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Part I:

Theoretical Introduction
1. Introduction

The following material goes back to an initiative for the study of racism in rural areas by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. The outcome of this research is based on a year-long investigation into the various areas pertaining to the problem of racism in rural environments.

The first task at hand was to define what rural areas might be, to differentiate between the various concepts on rural areas and to focus on the transformations that rural areas have undergone. In doing so, a solution was found through which both the differentiation of rural areas and the industrialisation of the countryside were taken into account.

The second task was to look at what the definition of racism might entail. Here, a very general idea of what racism was and is and how it developed, as well as a differentiation between the discriminatory and exclusionist phenomena, were considered and brought into the discussion of what neo-racism and xenophobia might mean today.

The aims of the study were:

1. To perform an inventory study on what is known about racism and discrimination taking place in rural areas – as opposite to urban areas – in the member states of the European Union.

2. To discuss the most important findings from research on racism in rural areas, particularly from 1995 and onwards, describing and analysing the vulnerable groups, the different forms of expressing racism and discrimination, their causes or consequences and the political situation with regard to migrants and members of cultural minorities living and working in the countrysides of the EU.

3. To discuss whether if there is a form of “rural racism” in opposition to a presumed “urban racism” and the validity of the concept “rural racism”.

4. To collect, develop and analyse statistics providing information on topics on racism in rural areas of the member states.

5. To describe and discuss governmental and non-governmental initiatives to combat racism and discrimination in rural areas and discrimination on racial, ethnic and religious grounds.
In order to identify patterns of racism the following concept was developed. Racism comprises practices of exclusion and inclusion of people due to a constructed or “real” cultural or ethnic background. Racism is grounded in presumed cultural or ethnic differences. Such differences let discriminatory practices emerge or be strengthened. The following forms of expression of racism have been taken into consideration:

- violent attacks;
- verbal aggressions and other unequivocal forms expressing negative feelings toward immigrants or members of ethnic minorities;
- the inferior position of immigrants and members of cultural minorities in the labour and housing markets and in health and education services in comparison to the autochthonous population (the identification of patterns of racist structural discrimination); and
- the presence or dominance of negative images among the autochthonous population regarding immigrants, immigration and cultural minorities.

The term “xenophobia” is used to refer to practices that are dominated by feelings of fear of strangers. The stranger is not necessarily understood as being culturally different.

With the term “rural racism”, practices of racist discrimination that take place in rural areas are described. The term “rural” should not be understood in relation to the existence or dominance of what might be called “rural life-worlds” (in Habermas’ sense). And the occurrence of racism should not be necessarily connected to traditional forms of rurality. European rural social fabrics have changed as a consequence of the economic and social transformation processes of the last decades. The rural is defined in opposition to urban, thus comprising the non-urban. The term “rural” refers to the demographic and social space where racism might take place. Only in a few cases is racism in rural areas related to typical forms of rurality.

Rurality is mostly associated with feelings of belonging to a closed community linked to agricultural activities. Nevertheless, changes in the economic and social structures of former traditional rural areas in the last decades in Europe make it difficult to speak of rurality. Many former rural areas have been completely transformed. Villages have turned into peripheries of urban centres as, for example, in the Netherlands and in Germany. Other places affected by industrialisation processes have maintained characteristics of rural societies because of their distance to urban centres, such as communities in Eastern Germany, Finland or Sweden. There are also typical rural areas with predominantly agricultural activities, such as in southern Spain. Nevertheless, even in these places profound changes of the social fabric have taken place as the consequence of extensive forms of agricultural production and the
embedding of local and regional production units in trans-state networks of commercialisation. In such cases is also difficult to speak of a traditional rural society.

Because of these social changes it is very difficult to make a general assertion on issues of rurality in Europe. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify paths of development in opposition to urban centres. Thus, rural and non-urban areas can be identified and particular characteristics of racism in these areas can be analysed. Because of the economic, social, political and cultural embedding of rural and non-urban areas in national and global structures, racism presents the same factors of emergence and development in urban as in rural areas. Despite this, the development of racism or its forms of expression in the countryside are often based, influenced or formed by the particular characteristics of the non-urban social fabric. Although rural areas present different characteristics in the various member states and regions, there are two common factors that strengthen racism in rural areas:

- the isolation of immigrants and members of cultural minorities from the autochthonous population and from each other; and,
- the lack of infrastructure to satisfy the existential necessities of immigrant and cultural minority populations and to promote their integration.

These two common factors also assume different forms in the various member states. For example, the second factor is most notable in countries where rural racism is related to the placement of asylum seekers in villages and small towns, mainly in poor living conditions. In countries with cultural minority populations living in the countryside, such as in the United Kingdom, this lack of infrastructure is expressed for example in the fact that members of cultural minorities do not get foodstuffs corresponding to their eating habits.

The first common factor, namely the isolation of the immigrant or cultural minority population from the autochthonous population is a key problem regarding rural racism. This isolation is in many countries a consequence of the refugee decentralisation policies of the European governments. In the framework of this policy asylum seekers are placed in villages and small towns, and mostly even on the edges of these small communities. Because of the poor living conditions of asylum seekers and their spatial isolation from the communities, the autochthonous population gets the impression that asylum seekers do not belong to society. Few language courses or activities exist to promote the integration of asylum seekers in these communities. As a rule, the mobility of asylum seekers is restricted because they do not have the money to travel outside of these communities. In addition, in many countries, as in Germany, there are even rules that limit the right of movement of asylum seekers. As a consequence of this situation, asylum seekers are mostly also
isolated from their compatriots. This restriction of mobility leads, in some cases, to a restriction of the right to practice religion, for example Muslim asylum seekers in areas where there are no Mosques.

In addition to this structural discrimination, asylum seekers often suffer from discrimination stemming from the autochthonous population. The discriminatory reasons for the rejection of the placement of asylum seekers in small communities in rural areas are the same in most of the countries. The most prevalent arguments used against asylum seekers are that these communities do not have the capacity and infrastructure to receive asylum seekers, that the later abuse the welfare state, disturb the social cohesion and are even involved in criminal activities. Negative prejudices against asylum seekers are often strengthened by local politicians who intend to gain audience by instrumentalising the topics of asylum and migration. In most of the communities throughout the countryside one can observe negative attitudes against asylum seekers and immigrants. In many communities there are even basis groups that organise initiatives against asylum seekers. This negative atmosphere against asylum seekers is in many places strengthened by the presence of militant right-wing extremist and neo-Nazi groups. Germany and the Scandinavian countries have the most problems with racist violence and right-wing extremism in the countryside.

Almost without exception, small communities in the countryside where asylum seekers have been placed have become problem areas of rural racism. Structural discrimination of asylum seekers, negative attitudes among the autochthonous population against them, their instrumentalisation by local politicians and racial violence, strengthened by the presence of militant right-wing extremist groups, are all forms of expression of rural racism. They are closely related to the decentralisation policies of the European governments.

Further problem areas of rural racism concern agricultural production. Here, a distinction should be made between extensive and non-extensive agricultural production. In countries of non-extensive agricultural production, such as Germany, the Netherlands or in the Scandinavian countries, immigrant workers – particularly those from Eastern Europe – are engaged for the harvest season. They are often employed illegally and receive very low salaries. The bad living and work conditions of these labour immigrants are the most frequent form of rural racism. In Spain, a country with an extensive agricultural production, rural racism assumes violent forms in addition to the poor living and work conditions of the immigrants. The massive racial attacks against immigrant workers from Morocco in El Ejido (2000) show the level of violence that racist discrimination can assume in the countryside. In general, the illegal employment of immigrant workers determines not only their poor living and work conditions, but also makes them more vulnerable to falling victims of racist incidents.
A general framework for analysing each country was established for this study and field research was undertaken. This included a study of literature and interviews with experts from every member state of the European Union. This approach made it possible to present, at least, the problematic impact of racism in rural areas and the special phenomena of racism in each member state.

Each country varied in regard to the experiences with cultural minorities, racism and immigration. In the end, however, comparable classifications of ruralism, rural environments, neo-racism and xenophobia could be observed and established. In a comparative perspective, we are confronted with a phenomenon that has been neglected in research and in the political discourses of anti-racism. Nevertheless, in many European countries and anti-racist projects, various examples of anti-racist activities have been established in the countries and in rural areas. These are described in the following country reports. Each country report includes the problems of the immigration process and the racist phenomenon in the country as such. After this, examples of racist phenomena in rural areas follow. Each country report has an introduction in terms of statistics and data on ruralism and racism, literature lists used in their description and analysis. Selected good practices against racism in the countryside are mentioned. Experts have been selected from the fields of migration research, research on ethnic relations and through the scientific investigation of racism and xenophobia.

The country reports were developed by a group of researchers who were responsible for the following countries: Austria (G. Ruiz Torres); Belgium (I. van Maele); Denmark (I. van Maele); Finland (G. Ruiz Torres); France (I. van Maele); Germany (G. Ruiz); Greece (A. Hoetzeldt; G. Ruiz Torres; A. Vazaki); Ireland (S. Dowling); Italy (G. Ruiz Torres); Luxembourg (I. van Maele); Netherlands (I. van Maele); Portugal (G. Ruiz Torres); Spain (T. Palomar; G. Ruiz Torres); Sweden (G. Ruiz Torres); United Kingdom (G. Ruiz Torres).

Statistical data was compiled and analysed by: D. Gebhardt, A. Miething and U. Standke. Bibliographic material was researched and placed together by: M. Rückwart and N. Schmidt. Expert interviews for the country reports were carried out by: J. Blaschke, R. Delarue, J. Enderle, C. Faraco, A. Hoetzeldt, I. van Maele, I. Meyer, T. Palomar, S. Pföhman, G. Ruiz Torres and N. Schlenzka.
2. Neo-Racism and Xenophobia

Racism is a political term deeply rooted in European history, but which has been difficult to define. A most suitable definition was formulated during a United Nations conference by Ruth Benedict (Benedict: 1983). Generally when one thinks of racism, anti-negroism and negrophobia in the United States (Myrdal: 1944) comes to mind, as well as the apartheid systems in in South Africa (Cohen: 1986). Today, however, one is mostly confronted with new – and less clear-cut – forms of what one calls racism. Nevertheless, there is a broad consensus in most civil societies and most political classes in which the traditional forms of racism are considered to be features of the past that should be fought against wherever they appear. A basic element of “new” forms of racism, however, is the establishment and continuity of new economic and social hierarchies along cultural lines. Indeed, this neo-racism could be defined as the discriminatory exclusion or inclusion of people along cultural lines or movements. In doing so, one must take into account all of the subtle social phenomena – images and orientations – that give the new forms of neo-racism their concrete basis.

Closely related to this is what is discussed under the term “xenophobia”. Here, the terms xenophobia and neo-racism could be used almost interchangeably. However, the idea that one actor is aggressively discriminatory against another actor or against another group of people, who are understood to be culturally strange (neo-racism) is a different concept than a fear of strangers (xenophobia) and a subsequent possibility that new forms of aggression against strangers per se, develop from this fear. The problem of the stranger as a threat to the social fabric and the body politics constitutes the underpinnings of xenophobia, a phenomenon which might be one of the cornerstones of what has been called the human condition. In this study, both phenomena – neo-racism and xenophobia – play their separate, but intertwined roles.

There has not yet been agreement on a definition of what rural racism is. However, various phenomena of neo-racism and xenophobia that might occur in rural environments has been developed for this study.

The first phenomenon – neo-fascism – has its roots in the fascist movements between the two World Wars and in anti-industrialist utopias of the last two centuries. The core of the fascist ideology was the mobilisation of people for the establishment of an organic society in which the whole institutional setting of body politics and social fabric works together in production and distribution of goods and services. It was, in many ways, an anti-capitalist and anti-industrialist construction of a fictional social model. However, the fascist movements did not fight against the established financial elites, but rather included them into the presumed organic structure of society. Each person was intended
to fulfill his or her function in society, economy and state. The whole fascist idea of an organic nation-state and national society was based on the romantic utopia of equality and trust among a national population or folk, a dream that transcended political, economic and social hierarchies in totalitarian escalations of political performances. This society was constructed along the fictional romantic image of a peasant society with landlords, serfs and peasants, all of whom cooperate on the basis of trust and common responsibility. More than fifty years after the defeat of fascism, and long after the establishment of modern democracies and welfare states in western Europe, all of these ideas still function and a continuity of organisations grounded in these traditions still exists.

Neo-fascism is closely related to neo-nationalism. The latter is, of course, not as radical as the former. But, neo-fascists and neo-nationalists still have close ideological affinities, though they have been – until now – represented by oppositional factions among the political classes in Europe. Neo-nationalism is a reaction towards globalisation and post-industrialism. Its political strategies and perspectives are understood to be alternatives to the development of the EU as a political project transcending the idea of the nation-state. Until the end of the 1990s, the project of a European Union was designed in terms of supranational economies and cultures as well as in terms of developing democracy and loyalty in the contexts of sub-national regions. In opposition to this, neo-nationalists are reviving the nation-state as the systemic basis for social collaboration and political responsibilities, defined to be national interests. The nation-state’s borders are again understood to be the most important boundaries to be upheld in order to prevent further economic and social decay. The continuation of homogenous national cultures is one of the outspoken perspectives of such politics. Neo-nationalists, for example, advocate for migration, cultural diversity and assimilation, or for what is called integration: Adapting to the national culture by adapting to the national language in the nation-state where one lives.

Nationalism and fascism share the idea of a certain trajectory of the modernised nation based on trust and grounded in organic world-views. This idea is referred to by the romantic notion of “homeland”, and is an opportunistic negation of the socially confusing and complex institution of the “nation-state”. Its main ideological value is found in the mix-up that occurs with its usage, because it presents the nation-state as a homeland which should be an object of orientation in everyday life in the form of national loyalty. This produces patriots or good citizens for the homeland, for the national community. This organic relation that patriots or good citizens have to the homeland – again formulated by neo-nationalists as trust and personal orientation towards “community” – should be fought for in confrontation to the individualising “society”. One finds this ideological type of articulation in various forms of rural social environments, most often articulated by new internal migrants.
moving from urban parts of European societies to rural areas or by former peasants and farmers endangered by changes in the agricultural sector and who, therefore, imagine a better life in the past.

Of course, there are still active forms of classical racism, based on colonialism. The construction of various hierarchies of cultural roots in colonial empires played a central role in the political relations of the 19th and 20th centuries. Today, one can still speak of post-colonial racism in this context. In the same vein, nationalistic ideology was formed around the idea of biological difference between various cultural groups. Such differences were concretised in the definition of ethnicity or “ethnic” groups. A huge amount of literature exists to this extent, thus defining other “ethnic groups” as being biologically inferior. Such images are still prevalent in the social world-views in various regions of western Europe.

In most European societies, but also in other places of the world, certain populations have been outcasts for centuries, some of them because of their religious beliefs or different cultural traits. Many of such mechanisms of exclusion and discrimination can be defined as forms of neo-racism. However, their structural forms and functions have changed over the centuries. Hundreds of years ago, antisemitism was based on religious difference. The division of labour as a result of the exclusionist politics against Jews completed a hierarchical production system. Such ideas were transformed during the nationalist 19th and 20th centuries into neo-antisemitism, which is a more a kind of general exclusionist ideology based on nationalistic images of political bodies consisting of pure national cultures and populations, than an argument based on religious difference and division of labour.

Gypsies – or the Roma – have lived in a double-bind situation since in the late medieval times. On the one hand, they suffered from extensive exclusion due to their position as occasional workers in the division of labour in the peasant societies’ frameworks, namely as craftsmen and traders. In this sense, they were incorporated into the economic structure and even protected by many princes and kings, while otherwise excluded from mainstream society. Similar to anti-Semitism, anti-Ziganism was transformed by nationalist and racist ideologies of the 19th and 20th centuries into a more aggressive discriminatory political project of exclusion (Hund: 1996; Hamburger: 1999).

Anti-Muslimism and anti-Islamism have their roots in a quite similar history. There is a deeply rooted anti-Islamism imagery in the European social and political world-view. In this view, Muslims have been threatening the European empires and principalities since the 14th century. Negative orientalism and a symbolic boundary between Europe and the Ottoman Empire are part of the idea of a Christian occident. Rather late, or since the mid-19th century, nationalistic and non-religious movements in the Muslim countries began
looking for new forms of international cohabitation, a political strategy that was counteracted by colonialistic and anti-colonialistic politics in which religious differences played important roles. Islamism was sometimes mixed with nationalism or it was merely considered to be a pure religious discourse. Since the Iranian revolution in 1979, however, Islamism has become a political idea against the European model of modernisation. Since then, Islamism is the ideology of new nationalist politics, and terrorist groups have, in the name of this ideology, attacked several sites in the industrialised world. This confrontation with Islamists weighs greatly into the sentiment of Anti-Muslimism in Europe (Vertovec: 2002).

Nationalism has created the international immigrant, who is defined as not being part of the nation in the form of the sum of the citizens of one nation-state. These immigrants were and are, indeed, excluded in various forms: as groups of foreign workers, as strangers or as less expensive labourers than workers “belonging” to the nation. Since early in the last century, immigration has become a mass-movement worldwide. Immigrants were no longer considered to be merely contributors to the growing populations of frontier societies or as cheap labour for personal services, agricultural production, early industries, etc. They also have been defined as dangerous to national integration and to the standards of living. Racist ideas of less adaptable people, for example, from China or Africa, were central to such protectionist perspectives. For reasons of national social security, quotas or limitations of immigrants have become central factors of immigrant policy.

Classical nationalism is very traditional, and it still survives in regional movements that propagate exclusionist ideas against immigrants. This also stems from the idea of essential ethnic traditions of culture, which the regional movements then claim to represent.

Discrimination and exclusion along biologically- or culturally- constructed boundaries are not the only outcomes of polity formations in European and global contexts. Many social images and orientations of racism and xenophobia have not been mentioned here. Such insider and outsider configurations have been described by classical sociologists like Schuetz, Simmel or Elias. If one looks at the micro-level of the social fabric, one will find various forms of group dynamics that develop social situations which can be interpreted through the terminology of racism and xenophobia.

Quite influential arenas of neo-racism and xenophobia are parliamentary institutions, post-fascist organisations, right-wing extremist movements and populist or neo-populist political parties. Many such organisations, movements and parties are even based on neo-racist and xenophobic ideas. Others merely the vocabulary of neo-racism or xenophobia for instrumental or symbolic politics in times of elections.
Besides such political fields of action (arenas), international youth cultures produce a variety of symbolic systems that are neo-racist or xenophobic. Likewise, the so-called youth “scenes” – which are, more or less, social group formations without continuity – are however, important in forming hate-filled or violent situations that can become dynamic and even explosive (Gebauer: 1999).
3. Rural and Provincial Society

The term “rural society” should be defined as a society in which agricultural production is dominant and in which traditions of peasant society conditions are still dominate the social collective imagery. Until the last century, rural societies have been dominant in Europe. After the First and Second World Wars, however, these societies were confronted with extensive processes of change. This social crisis is still occurring in the peripheries of the southern European countries. In most regions in western Europe, rural societies have changed into places where there are no longer many agricultural producers and where autonomous political decision-making in the region has vanished. The European rural societies of today are no longer the social formations of the eighteenth century, in which not only rural landlords and big landowners played a role, but also industrialists. Industry and manufacturing were still dependent on water, and waterways were important for transport and energy. Furthermore, the political class of the cities became partly merged through familial relations and other elective affinities with the landed gentry.

Since the twentieth century, all political decisions have been made in large towns and cities where the political classes lived and were active. There is, of course, a tradition of urban or metropolitan dominance, coupled with provincial backwardness; this has to do with cultural development. Provinces were the places where innovation did not take place and where people knew each other so well, that face-to-face politics dominated provincial life. This was not similarly present in the cities. Cities became the places where banks and money, industrial development and trade found their political expressions. Cities were the places of money and power. More so, people of wealth and nobility found places of entertainment and leisure only in the city. During the twentieth century, provincial areas away from towns and urban agglomerations were not considered to be places in which one could survive as a member of the civil society.

During the late decades of the last century, this structure has not necessarily remained so. The European social fabric has changed completely: Since the 1960s, extensive urban agglomerations have dominate Europe. Considering the ideal type of these urban agglomerations, one can reduce the number of such down to two main urban areas. The first area begins in the foothills in southern England, includes the Benelux-countries, the western parts of Germany, northern France, Switzerland and northern Italy. This is quite concurrent with the concept of the “European Urban Belt” (Rokkan, Stein: 1975). The second area of urban agglomeration starts in northern Italy. This includes southern France and the northEastern parts of Spain. This is – of course – an idealist interpretation of reality, but it shows the recent developmental perspectives. Apart from these areas, we have the less-developed areas in Europe, for
example, in outer Scotland, in some parts of northern England, in the western parts of Spain, in Portugal, Corsica, Sardinia, southern Italy, Greece and Eastern Germany.

Certainly, parts of northern France and Denmark must be included here. Most such peripheral areas are no longer intensely related to agricultural production. This has to do with the ongoing establishment of industrial sides in former small towns and provincial areas. Furthermore, many city dwellers have moved out of the cities and into countryside estates, or have established second homes in rural environments. This has taken place in most parts of western Europe, where rural environments have been more or less de-ruralised and might be now called rural-industrial agglomerations.

Nevertheless, some of these areas are still called “provinces” in terms of a lack of cultural and entertainment institutions, a lack of political decision-making power or a lack of intensive police control, etc. Many of these rural-industrial areas, which one can call “provincial areas”, lack official intervention bodies and, therefore, still possess a private and public continuity of control and sociability. Indeed, one sees here the issue of the industrialisation of rural Europe (Boyle, Paul, et al. (ed.): 1998; Hoggart, Keith, et al.: 1995).
4. City and Countryside as European Problems

When measuring agricultural production today, one realises the high productivity of the economy in the countryside, which is an expression of the standard of production in terms of mechanisation, automatisation and the reduction of the number of labourers. Most of the agricultural production sites have been changed into new forms of production and distribution. Most are now parts of a system that can be referred to as agri-industry or agribusiness, in which each producer is considered to be merely a part of a production line, starting with the production of seeds and fertilisers and finishing with the delivery of produce in supermarkets. Such production lines are governed by international concerns; this has caused most agriculture producers to work indirectly as dependent workers.

These agrarian producers are, in many cases, neighbours with persons who are influenced by – and oriented towards – urban traditions. One is confronted with a new form of rural life, in which the term “rural” is misleading and should be substituted by “provincial”. If we look at the European areas where these changes have taken place, most of Europe must be included. However, there are areas in which these developments have not been as strong as in other areas.

One might mention here, as examples, northern Sweden and northern Finland and the settlements of the Sami-minorities; these are minorities who are agricultural producers, but who are more and more endangered by agribusiness. In Denmark, an agribusiness exists with pockets of rural production. These are social pockets that could be described in the vocabulary of a peasant society.

In Britain, one is confronted with industrialised “farmers” in a country that has been industrialised in its agricultural areas from the sixteenth century onwards. There are still fringe areas in northern Scotland and in the western parts of England and northern Ireland that might be understood as rural. Many areas in the countryside of Britain have been developed through the establishment of new cities that have a completely urban character (red-brick towns). In terms of power control, however, such urban places are still provincial.

In Spain, one still discovers various areas that are nearly untouched by agribusiness. Surprisingly, others are extensively integrated into the agricultural production lines of international businesses. This is partly the case with traditional products, such as olives, olive oil, tomatoes, etc. Portugal is an industrial society, from the north to the south, with a large dominance of manufacturing. However, there are still areas, such as parts of the south, that
are to be understood as rural. Indeed, one could see Portugal – outside of the two large cities – as completely provincial.

This is a very important issue that should be discussed in further research dealing with ruralism in Europe. Italy has its rural areas in the south, but there is a highly developed rural-agricultural dominance in the north. In the south, a kind of classical Mediterranean economy still exists. In the north, many agricultural production sites are integrated into areas of manufacturing and production in industrial districts. Most agricultural products are manufactured near farms, including gammon, ham, sausages, pasta, cookies, etc.

In Greece, one can speak of a classical rural society. However, many parts of Greece have changed as well. The main problem here was the decline of rural production as a result of integration into the European Union, and the very strong urbanisation movements over the last 20 years. Today, a recovery of agricultural production is occurring as part of modern industrialised agriculture. Immigrant rural workers play their part in these developments.

The Netherlands is a country without rural societies, despite the existence of agricultural regions. The fact that Netherlands is an industrial country with a high agribusiness output is, indeed, the first comment made by those interviewed. There are some areas that can be called provincial, but the short territorial distances between larger cities do not allow for a real definition of areas away from urbanity.

In Belgium, the situation is very similar to the Netherlands. However, the change from agriculture to industry in the Flemish area is a rather recent phenomenon that has taken place over the last 50 years; the agriculturalisation of the Wallonian area is a similar recent development over the last 30 years. Luxemburg cannot be understood as a rural society at all.

The Austrian situation is very peculiar. There exist rural areas outside of Vienna that still understand themselves as provincial parts of the country. This is made clear by the definition of the Austrian polity as a contradiction between metropolitan and urban (none-religious and left-wing) Vienna and the rural and agricultural (catholic and more conservative) rest of the country. Contrary to this stereotype of the Austrian society most of Austria is more or less industrialised. Even the party system reflects these changes: The socialists are stronger in the provinces, and the conservatives have found strength in Vienna. Furthermore, one finds cultural minorities in many provincial regions of Austria.

Germany is the most complicated case in Europe. We are confronted with a totally industrialised society in which agricultural production still plays a role, but has a labour contribution to the national production of less than three
percent. Most of the German countryside has been industrialised. In East Germany the problem of re-industrialisation after the destruction of the traditional, institutional economic networks has become obvious in the last ten years.
5. Migration into Rural Areas

Since the seventeenth century, there has been a continuous migration to the rural areas in Europe. People in Europe moved to rural areas in order to contribute to seasonal work for harvest and springtime activities. In various parts of Europe, the population of the countryside was often substituted by immigrant labour. In northern Germany, immigrants were Polish and Swedish labourers; in southern Germany and western France, they were Italian rural workers; and in Britain, they were labourers from Ireland and later from the British colonies. These immigrants filled the gaps of labour supply in the different countrysides.

These classical flows of migrants have vanished over the years. In the meantime, new configurations of migration into rural areas have been established. First of all, migrants are recruited by private or public agencies in order to immigrate as labour to particular places. These places and types of work are, for example, the manning of fishing boats in the Mediterranean, the staffing of the mountain economies still dependent on large amounts of labour or the seasonal making of products like cheese, butter or meat, etc. in the meadows in the Alps, the Apennines or the Pyrenees. The big latifundia and industrialised landowner economies in various parts in Europe have established flexible recruitment systems. One finds Maghreb and Polish workers in Andalusia; Tunisian workers in southern Italy; Albanian, Tunisian, Moroccan and Polish workers in the north of Italy; and Polish workers in the vegetable industries of Germany. All over Europe, there are foreign seasonal workers working in the wine harvest, etc.

Most of these immigration configurations are quite small, have a tradition. Some of them, such as in Italy and Spain, are still comparable to traditional immigration flows to the countryside. Researchers knows little about these migration movements. Therefore, there should be more research done on such migration to rural areas.

Another feature of migration to rural areas is that of labourers working in industrial sites in the countryside. These are normally connected to small towns where manufacturing industries, small and medium-sized industries and industrial districts are situated. Here, rural areas or provinces are confronted with much immigration from migrants that play an important role in the work and industry of these areas. The industrial background of the work plays a special role in immigrants’ settlements. There are large industries that have been established in provincial areas, such as northern Italy and Germany, where migrants live in small towns and small camps related to these industries. The best known place in Europe is the town of Wolfsburg, where Volkswagen has a large production site.
With the establishment of new towns all over Europe and especially in Great Britain, many immigrants have moved out of the cities and are settling in these new towns. Here, they sometimes become victims of new racism and xenophobia. People who buy land in the countryside in order to become farmers themselves, are no longer common. However, there are famous peasant immigration places around Marseille, as well as in England and Italy.
6. Anti-Racism and Resistance

Since the 1950s, traditional racism and neo-racism have been confronted with a far reaching system of beliefs that concludes both that racism is not morally acceptable and also that racism and ethnic discrimination are dysfunctional elements in modern societies. Racism is confronted with political movements and even ruralised political groups that fight against it. In most European countries such anti-racist groups have their origin in parties and established political movements of various kinds. Some of them have been established as the result of certain particular confrontations.

The relationship between anti-racism and racism is not clear. There is anti-racism in some countries without an open racist activity, and there are many areas in Europe with widespread racist activities, but where no direct anti-racism confronts these racist or xenophobic phenomena. Anti-racist practices in the countryside are to be reflected separately from the neo-racist or xenophobic phenomena. But, anti-racism does play an important role in understanding racism in rural areas.
7. Arenas of Neo-Racism and Xenophobia

As mentioned, neo-racism and xenophobia are exposed in certain political arenas. Here, they play a role as central elements of social world views and political orientations. In these arenas, people are involved in political performances as articulators and followers. Such arenas are mostly isolated from each other. In exceptional political conjunctures, however, neo-racist or xenophobic political arenas can develop and have close political connections and affinities with other fields of activities that might be the basis for collective action.

Most of these arenas are divided not only by traditions of organization or thought. Many such fields of political action have certain functions in the modern political body and social fabric. Distances between the arenas are defined here by habitus, social images or orientations that they represent. Politically active people and institutions characterise the arenas, or fields of politics, by their roots in territorial or cultural traditions of political articulation. Such traditions, and the institutions concerned, vary widely from each other.

First of all, there are state elites, a parliament and parties. These agencies are extremely dependent on the mobilization of electorates and on elections that take place in certain political conjunctures. Especially in highly developed politics with parties that are no longer dependent on relationships between the elite and their clients and not oriented towards one political ideology, parties are forced from time to time to use the one or the other image of neo-racism and xenophobia to find the loyalty of a certain group of electors. There are two main arguments for this. First, the failure to mention neo-racist and xenophobic orientations might exclude the topic from public debates, thus minimizing neo-racist activities. The politics of immigrant inclusion, for example, does mobilize neo-racist populations and xenophobic conflicts. Second, it is only possible to survive in parliamentary systems when the established parties exclude the radical neo-xenophobic parties by means of, for example, a restrictionist policy towards immigrants. Both of these quite contradictory arguments often make it necessary to use neo-racist xenophobic propaganda from time to time. However, the outoming policy might be immigrant exclusionist and usually mobilizes new nationalists. This arena is rural as much as urban – television and other media extend this political arena even into the most peripheral areas.

The media and the arts are important in relation to the state and the parliamentary parties. The featuring of the other is indeed an essential activity of modern journalism. Here, large amounts of money has been made by describing kings, queens, princesses, popular musicians and the wealthy, all of whom have non-routinised lives. The description of other strangers who do not fit into the everyday life of people whose time is spent with dependent labour is a similar attraction. Constructed foreign cultures are splendid features for the
media and entertainment industry. Immigrants are, for example, foreigners with sometimes exotic body features, dress, habitus, etc. The media press journalists into stereotyping such social backgrounds, and, therefore, they contribute to cliches and stereotypes, which again develop xenophobia. The rainbow press is one of the widely available means of entertainment in provincial milieus: these media are widely read in public places. This phenomenon, however, has never been studied intensively.

For a long time, it has been underestimated how continuously traditional fascist organisations, with their roots in the period between the two world wars, are still propagating political views which most people have thought of as having vanished. Some of these fascists have renewed their propaganda and their covering of traditional organisational beliefs with images of a liberal and plural society. However, if one looks at the networks that they belong to and at the coalitions that they form politically, one can be convinced that fascist traditions are still a part of neo-racist movements, including their xenophobic stereotypes and beliefs. Most of them are indeed a danger to modern states, especially in times of political decline and crisis. A similar argument can be made with regard to right-wing radicalism, which is merely a kind of radical formation of conservative thought that brings together all ideas of the conservative traditions into a radical militant world view. Violence that propagates nationalism and patriotism is not uncommon.

In the contempt of catch-all parties, there is indeed an idea of populism involved. However, when such parties have a long history of taking part in parliamentary and governmental responsibilities, they are pressed into the rationale of modern politics. Populism, on the other hand, is the catch-all ideology that convinces people with less technocratic ideas about the political world. And, in showing simple patterns of political reform, in which the exclusion of less-integrated people and strangers play a central propagandistic element, simple-minded electorates can be mobilized.

Populist ideologists have, in the meantime, extended themselves towards a new form of politics that might be termed neo-populism. Here, populist arguments are no longer the presentation of a simple pattern of politics in a complicated world, but a pluralist collection of simple ideas about the world and its changing strategies, that wave in popularity among the electorate. In neo-populist thought, xenophobia might be turned into ‘political homophilia’ or into popular versions of neo-feminism; even immigrant inclusionism might be part of neo-populist propaganda - as a contribution to whatever idea the current political fashion might allow to be formulated. Neo-populists are not clear on what kind of sector of the political varieties they belong to. For them, the mobilisation of the electorate is a central issue. Classical relationships between conservative ideas, right-wing radicalism and populism are obviously not able to explain the neo-populist movement. There is an understanding of power that
seems to be coupled with basic anti-parliamentarism, when it comes to deliberating ideas of how a modern democracy should function.

Populism and neo-populism is dependent on cultural, economic, social, and political conjunctures. Nevertheless, there are continuos movements and organisations that organise seminars, cultural events and debates referring to neo-right-wing radicalism, racism and xenophobia. These movements have routinised this tradition and others address the phenomena in a short-term range. These organisations are established all over Europe, have international connections, are related to fascist, right-wing and populist parties, are able to mobilize youth cultures and are trying to establish a continuity of what we call neo-racism and xenophobia.

An element of these movements, typical for the new development of racism and xenophobia, is ‘youth culture’. Some groups of youths support immigrants and others are against them and other strangers. Some use fascist or neo-nationalist symbols for aggressive reasons; others develop pop music in which the songs are openly formulated as violence against strangers in the most brutal fashion. Such groups of youths are organised in small settings; others are ad hoc organisations, which stem from the same youth groups that recognize each other by dress and other symbols. These ad hoc cultures are called ‘scenes’ and play an important role in many parts of Europe as right-wing or neo-racist violent groups. Hooligans could be considered to form part of such ‘scenes’. Important cultural elements for this group include soccer games and other experiences among young people. Especially in parts of European societies, where young people have only a limited choice of being entertained, the scene or youth group is a splendid alternative to other organized activities. The group constitutes a social field for people looking for their own identity and rejecting the lifestyles of their parents and peers.

The most obvious xenophobic milieus in many European countries are regional movements with their forms of ethnic mobilisation and nationalism. Many of these movements have been developed as violent political action groups against immigrants. The Corsican movement was a reaction against the immigration of Pieds-Noirs. Similarly, the Basque movement and Catalan nationalism were reactions to Andalusian immigration. The Sami in Sweden have been mobilised against new settlements of farmers in the area that is called the Sami country. Regional movements have a tendency to essentialise their culture and their ethnicity. These tendencies of nationalism and ethnic essentialism form the basis for new European contracts for the protection of national minorities in Europe.
8. Social Images and Orientations

Social images, orientation and world views are the outcome of various layers of historiography and historical developments. Even more, they are results of education and life experiences. They are not painted or articulated merely by individuals, but they are the outcome of social action itself. The roots of neoracism and xenophobia are found in various archeological layers of knowledge. Many of these layers are revivable through collective memory work in the political arenas.

Quite central for political mobilization in rural areas are the crises of rural societies: the integration of peasants into the industrial and capitalist system and the transformation of peasants into farmers and to agricultural producers, who depend totally on market sales. Agricultural products are simply objects of calculation in the industrial concerns of agribusinesses. Many farming positions have been transformed into postindustrial positions serving as guardians of the natural environment – land that had previously been farmland.

The traditional peasant society has vanished. During the last two centuries, the labour force in industrial society was recruited from the peasant background. Nevertheless, the crisis of the peasant society had already begun much earlier. We have reached the end of a process that began in the sixteenth century, developed slowly until the First World War and accelerated greatly afterwards.

Fascism could be interpreted as an outcome of this peasant crisis. The double face of the fascism—on the one hand, modernising force with roots in early twentieth century intellectual movements such as futurism, on the other, negative utopias of peasants living and working in organic societies where everyone understands his or her place in society, where the common man understands the other and where a picture of what was called Heimat (homeland) could be realised. This double-bind utopia was the basic movement of fascist politics. Fascism was destructive towards the existing social order, and conservative with regards to its utopia.

Barrington Moore, jr. argued in his widely read book, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, Lord and Peasant and the Making of the Modern World, that the German, Italian and Japanese experiences of radical fascism had to do with late industrialism in both countries. Enfranchisment was restricted, and democracy was not strong enough to resist the fascist parties resulting from a blocked peasant society and a society modernised from above and not from below. The flourishing of fascism in Europe and Japan was identified as the result of a crisis of peasant societies.
Moore’s interpretation is now over 30 years old. Today, even German fascism is understood to be more or less an urban movement with some mystical thought pertaining to peasant society. The reasons for fascist orientations were not so much peasant hostilities towards capitalist industrialism, but rather the idea of modernisation, and idea which had its roots in world images of a constructed rural society. It was more the society of the de-peasantised industrial urbanist who was afraid of an individualised social future: The social construction of an organic Gemeinschaft, in which everyone was organically part of a social totality, was not a description of peasant life, but the utopian thinking about a world lost. The debate on the agrarian roots of fascism has also been reflected upon by David Renton (2001).

Fascism contained an inclusive idea of racism. This idea is rooted in nationalism and in nationalist discourses classifying nations according to perceived biological abilities of their populations. Neo-nationalism is also an important bearer of neo-racism and xenophobia. This is shown through the strengthening of national boarders, of border security-systems and of immigrant exclusionism. Xenophobia, as far as nationalism is concerned, is a means of excluding parts of a population that do not belong to the national citizenry. Indeed, this is a great danger to political strategies for cultural diversity since nationalism has always been closely connected to ideas of cultural homogeneity and cultural essentialism.

