



REFLEXION KIT ABOUT « MIGRATIONS » For the YAP network and partners

"Youth Action for Peace is an international movement which aims for societies of justice, peace and human solidarity..."

... It struggles against the different forms of violence, exploitation, injustice and exclusion; against networks of ideological, religious, sexist, political, cultural and economic oppression and imbalance of natural surroundings. It supports all those, women or men, who want to take their destiny into their own hands so as to organise collectively a responsible and liberating society." (Preamble of the Constitution)

Understanding the issues related to migrations and citizenship is one of the key steps for constructing peaceful and multicultural societies.

This support Kit aims at supporting MO's in their work regarding migrations and to be a thinking tool for volunteers involved in our activities. Though it we also would like to collect volunteers' impressions and the ideas in order to better organise our work around the topic.

It is a tool to allow collective thinking and a wide inter-cultural debate.

Content:

- Introduction p.2
- Final declaration of the YAP congress p.3
- Resource document from the *Citizenship, history and migrations* seminar p.5
- Basic definitions p.14
- Statistics p.17
- Possible games and activities to be implemented with groups p.21
- Questionnaire and possible orientation hints for debates p.29

Coordination of this initiative insured by YAP Italy

Contact person : Frederic

E-mail: yap@yap.it

Via Marco Dino Rossi 12/c

I – 00173 ROME

INTRODUCTION

For most of the last century, international migration was an important issue for only a handful of countries. Today, the phenomenon touches the lives of more people and looms larger in the economic, social, and domestic policies and international relations of more nations than at any other time. Indeed, due to various factors, international migration and immigration are gaining in importance in a globalized world.

Migrations flow, immigration, refugees, internally displaced persons, migrant workers or remittances, do we know exactly what do these concepts mean?

Almost all Members of the EU are currently target countries of international migrations. Together with the issue of migration and immigration, the issue of immigrant integration becomes a focal point of attention of the EU, its Member States. It appears that immigrant integration is of key importance for maintaining social cohesion of host societies and for economic development.

Due to a different historical experience with migration, immigration's issues are still a national stake. European countries differ in their way to face migrations flow, policies, and integration of migrants. At a national level, citizenship is narrowly linked to nationality. Migrants or foreigners are constantly at risks of institutional of discrimination; their civil rights are not fully recognized or violated. They are often unable to participate fully in the creation of societal values, but also benefits from these values.

Belonging to a minority, migrants have to face attitudes and behaviours from the mainstream population, often leading to xenophobia, violence, intimidation. But what are the causes and roots of social attitudes, implying exclusionism of migrants, or minority groups? What does social identity mean?

The problem of growing number of right-wing extremist opinions has been recognised in both public and political opinion. However, the increasing amount of violent acts against "foreign looking" and homeless people, discrimination, degradation, intimidation and violence against those who are different are not restricted to a right-wing extremist environment. Conflicts between social groups are also taking place in others contexts, between members of different ethnic minorities and native groups.

XXX

That is why we do think that YAP and its networks have a role to play in going own raising awareness among the civil society, especially about the issues of migration which become more and more important.

But this implies that we are ourselves well educated about this subject, that we share alive debates on such thematic within the scope of our day to day activities, at all levels of action and reflexion of our movement... from the most local to the international one.

Workcamps by their nature are a political act where direct solidarity is possible; where debates can naturally take place; where new visions of a better world are boiling... that is why we would like to invite you to use this basic kit as tool, in order to open new discussions... and if possible to ask volunteers to also fulfil the questionnaire included at the end, before sending them back to the secretariat of YAP Italy.

Wishing you all warm talks, thank you.

YOUTH ACTION FOR PEACE CONGRESS, WEIKERSDORF AUSTRIA 19th - 22nd FEBRUARY 2006

“Leaving and finding home; Emigration, immigration and intercultural society”

FINAL DECLARATION

Based on their practical experience and observations, members and partners of YAP came together to discuss questions of migration and marginalisation. Experts were invited to make presentations on the subjects of:

- “Migration, immigration and multicultural society”
- “Legal and historical background of immigration”
- “Absorption: is it legitimate to reject immigrants?”
- “Marginalisation, racism and xenophobia”
- “Cultural identity”

All these talks were followed by wide ranging and practical discussions and were complemented by study visits to three relevant projects in the city of Linz. A final discussion session on identity and marginalisation enabled the participants of the Congress to agree on the following statement and to propose a number of new concrete projects.

1)
As described in the preamble to its constitution, YAP must remain a strong political movement, taking stands on important issues, holding firmly to and acting according to its basic values and its mission, and consciously passing on its history to new generations of volunteers. By its nature YAP has always fought for freedom of movement, equal opportunities and self-determination and will continue to do so.

YAP must always empower individuals and the community at large to define and express what makes them unique and what they share in common, emphasizing initiatives which facilitate relations between minority and majority groups. These initiatives should aim more specifically at individuals and communities that are the most vulnerable, marginalised and suffering from discrimination.

2)
Education and raising awareness on the complex realities of migration should be carried out in the countries of origin as well as in the receiving and transit countries.

Migration is often a consequence of unequal political, economic, social and cultural structures and situations in the world, including armed conflicts, environmental and human disasters. We must hold governments to account for their foreign, economic and social policies that negatively affect migrants. Within the framework of the Human Rights declarations, governments and civil society should, with the willing cooperation of the migrant population:

- provide proper conditions for home and family life
- allow full participation at all levels of society and in decision making processes
- promote harmony between cultures

3)

YAP recognises the unconditional right of refugees and internally displaced persons to return home.

4)

In line with the above, YAP will make migration a priority issue in the coming three years along with its existing priorities. YAP will review its actions in the framework of non-formal education such as:

- intercultural exchanges
- intercultural learning programmes
- volunteer exchanges
- local development activities
- seminars
- training events
- cultural events

YAP will also consider new ideas such as advocacy and new types of activity to foster reciprocal and respectful interaction.

5)

For a better global outreach YAP will work in direct cooperation with local initiatives, international networks and institutions on the relevant issues.

Youth Action for Peace & Youth Action for Peace Italy



"Citizenship, history and migrations: how to build global and active citizenship through history and cooperation"

Santa Marinella (Rome), Italy. 6-10 May 2006

Overview of european migrations through history...

I) Types and stages of mass immigration in Europe

1) The inter- war period

2) Types of mass migration since the World War II

- a) Post-war migration, displacement and ethnic cleansing as a result of World War II, Yalta and Potsdam.**
- b) Migrations and decolonization**
- c) Labour migrations**
- d) Migration of elites**
- e) Ethnic and political refugees**

II) Impact of EU enlargement on migrations

III) Concepts of citizenship?

