion of diasporic groups in local, national and transnational spaces. Our analysis focuses on six themes within the three spatial positions, which emerge as the most significant in the national reports and the case studies we draw from (Table 3).

**Table 3 – Examining Exclusion from a Cultural Perspective**

<b>The Local</b>	<b>The National</b>	<b>The Transnational</b>
The (Re-)construction of Urban Space <sup>37</sup>	The National and the Policy Context: Enabling or Restricting Minority Voices <sup>38</sup>	Satellite Television Map: The Transnational as the Alternative <sup>39</sup>
The Multicultural and Mediated Local – Multicultural Media Projects <sup>40</sup>	Minority Media as a Challenge to the Mainstream National Media <sup>41</sup>	The Internet: Active participation in a Community <sup>42</sup>

#### 3.2.1. The Local

Everyday life is primarily experienced in locales, the media are integrated into everyday life and technologies are appropriated to meet interests, needs and cultural, political and social goals. Some of the experiences of mediation in local spaces recorded in our research reveal some of the most interesting – even if unexpected – elements of participation and the dialectics of inclusion/exclusion.

#### **The (Re-) construction of Urban Space**

One of the most significant forms of participation and connection within media cultures are largely invisible to the mainstream, but visible in multicultural neighbourhoods. Internet

cafes and *communication centres*<sup>43</sup> mushroom in multicultural neighbourhoods. Internet access points are also very popular with migrants and members of diasporic groups. According to Cammaerts (2002), 18% of the users of Internet in Belgian public libraries are members of such groups; in multicultural big cities – such as Antwerp – the figure is as high as 50%.

Other ethnographic data from Greece (Georgiou, 2002b) indicates how new technologies – and often telephone technologies – mediate processes of construction of local social and communicational spaces in the multicultural urban space; they also have a functional role as bridges to the country of origin and diasporic communities around the world. Telephone and Internet centres and diasporic video clubs rapidly grow in numbers in multiethnic neighbourhoods. Such communication centres both reproduce and sustain mediated minority communication, as well as direct and face-to-face communication. People visit these public spaces to use the communication technologies offered; at the same time, their visits become more than functional; these spaces social spaces for local interaction, with people just using them as meeting places.

This illustration suggests how on-line communication is experienced and involved in off-line forms of socialisation, how media converge in their use and how symbolic value is shaped in the everyday mediation experience. The character of some of these Internet cafes and *communication centres* in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods reflect new dimensions of ethnic public spaces and of ethnic identity performance in public. An Internet café in New Cross (South London) is at the same time an Afro-Caribbean hair salon. Another one in Seven Sisters (North London) is a supermarket selling *ethnic* food for its primarily North African clientele.

Yet, the diversity and revival<sup>44</sup> of such neighbourhoods – where these centres thrive – reflect only one side of the experience in the urban space. Another side of the same story is that of the degraded inner city ghetto-isation and a very different, but interesting, experience of the use of new communication technologies. The entry and settlement of migrants in the city and the locale reflects their economic position and their social and cultural integration; not all migrants' experience is the same. For example, Nigerians – who are some of the very few black groups in Greece – are highly marginalised and usually live in poor quality inner-city accommodation. This community is dependent on the informal economy and in pirate CD and videotape commerce. Furthermore, ICTs are a central, everyday reference<sup>45</sup> for the Nigerian community. A significant proportion of Nigerians become ICT-literate as this literacy is a necessary tool in the reproduction and commerce of pirate audio-visual

products and the formal and informal community spaces that attract members of the Nigerian group are extensively equipped with ICTs.

The boundaries between the professional and the personal use of ICTs are constantly blurred. ICTs are used for their own personal communication and information needs – especially email and surfing on (Nigerian) web sites – but also for sustaining a very particular, ethnic and informal economy, in particular, producing pirate CDs, DVDs and video tapes. It is interesting to note that ICTs economically sustain the majority of this community (most of its members are excluded from the mainstream economy, as they have no work permit). Furthermore, they have allowed the emergence of a very particular form of economy that has become an integrated part of the urban Greek everyday culture<sup>46</sup>.

This case, which is common in urban centres and among the most excluded diasporic groups, highlights the significant but controversial potential of ICTs for inclusion. The use and appropriation of such forms of ICT might be condemned by copyright legislation, but they do raise interesting and important cultural questions about the invisible and unexpected role of technology in projects of participation and inclusion. The dialectics of exclusion/inclusion in such cases raise very complex and difficult questions around theorisations of inclusion and for policy.

### **The Multicultural and Mediated Local – Multicultural Media Projects**

In the local, especially the urban spaces, ethnic cultures and public performance become visible and often develop around specific ethnic media and communication spaces and experiences. Locales are also the spaces where inter-ethnic co-existence takes places and where media projects of co-operation and dialogue develop. In addition to the media produced and consumed by specific groups, there are a growing number of new generation multicultural programmes. These programmes (for instance, Couleur Locale; Belgium; Radio Multikulti, Berlin, Germany; Radio OneWorld, Ireland; Colorful Radio, The Netherlands; Sesam, Sweden) address people of different cultural backgrounds, including minorities and majorities. Most of these multicultural projects are radio stations – with some examples of multicultural television, like Aarhus, Denmark – exist across Europe.

The common element of these projects is the sharing of a particular frequency or channel by different groups – diasporic minorities, but also minorities within the majority. These mediated spaces reflect and represent multiethnic spaces across Europe in ways that most national media fail to do. Different languages, different kinds of music, different religions and political groups find a space of representation in these projects.

Multicultural broadcasting is gaining popularity vis-à-vis the separate/separatist ethnic media. The increasing number of such programmes reflects the following developments. (i) A temporal change as new generations take over. (ii) Integration within a political project and the development of the multicultural public sphere that incorporates diasporas. (iii) A top-down approach to multiculturalism, which promotes media integration (for example, public service broadcasting). (iv) A to-down political attempt to cover the lack of existence of autonomous minority media in the new migration countries (for example, Spain).

### **3.2.2. The National**

#### **The National Context: Enabling or Restricting Minority Voices**

This report will now examine diasporic media produced within the national context in the case of six EU countries; many of these media are produced locally and some are outcomes of interethnic co-operation – the most characteristic being within community media projects (especially relevant in the case of Sweden and Germany). The reason for focusing on these countries is that they include some of the most accurate relevant data. The diversity of the available data across the 13 EU countries presented here does not allow a full comparison across them. Yet, this small-scale comparison is informing and indicative about the interrelations between the length of groups' experience in the diaspora and the extent of their media production; the length of their experience in the diaspora and the spatial positioning of their media; the extent of the experience of exclusion and the extent of media production. (So for example, does limited access to media production relate to extensive exclusion? Does political exclusion lead to more extensive media production?)

This table shows a considerable extreme variety of diasporic media production across Europe. The first and most significant conclusion that can be drawn is that the two countries that have the most developed multicultural policy and tradition and the ones that actively support minority media projects (The Netherlands and Sweden) are the two countries with the richer and more diverse minority media availability. In the UK – a country that advocates the multicultural model and a country with very diverse population – minority media production is surprisingly limited. This is because of the restrictive and highly controlled broadcasting space and the lack of support (for example, subsidies) to community and minority media projects. Needless to say that the limitations of this nationally framed media are challenged by transnational media production – especially satellite television – and Internet production and use (which is impossible to quantify, but which is of growing significance) across Europe.



**Table 4: A Cross-National Comparison of Diasporic Media<sup>47</sup>**

Group	Belgium	Greece	Germany	Spain	Sweden	UK
Arabic	3	4	5		17	11
Indian					5	58
Pakistani					2	6
Chinese	1		3			3
Black African	6				24	11
Caribbean						14
North African	4			1		
Spanish	4					
Italian	19		1			
Greek	5		3		4	5
Turkish	6	11	22		12	3
Kurdish	2		4		38	
Jewish			2		1	6
Iranian			2		57	
Polish	4	1	8		6	
Serbo-Croat	1		5		13	
Other East European		11	19		22	
Latin American	3			1	36	
Other Group		4	6	1	22	3
Multicultural	28	2		18	7	1

The inequalities between different groups in each country is partly related the numerical domination (for example, the largest groups have the highest production). However, there are other inequalities, which have more to do with the complexity of diasporic experience (for example, cultural traditions, group politics, literacy levels and economic affluence of the group). The last two points the direct link between other more widely recognised forms of social exclusion – for example, employment, education – to informal and cultural exclusion.

An analysis of the table leads to the following conclusions:

- The vast majority of minority media are print publications of periodical nature.
- The greater the support of the state is to multicultural projects – especially in terms of subsidies – the more minority media develop.
- The development of diasporic – especially broadcasting – media within each country relates directly to multicultural policies and legislation framing licensing, frequency control and diversity of the general media maps.

- Most of the media that are circulated on a national scale are print media, indicating that press is still the medium defined more than any other from national boundaries. Broadcasting media and the Internet are either local or transnational.
- In many cases, television and radio stations prove to be more influential and long-lived than ethnic press. This is the outcome of technological, economic and cultural elements. For instance, (i) Broadcast media require less effort and literacy from their audience as people do not have to be able to read in broadcast language (Ormond, 2002). (ii) Broadcast media project images and narratives that relate to people's sense of belonging thus they are more engaging. (iii) Broadcast media require a financial basis and more investment than print media and thus it is more likely to have professional standards.
- Nearly all of the national reports indicate that the vast majority of these media suffer from lack of resources and lack of professionalism. They depend extensively on volunteers and subsidies. Their longevity is threatened by legislative change (for example, cutting of resources in Denmark and Sweden as the government approach to multiculturalism and alternative media shifted).
- The national context – including media of national and local range – is by its nature incomplete and partial. Transnational media – especially satellite television – have become very popular and often supersede in significance, diversity and level of access all local and national projects. The transnational is the third position in the triangular mapping of diasporic media cultures than cannot be underestimated, as it has implications for both the local and the national context and production. Changes that have allowed transnational media to increase their popularity include: (i) The installation of satellite dishes has become cheaper. (ii) They offer an alternative and complementary cultural point vis-à-vis the mainstream television. (iii) They address communication and information diasporic interests, when other local and national level ethnic media are not developed (this is especially relevant for the new and poorer diasporic communities: for example, Polish; Tamil, some Arabic groups, Sudanese).
- Media produced within the national context are minimal compared to transnational media<sup>48</sup>. This is particularly the case in countries where there are no provisions or support of such media production within the national context (for example, Germany and Spain). Most of the groups turn to transnational media as there is lack or minimal choice of ethnic media produced locally and nationally.
- This mapping reconfirms the inequalities in media production and media availability between groups. The obvious first reason of this inequality relates to

the numerical scale (the larger the group the more likely it is to have more media). However, there are additional reasons that need to be emphasised and which relate to the general level of exclusion, economic deprivation, low literacy and limited citizenship rights among certain groups. These serve as a reminder of the interweaving of socio-economic, political and cultural exclusion.