Deeply rooted in most peoples’ collective memory is classical racism. The phenomena as such, which are related to the levels of our socio-ideological archeology, are distances related to the skin-colour or to the country of origin. In most European countries the rank, in terms of status, of a cultural minority or an immigrant group depends on the darkness of the skin. This is quite a constant classification, which has been, of course, interrupted by political conjunctures such as the Cold War in which Russian people were positioned on a lower level of the status ladder than Vietnamese immigrants in anti-communist environments. It is not only the status scale. Scales of distances have a close relationship to skin-colours. The origin of these differentiations are quite clear: They are – first of all – religious ideas of purity and danger, or they go back to classifications of people in colonial contexts, in times when empires developed their system of exploitations and governance by classifying people along their skin-colour.

Since the period of romanticism, the political discourse between European nation-states has invented biological features that were to support aggression and competition along national boundaries. British citizens were told by Charles Dickens that the people of the isles were three times larger than those of the continent. Germans were told that they are directly related to the power of Germanic Gods.
The post-slavery system in the United States and the negrophobic system of apartheid in South-Africa and elsewhere might be systematised as forms of classical post-colonial and colonial racism. One should distinguish between both forms and understand negrophobia in the United States and in South-Africa as special forms of classical racism. The pictures of a society, where black people are considered to be less intelligent and less adaptable, are – in modern civil societies – a contradiction to dominant social world views. Negrophobia, however, is still part of the behaviour of many people all over the world. Collective memories in many countries have conserved such stereotypes or have developed them into popular images: The black man of whom children have to be careful when they are crossing the boundaries of allowed collective behaviour. Many folkloric pictures of Santa Claus include black men who beat children when they have done bad deeds. Slavery and a colonial division of labour have structured many of our ideas about the social fabric, and the person with darker or black skin is still pressed into the niches similar to those of serfs and slaves. Such pictures of the world are more influential the more remote the place is. In rural milieus, the traditional idea of the negro is more alive than in urban surroundings. Real people with black skin are absent. When they appear, they are alienated to an even greater degree.

The most dangerous forms of discrimination and exclusion today are the phenomena of anti-Semitism, anti-ziganism and anti-Muslimism. Social formations and social relationships do not play a role, since people are excluded or discriminated against by merely referring to ideas about them in accordance with belief-systems and world views in everyday life. The most debated form of this phenomenon is anti-Semitism. During medieval times and afterwards, Jews were persecuted for two reasons. The first reason is because of the religious idea that Jews murdered the son of God, Jesus Christ, an idea, which was – of course – a simplistic and populist political message, but had a huge affect. That Jesus himself was a Jew did not play a role here. This kind of basic sin has been the reason to outlaw Jewish communities in many European countries. The second reason was the exclusion of Jews due to the reduction of economic activities to some exposed forms like money-lending or trading. These economic activities, however, were explainable by the social exclusion of Jews from peasant production and by the ban of interest and money-lending placed upon Christians. Those century-old images continued when anti-Semitism was confronted with neo-nationalism and racist ideas. Jews were now considered to be members of a foreign race, which could not belong to the biological body that the national political population of a nation-state was perceived to be. They were excluded from the rights of citizens and were generally discriminated against.

When modernisation and liberal political ideas dominated in the beginning of the twentieth century, anti-Semitism flourished more and more because many people felt that the inclusion of Jews in the modern societies, including
immigration from Central and Eastern Europe, was a danger to the political body. Primitive racism was made congruent to nationalism and racism. It was no wonder that especially nationalists preached anti-Semitism. In addition, anti-Semitism was the dominating political forms of exclusion in the ideological and social systems until the early second half of the last century.

Today, organized Jewish communities and Israeli states has changed the whole arena of anti-Semitism; it appears sometimes in the new form of anti-Zionism, and other political ideas and social stereotypes have developed. In most states, however, anti-Semitism today is a form of neo-racism and xenophobia, which as such now plays a central role in many societies, often without direct reference to anti-Semitism. Nevertheless, in areas where conservative and traditionalistic ideas are still popular, and where changes of social images and political orientations take place slowly, there are still fragments of anti-Semitist thought. Anti-Semitism developed such political energy and engagement in German national-socialism that the genocide of Jews, the Holocaust and the Shoah, became symbols of a dominant idea that any society should never be able to allow such miseries. In many modern countries, fascist symbols are outlawed. Therefore, young fundamentalist protesters, who want to show their total disapproval with their social environment, used and use anti-Semitic symbols. With national-socialist slogans, German youngsters expose their essential protest against their social surroundings. This was the case in places not patrolled by police and other forces, since such argumentation is not allowed by penal code.

One can speak of anti-Semitism as an ideology that is not accepted anywhere in Europe. However, there is anti-ziganism as a policy that excludes gypsies all over Europe. Most people in Europe stereotype gypsies as unable to co-exist with the native population. Gypsies have been the outcasts of the European societies, and they remain in this position. One can even define the gypsy condition as having been determined by the stereotypes against them. New literature shows that anti-ziganism paints a picture of gypsies that is contradictory to experiences of social action. Recently, a change in political awareness in the gypsy situation has started to take place, as more and more people, both gypsies and non-gypsies, enter into politically and socially responsible positions who think about what the images of gypsies are and should be. Too many victims of anti-ziganism have now passed examinations and entry regulations into normal social and economic careers and are living as invisible minorities in most European states. In some countries, as in Spain, a double-bind social structure has been established, which is, on one side, oriented towards the government stereotype of the exotic gypsy living in exclusive settlements and being concentrated in businesses in the entertainment industry such as music and dance. On the other hand, gypsies are playing the same social roles as in other European countries. They are excluded from the society and economy, by many stereotypes dominating social world views, but they are on the way towards emancipation both in turning to the mainstream of
society, in being included in the mainstream society or in articulating their own interests in new organisations and political movements. Many gypsies live in small countries and do not have any possibilities of hiding in the mainstream of society, since such living conditions guarantee recognition of certain persons and social groups. Here, the emancipation of gypsies will be a long-term process, much longer than in other settings.

Anti-Islamism and anti-Muslimism are today more or less a reaction to international developments in which Islamist political movements are playing with religion in order to radicalise political orientations. However, there is still a tradition of anti-Islamism and Anti-Muslimism in Europe that goes back to the anti-Islamism and Muslimism of medieval times to the earlier European borders between Christians and Muslims. There is, of course, a deep rooted idea of the Turks as enemies in the German-speaking countries of central Europe, and there is a more radical anti-Muslimism in southern Spain, which has its roots in nationalist Spanish myths pertaining to the liberation of Spain and the myths transported by Catholicism in the south. With the Muslim as the enemy, the ground is fertile for such anti-Islamist activities, especially in countryside of Spain, where the Catholic church still plays a central role in organizing everyday life. In other parts of Europe, anti-Islamism and anti-Muslimism is transferred from, first of all, xenophobia and immigrant restrictionism in countries to which many people from Muslim states have immigrated. This change from being aggressors against, for example, Pakistanis, Moroccans, Algerians or Turks towards a general idea of fighting against Islam and Muslims in the Western world is a recent innovation that began in the early 1990s and developed in accordance with various changes of international political orientations. The first is a new interest in religion; the second, the new interests in international threats of Islamic terrorism; the third entails Muslim states in which political leaders argue that Islamist politics are contradictory to what the west is considered to be, namely a region with a long history of institutions of democracy, human rights guarantees, and so on. Even here, it could be the case that in rural situations where the church plays another political and social role, Islamism might be a central political issue. However, most churches in Europe are organizing groups of understanding between Muslims and Christians and other means to fight against xenophobic and anti-Islamist tendencies.

Still, there is the central argument of immigrant reduction and immigrant exclusionism. The argument here is, first of all, that nation-states are like ships in which have a limited amount of passengers. This argument contradicts, of course, most experiences with immigrants and most ideas we have about modern economies. However, immigrant reductionism has other basic arguments against multiculturalism. The idea is that immigrants are endangering the cultural homogeneity of societies and their national integration. This is an argument that is closely related to neo-nationalism and
classical racism and that has a lot to do with the coming world views in which cultural social fabric and static essential political entities do not change. This is a view that is in contradiction to the experiences most people have in modern states.

Nevertheless, in areas which are predominantly rural, in which the situation had been quite stable for centuries, but in which such stable conditions have been under stress, and in which the population understands their living positions as being in a state of crisis and in which this crisis cannot be understood by finding a responsible answer in the area, immigrant restrictionism and exclusionism might find fertile soil. Extremist groups could be more likely find platforms and clientele more so in such societies and conservative traditions.

It is a general problem of racism, anti-racism, neo-racism and xenophobia that societies are organized as inside-outside configurations. The stranger generally does not belong to the worldview of a certain society. The stranger is often considered to be dangerous, and if there are population movements transferring larger groups of strangers into an insider community, they still live their lives as outsiders there. So we have a double process against outsiders inside the community and strangers outside of community. This, of course, a very simple structural model, but it shows that there are basic patterns in many societies that are xenophobic and that press a social image of the others. The more urbanized and metropolitan the configuration is, however, the less we see boundaries between insiders and outsiders; however, there are people painting such insider-outsider configurations as social worldviews even in metropolitan milieus. In rural milieus, however, where the insider is easily defined by the village face-to-face culture, an insider-outsider configuration is the natural background. This often does not turn into violence or other forms of extremism; however, it does play a role in social relations. Insiders have easier access to certain resources. Outsiders will try to develop resources inside their networks and might have opportunities in and outside of the village in certain areas that the insiders do not have. These kinds of confrontations draw a line between insiders and outsiders and might be the reason for certain conflicts. However, with time, insiders and outsiders merge through various social mechanisms, and such mergers might be more open to strangers than to other social configurations. In the post-1989 European countries, some obvious insider-outsider configurations have been formed, for example, by settling refugees into villages, by having established ethnic businesses in village surroundings, etc.

These new phenomena should be accepted by all communities. In many European villages and small towns, there have indeed been conflicts between the immigrant population and the insiders. Refugees have been settled sometimes in hotels in small towns or villages, often in places that even have been no social place for insiders, since most country businesses have died out over the 1970s and 1980s. Because of this, the new views of such infrastructures for refugees
pose a confrontation towards the insider groups more than military camps or youth prisons, etc. These refugee centres confront insiders with immigrants of whom many came from so-called third world countries. Many are Roma, Muslims or others with black skin colour.

Here, insider-outsider configurations develop new markers of rank. These cultural scenes, other movements and even agents and propaganda groups of parties have established themselves in the countryside to show their political symbolism. They try to convince rural people to join the movements. For example, skinhead cultures and other youth group configurations play an important role in the world of youth in the countryside. Music and ideas of styles, etc. are transferred into rural areas by direct contact, but even more so by the media, such as television, magazines, etc. Music festivals are run by outsider groups, skinheads, etc. These are quite popular among youngsters, and help to differentiate them against the world of adults and against other young groups and other young people. These cultural boundary formations are even intensified by being connected to the globalised cultural world broadcast by the media of various kinds. So, we have not only an inside-outside configuration created by the traditional image of the stranger or immigrant groups, but also a such configuration created by differentiating certain youth cultures out from social fabric of rural or small town areas.

Most importantly, of course, is the group dynamic that makes the political orientations, worldviews, existing cultural boundaries, religious or ethnic movements, nationalist and fascist traditions or popular ideas into political action. These group dynamics are most important everywhere and, in the rural areas, they have a special background regarding certain dynamic structures and structural patterns.

This special rural background is often due to the lack of entertainment consumption in villages or small towns. People are restricted to their homes, with televisions or internet news, or they have their automobiles and bicycles to move around the village. For other purposes, such as entertainment, they leave the villages or small towns. In the rural setting, they meet as small organisations or scenes. The more who join, the bigger they become. This is especially the case among youngsters. They establish special scenes and organisations, where they have parties together in which they share the details of their lives and others with one another. At such places, they try to be different from their families. These places and organisations become central instruments in their process of finding a personal identity. These processes bring the organisation patterns, the “grid”, closer together and this closeness further develops a common idea of the world that everyone can share. Such organisations can be aggressive against others and strangers, and can develop forms of social actions that are dangerous and violent. Here, we are confronted with a continued problem of neo-racist and xenophobic aggression and violence. Other scenes just come together at
pubs in their villages or small towns, or meet at football games. And, here they
develop situational hooliganism and aggression to the outside. These two forms
of behaviour are the central reasons for many incidents of rural neo-racism.
Nonetheless, there are other forms, for example, party organisations that
popularize neo-racism and xenophobic thought, media and arts that develop
ideas of aggression against strangers, active fascist traditions, etc. The mix of all
of this develops milieus in which neo-racist and xenophobic activities have a
place in rural society.
9. Performances

Concerning rural racism and xenophobia, we are neither intensely met with an expression of a fight for survival of social groups in the countryside, nor with the survival of people confronted with economic, political or social crises. Rather, it is the performance that is important here – the image of various social groups that have deep traditional roots in villages, small towns and in the countryside. The people living in these areas often still present the dreams of a time long gone.

New immigrants, coming from the cities and settling in the countryside, have a dream of what has been called Gemeinschaft (or organic communities living on trust and affinity) in the social sciences. These dreamers and settlers come from cities, flee the modern industrial world and picture new forms of the old nationalistic vision of Heimat (homeland). They have a double function as well. On the one hand, they are accelerators of modern right-wing thinking and, on the other, spread new forms of social relationships in the countryside. Most new people in the countryside are indeed such former urban dwellers, who find themselves settling in new environments. Such people have been victims of xenophobic aggressions in many tourist places in which often elderly immigrants dominate the social life, such as in the tourist areas of Spain, Italy, France and in the various islands in the Mediterranean.

Immigrants from outside of the country, who moved in as labour migrants, have not so much been the victims of aggression. There are some exceptions here, for example, the victims of anti-Muslimism in Andalusia, anti-ziganism in Eastern and western Germany or of Negrophobia all over Europe. Most importantly, victims of aggression have been refugees, who are “decentralized” into many remote places in Europe, where they are forced into resettling in rural environments, in which the population is often afraid of strangers and views outsiders as being threats to the social dynamics of their social infrastructure. A quite interesting phenomenon in the United Kingdom involves middle class and working class persons settling outside of cities in urban accommodations in more or less rural areas, sometimes together with people from minorities, where violence between immigrants and natives takes place at various times.

Political activism of state institutions, of parties in the fascist tradition, of populists parties and of youth movements, etc. have mobilized people in Eastern Germany. These mobilization activities were successful in various areas, so that there is no real stock of non-urban beliefs in images of the world, in which fascist ideas and new racist and xenophobic exclusionism and discrimination play roles. Politics have been organized by party collaborators with the aim of organising actors for general elections and regional elections.
The basic idea behind these organisations stemmed from the fact that the communist regime in Eastern Germany did not destroy enough of the pre-1945 visions of the world – instead, racist and populist parties are to be understood in the continuity of fascist worldviews. Many social scientists interpreted the development in Eastern Germany after 1991 as an expression of this continuity of xenophobic nationalistic world views.

Germany is a typical place for what might be called modern racism. Most people have experienced living in industrial formations and have gone through crises, in which they have been degenerated into social benefit receivers. Living in the countryside, many rural settlements and small towns have unemployment rates of more than 40 percent. The agricultural production has undergone a crisis, and the solution for the crisis is not quite clear. Many large farms belonging to the agricultural business sector have been established. People have been returning to their homes and to what they call their “private lives”. They behave as people who have no responsibility in the public sphere. This is not the case with everybody, and there are indeed majorities in regions of Eastern Germany who are intensely working in establishing a civil society, but the conditions for these people, who are active in politics, are not very optimistic. And social scientists are drawing pictures that show that Eastern Germany is nearly lost to right-wing radicalism and neo-racism. One should be careful with such claims. There have not been as many incidents as we expected. Hooliganism and interventions against strangers seem to be the dominant features of East Germany’s neo-racism and furthermore, xenophobia is not only oriented towards immigrants and people with foreign roots, but towards everyone with distinguishing markers that differentiate the persons at hand from the activist individual or group. Such confrontations regularly take place with people on the lower level of the social hierarchy, but the activists in scenes and organisations cannot be categorized as merely the lower social stratum. Such features are turning the whole phenomenon of rural racism into what might be called criminal action. Indeed, most incidents in Eastern Germany, and many confrontations between neo-racists and xenophobic people and their victims, are singularisable criminal acts. These show, of course, a pattern that makes them part of a universal activity. But, they are factional and local, and they are dependent on the levels of criminal surveillance and criminal control.

The situation is based on a social fabric dominated by a politically anomic behaviour of large parts of the population. The relationship between such anomic non-activism towards aggressive xenophobic and neo-racist activities is, at the same time, the soil in which neo-racist criminality take place. Against criminal action there is only one message of change. This is enlightenment and education on the one hand, and outside control and criminal investigation on the other. Indeed, many anti-racist movements have now discovered the whole population as their clientele. They have started establish to functioning civil society networks. These activities include the inclusion of groups endangered
by neo-racism or xenophobia. Such civil society networks might be able to control the countryside with its face-to-face social fabric and political body with many social groups endangered by neo-racist or xenophobic activities.

It is not so much globalism, nor the agricultural and post-agricultural feature of production, nor even the problem of being isolated, but rather the scattered feature of states’ activities in schools and the states’ control of ordinances that are large problems. Policing rural racism is an essential problem. Policing does not only mean being active in certain situations by intervention or by punishing. Policing also means more surveillance. It means surveying certain groups and their inside and outside configurations, being aware of group dynamics in social surroundings and intervening immediately in situations, in which a person or a group of persons might be in danger due to rural racism and xenophobia. This is nearly impossible in rural areas due the fact that there is often not enough control infrastructure to effectively fight against rural racism and xenophobia with regards to police forces, secret services, administrative units and schools. So what one needs is an improvement in rural activities and in civil society actions as well as further development of counterpropaganda aimed at convincing among the population to be active in the civil society, in positive relationships and in establishing institutions in the rural milieus that are good substitutions for the urban abundance of institutions of control and entertainment.
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Part II:

Country Reports
10. Austria

10.1 Country Report

Racism in the Austrian countryside has become a topic of discussion since the terrorist attack against Roma people in the Oberwart, Burgenland in 1995. Patterns of racist discrimination seem to be stronger in rural than in urban areas. Unfortunately there are no official statistics that confirm this assertion, although there are some studies on attitudes of the autochthonous population towards immigrants which show that hostile attitudes against foreigners are stronger in rural areas. Apart from these studies, there are others that deal with racism in rural areas. Here, the study von Gombos et. al., *Und da sind sie auf einmal dagewesen. Zur Situation von Flüchtlingen in Österreich. Beispiel Rechnitz*, should be mentioned. This study attempts to provide insight into ethnic relations in the small community Rechnitz, Burgenland, using interviews to show the negative perception of foreigners by the autochthonous population and illustrating patterns of racist discrimination experienced by refugees. This research also intends to contrast the tradition of cultural diversity of the region with current patterns of racist discrimination. According to this study, racist discrimination occurs due to lack of information about the immigrant population as well as through the discourses of the media and local politicians, presenting a negative picture of immigration and foreigners.

The lack of previous data and research have been complemented through our own research, consisting of interviews with experts on immigration and racism in rural areas. According to these experts the most affected group by racist discrimination are refugees. As a consequence, problem areas are communities in which asylum seekers’ camps are found, boarding-houses where refugees are accommodated. In accordance with the decentralisation policy of the Austrian government, such accommodations are found throughout the country, and there should be no particular region with a higher potential of racist incidents than others.

10.1.1 Migration

Immigration into Austria has increased significantly in the last decade. In 1991, foreigners comprised 6.6 percent of the total population. By 2001 this proportion was 9.1 percent. This growth of immigration began with the arrival of refugees from Bosnia and Kosovo. Citizens from Serbia and Montenegro form the major immigrant group in Austria, comprising 21 percent of the total foreigner population, followed by citizens from Turkey (18 percent), Bosnia (13 percent), Germany (10 percent) and Croatia (8 percent) (cf. Table 10.1/10.2).
Most foreigners live in Vienna, Vorarlberg and Salzburg. Only 4.6 percent of the foreign population lives in Burgenland, a typical rural region (cf. Figure 10.2). In Austria, border regions are inhabited by minority groups: Hungarians, Croatians, Czechs, Slovenians and Gypsies.

10.1.2 Migration in Rural Areas

Burgenland is perhaps the most typical rural area in Austria and is also known because of neo-Nazi terrorist attacks in the mid-1990s. Burgenland is an underdeveloped region. Apart from agriculture, small business and trade are the dominant economic activities. Over the last years, TNC production plants were established in the region, which were then transferred to Eastern Europe due to cost factors. Due to the low productivity of the agriculture sector in Burgenland, agricultural activity is only supplementary for most farmers.

Farmers often engage foreigners as seasonal workers during the harvest season, typically Hungarians. Asylum seekers are also employed on farms. These jobs are illegal, because, as a rule, asylum seekers are not allowed to work. During the harvest season, asylum seekers are not engaged as they would attract attention as undocumented workers (Schwarzarbeiter) because of their appearance.

In Burgenland, Hungarians, Croatians and Gypsies are the dominant minority ethnic groups. Croatians form the largest minority group, have the best community structures. Among so-called Austrian-Hungarians there is less of an “ethnic” self-consciousness. Only very few Austrian-Hungarians see themselves as members of a Hungarian community. Although Croatians and Hungarians are well assimilated, Gypsies are the primary victims of discrimination. According to the last census, 100 Gypsies live in Burgenland. However, this number is far below non-official estimates. This is attributed to the fact that many Gypsies do not like to admit their ethnic origin because of the discrimination they suffer.

During harvest time ca. 8,000 seasonal workers from Eastern Europe come into the framework of seasonal agreements, mostly from Hungary and Poland. However, most of the foreigners living permanently in Burgenland are asylum-seekers. They live in so-called “pensions”, which are normally located in villages, but do not provide dignified living conditions and whose owners receive an income from the state for the accommodation of the asylum seekers (Gombos, et al: 1992). Asylum seekers are normally not accepted by the inhabitants of the villages and the integration of the foreigners into the communities usually never takes place. There have been violent confrontations between local youths and young asylum seekers. Asylum policy creates an important factor that blocks the integration of the asylum seekers into the
communities: Asylum seekers are not allowed to work, which enforces the widespread image among the local population of the foreigners as social “parasites”. In addition, integration is blocked because asylum seekers are obliged by the authorities to often relocate to other places. This order usually takes place without any previous notification.

The situation of the asylum seekers in Burgenland described here is similar to other rural areas in Austria. The poor living conditions of the asylum seekers and their isolation from the autochthonous population provides the basis for and strengthens the ethnic discrimination in the Austrian countryside.

10.1.3 Racism in Rural Areas

Xenophobic attitudes are widespread among the population in Burgenland, and are strengthened by the discourses of politicians, particularly by the right-wing populist party, Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs (FPÖ), and the media. Cultural differences in Austria, as in other European countries, are the new motive for racist discrimination. The abuse of the social welfare system and the threat posed by foreigners to the dominant Austrian culture are the usual arguments which strengthen xenophobic prejudices among the population.

Neo-Racism in Burgenland and in other Austrian rural areas does not take on militant forms. Racist attacks against immigrants are rare and militant right-wing extremist groups or a right-wing extremist youth culture, such as that in Eastern Germany, do not exist. It has not been proven that organised right-wing groups planned, for example, the attack in 1995 against Gypsies in Oberwart, Burgenland. Racism is expressed in daily discriminatory practices as well as in the social exclusion of foreigners. Recently there has been a perceptible increase in xenophobic tendencies towards Eastern Europeans because of the fears that Eastern Europeans will come to Burgenland as a consequence of the enlargement of the EU.

Experts on racism have stated in an interview that the spread of xenophobia and racism in Burgenland is due to a lack of a collective discussion about Nazism and the Holocaust. In the Rechnitz community, for example, the older population keeps silent about a mass grave of 200 Jews murdered by the Nazis. The repression of a historical memory leads to a transfer of aggression towards foreigners. An economic pattern explaining racism does not seem to apply to Burgenland. There is no noticeable relationship between a worsening of the economic situation and the rise of racist tendencies. On the contrary, there has been continual economic growth, partly due to EU subsidies.
The role of the local politicians has to be taken into account regarding the increase of racism in a small community. In the Rechnitz community, for example, anti-racist projects and campaigns have been systematically blocked by local politicians. Nevertheless, local politicians in Oberwart have partly supported anti-racist initiatives. However, this support has been difficult to obtain, and anti-racist campaigns were first met with refusal or reservations from local parties. The murder of the Gypsies led to a sensitisation about the issue of racism in parts of the civil society. This also changed the attitude of politicians, who, in order to protect their image, took a more positive stance towards anti-racist initiatives or campaigns.

There is little literature on racism in rural areas. The work of Gombos, Gruber and Teuschler, with the title, *Und da sind sie auf einmal gewesen: Zur Situation von Flüchtlingen in Österreich. Beispiel Rechnitz*, (And Suddenly There they Were: On the Situation of Refugees in Rechnitz, Austria.) should be mentioned. This book deals with discrimination against members of ethnic minorities in Burgenland’s countryside. Despite a few publications and expert statements on racism and anti-racist activists, there are no studies that might prove more pronounced racist tendencies in the Austrian countryside. Racism can be quantified on the basis of criminal offences against members of ethnic minorities, the vote for right-wing extremist parties, as well as the attitudes of the population. However, it is extremely difficult to access data regarding criminal offences based on racist motives in Austria. There are no official statistics about xenophobic offences. In addition, the vote for right-wing extremist parties as a parameter of analysis is not useful in the Austrian case. Due to a strict legal regulation on the political parties, there are no legal right-wing extremist parties in Austria. A direct relationship between the right-wing populist party FPÖ voters and racist tendencies in the Austrian society cannot be established. The federal states with the most FPÖ voters are not those that show marked xenophobic tendencies (Lebhart/Münz: 1999). Therefore, studies on attitudes towards immigrants are an important source for the analysis of racism in the Austrian countryside. A study by Lebhart and Münz in this field should be mentioned. According to this study, stronger hostile attitudes against foreigners are more evident in rural areas (46 percent) and mainly in smaller and mid-size towns (2,001 to 5,000 and 5,001 to 50,000 inhabitants respectively, each with 52 percent) than in larger cities (more than 50,000 inhabitants, 38 percent; Vienna: 34 percent) (Lebhart/Münz: 1999) (cf. Table 10.6).

When comparing professional groups, xenophobic attitudes are most prevalent among farmers (70 percent). 72 percent of the farmers hold the opinion that there are too many foreigners in Austria, although most of them (67 percent) do not have foreigners in their local area (Lebhart/Münz: 1999). The foreigner rate in the direct local area has no direct influence on this attitude. It is, however, rather decisive whether the surveyed person has real contact with foreigners or not. Since such contact is less possible due to a low foreigner rate in rural areas
and in smaller towns, this can be an explanation for greater reservation about foreigners (cf. Table 10.4).

Apart from contact with foreigners, the following influence factors have the highest statistical significance: profession stratum affiliation, level of education and age. Because in rural areas, profession stratum affiliation and education level are generally lower and age generally higher than in cities, these factors could contribute towards an explanation for the greater xenophobia in rural areas in comparison to cities with more than 50,000 inhabitants (cf. Table 10.5).

The following statistical data can give us an image of the attitudes toward immigrants in Austrian rural areas. Nevertheless, they should be considered very carefully, since opinion polls do not always reflect developments in a society. The fact remains that members of ethnic minorities are more isolated from the autochthonous population and from other minority ethnic groups in rural areas. Moreover, infrastructure for the integration of immigrants is lacking, as well as for their protection against discriminatory practices in Austrian rural areas.

10.1.4 Good Practices

The main body responsible for anti-racist and refugee work in Burgenland are the Burgenländische Volkshochschulen (Burgenland’s Adult Education Centres). These carry out political education in the areas of foreigners and racism, especially among younger people. Another important initiative is the REFUGEES project, which attempts to establish the relationship between racism today and the lack of a public discussion on Nazism in Burgenland, connecting the anti-racism and refugee work with a collective discussion on Nazism and the Holocaust.
## 10.2. Statistics and Data

### Table 10.1: Population according to Citizenship, 1995-2000

**Annual Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Austrians</th>
<th>Foreigners</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>8 046 535</td>
<td>7 323 052</td>
<td>723 483</td>
<td>329 541</td>
<td>142 766</td>
<td>251 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8 059 385</td>
<td>7 331 195</td>
<td>728 190</td>
<td>333 591</td>
<td>140 841</td>
<td>253 758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>8 072 182</td>
<td>7 339 511</td>
<td>732 671</td>
<td>335 800</td>
<td>138 505</td>
<td>258 366</td>
<td>92 355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8 078 449</td>
<td>7 341 172</td>
<td>737 277</td>
<td>336 423</td>
<td>138 821</td>
<td>262 033</td>
<td>95 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8 092 254</td>
<td>7 344 082</td>
<td>748 172</td>
<td>340 862</td>
<td>136 334</td>
<td>270 976</td>
<td>99 967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8 110 244</td>
<td>7 352 367</td>
<td>757 877</td>
<td>341 634</td>
<td>134 547</td>
<td>281 696</td>
<td>105 369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |            |            |            |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|          | Percent    |            |            |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1995     | 100.0      | 91.0       | 9.0        | 4.1                  | 1.8                  | 3.1                  |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1996     | 100.0      | 91.0       | 9.0        | 4.1                  | 1.7                  | 3.1                  |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1997     | 100.0      | 90.9       | 9.1        | 4.2                  | 1.7                  | 3.2                  | 1.2                  |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1998     | 100.0      | 90.9       | 9.1        | 4.2                  | 1.7                  | 3.2                  | 1.2                  |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1999     | 100.0      | 90.8       | 9.2        | 4.2                  | 1.7                  | 3.3                  | 1.3                  |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 2000     | 100.0      | 90.7       | 9.3        | 4.2                  | 1.7                  | 3.5                  | 1.3                  |                      |                      |                      |                      |

*Source: Statistic Austria*
Table 10.2: Immigration of Refugees (Applicants for Asylum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>4,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>2,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>6,768</td>
<td>7,109</td>
<td>1,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Bosnia-Herzeg.</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed.Rep.Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total            | 6,991| 6,719| 13,805| 20,129| 18,284|

Source: Statistik Austria
Table 10.3: Criminal Offences with Extreme Right-Wing, Xenophobic or Anti-Semitic Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme right-wing</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobic</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of the Interior Annual Report 2000, pp. 31-34.

Table 10.4
Xenophobic Tendencies according to the Place of Residence

Table 10.5 Xenophobic Tendencies according to Occupation

Source: SOS-Menschenrechte - Statistik www.sos.at/stat6099.htm
Table 10.6: Hostility to Foreigners according to Demographic, Regional and Socio-economic traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tendency to xenophobia</th>
<th>not xenophobic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in %</td>
<td>in %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-75</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirol</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kärnten</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiermark</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 2000 inhabitants</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-5000 inhabitants</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-50000 inhabitants</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 50000 inhabitants</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>45.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lebhart/Münz, "Migration und Fremdenfeindlichkeit" 1999
Fig. 10.1: Resident Population km$^2$ on Community Basis 1998. Populated Areas 1998

Source: Statistik Austria
Fig. 10.2: Population Density per Region (Bundesland) and Share of Non-Nationals in 1999

Source: BIVS 2002, based on data from Statistik Austria 2000
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11. Belgium

11.1 Country Report

The group of immigrants most victimised by racism in Belgian rural areas are asylum seekers. In accordance with the decentralisation policy of refugees of the Belgian government, asylum seekers are placed in camps situated in villages and small towns. The vulnerability of asylum seekers to become victims of racial attacks lies in their poor living conditions, their isolation from the autochthonous population and the lack of integration measures in rural areas. Although racial incidents have been reported several times in villages and small towns, particularly in areas where asylum seekers’ camps are located, racist violence has not assumed considerable proportions comparable to Germany or in the Nordic countries until now. Unfortunately, there are no statistics or research that provide information on patterns of racism, particularly on racial violence in rural areas. According to experts, Flanders presents the most problematic area concerning racism in the countryside. There, inhabitants seem to have very little tolerance and openness toward other cultures.

11.1.1 Immigration

In 1999, 8.7 percent of the population of Belgium were foreigners. The six most important nationalities were Italians, Moroccans, French, Dutch, Turkish and Spanish (cf. Table 11.1). Together they represent 77 percent of the foreigners in Belgium. They live mainly in the former industrial zone of Bergen-Charleroi, in the former mine region in Limburg and in the cities of Brussels, Liège and Antwerp.

The Turks and Maghrebs are mainly concentrated in Brussels and in the Flemish cities. In 2000, 4.2 percent of the Turkish migrants lived in the Flemish countryside, mostly in the rural region of Limburg, where they stayed after the mines were closed.

With the collapse of the Communist Bloc and the beginning of the crisis in Yugoslavia, Belgium was faced with an unprecedented rise in the number of applicants for asylum. In 2000, Belgium had 38,100 asylum seekers. The largest group stems from Eastern Europe, in particular from Russia and Kosovo. Only three non-European countries figure in the top twelve countries of origin, notably Iran, Kazakhstan and Congo (CEOOR: 2002). The centres where asylum seekers stay during the first stage of the asylum procedure are spread throughout Belgium and can be found in cities as well as in small villages in
more rural areas. In order to accommodate those asylum seekers who no longer receive financial aid, various centres have recently been opened. This required opening refugee centres in order to accommodate over 10,000 asylum seekers on a short-term basis.

In 1997, the national statistic office of Belgium elaborated a study on the situation of migrants on the labour market (INS: 1997). The proportion of foreigners in the Belgian labour market is rather limited. Non-EU foreigners represented only two percent. When Belgians of foreign origin are included, this percentage increases to 11 percent. A study of the federal districts of Antwerp, Gent, Eeklo, Hasselt and Maaseik shows that Turks, Moroccans and – to a lesser degree – Italians are strongly concentrated in the most precarious sectors and in seasonal work, including restaurants, construction, industrial cleaning, agriculture, horticulture, and so on (Verhoeven: 1999). Many labour migrants who came to Belgium in the 1960s and 1970s are presently jobless. This is, among other reasons, due to the decline in importance of the primary sector in which non-skilled labourers were needed. A large proportion of Muslims living in Belgium feel stigmatised. The image of the hard working, reliable and honest labourers has been substituted by an image of delinquents or fundamentalists (Interkultureller Rat: 2002).

11.1.2 Rural Areas in Belgium

The population density in Belgium is 333 habitants per square kilometre, but large regional differences do exist. In Flanders there are 437 inhabitants per square kilometre, 197 in Wallonia and 5,906 in Brussels. Nearly 40 percent of the Belgian population lives in the six largest cities (cf. Figure 11.1).

According to the Ministry of Employment, in 1999 2.2 percent of the Belgian population worked in agriculture and fishery. In 1997, 8.6 percent of the working foreigners in Flanders worked in agriculture, whereas this percentage was only 2.8 percent in Wallonia. From a historical point of view, Flanders has a more rural character, whereas heavy industry was mainly located in Wallonia. Even now, the Flemish part of Belgium, although densely populated, is quite rural and provincial. However, there was a change of structure when immigrants arrived and when the Flemish national movement became strong. In this respect, Flanders can be compared to Denmark or the Alsace region of France. Wallonia has a different overall structure, due to its much more industrialised past and its workers’ tradition.

11.1.3 Rural Racism
As mentioned before, most of the migrants live in urban areas, except for asylum seekers who are more present in the countryside. Very few Muslims live in rural areas. The ones who live in rural areas tend to be extremely marginalised due to their distance from the Muslim communities in cities, and their access to limited services only. The history of the Muslim immigration in Belgium also shows how little settlement on the countryside was favoured (Interkultureller Rat: 2002).

In general, one can see that xenophobia and racism in Belgium stems from different causes that are attributed especially to rural areas:

- a relatively high standard of living has been reached in Belgium. However, people can feel menaced in their future well-being due to economic or political changes;
- there exist cultural boundaries in certain areas, such as the ability to speak the Flemish language; this is something that causes people to feel menaced in their cultural traditions;
- there exists a language problem in the Flemish part of the country and there is a fear that it will be superceded by the French language; immigrants speak mainly French;
- there is a perceived fear that the Dutch language, as an ethnic marker is not taken seriously by new migrants; and
- there is a lack of experience with non-Europeans.

In the last years many Belgians have moved from urban areas to small villages and more rural areas around the cities. They fear that the circumstances they have seen and experienced in the urban areas, e.g., many migrants and all the negative stereotypes associated with them, will reach the rural areas as well. This may explain xenophobia among many of them, but may not necessarily lead to racial violence.

Bataille stipulates that there is more hostility towards migrants in Flanders than in Wallonia (Bataille: 1994). Research shows that Flemish people were indeed not very tolerant or open towards other cultures. The little tolerance that they have has decreased since 1995 (Vrind: 1998). Belgium and Greece were – according to the Eurobarometer – the only countries where the number of “intolerants” was higher than the number of “active tolerants” – those who showed highly positive attitudes towards migrants and minorities.

More Flemish people than ever before are convinced that foreigners have to assimilate within the society. One-fourth of the population feels uncomfortable when confronted with a foreign culture or with foreigners in their environment. Women, elderly, and less-educated people, are less tolerant to foreigners.
The APS survey of 1998 also tested the reactions of the population regarding the implementation of a caravan field or a centre for asylum seekers in their own neighbourhoods (CEOOR 2002). Only a minority of the population would not have objections. The majority does not like the idea, but would accept it, whereas a third would sign protests. 30 percent of the youth would not complain or protest. The elderly are most likely to protest. The opening of new asylum centres throughout the country led to protests on the part of inhabitants from the villages where the centres were planned.

A main problem of the rural areas in Flanders is the lack of experience with foreigners. The media disseminates wrong information and prejudices on migrants, fuelled by the discussion on globalisation and a global economy. There is the fear of more incoming migrants who will threaten the native population. There is especially a fear of Islam, which has been a very highlighted issue in the media.