Spatial mobility is a crucial element characterizing open societies.

Only totalitarian regimes prevent their citizens from traveling abroad or emigrating, or force them to settle specific areas.

Democratic societies in contrast uphold the right of their citizens to choose their place of residence freely. This includes the right to emigrate.

I) Types and stages of mass immigration in Europe

Mass migration is neither a new phenomenon, nor can we say that migration is the historical exception. At least ever since the Industrial Revolution, spatial mobility has been a regular phenomenon characterizing European societies.

Between 1815 and 1930 more than 50 million people left the old World for North and South America, Australia and New Zealand (Hoerder, 1985).

During the same period large numbers of Polish and Ukrainian workers migrated to the emerging centres of the coal iron and steel industries in France (Lorraine), Germany and even England (the Midlands).

Large numbers of Italians moved to France, Switzerland and Western Austria, Irish to Britain. The growing cities of continental Europe also attracted large numbers of Slav immigrants from the Czech lands, from Galicia and from the Prussian parts of Poland.

Eastern European Jews fled from the rising tide of anti-Semitism, pogroms and economic misery in the Ukraine, Galicia and the Baltics and established themselves as large ethno-religious minorities in the booming metropolitan areas of the late 19th and early 20th centuries: Berlin, Vienna, Paris and cities like Lviv, Warsaw and Prague.

1.The inter-war period

After 1918 the influence of ethno- nationalistic, religious and political factors became even more evident as the winners of World War I had reshaped the political map of Europe. The establishing of new nation states also created large numbers of new ethnic minorities. In many places they were not recognized, but oppressed or even terrorized and forced to leave the country.

The main types of mass migration directly related to the results of World War I and the change of borders are:

- Migration, displacement directly related to the creation of new nation states;
- Migration related to the recruitment of foreign labour;
- Migration of political and ethno-religious refugees (mainly from the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany).

Among them were ethnic Greeks displaced from Istanbul and western Turkey and resettled in Greece; Muslims from the Balkans who were forced to leave Romania, Bulgaria and Greece for Turkey; ethnic Hungarians who left Romania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Ethnic Poles had to leave their homelands that had just become part of the Soviet Union (Kulischer, 1948; MYnz / Fassmann, 1994).

- Labour migrations

In Europe the inter-war period was also marked by a considerable amount of labour migration and return migration. **Between 1918 and the mid-1930s some 1.2 million labour migrants and family dependants moved within Europe.** During this period Poland became the main country of origin and France the main destination of migrant workers (Jungfer et al., 1993; MYnz / Fassmann, 1994).

2.Types of mass migration since the World War II

In the second half of XX century, several types of mass migration had a major impact:

- Displacement and ethnic cleansing directly related to the end of World War II and its consequences;
- Migration related to the decolonization of Africa, South and Southeast Asia and the Caribbean;
- Post-colonial migration from the former colonies to Western Europe;
- Migration related to the recruitment of foreign labour, and subsequent migration of family members;
- Migration of business elites and wealthy elderly Europeans;
- Victims of war, political refugees and asylum-seekers.

a) Post-war migration, displacement and ethnic cleansing as a result of World War II, Yalta, and Potsdam

During the collapse of the Nazi regime, some 12 million Germans (estimate for 1945-50) either fled or were expelled from the eastern parts of the former Third Reich and territories formerly occupied by the German Wehrmacht (Poland, the Baltics, Bohemia-Moravia, Slovenia, Serbia, Ukraine) or ruled during World War II by allied fascist and authoritarian regimes (Slovakia, Croatia, and Hungary). Another 2 million lost their lives as a result of this ethnic cleansing (Benz, 1985; Reichling, 1985).

During the same period, most of the 10.5 million displaced persons, forced labour and survivors of the concentration camps living in Germany and Austria in 1945 returned to their countries of origin (Bade, 192). Especially displaced persons from the Soviet Union were forced to return against their will.

After the foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in 1949, West Germany also had to deal with mass migration from East Germany. Some 3.8 million Germans crossed the line which gradually became the border between the two German states and gradually part of the Iron Curtain. The construction of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 closed a last loop hole and largely reduced this flow (Ulrich,1990; Rudolph, 1994).

Germans were not the only group affected by expulsions, allied arrangements and the new national boundaries drawn in Yalta and Potsdam.

1.5 million Poles had to leave their homes in former eastern Poland, i.e. areas that are now part of Lithuania, Belorussia and the Ukraine. They were resettled in areas, cities and houses just purged of their former German inhabitants.

Almost 600.000 Ukrainians, Belorussians and Lithuanians had to leave Poland and Czechoslovakia and were resettled in territories that had become part of Soviet Union in 1945 (Kersten 1968; Urban, 1993).

Under similar auspices more than 100,000 Czechs and Slovaks were resettled in the former Sudetenland and in Southern Moravia, also purged of their former German-speaking population (Stola, 1992).

At the same time (1945-50) more than 100,000 ethnic Italians were forced to leave Istria and Dalmatia. Some 300,000 members of the Hungarian minorities in Southern Slovakia, Transylvania (Romania) and the Vojvodina (Serbia) were transferred to Hungary or exchanged by order of their respective governments (Kosinski, 1982; Dsvenyi / Vukovich, 1994).

This list of enforced ethnic cleansing in central and South-Eastern Europe could easily be prolonged.

b) Migration and de-colonization

The second type of post-war mass migration was and still is related to the colonial history of the major West European Nations. During the process of de-colonization white colonists and settlers, troops and civil servants moved back to their home countries in large numbers. In some cases this process created a steady flow of return migrants, in other cases the former colonial powers were confronted with big waves of immigrants.

Since the early 1950s, sizeable numbers of people migrated from Indonesia to the Netherlands. In the 1970s, immigration from Surinam and the Dutch Antilles followed (Entzinger / Stijnen, 1991).

In the mid 1970s Portugal was also confronted with a sudden surge of returnees and immigrants from its former African colonies.

Since the 1950, several hundreds of thousands of people reemigrated from overseas territories back to Belgium, Italy, and Britain.

The third type of post-war mass migration is closely linked to the second one. Following the migrations of formal colonists, Native migrants from South and Southeast Asia, Africa and the Caribbean moved first to Britain, France and the Benelux countries, later also to Italy, Portugal and Spain.

The deterioration of living conditions in several Third World countries, ethnic and political conflicts in the newly founded states of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean, but also the growing demand for cheap labour in Europe led to considerable migratory flows. (Coleman / Salt, 1992; Entzinger / Stijnen, 1990; Tribalat) et al., 1991).