- There is a significant absence or very low presentation in this mapping of the newest refugee communities in most countries – for example, African communities, Eastern European communities. Their invisibility among the media produced within their host countries reflects the connection between their extensive experience of exclusion (for example, relating to poverty, low levels of integration, no citizenship rights) and their inability to develop and sustain their own media(-ted presence) in their country of settlement. This invisibility in media cultures can reflect and re-enforce exclusion from the public multiethnic society.
- On-line diasporic communication has been developing extensively. Many of the diasporic sites establish their presence in national, as well as in transnational spaces (for example, Palesta Network; [www.congovision.com](http://www.congovision.com); [www.latinos.be](http://www.latinos.be)).
- The relation in numbers between community/non-profit diasporic media and commercial diasporic media relates to the legislative framework of each country.
- For example, in Sweden community projects outnumber the commercial ones, though in the UK the opposite happens.
- Over-concentration of minorities in the large urban centres is reflected in the concentration of diasporic media production in these areas. Such media in Sweden are relatively decentralised possibly because of the general decentralisation of community media in the country. However, in most of the other countries, minority media production is concentrated in large urban centres.
- Sweden stands out as the country with the most diverse and numerically significant diasporic media production. One of the reasons for this richness is the availability of funds and subsidies for community and ethnic media projects, as well as the availability of radio frequencies and digital channels to such alternative projects (Camaeur, 2002). The country's cultural policy is characterised by a "world culture perspective" – that is, a recognition of the meeting of different cultures as positive for the country – and a focus on "participation of all in cultural life" (Camaeur, 2002, p.10). Yet, most of minority media rely on voluntarism and subsidies and thus lack professional standards and often face problems of long-term survival (Camaeur, 2002).

- Certain nation-states have significant structural differences within. For example, Belgian integration policies and media policies vary extensively between the Flemish and the French-speaking regions with the result that the experience of minorities rather diverse within the same country (Ormond, 2002). However, in both regions, mainstream television provides programmes for minorities even though the minority media production is still biased towards the transnational media – for example, satellite and the Internet.

### **Minority Media Output as a Challenge to the Mainstream National Media**

Data from the UK (Dodd quoted in Georgiou, 2002a), Denmark (Hussein, 2002) and Ireland (Ugba, 2002) shows that for the vast majority of the non-minority populations, familiarity with minority cultures is mediated. In Denmark, 80% of Danes have no interpersonal relation with migrants, while in the UK, two-thirds of those asked said that they get their information about Muslims from the media. This data shows the considerable role that media have in developing intercultural dialogue and promoting cultural understanding.

Although it indicates the increased role of mediation for intercultural dialogue and understanding, much of the relevant data presents a grim picture about the representation of multicultural society in mainstream media. In Denmark, multicultural programmes in public broadcasting are on the decrease, while legislation does not acknowledge this role of the media in processes of intercultural dialogue (Hussein, 2002). According to a report by the Runnymede Trust on multicultural Britain (2000), at senior decision-making level in the BBC, Channel 4 and ITV there were even fewer Black and Asians in 2000 than there had been in 1990<sup>49</sup>.

In the discussion around minority representation in the media, there are two dimensions that require special attention: (i) What kinds of representations, if any, are available to the whole of the public about minorities (Malonga, 2002)? (ii) What kinds of representations, if any, are available to the minorities for themselves? Both areas are linked to questions of inclusion.

On one hand, fair and visible representation of minorities in the mainstream is a reminder of the multicultural character of European societies and can lead to further understanding and acceptance of diversity. On the other hand, fair and visible representation of minorities for the minorities can become an everyday reminder of minorities' active participation in the

societies where they live in and enhance communication and participation within the particular diasporic communities.

Much has been said elsewhere on the significance of fair representation of minorities for majorities (for example, ter Wal, 2002; Malonga, 2002, Poole, 2002), but very little about the significance of representation of minorities for minorities for their inclusion in communities and societies. One of the most significant projects with political implications for the representation of minorities for themselves, as well as for and within the multicultural societies, is that of the European Manifesto for Minority media (for more information see [www.multicultural.net](http://www.multicultural.net)). This Manifesto, signed by dozens of minority media across Europe, calls for recognition of the role minority media play in Europe. The Manifesto, presented and lobbied for in the European Parliament, demands legislative status for minority media, in order to give them independent, equal and full access to national and local broadcast facilities and available frequencies. It also recommends minority media to co-operate among themselves to help improve their status and the content of their programmes.

The report now turns its attention to this process of seeking a voice and self-representation. It focuses on the alternative and the subaltern, not the mainstream media because the alternative is increasingly present as a counter-point to the mainstream. The data indicates that different projects of alternative minority media can challenge exclusion and can get involved in projects of minority participation in the multi-ethnic societies. The following table summarises the sub-themes that emerge as relevant to the output of alternative media's output and questions of inclusion in/exclusion from the mainstream society. The table is followed by examples to illustrate each sub-theme.

**Table 5: Minority Media Challenging Exclusion from the Mainstream**

Sub-theme	Example
Visibility	Persembe Newspaper Supplement
The Counter-point	New Vision
Information about Services and Rights	London Greek Radio

### **Visibility**

Cultural inclusion implies visibility – that is, for members of the society to be able to see their ethnicity, identity, cultural and political activities reflected in the representations of the society.

The case of the *Persembe* supplement is one of the few significant examples where minorities make a visible presence among, and as part of, the mainstream national media. Here it serves to remind both the majorities and the minorities of the existence of alternative cultural identities, agendas and interests in the German society. The weekly supplement was established in September 2000, sold every Thursday with the German daily *Die Tageszeitung* (Rigoni, 2002) and although the experiment lasted for no more than a year the experience retains its significance. *Persembe*, written in German and Turkish, was the only newspaper for Turkish people to be distributed in Germany and because it remained independent from the media industry in Turkey, it constituted a national minority media project.

The topic of integration, central to the concerns of minorities in Germany, was often addressed and the paper included expert and political opinion columns about issues that concern the Turkish minority and were relevant in Germany and Turkey. This agenda made *Persembe* a constant reminder that Germany is a country of immigration and that young people of migrant origin have the right to full economic, political and cultural integration (Rigoni, 2002). The inability of *Persembe* to remain part of the mainstream and compete with the rest of the mainstream media industry indicates the inequalities and the exclusions that minorities face in the struggles for participation in the very competitive and financially demanding European media settings.

### **The Counter-point**

Another example, *New Vision* ([www.newvision.org.uk](http://www.newvision.org.uk)), an Ethiopian initiative on the web, served as a characteristic challenge to singular boundaries and mainstream representations of refugees and asylum seekers. The *New Vision – The Independent Refugee News and Information Service* primarily addresses the refugee community in the UK, but also the Ethiopian diaspora and a community of activists on refugee rights in Britain and beyond.

The web site campaigns for such rights and includes up-to-date information about events, activities and news on refugee everyday life, job advertising and updates on refugee politics and policies. It also allocates space to news and information on a broader *social space* within the Ethiopian diaspora. The mission of *New Vision* is to make positive representations of refugees, which challenge those which view refugees as a problem. This mission is evident, for example, in an article about the contribution of the migrants employed as nurses and doctors in the British society and in frequent reports on refugee artists. *New Vision* constantly reminds its audiences – refugees, migrant and members of the refugee supporting community – of the possibilities for an inclusive, diverse society.

The website calls itself “The Voice for the Voiceless” and it defines its mission as a contribution to harmonious integration in multicultural Britain (<http://www.newvision.org.uk/mission.htm>).

### **Information about Services and Rights**

Alternative output of minority media does not only involve alternative representations, but also alternative agendas and alternative priorities in the themes presented. Particularly significant to excluded populations is the provision of easy to access and easy to understand information about services and rights (like social benefits, training, jobs).

Many of the local and national minority media pay special attention to this area, publishing and broadcasting such information in minority languages and in popular and simple language that makes it accessible to members of a group with low literacy and mainstream language skills. One such example is the weekly programme on social benefits broadcast on the London Greek Radio (LGR). This programme is presented in the Greek language and aims to popularise information about benefits offered by the state and local authorities. It also encourages the listeners to get in touch with the producer and presenter - a Greek working for social services - and to seek answers to their specific concerns. Many of the listeners of LGR view this is an accountable and constant source of information that they can trust and which speaks their own language thereby enforcing the feeling that they can participate in the broader society while being ethnically distinct (Georgiou, 2001).

### **3.2.2. The Transnational**

With the growth in diasporic production on the web, email communication has become one of the few uncontrolled, decentralised and participatory means for diasporic communication, but only for those with access and who are computer literate. Ethnic satellite television has also become a challenging counter-point to mainstream broadcasting and these transnational diasporic media-scapes have become central for any debates on exclusion/inclusion as well as for participation in diasporic communities and multi-ethnic societies. The attempt to systematically map of transnational diasporic communication meets the restrictions inherent in the diverse, fast-changing and fast-growing global communication, especially given that on-line production and communication is vast, uncontrolled and the popularity of on-line diasporic products almost impossible to record.

This report, bearing in mind the particularities of transnational diasporic media cultures, frames the approach in two ways. On one hand, this comprises a systematic recording of the richness of diasporic satellite television across Europe (Table 6). On the other hand, it

emphasises the growing significance of the Internet for diasporic inclusion in transnational communities - as well as in local communities and national societies - since this emerges as an important area in the national reports and the case studies. The on-line diasporic media presence cannot be recorded as systematically as satellite production but it is still possible through the analysis of themes to highlight some areas of significance for inclusion/exclusion.

### **Satellite Television Map: The Transnational as the Alternative**

One of the important communication technologies that is key to the trans-national of diasporic experience is satellite technology and Table 6 the extent to which this medium has contributed to a radical change in transnational communication. The technology meant that television produced in the *homeland* could become a media product available across the globe. This potential contributed to the mushrooming of other satellite television channels in the transnational communication space aimed specifically at transnational diasporic audiences (for example, Al Jazeera; MedTV). The presentation of the satellite diasporic television that follows<sup>50</sup> gives an indication of the availability of satellite television in relation to geographical area and country of origin.

The connection, simultaneity and sharing of common images and narratives between the country of origin and diasporic groups reinforces and reminds this dispersed population of the existence of a transnational community which is potentially inclusive on a global level. The consequences of satellite television originating in the *homeland* for community and identity are discussed elsewhere in further detail (Ogan, 2000; Georgiou, 2001; Aksoy and Robins, 2001; Rigoni, 2000).

Suffice to say here that the mapping in this project stresses the significance of satellite television for issues of inclusion/exclusion. These include the following: (i) The availability of diasporic satellite television challenges the mainstream and commercial television and its exclusionary approaches to minorities and minority cultures<sup>51</sup>. (ii) The amount and diversity of satellite television production available to different groups is extremely unequal and this has implications for the development of different diasporic media cultures and thus of cultural projects for inclusion. (iii) The quantitative diversity in production and access to media illustrates how inequality not only relates to control of media and technologies between the *majority*<sup>52</sup> and the minorities, but also between different minorities.