What is interesting to observe in Belgium is that there is a gap between xenophobic attitudes (very high) and xenophobic actions. Violence does not often occur because Belgium has a tradition of an informal mediation process in which all conflicts are settled verbally and through discussions. Nevertheless, the number of hate crimes has increased over the last years.

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of registered crimes based on racism and xenophobia rose from 426 to 607. In regional numbers, the 607 crimes in 1999 were committed in 574 different communities of Belgium (cf. Table 11.2). This speaks in favour of the fact that not all the crimes took place in the largest cities, although, more detailed information is not available on this topic. Most of the crimes caused by racism or xenophobia took place in Flanders (46.1 percent), followed by Wallonia (37.6 percent) and Brussels (22.2 percent), whereas most of the foreigners live in Wallonia (37 percent) (cf. Table 11.3).

When the state wants to open a new refugee reception centre, it is very difficult to find a village who wants to host it. An information campaign accompanied by strong pressure is the usual means to convince the inhabitants to accept the opening of a reception centre. Different activities are also set up to establish some connection between the refugees and the local population.

In Arendonk, a village of nearly 10,000 inhabitants where one of Belgium’s largest asylum centres is situated, there have been several racist incidents. In 2001, the CEOOR received eight complaints from Arendonk, where a right-wing group called RAF (Arendonk Racist Front) was founded in 1997. Different physical attacks towards asylum seekers took place. In one case, two asylum seekers with darker skin than the others were beaten. Another prominent case was the Diksmuide case in which a non-European was severely attacked and another case of violence has been registered. At the end of the 1990s, some
violent and racist groups, like Odal Aktiekomitee and Devenir were founded in Belgium.

Another remarkable development is the recent success of the right wing in the Flemish rural areas. Belgium has two political parties of the extreme right: Front National in Wallonia and Vlaams Blok in Flanders. Since 2000, the Front National has more or less disappeared out of the political landscape, whereas the Vlaams Blok has gained further importance in every election. This is rather surprising, because the conditions for extreme right involvement could be more favourable in some Wallonian areas (such as La Louvière, Seraing and Colfontaine) than in Flanders (such as Antwerpen, Gent and Ronse, where the Vlaams Blok is successful).

The difference in success of extreme rightist activities between Flanders and Wallonia can be explained historically in part. Flanders was confronted much later with immigration than was Wallonia. In the 1960s, Wallonia had already accrued 100 years of experience with immigration, whereas Flanders had, until that time, and for more than a century, been a region of emigration. Wallonia is, thus, in the final stage of a process of integration of new habitants into the society, a process that just began in Flanders.

Another reason for the difference in success of both parties can be found in their different structure. Vlaams Blok is an authoritarian party with a strong leadership, whereas the different fractions of the Front National struggle, rather than collaborate with each other.

The Vlaams Blok did not originate, like many extreme-right European parties, as a reaction to inflows of migrants, but was instead founded in 1979 as a separatist party of the Flemish-minded Volksunie. Until the local elections of 1988, the Vlaams Blok remained a small party with only 1.4 percent of the votes. Vlaams Blok became successful when it started to focus on the migrant issue.

Traditionally, the voters of the Vlaams Blok were labourers who were confronted with immigrants. This phenomenon of left-wing votes, switching to right-wing in poorer neighbourhoods when confronted with newcomers, is known and can be explained. However, Vlaams Blok has recently been significantly successful in the better neighbourhoods, a sign of cultural racism and intolerance (De Witte: 1996).

The Vlaams Blok gained a lot of votes in the municipal council elections of 2000. This was not only the case in the urban areas, but also in the Flemish villages. In 190 of the 308 Flemish municipals, it was possible to vote for Vlaams Blok, which was new for 71 municipals. In 18 municipals it was not possible at all to vote for the Vlaams Blok and in only two municipals did the Vlaams Blok lose
votes. In four municipals in the province of Antwerp, the Vlaams Blok was the most successful party.

The fact that the Vlaams Blok positions itself differently in the cities than in the more rural villages is quite remarkable. In its propaganda on the countryside, it presents itself as representing order and focusing on ethical conservative positions. In cities, they present themselves as the only opposition party. The Vlaams Blok, now wanting to focus more on the countryside, is working on a more “decent image” (Claeys: 2001).

The aforementioned factors and developments give an overview of the different elements that are playing a role in the attitudes of Belgian people living in rural areas towards migrants. It is, however, difficult to talk about the problem of rural racism, as until now, no research has been conducted in this field. The Fondation Rurale de Wallonie started research on the integration of foreign populations in the province of Luxembourg (a rural province in the south of Belgium). They interviewed Albanian and Iranian refugees, but the results of the research are not yet available. On a middle- to longer term, the Institut de Recherche, Formation et d’Action sur les Migrants (IRFAM) wants to start research on migration in semi-rural and rural areas in collaboration with other European research institutes.
### 11.2 Statistics and Data

Table 11.1: Non-Nationals in Belgian Censuses, 1930-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>absolute numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>8411234</td>
<td>8879814</td>
<td>9189722</td>
<td>9650944</td>
<td>9848647</td>
<td>9978681</td>
<td>10213752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgianians</td>
<td>8092004</td>
<td>8512195</td>
<td>8736255</td>
<td>8954662</td>
<td>8970070</td>
<td>9077826</td>
<td>9321772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-nationals</td>
<td>319230</td>
<td>367619</td>
<td>453467</td>
<td>696282</td>
<td>878577</td>
<td>900855</td>
<td>891980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3009</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>15787</td>
<td>67534</td>
<td>58255</td>
<td>51318</td>
<td>46635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>74163</td>
<td>66416</td>
<td>61438</td>
<td>86658</td>
<td>103512</td>
<td>9077826</td>
<td>105113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>3491</td>
<td>84134</td>
<td>200086</td>
<td>249490</td>
<td>279700</td>
<td>240127</td>
<td>202645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>65200</td>
<td>63700</td>
<td>50175</td>
<td>61261</td>
<td>66233</td>
<td>65294</td>
<td>84213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otherEU 1</td>
<td>38937</td>
<td>38300</td>
<td>9627</td>
<td>79352</td>
<td>94737</td>
<td>102713</td>
<td>123928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total EU 1</td>
<td>214003</td>
<td>255795</td>
<td>37376</td>
<td>54295</td>
<td>60283</td>
<td>552015</td>
<td>562534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20312</td>
<td>63587</td>
<td>85303</td>
<td>70701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Europeans</td>
<td>95780</td>
<td>91330</td>
<td>37341</td>
<td>36688</td>
<td>20053</td>
<td>17467</td>
<td>28165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>39284</td>
<td>105133</td>
<td>142098</td>
<td>125082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>9500</td>
<td>19904</td>
<td>21589</td>
<td>55693</td>
<td>87367</td>
<td>103152</td>
<td>105498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>in percent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otherEU 1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total EU 1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Europeans</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-nationals 3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 EU in the boundaries of 2000
2 percent of total number of non-nationals
3 percent of total population

*Source:* Recensements de 1930 à 1991 - RN pour 1999
Table 11.2: Geographic Distribution of Non-Nationals by Nationality. 1 January 2000 [% of national or status group living in region/area type]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Area type</th>
<th>Total Foreigners</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
<th>Total EU</th>
<th>Total non-EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>30,5</td>
<td>14,5</td>
<td>51,1</td>
<td>26,9</td>
<td>42,3</td>
<td>24,9</td>
<td>400,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>32,7</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>34,6</td>
<td>49,8</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>29,2</td>
<td>38,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In conurbations</td>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>24,8</td>
<td>27,6</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>23,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside conurbations</td>
<td>186,0</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallonia</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>23,2</td>
<td>27,7</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>21,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In conurbations</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td>14,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside conurbations</td>
<td>15,4</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>20,1</td>
<td>7,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Belgium</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.antiracisme.be, 12/09/02, modified

Table 11.3: Asylum Seekers by Nationality 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SOPEMI 2001, Centre for equal opportunities 2002
Fig. 11.1: Population Density per arrondissement at 1st of January 2001

Source: statbel 2002:www.statbel.fgov.be/figures/mesc/m21a_fr.htm, 15/11/02
Table 11.4: Registered Criminality against Aliens Law 1996-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of communities in the sample</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of crimes against aliens law</td>
<td>8505</td>
<td>9181</td>
<td>10545</td>
<td>10620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crimes concerning entrance, stay or settlement on the territory</td>
<td>7778</td>
<td>7955</td>
<td>9571</td>
<td>9447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crimes of racism and xenophobia</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: federal police, NIS, modified

Table 11.5: Registered Crimes of Racism and Xenophobia by Regions in 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>of which:</th>
<th>Brussels</th>
<th>Flanders</th>
<th>Wallonia</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,2%</td>
<td>46,1%</td>
<td>31,6%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: federal police, NIS, modified
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12. Denmark

12.1 Country Report

Denmark presents the same problems with racism in rural areas as other Nordic countries. These are related to the settlement of asylum seekers in villages and small towns. The poor living conditions of asylum seekers and their isolation from the autochthonous population represent the most extensive form of racism in rural areas. A further form of expression of racism in the countryside is racial violence. Although the reported racist incidents have decreased in the last years, racist violence in the countryside remains a problem in Denmark.

Unfortunately, statistical data on racial attacks in rural areas do not provide information on the levels and spread of racial violence in relation to urban areas. Patterns of racism in the countryside in Denmark are insufficiently researched. One of the few studies that should be mentioned is Lulu Hjarno’s study on racism in the community of Ishoej. The author asserts that the lack of infrastructure for the reception and integration of immigrants in small communities can lead to the formation of ghettos. In the case of Ishoej, this has contributed towards strengthening and spreading a negative picture of immigrants, as people unrightfully taking advantage of the Danish welfare state.

Similar to other Nordic countries, villages and small areas where asylum seekers have been placed can be considered to be problem areas in light of racism. The problem with racism in the countryside in Denmark is aggravated through the existence of right-wing oriented groups which are mostly responsible for racial attacks (including terrorist attacks) against refugees.

12.1.1 Immigration

Denmark was one of the ethnically most homogeneous populations in Europe before the end of the 1960s. This picture changed in 1967 when the Danish government opened its borders in order to import foreign labour. Since then, Denmark has received workers from the former Yugoslavia, Turkey, Morocco and Pakistan. In the 1970s and onwards, Denmark also granted asylum to an increasing number of refugees. Until the late 1960s, attitudes towards admitting foreign workers can be said to have been relatively positive.

The main countries of origin for the migrants in Denmark are: Turkey, the former Yugoslavia, Norway, Germany and the UK; regarding refugees, the primary ‘sending’ countries are Somalia, Iraq, Iran and Vietnam (cf. Table 12.1).
Asylum applicants in 1999 stemmed mainly from Iraq, Slovakia and the former Yugoslavia (cf. Table 12.2).

Approximately one-third of all migrants live in Copenhagen. In 2001, approximately one to two percent of the total population in Denmark consisted of Muslims; the majority of these live around the major urban centres throughout the country. The major part of the total immigrant population in Denmark lives in suburban settlements, which are isolated from city life.

With the establishment of the integration programmes for new refugees in 1998 and with the coming into force of the Integration Act, recognised refugees are distributed all over the country. The same is true of asylum seekers. Migrants are free to settle wherever they want, while asylum seekers are allocated to specific centres. Recognised refugees must stay in specific places during a three year-long integration programme. The rate of unemployment of recognised refugees is still high. After one year in the integration programme, only five percent of the participants have found a job. This is due to discrimination and the fact that the qualifications that refugees bring with them often do not match the Danish labour market. Therefore, refugees are often limited only to seasonal work.

12.1.2 Rural Areas

In comparison to many other countries, Denmark has different problems and developmental possibilities in rural areas. Short distances make it possible to live in rural areas, although people often do not work there anymore. In many places, rural areas are developing more and more into dormitory towns and are, consequently, struggling with problems (Tanvig: 2001). Until recently, rural areas in Denmark were closely connected with agriculture. As a consequence, the significant structural development in agriculture left strong marks in the rural areas. The number of farms declined considerably: from nearly 150,000 farms in 1970, to only 58,000 in 1999. On average, ten farms a day closed down in this time period, and employment in the primary sector further declined considerably. Most of the farms that still exist are part-time farms, in the sense that the farmers obtain their principal income elsewhere.

The definition of rural areas in Denmark covers the part of Denmark outside of urban societies, with more than 200 inhabitants (Tanvig: 2001). Many villages that could be termed as rural are not included in this definition, according to which 15 percent of the Danish population live in rural areas. The number of inhabitants of the Danish rural areas decreased considerably between 1970 and 1998 (cf. Table 12.3). The decrease in importance of the agricultural sector caused a migration flow towards the urban areas. After the middle of the 1990s,
however, an increase in population in the rural areas took place. These new rural inhabitants included people working in urban areas, who prefer living in the countryside. Their motives to move are based on access to nature and fresh air and a clean environment in which to raise their children. Today, in a socio-economic and cultural sense, the rural areas consist of a minority of farmers (with a farmers’ culture as a background) and a majority of people with a way of life, norms and values changing towards or reversing from other social models.

The phenomenon of immigration of foreigners to rural areas in Denmark is not very significant. In rural areas, there are hardly any migrants, although some migrants in mixed marriages tend to stay in rural areas. There are more refugees and asylum seekers to be found in the rural areas based on the strategy of decentralisation. However, there is not much knowledge on irregular migrants in the rural areas. In general, the situation of irregular migrants is very difficult in Denmark as the whole social system and the labour market are very controlled, leaving few niches for them. This is also related to the fact that one needs a personal social number for all labour market activities. Irregular work is only possible within the close circuits of family businesses, e.g., ethnic restaurants run by migrant families.

Regarding recognised refugees, it seems that the integration programmes function on the social level, causing refugees to become integrated in even smaller villages and more rural areas. In the agricultural sector, seasonal workers from the Baltic States can be found working on the basis of a temporary work permit. The new government has also encouraged its idea that asylum seekers could work in the agricultural sector during the harvest season in order to fill shortages. In Denmark, there are few problems with low wages or dumping, because of the strong position of the trade unions.

12.1.3 Rural Racism

Denmark, which in the 1960s was a tolerant state without signs of racism, now appears to be one of the states with the highest incidents of nationalism and racism within the European Union. The racist discourse in Denmark started in a small rural community, predominantly a farming community south-west of Copenhagen (Hjarnø: 2002). The council promised to invest in attractive infrastructure, which persuaded a number of special housing associations to build accommodations. As the transport facilities and the new industries were not established, the expected new taxpayers did not arrive as planned in the 1970s. In order to obtain tenants for the empty accommodation, the council began to import poor families on social benefits to these areas. The mayor, who belonged to the Social Democratic Party, further encouraged foreigners by
means of the media to come to live in his village. As a result, a concentration of poor Danish and foreigners emerged. Because the economic situation of the council was desperate, the mayor convinced the state, who invited guest workers and refugees, to pay the cost of integration for foreigners. He was very active in spreading the message that the immigrants were an economic burden to Denmark due to their extensive unemployment.

At the end of the 1970s, the far right Progress Party (*Fremskridtspartiet*) took over the arguments from the aforementioned mayor. The majority of Danish parties of the centre did not challenge the xenophobic and false allegations of the Progress Party, but instead, adopted a xenophobic line of argument themselves, hoping to win back the support of the voters.

In Denmark, a discourse has evolved in which immigrants and refugees are viewed as a problem (Schierup: 1996). Because of this discourse, many Danes ignore the fact that the real reasons for the lack of ethnic equality are based on social, economic and political factors. The way people describe and view things has serious consequences because these images may appear to be “true” and they produce, in accordance with their beliefs, self-fulfilling prophecies (Hall, cited in Hjarnø: 1996b). The intolerance among Danes can be explained as a reaction on the chaotic and fearful situation many Danes believe they live in (Hjarnø: 2002), in spite of the prosperous economic situation overall in Denmark: for instance, unemployment in rural areas is only four percent of the adult population. Yet, some Danes see the migrants as a threat for their wealth. They also see the Danish lifestyle threatened by the Islamic faith and a growing number of Muslims in Denmark. The results of the parliamentary elections in 2001 have demonstrated that the majority of Danes support intolerance and xenophobia. For the first time in a century, Denmark has a government that depends on the support of the extreme right-wing party, the Danish People’s Party (*Dansk Folkeparti*), which was supported by 18 percent of the voters. The Danish People’s Party won the vote in both rural as well as urban areas.

In general, it can be said that people in Copenhagen are more tolerant than elsewhere in Denmark. People living in villages have little experience and contact with migrants; therefore, they feel much more insecure and have a more hostile attitude towards migrants. These feelings have been, abused several times by local politicians, since the mid-1980s, who used racist, xenophobic and Islamophobic arguments to achieve power, also in rural areas. If a new reception centre for asylum seekers is to be opened, there is often protest by the local inhabitants of the villages. However, once the centre is opened, the attitude can change quickly as the refugees become known and as negative stereotypes are confronted with a different reality. Regular contact between refugees and the local inhabitants, who sometimes work as volunteers in the centres, could have the effect that they become more tolerant in the long run.
The main part of the support structure for migrants and refugees is based in Copenhagen, but there are also other, smaller initiatives in rural areas. In Denmark, the municipalities are self-governing. On the municipal level, the Integration Councils exist, which were founded in 1999. They have an advisory function and work only on matters related to integration of ethnic minorities. Since the local authorities are, themselves, responsible for integration, their racist discourse diminishes as they can no longer blame the Danish Refugee Aid, which was responsible for the integration of refugees prior to 1999.

Among foreigners, Somalis are the most discriminated against, followed by persons from Pakistan, Poland and Iran. Somalis have suffered from the highest level of physical attacks. Regarding racial violence, no studies on the reasons and motives exist. The level of xenophobic and far-right violence is considerably lower in Denmark than, for instance, in Sweden (Bjørgo: s.a.). Much of the violence against immigrants during the 1908s was attributed to the so-called Green Jackets (Grønjakkerne) and similar youth gangs using the imagery of the Ku Klux Klan as well as white power slogans. In the 1990s, after the collapse of the Green Jackets towards the end of the 1980s, the similar skinhead movement, consisting of a loose network of ca. 200 members filled in much of the space left vacant by previous groups. Nowadays, some smaller neo-Nazi groups in Denmark still exist, but they rarely appear publicly, nor do they have much support in Danish society. They are well organised groups, including Combat 18 as well as various blood- and-honour groups.

Most of the violent confrontations between youth gangs and immigrants in Denmark seem to have taken place in the larger cities, especially in Copenhagen and its suburbs. Nevertheless, the surveys that have been carried out thus far suggest that there is no direct correlation between the proportion of foreigners in the local population and the level of racist violence. Subjective perceptions rhetoric, such as “we are swamped by immigrants and asylum seekers”, are more important than the objective number of foreign citizens in the community. However, changes in a mono-ethnic community may be experienced by some as a dramatic and threatening development, even in cases in which only a small number of newcomers are involved. In this regard, one could expect that reactions towards newcomers are more visible in rural, rather than urban areas.
12.2 Statistics and Data

Table 12.1: Foreign National Residents by Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>73 672</td>
<td>157 887</td>
<td>158 902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2 201</td>
<td>2 101</td>
<td>2 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1 734</td>
<td>3 270</td>
<td>3 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1 555</td>
<td>4 089</td>
<td>4 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1 117</td>
<td>1 098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>2 651</td>
<td>5 868</td>
<td>5 807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1 729</td>
<td>2 646</td>
<td>2 718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>7 126</td>
<td>34 456</td>
<td>35 062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>10 030</td>
<td>12 229</td>
<td>12 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>5 508</td>
<td>5 571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 046</td>
<td>1 099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Soviet Union</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1 048</td>
<td>1 695</td>
<td>1 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>9 361</td>
<td>12 448</td>
<td>12 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7 726</td>
<td>10 448</td>
<td>10 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>14 086</td>
<td>38 055</td>
<td>36 569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8 700</td>
<td>12 429</td>
<td>12 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>4 112</td>
<td>23 872</td>
<td>25 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>3 631</td>
<td>3 573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13 138</td>
<td>14 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>5 096</td>
<td>6 406</td>
<td>6 538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4 271</td>
<td>5 209</td>
<td>5 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>1 644</td>
<td>3 402</td>
<td>3 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>13 638</td>
<td>54 840</td>
<td>56 062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 357</td>
<td>2 878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>2 098</td>
<td>2 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1 048</td>
<td>1 150</td>
<td>1 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11 294</td>
<td>12 687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6 330</td>
<td>5 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2 266</td>
<td>2 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3 834</td>
<td>3 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>6 400</td>
<td>7 135</td>
<td>7 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5 114</td>
<td>4 851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>3 718</td>
<td>4 092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1 286</td>
<td>5 160</td>
<td>5 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1 109</td>
<td>1 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Australia</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stateless and not known | 1 086 | 8 760 | 7 655 |

Source: Statistic Denmark, Statistical Yearbook 2000
Table 12.2: Origin of Asylum Applicants 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia, FR</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinians</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab. Republic</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,467</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNHCR*
Table 12.3: Number of Inhabitants in Rural Areas 1970-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>991 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>882 065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>826 608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>807 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>795 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>778 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>772 839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>784 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>798 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>796 370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Yearbook Denmark

Table 12.4: Number of Farms 1970-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>148 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>129 860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>125 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>112 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>89 659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>79 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>69 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>63 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>59 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>57 831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Yearbook Denmark
12.3 Literature

Rural Areas


Racism


Rural Racism

12.4 List of Experts

Researchers

Danish Center for Migration and Ethnic Studies
South Jutland University Centre
Niels Bohrs Vej 9
6700 Esbjerg
Contact Person:
Dr. Lulu Hjarnø
jh@sam.sdu.dk
es@suc.suc.dk
13. Finland

13.1 Country Report

Although the recovery of the Finnish economy over the past years seems to have contributed to a relatively positive change in the attitudes of the autochthonous population towards immigrants, racism remains a problem in the Finnish society. Like in other Nordic countries, the problem with racism in the countryside in Finland is related to the settlement of refugees in villages and small towns in former traditional rural areas that have become problem areas for incidents of racist violence.

The best-known place for racism in the countryside is the small city of Joensuu. In the beginning of the 1990s a wave of racial attacks against foreigners took place there, transforming the city into a center for right-wing extremist groups. The case of Joensuu illustrates the level of racism in the Finnish countryside. According to data of the Ministry of the Interior, the likelihood of an immigrant falling victim to a violent act is higher in Joensuu (2.56 percent) than in Helsinki (1.66 percent).

Unfortunately, there are no further official data that provide insight into the phenomenon of racism in rural areas or make possible a comparison to urban areas. Nevertheless, studies on attitudes of the autochthonous population towards immigrants exist. These studies suggest that people from villages and small towns are less tolerant and open towards foreigners that people from urban centres. The existing research on racism in the countryside in Finland has concentrated on the community of Joensuu that can serve as typical case to analyse patterns of racism in rural areas in Finland. According to experts, racism in Finnish rural areas is related to social and economic transformation processes taking place since the 1980s. The placement of asylum seekers in villages and small towns has coincided with the rise of unemployment in these areas. Experts criticise that there have been no information campaigns by governmental or local authorities attempting to tackle the false image that asylum is associated with unemployment and economic downturns. There is also often a lack of infrastructure to attend to the necessities of the asylum seekers.

13.1.1 Migration

Until two decades ago, Finland was an ethnically highly homogenous country with the lowest proportion of residents with foreign backgrounds among the total population in Western Europe. Since then, however, a growth of the foreigner population has taken place, increasing from approximately 26,255 in
1990 to 98,577 in 2001, or approximately 1.8 percent of the total population. The growth of immigration in the beginning of the 1990s was largely due to the immigration of refugees and ethnic Finns from the former Soviet Union. The largest group of immigrants are citizens from Russia and the former Soviet Union, (approximately 24 percent of the immigrants), followed by Estonians (12 percent), Swedes (9 percent) and Somalis (5 percent) (cf. Table 13.1).

Nearly half of the immigrants in Finland live in Helsinki, and only a small number in rural areas (cf. Fig. 13.1); in Southern Ostrobothia, for example, the percentage is only 0.4 percent (Kouros: 2002). The immigration of foreigners into rural areas is related to the Finnish refugees’ policy that has often placed refugees in small communities in the countryside and has established reception centres for asylum seekers in rural areas. Approximately 30 percent of the total refugees in Finland come from Somalia and 20 percent from the former Yugoslavia (cf. Table 13.2).

13.1.2 Rural Areas

In the Nordic Countries, the term, “developed areas” is used for areas that are neither rural nor urban, but where at least 200 people live within 200 metres of other domiciles, such that a certain concentration of persons is given. More than 80 percent of all Finns live in such “developed areas”. The urbanisation rate in Finland is 63 percent, lower in comparison to other EU-states. Rural areas are not homogeneous and areas close to larger cities should be differentiated from those areas that are rather isolated in the countryside. Younger families prefer to live closer to urban areas in order to find employment in the neighbouring cities. A trend of people moving from urban back to rural areas can be also observed. This trend is being promoted by the Finnish government, which seeks to prevent the trend towards an over-proportional share of the population in certain urban areas.

13.1.3 Racism in the Countryside

The existence of racial discrimination in employment, housing and access to public places, has been reported in several studies (ECRI: 2002). The recovery of the Finnish economy and the decrease in unemployment at the end of the 1990s seems to have contributed to a positive change in attitudes toward immigrants (cf. Table 13.3). Nevertheless, a steady growth of Islamophobia can be perceived. The perception of Islam as a threat to the Finnish culture seems to be growing among Finns (Jaakkola: 1999, cited in Virtanen: 2002).
Although terrorist-type acts, such as those in Denmark and Sweden, have not occurred, in Finland racism assumes violent forms as well. According to statistics, the most criminal offenses against foreigners are committed in Helsinki. Nevertheless, while the likelihood of an immigrant falling victim to a violent act in Helsinki was 1.66 percent, in Joensuu, a small community in the countryside, the figure was 2.56 percent (Ministry of the Interior Annual Report: 1997, cited in Virtanen: 2001). Racist aggressions always take place in public areas by an unknown individual, mostly by a young male.

Skinheads are often perpetrators of racial violence in Finland. Somalis, Moroccans and Iraqis are, according to statistics from the Ministry of the Interior, the most likely groups to become victims (Ministry of the Interior Annual Report: 1997, cited by Virtanen: 2001). Nevertheless, these statistics are not trustworthy, because often the police do not consider the racist motivation of an offense, or the victims do not have confidence in the authorities, causing a situation in which over the half of the victims of racial violence do not report the offenses to the police (Virtanen: 2002) (cf. Fig. 13.2).

Although right-wing extremist groups are small in comparison to the dimension of racist violence, they have become more visible in the last years. Most of them are small in size, consisting of few members. The total number of members of right-wing extremist groups is about 1,000. Nevertheless, the extreme right in Finland has not been able to organise mass demonstrations and the largest of them have consisted of a few hundred participants (Virtanen: 2002).

As the aforementioned data shows, racial violence often takes place in small communities in the Finnish countryside. This phenomenon is related to the emergence of youth gangs, neo-Nazi or racist groups in local communities. The case of Joensuu, a small city with about 51,000 inhabitants, has become paradigmatic regarding the question of racial discrimination in a small community. Joensuu received attention in the beginning of the 1990s in the Finnish public opinion because of the racial attacks against Somali refugees committed by skinhead groups. Important parts of the population seemed to be behind the actions of the young racists. Approximately 20 youths started an ultra-nationalist patriotic movement that aimed at sheltering Finland from foreign cultures. Members of the movement were allowed by local authorities to use public locations. Dozens of racial attacks were recorded by the police. Nevertheless, the problem of racial violence was not taken seriously by local politicians and police, and the justice system did not persecute these racial crimes with resolution. The Somali refugees have moved out from the city, resulting in a decrease from 60 in 1987 to four Somalis in 1999 (Virtanen: 2001; Kaplan: 2001).
The case Joensuu has strengthened interest among researchers towards the study of racism and right-wing extremism at the local level, in Finland predominantly a rural phenomenon. An important reference regarding this field of analysis is the paper presented by Jeffrey Kaplan at the Stockholm International Forum Combatting Intolerance in 2001. In the section of his paper regarding Finland, Kaplan analyses the case of Joensuu, referring to the most important studies in this case and forming a base for efforts undertaken in local studies. Kaplan refers particularly to the study of Vesa Puuronen (1996) on the right-wing extremism in Joensuu, Skinys ideologiana ja toimintakulttuurina (“Being a ‘Skin’ as an Ideology and Mode of Action”). Coinciding with Puuronen, Kaplan states that many youths associate the closing of the large factories and the resulting unemployment, which affected many families, with the arriving of asylum seekers that took place at the same time. Kaplan stressed this aspect as the only one in Puuronen’s study that takes particular local characteristics into account.

Kaplan also mentioned two studies that deal with right-wing extremism in Joensuu. The first is the Master’s thesis by Sini Perho entitled, Skineyden äärellä Joensuualaisnuorista (Youths Interested in Skinhead Culture in Joensuu) and the article by Sini Perho and Anne-Mari Keskisalo, Paikalliset ja tulijat - dialogia ja taistelua tilasta Joensuu (Dialogue and Struggle for Space in Joensuu). This research suggests that the problem in Joensuu has less to do with the category of “race” than with “space” and a “clash of cultures”. Interviewed skinheads perceived Russian immigrants as a more immediate threat than the Somalis.

Kaplan pointed to the fact that most studies on the case of Joensuu do not consider a key aspect of the extreme right movement in Joensuu and in Finland in general, the role of Finnish skinheads in the international skinhead scene. He stressed that the impact of international developments on local events can not be ignored (Kaplan: 2001).

The research carried out by Timo Virtanen, focusing on the constellations of youth, racism and right-wing extremism should be mentioned regarding racism and right-wing extremism in Finland. Although he does not deal specially with the particular forms of expressions of racism and right-wing extremism in the Finnish countryside or at the local level, an important part of his studies concern these topics in the context of the spread of racism among some small Finnish communities. Virtanen considers the rise of social frustration due to unemployment in some local communities and the diffusion of the image of refugees and asylum seekers as a threat for the security as key elements in order to explain the spread of racism and development of the extreme right in small communities. A further factor that aggravates this problem seems to be that racial violence is often not seriously taken into account by the police, justice and local politicians. Last but not least, in Virtanen’s opinion, traditions of local and
exclusive patriotism seems to add the possibility of a high number of racial attacks, as is the case in Sweden (Virtanen: 2002).

Racism and right-wing extremism in the Finnish countryside seems to be promoted by similar factors as in other Nordic countries: the isolation of asylum seekers who were often placed in small communities without the necessary infrastructure for their reception and integration; the construction of public discourses that occur at the local level which assume a causal relationship between unemployment and immigration; and the negative role of some local politicians who often manipulate the topics of asylum and immigration in order to win supporters. All of these seem to be key factors that strengthen racism and right-wing extremism in the Finnish countryside.

13.1.4 Good Practices

In community of Joensuu, examples of good practices can be found in the evaluation of programmes preventing racist violence made by Marja-Liisa Laapi in 1998. The anti-racist program carried out by the city of Joensuu should be mentioned, focusing on tolerance in elementary schools, on seeking a decrease in the racial violence and on promoting the integration of Finnish and immigrant youths involved in racist behaviour (Kaplan: 2001).
13.2 Statistics and Data

Fig. 13.1: Regional Population Density and Regional Share on Non-nationals

Source: BIVS, Statistics Finland
### Tab. 13.1: Foreigners in Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11 810</td>
<td>14 316</td>
<td>16 861</td>
<td>18 575</td>
<td>20 552</td>
<td>22 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>9 038</td>
<td>9 689</td>
<td>10 340</td>
<td>10 652</td>
<td>10 839</td>
<td>11 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7 291</td>
<td>7 507</td>
<td>7 756</td>
<td>7 809</td>
<td>7 887</td>
<td>7 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4 555</td>
<td>5 238</td>
<td>5 371</td>
<td>4 410</td>
<td>4 190</td>
<td>4 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>2 624</td>
<td>2 755</td>
<td>2 935</td>
<td>3 392</td>
<td>3 575</td>
<td>4 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1 855</td>
<td>2 435</td>
<td>2 670</td>
<td>2 960</td>
<td>3 102</td>
<td>3 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1 803</td>
<td>1 907</td>
<td>2 058</td>
<td>2 170</td>
<td>2 207</td>
<td>2 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1 836</td>
<td>1 961</td>
<td>2 072</td>
<td>2 162</td>
<td>2 201</td>
<td>2 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>5 187</td>
<td>4 675</td>
<td>3 628</td>
<td>2 966</td>
<td>2 447</td>
<td>2 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1 397</td>
<td>1 681</td>
<td>1 706</td>
<td>1 840</td>
<td>1 941</td>
<td>2 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1 833</td>
<td>1 905</td>
<td>2 001</td>
<td>2 063</td>
<td>2 010</td>
<td>2 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1 479</td>
<td>1 668</td>
<td>1 737</td>
<td>1 737</td>
<td>1 784</td>
<td>1 981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1 471</td>
<td>1 610</td>
<td>1 650</td>
<td>1 677</td>
<td>1 668</td>
<td>1 929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2 143</td>
<td>2 171</td>
<td>1 965</td>
<td>1 840</td>
<td>1 814</td>
<td>1 778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>1 342</td>
<td>1 420</td>
<td>1 496</td>
<td>1 581</td>
<td>1 627</td>
<td>1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1 084</td>
<td>1 194</td>
<td>1 306</td>
<td>1 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16 690</td>
<td>18 044</td>
<td>18 964</td>
<td>19 775</td>
<td>20 963</td>
<td>23 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73 754</strong></td>
<td><strong>80 600</strong></td>
<td><strong>85 060</strong></td>
<td><strong>87 680</strong></td>
<td><strong>91 074</strong></td>
<td><strong>98 577</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Statistics Finland*

### Tab. 13.2: Asylum Seekers by Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Rep. of Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia/former USSR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire/Kongo dem.rep.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bosnia-Herzegovina</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Tab. 13.3: The Attitudes of Finns towards Refugees and Foreign Job-Seekers, Percentage (the Share of Respondents who Accept the Immigration).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jaakkola 1987</th>
<th>Jaakkola 1993</th>
<th>Söderling 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of positive answers to the question: “Should Finland receive more refugees?”</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of positive answers to the question: “Should Finland receive more foreign job-seekers?”</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: “Welcome but...” Life management and the attitudes towards immigrants in Finland, Ismo Söderling

### Fig.13.2: Racist Incidents in Police Statistics

![Racist incidents in police statistics](image)
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14. France

14.1 Country Report

Racism in French rural areas does not find violent forms of expressions as is the case in the urban centres. In this sense, Corsica is an exception, being the region most touched by racist violence (21 of the 38 instances recorded in France in 2001). The official statistics on racist violence in France are unfortunately not analysed according to criteria that provide insight in topics of racism in urban and rural areas.

That the French countryside has problem areas regarding racism can be inferred from the degree of influence of the extreme rightist nationalist party, Front National, throughout French rural areas. The racist contents of the discourses of Le Pen’s party suggest a high potential for negative attitudes towards foreigners or members of ethnic minorities among their voters.

There are only a limited number of studies dealing with racism in rural areas in France, such as the project, ACCEPT. This study attempts to find out if there is a relationship between patterns of discrimination and rural areas. In addition, there are studies such as the research by Jacques Barou, that deals with migration in rural areas but not directly with patterns of discrimination against immigrants working in agriculture. Because of this reason it is very difficult to infer definitive conclusions regarding racism in rural France.

14.1.1 Immigration

In 1999, 9.6 percent of the population of France was of foreign origin. Since 1975, the proportion of foreigners has been more or less stable (cf. Graph 14.1). In addition, more than one in three immigrants have acquired the French nationality (cf. Table 14.1). The number of immigrants coming from other European countries has declined and totaled 45 percent in 1999 (cf. Graph 14.1). Immigrants coming from sub-Saharan Africa and Asia make up the groups of immigrants that are most quickly increasing. In 1982, they represented 12 percent of the total immigrants, a number which climbed to 21 percent in 1999. The asylum seekers in 2000 came mainly from China, Turkey and Mali (cf. Table 14.2).

In 1999, 37 percent of the immigrants lived in Île-de-France region of the country. The Rhône-Alpes and the Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur are two other
regions with a high number of migrants (11 percent and ten percent of the total immigrants in France). Therefore, the three highest populated regions are where 60 percent of immigrants living in France are concentrated.

The immigrant population lives mainly in cities and is clearly concentrated in the largest urban areas. Nearly two out of three immigrants in France live in a city with more than 200,000 inhabitants, Paris included. Only three percent of the immigrants in France live in rural areas. In 1999, only 2.6 percent of the employed immigrants worked in the agricultural sector.

Excluding asylum seekers, the social demographic characteristics and social practices of the immigrants in France are proof of real integration and of a small distance between them and the autochthonous inhabitants of France. The migrants from earlier migration flows (e.g., Italians) are completely integrated and are difficult to distinguish from the autochthonous French; this is especially true of the second generation.

14.1.2 Rural Areas

Rural areas in France have, for the most part, lost their agricultural character. 90 percent of the families living in rural areas do not have a member working in agriculture, and less than 20 percent of the employment in rural areas is in agriculture. The European context shows the enlargement of the agricultural work instead of the safeguarding of the number of actives in the agricultural sector. 35 percent of the active working population of the French rural areas are labourers, a percentage which is higher than in the urban areas. This resistance against industrial employment in rural areas can be an indication of the attractiveness of the rural areas in the development of certain activities. However, it could also be a sign of fragility found in the rural areas, a specialisation of standardised activities and a recourse to non-skilled labourers.