The colonial legacy - a common language shared by the citizens of former colonies and the former colonial power, cultural orientation towards London, Paris or Lisbon, established traffic channels - made it easier for people from Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, and from the Anglophone countries of the Caribbean to come to Britain, for Arabs from Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and for black people from West Africa to come to France, for Surinamese and Indonesian Molukkers to come to the Netherlands. At an early stage this kind of migration was amplified by several European countries granting citizenship to the residents of their former overseas territories or facilitating their immigration by granting them special legal status as quasi-nationals or privileged aliens (Cohen, 1994; Coleman, 1994a; Entzinger, 1994).

This type of migration has transformed the metropolitan areas of Western Europe into multicultural nutshells. It has led to the establishment of ethnic networks and so-called 'visible' minorities. Since the 1970s, these networks and minorities have created chain migration, explaining continuous streams of immigration (Zlotnik, 1992). This type of migration persists despite high rates of unemployment and anti-immigration policies in most West European countries (Coleman, 1994b).

But the minorities from Third World countries do not only remind us of Europe's colonial past. **Their presence has also re-imported racist and ethnic tensions and led in many places to the re-emergence of populist right-wing movements, ethno-centric rhetoric in everyday life, and to new forms of xenophobia, inter-ethnic tensions and violence.** In the age of a new ethnocentrism in Central and Western Europe these prejudices have replaced older ones (Hofrichter / Klein, 1996)

c) Labour migration

The fourth type of mass migration in Europe partly overlaps with the aforementioned third one. Following the end of World War II, the Western European economies first had to integrate refugees, displaced persons, and returnees from the colonies. By the end of the 1950s, some countries began to meet part of their growing demand for cheap labour and unskilled workers by recruiting immigrants from former colonies or the few still existing overseas territories. In other countries migrant workers were recruited in several Mediterranean Countries: at first in Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Greece, later in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Turkey, and former Yugoslavia.

In most cases the recruitment took place on the basis of bilateral agreements between sending and recruiting countries. In the early 1970s the employment of foreign labour in the countries of Western Europe reached its maximum (Stalker, 1994; Oecd / Sopemi, 1994; Gordon, 1989).

In the mid 1970s, Western European governments and employers reacted to the economic recession and the reduced absorption capacity of labour markets following the 1973 oil price shock by halting recruitment of foreign labour and by imposing restrictive immigration regulations on residents of former overseas territories (Hollifield, 1992). In some Western European countries - above all in Great Britain and France - the deteriorating economic position of visible immigrant minorities and native under classes led to social conflicts (Coleman, 1994c; Angenendt, 1992; Booth, 1992).

In the second half of the 1970s in some countries halted recruitment and restricted immigration led to a reduction in the foreign resident population. In relation to the size of the foreign resident population the largest reduction took place in Switzerland. There, already at the time, a massive anti-foreigner movement gained political momentum. The reduction in foreign labour was mainly achieved by not extending temporary residence and work permits (Haug, 1980). Similar measures were taken by Austria, Germany, and Sweden (Fassmann / MYnz, 1995; Rudolph, 1994).

At the same time other, Western European countries, e.g., France, the Benelux and the UK experienced no major decline in their foreign resident population. While in some cases the return of foreigners was strongly encouraged and rewarded by way of repatriation allowances (e.g., in West Germany), the newly introduced restrictions slowed rather than halted immigration.

In many countries family reunion and higher birth rates of the foreign resident population compensated for decreased labour migration. These phenomena led to significant changes

in the composition of the foreign population which earlier consisted mainly of males of employable age.

Meanwhile relatively open borders led to a rising number of irregular migrants. The existence of informal ethnic networks and the opportunity to enter the receiving country as a tourist, student, short-term contract worker, or asylum-seeker became an essential basis for this type of migration.

Today the internationalization of European labour markets has brought more million people to Western Europe or relocated them within the EU region, Norway and Switzerland (ILO / IOM / UNHCR, 1994), **thus creating new under classes largely excluded from political participation and not well represented by trade unions.**

d) Migration of elites

The fifth type of mass migration is frequently either not realized or underestimated: the international mobility of elites and the mobility of wealthy elderly citizens from northwestern Europe. The first group consists of managers and highly qualified specialists of multinational companies, students, trainees, academic scholars, diplomats, artists and employees of international organizations. In many cases they also compete with locals for housing and working facilities. Interestingly enough they hardly ever become targets of xenophobic violence. This elite migration has reached high numbers too, and therefore may be regarded as a part of mass migration.

e) Ethnic and political refugees and asylum-seekers

The sixth type of mass migration started as a stream of political and other refugees from Eastern Europe and the Third World to the West, and partially turned into a kind of poverty migration. For a long time its main characteristics were distinct waves of migration directly linked to political events or even to political bargaining.

Significantly enough before 1989, only western states had **joined the Geneva Convention of 1951**, although this was and is a UN convention. Today poverty, disasters, civil and inter-state wars have turned into motives for migration to a much larger extent (Opitz, 1991; UNHCR, 1993; UN-ECE, 1995; Weiner, 1995).

In 1956/57, some 194,000 Hungarians left their country just before Soviet troops and the Kádár regime closed the border, establishing the Iron Curtain between Hungary and Austria (Dsvenyi / Vukovich, 1994). Nobody asked for his or her individual motives. Following the logic of the Cold War, everybody who came from a communist country was considered in the West to be a true refugee.

In 1968/69, some 162,000 Czechs and Slovaks fled from Czechoslovakia after the occupation of their country by Soviet and allied Warsaw Pact troops (Chesnais, 1992; Fassmann / MYnz, 1995). They too met with great western sympathy. Worldwide media coverage of the Soviet military intervention had contributed to the sympathy on the side of the public.

In 1980/81, some 250,000 Poles fled from martial law and political repression to the West (Chesnais, 1992; Fassmann / MYnz, 1995). Public opinion did not generally accept them as political refugees. This time the willingness to receive them was already limited.

In 1989/90 more than 300,000 Bulgarians of Turkish descent fled from collective oppression, forced Bulgarianisation and economic problems. Most of them made their way to Turkey before the Turkish government closed the border to neighboring Bulgaria (Bobeva,

1994; Vasileva, 1992). Though Turkey considers itself to be the protector of the 1 to 1.2 million Muslims of Turkish and Slavic origin, it is unwilling to host and integrate all ethnic Turks and other Muslims (Pomaks, Gypsies) living in the area. 120,000 of these refugees later returned to Bulgaria.