In many European countries, diasporic communities have introduced and/or increased the popularity of satellite television. The density of satellite dishes and cable television subscription is higher in migrant households than in Austrian households (see Bose, Haberfellner and Koldas, 2002). Similar findings are evident in countries with large migrant communities, like Germany, Greece, while access to diasporic satellite television is becoming an area of political decisions with unpredictable consequences. Local authorities in a growing number of EU countries (for example, Austria, Denmark, The Netherlands) have introduced restrictions in the installation of satellite dishes, which allow the reception of diasporic channels.

Such restrictions can enforce the sense of exclusion within minorities who are on the receiving end of such cultural restrictions and reinforce a sense of other-ness of minorities in the host societies. At the same time, the popularity of satellite television among diasporic populations is growing, a feature that illustrates the shift in communication maps and which the nation-state can only be marginally control.

**Table 6: Transnational Satellite “diasporas” Television (by Geographic Region and Main Language of Broadcast)**

<b>Europe</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>Middle East</b>	<b>Latin America</b>
Puls-TV (Polish)	TV7 Tunisia (Arabic)	Tamil Alai (Tamil)	RTM1 (Arabic)	Rede Globo (Portuguese)
Andalusia TV (Spanish)	Algerian TV (Arabic)	Tamil Broadcasting (Tamil)	ESC1 (Arabic)	Pass a Pass (Portuguese)
ETB (Spanish)	Nile TV (Arabic)	UC Lanka (BID)	Sharjah TV (Arabic)	EPTV (Portuguese)
Los 40 Principales (Spanish)	Sudan TV (Arabic)	Bangla TV	LBC Sat (Arabic)	Vanguardia TV (Portuguese)
Super 1 (Polish)	Yemen TV (Arabic)	Asia 1 TV (Hindu)	ART Iqra (Arabic)	Rede Brazil (Portuguese)
Polonia 1 (Polish)	TV de Mauritanie	Arirang TV (Korean)	ART Arabic (Arabic)	RBS TV (Portuguese)
TeleMadrid Sat (Spanish)	Libya TV (Arabic)	Ary Digital (Hindu)	Bahrain TV (Arabic)	De Pelicula (Spanish)
Taquilla 0 (Spanish)	RTD Djibouti	B4U (Hindu)	Future International (Arabic)	TL Novelas America (Spanish)
No Zap (Spanish)	Jamahirya Satellite Channel (Arabic)	Zee TV UK (Hindu)	El Sharq (Arabic)	Artear (Spanish)

<b>Europe</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>Middle East</b>	<b>Latin America</b>
Astra Vision 1 (Spanish)	TV Africa (English)	Aastha (Hindu)	Zeen TV (Arabic)	Telefe (Spanish)
Mosaico Taquilla (Spanish)	TV Botswana	ARY Digital (Urdu)	Orbit Promo (Arabic)	Magavision (Spanish)
Mosaico Tematicos (Spanish)	BRTV (Berber)	CCTV (Chinese)	Saudi Channel 1 (Arabic)	ChileVision (Spanish)
Mosaico C+ (Spanish)	EWTN Africa (English)	Rhema Network (Chinese)	Voice of the Kingdom 1 (Arabic)	Canal Siete (Spanish)
Video Italia (Italian)			Al-Quran Al-Karim (Arabic)	Globo News (Portuguese)
Alice-The Wonder Channel (Italian)		Sony Asia (Hindu)	Voice of the Kingdom 2 (Arabic)	Telemundo International (Spanish)
TV Niepokalano w II (Polish)		Channel 1 (Bengali)	Emirates (Arabic)	City TV (Spanish)
MBC Europe (Arabic)		DD Bharati (Tamil)	Abu Dhabi TV (Arabic)	Colombia Noticia Deportes (Spanish)
Prima TV (Czech)		DD India (Hindu)	Dubai Sport Channel (Arabic)	Caracole TV (Spanish)
CT1 (Czech)		SET Asia (Hindu)	Dubai EDTV (Arabic)	E! (Spanish)
CT2 (Czech)		DD Gurjati (Gurjati)	Syria Satellite Channel (Arabic)	TV Nationale de Chile (Spanish)
TV3 (Czech)		TV Alfa (Chinese)	MBC (Arabic)	
TNV (Russian)		Congress TV (Chinese)	Al Jazeera (Arabic)	
Magazin na divane (Russian)		TIBET TV (Chinese)	Oman TV (Arabic)	
Teleshkola (Russian)		Buddhism Light TV (Chinese)	Kuwait Space Channel (Arabic)	
Echo of Moscow (Russian)		Channel Nepal (Hindu)	Palestinian Satellite Channel (PSC) (Arabic)	
Nasha Muzika (Russian)		KC TV (Korean)	Jordan Satellite Channel (Arabic)	
ART Telenet (Russian)		TVK (Cambodian)	Arabic News Network (Arabic)	
Kino Klassika (Russian)			Al Mustakillah (Arabic)	
Serebryany Dozhd (Russian)			Al Manar (Arabic)	
HTB (Russian)			TeleLiban (Arabic)	
THT (Russian)			Iraq Satellite Channel (Arabic)	
PTP (Russian)			Al Iraq (Arabic)	
Kultura (Russian)			Sahar Universal Network (Farsi)	
Videolina (Russian)			Super Kanal (Turkish)	

<b>Europe</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>Middle East</b>	<b>Latin America</b>
Lider TV (Azer)			Eylik TV (Turkish)	
Georgian TV (Georgian)			TV8 Turkey (Turkish)	
National TV Armenia (Armenian)			Senkron (Turkish)	
Marco Polo (Italian)			BTV (Turkish)	
OBN Sarajevo (Bosnian)			Bravo TV (Turkish)	
Novi Kanal (Ukrainian)			Galaxy TV (Turkish)	
TET (Ukrainian)			Kanal A (Turkish)	
ORT (Ukrainian)			NTV (Turkish)	
TRT Ukraina (Ukrainian)			Alice (Turkish)	
RIK 1 (Greek)			TRT International (Turkish)	
RIK 2 (Greek)			TRT4 (Turkish)	
Cyprus STA (Greek)			STV (Turkish)	
ERT-SAT (Greek)			Sinematurk (Turkish)	
Antenna Satellite (Greek)			TRT2 (Turkish)	
Etno TV (Rumanian)			TRT 3 (Turkish)	
TeleSport (Rumanian)			BRT (Turkish)	
Realitatea TV (Rumanian)			LigTV (Turkish)	
Mango TV (Polish)			Tavla TV (Turkish)	
RAI International (Italian)			Siralama (Turkish)	
FilmNet (Greek)			TV8 (Turkish)	
Star (Greek)			Haber Turk (Turkish)	
Alter (Greek)			Slow TV (Turkish)	
Nova (Greek)			Kanal D (Turkish)	
TV Pireas (Greek)			TurkCell Salon I (Turkish)	
Polis TV (Greek)			TGRT (Turkish)	
Canal Vasco (Spanish)			Levent Kirka TV (Turkish)	
Akasa TV (Rumanian)			TV Gool (Turkish)	
Pro TV (Rumanian)			Isik TV (Turkish)	
			NTV International (Turkish)	

Europe	Africa	Asia	Middle East	Latin America
			Mesaj TV (Turkish)	
			Show TV (Turkish)	
			Medya TV (Kurdish)	
			KurdSat (Kurdish)	
			Kurdistan TV (Kurdish)	
			Jam-E-Jam (Farsi)	
			Iran TV Network (Farsi)	
			Yes (Hebrew)	

The table makes it clear there are some groups with extensive access to transnational television:

- The Turkish transnational television is the most impressive in terms of range and extent, if one takes into account that it originates in one country alone. Much has been said about the symbolic importance of the extensive Turkish satellite availability for people's connection to a transnational imagined community and the continuity of their participation in this community (Ogan, 2001; Madianou, 2002; Rigoni, 2002).
- The Arabic channels are numerous, though they do vary in terms of country of origin, output and aimed audience. The language is spoken by large and diverse audiences and the availability of extensive transnational Arabic television is a key dimension of multicultural communication in Europe of particular interest in discussions on intercultural dialogue and ethnic participation after the attack on the Twin Towers on 11<sup>th</sup> September.
- Some diasporic communities in the making have a large and fast-growing choice of channels originating in their *homelands*, for example, Polish and Russian, and this availability often replaces the lack of local and national minority production for these communities in the host countries.
- Some of the communities originating in poorer areas of the world, like Black Africa, have a limited choice of transnational diasporic channels. Is the poverty of their *homeland* reproduced as communication poverty in the diaspora?
- There are indications (for example, Nigerian community in Greece; New Vision project in the UK; Finnish and Belgian reports) that communities with limited access to transnational television use the Internet extensively as an alternative – and often complementary – means for transnational communication.

### **3.2.1. The Alternative in Times of Crisis**

*Al Jazeera*, an Arabic satellite television station extensively consumed by transnational Arabic audiences but unknown until recently to the west, has suddenly entered the mainstream media-scapes and everyday political discourse as a powerful player. After September 11 *Al Jazeera*, which is based in Qatar, broadcast a series of exclusive monologues of Bin Laden and other reports from Afghanistan when no other medium had access in the country. Overnight, *Al Jazeera* became one of the most broadly quoted media, visibly altering communication settings. The US Secretary of State Colin Powell demanded of the Emir of Qatar that the station stopped the broadcasts of the Bin Laden videos, while the station's European Brussels-based editor Ahmad Kamel found himself detained and deported by the Swiss authorities on October 14 (*Journalist*, 2002).

The power of *Al Jazeera* that brought it in the centre of global publicity is directly connected to its ability to cross boundaries and surpass the broadcasting restrictions of nation-states. The station's content and access to its content are difficult to control though such attempts have been made in the US and in the Arab world (*Journalist*, 2002). Nevertheless, *Al Jazeera*'s popularity is increasing fast to the point where it now has 50 million viewers around the world. It is a station that addresses an Arabic transnational community and enables that diaspora to receive information beyond the restrictions imposed by *homeland* governments and beyond the restrictions of their country of settlement. *Al Jazeera* reflects a changing media setting in that it reflects changes in media settings that are directly connected to ICT developments. As the number of the transnational Muslim audiences of *Al Jazeera* increase, so does the awareness that alternative political and cultural discourses are not marginal and restrained.

### **3.3.2. The Internet: Active participation in a Community**

If the Internet is seen as a social space (Poster, 1997), then it becomes particularly relevant to questions around diasporic inclusion. The Internet as an environment for transnational and localised communication, for public and private connections, for the exchange of information, entertainment and interpersonal attachment has enabled the Internet to be seen as a space for transnational, interactive and decentralized communication among dispersed populations. A series of themes emerged from this research which highlights significant and distinct characteristics of the diasporic Internet and which explain why and how on-line diasporic communication relates to inclusion in transnational communities and multi-ethnic societies.