When studying the definitions of urban and rural areas, it becomes clear that cities are on the top of a hierarchy concerning the elaboration of concepts that create a distinction between cities and rural areas. Until now, “rural” has mostly been defined as everything that is not urban.
Between the 1960s and 1996, *Insee*, the French national office of statistics, based its definition of the term “rural area” on both the number persons leaving a village to go to work in urban areas and also on the percentage of families living from agriculture. Because of the increasing mobility and the decrease of the number of people active in agriculture, the definition had to be reviewed.

In 1996, *Insee* developed new definitions with a more restrictive view concerning urban areas. Urban areas are presently considered to consist of more than eight to ten thousand inhabitants or are areas that can are able to generate at least 5000 jobs. Semi-urban areas those in which at least 40 percent of the active population works in an urban or an other semi-urban area. These new definitions divide the French territory into areas with mainly urban influences and areas with rural character. The first consists of 13,300 villages, or 76 percent of the total population, and the rural area consists of 23,300 villages with 13,4 million inhabitants (*Insee*: 1998; Bessy-Pietri, Hilal, Schmitt: 2000).

Many experts found that the Insee definitions of 1996 hardly take into account the heterogeneity of rural areas. Rural areas are no longer homogeneous societies were the identity of these areas is based exclusively on agriculture as the main activity. The number of people active in agriculture is still declining; in 1980, 1,869,000 persons were active in the agricultural sector, in 2001 this number totalled only 906,000, accounting for only two percent of the total population.

Presently, one has to differentiate among rural areas themselves. There exist rural areas with wide-ranging population densities. In order to fulfil this need towards differentiation, *Insee* and *Inra* divided rural areas into four categories. The first category, Rural Areas With Few Urban Influences, forms a circle around the urban zones and signifies communities where at least 20 percent of the active inhabitants work in urban areas. The second group, the Rural Poles, considers the small urban bodies that offer between 2,000 and 5,000 jobs and accounts for more places of employment than inhabitants. This implies that these poles exercise a certain attraction
on the surrounding rural environment, and offers a certain infrastructure. The third category consists of the Outskirts of Rural Poles, of which 20 percent of the active workers work in a rural pole. The last category, the Remote Rural Areas, is comprised of the rural areas not defined by the first three categories and represents more than one-third of the French territory and ten percent of its population.

Most départements (French federal administrative units) with the highest percentage of population living in rural communities as defined by Insee, are found on a horizontal line in the centre of France (cf. Figure 14.1). These generally have a rather low share of non-French population. Corsica is an exception due to its rural population. Due to seasonal work and the development in the agricultural zones, migrants are more dispersed in rural zones than in urban poles. This affects their forms of social cohesion. A limited migrant community living in a rural area, however, is less likely to be able to see itself as part of a community than a comparable community in an urban environment. In rural areas, it seems difficult to find well-structured migrant organisations that are part of national migrant organisations, as existing in larger cities.
14.1.3 Rural Racism

Behaviour with xenophobic tendencies often has nostalgic dimensions and is used notably among farmers deprived from social and cultural planning in France. This is not directly linked to racist acts, which mostly take place in the urbanised areas in France. In this sense, Corsica is also exceptional (cf. Figure 14.3).

However, in contradiction to what is often thought, ethnocentrism as a whole declined in France during the last decade. Until the mid 1990s, the levels of violence based on racism, anti-Semitism or xenophobia, seem to have declined (cf. Tables 14.3 and 14.4). In 2001, the region most afflicted by anti-Semitic behaviour was the most urbanised region in France with the highest percentage of immigrants, Île-de-France (18 of the 29 anti-Semitic instances committed in 2001 in France occurred here). Anti-Semitism was strongly present in two groups of the population: among a sector of the right, the so-called droite gaulliste, and among practising Catholics.

In the same year, Corsica was the region most touched by violence resulting from racism and xenophobia (21 of the 38 instances committed in France in 2001) (cf. Table 14.5). Also, the number of smaller manifestations, defined under “threats”, declined considerably since the beginning of the 1990s. In 2001, the majority of the threats took place in the Île-de-France region (nearly 35 percent), followed by the Rhône-Alpes region (39 threats). The rest of the 334 threats took place in areas across the country (CNCDH: 2002).

The statistics pertaining to racial, xenophobic and anti-Semitic violence give an idea of the areas where racism is mostly expressed in a strong degree, but do not say much about the degree in which a certain area is characterised by xenophobic attitudes. Concerning the differences in mentality between urban and rural areas, a cleavage can be observed between the politically, economically, socially and culturally open urban societies and the closed societies in rural areas. The resistance against the European Union is, for example, very strong in some regions, and farmers feel especially threatened by the changes caused by the EU.

The general crime rate in rural areas rose spectacularly in the last year (17.7 percent compared to seven percent in urban areas). This shows that the typical urban feelings of insecurity have spread to rural areas. Even a low rate of crime is enough to create a feeling of insecurity, which, in turn, calls into question the traditional way of life, characterised by strong social cohesion and confidence in others.

The “closed” rural communities are marked by a general rejection of everything coming from outside, in particular everything coming from the cities. The rejection of foreigners here has to be seen in this frame, and is, as a consequence, neither necessarily based on the appearance of the other, nor on
the colour of skin. Jacques Barou, a researcher at the CNRS in Grenoble, points out Corsica and the Provence as the rural regions that are most touched by a racist mentalities in France.

In certain regions, regionalism also reflects some racist attitudes. The feelings of the separatists, for example, include a rejection of foreigners. Corsica, for instance, is marked by racism towards Algerian-French persons. The reason could be found in the economic development of the island by the French Algerians in the 1960s, which caused an inferiority complex among the Corsicans.

Nona Mayer stated in an interview that no specific rural racism exists in France, but that the racism in rural areas can be explained by other political and socio-economic characteristics of the rural population; more specifically, by the relatively low degree of education, the socio-economic frustration and political attitudes of the conservative right.

A remarkable evolution in rural areas is the success of the extreme right in the elections of 2002. The extreme right has never been more successful in France. Two parties together, the *Front National* and *Mouvement National Républicain*, received a total 19.2 percent of the votes in the first round of the elections. The success of the *Front National* in the larger cities in 1988 spread to the mid-sized and smaller towns in 1995. In 2002, the *Front National* broke through in the rural communities with less than 2,000 inhabitants. In 1988, 12 percent of the voters in the villages with less than 2,000 inhabitants voted for Le Pen’s Front National; in 1995, 14 percent; and, in the last elections in 2002, 19 percent. In 1988 and 1995, approximately ten percent of the French farmers voted for extreme right. In 2002, the percentage of French farmers voting the right-wing parties climbed to 22 percent. This is equivalent to the percentage of voters among labourers and employees.

A survey carried out by IPSOS showed that the main worries of the voters of the extreme right in 2002 were insecurity, immigration and justice, whereas the main worries from the general electorate were insecurity, joblessness and exclusion. The voters of the extreme right are the most hostile towards immigrants, but the immigration issue was extensively discussed by most of the parties.

From a geographical standpoint, the extreme right was particularly successful in the east of the country, from Le Havre over Valence to Perpignan (cf. Figure 14.2). In this part of France, there exist different large cities with a high rate of criminality; in some regions of these there are many foreigners present. These factors often create security worries by some French inhabitants and strain their relations towards the “others”. Perrineau stipulates that the Eastern part of France is characterised by the fact that these typical urban fears have spread into the semi-rural and rural areas, especially in Saône-et-Loire, Haute-Saône, Tarn-et-Garonne (Perrineau: 2002). In the 1980s and 1990s, this feeling of insecurity present in the urbanised areas was the structural reason for the
success of Le Pen. In April 2002, the success of the two parties of the extreme right was additionally based on the anxiety present in the rural and semi-rural zones with demographic and socio-economic problems.

In France as a whole, the extreme-right gained votes in comparison to the 1995 elections. The large majority of the départements with the highest percentage change are situated on the so-called “dry diagonal Charleville-Foix”, consisting of a series of départements in recession, marked by low population density, depopulation and a scarcity of public utilities. The inhabitants here feel abandoned and threatened by the changes. The most pronounced situation is the département of Saône-et-Loire, where the population decreased by 4.73 percent between 1982 and 1999, and where the industrial and agricultural activities declined rapidly. In this département, the extreme right attained one of its most notable electoral victories: 7.2 percent more votes than in 1995. The Front National was able to mobilise these regions and is touched by a demographic depression, the social integration in rural environment and a spread of the delinquency in rural areas, all of which was a consequence of the urbanisation of the rural zones.

Historically seen, the tradition of regionalism, of opposition to the central power, also plays a role in the results of right-wing parties. This is especially true for the areas of Occitanie and Limousin and outside of the ‘dry diagonal’ for the two Corsican départements. Even more important are the anti-European feelings: 21 départements of the 25 with the highest progress for extreme-right, voted in the negative to the Maastricht Treaty. These départements are marked by the rejection of the open society, no matter if it is represented by Europe, the mondialisation or the mixing up of different cultures (Perrineau: 2002).

An analysis of the election results showed that the increases of the extreme right are closely linked to the disappearance of the left in some départements. Especially in rural and semi-rural zones, a switch from a secular and rural left to the extreme right is to be observed. This was the case in 13 different départements in which the extreme right won a large number of votes in small rural communities and small and mid-sized towns. These départements are characterised by an aging population and a strong presence of farmers and craftsmen.

**14.1.4 Good Practices**

In France, various projects have been initiated with the goal of favouring the integration of migrants in rural areas.

The project, Accept, is an international research project on discrimination in rural areas. The project’s purpose is to fight the phenomenon of discrimination. During the first part of the project, a sociological survey was conducted in order to better understand the problem. Associations (28), public services (17),
inhabitants (286) and victims (11) of discrimination in rural zones were interviewed. In France, the survey was conducted in three parts the region of Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur (Foyer Rural CEPAGE: 2001).

The survey focused on all kinds of discrimination, but found that the major motive of discrimination was “race and different ethnic origin” (in contrast to the other countries studied). The number of respondents in France who have said that discrimination is an important phenomenon in rural areas is approximately the same as the number of respondents who answered the opposite. Discrimination plays an important role in access to social, political and cultural life.

According to the population interviewed, the main attitudes associated with discrimination are prejudice, fear of others, rejection of differences and preferences given to the local population. Associations and public institutions saw as main reasons the rejection of the difference, the preference given to the local population and a conservative mentality. All of these are factors closely related to rural group identity. This was confirmed by the victims’ answers in relation to the effects of discrimination: isolation and rejection by the local community.

The survey also found that most people saw the solution in the organisation of meetings and exchanges between the population groups, in the establishment of sensitivity workshops in schools and in the launching of a strong political movement against discrimination. Positive discrimination and the creation of help centres were the least-mentioned solutions.

Valérie Urbani from the Foyer Rural CEPAGE finds that legislative measures are important prerequisites, but that they do not constitute a cure for the eradication of discriminatory practices (Foyer Rural CEPAGE: 2002). Discrimination arises from lack of knowledge, from prejudices and from stereotypes towards persons or groups of persons that are seen as being different. To these causes, certain rural characteristics, which are specific to the rural population (strong rural identity, conservative mentality, a rapidly ageing population, a strong bond to the local group that leads to the rejection of everybody who is external to the group, etc.), can be added.

In order to fight these causes, it is necessary to put a strategy in place that will influence the minds of people in order to fight prejudices and stereotypes, and, in this way, open the minds on the richness of other cultures and differences. These actions, which can be qualified as ‘educative’, can take many forms, such as sensitivity training, information meetings, information stands, workshops, etc. They will create awareness about existing discrimination, which is not necessarily perceived as such by the rural population.

Starting from the need to create awareness about discrimination and against prejudices in rural areas, the Foyer Rural CEPAGE and the partners of the
project, ACCEPT, have put in place sensitivity training targeted at a rural public on an experimental and pilot basis. The sensitivity activities were put in practice through long-term education programmes in schools. The schoolmasters were very enthusiastic and were willing to renew such actions. From the support of existing education activities came the benefit of the creation of a debate and a sensitisation on discrimination, as the experience showed that formal meetings had not generated a significant response from the rural population.

It seems especially necessary to sensitise rural inhabitants who are more than 50 years old, as it is the group that is the least aware of the existence of discrimination and that has shown the highest propensity to adopt discriminatory attitudes. Also, public servants need to be made aware of the problem.

The Confédération Paysanne Française is developing another good practice project in collaboration with the COAG-Initiativa Rural. The main aim of the project is to help to integrate immigrant agricultural workers and their families into rural areas. Assistance with social, legal and employment matters will be provided. A second aim is to raise the awareness of the rural population towards the need for integration, focused on cultural exchange. A working group will develop an innovative integration model to be applied later in the different European countries. In addition, a discussion day with public and private organisations will take place in order to discuss and improve the integration model.

The Atrio Project is an international project on which the Centre Régional de Formation et d’Animation-Union Française des Centres de Vacances et de Loisirs in Orléans and the Union d’Economie Sociale Pierre d’Angle in Toulouse work together. The main goal is to provide a coherent approach to immigrant housing in rural areas, in order to combat discrimination and to increase public awareness on the issue.
14.2 Statistics and Data

Fig. 14.1: Proportion of Resident Population Living in Rural Communes and Non-French Population per Region

Source: BIVS. 2002 based on own calculations and data from INSEE 2002, statistical yearbook
Fig. 14.2: Votes for Jean-Marie Le Pen’s *Front National* during the 2002 presidential elections (1st round)

*Source: http://www.eludefrance.net/president2002T1/lepenID2002.gif, 15/11/02*
Fig. 14.3: Regional Distribution of Registered Racist and Xenophobic Acts 1997-2001

Source: BIVS 2002 based on data from the French Ministry for Interior Affairs
Table 14.1: Total Population in France and Non-Nationals According to Nationality at Census Dates

*Source: INSEE, Annuaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>39848182</td>
<td>42781370</td>
<td>46458956</td>
<td>49654556</td>
<td>52599430</td>
<td>54295612</td>
<td>56651955</td>
<td>58520688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French by birth</td>
<td>49159844</td>
<td>51275074</td>
<td>52902209</td>
<td>54275094</td>
<td>55194620</td>
<td>56226010</td>
<td>56966020</td>
<td>52902209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired French nationality</td>
<td>1421568</td>
<td>1780279</td>
<td>2355293</td>
<td>2621088</td>
<td>3442415</td>
<td>3714200</td>
<td>3596602</td>
<td>3263186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>1743619</td>
<td>1765298</td>
<td>2169665</td>
<td>2621088</td>
<td>3442415</td>
<td>3714200</td>
<td>3596602</td>
<td>3263186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
<td>5,3%</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
<td>6,8%</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
<td>5,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1547288</td>
<td>1396718</td>
<td>1566205</td>
<td>1875600</td>
<td>2090200</td>
<td>1768200</td>
<td>1459113</td>
<td>1334412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>302201</td>
<td>288923</td>
<td>441658</td>
<td>607184</td>
<td>497480</td>
<td>327156</td>
<td>216047</td>
<td>161762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>450764</td>
<td>507602</td>
<td>628956</td>
<td>571684</td>
<td>462940</td>
<td>340308</td>
<td>252759</td>
<td>201670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>22261</td>
<td>20805</td>
<td>50010</td>
<td>296448</td>
<td>758925</td>
<td>767304</td>
<td>649714</td>
<td>553663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>423470</td>
<td>269269</td>
<td>177181</td>
<td>131668</td>
<td>93655</td>
<td>64804</td>
<td>47127</td>
<td>33758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavian*</td>
<td>20858</td>
<td>17159</td>
<td>21314</td>
<td>47544</td>
<td>70280</td>
<td>62472</td>
<td>52453</td>
<td>50543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>7770</td>
<td>5273</td>
<td>7628</td>
<td>50860</td>
<td>122260</td>
<td>197712</td>
<td>208049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>54005</td>
<td>229505</td>
<td>428160</td>
<td>652096</td>
<td>1192300</td>
<td>1594800</td>
<td>1633100</td>
<td>1419758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>22114</td>
<td>211675</td>
<td>350484</td>
<td>473812</td>
<td>710690</td>
<td>805116</td>
<td>614207</td>
<td>477482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>16458</td>
<td>10734</td>
<td>33320</td>
<td>84236</td>
<td>260025</td>
<td>441308</td>
<td>527652</td>
<td>504096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunesian</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>26569</td>
<td>61028</td>
<td>139735</td>
<td>190800</td>
<td>206336</td>
<td>154356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Africa</td>
<td>13517</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>17787</td>
<td>33020</td>
<td>81850</td>
<td>157576</td>
<td>239905</td>
<td>283824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroun</td>
<td>20436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>36186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>20453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>10172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>36091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>38956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia**</td>
<td>69741</td>
<td>40687</td>
<td>36921</td>
<td>45700</td>
<td>104465</td>
<td>289560</td>
<td>424668</td>
<td>407450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Former-Yugoslavia*
** from 1982 on with Oceania
Graph 14.1: Total Population and Non-Nationals at Census Dates in France
Table 14.2: Asylum Seekers in France According to Country of Origin

*Source: SOPEMI France 2001, Haut Conseil à*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td>2466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ex-USSR</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>9984</td>
<td>10708</td>
<td>10478</td>
<td>14725</td>
<td>23456</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>2931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>3807</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>2931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>3314</td>
<td>3494</td>
<td>4255</td>
<td>7417</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauretania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>3352</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>16243</td>
<td>13071</td>
<td>14424</td>
<td>15112</td>
<td>31305</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>5169</td>
<td>4961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>643</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>4536</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>3276</td>
<td>5490</td>
<td>6735</td>
<td>17355</td>
<td>11800</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>3597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2666</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>28809</td>
<td>26196</td>
<td>27568</td>
<td>34253</td>
<td>61372</td>
<td>54800</td>
<td>47400</td>
<td>28900</td>
<td>27600</td>
<td>26000</td>
<td>20400</td>
<td>17405</td>
<td>21416</td>
<td>22375</td>
<td>30907</td>
<td>38747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14.3: Reported Acts with Racist and Xenophobic Background in France and Corsica (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 14.4: Reported Acts with Anti-Semitic Background (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of vandalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14.5: Regional Distribution of Registered Racist and Xenophobic Acts 1997-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aggr.</td>
<td>threats</td>
<td>aggr.</td>
<td>threats</td>
<td>aggr.</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auvergne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretagne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champagne-Ard.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corse</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languedoc-Rouss.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limousin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midi-Pyrénées</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basse-Normandie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Normandie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays de Loire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picardie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitou-Charentes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Île-de-France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministère de l'Intérieur
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15. Germany

15.1 Country Report

Germany is one of the countries within the European Union with the most problems with rural racism. Particularly in Eastern Germany, racism takes on considerable proportions in the countryside. There are official and non-official statistics that illustrate rural racism. The statistical data provide us, albeit indirectly, with information about the dimension of racist violence in the countryside in Eastern Germany. It is possible to define racial attacks in rural areas concerning urban centres of the former German Democratic Republik (GDR), because apart from few large cities the rest can be considered to be rural areas. In West Germany is not as easy to classify where these attacks took place because of the geographic extension of urbanisation processes and the resulting difficulty in accounting for what is rural or urban.

According to statistics, most of acts of violence with proved or suspected racist and right-wing extremist background have occurred in East Germany (about 70 percent), mostly in villages and small towns of the countryside. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the estimated number of unknown cases is very high. Unfortunately, a very high number of cases are not reported or not considered by the police as acts of violence with a racist or a right-wing extremist background.

In addition to statistical data there are also studies on attitudes towards immigrants that illustrate racist and xenophobic tendencies among the autochthonous population. According to these studies, xenophobic and racist tendencies are more extensive among the autochthonous population in Eastern that in West Germany, in villages and small towns rather than urban centres. Unfortunately, most of these studies do not take into account particular characteristics of socialization processes in rural areas.

There is a large amount of literature on racism and right-wing extremism in rural areas. The high number of these studies is related to the extension of this phenomenon in East Germany, particularly in the countryside. There is high level of interest among researchers on racism and right-wing extremism in this area, concentrating in particular on the living conditions of refugees as well as on the factors strengthening right-wing extremism in villages and small towns. These studies are based on the different explanatory approaches which lead the debate on racism and right-wing extremism in Germany: historical, sociological, economic, macro-political, etc. and do not concentrate on the analysis of the particular paths of development of rural areas and their relation to the extension of racism and right-wing extremism.
Abandoning the mainstream of these explanatory approaches, Andreas Willsch’s study *Drogen am Eichberg oder Feuer im Ausländerheim* should be stressed. This study analyses the relationship between economic and social transformation processes that resulted from the German reunification and the rise of racism and right-wing extremism in the countryside in East Germany. According to this study, economic crises, a rise in unemployment and wide ranging social decline has lead, since the beginning of the 1990s, to the ghettoisation of the countryside in extensive parts of East Germany. Youths, in particular, do not have a regular work-day and there are few perspectives in finding a job. For many youths, racism has become a feature of social articulation in the search for social recognition, and the consumption of drugs a medium to escape from a life without perspectives (Willsch: 1999).

The studies of Spüllbeck on Russian Jews and Antisemitism in villages in Eastern Germany (Spüllbeck: 1995; Spüllbeck: 1997) should be also mentioned.

Exemplifying the particular characteristics of a small community in the countryside that present the problems of racism and right-wing extremism are the studies by Funke, Schröder, Sturzbecher and Wagner. According to these authors the most important factors that strengthen the rise of racism and right-wing extremism in Eastern Germany are the effect of the value orientations of the former GDR (ethnocentric, authoritarian, nationalistic and undemocratic values), the lack of a profound confrontation with the fascist period during the GDR and the socio-economical processes of transformation as consequence of German re-unification that have led to a deep social crisis and to a disintegration of identities. Consequently many people try to facilitate their integration in a performance-oriented capitalist society by the discrimination of marginalised groups and ethnicity has become the most social reference in their striving after a social identity (Funke: 1999; 2002a; 2002b; Schröder: 1997; Sturzbecher: 1997; 2000a; 2000b; Wagner: 1998a; 1998b; 2000a; 2000b).

These factors strengthening racism and right-wing extremism find their sharpest forms of expression in small communities of the countryside in East Germany. This is due to the fact that these communities have been most negatively affected by the economic and social transformation processes as consequence of re-unification and that there has traditionally been less mobility in villages and small towns, something that strengthens a closed feeling of "community". Besides these factors, studies analysing specific communities have pointed to various factors strengthening racism and right-wing extremism. For example, in the case of Oranienburg, in the federal state of Brandenburg, the existence of a Holocaust memorial in a former concentration camp has not lead to a collective reflexion on the Nazi-past, but to a rejection of the topic (Funke; Kemper; Klier: 1999).
An important attempt to research discrimination against immigrants in European rural areas are the activities of the Interkultureller Rat (Intercultural Council) in Germany, that aimed to compare experiences of racism and anti-racism in the countryside in Europe. In the framework of the project, Fremde auf dem Lande (Foreigners in the countryside) two international conferences, a web site and two publications containing the papers of the conferences “Fremde auf dem Lande” and “Islam auf dem Lande” (“Islam in the Countryside”) have been carried out. Anja Schwier, the main researcher of this project, has conducted a study on discrimination against immigrants in rural areas in the region of the federal state of Hessen, but the outcomes of her work can be applied to the analysis of rural racism for West Germany in general. According to Schwier racist discrimination in the countryside lies in the isolation of citizens with an immigration background, the lack of knowledge about the cultures of the immigrant population, particularly about the Islam, the role of local politicians that often strengthen negative attitudes towards immigrants, as well as the lack of infrastructure for the integration of immigrants or members of ethnic minorities and inter-cultural cohabitation (Schwier: 2002).

15.1.1 Rural Racism

In Germany, a rather large number of attacks across cultural boundaries illustrates the existence of neo-racist phenomena. Such attacks tend to peak in areas that might be described as de-industrialised, with a small number of inhabitants per square-kilometre, and with a more or less dominating agricultural production. In many small towns in East Germany, extensive districts became taboo for immigrants or other strangers. In order to analyse the particularities of racism in Germany, the different manifestations of racism in Eastern and West Germany should be examined. Rural areas are more extensive in Eastern than in West Germany. Consequently, the share of the rural population compared to the urban population is much higher in Eastern Germany.

The level of violence and militancy of neo-racist and xenophobic activists as well as racial attacks higher in East Germany. In order to evaluate the data correctly, one has to consider fours aspects:

- most racial attacks are committed in small towns and villages;
- most are committed at daytime in rural areas of East. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that the culprits do not expect the villagers to denounce them;
- many racial attacks are committed by average people in villages who are not participants or followers of militant organisations;
- furthermore, official statistics do not include all racial attacks. The racist motivation of attacks is often not considered by the police.
As proved by several studies, the potentiality of racist attitudes among the population is stronger in Eastern than in West Germany. In Brandenburg, a district with vast wide rural areas in East Germany, opinion polls illustrate racist attitudes in the population as follows:

- 57 percent of respondents consider that “foreigners abuse our social system”;
- 56 percent are proud of being German;
- 48 percent hold the opinion that “foreigners raise unemployment”; and
- 34 percent think that “politicians do too much for foreigners”.

In order to understand the background of neo-racism, one has to consider that only 3 percent of the population in Brandenburg are foreigners.

A lack of a critical civil society can be considered for understanding the numbers in East Germany. Public opinion tends towards an extensively uncritical attitude towards racism. Many people tolerate, accept or even support racial attacks. Additionally, a lack of democratic values especially in rural areas is obvious. Just two examples:

- the local press very seldom informs about racist incidents in the villages. Few anti-racist initiatives exist which are uncoordinated, and
- critical young people are often terrorised by right-wing groups and, consequently, are likely to move to urban areas.

Two types of factors should be considered in order to analyse the development of racism in East Germany:

- those that emerged from the heritage of the GDR society; and
- those that emerged from the consequences of the reunification of Germany.

One important factor is the effect of the value orientations of the GDR. In the former GDR, ethnocentric, authoritarian, nationalistic and undemocratic political contents were at times present. These are value orientations that still could be rooted in the minds of many people, thus prevailing among the political culture in the East.

A second aspect to be considered is that the GDR state defined itself as an antifascist state. The official discourse negated any responsibilities of the GDR society for the Holocaust. As a consequence, a profound confrontation with the National Socialism period, followed by a public discussion about racism, never took place. The consequences of the lack of this confrontation with racism can be observed in East Germany.
A stronger sense of community is also a part of the heritage of the GDR. Collectively organised social structures strengthen the sense of community in the former GDR: social ties were reinforced by immobile labour forces, thus establishing tight milieus and a very strong sense of community. But, it is this sense of community that promotes the marginalisation of people who do not belong to this concrete or imaginary community. The phenomenon is more intense in rural areas.

Factors that emerged from the reunification of East and West Germany should be also taken into account:

- Socio-economic processes of transformation: Due to the economic modernization of Eastern Germany, many factories were closed or restructured. In particular, the rural districts of the East Germany were affected. Their rural co-partnerships of production were shut down. As a consequence, today only three percent of the population in East Germany work in the agricultural sector, a sector which amounted to 15 percent of the labour force in the former GDR. Agricultural activities disappeared from many small towns and villages. Unemployment rose immediately. Those who found other occupations were fortunate. Increasing unemployment and the social decline of a wide range of society were the consequences. The unemployment rate today reaches almost 60 percent in some small towns. Young people are especially affected. In the former GDR, the job determined the social and cultural practices everyday life. This was superseded by an increasing individualisation, followed by the disintegration of identities and milieus. Consequently, many people try to facilitate their integration in a performance-oriented capitalist society through discrimination of marginalised groups;

- The dissolution of the GDR system: The GDR system offered strong social bases, including safety, stability and order. The disappearance of the GDR state was accompanied by the disappearance of the system of safety and stability. Therefore, many people needed new social foundations. Especially for young people, ethnicity became the most important social referent in their search for new social identity. Nationalism and racism became the means which offered safety and stability in everyday life. Accordingly, racism became a feature of social integration.

The interaction of racism, local politics and local state institutions should also be taken into consideration in order to understand the dimension of racism in East Germany. Committed policies against social racism cannot be discerned. Foreigners are converted into second-class citizens, and racist prejudices are reinforced by the asylum and immigration policies that come from the political leadership of Germany. These are also policies that reinforce discrimination against migrants among the German people.
In rural areas of East Germany, the interaction of racism and politics assumes stronger forms. Local politics promote the formation of ghettos for asylum seekers. Camps for asylum seekers are built in the outskirts of small towns and villages under extremely bad living conditions. This strengthens the isolation of asylum seekers and the image in the population that foreigners do not belong to the society.

Other aspects which illustrate the interaction of racism and politics in rural areas are the attitudes of local politicians. In many small towns and villages, local politicians tolerate, accept or promote the racist attitudes among the people of their communities. For example, many local politicians play down racism and racial attacks occurring in their towns. In some towns, politicians support youth centres right-wing groups meet.

Often, there is no difference between parties oriented towards right and the left. For example, anti-racist groups often argued that many local politicians or parties on the left did not authorize anti-racist manifestations, or even refused to participate on anti-racist campaigns.

We have seen that racism is the result of various factors. Nationalistic, authoritarian and ethnocentric values have shaped the political culture among many people in East Germany. A democratic civil and political society is lacking everywhere in rural areas in East Germany, something that underscores the prevalence of racism. In order to fight racism, what the non-racist part of the population is important. The problem becomes more complex when the performance-oriented society and state reinforce racism as a legitimation for marginalisation of minorities. As long as these factors for the development of racism exist, an end to racism in rural East Germany is unforeseeable. As long as local politicians pursue the discriminatory policies in their towns; so long that local justice and police do not resolutely fight racial attacks; as long as a democratic civil society does not develop in rural areas, and as long as that there is no economic and social development of rural areas, racism in rural East Germany will continue to exist.

### 15.1.2 Good Practices

As examples of good practices the Antidiskriminierungsstelle (Anti-Discrimination Office) of the federal Brandenburg should be mentioned. It was founded in 1999 and works in the field of prevention. A important part of its work is carried out in small communities in the countryside.

Its most important fields of work are assisting victims of discrimination, the identification of places of discrimination, the winning of partners to fight racism.
in the communities, offering seminars for public officers, and others. Their goals are sensibilising the local population, particularly public officers, on the topic of discrimination, contributing to the development of intercultural competence in the administration and, in this way, to the decrease of discriminatory attitudes. The **Antidiskriminierungsstelle** deals with complaints concerning discrimination and acts as intermediary between victims of discrimination and discriminative institutions or individuals.

The majority of those they work with are asylum seekers that form the largest group of immigrants in Brandenburg. From 48,000 foreigners in Brandenburg, 9,000 are asylum seekers. One of the main problems of asylum seekers is the isolation from which they suffer. Out of 42 asylum centres, 12 are located middle in wooded areas, close to small towns. This spatial isolation strengthens the social isolation of asylum seekers, who do not have any contact with autochthonous people and any protection against racial violence.

Another important institution dealing with discrimination is the **Mobiles Beratungsteam Brandenburg** (Mobile Consultation Team Brandenburg), which is integrated into the project of the federal state of Brandenburg **Tolerantes Brandenburg** (Tolerant Brandenburg). Its main task is to support local authorities and actors such as trade unions or associations, which have to deal with discrimination in their communities. A very useful tool is the organization of round tables and workshops to inform, discuss and develop preventive strategies against discrimination at a local level. A very important informative task is carried out with schools, attempting to sensibilize teachers and pupils on topics dealing with discrimination. The **Mobiles Beratungsteam** often works together with local authorities of communities, that have experienced incidents of racist violence. These authorities often do not know what to do in such cases. This shows the lack of structures concerning anti-discrimination. The goal of the **Mobiles Beratungsteam** is to contribute to a change of negative atmosphere regarding discrimination.

Among anti-discrimination measures in the German countryside, the **Opferperspektive** (Victims’ Perspective) should be mentioned. Its main task is to support victims of racial violence. Members of **Opferperspektive** are usually the first persons to be sought out by victims of a racist violent attack. Together with the victims, strategies are developed to bring the perpetrators to trial. The victims are mostly asylum seekers and often suffer after the attack from traumas. The **Opferperspektive** intervenes so that the asylum seekers can be placed in other areas.

These three examples of good practices reflect the variety of levels of racial discrimination in the German countryside and the necessity to continue developing infrastructure in order to deal with anti-racism. The enforcing of democratic structures in small communities, information campaigns especially
for and with young people, and the protection and support of the victims of racial discrimination or violence should be combined in order to fight against racism.
15.2 Statistics and Data

Fig. 15.1: Regional Population Density and Regional Share on Non-Nationals
Table 15.1: Foreign Residents in Germany by Selected Nationalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995 %</td>
<td>1998 %</td>
<td>2000 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU total</td>
<td>1 811 748</td>
<td>1 851 514</td>
<td>1.872.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2 014 311</td>
<td>2 110 223</td>
<td>1 998 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR Yugoslavia **</td>
<td>797 754</td>
<td>719 474</td>
<td>662 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>586 089</td>
<td>612 048</td>
<td>619 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>359 556</td>
<td>363 514</td>
<td>365 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>185 122</td>
<td>208 909</td>
<td>216 827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>132 283</td>
<td>131 121</td>
<td>129 471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>125 131</td>
<td>132 578</td>
<td>133 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>81 922</td>
<td>82 748</td>
<td>80 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>33 984</td>
<td>46 167</td>
<td>51 841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>26 396</td>
<td>24 549</td>
<td>24 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>17 328</td>
<td>18 412</td>
<td>18 766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>276 753</td>
<td>283 604</td>
<td>301 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>184 470</td>
<td>185 159</td>
<td>187 742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>183 019</td>
<td>110 680</td>
<td>113 623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>115 826</td>
<td>111 248</td>
<td>115 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>113 063</td>
<td>112 072</td>
<td>110 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>109 256</td>
<td>89 801</td>
<td>90 094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>106 979</td>
<td>115 094</td>
<td>107 927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>99 135</td>
<td>105 808</td>
<td>110 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>96 032</td>
<td>85 452</td>
<td>84 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 173 866</td>
<td>7 319 593</td>
<td>7.296.817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Share of the total number of foreign residents
** Serbia/Montenegro. All residents in the central registration for foreigners with Yugoslavian citizenship.

Source: Bundesamt für Statistik/Bundesverwaltungsamt
Table 15.2: Germany - Employees/Self-Employed in Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>973 000</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
<td>962 000</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
<td>940 000</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt Deutschland 2002
http://www.destatis.de/basis/d/erwerb/erwerbtab4.htm (03.04.2002)

Table 15.3: Foreign Employees in Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery in West Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 287</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>27 272</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26 512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* in September
** Percentage of all employed

Source: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit

Table 15.4: Percentage of Employees/Self-Employed in Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery in comparison to all employed in East Germany (including East-Berlin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt Deutschland 2002
http://www.destatis.de/basis/d/erwerb/erwerbtab4.htm (03.04.2002)
Table 15.5: Asylum Demands according to Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td>101 631</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>67 411</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>47 742</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>28 495</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>9 155</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>35 345</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3 522</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>22 082</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>25 514</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9 065</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8 968</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8 341</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1 152</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (1)</td>
<td>22 114</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>26 227</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>31 451</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>11 121</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzeg.</td>
<td>4 932</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1 755</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1 638</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Fed.(2)</td>
<td>1 436</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2 546</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1 096</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td>24 210</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14 374</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9 594</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9 593</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2 068</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1 168</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1 035</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1 447</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1 473</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 379</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3 786</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>5 399</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1 164</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongo, D.R. (Zaire)</td>
<td>1 389</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2 546</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>America and Australia</strong></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td>60 900</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>45 815</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>34 874</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>37 239</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>7 348</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7 515</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4 458</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5 380</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>3 383</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2 386</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aserbaidschan</td>
<td>2 628</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1 418</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1 236</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2 072</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5 612</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2 691</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1 499</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1 826</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6 880</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8 662</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11 601</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>7 271</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3 908</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3 407</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4 878</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>16 229</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1 126</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>3 983</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3 116</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1 727</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1 506</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3 793</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6 048</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1 254</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1 170</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>3 913</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1 158</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2 156</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2 641</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>9 428</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2 619</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2 425</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2 332</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateless</td>
<td>5 920</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2 615</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2 899</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128
| Total  | 193 063 | 100.0 | 127 937 | 100.0 | 95 113 | 100.0 | 78 564 | 100.0 |

Notes:
From 1995 with former GDR
1) From 1995 Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and Macedonia are accounted separately.
2) Until 1990 Soviet Union
Figure 15.2: Acts of Violence with Proven or Suspected Extreme Right-Wing Motivation:

Source: (See Table 15.8)

Table 15.6: Criminal Offences with Proven or Suspected Right-Extremist Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion/threat</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of racist</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>10,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propaganda and use of insignia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incitement to hatred and</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>3,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of Jewish</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cemeteries and sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,324</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>10,929</td>
<td>10,341</td>
<td>9,291</td>
<td>14,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (See Table 15.8)

Table 15.7: Acts of Violence with Proven or Suspected Right-Extremist Background
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempted homicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical injury</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing a detonation by explosives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of public peace</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (See Table 15.8)

Table 15.8: Acts of Violence with Proven or Suspected Xenophobic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted homicide</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical injury</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing a detonation by explosives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of public peace</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources (Figure 1, Table 6-8):
Figure 15.3: Acts of Violence with Proved or Suspected Right-Wing Extremist Background (per 100 000 Inhabitants in the German “Länder”)

Source: Verfassungsschutzbericht Land Brandenburg 2000

Table 15.9: Members of Extreme Right-Wing Groups (Estimated)
sub-culturally charactered violent right-wing extremists & 9 700 & 10 400 & 600 & 600 \\
organised and non-organised Neo-Nazis & 2 200 & 2 800 & 190 & 190 \\
NPD & 6 500 & 6 500 & 225 & 205 \\
JN & 500 & 350 & 35 & 30 \\
DVU & 17 000 & 15 000 & 300 & 270 \\
REP & 13 000 & 11 500 & 150 & 100 \\
other right-wing extremist organisations & 3 700 & 3 950 & 35 & 25 \\
total & 52 600 & 50 500 & 1 535 & 1 420 \\
multiple memberships & 1 700 & 800 & 45 & 50 \\
actual potential of persons & 50 900 & 49 700 & 1 490 & 1 370 \\

Source: Verfassungsschutzbericht Brandenburg 2001  

Table 15.10: Crimes Motivated by Right-Wing Extremism in Brandenburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homicides</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempted homicides</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault and battery</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance of the peace/Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to Property</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedition/Calling for racially-motivated crimes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usage of symbols of unconstitutional organisations</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usage of propaganda of unconstitutional organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total crimes</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof xenophobic</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-semitic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violent crimes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof xenophobic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-semitic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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16. Greece

16.1 Country Report

May-June 1998, in a rural area near the city of Volos. The first strike of foreign workers in Greece took place in. About 200 foreign workers from Albania and Romania working in the tomato and cotton cultivation, began a strike demanding higher pay and better working conditions. The immigrant workers carried out the strike although they were undocumented workers. According to the Volos Labour Centre, an organisation close to the trade unions, the hiring of illegal labour, regardless of its origins, is an expression of racism and affects the rights of the local labour force. The Centre asserts that “rather than merely chase foreign workers in the area, the police would do better also to arrest the illegal employers who exploit them for a crust of bread” (Labour Centre cited by European Industrial Relations Observatory - on-line http://www.eiro.europa.eu/1998/06/InBrief/GR9806176N.html). After five days, the strike ended successfully for the workers, achieving the right to an eight-hour day and a salary increase.