The largest migration wave of refugees on European soil began in 1991, when Yugoslavia broke apart, and the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina began. Since then more than 5.3 million people left their home region or suffered expulsion. More than 1 million were able to reach Western Europe, among them 700,000 who were recognized as political refugees or at least tolerated temporarily (Unhcr, 1994). These figures have hardly changed since 1993, as, in the meantime, nearly all-European states have closed their borders for victims of war and ethnic cleansing from Croatia, Bosnia, Vojvodina and Kosovo.

4.3 million victims of war and ethnic cleansing still remain on the territory of former Yugoslavia: 690,000 in the part of Croatia controlled by the regime in Zagreb, 110,000 in the parts of Croatia controlled by Serbian militia, 630,000 in Serbia and Montenegro, and more than 2.7 million in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Unhcr, 1994), which has to carry the major burden of what is to be regarded as Europe's largest political and humanitarian disaster. All in all the number of refugees and displaced persons within former Yugoslavia or originally coming from this country now exceed 5 million people.

In 1983 only 65,000 people applied for asylum in Western Europe. In 1986 the number had tripled to 195,000. In 1992 the unprecedented number of 693,000 people asked for political asylum in Europe, two thirds of them in Germany. Many of them were not political refugees in the strict sense of the Geneva Convention, but might have had good reasons for fleeing from political or military repression, economic recession, ecological disasters, or ethnic conflict. Refugees from Bosnia are the best example for this phenomenon.

II) Impact of EU enlargement on migrations : extract from Joanne van Selm and Eleni Tsolakis Migration Policy Institute

The enlargement of the European Union on May 1 2004 gave nationals of the 10 new EU Member States **the right to move relatively freely around the whole EU territory**. The potential consequences of this new freedom have fuelled debate in the 15 existing EU states (the so-called EU-15), where **many fear that migrants from the new members will swamp their labour markets and strain their welfare systems**.

In theory, the nationals of all 10 new Member States are now officially EU citizens with the right to live and work in any Member State. The near-term reality, however, is that domestic outcries have already led 14 of the original EU states (the exception being Sweden) to **impose employment or welfare access restrictions on citizens of eight of the new Member States**: Estonia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia, and the Slovak Republic.

Many EU-15 leaders fear that the weaker economies of these Central and Eastern European countries will provide incentives for their citizens to migrate in search of work.

In reality, many analysts believe the effect of the enlargement on EU migratory trends will most likely be similar to that of the addition of Greece in 1981 and Spain and Portugal in 1986. Those enlargements prompted only small-scale emigration from the new Member States, despite differences in per-capita income similar to those that exist today between the EU-15 and the new Member States.

Estimates of the number of new EU citizens who will move over a 10-year period as a

result of the changes vary between 0.5 million and 6.3 million. Most experts believe that roughly one million people will move: just 0.27 percent of the current total EU population and a number roughly equal to the current Eastern European population in the EU-15. If this estimate is correct, the number of migrants will be much less significant than has been portrayed in much of the media.

Two groups *are* thought more likely to move: the young (aged 18 to 24) and the family members of people who had migrated prior to May 2004, but who previously had no right to family reunification.

Migration for family reunification will be allowed in the newly unified EU, but it is thought that these individuals are unlikely to wish to enter the labour force in the short term.

The young, meanwhile, are needed by the EU-15, whose welfare systems face a potential future crisis as their demographics swing towards aging populations. This "youth drain" together with the more familiar "brain drain" may pose special challenges to the new Member States.

III) Concepts of citizenship ?

Since the Greek *Polis*, the concept of citizenship has always been a very discussed and evolving one for it is at the core of the question of power.

"Indeed, citizenship could be seen as a battlefield where definitions are continuously contested by new ones". (Spyros Sophos, Citizenship in Europe, Editorial, *Journal of Area Studies*)

The notion of citizenship bears a dual dimension since **it both defines the way the members of a community participates to the exercise of power**, that is the nature of their relation with the government and **what is creating the social bond and the identity between the individuals of a same community**.

To avoid any misunderstanding it is important to distinguish between "European citizenship" and "citizenship in Europe". Those two concepts, though different, remain narrowly interrelated. Such analysis brings us to stress the difference between the local and the global levels of citizenship: globalization is putting to the foreground new centres of decision making that directly compete with traditional jurisdictions such as nation-state while international preoccupations (the environment for example) transcend national boundaries and contribute to shape a transnational public opinion.

The modern definitions of citizenship

The French Revolution proclaimed the rights of man as well as those of citizen. The social contract is at the basis of French citizenship as it establishes a compromise between the obedience to the law and the exercise of fundamental political rights, i.e. sovereignty. The main criteria of citizenship as Ernest Renan will later conceptualize is highly subjective: "*the consent to live together*" remains a core principle of French contemporary citizenship and maybe one of a guidelines of European common identity as it has a propensity for universalism. One of the main impact of the French Revolution and of the following Napoleonic episode is to have favoured the appearance of national consciousness. Indeed, nationality (the belonging to the community) and citizenship (the participation to power) are confused.

The late 19th and early 20th century nationalisms are premised on a distinction of the two notions and an exacerbation of the former. German nationalism typifies this scheme for it is based on the myth of an homogeneous community (*volk*) where nationality and citizenship are inherited and not the result of a choice.

After the second World War, European democracies have undergone significant social and economic changes. The failure of democracies to regulate economic inequities had been emphasized by totalitarian ideologies. The Marxist critique underlined the gap between formal rights and substantial ones. A fairer allocation of resources through public interventionism and the Welfare State was a response to this dilemma and gave birth to the notion of social citizenship. T.H. Marshall showed that modern models of citizenship have been consistently evolving. Citizenship in the 18th century comprised the rights which were necessary for individual freedom, rights to be protected through the courts. In the 19th century citizenship came to include the right of political participation and was concerned with the extension of access to the parliamentary process. In the 20th century citizenship came to include "*the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security and the right to share to the full in social heritage*".

European citizenship

"As Tung-Lai Margu argues, "citizenship in the Union" as the Treaty states has often been reproached its ambition of creating an artificial and supranational identity at the expense of national sentiment. In fact, the basic idea of the treaty was to impulse the consciousness of a common European legacy, i.e. the common traditions of democracy, pluralism and equality. The ambitions of its authors was not to impose cultural uniformity. The authors didn't consider European citizenship as substitute for national citizenship but as a way to transcend it through concrete rights entailed by the belonging of citizens to a larger entity, namely the EU. "

Let's define concepts... basic definitions

This page is a basic overview of the vocabulary of international migration statistics and concepts, the latest United Nations definitions. Because these terms may be used differently by particular countries, non-governmental organizations and international bodies, we encourage you to cross-check these definitions according to your country!