The themes presented here illustrate the following: (i) How the Internet is appropriated by diasporic communities to reflect their transnational, decentralized and diverse spatial and cultural positions. (ii) How the Internet becomes a space where representations and agendas are shaped in contrast and in struggle with the society and community mainstream. (iii) How a sense and an imagination of more inclusive cultural spaces are constructed on-line.

### **3.3.3. Focusing on the Internet – A theme-based Analysis:**

The much lower cost of developing and sustaining web sites, compared to other media, as well as the increased possibility to reach dispersed audiences has led to the development of a whole niche of on-line diasporic news and information providers. Increasingly diasporic minority groups and individuals are resorting to Internet publishing rather than the more expensive and laborious traditional publishing. For example, in Ireland there is Metro Eireann and Belgium Info-Turk ([www.info-turk.be](http://www.info-turk.be)) (Ormond, 2002) and of Muslim News in the UK (Georgiou, 2002a).

Another form of alternative access points to information is that of national and transnational search engines – search engines that prioritise sites that relate to specific communities and which are usually marginalized in mainstream search engines. For instance, Latinos.be which is described as “the search engine for websites related to the Spanish and Latin American world within Belgium” (Ormond, 2002, p.108).

Then there is growing similarity in the character of diasporic web sites. A small-scale mapping of diasporic on-line production in Germany, developed by Raiser for this project (2002b), offers some examples. Raiser recorded some of the most popular websites created by and for the five most visible diasporic groups in Germany, that is, Turks, Jews, Polish, Russian and Vietnamese. While there are some obvious differences between the groups – such as those of older groups being bilingual while those on new migrant groups being only in the minority language - the web sites has similar structure.

Apart from two sites, the rest combine extensive information on the community life in Germany and on the political situation at home with the possibility for chat and interaction. They usually do not emphasise a singular specific topic (Raiser, 2002b).

Most popular websites are bilingual and sometimes multilingual but it is interesting that the languages they adapt do not necessarily include the majority language of the host country. So for instance, the European Sephardic Institute at [www.sefarad.org](http://www.sefarad.org) uses English, French and Spanish while the Brussels-based Latina y del Caribe – available at

<http://www.geocities.com/TimesSquare/8657/oshun.htm> – does not use Flemish. This is an indication of the ultimate transnational character of these sites.

Limitations set by the host countries and those set by the countries of origin are often challenged in diasporic websites. For example, the UK-based, award winning Muslim News (<http://www.muslimnews.co.uk>) claims a role as an independent news provider that is ultimately diasporic and transnational with no attachment to any particular Muslim country or government. There are also a few other active and popular sites, directly challenging state control and dependence. The Arabic Internet Media Network (<http://www.amin.org>) defines itself as an “uncensored”, bilingual (Arabic and English) professional journalism site, while the Arab Press Freedom Watch (<http://www.apfwatch.org/en>) is able to use its transnational diasporic position to struggle for press freedom in Arab countries.

The Internet not only creates competitive spaces for communication beyond state control, but it also challenges concentration of power and control in singular points within global space. There are many cases, where diasporic websites provide decentralised spaces for information exchange and for communication. The case of the PALESTA (Palestinian Scientists and Technologists Abroad, available at [www.palesta.gov.ps](http://www.palesta.gov.ps)) is a good example in this area. This network challenged the control of information and communication flows from within the Palestinian territories. The centre has lost its original, fundamental and unchallenged role as the heart of a global community (Hanafi, 2001) as Palesta members demanded and succeeded in communicating from within different positions in the diaspora, without this communication being controlled by the centre/*homeland*.

The absence of minorities from the mainstream of media representations and production has been highlighted for long as a significant process of cultural and political exclusion (ter Wal, 2002). Compared to mainstream media, where minorities have no place, new places of alternative communication, representation and imagination are expanding. The lower costs and professionalism required for developing alternative media in local, national and transnational spaces means that minorities can be at the production side of media and media representations. *New Vision (The Independent Refugee News and Information Service)*, an Ethiopian initiative on the web and based in the UK, is characteristic in that it offers an inclusive community space where positive representation of refugees predominates and where the boundaries of a community are redefined. The website is both a space for the Ethiopian diaspora and for the refugee community, challenging the singularity and the bounded-ness of diasporic cultural spaces.

## **4. Addressing Exclusion/Inclusion from a Cultural Perspective: The Significance of a Multi-positioned Analysis**

This study is intended to highlight how media cultures can become distinct cultural spaces reflecting diasporic transnational positioning, diasporic challenges to singular and exclusive discourses and potentials for alternative and cultural inclusion.

Different media and technologies are involved in the emergence of communication spaces that challenge the exclusion of minorities from the mainstream and of minorities within minorities. The themes that are addressed here highlight two main points in relation to media and technologies: (i) Minority media cultures do not usually emerge around a singular medium or technology – rather they are shaped in a multiple and complex engagement of people with the media and in the convergence of the media. Different media and technologies, both “old” and “new”, form diasporic media cultures, which are diverse but also converge and co-exist. (ii) Media and technologies have their specificities but their significance does not lie so much in the technologies as in the common denominator of mediation (Couldry, 1999; Silverstone, 2002). The approach means this analysis is less technology-driven and more concerned with the implications of diasporic media cultures, diasporic media and uses of technologies. Mediation relates to wider social for the (cultural) experience of inclusion and participation.

The theorisation of the research findings can be summarised into three main points:

### **4.1. Participating in the Local, the National and the Transnational**

Diasporic space is a multi-positioned space and includes three interweaving and competing spaces: the local, the national and the transnational. Media are taking more and more the role of the mediator of the triangular spatial context of diasporic belonging – in the locality, in the host country, in connection with the country of origin and the global diasporic community.

The radio, the television, the Internet and the press are increasingly becoming the necessary mediators of the triangular spatial context of diasporic belonging. The interplay among these three spaces and the mobility of people across them initiates the construction of imagined communities and alternative publics.



Diasporic media cultures create and reconfirm connections and networks across places and initiate participation in cross-European and transnational communities. The daily interaction and participation in homes and publics, becomes the basis for constructing a multi-layered belonging in a diasporic community that crosses geographical boundaries.

More than that, the existence of these media increases awareness among these groups of global networks (Sassen, 2001) of diasporic groups, that is, it promotes a wider sense of diasporic belonging. Similarly, diasporic media cultures feed a symbolic sense of visibility and participation in the locale especially in the urban spaces where minorities tend to concentrate. One could say that diasporic media can help the development of *imagined presences* (Sassen, 2001) of “[non-national] communities of sentiment and interpretation” (Gilroy, 1995, p.17) and in so doing they help shape identity and diasporic consciousness (Iordanova, 2001).

#### **4.1.1. The Local**

The local is not only a space for production, it is also a space where some of the diasporic media are produced, where media are consumed and where they get their meanings. Thus diasporic media might be produced and distributed on transnational, national and local levels but their actual consumption is grounded in particular localities where the everyday evolves. The regeneration of neighbourhoods around the diasporic and inter-ethnic everyday, which includes media and technology consumption and appropriation; the development of diverse city spaces through intercultural projects like local media; the informal and subversive forms of economy and technology production and appropriation that grow in multicultural cities<sup>53</sup> all indicate the significance of the local in the discussion of cultural participation and inclusion in the European societies. The local context serves as a reminder of the possibilities for dialogue and inclusion in multiethnic publics, which are not always visible when we think through the national.

The national is a much more orderly context where governance, regulation and visibility are central points of reference. Furthermore, it can often undermine the cultural element of inclusion and exclusion found in the ordinary conduct of everyday life in the local and in particular in subversive and empowering small-scale projects developed in the locale, that is, the development of neighbourhood micro-public spheres and multicultural local media projects. What happens on the local level should inform the debate around exclusion in the national and the transnational. Thus, if the focus is on furthering inclusion the everyday, cultural and localised experience cannot be ignored. For this reason, we referred to particular experiences that are grounded in local and especially urban spaces.

#### **4.1.2. The National**

Arguing for the significance of the local is not an attempt to undermine the national context. On the contrary, a central contention in this study is that if a discussion of media, ICTs and exclusion is to be meaningful to needs to consider multiple spaces. The local might be the immediate context for the conduct of everyday life, but the national is a context of regulation and control in particular national legislation on migration, integration and the media. Thus the nation-state can limit the potentials for inclusion<sup>54</sup> but at the same time, national projects that imply exclusions from the mainstream can be challenged in local and transnational spaces. Diasporic media that cut across countries and bypass the central points of power in the national context are some of the most important challenges to the nation-state. Challenging national power does not mean that the nation-state becomes less significant. Instead, this paper has argued that much media production is initiated or restricted because of the different national legislative, political and historical contexts<sup>55</sup>.

The next section will consider how the nation-state can learn from the cultural processes that take place in the local and the transnational. National policy on inclusion cannot be successful unless local and transnational everyday informal processes of communication and participation – that is, *the cultural* – are taken into consideration. Similarly, nation-states cannot shape their cultural, media and ICT policies while ignoring the diversity of populations and cultures within them and across them.

#### **4.1.3. The Transnational**

As diasporic media cross geographical boundaries and allow direct access to information from the country of origin and immediacy in communication beyond the limitations of space, they become compatible with diasporic trans-national. Diasporic communities, however diverse and particular, have always relied on networks, which expanded from the immediate locale to the global. In the diaspora, the construction of common imagination, partly dependent on sharing images and sounds, has been a fundamental element in sustaining community (Dayan, 1998; Naficy, 1999).

The development of transnational communication and the adoption of new technologies that allow immediate and relatively cheap access to these images and sounds have increased possibilities for discovering and rediscovering shared imagination and commonality. New communication technologies have taken even further the potentials for developing diasporic cultures of mediated, transnational and partly free from state control communication (Naficy, 1998; Aksoy and Robins, 2001; Morley, 2001), as case studies of Palesta and Al Jazeera illustrate. Satellite broadcasts are some of the most popular diasporic media and

have growing cultural role in the everyday lives of these populations. Simultaneous broadcasts, interconnections and the sharing of images and narratives in satellite television are also compatible with diasporic belonging and reflect processes of construction of shared imaginings of commonality.

#### **4.2. Representation and Self-representation**

Diasporic media, with their diversity and spatial multi-positionality, become relevant as alternatives to mainstream representations. They are inclusive of marginalised expressions of identity and they promote positive representations of otherwise invisible and stereotyped cultural behaviours.