This case illustrates that labour immigration and discrimination of foreigners in the countryside are current topics in Greece. Nevertheless, there are no statistical data and studies that provide information on patterns of immigration and discrimination against immigrants in the Greek rural areas. Because of the lack of statistics and research it is not possible to make a final assessment of the phenomenon of rural racism in Greece. In order to obtain further information on rural racism interviews with experts were conducted. According to experts, racism in Greek rural areas is expressed in the poor living and working conditions of immigrants. The regularisation of so-called illegal immigrants and the regulation of the seasonal work in agriculture could contribute to reducing the material conditions for the discrimination of immigrants.

16.1.1 Migration

Greece, which was a classical emigration country in the 1960s and 1970s, has changed from a transit country to an immigration country in the last few decades, although it officially continues to claim not to be an immigration country (cf. Tables 16.4/Table16.5). Even the second regularization process, which was implemented in August 2001 with its ambiguity and sometimes anti-constitutional parameters, has failed to successfully address the issue of immigration in Greece (Siadima: 2001).
Greece is a major entry point for asylum seekers due to its geographical proximity to countries with long-term conflicts, severe economic problems or authoritarian regimes. This poses difficulties for Greek authorities in controlling the coastal borders. There are no organized reception facilities on a large number of Greek islands and thus, asylum seekers are hosted in ad hoc manner (cf. Table 16.6).

Until the 1990s, the Greek political discourse was linked to the myth of an ethnically, culturally and religiously homogenous society. Therefore, issues of racism, xenophobia and discrimination were absent from the political agendas of all parties. During the 1990s, Greek society had to face the influx of almost one million foreign migrants, refugees and repatriates from Albania and the newly independent states of the former USSR (cf. Table 16.1). This rising percentage of migrants, often with an undocumented status from Albania, Russia, Bulgaria and Rumania, brought the issue of racism and xenophobia onto the political agenda, although the political elite and the media defined it as an imported problem that arose because of the rapid increase of migrants.

According to the first preliminary results of the 2001 Census, published in May 2002, the number of resident aliens has risen significantly. The number of recorded non-nationals has reached a total of 797,093 (including refugees and asylum seekers) out of a total population of 10,964,080. Another indicator of the number of foreign migrants (non-repatriated ethnic Greeks from the former USSR) are the results of the two migrant registration processes in 1998 and 2001. It is assumed that the number of both registered (approximately 720,000) and unregistered (estimated 200,000 to 300,000) migrants is about 900,000, which roughly corresponds to the findings of the 2001 Census, as many unregistered migrants preferred not to participate for fear of deportation. Thus the migrant population constitutes roughly 8.5 to 9 percent of the total population (Raxen Report: 2002).

16.1.2 Migration in Rural Areas

The migration flows into rural areas in the 1980s correlate with the emigration of the Greek population in the 1960s and 1970s. Foreign labour workers, particularly from North Africa, played an important role in agriculture after the strong emigration flows of Greek workers to other European countries. Although most of the migrants work in the service sector and in the informal economy, the percentage of migrant workers in the agricultural sector is still very high during the harvest season. The highest number of migrants come from Albania, Bulgaria and Poland. To a lesser degree, there are migrants from Ukraine, Rumania, Georgia, Pakistan, India, Egypt and Syria.
Migrants form a high percentage of the economically active population of the country, estimated at just over 15 percent. An analysis of registered migrants under the first regularization programme of 1997 indicated that over 70 percent of them were mostly non-skilled males with a satisfactory level of education. These were concentrated in the region of Athens. Over 65 percent of the migrants were Albanian and were settled in rural areas in relatively larger percentages than the indigenous population (Kasimis, et al.: s.a.).

Many of the Albanian immigrants have crossed the border illegally, many of them people who believed that they were of Greek heritage. Further, many of these Albanian people belonged to excluded population groups in communist Albania. Most of them were of peasant background. They moved into Greece and the Greek peasants were happy to employ them. Most peasants were only minimally paid and had to sleep outside the house. This contribution of immigrants to the agrarian production was of most importance for Greece as a rural country. In many parts of Greece, old agrarian technologies were revived and many established Greek peasants used the Albanians to improve production. There has been an evaluation by a Greek bank which argued that more than one percent of the Country’s Gross Domestic Product was produced by Albanian immigrants.

During the first years, the production and labor relations were notably difficult. Peasants were invited to work in exchange for basic, non-monetary recompensation, but shortly there after the Albanians were asking for money and income. The Greek peasants called the police. The police then took the Albanians into custody and deported them. This system, however, was not perfect. Albanians had established in the 1990s a network of means to stay in towns and in the countryside. Many were able to return and asked the peasants for their money. Many peasants became victims of vendetar-like revenge and were shot. Thus, a myth was created that Albanians were a security threat to the Greek people and that the countryside was a not secure place.

Further, Albanians increasingly moved also into towns and cities where they participated in the construction and small business sectors. In the beginning, police sometimes deported undocumented migrants collectively. However, foreigners were later legalised. Around 500,000 Albanians seemed to have been legalised out of a foreign population of 1.5 million. The government started a green-card system by which the immigrants obtained a quasi-legal status.

Contrary to the real situation, the country media and press were rather aggressive against foreigners and used the incidents of revenge as a central argument against the ‘dangerous Albanians’.

Male migrants in rural areas work in agriculture and in the construction sector, while female migrants are normally employed as cleaners and housekeepers. Another phenomenon in Greece, which not only occurs in urban areas, is the
existence of trafficked women who live under slave-like conditions and who are forced into prostitution. Unverified estimates speak of approximately 10,000 trafficked women in Greece. The highest percentage of these are originally from the former USSR and Albania. According to information from a member of an NGO based in Athens, the existence of trafficked women in rural areas does not create racism against these women. They are viewed as victims and, therefore, Greek society and particularly Greek women blame the government rather than the women themselves for their current situation.

According to the Ministry of Labour, migrants have been an important factor in the Greek economy and have contributed extensively to its stabilization and to the competitiveness of Greece in the European market. It should be understood that this development was often achieved through the exploitation of migrant workers (Siadima: 2001). Two years ago, an illegal migrant from Albania received an average daily salary of six to ten Euros. In 1998, the poor working and living conditions of migrants and their exploitation led to a strike near to the city of Volos. Approximately 200 striking migrants from Albania and Rumania demanded an eight-hour day, an adequate salary for their work and medical insurance. Since then, the situation has approved in those rural areas with a high need for seasonal workers, such as Crete during the winter, when olives are picked. Currently, the daily salary of migrant workers varies between 33 and 35 Euros, although social and medical insurance is not included.

16.1.3 Rural Racism

Research on the manifestations of (rural) racism against vulnerable groups, such as migrants, refugees and minorities constitutes a new field in scientific research in Greece. Therefore, researchers working on this issue face a number of problems:

- little relevant Greek literature and in languages other than Greek;
- absence of official data and problems getting the existing raw data from public authorities, who are very selective in issuing it; and
- quality problems with the data provided by NGOs.

In fact, there is a complex spectrum of discrimination and racism in Greek society, but scientific research is just beginning to interpret and understand the problem, due to the fact that the appearance of a high percentage of foreigners is a new phenomenon.

Racism in Greek society is connected to poor living conditions and isolation. Until the present, the infrastructure for the integration of migrants into Greek society has been only weakly developed. For these reasons, migrants are mostly isolated and socially excluded from the Greek population. An important aspect
concerning discrimination and racism in Greece is the non-acceptance of groups such as Muslims, Macedonians, Jews and Catholics. Most Greeks believe that a “real Greek” has to be white and orthodox Christian. This notion goes back to the idea of a Greek homogenous nation-state, which has always constituted a fundamental aspect of the country’s national political ideology (ECRI: 2000).

As previously stated, the influx of foreigners into Greece has been a new development, that began during the 1990s. Even today, Greece has not developed an adequate regulatory and social support system. Combined with the economic exploitation of migrants and refugees in urban areas and particularly in rural areas, this has created an environment of social exclusion, as well as the construction of negative stereotypes about foreigners in the public consciousness. This development is twofold; on the one hand, there are strong prejudices and racism against Gypsies, who are mostly Greek citizens and have lived in the region of Greece since the Middle Ages. According to existing research, they number between 150,000 and 300,000. The exact figure remains uncertain, however, as a significant number live a nomadic life. Others, particularly educated and settled Gypsies, refuse to be registered, because they are frightened that if they disclose the fact that they are Gypsies, they will loose their jobs (EUMC Raxen Report: 2002). Gypsies are the main target group against whom racist incidents occur in Greece. On the other hand, there is less aggressive xenophobia against foreigners, such as Albanians, who are most often economically exploited. Most Greeks are aware of their desperate economic and social situation and do not resent them, provided that the Albanians do not demand too much. Due to the fact that these migrants remain more or less “invisible” as a segregated group, i.e., they are not visible in the service sector (restaurants, cinema, theatre, etc.), they rarely become the victims of racism.

Racist violence causing death or injury, such as that in Spain or Germany, is hardly ever reported in Greece. Racist attitudes among the younger generation, which faces a high percentage of unemployment, mainly occurs in connection with economic reasons. Similar to other European countries, people have prejudices about migrants “stealing” their jobs. This has a negative influence on employment policy.

Refugees and asylum seekers granted temporary residence under the Geneva Convention are granted a work permit and free access to education, health care and social assistance. Theoretically, this legislation should be the basis for the employment and long-term integration of foreigners in Greek society. On a practical level, however, it is a complicated process given the high rate of unemployment among both unskilled and skilled workers, of whom many hold qualifications from their home country and the competition for jobs.
Migrants serve as scapegoats for the rising unemployment rate and the rising dissatisfaction among young people. However, recent research on the economic and social implications of migrant labour in rural Greece has shown that migration fills the gaps in the agricultural labour force, providing a solution to longstanding shortages of labour in rural Greece, which have resulted from the restructuring of its agriculture and the rural economy, the demographic crisis experienced by the rural population, the social rejection of life and labour in rural areas by the younger generation, as well as the increased options of off-farm employment for family members (Kasimis, et al.: s.a.). According to this research, certain groups of unemployed people, young people and women with good educational levels, who reject their labour market placement, are not in direct competition with the migrants in the labour market. The real problem in the Greek labour market is the unsuccessful Greek economic policy and not the migrants.

16.1.4 Good Practices

Individuals and organized groups in Greek society have become aware of the migrant problem and have started to fight the social prejudices and discrimination against migrants. They react both spontaneously, and in organized ways to show their solidarity with migrants. One form of spontaneous reaction can be seen in the health sector, where doctors and nurses give medical treatment to illegal migrants, without informing the police afterwards.

Another expression of an organized form of opposition to the discrimination against migrants is the establishment of a migration centre in Rethymno, which has been described as a “real experiment”. Researchers and migrants aim to develop information campaigns in order to teach everyone a kind of “learning democracy”. The centre offers different activities, such as a regular café, which acts as an open meeting point for migrants, students and Greeks, with language courses as well as cultural activities, such as painting courses and dance courses. Furthermore, the centre tries to maintain a good relationship with the local press and to intensify contact and co-operation with similar organizations. One large success was the organization of an anti-racist festival in the city (Marvakis: s.a.).

Members of anti-racist organizations have pointed out in interviews that in order to effectively combat xenophobia, discrimination and racism in Greece several steps need to be taken:

- official data about racist incidents and discrimination cases must be recorded;
- adequate anti-racist and anti-discrimination legislative provisions at the local and national levels, as well as for every important political, social and administrative sector must be developed;
- in order to track the implementation of legislation and document racist attacks and intolerance the creation of monitoring systems is necessary;
- the of public awareness must be strengthened;
- inclusion mechanisms must be developed;
- social services are understaffed and have no resources, especially to help the Gypsies, and do not have mechanisms of control over benefits given. “They want to do something, but they cannot” (NGO in Athens). Thus, social services should be strengthened.

16.2 Statistics and Data

Table 16.1: Immigrants by Nationality and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGIN COUNTRY</th>
<th>IMMIGRANTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF IMMIGRANTS %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>131 593</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>16 403</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKISTAN</td>
<td>9 087</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUMANIA</td>
<td>8 230</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>5 890</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>5 270</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>5 183</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>4 385</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>3 723</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>3 629</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>2 787</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLDOVA</td>
<td>2 783</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>2 463</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIA</td>
<td>1 635</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMENIA</td>
<td>1 597</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUgosloVIA</td>
<td>1 401</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>1 089</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI LANKA</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAROCCO</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16.2: Greece: Immigrants by Regional Distribution and Sex 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>% of total immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTIKI</td>
<td>96 795</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>23 862</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELOPONNESE</td>
<td>19 051</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRETE</td>
<td>15 043</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESSALIA</td>
<td>12 785</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEREA HELLADA</td>
<td>12 424</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST GREECE</td>
<td>10 918</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST MACEDONIA</td>
<td>4 872</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SOPEMI 2002, Rapport pour la Grèce

Table 16.3: Statistics on Youth, Demographic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 1995:</td>
<td>10 454 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population 2030:</td>
<td>9 885 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Population (15-24) 1995:</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Youth Population 2030:</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Population (15-24) 1995:</td>
<td>759 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age 1995 (years):</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 16.4: Recorded Non-Nationals 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nationals</th>
<th>non-nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Greece</td>
<td>10 964 080</td>
<td>797 093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>3 761 810</td>
<td>376 732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.5: Documented and Undocumented Migrants 2001 (estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>registered migrants</th>
<th>of which: migrants who applied for residence and work permits</th>
<th>unregistered migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>720 000</td>
<td>351 000</td>
<td>200 000-300 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 16.6: Asylum Seekers and Refugees 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total number of refugees</th>
<th>of which: examined</th>
<th>asylum applications</th>
<th>residence permits granted (humanitarian reasons)</th>
<th>refugee status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 948</td>
<td>1 312</td>
<td>5 499</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.7a: Nationals and Foreigners by Sex, Age Group and by Work Status 2001, Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Not in the workforce</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>2 325 384</td>
<td>166 396</td>
<td>2 333 404</td>
<td>4 825 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>184 734</td>
<td>50 262</td>
<td>392 981</td>
<td>627 977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>568 422</td>
<td>58 837</td>
<td>42 293</td>
<td>669 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>586 119</td>
<td>22 188</td>
<td>19 775</td>
<td>628 080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>579 714</td>
<td>19 572</td>
<td>58 240</td>
<td>657 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>334 640</td>
<td>14 270</td>
<td>264 634</td>
<td>613 544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>71 757</td>
<td>1 265</td>
<td>877 564</td>
<td>950 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>105 967</td>
<td>8 807</td>
<td>52 013</td>
<td>166 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>14 336</td>
<td>2 761</td>
<td>9 346</td>
<td>26 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>43 033</td>
<td>2 121</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>46 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>32 893</td>
<td>1 930</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>35 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>11 556</td>
<td>1 702</td>
<td>1 227</td>
<td>14 485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>3 617</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1 889</td>
<td>5 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4 388</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Service National de Statistique en Crête, Enquête de la main d'œuvre, Athènes 2002
Table 16.7b: Nationals and Foreigners by Sex, Age Group and by Work Status 2001, Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Not in the workforce</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationals</td>
<td>1 427 678</td>
<td>257 167</td>
<td>3 513 961</td>
<td>5 198 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>653 944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>142 644</td>
<td>78 531</td>
<td>433 393</td>
<td>654 569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>389 249</td>
<td>88 811</td>
<td>191 242</td>
<td>669 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>398 998</td>
<td>53 774</td>
<td>250 808</td>
<td>703 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>314 744</td>
<td>29 675</td>
<td>366 338</td>
<td>710 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>151 660</td>
<td>6 375</td>
<td>513 108</td>
<td>671 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>30 384</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 105 127</td>
<td>1 135 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>58 471</td>
<td>12 342</td>
<td>91 917</td>
<td>162 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>6 048</td>
<td>4 017</td>
<td>17 155</td>
<td>27 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>19 063</td>
<td>5 061</td>
<td>18 604</td>
<td>42 729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>19 340</td>
<td>2 129</td>
<td>11 226</td>
<td>32 696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>11 522</td>
<td>1 026</td>
<td>4 504</td>
<td>17 052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>2 143</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3 466</td>
<td>5 719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2 971</td>
<td>3 326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Service National de Statistique en Créece, Enquête de la main d’oeuvre, Athènes 2002
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17. Republic of Ireland

17.1 Country Report

Rural racism in Ireland has been traditionally related to the discrimination against the Travellers. Research on these patterns of discrimination has unfortunately not differentiated between rural and urban discrimination. With the placement of asylum seekers in villages and small towns in the last years, following the decentralization policy of the Irish government, members of ethnic minorities have also become victims of discrimination in the countryside in Ireland. In many places the arrival of asylum seekers has found the rejection of the autochthonous population. Anti-immigrant groups have been organized, as in the village of Clogheen, County Tipperary, where in April 2000 local people mounted a picket to protest against the settlement of asylum seekers in the village. In Clonakilty, County Cork, anti-immigrant groups distributed leaflets suggesting that refugees could be carriers of diseases such as AIDS. There have also been racial attacks as in the community of Waterford, where an asylum seeker from Nigeria was seriously injured by racist youths.

Unfortunately, there are also no statistics that provide information on discriminatory practices against ethnic minorities in the countryside. Studies dealing with racism in Ireland have not focused on the particularities of the non-urban Irish social fabric. Here, the study, ACCEPT, represents an exception. This study was carried out in Waterford County and attempts to analyse the role of rural mentalities in patterns of discrimination. Irish Experts on racism and rural areas point out that the poverty and underdevelopment of rural areas as well as the lack of the necessary infrastructure to receive and integrate asylum seekers in the communities are the main causes for the rise of racism in rural areas.

17.1.1 Migration in Ireland

Ireland is a highly homogenous country. 92.7 percent of the population was born in Ireland and 1.1 percent outside of the European Union. The number of non-EU citizens increased from 8,400 in 1983 to 22,000 in 1997. In 1998, the overall number of immigrants to Ireland reached 44,000, almost half of whom were from the United Kingdom. 91.6 percent of the population is Roman Catholic. Protestants form the only significant religious minority (three percent). There is a small, long-established Jewish community of between 1,200 and 1,600 (0.04 percent) and 12,000 to 15,000 Muslims (0.4 percent) (IJPR: 2001).
There are over 25,000 Irish Travellers, an indigenous minority group (cf. Table 17.1).

In the late 1990s, there was a marked increase in the rate of inward migration to Ireland. Although these were largely returning Irish emigrants, there was also a sharp rise in the number of non-nationals migrating to Ireland. According to the Minister of Justice, 80 percent of immigrants have work permits or student visas. However, attention in recent years has focused on asylum seekers and refugees. In 1992, 39 people applied for asylum in Ireland, and by 2001 this had increased to 10,325. This is a rapid increase, but is still low compared to other EU countries. One of the most repeated assertions in explaining this increase is the pull factor of Ireland’s strong economy and low unemployment rate. This has led to asylum seekers being regarded as “bogus”, i.e., as economic migrants. According to the UNHCR, the principal countries of origin for asylum seekers in Ireland in 2001 were Nigeria (3,461), Romania (1,348) Moldova (549), the Ukraine (376), the Russian Federation (307) and Croatia (292) (USCR: 2002) (cf. Table 17.2).

In 2001, Ireland granted refugee status to 456 persons and a further 478 were granted asylum at the appeals stage. A further 70 people were granted temporary protection. 4,532 applications were denied during 2001, while 7,195 applications were deemed abandoned (USCR: 2002).

In 1997 the Irish media began to report on the “immigration problem” in which refugees were often described as bogus, spongers or scroungers who were coming to Ireland to take advantage of the “generous” social welfare system. The media also quoted some Gardai sources as saying that they were worried about the growing involvement of refugees in street crime and prostitution.

The Travellers are an indigenous minority community, traditionally nomadic, and are one of the most marginalised and disadvantaged groups in Irish society. Travellers fare poorly on every indicator used to measure disadvantage: unemployment, poverty, social exclusion, health, infant mortality (more than twice that of the general population), life expectancy (ten to twelve years less than the average), illiteracy (80 percent of adults), education, political representation, gender equality, access to credit, accommodation, etc. (O’Connell, 2002).

Anti-Traveller xenophobia in Ireland takes on a number of forms. Individuals who are recognised as Travellers are sometimes refused entry or access to public places or services, and often experience verbal or physical abuse. For many years, Travellers were segregated in the provision of social welfare services. Traveller children have often been segregated into “special” classes in schools. The most public form of discrimination is in the provision of accommodation. Local residents’ associations and local authorities often oppose Travellers living in their areas and there are frequent evictions of Travellers
from unofficial halting sites. In March 2002, the Irish parliament passed the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, which has been described as the Trespass Bill. Amendments to the act criminalize trespassing, which effectively criminalize nomadism. The government had claimed that the act would only be used against “large-scale commercial encampments”, however, Travellers have had their caravans seized and have been arrested for parking illegally. A number of Traveller groups and the Irish Council for Civil Liberties are campaigning to have the act repealed on the grounds that it victimises the Travelling community.

17.1.2 Migration in Rural Ireland

Ireland has a population density of 53 persons per square kilometre. According to the 1996 census, 42 percent of Ireland’s population lives in small villages and the open countryside. The remaining 58 percent live in combined towns and suburbs with more than 1,500 inhabitants. Rural areas are nationally at the highest risks of poverty, with problems of economic dependency, isolation and unequal opportunity combined with distance from services and amenities (cf. Figure 17.1).

Minority ethnic groups have tended to live in Dublin or Ennis, for a number of reasons. These locations are close to transport terminals (Ennis is close to Shannon International Airport). There is a higher availability of accommodation, services, economic opportunities and other people of the same ethnic or national origin, including family and friends. There is also a lack of affordable accommodation elsewhere and there is fear or experience of isolation or racism in other areas.

Until 2000, 80 percent of asylum seekers were based in Dublin. In April 2000, due to the acute shortage of accommodation in the Dublin area, the Irish government introduced a “direct provision” dispersal plan, whereby the financial allowance for food and accommodation was replaced by assigned housing located outside of Dublin and reduced social welfare payments. Asylum seekers are now housed in reception centres for two weeks, before being transferred to accommodation in 70 locations around the country, including small rural towns. They are given meals and a small weekly payment per person. A report by the Irish Refugee Council found that 92 percent of asylum seekers with children stated that they needed supplements to their food allowances, and that overcrowded and substandard accommodation has resulted in psychological stress and health and safety risks. (Irish Refugee Council: 2002). Language difficulties and lack of financial resources may also hinder asylum seekers from accessing medical care. There is also often a lack of sensitivity to the differing needs of asylum seekers from different countries and background (ECRI: 2002).
17.1.3 Rural Racism

There has been a recent increase in the number of racist incidents reported in Ireland, particularly in Dublin. These include verbal abuse, physical violence, discriminatory door policies in pubs and nightclubs, racist graffiti and the distribution of racist leaflets. In April 1998, the Gardai confirmed a claim by the Association for Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Ireland (ASARI) that members of ethnic minorities in some parts of Dublin’s inner city had been warned not to go out at night. So far there have been two racist murders. The NCCRI has initiated an online Racist Incidents Reporting Procedure for the purpose of identifying emerging patterns such as the location of such incidents. The Gardai have been reluctant to record crimes in terms of whether they are racially motivated or not, and at present there are no provisions in Irish criminal law defining common offences of a racist or xenophobic nature as specific offences (ECRI: 2002).

An Amnesty International survey, Racism in Ireland: The Views of Black and Ethnic Minorities (2001), found that 78 percent of the sample of 600 had experienced racism and 81.5 percent agreed that the government is not doing enough to combat racism. Only 14 percent said they believed that the Gardai take racist incidents seriously. Over 60 percent said that people who commit racist acts were not likely to be brought to justice, and most said they did not feel comfortable reporting racist incidents to the Gardai. (Amnesty International: 2001) A needs analysis survey conducted by the African Refugee Network in 1999 found that 89.7 percent of respondents had experienced racism in Ireland, with 68.75 percent experiencing verbal abuse, 25 percent physical abuse and 6.25 percent being arrested. 79 percent said that they were refused service in pubs and nightclubs (Lentin/McVeigh: 2002). A study by the Irish Refugee Council found that 4 out of the 10 asylum seekers allowed to work have experienced discrimination at the hands of recruiters and employers (IJPR: 2001). 48 international students interviewed reported 128 cases in which they had experienced discrimination, an average of 2.6 incidents per person (Boucher: 1998).

The government’s direct provision dispersal programme initially led to opposition in many parts of rural Ireland. There were vociferous campaigns in Wexford and Tipperary, with racist views expressed at public meetings about culture swamping and the spread of disease. In County Kildare, 300 people, including 70 children, marched in opposition to dispersal carrying placards stating, “Health - we are at risk”. A government plan to house 38 asylum seekers in a disused hotel in the village of Clogheen, County Tipperary (population 420) was postponed in April 2000 following an arson attack on the hotel and a picket mounted by the local villagers, who claimed that the refugees
would destroy the social fabric of the village. Also, in 2000, a Nigerian asylum-seeker who was sent to the town of Waterford was seriously assaulted by a group of youths. He was then followed by the same people who told him that they did not want any blacks in the town. He returned to Dublin and asked permission to stay there. In 1998, following a report that 250 Romanians had been smuggled illegally into the port of Rosslare, the local newspaper, the Wexford Leader, described the refugees as wearing designer clothes, eating in restaurants and living in expensive flats courtesy of the Irish taxpayers. The article claimed that the public services were being brought to breaking point (Pollack: 1999). In a survey carried out by County Wexford’s Parish House Community in 2000, 95 percent of African asylum-seekers had encountered racist abuse, the figure for the total number of asylum seekers was 80 percent.

The depiction in the media of refugees as “bogus” and the already existing prejudices against outsiders and Travellers has been combined with resentment against the central Dublin government imposing the “immigration problem” on rural Ireland without consultation. In May 2000, the Sunday Independent featured an article entitled: Villages Cannot Veto Immigrant Influx. The first sentence read: “The head of the Directorate of Asylum Support Service has warned that rural communities will not be allowed to veto the arrival of immigrants among them or negotiate the number to be accommodated.” In the same newspaper, the political correspondent, Joseph O’Malley, wrote of the effect on political careers due to rural outrage against the government dispersal, “Certainly it could strain social cohesion as tensions rise among local communities directly affected by the government’s new ‘dispersal’ policy in the placement of asylum seekers, and who are outraged by the failure to consult adequately in advance.” (White: 2002).

Rural racism has incorporated a number of ideas, including that of culture swamping, whereby the strong social cohesion could not easily incorporate other cultures and there is a “common sense” view that people from different cultures do not mix. There is also the idea of a threshold of tolerance, that a community can cope with a certain quota of outsiders, but should not be pushed beyond that point. Racism is also expressed with the idea that immigrants could be carriers of infectious diseases, such as hepatitis and tuberculosis. In Clonakilty, County Cork, anti-immigrant groups distributed leaflets warning that AIDS is rampant in many of the countries of origin of the refugees. However, according to the ECRI, the wave of hostility that met the dispersal policy has died down and many local communities have been instrumental in taking steps to welcome asylum seekers and set up various support structures (ECRI: 2002) The UNHCR reported that local resistance to the dispersal plan declined during 2001 (USCR: 2002).

One empirical study has been carried out in rural Ireland, the ACCEPT project, which looked at the impact of discrimination in rural areas, and was carried out
in County Waterford. The study was based on opinion polls among the local population, asking people what they thought about discrimination or whether they were victims of discrimination. The study focused on whether rural mentality was a cause for discrimination. The results found the existence of a strong rural mentality, but this did not translate into a rejection of minority groups. The Irish sample believed that discrimination effected gypsies and Travellers most severely (European Project ACCEPT: 2001).

There is a lack of specific research into rural racism in Ireland. This may be due to the relatively recent phenomenon of significant minority groups settling in rural Ireland. Meanwhile, the research into Anti-Traveller racism has not tended to differentiate between rural and urban discrimination. It may be that the causes and motives for racism in Ireland are similar in both rural and urban settings, although until more research is carried out into the specific forms of rural racism this will be uncertain. The range of anti-racism institutions and programmes have only recently been introduced and it will take some time before their impact can be assessed.

17.1.4 Good practices

Ireland recently established a Human Rights Commission, whose duties include examining governmental legislative proposals and promoting awareness of human rights. New initiatives have been taken to introduce human rights education into schools at primary and secondary level. The National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI) was established by the Department of Justice in 1998, with the aim of providing an ongoing structure to develop programmes and actions aimed at developing an integrated approach against racism and to act in a policy advisory role. It is a partnership of twenty state agencies, social partners, government departments and NGOs. In 2001, it launched a public awareness campaign Know Racism, with 4.5 million Euros of government funding. It has developed an anti-racism protocol for all political parties, established a Community Development Unit to provide support to refugees and asylum seekers, and provides ant-racist training in various state agencies. Furthermore, the police force has established a Garda Racial and Intercultural Office with responsibility for co-ordinating, monitoring and advising on all aspects of policing in this area.

Following the direct provision plan and the dispersal of asylum seekers throughout the country a number of support groups were set up by local groups to help asylum seekers and to counter any upsurge in racism. In Cork, which had previously seen few asylum seekers, 800 were accommodated in four hotels as a result of dispersal. Three organisations: Comhlamh Action for
Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants (CARASI), Immigrant Solidarity, and Welcome English Classes worked together to lobby, form outreach programmes for workshops and classes on anti-racism, and organise English classes for asylum seekers. These groups formed NASC, the Irish Immigrant Support Centre, in June 2000.

In 2002, the Irish Government held a consultation process towards the development of the Irish National Action Plan Against Racism, including a national conference held in March 2002 involving representatives from government, national expert bodies (i.e., NCCRI, Human Rights Commission and the Equality Authority) and NGOs.

The Community Workers Co-operative, based in Tuam, County Galway, is active in community work and in promoting social change in Ireland and in its submission to the National Action Plan Against Racism in Ireland, it called for the inclusion of minority groups in the focus of the Local Government Reform Process, and the needs of these groups to be included in the Strategic Policy Committee and County/City Development Boards. It also called for anti-racism to be included in the school curriculum at junior levels and to include anti-racism training in teacher training (CWC: 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1000]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>3422.2</td>
<td>3505.3</td>
<td>3508.3</td>
<td>3546.2</td>
<td>3593.8</td>
<td>3626.7</td>
<td>3660.4</td>
<td>3687.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non EU</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>126.5</td>
<td>151.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ireland</td>
<td>3505.0</td>
<td>3601.5</td>
<td>3626.1</td>
<td>3660.6</td>
<td>3704.8</td>
<td>3744.5</td>
<td>3786.9</td>
<td>3839.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSO. (a) Annual Series of Labour Surveys, 1983-1997
(b) Quarterly National Household Surveys 1998-2001 (second quarter).
### Table 17.2: Origin of Asylum Applicants in Ireland 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia, FR</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. of Moldova</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. Rep. of the Congo</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>4009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7724</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNHCR*
Fig. 17.1: Population Density per km² in 1996 on the Level of Counties

source: http://www.irelandstory.com/maps/island_density.gif, 15/10/02
Table 17.3: Sectors in which Non-EU Nationals were Employed under Work Permits, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permits Issued and Renewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2 980</td>
<td>4 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1 750</td>
<td>2 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3 869</td>
<td>3 291</td>
<td>3 780</td>
<td>4 941</td>
<td>5 130</td>
<td>13 276</td>
<td>22 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Nursing</td>
<td>2 120</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1 360</td>
<td>1 781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>3 920</td>
<td>7 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Sport</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1 029</td>
<td>1 300</td>
<td>2 129</td>
<td>3 093</td>
<td>3 355</td>
<td>6 655</td>
<td>11 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4 279</td>
<td>3 770</td>
<td>4 492</td>
<td>5 716</td>
<td>6 262</td>
<td>18 006</td>
<td>29 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The period in 2001 covered in the Table is from January to mid-October.

*Source: Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment*
Figure 17.2: Non-EU Nationals working in Ireland by Economic Sector in 2000

Note: some 18,000 work permits were issued for non-EU nationals in 2000
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18. Italy

18.1 Country Report

It should be stressed that the discussion on racism in Italy started with a racist incident in the small community of Vila Laterna, which lies in the countryside close to Naples. Jerry Moslow, a young South African refugee who had worked as a tomato grower, was robbed and murdered by people who came from marginal contexts. This incident in the countryside was the starting point of anti-racist activities in Italy.

Another incident connected with the ethnic origin of victims took place in Tavilere in Pulia Ortenova. Tavilere is a village of peasant farmers, the main product is grapes in this area. Immigrants were active as irrigation workers. After the immigration of new workers, a revolt took place, the background being a struggle for employment in the village. There was much damage done. Several publications were presented on these activities.

Despite these cases, there have not been many other incidents. Racism in Italian rural areas has no visible forms. According to experts, the racism in rural areas find its form of expression in the poorer living and work conditions of immigrants. Many immigrants working in the harvest do not have a legal status, receive very low salaries, live in huts and mostly isolated from each and from the local population.

Despite of a few studies on immigrants working in the agriculture, there are no research focusing on patterns of immigration and racism in the countryside in Italy. Here, the part dealing with Italy of the study ACCEPT is an exception. It was carried out in the region of Liguria and put the focus of attention on the question of rural identity as cause for discrimination.

There are also no statistical data that illustrate patterns of immigration and racism in the countryside. There are only statistics on so-called legal immigrants working in agriculture. Nevertheless, these statistics are not representative because of the considerable dimension of the illegal employment in the agriculture. Because of the lack of data and studies on immigration and rural racism it is necessary to develop research in this field.
18.1.1 Migration

Italy has experienced a pronounced increase of migration flows since the beginning of the 1990s (cf. Table 18.1). There are several reasons for this increase: a more restrictive policy toward the migration in countries that were typical destinations of migration flows, such as Germany or England; the growth of the Italian labour market for non-skilled jobs; and the strengthening of the economic, social and political crises in the countries of origin. Not only has this led to an increase of the immigration to Italy, but also to a change in the composition of the major groups of immigrants in the last ten years. The immigration from Africa and from the Balkan countries, particularly from Bosnia and Kosovo, has increased notably in the last years. This growth of immigration has not been accompanied by governmental policies intended to solve the problems that have arisen from a lack of infrastructure necessary for the reception of migration flows. The development of such legislation in the field of migration has not emerged as an initiative of the Italian government, but rather took place in the framework of the unification of legislation among the EU countries (Melicia: 2001).

The lack of a migration policy on the part of the Italian government has contributed to a deepening of the problems that have emerged from the immigration. Racist tendencies in the Italian society have been amplified by populist political parties, which have manipulated the topic of migration in order to find an audience among voters. Particularly, members of the Lega Nord and the Allianza Nationale have been active in the spreading of racist propaganda (ECRI: 2002). The fact that these both parties are part of the Italian government shows how extensive xenophobic prejudices can be among the population, which contradicts the image of a open southern Europe (Campani: 1995).

The role of the media in the spreading of negative images of migration should be stressed. Similar to political discourses, the dominant discourses of the media present immigrants as a threat for security, for the social welfare of Italians and for the cultural homogeneity of Italy. These discourses have also strengthened negative attitudes toward immigrants. A survey carried out by the organisation Rete d’urgenza contro il razzismo shows the areas where there are the most verified cases of racial or xenophobic discrimination for the year 1999. More than 20 percent of the cases are related to problems of entry, residence, free circulation and citizenship. Other areas of discrimination involve the housing market (seven percent), the workplace (13 percent), goods and services (23 percent), law and order enforcement agencies (15 percent), law (three percent), education (three percent) and individuals (13 percent). This study also shows that racial violence does not represent an exception to the forms of discrimination, even though it is not the most usual form (Rete d’urgenza contro il razzismo: 1999).
18.1.2 Migration in Rural Areas

The most migrants live in the large cities of Italy (cf. Fig. 18.1 / Table 18.2). Only a small number of these live in the countryside. Here, most of them work in agriculture. The agricultural activity is, in the most cases, the first step after immigration. The figure of registered immigrants working in agriculture increased from 5.8 percent in 1998 to 7.6 percent in 2000 (cf. Table 18.4). In 2000 10.6 percent of the newly employed immigrants worked in agriculture (cf. Table 18.5). Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that there is no trustworthy data on immigrants working in the agriculture; in areas with small farms and enterprises there are no numbers available at all.