Asylum: Protection granted by a state to refugees. (Source: *Webster's Dictionary*)

Asylum-seekers: Persons who file an application for asylum in a country other than their own. They remain in the status of asylum-seeker until their application is considered and adjudicated. See also *foreigners seeking asylum*.

Border workers: Persons commuting between their country of usual residence (which is usually their country of citizenship as well) and their place of employment abroad.

Brain Drain: The emigration of a large number of a country's highly skilled and educated population to other countries that offer superior economic and social opportunities (Source: Population Reference Bureau).

Citizenship: The country in which a person is born or naturalized and in which that person has rights and responsibilities (Source: United States Immigration and Naturalization Service).

Contract migrant workers: Persons working in a country other than their own under contractual arrangements that set limits on the period of employment and on the specific job held by the migrant (that is to say, contract migrant workers cannot change jobs without permission granted by the authorities of the receiving State).

Foreigners admitted for family formation or reunification: Foreigners admitted because they are the immediate relatives of citizens or foreigners already residing in the receiving country or because they are the foreign fianc(e)s or the foreign adopted children of citizens. The definition of immediate relatives varies from country to country but it generally includes the spouse and minor children of the person concerned.

Foreigners admitted for humanitarian reasons (other than asylum proper or temporary protection): Foreigners who are not granted full refugee status but are nevertheless admitted for humanitarian reasons because they find themselves in refugee-like situations. See also asylum-seekers, refugees and foreigners granted temporary protected status.

Foreigners admitted for settlement: Foreign persons granted the permission to reside in the receiving country without limitations regarding duration of stay or exercise of an economic activity. Their dependants, if admitted, are also included in this category.

Foreigners granted temporary protected status: Foreigners who are allowed to stay for a temporary though possibly indefinite period because their life would be in danger if they were to return to their country of citizenship. See also foreigners seeking asylum.

Foreigners have the right to free establishment: Foreigners who have the right to enter, stay and work within the territory of a country other than their own by virtue of an agreement or treaty concluded between their country of citizenship and the country they enter.

Foreigners in transit: Persons who arrive in the receiving country but do not enter it formally because they are on their way to another destination.

Foreigners seeking asylum: A category that encompasses both persons who are eventually allowed to file an application for asylum (asylum-seekers proper) and those who do not enter the asylum adjudication system formally but are nevertheless granted the permission to stay until they can return safely to their countries of origin (that is to say, they become foreigners granted temporary protected status).

Foreign migrant workers: Foreigners admitted by the receiving State for the specific purpose of exercising an economic activity remunerated from within the receiving country. Their length of stay is usually restricted as is the type of employment they can hold.

Foreign students: Persons admitted by a country other than their own, usually under special permits or visas, for the specific purpose of following a particular course of study in an accredited institution of the receiving country.

Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs): Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or man-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border. (Source: "Guiding Principles on Internal Displacements" issued by the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General in 1998)

Jus Sanguinis: Literally meaning right of blood, it makes descent from a family member the primary determinant of citizenship. (Source: United States Immigration and Naturalization Service).

Jus Solis: States that a person is granted citizenship through place of birth. (Source: United States Immigration and Naturalization Service).

Long-term migrant: A person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least a year (12 months), so that the country of destination effectively becomes his or her new country of usual residence. From the perspective of the country of departure, the person will be a long-term emigrant and from that of the country of arrival, the person will be a long-term immigrant.

Nomads: Persons without a fixed place of usual residence who move from one site to another, usually according to well-established patterns of geographical mobility. When their trajectory involves crossing current international boundaries, they become part of the international flows of people. Some nomads may be stateless persons because, lacking a fixed place of residence, they may not be recognized as citizens by any of the countries through which they pass.

Refugee: Any person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being

outside of the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to return to it. (Source: UN Convention Related to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol) (See *refugees*)

Refugees: Foreign persons granted refugee status either at the time of admission or before admission. This category therefore includes foreign persons granted refugee status while abroad and entering to be resettled in the receiving country as well as persons granted refugee status on a group basis upon arrival in the country. In some cases, refugee status may be granted when the persons involved are still in their country of origin through "in-country processing" of requests for asylum. Refugee status may be granted on the basis of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol or pertinent regional instruments.

Resettlement: Permanent relocation of refugees, internally displaced persons or others that have been displaced to a new place that allows them to establish residence. Refers to both international and internal relocations. (Source: United States Immigration and Naturalization Service).

Short-term migrant: A person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least three months but less than a year (12 months) except in cases where the movement to that country is for purposes of recreation, holiday, visits to friends or relatives, business, medical treatment or religious image. For purposes of international migration statistics, the country of usual residence of short-term migrants is considered to be the country of destination during the period they spend in it.

Xenophobia: An unreasonable fear or hatred of foreigners or strangers or of that which is foreign or strange. (Source: Webster's Dictionary).

STATISTICS

Global Estimates and Trends

source <http://www.iom.int/jahia/page254.html>

Global estimates¹

There are an estimated **191 million migrants worldwide** in 2005, up from 176 million in 2000.

Migrants comprise **3.0 per cent of the global population**.

The number of the migrants worldwide would constitute the fifth most populous country in the world.²

Women accounted for 49.6 per cent of global migrants in 2005.

In 2005, **remittance flows are estimated to have exceeded USD 233 billion worldwide**, USD 167 billion of which went to developing countries.³

There are roughly **30 to 40 million unauthorized migrants worldwide**, comprising around 15 to 20 percent of the world's immigrant stock.⁴

There are between seven and eight million undocumented migrants in Europe.⁵

According to 2005 estimates, the US hosts 10.3 million undocumented migrants.⁶ Approximately 500,000 arrive each year.⁷

The US has the largest absolute number of irregular immigrants, which make up about 30 percent of its total foreign-born population.⁸

In 2005, there were **6.6 million internally displaced persons (IDPs)** in 16 countries compared to 5.4 million IDPs in 13 countries the year before.⁹

In 2005, the **global number of refugees reached an estimated 8.4 million persons**.¹⁰

Global trends¹¹

Migration flows have shifted in recent years with changing poles of attraction for labour migration.

In some parts of the world, migrant stock has actually decreased.