On-line diasporic communication defies and challenges boundaries set as identifiers and social margins around communities. Exclusion, marginalisation and racism have always created and depended upon the assignment of single-dimensional identities and on the use of clear-cut boundaries to divide groups between “we” and “others”. In the rich and diverse diasporic on-line presence, singular identifications and stereotyping of minorities are directly and actively challenged. The construction of self-representations of diasporic groups and subgroups challenges the exclusionary discourses of the mainstream communities and societies creating a setting for increased participation through difference.

Some examples from diasporic communication have highlighted the growing challenges to homogeneity and stereotyping of groups from the mainstream and from the dominant powers within diasporic groups. Mainstream and dominant projects that homogenise and stereotype diasporic groups (for example, the national satellite television from the country of origin) are constantly challenged by alternative voices within the group (like, New Vision, Al Jazeera, Palesta examples). In these processes, diasporic communication can develop as a bottom-up construction of diverse cultural repertoires in contrast to a top-down singular scenario.

#### **4.3. Finding a Voice – Global Commons**

The struggle around the occupation, ownership and control of mediated space should inform the debates on mediation, exclusion and inclusion

Diasporic media - through their interactivity, transnationality and diversity - may allow the development of communication and cultural spaces that are more open and less controlled by singular centers. In diasporic mediated spaces, there is a possibility for the emergence of

a *global commons* (Silverstone, 2002) which is contested but also allows those marginalised by mainstream groups to find a voice.

Minorities within minorities – women, sexual minorities – are neither voiceless nor invisible anymore as community hierarchies become more directly challenged. Franklin, writing about on-line communication about Pacific female diasporas, notes:

“...the Internet/www allows them [women] an oral space, through access to on-line forums. They press on and loosen gendered conventions and hierarchies of the right to speak by making use of the more permissive features of on-line debate; (quasi-) anonymity, informal syntax and the immediacy – and safety of posting a message for instance” (Franklin, 2001, p.400).

It has become apparent that a discussion about diasporic media and inclusion cannot be a discussion on media *for all* and *by all*; this is not only utopian, but it also reproduces exclusion in thinking of minorities as homogenous. Not all representations in diasporic media projects reflect and express everybody’s agenda and identity within particular groups; not everybody is included and is equally represented; and some of these projects promote exclusion and discrimination. These are spaces of mediation like any other and as are not harmonious. Other-ness within diasporic groups exists as much as it exists in the relations between these groups and the mainstream.

Nevertheless, by emphasising difference and viewing difference as threatening and exclusive, other-ness becomes a point of conflict and a point where boundaries are raised. The project of inclusion is a constant struggle for understanding and tolerance. Inclusion is a project for lateral recognition and participation (Sassen, 2001); it is a project of differentiated communication (Kymlicka, 1995).

The point to bear in mind, though, is that diasporic media in allowing the development of more open communication spaces, also allow for the emergence of a commons that hosts users or members of a community characterised by geographical and identity diversity and dispersal. But if diasporic groups are to become part of more inclusive European societies it will need to be through an understanding of their diversity and complexity where dialogue and participation can be based.

## 5. Policy Implications

The policy implications of diasporic media cultures, European media flows, participation and inclusion are considerable not least because they require policy elites to consider a range of issues. These include:

- The diverse and contradictory nature of diasporic media and media cultures render impossible any attempt to normalise or control the map whether this be by state, the EC or a regulator. Singular tactics and homogenous understandings of this mapping cannot meaningfully address all the issues addressed. A theme-based analysis and approach in policy is more useful.
- European Information Society policies should go beyond the functional and linear perspectives of the significance of ICTs for inclusion. ICT's can not only foster the development of skills but they can also expand communication potentials for excluded populations with consequences for their cultural inclusion and empowerment.
- Husband (1993) argues that the political discourse and the policies about immigration, minorities and communication within both the EU and its member states have evolved with certain degree of independence. Member states often stress the autonomy of these three areas, although Husband emphasises their "inevitable complex interaction" (1993, p.1). This being the case, some level of integration in these policies is necessary for the following reasons: (i) The recognition of the interconnection between cultural, political and economic dimensions will make for a more effective tackling of exclusion. (ii) Communication policies that take into account invisible minority producers can create more hospitable communication spaces for inclusion. (iii) Mainstream immigration and integration debates should consider not only the expansion of "formal" rights like citizenship but also the expansion of the cultural rights of minorities.
- European transnational media policies should not only think within the nation-state frame, but also take into consideration transnational media flows that link diasporic populations. Television without Frontiers cannot be a "privilege" and an area of interest only for the major national broadcasting corporations. The current top-down cross-border co-operation needs to be matched by a bottom-up approach that reflect the transnational cross-European flows. Major, top-down policies could even learn how decentralised, transnational networks become successful and inclusive.

- The data presented by this research shows that diversity has increased in media projects originating in minorities and this is reflected in the increase in the number of production outlets and in the range of style and content in diasporic media. In contrast, inclusion has often decreased in the mainstream media and in mainstream-centred initiatives (evident in decreased subsidies, cuts to multicultural media projects support, lower or stable levels of employment of minorities in mainstream media). This contradiction reinforces actual experience of exclusion as well as minorities' perceptions of exclusion.
- Internet access increases and becomes cheaper, but still inequalities exist. Access of underprivileged groups should remain high in the agenda.
- Use of ICTs can have unpredictable consequences as evident in the regeneration of intercultural neighbourhoods and the growth in informal or illegal Nigerian commerce in Greece. These developments can eventually improve this group's economic position but the implications require special attention and consideration of the complications of dealing with them.
- Diasporic media cultures are not only diverse on the level of production, but also on the level of consumption. Audiences within diasporic groups have very diverse interests and patterns of use.
- Restrictions initiated by some member states and some local authorities on the availability of diasporic media, particularly satellite television, polarise populations and reinforce divisions of powerful majorities and resisting minorities. In such cases, cultural diversity can become an area of political struggle.
- Restrictions in the distribution of diasporic media and their content can only be reactionary and ineffective. The increasingly transnational character of diasporic media production means that there are increasingly diverse methods for production, distribution and reception.
- Concerns about subsidies for diasporic and minority media become particularly relevant given that most of these projects are short-lived and unprofessional<sup>56</sup>. They lack the resources to establish themselves as significant, attractive and competing media in the rich national and transnational European media mapping.
- Inequalities of production between and within different groups, with the implications this has for the control of communication flows and outputs, raises questions about the responsibility of states and the EU for promoting different rights (Kymlicka, 1995) and subsidies to support the most excluded minorities and the minorities within minorities.

## 6. Conclusions

Media and ICTs, in the production of images and narratives and in the adoption and appropriation of inter-community and inter-spatial communication, actively get involved in debates about identification with communities and the selective inclusion in and exclusion from groups and societies.

Diasporic media propose agendas and cultural repertoires which complement and compete with the mainstream, create new possibilities for communication beyond spatial and national boundaries and initiate the emergence of alternatives to the mainstream and the national media cultures. In this context, media cultures become a significant terrain for challenging exclusion and addressing questions of multiple inclusions as well as for highlighting the significance of the cultural and the everyday in the processes of enabling participation in European and transnational publics.

As some of the case studies have shown, diasporic media can become powerful mouthpieces of the community they represent, they can create powerful images of self-representation for the group (Riggins, 1992; Husband 1994) and in their communal consumption they can sustain a sense of ethnic commonality (Georgiou, 2001). Diasporic media and ICTs can enable the production and reproduction of symbolic<sup>57</sup> empowerment for otherwise excluded groups; they can inform and communicate symbols of community; and they can potentially mediate the participation of a group in the country where they live in, in their country of origin and in the transnational spaces that emerge in the diasporic experience.

Potential like this for participation and inclusion in communities, for the greater possibility of being informed and part of an interpretative diasporic community is advanced by information and communication technologies. New technology means the space for the development of alternative media is broader than ever, especially on the Internet and on satellite, but this also brings greater competition for the attention of audiences. The cost of developing and sustaining alternative media has fallen substantially and this is allowing new small, and until recently excluded, players to become producers. Finally, the spatial specificity and bounded-ness of the media are much more flexible than in the past.

However, new information and communication technologies not only expand the potential for communication within, across diasporic groups and with their country of origin. The qualities and meanings of this communication are also altered. Hanafi (2001) contends that

the old myth of return to the original *homeland* – which has always been primarily a myth rather than a reality (Cohen, 1997) - is now taking a new form. Instead of a physical return, there is a *virtual return*, taking place in the networks developing with the employment and appropriation of ICTs.

The implications of the use of new technologies and the development of decentralised networks and networks which originate and evolve in different directions, mean that the linearity and one-way relationship between the centre (the original *homeland*) and the diaspora is forever changed. New diasporic networks reshape geography; they do not bring the end of geography (Hanafi, 2001). Nevertheless, as this research has shown, the original *homeland* is still a significant place of reference – even if partly imagined – as much as the locality, where these populations live, is.

At the same time, new communication technologies have not turned diasporic populations into free-floating individuals who move between virtual (if not real) communication spaces without any constraints and burdens. Different forms of exclusions and inequalities are generated in the host country, the locality, the broader diaspora. At the same time, collective memories of displacement and myths of return, loyalties and passions remain relevant<sup>58</sup>.

What does happen is that the concentration of cultural and communication power, the linearity of communication from centres to peripheries and the binary oppositions between majority-included and minorities-excluded are challenged and destabilised<sup>59</sup>. Different diasporic fractions gain a voice in broader global communities and in host countries and localities as they can feed cultural repertoires and control some communication flows. No group is invisible anymore; no majority or nation-state can claim ignorance about the presence of diasporic groups and subgroups.

Participation in diasporic communities not only relates to transnational spaces but also has implications and significance for the multicultural national and local European spaces, in which diasporic communication is crucial. Boundaries of exclusion are challenged when disseminated information allows diasporic groups to develop the informal knowledge, which eases their entry in social and economic systems in the host countries. Information about social services, employment, local political and social life is often part of the diasporic media agenda. At the same time, the size and amateur nature of many diasporic media imply an active participation or easy access of the consumers to media production. Many of these projects can symbolically empower groups as they represent the cultural



production of an excluded community and as they bring the concerns of a community about politics, the economy and the society into the local and national mainstreams.

Even so, this project takes care not to idealise diasporic media in terms of their contribution to empowerment and participation. Many of these media, particularly satellite channels, develop their agendas and content without the participation of the dispersed transnational communities. Some of these projects represent powerful actors within diasporic communities who exclude different and diverse voices within those communities and others are too self-indulgent, ignoring the multiple cultural, social and economic concerns of the community they supposedly represent. Furthermore, questions of political economy and limitations in production abilities for production and issues of longevity are relevant.

Husband, Beattie and Markelin (1994, p.5) argue that the possibilities for viability and competitiveness in the diasporic media field should not be underestimated. On one hand, most minority media are constrained by policies and regulation. On the other, they are bound by the rules of markets that are increasingly transnational and relate to the context of media production within and across countries. Diasporic media target distinct audiences that can make them viable either as community projects and, or, as commercial institutions especially advertising. In addition, media cultures reflect only one of the areas where cultural reproduction of communities and identities take place (Antunes da Cunha, 2002) and where relations of inclusion and exclusion are shaped.