Many immigrants work for a salary which is between ten and 20 percent less than that which an Italian worker in agriculture earns. Most of the immigrants in the countryside live in tents or dilapidated houses. It was mentioned in an interview that the situation in which farmers and peasants live and that the inclusion of foreign workers into the agricultural activities varies from place to place. There are places in northern Italy where the immigrants are more or less accepted, possess a legal status and live as industrial workers, some of them in farms and others in farms-related factories. This connection is a special feature in northern Italy where the product development is still a village activity and also where many small farms have established a known landscape of production. Most of the immigrants working in these enterprises related to the agricultural production have very good qualifications due to their educational backgrounds. In the north of Italy unemployment is low, such that racism is a phenomenon of the south. In other areas immigrants are held as family members or, on the contrary, are treated as quasi slaves in the farm’s division of labour. Furthermore, there are immigrant seasonal workers who work in plantations, growing and harvesting fruits and vegetables such as olives. Such seasonal workers still come by means of internal immigration movements. However, there is a growing number of immigrants from abroad.

In order to understand the immigration to the Italian countryside, it is important to take into consideration the differences in the agricultural production in various parts of Italy. The social and political formations are different in relation to these production differences. Whereas the south has a dominance of the Mediterranean agriculture, the north has an agricultural production that is more continental and varies from province to province. The agricultural product development in northern Italy has established a very rich agricultural countryside, attracting more immigration flows.
Racism in the Italian countryside does not seem to assume violent forms. Experts and anti-racist activists have stressed in interviews that the discrimination against immigrants find its expression in their poor living conditions and in the economic over-exploitation, from which they suffer greatly. The immigrants, coming mostly from Eastern Europe – some of them are refugees from Bosnia and Kosovo – work in agriculture in the region of Toscana. They receive very low salaries, live in huts, are mostly isolated from each other and from the local population. There are no aggressive attitudes from the Italian people toward these immigrants. Integrative measures like language courses have been undertaken only for the immigrants from Bosnia and Kosovo.

According to interviewed researchers, there are no specifics of a rural racism. There is no link between the characteristics of the Italian rural society and the forms of expressions of racism in rural areas. It should be spoken of particular characteristics of racism corresponding to the different paths of development at the local or regional level. A differentiation should be made between northern and southern Italy.

In northern Italy, racism is connected to the ideological programme of the Lega Nord. Migrants are not discriminated against because of any phenotypical features or origin, but rather because of their not belonging to the northern Italian ethnic society. Nevertheless, there are two levels in the racist discourses of the Lega Nord. The level of racist discourse is the typical discourse, which presents migrants as persons who abuse the social system and who are a threat for security. In southern Italy, the racism that exists does not have the ideological background that is does in northern Italy. Discrimination lies in the living conditions of migrants that emerge from the over-exploitation of which they are victims. The fact that the landowners need the labour force of migrants reduces the potential for racial discrimination. In southern Italy, the probability of integration is larger when the migrants are in families. This can be observed in the attitudes of the population towards the migrant groups. Last but not least, the presence of solidarity on part of a revolutionary proletarian community was mentioned by researchers.

Regarding rural racism, one empirical study should be mentioned. The project ACCEPT, was carried out in the region of Ligura in the province of Imperia. In this region, there has an increase of immigration, particularly from northern Africa and Albania. This study was based on opinion polls among the local population. The interviewed people were asked, for example, what they thought about discrimination or whether they feel discriminated. The study centered on the question of rural identity as a cause for discrimination. Unfortunately, this study gives no information on the occupations and living
conditions of the immigrants. The study finds out that northern African and Gypsy persons are discriminated more than other discriminated groups like older persons, homosexuals and handicapped persons (Foyer Rural CEPAGE: 2001).

Despite this study, there is very little literature on racism in rural areas in Italy. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to analyse this phenomenon. Nevertheless, it could be said that there is no extensive racial violence in the Italian countryside. Ethnic discrimination finds its sharpest form of expression in the poorer living and work conditions of the immigrants in the countryside. There exist differences with regards to the exploitation of immigrants according to the different paths of development in the rural areas of the different regions and according to the different social and political formations emerging from these. In any case, it is necessary that studies be carried out in this field in order to develop strategies to fight the ethnic discrimination in the Italian countryside.
18.2 Statistics and Data

Fig. 18.1: Regional Population Density and Regional Share on Non-Nationals

Table 18.1: Stock of Foreign Population by Nationality, by Residence Permits and Municipal Registries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>119481</td>
<td>131406</td>
<td>145843</td>
<td>149491</td>
<td>159599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>63967</td>
<td>83807</td>
<td>91637</td>
<td>115755</td>
<td>142066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>31673</td>
<td>38138</td>
<td>37114</td>
<td>51620</td>
<td>68929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>57071</td>
<td>61285</td>
<td>67574</td>
<td>61004</td>
<td>65353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>29073</td>
<td>37838</td>
<td>38038</td>
<td>47108</td>
<td>60075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>54652</td>
<td>59572</td>
<td>55839</td>
<td>47568</td>
<td>47418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>44821</td>
<td>48909</td>
<td>47261</td>
<td>44044</td>
<td>45680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>48258</td>
<td>44370</td>
<td>40848</td>
<td>54698</td>
<td>40039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>31871</td>
<td>34831</td>
<td>35897</td>
<td>37413</td>
<td>38982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>36515</td>
<td>40079</td>
<td>40749</td>
<td>35372</td>
<td>37269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>24921</td>
<td>28162</td>
<td>31294</td>
<td>29861</td>
<td>33669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>23785</td>
<td>26171</td>
<td>27664</td>
<td>28264</td>
<td>32841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>27375</td>
<td>31329</td>
<td>28199</td>
<td>27711</td>
<td>31372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>19417</td>
<td>22620</td>
<td>25320</td>
<td>25608</td>
<td>30338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>21738</td>
<td>24362</td>
<td>26832</td>
<td>26470</td>
<td>29896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>25585</td>
<td>28333</td>
<td>29477</td>
<td>25077</td>
<td>26354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>24779</td>
<td>26771</td>
<td>27018</td>
<td>22371</td>
<td>23203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>16419</td>
<td>12434</td>
<td>18566</td>
<td>18563</td>
<td>21988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>11145</td>
<td>10752</td>
<td>14052</td>
<td>14767</td>
<td>20826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>11229</td>
<td>11324</td>
<td>13767</td>
<td>15991</td>
<td>19491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>16379</td>
<td>14374</td>
<td>17884</td>
<td>18172</td>
<td>19360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>19887</td>
<td>23008</td>
<td>19747</td>
<td>18013</td>
<td>19277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16842</td>
<td>15845</td>
<td>20410</td>
<td>17350</td>
<td>18700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>10133</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13434</td>
<td>18259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>17923</td>
<td>18611</td>
<td>20837</td>
<td>17470</td>
<td>17625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>18865</td>
<td>20464</td>
<td>17661</td>
<td>15921</td>
<td>16942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>9970</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12327</td>
<td>13455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>11311</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12381</td>
<td>13216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia Herzeg.</td>
<td>11068</td>
<td>7749</td>
<td>8779</td>
<td>10399</td>
<td>11869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>9012</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>7023</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>13688</td>
<td>6718</td>
<td>13357</td>
<td>11034</td>
<td>9931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6678</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4435</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>194276</td>
<td>331125</td>
<td>288650</td>
<td>226740</td>
<td>188654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1095600</td>
<td>1240721</td>
<td>1250214</td>
<td>1251997</td>
<td>1388153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: EU</td>
<td>152100</td>
<td>168125</td>
<td>171601</td>
<td>145787</td>
<td>151799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* data not available
Source: Ministry of interior, ISTAT 2001 / Sopemi Report Italy 2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1982</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>development 1982-2000 [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V..Aosta</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>379.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>15554</td>
<td>83811</td>
<td>538.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>63363</td>
<td>308408</td>
<td>486.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liguria</td>
<td>13398</td>
<td>38784</td>
<td>289.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NordOvest</td>
<td>92972</td>
<td>433497</td>
<td>466.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trentino A.A.</td>
<td>6511</td>
<td>31799</td>
<td>488.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>17255</td>
<td>139522</td>
<td>808.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friuli V.G.</td>
<td>16471</td>
<td>43432</td>
<td>263.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia R.</td>
<td>22342</td>
<td>113048</td>
<td>506.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NordEst</td>
<td>6785</td>
<td>377801</td>
<td>593.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td>15552</td>
<td>761298</td>
<td>489.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscana</td>
<td>19264</td>
<td>114972</td>
<td>596.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>23463</td>
<td>26068</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche</td>
<td>5232</td>
<td>35777</td>
<td>683.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>9775</td>
<td>245666</td>
<td>252.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro</td>
<td>145189</td>
<td>422483</td>
<td>290.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abruzzo</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>18933</td>
<td>446.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molise</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>416.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>21505</td>
<td>68159</td>
<td>316.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>8099</td>
<td>35565</td>
<td>439.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>775.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>2903</td>
<td>15315</td>
<td>527.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sud</td>
<td>37637</td>
<td>143121</td>
<td>380.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilia</td>
<td>13796</td>
<td>49808</td>
<td>367.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardeena</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>114443</td>
<td>345.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isole</td>
<td>17053</td>
<td>61251</td>
<td>359.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIA</td>
<td>355431</td>
<td>1388153</td>
<td>390.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: istat 2001, modified
Table 18.3: Asylum Seekers in 2000 (Excluding Dependents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>13 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3 528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (ex Zaire)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24 477</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Interior 2002, Sopemi Report Italy 2001

Table 18.4: Registered Agricultural Workers 1998-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-nationals</th>
<th>Italians</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% non-nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>55 080</td>
<td>893 281</td>
<td>948 361</td>
<td>5,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>64 564</td>
<td>895 746</td>
<td>960 310</td>
<td>6,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>73 259</td>
<td>891 518</td>
<td>964 777</td>
<td>7,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SOPEMI Italy 2001
Table 18.5: Court Decisions Based on Racial Grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House breaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent assaults</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression of Fascism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of CERD and other norms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of the arms and explosives act</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propaganda offences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 18.6: Immigrants in Employment Sectors (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sectors</th>
<th>new employed immigrants</th>
<th>% of total employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>handwork</td>
<td>115 669</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostels</td>
<td>81 184</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture</td>
<td>54 479</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction</td>
<td>50 759</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate</td>
<td>44 940</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commerce</td>
<td>27 742</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborazioni Caritas/Dossier Statistico Immigrazione 2001
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19. Luxembourg

19.1 Country Report

Luxembourg has a very high percent of foreigners, and most of them are EU-citizens. Because of the high prices of housing accommodations in Luxembourg City and surrounding the capital, in the last years foreigners have moved into rural areas. Statistics provide information on the regional distribution of foreigners across the country. Some of the foreigners living in the countryside are non-EU citizens, in particular asylum seekers. These often live in remote villages where there is hardly any transportation to urban areas. Unfortunately, there are no data or studies that provide us information on the living conditions of immigrants in rural areas. Rural racism does not seem to be a big problem in Luxembourg.

19.1.1 Immigration

Luxembourg has a very high percent of foreigners. In 2001, 37 percent of the population were foreigners and 87 percent of the foreigners were EU nationals (Statec: 2001). Portuguese constitute the largest group of foreigners, followed by Italians, who were the largest group between the Second World War and the 1970s (cf. Table 19.1). In the second half of the 1990s, a rise in the number of asylum seekers was observed. Most of the asylum seekers stem from the former Yugoslavia (cf. Table 19.2). Many of the applicants for asylum are accompanied by their families and reside in pensions, hotels, or at campgrounds during the summer months.

Of the 118 municipalities in Luxembourg, there are none with fewer than 12 percent foreigners (cf. Figure 19.1). The population of the three largest cities in the country, Luxembourg City, Esch/Alzette and Differlingen, consists of more than 40 percent foreigners. The percentage in Luxembourg City is 54 percent. 56 percent of the foreigners in Luxembourg are concentrated in the 12 largest cities.

Most of the migrants in Luxembourg consist of labour migrants and their families, stemming predominantly from other member states of the European Union, especially Portuguese. A partial connection between labour structures and migration flows exists: certain sectors rely more and more on foreign workers, including the building and construction sectors, domestic help in hotels and restaurants, cleaning companies, transport and farming.
Foreigners with unresolved statuses also work within these sectors. The working conditions in these sectors are often difficult and the salary conditions are often poor.

This concentration of foreigners in some labour market sectors is one of the reasons why the communities of Luxembourghian and foreigners functions in a partly parallel manner. This is especially the case for the most numerous migrant group, the Portuguese, who are primarily involved in Portuguese associations. However, the Baleine study showed that the Luxembourgers more frequently take part in organizations than foreigners (SESOP: 1998b).

The Commissions Consultative Communales pour Étrangers is the only official structure that, among other things, aims towards promoting the participation of foreigners in municipal life. These local authorities offer additional advice to foreigners about specific problems. For every community with more than 20 percent foreigners, these commissions are obligatory. These commissions also deal with living, health and safety problems as well as the welfare aid for foreigners. Thus, the commissions have a political role, but they also organise social and cultural events (such as language courses and friendship parties between the different nationalities).

The degree of undocumented immigration to Luxembourg is difficult to estimate. When the legalization campaign started in 2001, the estimated numbers of unrecorded cases from the side of the labour unions sometimes reached 5,000 persons. The campaign for the legalization of foreigners without a residence permit or a status worthy of a residence permit was in fact a regularisation for foreigners in the labour market. 1,657 applications were filed (2,886 with the inclusion of family members).

19.1.2 Rural Areas

The population density of Luxembourg is 170 persons per square kilometre. 89 percent of the Luxembourghian territory is in use for agriculture or forest. The capital, Luxembourg City, is situated in the south of the country. Its surroundings are also rather urbanised and together form the only larger agglomeration in Luxembourg. The south of the country is industrialised (mining region), and the northern half of the country is a more rural region. The population in this northern part is characterised by a certain degree of rural mentality. Solidarity is higher in the north and is not present in the same way in the other parts of the country.

Luxembourg’s size hinders a distinction between rural and urban areas. Due to the expense and high costs of finding housing accommodations in Luxembourg
City and surrounding the capital, both Luxembourgers and foreigners alike have been primarily settling in areas located farther away from the capital within the last few years.

Today, the strong presence of foreigners is reflected in all municipalities throughout Luxembourg, also in the more rural areas. Furthermore, there have been a few rural areas already in existence for quite some time, in which the foreign population has always been very strong, sometimes due to historical reasons. For instance, among the 1,742 residents in the Larochette population, for instance, 63 percent are foreigners, most of whom are Portuguese. These moved into cheap, empty, workers’ apartments in the 1960s—phenomenon that increased by the 1970s. Larochette represents the Luxembourg municipality with the highest number of foreigners.

Over the last thirty years, a wide dispersal of foreigners across all areas took place: In 1970, there were 36 municipalities with fewer than 10 percent foreigners, in 1981, there were only 18, in 1991, only 6 and in 2001, there were no municipalities left fewer than 10 percent foreigners. In the rural bordering areas of Germany and Belgium, for instance, a high number of foreigners from these neighbouring countries settled. Besides these foreigners, there are also non-EU foreigners located in rural areas. Those from the former Yugoslavia who are living in the rural areas, are either labour migrants (of these, many received residence permits during the legalisation campaign), applicants for asylums or refused applicants for asylum. A large percentage of applicants for asylum find accommodations in family pensions or hotels. The Bosnians among them are mostly integrated into the society as labour migrants, as are some of the Cape Verdeans as well. Others have an illegal status. Polish migrants mostly work legally (for example, in vintage) while some work illegally in other branches of agriculture.

Some asylum seekers find accommodations in remote rural areas, where there is hardly any transportation to municipal urban areas. By reviewing a document from the Luxembourg Refugee Council, it has been argued that rural accommodations in remote villages have sometimes been used as a form of punishment for applicants for political asylum.

Foreigners living in rural areas work mostly in the agricultural sector, but also in hotels and restaurants. According to official information, 3,482 independent farmers work in the agricultural fields. Those working in a dependent labour relationship amount to 1,238 employees. Foreigners make up only four percent of independent farmers, whereas they represent 71 percent of the second group. These numbers do not say anything about the quality of employee-employer relationships. However, some sectors, such as farming and restaurants, are seasonal, often meaning that time limits and temporary contracts are involved. Nowadays, many Poles (between 500 and 700) have been working at wine
vintages in the Luxembourg Mosel. In accordance with a simple hiring procedure, these employees have been awarded legal access to this labour market since 1992.

### 19.1.3 Racism in Rural Areas

In general, racism and xenophobia was less pronounced in Luxembourg than in other European countries. This could be linked to low rates of unemployment.

According to the *European Values Study* from 1999, there is a reserved, yet sometimes shared opinion among the population of Luxembourg in regard to immigration (Halman: 2001). Most Luxembourgers stated that they accept foreigners under certain conditions. However, 20 percent hardly tolerate foreigners at all.

Racism in Luxembourg seems to be based on lack of knowledge and anxiousness when dealing with the unknown. It is mostly expressed by symbolic racism and only sometimes by violence. Nevertheless, a number of racist and anti-Semitic incidents took place in 1994. Since then, no larger confrontations have taken place. In 1994, several hundred Nazis from Germany, the Netherlands, France and Belgium came to Luxembourg. The racist violence and threats in 1994 caused a lot of agitation among the Luxembourgian population.

Since then, racial violence and the right-wing movements have disappeared out of the Luxembourg landscape. In the 1980s, the fascist, ultra-nationalistic and anti-European National-Bewegong (NB) tried to gather votes by focusing on xenophobic propaganda. They distributed pamphlets, the targets of which were the Portuguese and the war refugees from the former Yugoslavia. The NB attained less than three percent during the parliamentary elections of 1994 and dispersed in 1995.

At the moment, no radical right groups or structures exist in the rural areas of Luxembourg. In the 1980s and 1990s, some regionalist initiatives tried to organise themselves politically. In 1989, the Lescht fir den Eislecker was strongly oriented towards regionalism and obtained 1.6 percent of the votes in the northern election district. The Eislecker Fraiheetsbewegung, a branch of the nationalistic movement, obtained 1.8 percent of the votes in the elections of 1994. These kind of movements were not present in the last years. In the community elections of 1999, they played no role whatsoever.

Until now, no specified studies were carried out in Luxembourg to investigate rural racism. The Comité de Liaison et d’Action des Etrangers (CLAE) organises
intercultural projects and has different information points all over Luxembourg. Specific projects for the improvement of living conditions of migrants in rural areas do not exist. There is one project, OASIS, led by the Luxembourg Caritas, that primarily attempts to integrate refugee women from the former Yugoslavia and promotes co-operative living among foreigners and Luxembourgian communities.
### 19.2 Statistics and Data

#### Table 19.1: Luxembourg: Population by Nationality 1991-2002*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384 400</td>
<td>406 600</td>
<td>435 700</td>
<td>444 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourgers</td>
<td>271 350</td>
<td>274 100</td>
<td>276 300</td>
<td>277 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nationals</td>
<td>113 050</td>
<td>132 500</td>
<td>159 400</td>
<td>166 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>13 000</td>
<td>14 340</td>
<td>18 780</td>
<td>20 905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgians</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>11 340</td>
<td>14 520</td>
<td>15 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>8 800</td>
<td>9 520</td>
<td>10 500</td>
<td>10 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>3 500</td>
<td>3 760</td>
<td>3 840</td>
<td>3 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>19 500</td>
<td>19 740</td>
<td>20 130</td>
<td>19 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>39 100</td>
<td>49 400</td>
<td>57 030</td>
<td>59 770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2 500</td>
<td>2 740</td>
<td>2 970</td>
<td>2 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>3 200</td>
<td>4 010</td>
<td>4 580</td>
<td>4 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1 020</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>1 280</td>
<td>1 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>1 890</td>
<td>2 040</td>
<td>2 010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrians</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1 050</td>
<td>1 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9 200</td>
<td>12 690</td>
<td>20 450</td>
<td>23 540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Statec Luxemburg;*  
Figure 19.1: Percentage of Foreigners per Community, January 2000
Table 19.2: Origin of Asylum Applicants in Luxembourg 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia, FR</td>
<td>2606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statec Luxembourg (2001)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR Macedonia</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakstan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. of Moldova</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2 819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR
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20. The Netherlands

20.1 Country Report

It should be stressed that due to the widely spread urbanisation processes, it is not easy to speak about rural areas in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, one can find villages and small towns with rural life-worlds. Two main patterns of discrimination against foreigners in the countryside in the Netherlands. One pattern of discrimination is related to the bad living and work conditions of foreigners working in the agricultural sector. Most of them are seasonal workers, mostly from Eastern Europe. A further pattern of discrimination against immigrants is connected to the refugees decentralization policy of the government. The communities often lack sufficient resources to receive and integrate asylum seekers. This fact is often used by local politicians and media creating and diffusing a negative picture of the foreigners. As consequence, in many villages and small towns there have been actions of protest of the autochthonous population against the settlement of asylum seekers in their communities as in Eerden (a small village in Brabant) towards the planned centre for asylum seekers. Problems of racism in villages and small towns in the countryside are aggravated by the presence of right-wing militant groups. According to experts, feelings of belonging to a community contribute to strengthen negative attitudes towards immigrants.

Unfortunately, there are no systematized statistics that provide information on discriminatory practices against immigrants or with racist violence in rural areas in the Netherlands. The research in these field is also not extensive.

20.1.1 Migration

In 1999, 17 percent of the inhabitants of the Netherlands were persons of non-native origin. Approximately half of these were of Western origin. Two-thirds of the ‘non-western migrants’ in the Netherlands stem from Turkey, Morocco, Suriname, Netherlands Antilles and Aruba (cf. Table 20.1). Turks and Moroccans came to the Netherlands in the 1960s and 1970s as labour migrants intended for the industrial zones and, as a consequence, tend to concentrate in the west of the Netherlands, the most urbanised area of the Netherlands. Surinamese and Antilleans, who mostly came to the Netherlands in the mid-1970s, are also settled in urbanised agglomerations as their goals were mostly to study or work.
The third wave of immigration took place in the 1990s and consisted of asylum seekers and refugees. Asylum seekers, mainly from Afghanistan, Iraq and the former Yugoslavia (cf. Table 20.3), live less concentrated in the four largest cities in the Netherlands than ‘traditional migrants’ do. These live in asylum centres, mostly in smaller villages and are spread throughout the whole country. Many asylum seekers stay in these villages after being recognised as refugees. The policy concerning the assignment of living quarters for recognised asylum seekers aims to spread asylum seekers and refugees equally throughout the country.

The controls intended to stop the phenomenon of illegal immigration are rather severe. Official estimates state that the number of illegal persons in the Netherlands is limited to 100,000.

In general, non-western immigrants live very unevenly spread throughout the Netherlands. 40 percent live in the four largest cities of the country, while only 13 percent of the total population of the Netherlands inhabit these cities (cf. Figure 20.1). The non-Dutch population is mainly concentrated in the west and (cf. Figure 20.2). In most of the 500 communities in the Netherlands, the number of foreigners is rather low: Only 50 communities have a percentage of non-western migrants higher than the country’s average of 8.9 percent (cf. Figure 20.3). In more than 200 communities the percentage of these migrants is less than 2 percent (Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek: 2001).

20.1.2 Rural Areas

Rural researchers in the Netherlands make a distinction between three forms of a rural identification (de Haan: 1998). The first form refers to “localists“, who attach importance to a sense of community and good neighbourhood relations. Their way of life is strongly orientated locally and they are reluctant to accept urban influences. Rurality is for them a way to construct their own identity and the identity of others, which results in a strong dualistic way of thinking. Secondly, the researchers defined a group referred to as “naturalists“. These do not identify as strongly with the social-cultural character or the rural society. Instead, they attach more importance to nature and quietness. Thirdly, there are “regionalists“, who identify themselves with the region and who long for security and an authentic atmosphere. The question to be posed is which rural identity still exists in the rural areas of the Netherlands.

The increase in mobility and the increasing degree of urbanisation in the rural areas of the Netherlands have caused the social cohesion in rural villages to change quickly in the last decades. Social geographers have shown in their recent research that the social local cohesion in rural areas in the Netherlands is
still strong and that a strong social ‘middle’ (participation in local organisations, volunteer work, etc.) still exists (Thissen and Drooglever-Fortuijn: 1999). At the same time, this research makes clear that the traditional forms of local social cohesion are becoming less and less evident and that it is not always easy to develop new forms of local social cohesion.

Approximately 10 percent of the Netherlands can be considered to be rural areas with small villages. More often than not, cities are to be found in close proximity to the rural regions. Despite this, a rural culture still exists in the Netherlands. This is expressed through specific dialects, social structures in small villages and the strong presence of associations. However, the rural structures in the Netherlands are uncomparable to those in other countries (e.g., Spain, Germany, etc.).

In the Netherlands, problems with the integration of migrants mostly take place in urban areas, whereas the isolated families in the rural regions are significantly better integrated. With the exception of asylum seekers, one can conclude that very few migrants live in rural regions. Those who do often work in the agricultural sector.

Agriculture, an important sector in the Netherlands (greenhouses) is highly modernised and “industrialised”. 130,000 regular workers are employed in the sector and at least the same number are seasonal and foreign migrant workers (legal or illegal). Most of the production is concentrated in the Westland, which is an urbanised area. Two-thirds of the work in the agricultural sector is seasonal work. The working conditions are bad and the salaries low. According to the ILO, employers have the tendency to employ numerous illegal persons from different nationalities. The official percentage here was 23 percent in 2000 (Brodal, Behr: 2002). Turks and Moroccans, who have worked in this sector over longer periods of time, are being replaced by Eastern Europeans. Due to the economic importance of this sector, few controls exist. Recently, most of the foreigners in the sector have been employed by interim offices founded by legal migrants who know the community of foreigners. In the year 2000, more than 1,000 of these offices existed.

20.1.3 Racism in Rural Areas

Until now, no specific research has been done on racism in the Dutch countryside. The racism expert van Donselaar stated during an interview that he does not consider the separation between “urban” and “rural” as appropriate for the Netherlands.

In general, the number of racist attacks outside the western part of the Netherlands increased in the last years. More attacks outside of the cities with a high
migrant concentration were reported, as was the case in more rural areas. In some regions there is a weak link to the neo-Nazi scene. This is, for example, the case in the province of Limburg, where contacts to Belgium and Germany exist. After the 11th of September 2001, stronger anti-Islamic tendencies were observed in the Netherlands. In general, more attacks on Muslims and mosques took place in the Netherlands. This increase, however, was especially evident in the larger cities.

The opening of new asylum centres all over the country caused significant protest from the inhabitants of some of the villages where asylum centres were planned. The LBR states that this is especially the case in places where a larger asylum centre is planned in a small village. Violent protest took place in some of the cases and, in the past, several bomb attacks against asylum centres took place.

A study has been made on the negative attitudes and protests of the inhabitants of Eerden (a small village in Brabant) towards the planned centre for asylum seekers (de Koning: 2002). The village is characterised as a place with high participation in local organisations, with social control, and with inhabitants who care about their village.

De Koning is convinced that racism plays a role in this protest, but also that it is not the only relevant factor. The arguments that the inhabitants use have little to do with biological racism, but rather are more culturally determined. This cultural racism is an expression of ethnic absolutism: an essential understanding of ethnic and national differences through an absolutistic vision on culture that is very strong. The inhabitants of Eerden typically see migrants as one large group, without differentiating among asylum seekers and others.

De Jong and Verkuyten, who studied a similar phenomenon in Spangen, state that power plays an important role in the appearance of racism (de Jong, Verkuyten: 1991). They differentiate between three sources of power the autochthonous inhabitants: the numeric majority/minority, the relationship between settled persons and outsiders and the degree in which institutions address themselves to autochthonous inhabitants or migrants. Elias and Scotson show that an unequal balance of power between settled and outsiders exists (Elias and Scotson: 1965). The persons of the dominant group think that they are better than the minority group. Their conceptions of the outsiders are based on the worst characteristics of the worst part of the outsider group and their self-image is based on the best characteristics of their own group. Different social and political elements play, apart from the cultural racism, a role in the image building.

Remarkable is that not only exclusion mechanisms exist, but also that the settled inhabitants try to assimilate the outsiders. As long as people assimilate, there
seems to be no problem. But from the moment they do not, the situation can lead to exclusion. This mechanism may take place, both, when new Dutch people enter the community as when foreigners do. The attitudes of the settled inhabitants towards the newcomers depend on the possibilities that exist for integration. However, they often consider the cultural differences between the asylum seekers and themselves as too large and see no possibility for assimilation. This is linked to the fact that the feelings of superiority and the degree of stigmatisation are stronger towards groups with lower statuses. As the inhabitants of the small villages lack examples of foreigners living in their own environment, their image of foreigners is based on indirect stories and messages in the media, all of which are generally negative. The information they receive determines the contents of images of foreigners or asylum seekers to a large degree.

An important condition in the model of Scotson and Elias is the presence of power and social cohesion. One can stipulate that the relations in a small village are more often characterised by these elements than the relations in an urbanised environment. In each case, these elements play an important role in the village of Eerden, which makes it difficult for new people to be accepted into the community. The settled inhabitants see in the newcomers a threat to this community spirit. Such a negative image, strengthened by local leaders, makes the social cohesion among the settled inhabitants grow (de Jong and Verkuyten: 1991). But objectively seen, the change that the power relations in Eerden would experience with the opening of an asylum centre would be very small.

The inhabitants of Eerden have constructed a kind of symbolic community. Their own identity is based on the borders of the community. They stand behind the community as a symbol, which does not mean that they understand the same idea behind the symbol. An asylum seeker, coming from outside of the community borders, is the personification of everything which is frightening and negatively loaded; of all what the community is not.

According to Grubben Ge from the LBR, the reasons for these protests are mostly anxiousness regarding criminality, insecurity, fear of the “unknown”, fear of foreign infiltration and prejudices. Once the asylum centre is in use, the protest mostly declines or disappears. In most of the asylum centres, also in the ones situated in small villages, many volunteers commit themselves. Van Donselaar says that too few data material or reliable qualitative studies on the issue exist, so that it is impossible to know why the protest took place in some villages were an asylum centre was planned and not in others.

Another development in the Netherlands shows that, since the 1990s, the success of the right-wing parties was no longer limited to the more urbanised areas. In 1993, three percent of the Dutch voters voted for the extreme right
parties, which was the highest percentage ever reached. In 1998, the extreme right experienced an electoral failure in the national elections as well as in the municipal elections.

In the last years, there has been a clear increase in racist violence. This has been reflected in the last parliamentary elections of 2002, more specifically in the success of the right-wing party of Pim Fortuyn. The Lijst Pim Fortuyn gained 17 percent of the votes and was successful all over the Netherlands. The new party gained 26 seats, an unprecedented event in Dutch political history (Pennings, Keman: 2002). The difference in obtained votes between the urban and the rural areas was not very large. Pim Fortuyn managed to mobilise the public opinion against the so-called “purple cabinet” of the Labour Party (PvdA), the conservative liberals (VVD) and the smaller progressive liberals (D66). These had been governing since 1994 and had replaced the old-fashioned centre politics of the Christian Democrats. The general climate changed after the elections, meaning that critical standpoints towards migrants are now openly discussed.

Two other small right-wing parties do exist: the Nederlandse Volksunie and the Nieuwe Nationale Partij, which bring together between 100 and 200 members. Their voters are mostly located in the cities. The main extra-parliamentary groups of the extreme right are Voorpost and the nationalistic student platform Landelijk Actieplatform voor Nationalistische Studenten (LANS). The Actiefront Nationale Socialisten (ANS) is one of the best known neo-Nazi groups. Several meetings of European extreme right activists took place in the Netherlands in the year 2000.

It is difficult to link these extreme right movements and racial violence to one another. First, what should be pointed out with regard to perpetrators is that a vast majority of violent incidents go unsolved. Thus, reaching any conclusions about perpetrators has its limitations. The violent attacks against refugees and migrants are partly committed by single persons or small groups of 5 to 10 persons. Mostly, they are young males, who partly have a right-wing extremist background.

A further attempt was made to determine the extent to which violent incidents can be attributed to right-wing extremism. In 1997 it appeared that 61 of the 298 cases had a (probable) right-wing extremist connection; in 1998 that was 59 of 313 incidents.

In general, the urban centres in rural areas are more weaponed against fascist movements than in the bigger cities, because of the more traditional infrastructure. In rural areas, some fundamentalist Christian movements can be found. They direct themselves against migrants, especially migrants with other
religious convictions. According to the LBR, these movements could cause more problems than the right-wing parties.
### Table 20.1: Netherlands: People with a Foreign Background by Age, Sex and Group of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of origin with a foreign background</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>First and second generation foreigners</th>
<th>First generation</th>
<th>Second generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,498,725</td>
<td>1,284,120</td>
<td>1,214,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,620,405</td>
<td>1,345,725</td>
<td>1,274,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,775,310</td>
<td>1,431,140</td>
<td>1,344,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,964,949</td>
<td>1,547,079</td>
<td>1,417,870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,171,115</td>
<td>761,565</td>
<td>409,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,278,450</td>
<td>816,205</td>
<td>462,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,408,770</td>
<td>886,245</td>
<td>522,535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,558,362</td>
<td>971,706</td>
<td>586,656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,327,610</td>
<td>522,555</td>
<td>805,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,341,955</td>
<td>529,520</td>
<td>812,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,366,540</td>
<td>544,895</td>
<td>821,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,406,587</td>
<td>575,373</td>
<td>831,214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>225,090</td>
<td>140,570</td>
<td>84,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>241,980</td>
<td>145,600</td>
<td>96,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>262,220</td>
<td>152,540</td>
<td>109,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>284,124</td>
<td>159,605</td>
<td>124,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilles and Aruba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>86,825</td>
<td>55,805</td>
<td>31,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>92,105</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>33,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>107,200</td>
<td>69,265</td>
<td>37,935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>124,870</td>
<td>82,209</td>
<td>42,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>280,615</td>
<td>179,265</td>
<td>101,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>290,465</td>
<td>180,520</td>
<td>109,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>302,515</td>
<td>183,250</td>
<td>119,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>315,177</td>
<td>186,262</td>
<td>128,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all ages</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>271,510</td>
<td>167,250</td>
<td>104,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>289,780</td>
<td>172,415</td>
<td>117,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>308,890</td>
<td>177,755</td>
<td>131,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>330,709</td>
<td>185,943</td>
<td>144,766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Netherlands (2002)

### Table 20.2: Netherlands, Stock of Foreign Population by Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Total all ages</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First and second generation foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>156.4</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td>154.3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>149.8</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>212.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>552.5</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>757.0</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: EU</td>
<td>166.4</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% woman</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SOPEMI, Statistics Netherlands (2001)*
Table 20.3: Origin of Asylum Applicants in the Netherlands 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>3,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia, FR</td>
<td>3,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab. Rep.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>11,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>19,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>7,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America/Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNHCR (2001)*

Table 20.4: Experiences of Racism by Ethnic Origin (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Moroccan</th>
<th>Suriname</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insults</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None of these</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 20.1: Population Density in the Netherlands

Source: modified after Hans van der Maarel 2000, www.mapublisher.nl
Figure 20.2: Non-Dutch Population by Community, 2000

Source: Atlas van Nederland 2002
Figure 20.3: Non-Western Immigrants by Community 2000

Source: CBS 2001, Allochtonen in Nederland
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21. Portugal

21.1 Country Report

Racism in the Portuguese countryside is not characterized by forms common to other EU countries. In the last years, immigrants from Eastern Europe have been coming into the Portuguese rural areas. The lack of labour in agriculture has attracted the migration into the countryside. A large part of these immigrants have a legal status as consequence of regularisation processes of so-called illegals. According to experts, most of these immigrants are integrated, being perceived as hard-workers by the autochthonous population. Problems of racism in the countryside have primarily affected Gypsies. They are the most victimised group of racist discrimination in Portugal.

There are no statistics that illustrate patterns of immigration and racism in Portuguese rural areas. The few studies dealing with racism in rural areas focus on discrimination against Gypsies. The studies by Manuel Carlos Silva and Susana Silva will be mentioned in the following. These studies focused on racist discrimination in rural areas of the province of Braga in northern Portugal and deal with the role of local authorities in the discrimination of minority ethnic groups of African and Gypsy origin. Due to the lack of statistics and to the few studies dealing with immigration and racism in rural areas, it is necessary that more research be conducted.

21.1.1 Migration

Approximately 400,000 foreigners live in Portugal. Most of them have arrived in the past years (cf. Table 21.1). The growth of the Portuguese economy and the eruption of armed conflicts, particularly in Kosovo and Sierra Leone, have lead to an unprecedented rise of immigration to Portugal. The programmes started by the government regarding the regularisation of the so-called illegals have also attracted migration flows to Portugal. Through three so-called legalisation programs, conducted in 1992, 1996 and 2001, about 200,000 immigrants became legal (cf. Table 21.2/Figure 21.2). Asylum seekers and refugees comprise a very marginal quota of the immigration in Portugal (SOS Racismo: 2002) (cf. Table 21.3).

The major migrant groups in Portugal remain people from former colonies, Angola, Cape Verde and Brasil. In the last years, people have been arriving from Eastern Europe, mainly from the Ukraine. These comprise 16 percent of the immigrant population. Most of the immigrants live in the large cities, such as Lisbon and Coimbra; only a small number lives in the countryside, mostly
immigrants from the Ukraine and Moldavia (cf. Figure 21.1). There are no statistics based on “race”, because the Portuguese Constitution forbids such statistical surveys (Virtanen: 2001).

21.1.2 Rural Racism

Until a few years ago, the generalised opinion that there is no racism in Portugal prevailed. This presumption was supported by the constitutional and legal condemnation of racism and by positive reports of international organisations on racial discrimination in Portugal (SOS Racismo: 2002). Nevertheless, the increase of racist incidents during the 1990s, and the emergence of skinhead groups, contradicted the idyllic image of an open Portugal. Nevertheless, racial violence has not assumed the proportions of other European countries. A cause for low levels of racial violence might be found in the resolute condemnation of racial attacks by the justice system. In the case of a Cape Verdean man murdered by skinheads in 1995 in Lisbon, the perpetrators were sentenced to 18 years of prison. It should be mentioned that there are explicit references to racial motivations in the Portuguese penal code, and that racism is seen as a cause for the aggravation of a criminal offence (Virtanen: 2001).