- Although the number of Asian migrants has increased from 28.1 million in 1970 to 43.8 million in 2000, Asia's share of global migrant stock decreased from 34.5 per cent to 25 per cent over the same period.
- Africa has also seen a decline in its share of international migrants: from 12 per cent in 1970 to 9 per cent in 2000
- This is also true for Latin America and the Caribbean (down from 7.1 per cent to 3.4 per cent); Europe (down from 22.9 per cent to 18.7 per cent) and for Oceania (3.7 per cent to 3.3 per cent).
- Only Northern America and the former USSR have seen a sharp increase in their migrant stock between 1970 and 2000 (from 15.9 per cent to 23.3 per cent for

Northern America and 3.8 per cent to 16.8 per cent for the Former USSR). In the latter case however, this increase has more to do with the redefinition of borders than with the actual movement of people.

The stock of international migrants remains concentrated in relatively few countries.

- 75 per cent of all international migrants are in 12 per cent of all countries.¹²
-

Sources

- ¹ All data from "Global estimates" are from the United Nations' Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2005 Revision, <http://esa.un.org/migration>, unless noted otherwise.
- ² US Census Bureau, IDB - Rank Countries by Population, <http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idbrank.html>
- ³ World Bank's Global Economic Prospects 2006, <http://www.worldbank.org/>
- ⁴ United Nations' Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2003 Revision
- ⁵ Migration Information Source, <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=336>
- ⁶ See above, <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=329>
- ⁷ World Migration 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration
- ⁸ See [5]
- ⁹ 2005 Global Refugee Trends, <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics>
- ¹⁰ See above, <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics>. Does not include some 4.3 million Palestinian refugees under the responsibility of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).
- ¹¹ All data from "Global trends" are from World Migration 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration unless noted otherwise.
- ¹² See [4], data in digital form.

Regional and Country Figures

Source <http://www.iom.int/jahia/page255.html>

Migrant population ¹

Geographic area	Population (millions)	Percentage of the area's population
Europe (including the European part of the former USSR)	56.1	7.7
Asia	49.9	1.4
North America	40.8	12.9
Africa	16.3	2
Latin America	5.9	1.1
Australia	5.8	18.7

Countries hosting the largest number of international migrants in 2000 ²

Country	International migrants (millions)
United States	35.0
Russian Federation	13.0
Germany	7.3
Ukraine	6.9
France	6.3
India	6.3
Canada	5.8
Saudi Arabia	5.3
Australia	4.7
Pakistan	4.2
United Kingdom	4.0

Top 3 migrant sending countries

Country	Estimated diaspora (millions)
China	35
India	20
The Philippines	7

Countries where international migrants made up more than 60 per cent of the population in 2000

- Andorra
- Macao Special Administrative Region of China
- Guam
- The Holy See
- Monaco
- Qatar
- The United Arab Emirates

Traditional countries of immigration

- Australia
- Canada
- New Zealand
- United States

New countries of destination of migrants

- Ireland
- Italy
- Norway
- Portugal

Sources

All data are from World Migration 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration unless noted otherwise.

^{1, 2} United Nations, Trends in Migrant Stock: The 2003 Revision, data in digital form.

XX

Nota bene:

A good ***world map of migrations*** giving the situation by country at the date of the 31st December 2000 can be found on the site of the ***Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees*** linked with the International Migration Statistics: http://www.gcir.org/about_immigration/world_map.htm

The main reference staying the site and the publications of the

International office of Migration

XX

Possible games and activities to be implemented with groups

I Beware of culture.

Theme: Culture and immigrants as presented in the media and by the politicians Aim (what for?): Awareness of the misuse of the concept of culture to exclude ethnic minorities (with examples from the extreme right and mainstream media).

Awareness of the misuse of the concept of culture to excuse negative behaviour.

Group (whom for?): 8 – 32 (working in smaller groups of 4-8 persons)

Material needed: Worksheets, flipchart, pens, the cases Duration 90 minutes or more
Description Split the participants into 4 groups. Each group will be given a case they have to discuss and then present in plenary. They will get a sheet with 1) a case & 2) some questions to discuss.

Part one (30 minutes)

The participants discuss the cases.

Part two (30 minutes)

In plenary each group is asked to present their case shortly

Part three (20 minutes)

Debriefing:

What can culture explain in connection to behaviour?

What can it not explain?

Which other explanations of the behaviour did you come up with?

What happens when we try to explain delinquency, unemployment etc. with the concept of culture?

When arguing that we should respect culture no matter what, what do we miss out on?

Part four (10 minutes)

Sum up the debriefing with a presentation of stereotypes, prejudices, discrimination and exclusion. Be aware of cultural differences as a first best guess, but beware of the use of culture to explain or excuse negative behaviour. Otherwise culture turns into a new concept for "race".

II Case studies

Case 1

The following quote is taken for a book "Generous Betrayal. Politics of Culture in the New Europe", which is written by the Norwegian anthropologist Unni Wikan who works on issues of immigrants and refugees in Norway.

As a culture expert – an anthropologist – I receive frequent calls from people who are dealing with immigrants and refugees. One type of questions is of this nature "He has beaten his wife (or children), but he says it is his culture. What are we to do?" The callers are social workers. A different type of question comes from a lawyer who phones and says: "I have this client. He has beaten his wife (or murdered a man or something), but I think it's his culture... Would you please appear in court as an expert witness for the defence and say that?"

Unni Wikan continues....

When I say I will not, this is not a matter of culture, the lawyer then proceeds: "But do you think we can find somebody else who will say this is his culture?" To which my answer is "Certainly!"

Discussion points

We have previously discussed culture and cultural differences. We will now ask you to discuss whether the concept of culture can explain violence (e.g. against women) or not, and if not which other factors can explain it.

If you have more time you can....

- Relate the discussion to similar cases where forced marriages, circumcision of women, or abuse of the social welfare system is excused with culture.
- Discuss whether explaining with culture can disempower people.

Case 2

The following quote has been taken from Pim Fortuyn (a Dutch politician of the extreme right). An environmentalist has killed this politician because of his radical statements.

The Netherlands is a multicultural country, and that is a fact. The problem we face is that of integration and then especially the Islamic culture. When we look at the difference in values and beliefs between our cultures, I see a gap that is hard to bridge. Look at the countries where Islam is the main religion; all non-democratic countries with a little lack of a clear and just justice system. And what about the separation of religion and politics there? But also when we look closer home we see the differences. How else come that eighty percent of the juvenile delinquents in our prisons are Moroccans and Turkish? To start a truly multicultural society we first need to close our borders to the South and deal with the problems of integrating others in our society. Then we will have time to integrate them and make them understand that we have different norms and values here in the Dutch culture.