Diasporic media have the potential to expand capabilities and broaden participation; this potential is not taken-for-granted.

### **Diasporas” Media Cultures – The Other Side(s)**

Contradictions and complexities characterise the relationship between media, technologies and exclusion/inclusion. While this study focuses on visibility and inclusion, issues of exclusion remain relevant and experiences of unsuccessful media projects are common. Those excluded from media production are not visible in this account and some of the questions around the insistent elements of exclusion have not been addressed. Other factors to take into account include:

- Media space is a contested space in which the most excluded groups – like, women, old migrants, sexual minorities, the most deprived – are those who are less represented and less directly involved in the output of popular websites.

- Resources and technologies are unequally distributed between and within diasporic groups and this has consequences for relations of power and the reproduction of exclusion of the most marginalised subgroups.
- New technologies might have allowed the expansion of production, but this is not always a sign of expanded media consumption. Empirical research indicates that consumption patterns vary between groups, and especially between subgroups within diasporic communities. Identity diversity, in particular age, gender and class, often define choices of the media.
- Easy, cheap access to ICTs might increase and decentralise media production, but restrictions to access in terms of cost and computer illiteracy restricts large proportions of diasporic groups, especially migrants and the poorest, from using them.
- Most diasporic media projects have short life spans and lack the professional know-how that would make them attractive for audiences that are used to a large choice of competitive and commercialised media.
- Significant proportions of diasporic groups, especially those of the migrant generation, use channels from their countries of origin. Yet, these channels – in particular old media like print and local analogue radio – decrease interactivity and have a negative implication for participation. Satellite channels usually shape their agendas and content without the input of the dispersed transnational communities.
- Many of the popular media talk *on behalf* of communities, although they are usually run by small groups of individuals, minority entrepreneurs or organisations. Such *community* projects often raise internal conflicts about *who has the right to talk in the name of whom*, reflecting similar conflicts about representativeness, as those expressed about other media.

Representations and participation in shaping discourses in mediated spaces have significant consequences for a sense of belonging and for increasing a sense of emancipation, but it does not guarantee inclusion. The cultural is only one element of exclusion and inclusion.

This report concludes that diasporic media have *the potential* to facilitate projects of participation and empowerment; but this potential is not a taken-for-granted role. Despite this caveat, growing diasporic media cultures are having there is a powerful symbolic impact even if the actual content of diasporic media does not always help diasporic groups develop knowledge and awareness about the social, economic and political systems. However, their existence can:

- Potentially open spaces for dialogue and for minority participation in setting agendas in local, national and transnational spaces and forums. This might be a long-term and difficult process with struggles both within a minority and between the minority community and the mainstream but it is a process of democratisation.
- Allow minorities to express and bring to the public domain alternative suggestions about employment, education and quality of life (for example, they can show that different kinds of skills and different forms of economic activity can be valuably *productive* or indicate alternative mechanisms for successful forms of community life).
- Bring a sense of symbolic empowerment within minority groups. As cultures become increasingly mediated, the access and control of their own media can be compared to developing skills and having control of valuable resources.
- Eventually challenge ethnic essentialism and ideologies that consider difference (and inequality) as singularly defined by ethnicity, since media are increasingly diverse and decentralised.

These are major issues, which address diversity, co-existence and participation in multicultural Europe. This research introduced a set of themes that will, possibly, generate further debating and research in this area. This mapping is just the first step.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Reference to case studies indicates (i.) how Internet cafes and telephone centres become integral and significant spaces for inclusion in a neighbourhood's social life, and (ii.) how ICTs initiate the participation of some of the most excluded groups in the informal economy/life of the city.

<sup>2</sup> Comparison of minority media production between five EU member-states indicates the significance of the limitations and the provision provided by the state and through policy for development of media cultures.

<sup>3</sup> Data shows that diasporic satellite television has become one of the most important components of diasporic media cultures; satellite television offers alternative to the mainstream representations and a global space for communication within the country of origin and the global diaspora.

<sup>4</sup> Reference to different multicultural media shows how intercultural dialogue develops in the locales.

<sup>5</sup> Reference to case studies of minority media projects that challenge the mainstream agendas and exclusion of minorities, for example, Persembe in Germany, New Vision in the UK and other brief references from across the EU.

<sup>6</sup> Different case studies highlight significant characteristics of participatory communication on-line: diasporic groups gain broader access to information; they develop decentralised web presence; they challenge the centrality of their country of origin in their gaining a space in the *global commons*.

<sup>7</sup> The concept of *homeland* appears in italics in this report, as it is addressed primarily as a symbolic concept – a concept that addresses issues of imagination, longing and belonging – and less as a specific geographical place.

<sup>8</sup> The boundaries of the nation-state have been initially challenged (Touraine cited in Smart, op. cit.) by the mobility and movement of populations through migration. Populations are no more bounded within specific spatial boundaries because of their national and ethnic identification (Morley, 1999). This mobility has led to demographic changes and changes in nation-states' laws and structures (Rex, 1997). The process that followed migration and which continues and becomes more and more extensive, is the symbolic challenge of nation-state's boundaries in the era of globalisation as people can actively be more and more "here and there" (Bhabha, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> The concept of the *host society* will be used here as a synonym to the country of settlement. This concept is used here conventionally; it is, however, a problematic concept as it implies that ethnic diasporic minorities do *not belong* and are *hosted* in the societies of their settlement. We argue that these groups are part of the European societies and cultures shaped in Europe. The "host society" concept is only useful in the context of a discussion of the transnational character of these groups.

<sup>10</sup> See Part 3, especially Section 2.

<sup>11</sup> See examples presented already on diasporic mailing lists, the significance of email communication and on the consumption of local media that offer locally relevant information.

<sup>12</sup> See especially Sections 1 and 2 in Part 3.

<sup>13</sup> See relevant discussions in the national reports on diasporic media subsidies, on the liberalisation of the broadcasting spectra in different countries, on the comparison between assimilationist and multicultural national models and their significance for cultural diversity.

<sup>14</sup> The focus in this project is on media and new information and communication technologies. Some *old technologies* and *old media* (especially the press) are discussed in some detail. We argue that the existence and success of these *old media* is interwoven in Information Society developments (for example, global networks of distribution, convergence, reduction of print costs because of technological developments) and thus are not part of a separate discussion, but of the discussion around the Information Society.

<sup>15</sup> The three projects on exclusion within EMTEL 2 learn and complement each other and address these three areas of exclusion – inclusion: the political (ASCOR/TNO); the socio-economic (LENTIC) and the cultural ([Media@LSE](mailto:Media@LSE)).

<sup>16</sup> As much as we can know, such a project of examining diasporic media cultures across the EU (drawing from 13 national reports and a series of case studies) has not been conducted before.

<sup>17</sup> This applies especially to questions that require long and in-depth research, such as those around identity.

<sup>18</sup> These countries comprise: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Germany, Italy, Ireland, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the UK.

<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, there are two case studies from France – regarding minority representation in mainstream media and the Portuguese media cultures in the country, a cross-national report of Turkish media in France and other European countries, as well as an extensive map of minority publications in France. We thank the scholars who conducted these studies.

<sup>20</sup> Most of the reports do not provide only descriptive data but also interesting and qualitative additional data.

<sup>21</sup> The most characteristic example is the present experience of the economic migration from Eastern Europe. There are obvious reasons for Eastern Europeans to emigrate (especially economic deprivation) western European countries try to restrict immigration because they consider to be against their economic and political interests. Thus, there are flows of migration but resistance in migrants' settlement.

<sup>22</sup> A critique to Cohen's framework is briefly discussed in Part 1 and more extensively in:

[http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/Media/EMTEL/Minorities/Minority\\_framework.doc](http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/Media/EMTEL/Minorities/Minority_framework.doc)

<sup>23</sup> The most important include their sustaining of links with the original *homeland*, transnational networks, troubled relation with the country of settlement and an imagined sense of belonging in a (transnational) ethnic community (see Part 1).

<sup>24</sup> Not all individuals or fractions of a diasporic group migrate for the same reasons. The reasons referred to here relate to dominant emic and etic ideologies about the singular reason that led to their dispersal.

<sup>25</sup> See <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/Media/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html> and COE (2000).

<sup>26</sup> The 'Latin American' and 'Central American' categories include all the countries of those regions; they have been grouped in these categories, as emigrations from these countries has taken place in similar times and for similar reasons.

<sup>27</sup> Accurate numerical representations of different diasporic groups are difficult to achieve, as there are important differences in the ways different groups are counted in national censuses across the EU, while on a European level statistics only include non-citizens (thus old groups become numerically 'invisible'). These problems meant this report only referred to the most relevant and indicative statistics from a number of sources (look at the national reports for more extensive use of relevant statistics collected from different countries).

<sup>28</sup> This categorisation is useful for highlighting the numerical and geographical extent of mobility between the rest of the world and Europe. Yet, this categorisation does not include the older diasporic groups (especially the Jews and the Irish) and those groups who have moved within Europe.

<sup>29</sup> A thorough discussion on skilled migration is developed in T. Berker's EMTEL report.

<sup>30</sup> This period includes 1992 – the year that asylum applications peaked. In 2000 the number was considerably smaller than 1992 (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/Public/datashop/print-product/EN?catalogue=Eurostat&product=Freeselect1-EN&mode=download> )

<sup>31</sup> The categorisations and content presented in this table draws from the national reports. Special thanks to the scholars who produced them.

<sup>32</sup> In reviewing the historical outline presented in the national reports, this report draws some lines across the EU, based on each country's immigration experience. This explanatory categorisation helps us understand the main reasons for the development of immigration from the host countries' perspective: (i) Industrial Development – inviting migrants to work in developing industry, especially in the post-WWII period. (ii) The Democratic Host – opening the doors to migrants who are victims of prosecution; (iii) The Peripheral Transition; From Emigration to Immigration (Countries of the periphery which have recently become immigration countries).

<sup>33</sup> Migrant and diasporic groups are subject to citizenship rights' restrictions; in some countries citizenship rights are more exclusive than others. Overall, in present EU there is a tendency to increase restrictions. The category 'Low/Medium' restrictions represents this shift that takes place in countries which traditionally had an accommodating citizenship rights' framework but which have recently imposed stricter restrictions.

<sup>34</sup> The third dimension that defines diasporic minorities' cultures and participation within European states is that which relates to policy of assimilation, integration and participation of minorities in the national public spheres and mainstream culture. Though there are differences across the EU, there are some dominant models. The two dominant models are the multicultural

and the assimilationist (sometimes called 'integrationist'). The multicultural model recognises and celebrates cultural diversity; it aims at representing difference and expanding participation of minorities in the mainstream. The assimilationist model (even though it is rarely called like that anymore) implies that cultural diversity is problematic for the society and dangerous for harmony; it discourages projects of ethnic distinctiveness and resists the representation of visible difference (for example, headscarf; bilingualism). A third model, which integrates characteristics of the two previous is the multi-positioned one.