Nevertheless, racism assumes more subtle forms in Portugal. For instance, the discrimination of immigrants exists in housing and in the labour market. Experts on racism identify different levels of racist discrimination. A first level of racism should be recognized in relationship with the conflict for resources. Foreigners are perceived as a threat for the economic stability of the Portuguese. A second level has to do with the perception of immigrants as a threat to internal security. Prejudice on this topic is reinforced by the increase of immigration from Eastern Europe and the public discussion on the emerging mafias of nationals from these countries. A third level is constituted by discrimination based on cultural differences. Parting from a cultural difference, a racial difference appears to be constructed which spreads the image that the integration of immigrants is not possible (Vala et. al.: 1999, Vala: 1999).

Regarding the factors strengthening ethnic discrimination in Portugal, the legal framework on migration and ethnic minorities does not provide the necessary channels and instruments for the integration of immigrants into the Portuguese society. This makes it difficult to achieve equality among nationals and immigrants. Difficulties in getting the Portuguese citizenship and the lack of a governmental integration policy are mentioned as obstacles for the integration of immigrants. A second factor is to be found in the political discourses, which reinforce prejudices against migrants in the population and present migrants as a threat for the security, economic stability and cultural homogeneity of
Portugal. Nevertheless, it should be said that manipulation of the topic of migration by politicians does not seem to be so pronounced in Portugal, as it is in other European countries. A third factor is the important role that the media plays in strengthening racial discrimination in Portugal as well as in disseminating the described negative images of immigration and of migrants. Moreover, there is no consensus among the experts on the influence of the colonial past in the collective imagination of the Portuguese society. It was mentioned in interviews that the different positive and negative experiences that are connected with the former colonies have formed different attitudes among the Portuguese toward immigrants from these countries.

Racism in rural areas in Portugal is not as acute as it is in other countries. Immigration in rural areas is a recent phenomenon and is connected with the de-population of the countryside in the last years. A large percentage of Portuguese youths have moved from the countryside to bigger cities, have left the country or have chosen more profitable occupations, such as the construction sector. Because of this, an appropriately large labour force has been lacking in the agriculture sector, particularly in small-scale agriculture. This fact attracted immigration, mostly from Eastern Europe to rural areas. A large percentage of them have settled in the middle coast and in northern Portugal. There is very little immigration of other groups of ethnic communities, such as Cape Verdeans or Brazilians, to rural areas. Reasons for this can lie in the low salaries in the agricultural activities and in the fact that other members of minority ethnic groups speak the Portuguese language, thus giving them more possibilities to get better employment. According to interviewed experts, some immigrants from Eastern Europe come to Portugal trough traffickers, and it is difficult for the immigrants to come away from these mafias.

As a rule, immigrants receive very low salaries. Most of them work in the agriculture sector on small farms, but also in small factories or as domestic personal. They often live with their families for whom they are working. The majority has a so-called legal status due to regularisation programs from 2001. Most of them are well integrated, particularly in the small communities of the middle coast, because they are perceived as hard-working people and as alternatives to the de-population of the Portuguese countryside. Some members of other minority ethnic groups like Cape Verdeans and Gypsies can also be found in rural areas, but are often victims of racist discrimination due to their ethnic origin or skin colour. Especially the discrimination of Gypsies lies in their social and economic marginalisation; they are often stigmatised as drug dealers.

There seems to be more intolerance in the northern coast, than in the northern centre or the middle coast, which is known for its openness and tolerance. This phenomenon has to do with the fact that those living on the northern coast have historically had less contact with foreigners and that they have stronger
traditional cultural structures. In this region there have been problems with Gypsies.

Regarding the causes that reinforce racist intolerance in Portugal, experts have concluded that local politicians play a very important role in the development of negative or positive tendencies towards members of minority ethnic groups in communities in the countryside. It should be stressed that the political orientation does not have not do with the fact that local politicians promote or fight racism at the local level. The success or failure of local politicians stands in no relationship to their discourses on members of ethnic minorities (Vala et. al.: 1999; Vala 1999).

As mentioned above, little literature exists concerning the research on racism in the countryside. The studies conducted by Manuel Carlos Silva and Susana Silva from the Universidade do Minho should be mentioned. These studies focused particularly on racist discrimination in the rural areas of the province of Braga in northern Portugal. These studies deal with the role of local authorities in the discrimination of minority ethnic groups of African and Gypsy origin as well as with the attitudes of the autochthonous population towards these minority ethnic groups and the discriminatory practices against them (Silva:1999).

21.1.3 Good Practices

Examples of good practices on anti-racism in rural areas are the activities carried out by the Alto Comissário para a Imigração e Minorias Étnicas (ACIME) in rural areas. The ACIME assumed a role of intermediation in communities of rural areas where there were problems between members of ethnic minorities and the autochthonous population of the communities. Roundtables with local authorities, members of the minority ethnic groups and anti-racist organisational efforts took place, all of which intended to discuss the reasons for such confrontations. The results of these initiatives have been positive. Another example of a good practice, although it is hardly carried out in the countryside, is the anti-racist work of SOS Racismo. This organisation focuses on working in the schools and on trying to sensitise young people on the topic racism.
21.2 Statistics and Data

Figure 21.1: Foreign Residents per Districts

Source: Os numeros oficiais da imigração
Table 21.1: Foreign Residents in Portugal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe/EU</td>
<td>52 731</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe/others</td>
<td>4 302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Europe</td>
<td>57 033</td>
<td>61 985</td>
<td>66 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>89 516</td>
<td>99 021</td>
<td>106 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>10 171</td>
<td>10 461</td>
<td>10 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and South America</td>
<td>25 818</td>
<td>28 114</td>
<td>28 985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total America</td>
<td>38 989</td>
<td>38 875</td>
<td>39 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>7 871</td>
<td>8 710</td>
<td>9 623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190 896</td>
<td>209 102</td>
<td>223 602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE, Os numeros oficiais da imigração, p.292

Table 21.2: Residence Permits, Approved until 31/05/02
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>65,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavia</td>
<td>13,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>10,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasil</td>
<td>33,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>7,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>6,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>4,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>30,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>181,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEF, 31/5/2002; Os numeros oficiais da imigração

Figure 21.2: Residence Permits, Approved until 31/05/02
Table 21.3: Refugees according to Geneva Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Conakry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. Congo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruanda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: A imigração em Portugal; SEF*
21.3 Literature

Migration

Rocha-Trindade, Maria Beatriz; Universidade Aberta (ed.): 1995, Sociologia das migrações. Lisbon.

Racism

Vala, Jorge; Brito, Rodrigo; Lopes, Diniz: 1999, Expressões dos Racismos em Portugal. Lisbon.
Vala, Jorge; Lima, Marcus; Lopes, Diniz: s.a., Social values, prejudice and solidarity in the European Union.

Rural Racism

Silva, Susana: s.a., Os (Não)Ciganos e a (In)Tolerância - um estudo de caso, First Conference of the just-licensed in Sociology of Organizations, University of Minho, 26th March 1999. S.l.

Anti-Racism


21.4 List of Experts

a) Public Institutions

Alto Comissario para a Imigração e Minorias Étnicas
High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities

Palacio Foz
Praca dos Restauradores
Apartado 2596
1113-001 Lisboa

b) NGOs

226
SOS Racimo
Rua de São José, 50
1150 Lisboa
Portugal
Contact person:
Mr. José Falcão
Tel./Fax: 213479905
sosracis@esoterica..pt

Núcleo de Coimbra
Apartado 1138-3000
Coimbra 8
sosraciscoimbra@mail.pt

Rede Anti-Racista (RAR)
Apart. 22508 - 1147-501 Lisboa
tel.: 00351 21 347 9903
00351 21 347 9905
Fax: 00351 21 342 1557
Rantir@yahoo.com

c) Researchers

Centre for the Study of Migrations and Intercultural Relations
Palácio Ceia
Rua da escola Politécnica 147
1250 Lisboa
Contact person:
Prof.Dr.Maria Beatriz Rocha-Trindade

Centro de Estudos de Migrações e Minorias Étnicas
Avenida de Berna, 26-C
Lisboa
Contact person:
José Gabriel Pereira Bastos
Tel: 21 849 48 20

Susana Manuela Ribeiro Dias de Silva

Department of Sociology. Institute for Social Sciences. University of Minho. Campus de Gualtar. 4710-057 Braga
Tel: 00 351 253 604 212

Jorge Vala
Professor de Psicologia Social
Univ. de Lisboa
Av. das Forcas Armadas
1600 Lisboa, Portugal
Tel: 00 351 217 995 000
jorge.vala@ics.ul.pt
d) Others

International Organization for Migration
Mission in Portugal
Praça dos Restauradores 65
3° Dt. 1250-188 Lisboa
Portugal
Tel.: 213 242940
Fax: 213 23866
www.oim.pt
geral@oim.pt

Dr. José Leitão
(former High Commissioner for Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities)
Rua Passos Manuel, 101, r/c Dto
1150-258 Lisboa
Portugal
E-mail:
Tel: 351 21 354 38 99

22. Spain

22.1 Country Report

Spain is one of the European countries with the most extensive rural areas. The number of immigrants living and working in the countryside in Spain is very high. Most of the immigrants work in the intensive agricultural production and do not have a legal status. The largest flows of labour migration into the countryside are concentrated in Andalusia. Most of the immigrants working in the agriculture there come from Morocco. In the last years immigrants from Ecuador and Eastern Europe have arrived, in the framework of a governmental project to satisfy the demand of labour in the agriculture and to combat the illegal labour immigration, particularly from Morocco. A further goal of this project has been to avoid further conflicts between the autochthonous and the immigrant population.

Rural racism has become a topic of discussion in Spain since the programs in El Ejido, Andalusia, in February 2000, against immigrants from Morocco. But these were not the first racist incidents in rural areas. Since the middle of the 1990s
there have been racist attacks in Spanish rural areas. Racial violence represents one pattern of rural racism in Spain. This is related to further racist discrimination in the countryside, namely, to the extreme poor living and exploitative work conditions of immigrants. Particularly so-called illegal immigrants from Morocco are affected by this situation.

Unfortunately there are no official statistical data that provide information on racist attacks in rural areas. However, immigrants and anti-racist organizations have collected data on racial violence, also in rural areas. These data concern mostly certain provinces or towns. There are no data that cover the entire territory or provide information on racism in relation to rural and urban areas.

The research on rural racism in Spain is considerably developed. Most of the studies focus on the relation between patterns of racism and transformation processes taking place in the Spanish rural areas since the beginning of the 1990s. According to experts, the causes for the emergence and spread of patterns of racism in Spanish rural areas are as follows:

- the conflict between labour immigrants and interest economic groups emerging from the exploitative work conditions of the immigrant workers without a legal status.
- the diffusion through the media of a negative picture of the immigrants, particularly of Muslim immigrants
- the role of politicians, particularly at local level, contributing to the negative depiction of the immigrants, while attempting to find audience and voters among the autochthonous population
- the re-emergence of Spanish nationalism, expressed in the Andalusian case in the fears related to the crisis of the agricultural production because of the development of the agriculture in Morocco
- the spread of anti-Islamic attitudes among the non-Islamic population

The Spanish officials have tried to solve the problems emerging from the labour conflicts between Moroccan immigrants and their employers. The strategy designed focuses on stopping so-called illegal immigration of labour force from Northern Africa. In order to achieve this goal, immigrants from Ecuador and Eastern Europe have been engaged to reduce the demand of labour of the Moroccan immigrants, particularly in southern Spain. Besides this project, the border controls have been intensified to avoid the arriving of further Moroccan immigrants. There have been no measures to improve the living or work conditions of Moroccan workers. These could not benefited from the regularisation laws passed by the Spanish government in order to legalise so-called illegal persons. Activities and efforts attempting the integration and the improvement of the living conditions of immigrants in the countryside are carried out by anti-racist and immigrants organisations.
22.1.1 Migration

In spite of the fact that the number of emigrants was higher than that of immigrants at the end of the 1990s (approximately 2.2 million Spaniards live in foreign countries), Spain has become a country of immigration. About 800,000 so-called legal immigrants currently live in Spain, representing ca. two percent of the population (Colectivo IOE: 2000).

In Spain, European migrants represented 58 percent of the foreign population until 2000. In that year, the inverse proportion was the case for the first time; the non-EU population, who migrates to Spain to work, has become the majority of migrants, making up approximately 1,400,000 persons. 42 percent of legal immigrants come from the EU, 21 percent from Northern Africa (Maghreb), 12 percent from South America, six percent from Central America and the Caribbean, eight percent from Asia, three percent from Eastern Europe, four percent from sub-Saharan Africa and two percent from other European countries (cf. Table 22.1/Figure 22.1/Figure 22.3).

Asylum and refugees are not important migration topics in Spain; between 1988 and 1998 there were 68,000 applications for asylum. Concerning legal immigrants, the majority live in large cities like Madrid and Barcelona. Women represent half of the immigrant population (Colectivo IOE: 2000) (cf. Table 22.3).

In 1999 there were approximately 300,000 legal migrant workers, about 2.2 percent of the total Spanish labour force. 61 percent of immigrants worked in services, 20 percent in industry, ten percent in construction and 7.7 percent in agriculture (cf. Table 22.5). The “illegal” labour market can be studied according to labour market sectors and sex/gender relations. Men are traditionally employed illegally in the agricultural sector (particularly in southern Spain), whereas women work illegally in domestic services or as sex workers. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that, in the last few years, and due to bilateral agreements between Spain and some countries of emigration, there has also been an increase in temporary contracts for women in agriculture (for instance, those signed between Cruz Roja in Valencia or Unió de Pagesos in Lleida, both with the Moroccan government).
The main legislation concerning aliens currently in force, the Ley Orgánica 8/2000 de Derechos y Libertades de los Extranjeros (Law of Rights and Freedoms of Aliens), represents a step backward in the elimination of the dichotomy between documented and undocumented immigrants. This law replaced the Law 4/2000, a legal instrument that was approved by the Spanish parliament without the approval of the conservative government only a few months previously. The Law 4/2000 eliminated irregularity as a cause for expulsion and introduced one of the most progressive aspects in European legislation, that of the possibility of moving from a situation of irregularity to another of legality within only two years.

Concerning integration, in 1995, the Foro para la Integración Social de los Inmigrantes (Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants) was established. It is an advisory body and a meeting place for immigrant welfare organizations, unions and public administrations that serve as a channel for the better use of resources concerning the integration of the immigrant population.

### 22.1.2 Rural Racism

Criminal offences with a racist motivation do not always appear in the statistics of the different Procurator Departments. Therefore, until 1999, the number of offences with racist or xenophobic motivations has been quite low, ranging from 54 in 1995 to 94 in 1999, with Moroccans being the most affected group. In 2000, however, this trend worsened considerably, with 196 motivated offences (Virtanen: 2001). In addition, it should be stressed that the obscure data on racial attacks is extremely high due to the natural reluctance of non-documented immigrants to report offences (cf. Table 22.6).

Although racial violence is not so widespread in Spain as in Germany or Great Britain, there has been an increase in racist attacks in the last few years. North Africans, Gypsies and black Africans are the main targets of racist violence. According to the data collected by the anti-racist organisation Movimiento contra la Intolerancia (Movement against Intolerance), there were about 70 cases in 2000.

The police have to be counted among those perpetrating racist violence. During the 1990s, anti-racist and human rights organisations denounced the racist treatment of immigrants by members of the police. The new Spanish penal code, dating from 1995, introduced new types of crimes, such as those related to offences against the rights of workers referring to the recruitment of foreign nationals without work permits under conditions that can violate their rights, and to the serious offence of discrimination in employment on grounds
pertaining to ethnic background, race or nationality. However, this does not seem to have had a positive impact in reducing racist offences.

Although there are no important right-wing movements, such as those in other European countries, right-wing extremist groups, e.g., skinheads, seem to be growing. Right-wing extremist groups have been involved in the deaths of 21 persons from 1994 until 2001 and in numerous racist attacks. According to reports by anti-racist organizations, there are about 20,000 Spaniards involved in neo-Nazi activities and members in racist groups have quintupled in the last years. Many of the militants on the extreme right are recruited among football supporters (hooligans). In 1995, the police identified 2,331 youths as being members of violent groups (Virtanen: 2001).

Nevertheless, it should be noted that most of the racially motivated offences are not perpetrated by members of organised right-wing groups as, for example, the pogrom in El Ejido in 2000 can show.

According to Sos Racisme Catalunya, the appearance of parties, such as Plataforma per Catalunya (Platform for Catalonia), which try to put up candidates in some municipalities, generates fractures and tension. Sos Racisme Catalunya insists that these threats from such organisations could impinge on the rural environment during the coming years. It depends on their capacity to organise, on their success while presenting candidates, etc.

What defines rural racism in classical terms is the existence of patriarchal structures, based on values of land possession. These work in such a way that the arrival of the stranger (both the city dweller and the foreigner) creates an extra menace.

The difficulty in discussing a characterisation of rural racism is combined with another problematic term, that of “rural area”. In sociological terms, such an area is characterised by a number of 10,000 inhabitants at most. Following this criteria, there are around 7,000 rural areas, representing 95 percent of the Spanish municipalities.

The pogrom in El Ejido, Andalusia, in February 2000, described by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia as one of the most serious racist attacks of the autochthonous population against the presence of immigrants in Europe, illustrates the problem of a strict identification of rural racism (cf. Figure 22.5). However, it could apply to other agrarian areas such as Nijar, Cartagena and some parts of Catalonia (Ca n’Anglada, Girona and Banyoles), where racist and xenophobic attacks have also been reported.

The characteristics of El Ejido are as follows: El Ejido is a traditional agrarian area whose inhabitants started to develop an intensive agricultural production...
at the beginning of the 1980s (cf. Figure 22.4). The rapid increase in productivity led to the impossibility of continuing with the traditional familiar piecework and the necessity of a new labour force. As a result of the difficult working conditions, Spaniards started to reject such jobs, and were replaced with foreign immigrants, mainly from the Maghreb.

In demographic terms, El Ejido represents an area of 138,000 inhabitants, with only five percent born in the region, the rest being internal immigrants; the documented foreign immigrants represented 21,000 persons in 1999, as well as 5,000 non-documented immigrants. The latter were exposed to over-exploitation by the employers (cf. Table 22.7). Two characteristics of these inhumane conditions can be described as decisive elements that could define rural racism. The first is the rural space division among immigrants and natives. In Almería and Murcia, immigrants live in the countryside and in isolated areas. This situation, together with phenomena, such as the lack of housing, undoubtedly determine a discriminatory attitude in rural areas.

This situation was aggravated by fluctuations in the international markets at the end of the 1990s. There was a reduction of wages, which caused the protest of the immigrant workers. They manifested their protest through strikes and the sabotage of production. The reactions of the farmers, businesspersons involved in the agricultural industry, local politicians and the media involved a public campaign against immigrants, spreading the image of the Moroccan as being criminal. The racial attacks in El Ejido, connected with this defamatory campaign, were bound to the interests of the local elite and people profiting from the agricultural industry.

According to Martínez Veiga, the events in El Ejido are the result of an exacerbated Spanish nationalism (a culmination of an aggressive atmosphere in Spanish society against immigrants from the so-called Third World). This can be extrapolated to the rest of the state as has already been the case in the areas mentioned above.

The interest in keeping these conditions of production leads to a discourse of legitimacy of the system based upon ethnicization or culturalisation. These have two main forms of expression, principally against the Moroccan immigrants: on the one hand, the widespread vulgarisation of the racist ideology (“Moroccans are dirty, savage and offend our women”) and a more subtle institutionalised racism through the linking of immigration and criminality.

On the other hand, the ethnic component of the conflict finds its form of expression through engaging workers from Eastern Europe and Ecuador in order to replace the Moroccan workers. This measure was initiated by the local employers and supported by governmental agencies. What began as a measure
against the protest by the Moroccan workers, has become an official strategy to satisfy the demand for a labour force in the intensive agricultural production. This policy has aggravated the situation of the Moroccan workers and has caused sometimes violent confrontation among the different migrant groups, among Moroccans and immigrants from Eastern Europe and Ecuador. In other parts of Spain, this policy is carried out by engaging workers from Romania in the agriculture sector. It should be pointed out that this policy aggravates the situations of the immigrant workers from Morocco. Workers from Eastern Europe and Ecuador have been engaged, instead of undertaking efforts to solve the problem emerging from the abuse of the labour force of immigrants.

Spain is the country with the most studies on racism in rural areas. There is also a great amount of literature on labour migration in the countryside. These studies deal particularly with migration flows of labour immigrants, their working conditions and the developments in the work structures in agriculture connected with the migration flows. The research on racism in the Spanish countryside received an impulse from the racist incidents in El Ejido. A large number of articles and studies have been published dealing with racism in places of intensive agriculture, mostly in Andalusia. Most of these studies connect the sphere of the working conditions and the property structures to social, political and cultural factors at the local level that strengthen racist tendencies among the population. Some researchers agree that one cannot speak of rural racism, because there are no more rural societies. They stress the crisis of social rural structures as a consequence of processes of transformation in agricultural economic activities. The section on Spain in the ACCEPT study on discrimination in rural areas should also be mentioned, as it is based on surveys that attempt to identify a connection between rurality and discriminatory practices. According to this study, minority ethnic groups of Moroccan origin are more discriminated against than other groups, such as the elderly, disabled persons and Gypsy people. Despite the question of the existence of a Spanish rural society or of a connection between rural structures and racism, the fact is that racism assumes sharper forms in the countryside because of the lower level of institutional infrastructure for integration, the immigrants’ poor living conditions and the stronger processes of economic and social transformation, particularly in the south of Spain.

22.1.3 Good Practices

The two main Spanish trade unions, Comisiones Obreras and Unión General de Trabajadores, have paid considerable attention to migration since the early 1990s, being aware of the changes in migration flows and the growing presence of immigrants in the country.
To that extent, each union has developed its own network of special sections concerning immigrants’ issues. The CITES (Information Centres for Foreign Workers), has been established by the Comisiones Obreras, the Centros-Guía (Advisory Centres for Immigrants and Refugees), and by the Unión General de Trabajadores.

Their main goal is to deal with the most common discriminatory practices against immigrants, that is against the failure to formalize employment relationships and the low wages and poorer working conditions for immigrants, both of which places them in weaker positions.

Both networks provide for two main types of services, legal and social. In the first case, they provide for immigrants with information related to their judicial status and help them in negotiations with administrative and judicial authorities. In the second case, they offer training courses in Spanish, workshops on health promotion and prevention, etc.

The work conducted by organizations such as the ACOGE network, Mujeres Progresistas (Progressive Women) and SOS Racismo should be stressed. These empower the integration of immigrants and advise the public about anti-discriminatory education.

The agrarian union, Unió de Pagesos, which contracts temporary workers from emigration countries (mainly Colombia and Morocco), has created a foundation, Pagesos Solidaris (Farmers’ Solidarity), which offers agrarian vocational training for immigrant workers when they return to their countries of origin.

The Confederación de Agricultores (COAG) (Confederation of Farmers) is developing a project for the integration of immigrant workers into rural areas. The project, which includes the collaboration of the Confédération Paysanne Francaise (CPF) as a transnational partner, is subsided by the European Union. Its general aim is to help immigrant workers and their families in rural areas and to integrate them into all areas of life by providing them with legal and social assistance and consultation on aspects concerning employment matters (health, access to housing, social services, finding employment, etc.).

ATRIO is the name of another transnational project, which is implemented in Spain by the Mancomunidad de Servicios Sociales del Sureste (project leader: Silvia Fernández Rodriguez) (Association of Social Services of the Southwest). Its aim is to set up a transnational and transregional network for a coherent approach to immigrant housing. Taking housing as a primary integration factor, the partners seek to promote ways of combatting discrimination against
immigrants on the housing market in order to increase public awareness of the contribution of immigrants to the community.
### 22.2 Statistics and Data

#### Table 22.1: Foreign Population by Nationality, in Thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>278.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>499.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>609.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: EU</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>164.6</td>
<td>235.6</td>
<td>260.6</td>
<td>3122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Sopemi 1998, 2001*
Fig. 22.1: Non-Nationals on the Level of Regions (Autonomous Communities) in 2000

Fig. 22.2: Regional population density and regional share on non-nationals
Table 22.2: Non-Nationals by Regions (Autonomous Communities) 1975-99
Year

Total

Andalucia Aragon Asturias Cantabria Castilla- Castilla Cataluña Valencia ExtreLa
y Leon
madura
Mancha

Galicia

Murcia

Navarra

Pais
La
Vasco Rioja

1975

165 289

23 635

2 071

3 590

1 177

460

4 803

36 207

13 796

1 537

10 847

861

2 528

5 607

251

1976

158 973

18 689

2 099

3 478

1 238

453

4 794

37 558

13 759

1 523

10 453

930

1 713

6 075

263

1977

161 451

19 312

1 906

3 523

1 232

485

4 173

38 400

14 723

1 508

10 346

1 032

1 076

6 417

274

1978

158 349

19 589

1 707

3 425

969

424

3 922

36 848

15 338

1 412

9 503

897

1 061

7 062

300

1979

173 043

21 784

1 673

3 719

1 137

644

4 345

37 640

16 859

1 465

10 196

1 036

1 349

5 691

332

1980

181 544

23 164

1 840

3 804

1 281

634

5 174

38 656

19 178

1 529

10 248

1 149

1 357

5 644

339

1981

198 042

27 872

1 987

3 712

1 423

644

6 058

39 640

22 891

1 522

10 751

1 286

1 215

5 349

359

1982

200 911

30 162

2 364

3 515

1 489

719

6 144

39 143

26 127

1 425

10 809

1 363

1 241

5 394

385

1983

210 350

31 734

2 277

3 300

1 385

615

6 204

40 143

28 862

1 451

9 768

1 416

1 141

5 262

390

1984

226 470

35 119

2 016

3 400

1 315

680

6 227

42 650

32 137

1 519

9 764

1 355

1 186

6 189

410

1985

241 971

38 253

2 062

3 409

1 216

821

6 394

45 246

35 516

1 600

10 045

1 629

1 201

6 188

427

1986

293 208

47 713

2 686

4 362

1 399

1 365

8 474

51 934

42 973

1 852

11 377

2 217

1 272

7 675

561

1987

334 935

56 750

3 347

4 463

1 516

1 579

8 156

59 362

46 201

1 989

12 362

2 520

1 481

9 160

546

1988

360 032

62 060

3 573

4 110

1 540

1 619

8 350

58 582

52 805

1 979

12 945

2 789

1 334

10 714

492

1989

398 147

67 402

3 761

4 089

1 479

1 651

8 965

63 542

59 382

2 009

13 936

3 131

1 379

11 721

530

1990

407 647

72 543

3 988

4 198

1 751

1 992

10 047

65 542

64 451

2 273

15 062

3 422

1 638

13 169

598

1991

360 655

48 722

4 702

5 774

1 749

2 980

10 547

60 800

47 458

3 071

12 598

6 286

1 920

9 412

984

1992

402 350

55 992

5 239

6 170

2 025

3 800

12 970

72 291

50 672

3 517

14 179

5 627

2 540

10 986 1 131

1993

484 342

60 992

8 186

6 905

2 659

5 409

15 346

86 758

57 466

4 492

17 147

8 029

4 042

14 171 1 420

1994

461 364

61 437

6 305

6 282

2 650

5 573

13 864

83 296

56 163

4 516

16 431

6 549

3 784

12 262 1 348

1995

499 772

67 127

6 877

6 562

2 864

6 513

14 628

106 809

57 790

5 060

16 833

7 390

4 202

13 569 1 659

1996

538 981

70 725

6 290

6 515

3 078

6 670

15 011

114 264

59 952

4 516

17 615

7 939

4 693

13 135 1 893

1997

609 813

83 943

9 747

7 483

3 469

9 347

17 422

124 550

64 821

7 266

19 241

9 643

4 850

15 647 2 530

1998

719 647

95 970

11 877

8 682

3 910

11 374

20 113

148 803

69 972

9 063

21 140

15 731

6 385

16 995 3 253

1999

801 329

109 129

15 449

9 522

4 546

12 739

22 908

183 736

80 594

9 784

22 523

16 319

8 131

18 622 4 768

Source: Anuario de Migraciones 2000, Ministerio del Interior
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Fig. 22.3: Non-Nationals’ Share of Total Population in Provinces 2000

Table 22.3: Inflow of Asylum Seekers 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia, FR</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. Rep. of the Congo</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. of Moldova</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td>7,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22.4: Internal Migration, Saldo 1997-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalucia</td>
<td>-4,317</td>
<td>-7,506</td>
<td>-7,995</td>
<td>-7,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragon</td>
<td>-2,801</td>
<td>-4,863</td>
<td>-6,331</td>
<td>-8,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asturias (Princip. de)</td>
<td>-923</td>
<td>-2,305</td>
<td>-2,094</td>
<td>-2,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baleares (Islas)</td>
<td>5,845</td>
<td>9,979</td>
<td>10,931</td>
<td>11,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canarias (Islas)</td>
<td>10,351</td>
<td>8,945</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>7,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantabria</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla - La Mancha</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla y Leon</td>
<td>-4,172</td>
<td>-4,608</td>
<td>-5,808</td>
<td>-7,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CataluZa</td>
<td>-3,286</td>
<td>-2,896</td>
<td>-1,737</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunidad Valenciana</td>
<td>7,389</td>
<td>8,364</td>
<td>10,489</td>
<td>13,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura</td>
<td>-550</td>
<td>-2,028</td>
<td>-2,242</td>
<td>-3,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>-2,138</td>
<td>-3,574</td>
<td>-5,138</td>
<td>-5,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid (Comunidad de)</td>
<td>-9,183</td>
<td>-7,424</td>
<td>-8,420</td>
<td>-6,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murcia (Region de)</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarra (Com.Foral de)</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pais Vasco</td>
<td>-4,290</td>
<td>-4,591</td>
<td>-5,139</td>
<td>-4,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rioia (La)</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceuta</td>
<td>-202</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melila</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE 2001

Table 22.5: Sectoral Share of Immigrant Labour in Spain 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>absolute values</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrarian</td>
<td>54229</td>
<td>6391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>33409</td>
<td>8127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>54557</td>
<td>2362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>153980</td>
<td>140764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non classified</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296658</td>
<td>157780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Including those not classified by sex
Fig. 22.4: Work permits by sector of activity and continent 1999

Source: Comisión Interministerial de Extranjería, Anuario Estadístico de Extranjería 2000
### 2.6: Attacks with Racist or Xenophobic Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily injury</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks with explosives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propaganda actions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


![Intensive Agriculture under Plastic around Almería, 1991](source)

*Source: Europäisches Bürgerforum (2001): z.B. El Ejido, p.57*
Table 22.7: Socio-economic Profile of Almeria Region, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Immigrants (1998)</th>
<th>Total unemployed</th>
<th>Total surface (km²)</th>
<th>Agricultural surface (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Ejido</td>
<td>50170</td>
<td>5540</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roquetas de Mar</td>
<td>40582</td>
<td>4289</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijar</td>
<td>15406</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>14973</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mojonera</td>
<td>6561</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Almeria</td>
<td>168025</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>5715</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fig. 22.6: Focal Points of the Anti-immigrant Violence in February 2000
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22.4 List of Experts

a) Public Institutions

COAG-Iniciativa Rural
Agustín de Bethancourt 17
E-28003 Madrid
Spanien
Contact person:
Mariano Castellanos
Tel.: 00 34 91 5346391
Fax: 00 34 91 5346537
E-mail:
coag.madrid@cdrtcampos.es

Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social
Paseo del Pintor Rosales, 44-46
28003 Madrid
tel.: +34 91 547 4665
Tel.: 0034 91 3 47 90 00
fax: +34 91 541 3818
Fax: 0034 91 3 47 38 18

Diputación de Granada - Área de la Mujer
Cl Lope de Vega 4, 1º cyd cp
18002 Granada
Spanien
Contact person: Elvira Ramón Utrabo
Tel.: 00 34 958 25 93 51
Fax: 00 34 958 25 12 00
E-mail:
cm.formacion.empleo@corp.dipgra.es

b) NGOs

SOS Racisme
Passatge de la Pau, 10 bis, Ent.2º
08002 Barcelona
tel.: 933010597
Fax: 933010147
www.sosracisme.org
sosracisme@troc.es

Movimiento contra la Intolerancia
Secretaría Técnica
Aptdo. Correos 1.548
50080 Zaragoza
Tfno/fax: 976 28 07 56
intolerancia@terra.es

c) Researchers

Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Centro de Investigación sobre Migración y Racismo CEMIRA
Contact person:
Dr. Calvo Buezas, Tomás
Tel: 0034 91 3 94 39 76
Fax: 0034 91 5 43 49 43
tcalvobuezas@cps.ucm.es

Instituto Universitario de Estudios sobre Migraciones
Universidad Pontificia de Comillas
3
28049 Madrid (UAM)
Spanien
Contact person:
Prof. Rosa Aparicio
Tel: 0034 91 7 34 39 50
Fax: 0034 91 7 34 45 70

Prof. Lorenzo Cachón
Dpto. Sociología I
Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y
Sociología
Universidad Complutense de
Madrid
Campus de Somosaguas
28223 Madrid, Spain
Tel.: 0034 91 394 28 99
FAX: 0034 91 39 42 767
lcachon@cps.umc.es

University of Valencia
Departamento de Filosofía de
Derecho Moral y Política.
Facultad de Derecho.
Av. de los Naranjos
Valencia
Contact person:
Prof. De Lucas
Tel: 00 34 96 382 81 00
lucasfra@uv.es

Universidad Autónoma de
Madrid. Facultad de CC.
Económicas y Empresariales. Dpto.
de Sociología y Antropología
Social
Cantoblanco
28049 Madrid
Contact person:
Ubaldo Martínez Veiga
Carlos Giménez
Tel.: 0034 91 397 51 29
Fax: 0034 91 397 51 29

Laboratorio de Estudios
Interculturales
Universidad de Granada
Rector López Argueta, s/n
18071 Granada
Contact person:
Javier García Castaño
Tel.: 0034 958 24 28 30

Colectivo IOÉ
c/ Luna, 11 - 1º derecha
28004 -MADRID (España)
Teléfono: 34 91.531.01.23
ioe@nodo50.org

CSIC
Departamento de antropología
C/ Duque de Medinaceli, 6
28014 Madrid
Contact person:
Dra. Del Olmo, Margarita
Teléfono: 914290626
mdelolmo@filol.csic.es

ICESB - School Social Work
Ramon Llull University
Enric Granados, 2
08007 Barcelona
Spain
Contact person:
Doncel Rasillo, Concha
tel: +34 (3) 45 32 800
+34 (3) 23 76 234
fax: +34 (3) 45 49 655
e-mail: cdoncelr@wanadoo.es

Prof. Javier García Castaño
Laboratorio de Estudios
Interculturales
Facultad de Educación
Universidad de Granada
Campus de Cartuja, s/n
18071 Granada
Spanien
Contact person:
Tel: 0034 958 24 28 30
Fax: 0034 958 24 63 44
fjgarcia@ugr.es

Prof. Dr. José Cazorla Perez
University of Granada
Departamento de Ciencia Política
Facultad de CC.
d) Trade Unions

Sindicato Agrario del País Vasco - EHNE
Plaza Simón Bolívar, 14
01003 Vitoria-Gasteiz
Contact person:
Marta Ugarte
telf.: 945-27 54 77
Fax: 945-27 57 31
E-mail: ehne@ehne.org
mugarte@ehne.org

UGT
C/ Hortaleza 88
E-28004 Madrid
Spanien
Contact person:
Fontecha López Almuneda
Tel.: 00 34 91 589 76 00
Fax: 00 34 91 589 76 03
E-mail: Acorral@cec.ugt.org
www.ccoo.es
Confederación General Del Trabajo
(CGТ)
Alenza, 13
28003 Madrid
Tel.: 0034 91 554 72 05
Fax.: 0034 91 554 73 04

UGT-E Union General de Trabajadores
Hortaleza n° 88
28004 Madrid
tel.: +34 91 589 7601
tel. : +34 91 589 7600
fax: +34 91 589 7603

AMIC (an advisory centre for foreign workers of Unió General de Treballadors (UGT)
Rambla de Santa Mónica 10
08002 Barcelona
Tel.: 0034 93 304 68 00
Fax: 0034 93 304 68 25
www.ugtcat.com

Unión Sindical Obrera (USO)
Plaza de Santa Bárbara 5-5º
28004 Madrid
Tel.: 0034 91 308 25 86
Fax: 0034 91 310 16 01

Portes Obertes (an advisory centre for foreign workers of Confederació General de Treballadors (CGT)
Via Laietana 18, planta 9
08003 Barcelona
www.cgt.es/cgtcatalunya
23. Sweden

23.1 Country Report

As in most European countries, rural racism in Sweden is also related to the refugees decentralisation policy of the Swedish government. According to this policy asylum seekers are placed in villages and small towns. These small communities do not have often the required infrastructure for the reception and integration of asylum seekers. In many places there have been a negative reaction of the autochthonous population to the settlement of asylum seekers in their communities. Negative attitudes toward immigrants has often expressed in racial violence. Particularly in the small communities of Kode, Valberg and specially Klippan there have been racist incidents and right-wing structures have developed. These communities present the characteristics of typical problem areas for racism in the Swedish countryside. They are communities that have been hardly affected by economic and social transformation processes and the crisis of social structures, and that have received immigration flows of asylum seekers.

The statistical data dealing with racist incidents show that the southern part of Sweden is the most affected by racial violence. Problems of racism in the countryside are aggravated by the existence of right-militant groups. Unfortunately, the data do not provide information on the demographic distribution -rural and urban areas- of the racial violence. Nevertheless, observing the regional distribution of racist attacks one can deduce that there is a high incidence of racist violence in Swedish rural areas.