A reply to this statement was to be expected and came one day later, from another politician. He said:

It is true that there are gaps; it is true that we maybe should restrict immigration; it is true that there are mostly Moroccans and Turkish youngsters in our prisons, but can we also have a look at how many youngsters with the same origin we see at the universities? How often they are perceived as criminals? How often they are made jokes of, of a level that is beyond disgusting? There are two sides of the story, and mentioning one alone, is dangerous.

Discussion points

We have previously discussed culture and cultural differences. We will now ask you to discuss whether the concept of culture can explain the lack of democracy in certain countries and delinquency of immigrant youngsters or not, and if not which other factors can explain it.

If you have time you can relate the discussion to the recent troubles in the suburbs of Paris (November 2005 and March 2006).

Case 3

The following case has been taken from a large Danish newspaper: Berlingske Tidende from November 2005. It is a comment written by a member of the parliament for the labor party (former social minister and minister of internal affairs).

The theme Islam and terrorism has recently dominated the media. One big case has been the finding of a group of young Muslims in Denmark suspected of planning a terrorist attack....

Many voices have tried to explain violent and terrorist tendencies among some Muslims by saying that it is the fault of the Danish society... It is for instance claimed that it is not appropriate to see threats, violence and terrorism as cultural or ideological problems. The same tendency is found in broader discussions on integration, where it is often claimed that the problems are social and nothing has to do with culture.

This claim has no basis in reality... The fact is that terrorism arises out of problems in the Muslim countries themselves. Those who promote terrorism are convinced that Islam is above all other religions and cultures. They despise the Western world and its values. Therefore they feel powerless when the Muslim countries generally are economically and politically inferior. They do not want to face the fact that the Muslim countries have to go through a cultural change process, which enables them to develop modern societies.

Moreover cultural barriers often go together with social problems...When many immigrant women live isolated from the society it has to do with the female role in the cultures they come from, and when they want a spouse from home through an arranged marriage, it has to do with their culture.

The above tendency to blame the Danish society is contrasted by the Dutch politician Ayaan Hirsi Ali (Somali origin, declared non Muslim, co-producer of the controversial movie "Submission about the suppression of women in Islam, and currently member of the liberal party). Ayaan Hirsi Ali claims that we in the Western are underestimating how strong a barrier Islam and the culture in the Muslim countries are to the Western values (e.g. freedom of speech, human rights). Many politicians in The Netherlands do not think that the killing of Theo van Gogh (the moviemaker of "Submission") has anything to do with his Islamic background, even though he has declared in court that he is willing to cut the throat of anybody who offends Allah or his prophets.

Discussion points

We have previously discussed culture and cultural differences. We will now ask you to discuss whether the concept of culture can explain terrorism and political killings, and if not which other factors can explain it.

Discuss furthermore the difference between explaining/understanding and accepting behaviour and relate this to the case.

Case 4

The following case is a comment writing in a large Danish newspaper: Berlingske Tidende.

There is a clear tendency in Danish journalism to describe different groups in society according to very different approaches. Muslims or "immigrants" are typically described as members of a group, where others are described as individuals. A comparison between two cases, which have received quite some media coverage and which both show the worst sides of humans, can illustrate this; namely the killing of the Dutch movie-maker Theo van Gogh and the torture in the Iraqi prison Abu Ghraib.

Van Gogh's murderer was Muslim, and this is how he has been described in the Danish press. In two large newspaper he was called "extremist Moroccan Muslim and a "Moroccan who thought that van Gogh had offended Islam". In one article in another (left-wing) newspaper he was described a bit more nuanced: The murderer had previously been to prison, had been rehabilitated and got a job at a newspaper, but the conclusion is similar to other newspapers: He had been reading the Koran, intensively. And then he killed a man. The message from the Danish press is very clear: Mohammed Bouyeri became a murderer because he was a Muslim. Other aspects were simply not relevant to describe.

This simplified approach does not apply to other atrocities. When pictures of American prison guards in Iraq, torturing prisoners were published last year, the guard, Charles Graner and his previous girlfriend Lynndie England were described in detail. Graner had a past as a prison guard with quite some complaints about his behaviour, he was divorced because of wife battering. Lynndie grew up in a trailer at the end of an earth track, and had had mental troubles as well as learning disabilities since she was a child. It can be assumed that Graner and England's social background is considered relevant for the understanding of their crimes. They were described as individuals.

The consequence is that you describe an individual's act as an expression of a group identity when it comes to Muslims but not to others. Mohammed Bouyeri's acts thus become a Muslim phenomenon, and then you have ascribed these negative tendencies to all Muslims.

Discussion points

We have previously discussed culture and cultural differences. We will now ask you to discuss whether the concept of culture can explain killings and torture, and if not which other factors can explain it.

If you have more time try to think of other examples, where immigrants' behaviour is explained with their culture, when the same behaviour is explained by other means, when it is shown by the majority.

III Take a step forward

"Everything flows from the rights of the others and my never-ending duty to respect them".

Emmanuel Lévinas

Group size 10 – 30

Time 60 minutes

Overview We are all equal, but some are more equal than others. In this activity participants experience what it is like to be someone else in their society. The issues addressed include:

- Social inequality being often a source of discrimination and exclusion
- Empathy and its limits.

Objectives

- To promote empathy with others who are different
- To raise awareness about the inequality of opportunities in society
- To foster an understanding of possible personal consequences of belonging to certain social minorities or cultural groups

Materials

- Role cards
- An open space (a corridor, large room or outdoors)
- Tape or CD player and soft/relaxing music

Preparation

- Read the activity carefully. Review the list of "situations and events" and adapt it to the group that you are working with.
- Make the role cards, one per participant. Copy the (adapted) sheet either by hand or on a photocopier, cut out the strips and fold them over.

Instructions

1. Create a calm atmosphere with some soft background music. Alternatively, ask the participants for silence.
2. Hand out the role cards at random, one to each participant. Tell them to keep it to themselves and not to show it to anyone else.
3. Invite them to sit down (preferably on the floor) and to read their role card.
4. Now ask them to begin to get into role. To help, read out some of the following questions, pausing after each one, to give people time to reflect and build up a picture of themselves and their lives:
 - What was your childhood like? What sort of house did you live in? What kind of games did you play? What sort of work did your parents do?
 - What is your everyday life like now? Where do you socialise? What do you do in the morning, in the afternoon, in the evening?
 - What sort of lifestyle do you have? Where do you live? How much money do you earn each month? What do you do in your leisure time? What do you do in your holidays?
 - What excites you and what are you afraid of?