<sup>35</sup> We bring out five main categories that reflect the trends in each of the 14 countries' legal frameworks relating to minority media. These categories are especially relevant to broadcasting media – which are the media subject to most restrictions and control: (i) Pluralist where a pluralist ideology characterises the media terrain. (ii) Pluralist and accommodating where pluralist ideologies dominate, but there are particular provisions for minorities. (iii) Accommodating with the emphasis on providing media space and support for minorities. (iv) Resistant/Restrictive where the dominant policy ideologies are those that discourage minority media projects. (v) *Alegal*. This concept is used on Gaya's Spain report (2002) and it applies for countries where there is no policy for minority media.

<sup>36</sup> Although a national report on France has not been conducted for this project, a series of case studies and secondary data analysis has offered us the relevant information.

<sup>37</sup> Reference to case studies indicates (i) how Internet cafes and telephone centres become integral and significant spaces for inclusion in a neighbourhood's social life, and (ii) how ICTs initiate the participation of some of the most excluded groups in the informal economy/life of the city.

<sup>38</sup> Comparison of minority media production between five EU member-states indicates the significance of the limitations and the provision provided by the state and through policy for development of media cultures.

<sup>39</sup> Data shows that diasporic satellite television has become one of the most important components of diasporic media cultures; satellite television offers alternative to the mainstream representations and a global space for communication within the country of origin and the global diaspora.

<sup>40</sup> Reference to different multicultural media shows how intercultural dialogue develops in the locales.

<sup>41</sup> Reference to case studies of minority media projects that challenge the mainstream agendas and exclusion of minorities, for example, Albanian Gazeta in Greece, Persembe in Germany, New Vision in the UK and other brief references from across the EU.

<sup>42</sup> Different case studies highlight significant characteristics of participatory communication on-line: "diasporas" groups gain broader access to information; they develop decentralised web presence; they challenge the centrality of their country of origin in their gaining a space in the *global commons*.

<sup>43</sup> These are small shops that offer Internet access and cheap international calls/fax service. Their character varies. They might offer just these communication services or they might also sell all kinds of different merchandise (for example, groceries or gifts).

<sup>44</sup> Examples from countries of the periphery (for example, Greece, Spain) show that migrant communities have brought more life to degraded neighbourhoods.

<sup>45</sup> This is described by an informant, who spends most of his working time among migrant communities

<sup>46</sup> The Nigerian CD 'mobile street trader' has become a common image of the urban everyday life. It is almost impossible not to see at least a couple of Nigerian street traders on any day in Athens. Especially the pirate CD trade seems to be exclusively a Nigerian migrant's trade.

<sup>47</sup> This mapping does not include transnational media (unless their output is integrated in local/national media) and Internet use and production. These will be discussed in the following section.

<sup>48</sup> See following section.

<sup>49</sup> See also Malonga (2002) at [www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities)) for a report of minority representation in France.

<sup>50</sup> This mapping draws from the national reports and the <http://www.satcodx.com/> web site data about satellite channels available across Europe. This mapping is as accurate and updated as the fast-changing field of satellite channels can be. It seeks to avoid mainstream commercial satellite channels; these are included only when they address specific diasporic groups (for example,

public Greek and Spanish television addressed Greek and Spanish diasporic groups respectively, who live in other EU countries). This report does not include North America, as – according to the theorisation of diasporic groups already presented – these groups are not diasporic. Finally, a special category is included about Middle Eastern channels for two reasons. (i) There are a substantial number of satellite channels originating in the Middle East. (ii) This examines in particular the relation between Muslim communities’ experience in Europe after 9/11 and the development of their media cultures.

<sup>51</sup> For the representation, stereotyping and exclusion of minorities from the mainstream media see ter Waal, 2002, Poole, 2002 and many of the reports available at [www.multicultural.net](http://www.multicultural.net)

<sup>52</sup> Majority is in italics, as it refers to the politically and economically dominant groups in different countries and areas and not to *numerical* majorities.

<sup>53</sup> See Part 3.

<sup>54</sup> See Part 3.

<sup>55</sup> See relevant discussions on diasporic media subsidies, on the liberalisation of the broadcasting spectra in different countries, on the comparison between assimilationist and multicultural national models and their significance for cultural diversity.

<sup>56</sup> See for example Swedish and Italian national reports and the Russian media case study.

<sup>57</sup> Symbolic is used to refer to images, narratives and discourses.

<sup>58</sup> This is where the economic and political exclusion addressed within two other projects in the EMTEL network become very significant as cross-references.

<sup>59</sup> The fact that some of these relations are challenged does not mean that concentrated and centralised power become insignificant. As Darieva (2002) notes in relation to Russian media (see Case studies on [www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities)) and as the satellite channel map indicates, broadcasting media originating in the country of origin still are numerically dominant. Furthermore, limitations and control of broadcasting maps in the host countries (for example, Italy and UK) make it difficult for autonomous broadcasting projects to develop in the country of settlement.

## References

### Primary Sources

- Bink, S. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: The Netherlands': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Bose, M., R. Haberfellner and A. Koldas (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Austria': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Camauer, L. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Sweden': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- COSPE (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Italy': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Da Cunha, M. A. (2002) 'Media and Portuguese in France': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Darieva, T. (2002) 'A Map of Russian Media in Europe': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Figueiredo, A. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Portugal': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Gaya, B. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Spain': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Gellaw, A. (2002) 'Challenging Media Prejudice': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Georgiou, M. (2002a) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: The UK': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Georgiou, M. (2002b) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Greece': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Hanafi, S. (2001) 'Palestinian Community Networks in Europe and New Media': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Hussein, M. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Denmark': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Kauranen, R. and S. Tuori (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Finland': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.



- Malonga, M-F. (2002) 'Ethnic Minorities: Which Place and Which Image in French Television': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Ormond, M. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Belgium': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Raiser, U. (2002a) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Germany': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Raiser, U. (2002b) 'Selection of Minority Web Sites in Germany': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Rigoni, I. (2002) 'Turkish and Kurdish Media Production in Europe: An Overview': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).
- Ugba, A. (2002) 'Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context: Ireland': <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>.
- Wajid, S. (2002) 'The Black Media Journal Experience': [http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case\\_studies.html](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL/Minorities/case_studies.html).

## Additional References

- Aksoy, A.S and K. Robins (2000) 'Thinking Across Spaces: Trans-national Television from Turkey', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3(3): 343-365.
- Alasuutari, P. (1999) 'Introduction: Three Phases of Reception Studies' in P Alasuutari (ed.) *Rethinking the Media Audience*. London: Sage.
- Anderson, B. (1983(1991)) *Imagined Communities: Reflections On the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anthias, F. (2001) 'The concept of "Social Division" and Theorising Social Stratification: Looking at Ethnicity and Class', *Sociology*, 35(4): 835-854.
- Appadurai, A. (1990) 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy' in Featherstone, Mike (ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bakir, V. (1996) 'An Identity for Europe? The Role of the Media' in M. Wintle (ed.) *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present*. Aldershot, Brookfield, Hong Kong, Singapore, Sydney: Avebury.
- Baumann, G. (1996) *Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-Ethnic London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berker, T. (2003) *Boundaries in a Space of Flows: The Case of Migrant Researchers' Use of ICTs*. EMTEL Report.

- Bhabha, H. K. (1990) 'Dissemination: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation' in *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1996) 'Culture's In-Between' in S. Hall and P. Du Gay (eds.) (1996) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.
- Blumler, J. G., J. M. McLeod and K. E. Rosengren (eds.) (1992a) *Comparatively Speaking: Communication and Culture Across Space and Time*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Blumler, J. G., J. M. McLeod and K. E. Rosengren (1992b) 'An Introduction to Comparative Communication Research' in J. G. Blumler, J. M. McLeod and K. E. Rosengren *Comparatively Speaking: Communication and Culture Across Space and Time*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Boecker, A. (1998) *Asylum Migration to the European Union: Patterns of Origin and Destination*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Brah, A. (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Brah, A. and A. E. Coombes (eds.) (2000) *Hybridity and Its Discontents: Politics, Science, Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Byrne, D. (1999) *Social Exclusion*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Cammaerts, B. (2001) *Een kwantitatieve analyse van de Internet-gebruikers en het Internet-gebruik in de Vlaamse Openbare Bibliotheken*. Unpublished Thesis. Brussels: SMIT-VUB.
- Cammaerts, B. (2003) ICT's-usage of Trans-national Social Movements in the Networked Society. EMTEL Report.
- Castells, M. (2001) *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, S. et al. (1984) *Here for Good: Western Europe's New Ethnic Minorities*. London: Pluto.
- Castles, S. and A. Davinson (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. Basington: Macmillan.
- Chambers, I. (1994) *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and Translation in the late Twentieth century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Clifford, J., and C.E. Marcus (eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Cohen, R. (1997) *Global "diasporas": An Introduction*. London: UCL Press.
- Cormack, M. (1998) 'Minority Language Media in Western Europe: Preliminary Considerations', *European Journal of Communication*, 13(1): 33-52. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Cormack, M. (2000) 'Minority Languages, Nationalism and Broadcasting: The British and Irish Examples', *Nations and Nationalism*, 6(3).
- Couldry, N. (2000) *The Place of Media Power*. London: Routledge.
- Couldry, N. (2001) Presentation at Diaspora, Globalisation and the Media seminar series, [Media@LSE](#). November 2001.
- Council of Europe (1993) *Political and Demographic Aspects of Migration Flows to Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2000) *Recent Demographic Developments in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of the European Union; Commission of the European Communities (2000) *eEurope 2002*.
- Council of the European Union; Commission of the European Communities (2000) *eEurope 2005*.
- Dayan, D. (1998) 'Particularistic Media and "diasporas" Communications' in T. Liebes and J. Curran (eds.) *Media, Ritual and Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- De Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Dewitte, P. (ed.) (2002) *Migrants.com*. Special Issue of *Hommes & Migrations* Journal on Minorities, Media and ICTs, 1240.
- D'Haenens, L., J. W.J. Beentjes and S. Bink (2000) 'The Media Experience of Ethnic Minorities in the Netherlands: A Qualitative Study', *Communications*, 25 (3).
- Dodd, V. (2002) 'Muslims face more Suspicion', *The Guardian*, 5/11/02.
- Durieux, D. (2003) *ICT and Social Inclusion in the Everyday Life of Less Able People*. EMTEL Report.
- El Nawawy, M. and A. Iskandar (2002) *Al-Jazeera: How the Free Arab News Network Scooped the World and Changed the Middle East*. Cambridge, MA: Westview.
- Fanon, F. (1986) *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fischer, P. and S. Peak (2000) *Media Guide*. London: The Guardian.

- Fortier, A-Marie (1999) 'Re-membering Places and the Performance of Belonging(s)', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16 (2).
- Franklin, M.I. (2001) 'Postcolonial Subjectivities and Everyday Life Online', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 3(3): 387-422.
- Friedman, J. (1995) *Cultural Identity and Global Process*, London: Sage.
- Gabriel, J. (1998) *Whitewash: Racialized Politics and the Media*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gatling, J. (1989) *Europe in the Making*. London: Crane Russak.
- Georgiou, M. (2001) 'Negotiated Uses, Contested Meanings, Changing Identities: Greek Cypriot Media Consumption and Ethnic Identity Formations in North London'. Unpublished Thesis. London: University of London.
- Georgiou, M. (2002) 'Les "diasporas" En Ligne: Une Experience Concrete de Trans-nationalisme', *Hommes & Migrations*, 1240: 10-18.
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self Identity : Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- Gillespie, M. (1995) *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change*. London: Routledge.
- Gilroy, P. (1995) 'Roots and Routes: Black Identity as an Outernational Project' in H.W.Harris et al. (eds.) *Racial and Ethnic Identity: Psychological Development and Creative Expression*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1990) 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora' in J. Rutherford (ed.) *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart *Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. London: Macmillan.
- Hall, S. (1992) 'The New Ethnicities' in J. Donald and A. Rattansi (eds.) *Race, Culture and Difference*. London: Sage.
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt, and J. Perraton (1999) *Global Transformations. Politics, economics and culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holmes, D. (1997) 'Virtual Identity: Communities of Broadcast, Communities of Interactivity' in D. Holmes (ed.) *Virtual Politics: Identity and Community in Cyberspace*. London: Sage.

- Husband, C. (1994) *A Richer Vision: The Development of Ethnic Minority Media in Western Democracies*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Husband, C., Beattie L and L Markelin (2000) 'The Key Role of Minority Ethnic Media in Multiethnic Societies: Case Study, UK'.  
<http://www.ifj.org/working/issues/racism/emruk.rtf>.
- Hulshoff, G.C. (1999) 'Multicultural Radio in an International Perspective. Report for STOA (Mira Media).
- Iordanova, D. (2001) *Cinema of Flames: Balkan Film, Culture and the Media*. London: BFI.
- Jones, S. G. (1995) 'Introduction' in S.G. Jones (ed.) *CyberSociety: Computer-Mediated Communication and Community*. London: Sage.
- Journalist (2001) 'War of Words': Interview of Imrab Khan by Tim Gopsill in *Journalist, the NUJ magazine*.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995) *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lengel, L. (2000) (ed.) *Culture and Technology in the New Europe*. Stamford, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing.
- Livingstone, S. (2001) 'On the Challenges of Cross-national Comparative Media Research'. Unpublished paper.
- Manowich, L.(2001) *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marienstras, R. (1989) 'On the Notion of Diaspora' in G. Chaliand (ed.) *Minority Peoples in the Age of Nation-states*. London: Pluto.
- Massey, D. (1993) 'A Global Sense of Place' in Gray, A. and J. McGuigan (eds.) *Studying Culture: An Introductory Reader*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Miller, D. and D. Slater (2000) *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford: Berg.
- Minority Rights Group (ed.) (1997) *World Directory of Minorities*. Minority Rights Group International.
- Modood, T.R Berthoud *et al.* (eds.) (1997) *The Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities: Ethnic Minorities in Britain, Diversity and Disadvantage*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Morley, D. (1999) 'Bounded Realms: Household, Family, Community, and Nation' in H. Naficy (ed.) *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media and the Politics of Place*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Naficy, H. (1993) *The Making of Exile Cultures: Iranian Television in Los Angeles*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Naficy, H. (1999) *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media and the Politics of Place*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Ogan, C. (2001) *Communication and Identity in the Diaspora: Turkish Migrants in Amsterdam and their Use of Media*. Lanham: Lexington.
- O'Loughlin, J. (1987) 'Introduction: Foreign Minorities in Continental European Cities' in Glebe, Guenther and John O'Loughlin (eds.) *Foreign Minorities in Continental European Cities*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden
- Oyens, Else (1990) *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*. London, Newbury Park New Delhi: Sage
- Morley, David and Kevin Robins. (1995) *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London: Routledge
- Papastergiadis, N. (1998) *Dialogues in the Diaspora: Essays and Conversations on Cultural Identity*. London and New York: Rivers Oram Press.
- Perotti, A. (1997) *Practising Cultural Diversity in Culture and the Media*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Pieterse, J.N. (1991) 'Fictions of Europe', *Race and Class*, 32 (3).
- Pieterse, J. N. (1992) 'White Negroes' in G. Dines and J. M. Humez (eds.) *Gender, Race and Class in Media: A Text Reader*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Poster, M. (1997) 'Cyberdemocracy: The Internet and the Public Sphere' in D. Holmes (ed.) *Virtual Politics: Identity and Community in Cyberspace*. London: Sage.
- Poulain, M. (1993) 'Recent Trends in Stocks and Flows of Migrants in the Member Countries of the Council of Europe: A Statistical Approach' in *Political and Demographic Aspects of Migration Flows to Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Radtke, F.-O. (1994) 'The Formation of Ethnic Minorities and the Transformation of Social into Ethnic conflicts in a so-called Multi-cultural Society – The Case of Germany' in J. Rex and B. Drudy (eds.) *Ethnic Mobilisation in a Multi-cultural Europe*. Aldershot and Brookfield, VE: Avebury.
- Rex, J. (1991) 'The Political Sociology of a Multicultural Society', *European Journal of Inter-cultural Studies*, 2(1): 7-19.
- Rex, J. (1997) 'The Nature of Ethnicity in the Project of Migration' in M. Guibernau and J. Rex (eds.) *The Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*. Cambridge, Oxford, Malden, MA: Polity Press.

- Rex, J. and B. Drudy (eds.) (1994) *Ethnic Mobilisation in a Multi-cultural Europe*. Aldershot and Brookfield, VE: Avebury.
- Riggins, S. H (1992) *Ethnic Minority Media, An International Perspective*. London: Sage.
- Robins, K. (1996) 'Interrupting Identities: Turkey/Europe' in S. Hall and P. Du Gay (eds.) (1996) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.
- Robins, K. (2001) 'Becoming Anybody: Thinking Against the Nation and Through the City', *City*, 5(1): 77-90.
- Rodgers, G., C Gore and J. B. Figueiredo (1995) *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Runnymede Trust (2000) *The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain*. London: Profile books.
- Said, E. (1985) *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Safran, W. (1991) "'diasporas" in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return', *Diaspora*, 1(1), 83-99.
- Sassen, S. (2001) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft mbH (2000) *Development of Digital TV in Europe*. Salzburg: Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft mbH.
- Schlesinger, P. (1987) 'On National Identity: Some Conceptions and Misconceptions Criticised', *Social Science Information*, 26 (2).
- Schlesinger, P. (1991) *Media, State and Nations: Political violence and Collective Identities*. London: Sage.
- Sen, A. (1995) *Inequality Reexamined*. Clarendon: Oxford.
- Siapera, E. (2002) 'Internet and Asylum Politics: The Case of UK Refugee Support Groups'. Presentation at the 23<sup>rd</sup> IAMCR Conference. Barcelona.
- Silver H. (1994) 'Social exclusion and social solidarity: three paradigms', *International Labour Review*, 133 (5-6): 531-578.
- Silverstone, R. (1994) *Television and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
- Silverstone, R. (2001) 'Under Construction: New Media and Information Technologies in the Societies of Europe. A Framework Paper for the EMTEL Network'. Unpublished Paper.
- Silverstone, R. (2002) 'Finding a Voice: Minorities, Media and the Global Commons' in G. Stald and T. Tuftte (eds.) *Global Encounters: Media and Cultural Transformation*. Luton: University of Luton Press.

- Social Exclusion Unit (2000) *Minority Ethnic Issues in Social Exclusion and Neighbourhood Renewal*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *Preventing Social Exclusion*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Ter Wal, J. (2002) (ed.) *Racism and Cultural Diversity on the Mass Media*. Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).
- Ter Wal, J. (2002) 'Survey: Media and Minorities Report'. Report for On-Line/More Colour in the Media.
- Urry, J. (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vertovec, Steven (1996) 'Berlin Multikulti: Germany, "Foreigners" and "World-Openness"', *New Community*, 22(3): 381-399.
- Wintle, M. (1996) 'Cultural Identity in Europe: Shared Experience' in M. Wintle (ed.) *Culture and Identity in Europe: Perceptions of Divergence and Unity in Past and Present*. Aldershot, Brookfield, Hong Kong, Singapore, Sydney: Avebury.
- Wrench, John and John Solomos (eds.) (1993) *Racism and Migration in Western Europe*. Oxford: Berg



## **Appendix 1: EMTEL Deliverables**

### **Final Deliverables**

- Brants, K. and Frissen, V. (2003) 'Inclusion and Exclusion in the Information Society', University of Amsterdam (ASCoR) and TNO Strategy, Technology and Policy.
- Pichault, F. and Durieux, D. (2003) 'The Information Society in Europe: Methods and Methodologies', LENTIC, University of Liege and ASCoR, University of Amsterdam.
- Preston, P. (2003) 'ICTs in Everyday Life: Public Policy Implications for Europe's Way to the Information Society.
- Punie, Y., Bogdanowicz, M., Berg, Anne-Jorunn., Pauwels C. and Burgelman, J-C. 'Living and Working in the Information Society: Quality of Life in a digital world', IPTS-JRC, European Commission, Sevilla; Centre for Technology & Society, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim; SMIT, Free University of Brussels.
- Silverstone, R. (2003) 'Media and Technology in the Everyday Life of European Societies', [Media@lse](mailto:Media@lse), London School of Economics and Political Science.

### **Key Deliverables**

- Berker, T. (2003) 'Boundaries in a space of flows: the case of migrant researchers' use of ICTs', NTNU, University of Trondheim.
- Cammaerts, B. and Van Audenhove, L. (2003) 'ICT usage among transnational social movements in the networked society', ASCoR/TNO, University of Amsterdam.
- Durieux, D. (2003) 'ICT and social inclusion in the everyday life of less abled people', LENTIC, University of Liege and ASCoR, University of Amsterdam.
- Georgiou, M. (2003) 'Mapping diasporic media across the EU; addressing cultural exclusion', [Media@lse](mailto:Media@lse), London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Hartmann, M. (2003) 'The Web Generation: the (de)construction of users, morals and consumption', SMIT-VUB, Free University of Brussels.
- Punie, Y. (2003) 'A social and technological view of Ambient Intelligence in everyday life', IPTS (JCR-EC), Seville.
- Ward, K. (2003) 'An ethnographic study of internet consumption in Ireland: between domesticity and public participation', COMTEC, Dublin City University.