5. Now ask people to remain absolutely silent as they line up beside each other (like on a starting line)
6. Tell the participants that you are going to read out a list of situations or events. Every time that they can answer "yes" to the statement, they should take a step forward. Otherwise, they should stay where they are and not move.
7. Read out the situations one at a time. Pause for a while between each statement to allow people time to step forward and to look around to take note of their positions relative to each other.
8. At the end invite everyone to take note of their final positions. Then give them a couple of minutes to come out of role before debriefing in plenary.

Debriefing and evaluation

Start by asking participants about what happened and how they feel about the activity and then go on to talk about the issues raised and what they learnt.

1. How did people feel stepping forward - or not?
2. For those who stepped forward often, at what point did they begin to notice that
3. others were not moving as fast as they were?
4. Did anyone feel that there were moments when their basic human rights were being ignored?
5. Can people guess each other's roles? (Let people reveal their roles during this part of the discussion)
6. How easy or difficult was it to play the different roles? How did they imagine what the person they were playing was like?
7. Does the exercise mirror society in some way? How?
8. Which human rights are at stake for each of the roles? Could anyone say that their
9. human rights were not being respected or that they did not have access to them?
10. What first steps could be taken to address the inequalities in society?

Tips for facilitators

If you do this activity outdoors, make sure that the participants can hear you, especially if you are doing it with a large group! You may need to use your co-facilitators to relay the statements.

In the imagining phase at the beginning, it is possible that some participants may say that they know little about the life of the person they have to role-play. Tell them, this does not matter especially, and that they should use their imagination and to do it as best they can. The power of this activity lies in the impact of actually seeing the distance increasing between the participants, especially at the end when there should be a big distance between those that stepped forward often and those who did not. To enhance the impact, it is important that you adjust the roles to reflect the realities of the participants' own lives. As you do so, be sure you adapt the roles so that only a minimum of people can take steps forward (i.e. can answer "yes"). This also applies if you have a large group and have to devise more roles.

During the debriefing and evaluation it is important to explore how participants knew about the character whose role they had to play. Was it through personal experience or through other sources of information (news, books, and jokes)? Are they sure the information and the images they have of the characters are reliable? In this way you can introduce how stereotypes and prejudice work.

This activity is particularly relevant to making links between the different generations of rights (civil/political and social/economic/cultural rights) and the access to them. The problems of poverty and social exclusion are not only a problem of formal rights - although

the latter also exists for refugees and asylum-seekers for example. The problem is very often a matter of effective access to those rights.

Variations

One way to get more ideas on the table and to deepen participants' understanding is to work first in small groups and then to get them to share their ideas in plenary. Having co-facilitators is almost essential if you do this. Try this method by taking the second part of the debriefing - after each role has been revealed - in smaller groups. Ask people to explore who in their society has fewer, and who has more, chances or opportunities, and what first steps can and should be taken to address the inequalities. Alternatively, ask people to take one of the characters and ask what could be done, i.e. what duties and responsibilities they themselves, the community and the government have towards this person.

Suggestions for follow-up

Depending on the social context you work in, you may want to invite representatives from advocacy groups for certain cultural or social minorities to talk to the group. Find out from them what issues they are currently fighting for and how you and young people can help. Such a face-to-face meeting would also be an opportunity to address or review some of the prejudices or stereotyping that came out during the discussion.

The group may like to take more time to consider the stereotypic images they have of the people represented in "Take a step forward". You could use the activity, "[Euro-rail "a la carte"](#)" in the all different all equal education pack to ask which people they would most like to share a railway carriage with, and which people they would least like to share with. If the group would like to find out more about the issues relating to inequalities in education provision world-wide and the measures that are being taken to address the problems, you may wish to look at the activity "[Education for all](#)".

Ideas for action

Take up the ideas from the follow-up. Follow through how you and young people can help groups and organisations working with cultural or social minorities, and turn the ideas into practice.

Handouts

Role cards

You are an unemployed single mother.	You are an Arab Muslim girl living with your parents who are devoutly religious people.
You are the daughter of the local bank manager. You study economics at university.	You are the 19-year-old son of a farmer in a remote village in the mountains.
You are a soldier in the army, doing compulsory military service.	You are a disabled young man who can only move in a wheelchair.
You are a 17-year-old Roma (Gypsy) girl who never finished primary school.	You are an HIV positive, middle-aged prostitute.
You are an unemployed schoolteacher in a country whose new official language you are not fluent in.	You are a 24-year-old refugee from Afghanistan.

You are an illegal immigrant from Mali.	You are the president of a party-political youth organisation (whose "mother" party is now in power).
You are the son of a Chinese immigrant who runs a successful fast food business.	You are the daughter of the American ambassador to the country where you are now living.
You are the owner of a successful import-export company.	You are a retired worker from a factory that makes shoes.
You are the girlfriend of a young artist who is addicted to heroin.	You are a 22-year-old lesbian.
You are a fashion model of African origin.	You are a homeless young man, 27 years old.

Situations and events

Read the following situations out aloud. Allow time after reading out each situation for participants to step forward and also to look to see how far they have moved relative to each other.

- You have never encountered any serious financial difficulty.
- You have decent housing with a telephone line and television.
- You feel your language, religion and culture are respected in the society where you live.
- You feel that your opinion on social and political issues matters, and your views are listened to.
- Other people consult you about different issues.
- You are not afraid of being stopped by the police.
- You know where to turn for advice and help if you need it.
- You have never felt discriminated against because of your origin.
- You have adequate social and medical protection for your needs.
- You can go away on holiday once a year.
- You can invite friends for dinner at home.
- You have an interesting life and you are positive about your future.
- You feel you can study and follow the profession of your choice.
- You are not afraid of being harassed or attacked in the streets, or in the media.
- You can vote in national and local elections.
- You can celebrate the most important religious festivals with your relatives and close friends.
- You can participate in an international seminar abroad.
- You can go to the cinema or the theatre at least once a week.
- You are not afraid for the future of your children.
- You can buy new clothes at least once every three months.
- You can fall in love with the person of your choice.
- You feel that your competence is appreciated and respected in the society where you live.
- You can use and benefit from the Internet.

Questionnaire and possible orientation hints for debates...

- Please mention:
 - Your age:
 - Your gender:
 - Your nationality:
 - Your field and level of studies:

- Are you yourself an immigrant? If yes from which country.

- Are you a child of immigrants at the second or at the third generation? If yes from which origin.

- Do you think that migration is a natural phenomenon? Explain your position.

- Do you think that migration is a problem? Explain your position.

- From where and why do immigrants come to your country?

- To where and why do emigrants leave your country?

- For which countries do you need a visa?