Concerning literature there are a few studies dealing with racism in villages and small towns. However, studies by Berets Wigerfelt, Anders Wigerfelt and Rantaiseu et. al. deserve attention. These two studies deal with problems of racism and right-wing extremism in small communities in Swedish rural areas. The authors of these studies agree that an eruption of the economic crisis coinciding with the arrival of asylum seekers has contributed in many places to the emerging and spread of racism and right-wing structures in rural areas in Sweden. The authors coincide also in showing how local media and local politicians contribute to strengthen racist tendencies among the autochthonous population, spreading a negative picture of immigration and immigrants.

23.1.1 Migration

In the last decades, Sweden has become an immigration country. Armed conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and in the so-called Third World, the deepening of the economic and social crises in the countries of origin and the
development of channels for illegal immigration have led to an increase of the migration flows to Sweden. About 12 percent of the population is of foreign background. The largest immigrant groups come from Finland, Denmark, Norway, the former Yugoslavia and Iran (cf. Table 23.1). The most non-Nordic immigrants have come to Sweden as refugees or asylum seekers (cf. Table 23.2).

23.1.2 Migration in Rural Areas

The majority of immigrants live in larger cities in Sweden, where there are already more ethnic groups who favour integration (cf. Figure 23.1). In addition, there also examples of high powered business leaders who actually belong to certain ethnic groups.

The most visible group of immigrants in the Swedish countryside are asylum-seekers and refugees. The refugee policy of the Swedish government has led to the establishment of centres for asylum seekers, located in small cities and towns. This policy is often implemented against the will of the local populations, further contributing to strengthened negative prejudices and attitudes toward immigrants. These negative attitudes are often supported by local authorities and politicians, who tend to manipulate the topic of asylum in order to win sympathies within their communities. For example, local politicians have recently aimed at restricting the free movement of asylum-seekers, while 14 municipalities have refused and limited the freedom of movement based on the argument that they do not receive a 100 percent reimbursement for financing the asylum-seekers. As a result, these municipalities do not allow the asylum seekers access to their region.

Other important groups of immigrants in rural areas include seasonal workers, who remain mostly based on conditions of illegality in Sweden. Many of these workers come from Poland, Russia, the Baltic states and Vietnam. Farming, picking berries, housecleaning, babysitting and construction are the usual occupations of these illegal immigrants. Many seasonal workers stay on farms for the harvest season, but no statistics exist for such situations. There are no legal measures available for them to change their status (except to be granted refugee status). Many people try to illegally buy working permits which allow them to lengthen their stay. Seasonal workers are in Sweden on a tourist visa. There are usually no work permits granted for periods of short duration.

23.1.3 Racism in Rural Areas
Although racist terrorism has diminished in the last years, ethnic discrimination continues to exist in Swedish society, mostly in the labour market, housing and education. According to Swedish researchers, the spread of a negative image of immigrants and of immigration by the media and political discourses as well as the deepening of the social and economic crisis among parts of the population have contributed to an increase in racist tendencies in Sweden (Virtanen: 2001).

Although a decrease in cases of racist terrorism took place following the wave of attacks on asylum centres during the beginning of the 1990s, total figures of racial violence increased notably in Sweden (cf. Table 23.3/Table 23.4). It should be stressed that more racial attacks are committed in Sweden than in the other Scandinavian countries (Bjørgo, cited in Virtanen: 2001). The most victimised groups in Sweden are blacks and non-Europeans, that is, anyone who outwardly appears as non-swedish. According to surveys of the Swedish Security Police (SÄPO), the majority of racial attacks have been perpetrated by local youths without any articulated political ideology and who had no direct connections with political organisations. Studies have also shown that there is a coincidence between the increase of youth unemployment and arriving asylum seekers and the increase in racial violence (Virtanen: 2001).

Nevertheless, members of extreme right-wing groups are often connected with cases of racial violence. Right-wing extremism has become more active in the last years, particularly due to the spread of white power music. The National Socialist Front (Nationalsocialistisk Front) (NSF), with its headquarters in the southern town of Karlskrona, and the National Youth (Nationell Ungdom) (NU), seated in Stockholm, are among the better organised Nazi organisations. There are also other loosely tied Nazi groups in small communities, mainly in the south of Sweden (Raxen Report: s.a.).

Statistics confirm that race-motivated offenses and those linked with the right-wing extremist movements have increased since 1995 by approximately 127 percent. As in other countries, however, the statistics are not so trustworthy, because either immigrants do not always have confidence in the authorities and/or the racist offenses are not classified as racially motivated.

Particularly small communities in the Swedish countryside, such as in Kode, Valberg and especially in Klippan, have been shaken by racist violence (cf. Figure 23.2). In 1995, an asylum seeker was murdered by skinheads in Klippan, a small town in Sweden. The response of the media regarding this case attracted the attention of the entire country, also of right-wing groups; as a result, Klippan became a place of political reference for the Swedish right-wing extremism. With the Klippan case, the question of racism arose, stirring researchers to begin studying the existence of neo-Nazism in small communities in the nordic country.
To name a few, Berit Wigerfelt and Anders Wigerfelt conducted a study entitled, Manifestations of Racism. Racism and Nazism in a Local Community in Southern Sweden. In response to the Klippan case and Rantakeisu, Almgren and Starrin wrote, Racially Motivated Violence or Just a Common Disturbance. Interpreting the Underlying Meaning of Events in a Small Community in Sweden on the case Valberg. The first study analyses the particular development conditions of a small community, attempting to identify the contributing factors which could have further exacerbated the spread of racism and right-wing extremism in the town. Based on these studies, some factors can be identified, which may prove to strengthen the rise of racism and right-wing activity.

Racism can become open and right extremism can spread in places that have been hit particularly hard by the social and economic transformation processes. Many small communities in the countryside have been particularly affected by such transformation processes. For example, in Klippan the economic sectors which generated jobs have dropped consecutively in the last decades: agricultural production, the mill activities, the industry and the public sector. These transformation processes have lead in many cases to a crisis of the social structures in small communities in rural areas. The loss of common social references seems to have contributed to the rejection of all that could be perceived as a threat for the own, real or constructed, social group.

In the beginning of the 1990s, the eruption of the crisis coincided with the arrival of asylum seekers. In some small communities along the countryside, the association of asylum seekers with crisis and unemployment appeared stronger, due to the increasing visibility of asylum seekers being placed in these areas. Nevertheless, communities with a fewer number of immigrants, such as the community Vellinge, do still exist without evidently strong neo-Nazi structures.

Racism and right-wing extremism seems to develop more easily in communities, that have a tradition of closed societies and a strong sense of community. This is the case in many small communities throughout the Swedish countryside, where so-called outsiders are often marginalised. In this context the case of Klippan should be mentioned again. Klippan is a mill town and appears to maintain the social structures of such a community. Some researchers think that mill towns are characterised by a patron-client relationship, as closed communities tending to be hostile to outsiders (Bjørgo, cited by Wigerfelt: 2001).

The low level of education seems to contribute as well to the spread of racism and right-wing extremism in some small communities. For example, 46 percent of the population in Klippan have a low level of education.
Like in the most other Europeans countries, local politicians play an important role in strengthening negative attitudes toward migrants among the local population. As in the Valberg case, where an immigrant family was attacked and terrorised by right-wing youths, local politicians can contribute to playing down problems of racism and right-wing extremism at the local level. In other cases, local politicians, especially from populist parties, tend to manipulate the topic of asylum in order to win support among the local population. This kind of attitude contributes to the increase in racist prejudice against immigrants, is connected with a lack of a policy. Such policies fight racist tendencies at the local level but give support to right-wing youths, who see in these discourses a kind of approbation for their acts (Rantakeisu. et. al.: s.a.).

The historical background of the communities seems to play a role in the spread of racism and right-wing extremism. Researchers have found a relationship between the communities that once supported the German Nazi regime and those, in which developed neo-Nazi structures already exist.

Regarding the development of right-wing extremism at the local level, researchers Berit and Anders Wigerfelt, who researched the Klippan case, argue that local factors should not be analysed isolated from the global, national and regional variables. Instead, the internal factors of the right-extreme movement, the ability of the different groups of skilled leadership and organisations, global, national and regional events and processes should be taken into account (Wigerfelt: 2001).

Besides the factors and forms of expressions of xenophobia and racism in Swedish society, the stronger isolation of immigrants and the lack of mechanisms for protecting immigrants against the every day racism seem to be the particular characteristics of racist discrimination in the Swedish countryside.

The problem of racism in rural areas in Sweden has been treated mainly through the analysis of racism and right-wing extremism in small communities, in which racist incidents have occurred or which are well known because there are neo-Nazi structures there. The treatment of this topic is connected with the spread of racism and neo-Nazism in small communities, particularly in the countryside. Examples of research in this field consist of the cited case studies of Berit and Wigerfelt on the communities Klippan in Skane, southern Sweden and of Rantakeisu, Almgren, Starrin on Valberg in Värmland, in the west-central part of the country. Nevertheless, the studies on racism and right-wing extremism in rural areas are very numerous. Many studies deal with racism and right-extremism in rural areas, but they do not treat the particularities of this phenomena in the countryside.

Connected with the problem of racism in the countryside, the seminar Strategies for the Local Community in the framework of the Stockholm
International Forum Combatting Intolerance (January of 2001) should be mentioned, albeit indirectly. The topics discussed in this conference connected with racism and counter-strategies at the local level should be taken into consideration in order to formulate strategies to tackle racism in the countryside, also in Sweden.

Regarding the good practices oriented to breaking down the isolation of immigrants, particularly of refugees, Dr. Lööw mentioned in an interview that there are initiatives to establish contact families in municipalities for incoming refugees in order to engage the new refugees with already existing refugees in the area. This sort of integration activity depends on the grade of integration of the refugees living in Sweden. Other kinds of good practices can be found among local initiatives within the church or among friends or classmates, who try to raise public awareness, protect refugees, and tackle racism at the local level.
23.2 Statistics and Data

Figure 23.1: Regional Population Density and Regional Share on Non-Nationals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>388.6</td>
<td>483.7</td>
<td>531.8</td>
<td>5266</td>
<td>5520</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>4773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23.2: Asylum-Seekers during 2001 by Citizenship and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country of citizenship</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>23 508</td>
<td>8 493</td>
<td>15 015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe without EU15 and Nordic countries</td>
<td>9 536</td>
<td>4 130</td>
<td>5 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia - Herzegovina</td>
<td>2 771</td>
<td>1 279</td>
<td>1 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>3 121</td>
<td>1 390</td>
<td>1 731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1 616</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1 052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>10 643</td>
<td>3 097</td>
<td>7 546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>6 223</td>
<td>1 432</td>
<td>4 791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateless</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Sweden, 2002
Table 23.3: All Offences of a Xenophobic or Racist Nature (Majority against Minority), of an Anti-Semitic Nature, and those linked with the White Power Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobic or Racist</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitic</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Power Movement</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 23.4: Serious Offences Linked to the White Power Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 23.2: Distribution of Incidents of Racial Hatered on County Level in 2000. Number of Offences Reported to the Police per 100 000 Inhabitants
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24. United Kingdom

24.1 Country Report

According to studies, the likelihood falling victim of a racist attack is ten times higher in rural than in urban areas in the UK. Nevertheless, issues of racism have not been traditionally associated with the countryside in the UK because of a presumed homogeneity of the autochthonous population. For this reason ethnicity has not been taken into account as a rural political concern despite the existence of rural-based minority ethnic communities and high levels of rural racism. Recently there has been more awareness among researchers, policy makers and in the public opinion about rural racism, recognizing that racism does not remain an urban phenomenon (Neal: 2002).

Besides Germany and Spain, the most literature dealing with rural racism can be found in the UK. Most of the literature dealing with rural racism in the UK focuses on southern England and in Scotland. Jay’s study, Keep Them in Birmingham, was considered an important research milestone by the Commission for Racial Equality. This study researched the attitudes of the autochthonous population towards members of ethnic minorities in the communities of Devon and Cornwall, southern England, drawing attention to the plight of minority ethnic people in rural areas.

There are no official statistics that provide us information on the geographic distribution of racial attacks in urban and rural areas. Nevertheless, there are statistical data on racist attacks and complaints on racist discrimination developed by anti-racist or immigrant organisations that study rural areas. It should be stressed that in the UK a anti-discrimination law exists. In virtue of this law is easier for the victims of discrimination to make complaints and therefore statistics are easier to be developed. The Rural Race Equality Project is one of the organisations collecting statistical data on cases of racist discrimination, concentrating on the South-West region.

Victims of rural racism in the UK are, on the one hand, members of ethnic minorities, meaning that British citizens with an immigration background, and, on the other hand, asylum seekers, that are placed in camps in small towns and villages. In this sense, the racism in British rural areas is not only related to the decentralisation refugees policy of the government in which the poor living conditions of asylum seekers are based, but also to the isolation of member of ethnic minorities and to the lack of infrastructure for their integration. Not only immigrants or members of ethnic minorities who live in the countryside are in danger falling victim of racial attacks, but also persons who visit the countryside. Corresponding to this situation, unlike in other countries, problem
areas for racism in the countryside in the UK are not only towns and villages where asylum seekers placed. The likelihood for immigrants or members of ethnic minorities falling a victim of racist attacks extends throughout the countryside.

Apart from racial attacks other forms of racist discrimination take place throughout the countryside. Cases of discrimination at the work due to ethnic background or racist offences are also usual practices of racism in rural areas. Anti-racist and immigrants organisations have pointed out that issues of racism in the countryside are aggravated by the isolation of the immigrants and of the members of ethnic minorities from the autochthonous population and from each other and by the lack of infrastructure to satisfy their, basic necessities and to promote their integration.

Despite of the existing literature dealing with rural racism and of the existence of projects fighting racism and promoting the integration of immigrants and members of ethnic minorities in British rural areas, is necessary to conduct more research in this field, develop statistics and to carry out projects for the integration of immigrants and members of ethnic minorities.

24.1.1 Migration

The United Kingdom is a country with a large tradition of migration (cf. Table 24.1). At the end of the 1990s, two percent of the population aged ten and over in England and Wales were of black ethnic origin, three percent of Asian origin and one percent of other “non-white” origin. Members of ethnic minorities comprise approximately six percent of the population in England, 1.5 percent in Wales, and 1.3 percent in Scotland. Nearly half of the people of colour in England were born in the UK (Institute of Race Relations: 2000, cited by Virtanen: 2001). Many members of ethnic minorities are UK citizens; thus, regarding racism and discrimination in the UK, it makes sense to refer to members of ethnic minorities, instead of immigrants.

In England, most members of ethnic communities live in the urban centres of London, Birmingham and greater Manchester. In Scotland, these live in the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh. Increasingly, however, there are residents of ethnic minorities in the remotest parts of the country, the largest group being of Indian ethnic origin. In Wales, the largest group of ethnic minorities are of Pakistani origin, concentrated in Cardiff. In Northern Ireland, the main groups are Chinese, Indian and Pakistani.
24.1.2 Rural Racism

Historically, members of ethnic minorities have lived in rural areas. Only in the last fifty years has there been a change in the settlement pattern of ethnic minorities. According to the 1991 census, about 200,000 persons with ethnic minority backgrounds lived in rural areas (cf. Table 24.4). This figure seems to underestimate newer developments. A greater mobility, economic opportunities in the countryside and increased incomes of some members of minority ethnic groups are leading to an increase of the minority ethnic population in rural areas (Henderson/Kaur: 1999). For example, according to a report by the Southwest Racial Equality Council, approximately 5,000 jobs are going to be created over the next three years in the countryside of the English Southwest (Southwest Racial Equality Council: 2002).

Members of ethnic minorities live most isolated in the countryside and are often victims of racist discrimination (cf. Table 24.3). Victims of racial violence are not only members of ethnic minorities living in the countryside, but also those that visit rural areas. The likelihood of falling victim to racial violence is ten times higher in rural than in urban areas. Cases of racial discrimination or violence are often not taken into account by the police and other authorities, which causes a lack of confidence in the authorities among members of ethnic minorities. For this reason, racial attacks are often not reported to the authorities. This increases the vulnerability of victims of racial violence and contributes to the fact that racial discrimination in the countryside remains rather unknown to the public opinion (Dhalech: 2001). Perceiving racism in rural areas often does not occur because many researchers and officers assume that racism is not a problem in areas with a low or medium concentration of persons with ethnic minority backgrounds (Henderson/Kaur: 1999).

The largest amount of literature on rural racism can be found in the UK; the first studies appeared in the beginning of the 1990s. Jay’s report, Keep Them in Birmingham, on behalf of the Commission for Racial Equality, was a milestone in this field of research. Researching the attitudes of so-called white people in Devon and Cornwall, this study points to the existence and dimension of racism in rural areas (Jay: 1992). Another important contribution to the analysis of racial discrimination in the countryside is the compilation, Rural Racism in the UK. Example of Community Based Responses by Henderson and Kaur. The purpose of this publication is to discuss community-based responses as valid anti-racist approaches in the countryside. The editors of this publication point out that members of ethnic minorities suffer a double isolation in rural areas: the isolation from other members of their communities that often live far from them and the barriers existing between themselves and the so-called white people (Henderson/Kaur: 1999). The isolation of minority ethnic people causes the problem that they cannot share their experiences connected with
discrimination. Nor can they seek advice and support from people in their communities (Dhalech: 2001).

Among the studies carried out in recent years the works of Mohammed Dhalech from the Rural Race Equality Project in Exeter and Philomena de Lima, a researcher at the University of the Highlands and Islands in Scotland, should be mentioned. Both authors analyse the cases of southern England and Scotland respectively, and their identification of the problems connected with rural racism coincide with one another: the isolation of members of ethnic minorities, which can exacerbate the experience of racism and strengthen its invisibility; a lack of infrastructure to redress issues of discrimination; a lack of awareness and willingness among service providers to satisfy the demands of the ethnic minority groups, an under-use of services and an under-reporting of the needs of minority ethnic people as well as a lack of infrastructure to redress issues of discrimination (Dhalech: 1999; de Lima: 2001).

According to Dhalech, there is no fundamental difference between urban and rural racism. The difference lies in the way racism is expressed, the effect it has on the people affected by racism and in the way it is addressed. A problem that seems to erupt more frequently in rural areas is the negation of the existence of racism. Another aspect that needs to be taken into account is that, in contrast to urban areas, there is no developed infrastructure to tackle racism in the countryside. In rural areas, anti-racist work has just begun (Dhalech: 1999).

Analysing the Scotland case, de Lima contends that the image of rural as something homogenous is embedded in popular culture, with its social and cultural construction acting as an “exclusionary device”. Minority ethnic groups are isolated, lack contact with others from the same cultural background and there is little evidence of socialising with local people or community involvement. Most schools ignore cultural and identity issues, and language and communication barriers are caused by a failure of agencies to provide interpretation and language support facilities. Work on “race” in rural communities tends to be championed by one or two committed individuals from rural minority ethnic groups. There is a lack of support from the top which might ensure long-term sustainability (de Lima: 2001). De Lima stresses that initiatives undertaken by rural agencies need to take into account the perspectives of rural minority ethnic inhabitants when formulating their policy and strategy decisions. There is a need to focus on the ways in which rurality might impact minority ethnic residents, as well as to consider how visitors from minority ethnic backgrounds might be welcomed and encouraged to use the countryside as a recreational facility (de Lima: 2001).

Among the studies on racism in the countryside, the work of Stewart and Kilfeather Working with Travellers in Northern Ireland should be mentioned. This article deals with the conditions of ethnic discrimination from which
nomadic Travellers are victims. The absence of adequate site provisions, which means that Traveller families often live on unserviced roadside sites, without access to clean water, electricity and sanitation, forms the main problem of discrimination suffered by Travellers in the countryside of Northern Ireland. The sites are often either provided for in a long distance from services, schools and shops or near settled housing, where Travellers are often victims of racist abuse and intimidation, which causes them to move on (Stewart/Kilfeather: 1999).

Rural racism in the UK presents the same characteristics in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The isolation of the members of ethnic minorities, the lack of programs to support victims of racial discrimination, the lack of awareness and willingness of service providers to attend to the needs of minority ethnic groups, the lack of sensibility among the police and local officers to tackle and fight racism at the local level all strengthen the causes of racial discrimination in the countryside in the UK.

24.1.3 Good Practices

Most examples of good practices can be found in the Southwest England. The Rural Race Equality Project is carried out in the rural areas of Cornwall, Devon and Somerset, and its main objective is to promote the equal treatment of ethnic minorities, to identify ethnic minority groups in the mentioned areas, to research and quantify their need for advice and to identify the barriers perceived by them when it comes to having their advice needs met. Among the initiatives and activities of the project is a publication of all the race equality and minority ethnic organizations in the area; the development of a Racist Incidents Evidence Form in order to report and account for racist offenses and, in this way, assess more accurately the extent of racism; the development of material to raise awareness on the problem of racism in rural areas; the building of a network of local authorities and organisations of minority ethnic groups in order to carry out common activities or to exchange information and experiences; and training in anti-racist issues (Dhalech: 2001).

Further projects are the Black Networking Group (BNG) and the Roots SW. The BNG is a network of employees from ethnic minorities, who comes together to exchange their experiences and discuss problems in the workplace. The Roots SW is another network that brings together local authorities, anti-racist initiatives and organisations of ethnic minority groups in order to carry out common activities (Dhalech: 2001).

De Lima refers to initiatives, such as the Community Safety, which are beginning to tackle incidents involving racism in some rural areas of Scotland.
Nevertheless, these initiatives are not oriented to support the needs of victims of racial discrimination or violence (de Lima: 2001).

Stewart and Kilfeather describe the Craigavon Travellers Support Committee (CTSC) in Northern Ireland, which was founded in 1989 as an answer to racist incidents against Travellers in the Craigavon area. The achievements of this initiative are the provision of facilities, consultation on the provision of serviced sites, information sessions, anti-racist training, networking and the provision of access to services, including legal advice, campaigning, conferences and exhibitions. Nevertheless, it has been criticised that the project has to engage Travellers in the process, as their experience shows that their basic needs have still not been met (Stewart/ Kilfeather: 1999).
24.2 Statistics and Data

Fig. 24.1: Population Density (without Northern Ireland)

Light surfaces indicate sparsely populated areas

Source: Steve Carver, Leeds University 2002
http://www.geog.leeds.ac.uk/people/s.carver/pop.gif, 15/10/02
Fig. 24.2: Incidents of Racial Crime in London


Table 24.1: UK Population by Citizenship 1984-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>55843</td>
<td>56704</td>
<td>57680</td>
<td>58650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Nationals</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU &amp; EFTA</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian sub-continent</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24.2: Main Countries of Origin for Asylum Seekers

Source: Refugee Council online 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>7475</td>
<td>6805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3980</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td>9190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>2085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>7495</td>
<td>6020</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5130</td>
<td>6395</td>
<td>5545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>3740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>5610</td>
<td>3450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>5610</td>
<td>3450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Yugoslavia</td>
<td>11465</td>
<td>6070</td>
<td>3190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24.3: South-West - Avon and Bristol Law Centre’s Race Discrimination Project (RDP) Reported cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Inquiries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 24.4: Minority Population in the South-West Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black car</th>
<th>Black afr.</th>
<th>Black oth.</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bangled.</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Asian other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>465899</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1003104</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>630595</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>457860</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2566258</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25. Racism in Rural Areas – A Synthesis Report

In the 15 European Union member states, the phenomenon of rural racism has been studied using various methods. Literature was interpreted, experts and anti-racist activists were interviewed, statistics and data were collected and systematised.

First of all, the problems of rural areas were considered:
1. The premises of the project were that the rural areas vary from region to region and not representable by a single model.

2. All European rural areas have their base in peasant societies and that the de-peasantisation of the rural areas occurred through urbanisation, changes of agricultural production and small industries in the countryside.

3. Today, the rural areas of Europe are more or less the remains of what is left from organisation processes that covered most of Europe’s territories.

4. There are peripheral areas, like those in southern Portugal, southern Spain, northern Greece, in the north of Finland and Sweden or in northern Scotland, where we are still confronted with peasants and small landholders producing for their own consumption and for a regional market.

5. Most other agricultural areas in Europe are now part of what might be called the European agricultural system, a system which is dominated by farmers, big land owners and agribusiness concerns.

6. Agricultural production is industrialised and has connections to manufacturing or industrial sites, where products are prepared for European supermarkets and wholesalers.

7. Furthermore, there are still areas where fisheries or forests dominate production, or where the countryside has been changed into an environmental protection area.

Most of the European rural areas are places where immigration took place and where emigration and organisation has been turned into the rural-urban continuum. There has been a continuity of immigrants who live as labour forces in agricultural production and in the processing of agricultural goods. There are periphery territories used as places for settling refugees during their applications processes for the determination of their statuses. And there is a huge migration flow from the urban agglomerations into the countryside, as settlers, long-term tourists or elderly people, who also want to live in non-urban environments.

In spite of these complex patterns of change, ideological continuities are characteristic for rural areas in Europe:

1. Religion still maintains a prominent role and a secularization process is not finished. Thus, the immigration of Muslims is more recognizable in big cities.
2. Conservative and traditionalist world views still dominate the image of the stranger; these are still important parts of the social systems in rural surroundings.

3. Most important is the problem of living standards in the rural areas. People have, on average, a lower standard of living with regards to housing and access to the labour markets. When immigrants move, this might be understood as structural racism, since immigrants often live in bad housing conditions and have difficulties in the labour market.

A central problem is that rural areas have no access to entertainment and leisure as people in the cities might have. This affects younger people greatly. The fight against boredom is an important part in young peoples’ lives living in rural areas. This produces a certain lifestyle in which youth culture and scenes play important roles. Many incidents and neo-racist phenomena might be explained just by these lifestyles.

Forms of racism consist of a broad variety of actions. For this study, a categorization was developed distinguished between classical racism, neo-racism, neo-nationalism and xenophobia. More so, there was a distinction made between various forms of aggression and phobic reactions toward certain groups of people – against Blacks, Jews, Gypsies, Muslims etc.

Of course, even in the countryside the classical problem of xenophobia exists with the image of strangers and the configuration of insiders and outsiders. These configurations play an important role in structuring neo-racist phenomena. Forms of action, such as hooliganism and scene-building on the one hand, and aggression against strangers and the formation of “closely gritted organizations” on the other hand, are part of the topology which classifies the results of investigation.

These are the results of the research:

1. There exists a diversity of different phenomena, which might be called rural racism and might be brought together under the general umbrella of neo-racism and xenophobia.

2. There are a variety of social formations that can be called rural. These formations differ in Europe, both from country to country and within the European Union member states.

3. The rural areas of Europe are under pressure created by accelerated changes and social and political crises.
4. It is difficult to distinguish the rural from the urban, and it as labourious to construct a kind of continuity between industrial and agricultural territories in Europe.

5. Information and statistics about neo-racism and xenophobia, obviously present in many rural areas of Europe, are not collected systematically.

6. There are places in Europe where anti-racist movements or the academic world are aware of the peculiarities of rural developments. However, in most of Europe studies on migration, ethnic relations, minorities and racism still concentrate on urban phenomena.

Indeed, we can speak about the subject of this study as a research area that emerges more and more as a part of urban studies. Only some exceptional studies about rural change, migration into rural areas, the role of regional minorities and other possible victims of neo-racism and xenophobia are included, despite the wide range of rural research issues.

It is neither possible to develop a classification of ideal types of ideas and orientations, nor of agents and activists nor of victims of neo-racism and xenophobia. There is not enough material to develop a scientific theory of neo-racism in the countryside.

In rural areas various actions against neo-racism and xenophobia have been developed. This might be distinguished by five different general purposes:

1. There are anti-racist actions that survey neo-racism and xenophobia and disseminate documents of such developments.

2. There are many anti-racist groups that develop community work with young people, or that try to influence schools to produce teaching materials or curricula, in order to empower students as well as teachers in understanding the problem of racism.

3. There are many anti-racist agencies that develop assistance structures for potential victims. There are other activities that focus on networking with migrants and with members of minorities in order to reflect social conditions. Other agencies try to help victims after racist incidents and xenophobic actions.

4. The most important type of activity is the construction of civil societies – active societies in which xenophobia and racism have no opportunity to develop and grow as part of social and political world views. Anti-racist groups are trying to mobilize people and intensify political reflection and activity.
5. There are other agencies that try to network associations in rural, social relationships in order to establish new associations of various kinds that might become the backbone of anti-racist behaviour and actions.

6. There are other social activities concentrating on training police, administrations, teachers, etc. in order to strengthen the ability of local and regional governments to improve the ability of fighting neo-racism and xenophobia in the countryside.

Finally, it should be mentioned that there are three issues that have been discussed by the people active in preparing this report on racism in rural areas:

1. There should be more micro-social comparative studies dealing with rural racism in Europe and beyond.

2. There should be more studies on immigration and minority formations in provincial milieus.

3. There should be more efforts to improve the documentation and data descriptions on racist phenomena in the countryside.
Summary of the Findings

Patterns of immigration flows

There are two patterns of immigration flows in rural areas of the Member States.

1. One pattern is related to the labour immigration in agriculture and to the demand of labour in this sector. This phenomenon has different characteristics in each country. In some areas of Europe, migrants are still employed as farm workers or for forest labour. However, in extensive rural regions of Europe, many immigrants work in industries that have been transferred from big cities to the countryside. In many regions, established immigration flows exist in the form of seasonal workers for harvesting grapes, fruit of various kinds, vegetables or ordinary farm products. In regions with a large demand of labour in agriculture, there is a continuous settlement of immigrant workers over a long time. Although the demand of immigrant labour for agricultural work is found throughout Europe, this phenomenon shows its sharpest forms in the extensive agricultural production, particularly in Spain. In other regions, without intensive forms of agricultural production, immigration takes place during the harvest seasons. This type of seasonal settlement is the most extended throughout the countryside in the Member States. Particularly in Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and the Scandinavian countries, one can find the seasonal engagement of immigrant workers in agriculture, mostly from Eastern Europe.

2. The second pattern of immigration flows is related to the refugees decentralisation policy of the governments of the European Union. Particularly in Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Nordic Countries and the United Kingdom refugees are placed in villages and small towns that do not possess the necessary infrastructure to receive them. This policy has often found the opposition of the autochthonous population, and is sometimes accompanied by right-wing structures in rural areas. This phenomenon is not present in Southern Europe.

Status of the immigrants

• Most immigrants in the countryside of the Member States have a status that does not allow them to exercise their civil and political rights and impedes their integration in the receiver societies. Most of the labour immigrants working in agriculture do not have a legal status and are illegally employed. Because of restrictions of the asylum legislation, asylum seekers living in the
countryside cannot conduct a life according to minimal standards recognized by international civil and human rights treatments, as the right of movement and the right to work. These restrictions contribute to the isolation from immigrant workers and asylum seekers from the autochthonous population.

Victims of racist discrimination or racial attacks

• Victims of racist discrimination and racial attacks in rural areas are mostly immigrants and members of ethnic minorities. Within these groups victims distinguish each other according to the different countries. In Spain, labour immigrants from Morocco are the most victimised group while immigrants from South America and Eastern Europe are generally not a target of racist discrimination. In Portugal, the Gypsies are the most discriminated group, while labour immigrants from Eastern Europe, particularly from the Ukraine and Russia, are relatively integrated. In Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries and the UK are asylum seekers and members of ethnic minorities the most victimised groups. In general, the likelihood of falling victim of racist discrimination or racial attacks is related to the skin colour of the potential victims. In Ireland, there is also a strong discrimination against the Travellers population. In Italy, France and Greece are not special groups of victimised people; discrimination is connected to the different patterns of immigration flows in the various regions within these countries. In Greece, in some regions are the immigrant workers from Albania the most affected group, in other regions are people of Turkish origin. In Italy, in a few regions refugees from the former Yugoslavia are discriminated against, while in other regions asylum seekers from Africa the most discriminated groups. In France, in typical agricultural regions victims could become immigrant workers from Eastern Europe, while in other parts Gypsies are the most victimised groups.

Forms of expressions of rural racism

• A first form of expression of racist discrimination throughout the countryside is the structural discrimination immigrants and members of ethnic minorities. This structural discrimination can be observed in the living and work conditions of the immigrant and ethnic minority population. When one looks at the labour and housing markets as well as at the education and health services, one will observe that immigrants and members of ethnic minorities are in a disavantaged/lower position in comparison to the autochthonous population.

1. So-called illegal immigrant workers normally live outside villages and towns, in barracks in degrading living conditions. Visiting the barracks of Polish workers in the Netherlands or in Belgium, of Ukrainian or Russian
workers in the Scandinavian countries or Marocain workers in Spain, will verify these facts. The degrading living conditions of immigrant workers is not only an expression of discrimination, but also contributes to the emerging and development of the sharpest forms of racism, racial violence. Often, this fact strengthens the impression that immigrants or members of ethnic minorities do not belong to the society, and particularly to their communities. A similar situation is present in the case of asylum seekers. Most of asylum seekers’ camps are placed in rural areas that do not fulfill minimal housing standards.

2. In regard to the labour market the discrimination of immigrants or members of ethnic minorities is evident. Because most of the immigrants working in agriculture are illegally engaged, they receive very low salaries and work under conditions that infringe international labour standards. Despite their condition of “illegals”, there have been massive inflows of immigrant workers in Spain and in Greece protesting against degrading work conditions. The situation of asylum seekers living in rural areas is more dramatic; in the most countries asylum seekers are not allowed to work. But, because the economic support they receive from the state is insufficient to satisfy their basic necessities, they have to work in the black labour market in the worst jobs. Concerning the situation of members of ethnic minorities, one can observe a similar phenomenon. Ethnic minority population, as Gypsies in Spain and Portugal, is mostly at the lowest level of the scala within the labour market.

3. Most immigrant workers have to confront to the problem of the so-called illegality in health services. In some countries as in Spain or in Italy so-called illegals have a right only to basic medical attention. In other countries as in Germany, there is control of the police around the medical attention so that the visit of a hospital in a case of urgency can mean the expulsion for a so-called illegal person. The difference to urban areas lies in the fact that in rural areas, in general, there is no alternative infrastructure managed by immigrant or anti-racist groups to provide medical attention for so-called illegals, as in Berlin or in London.

4. In regard to the education, the asylum seekers are the most affected group by their disadvantaged position. In rural areas there is even less infrastructure to support children of asylum seekers. Immigrant workers come into the countries mostly without their families.

• The second form of expression of racism in rural areas is constituted by verbal attacks of other unequivocal forms to express negative feelings toward immigrants or members of ethnic minorities. Only in a few countries, as in the UK, the Netherlands or in some regions of Germany, there are offices where victims of racist discrimination can make complaints. Statistics
developed by these anti-discrimination offices provide a picture of the level of discrimination in the different countries. Unfortunately, these statistics are not systematised distinguishing urban from rural areas. Nevertheless, anti-racist initiatives, as the Mobiles Beratungsteam in Brandenburg or Rural Race Equality Project in south England, provide data on complaints in rural areas.

A negative atmosphere against immigrants or members of ethnic minorities is reflected in studies on attitudes toward immigrant and ethnic minority population. There are only few such studies that provide information on the relation rural-urban areas. According to these surveys, conducted in the countryside in Austria, Germany and Spain, there are stronger negative attitudes against immigrants and members of ethnic minorities among the autochthonous population in rural than in urban areas. Nevertheless, these data represent only approximations and do not reflect the dimension of the whole problem.

- Racial violence is the sharpest form of racist discrimination. Almost all countries present or have presented problems of racist violence in the countryside. Particularly in Germany, the Scandinavian countries, the UK and Spain racist violence has assumed considerable dimensions in rural areas. The likelihood of falling victim to a racist aggression in these countries is normally higher in the countryside than in urban centres. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that, with the exception of Germany, racial violence in rural areas has decreased in the last years in these countries. It should be mentioned, that the number of racial attacks might be very higher because many incidents are not reported or not considered to have a racist background.

Racist violence in rural areas, particularly in East Germany and in the Scandinavian countries, is often strengthened by the presence of right-wing extremist groups. In villages and small towns right-wing activists are often the most perpetrators of racist attacks.

**Particular characteristics**

Analysing the different patterns of discrimination as well as their forms of expression throughout the countryside in Europe one can say that the causes for the emerging development of racism are the same in urban as in rural areas. Nevertheless, there are two aspects that distinguish the racism in each area:

1. In rural areas immigrants and members of ethnic minorities are more isolated from the autochthonous population and from each other.
2. In rural areas there is a lack of infrastructure to satisfy the necessities of the immigrant and ethnic minority population and to promote their integration in the reception societies.

Factors strengthening rural racism

Although racism in rural areas presents different paths of development and forms of expression in the Member States, some factors strengthening rural racism can be found in almost all cases:

1. The irruption and deepening of economic crisis and increase of unemployment. In many cases the irruption of the crisis has coincided with the placement of asylum seekers in communities throughout the countryside, being the since asylum is often associated to crisis and unemployment. It should be stressed that in most cases local politicians have played a decisive role in negative depiction of asylum seekers. Particularly, villages and small towns throughout the countryside in Germany, the Scandinavian countries and the UK have been affected by this phenomenon.

2. The lack of a democratic civil society. In most villages and small towns there are no structures promoting and strengthening democratic values. Initiatives working for the civil rights of minorities and for the equal treatment in the society in the countryside of Member States are lacking. There are exceptions such as immigrant and anti-racist groups working in rural areas in Austria, Germany, the UK or Spain. But it is only the beginning. Nevertheless, the building or strengthening of a democratic civil society is a task that corresponds to the citizens self. Civil society is not built from above.

3. The lack of a democratic political society. The role of local politicians is decisive for the emerging or development of tendencies of racism among the autochthonous population in villages and small towns in rural areas of the Member States. Local politicians often instrumentalise the topics immigration and asylum in order to gain an audience. They strengthen a negative picture of the immigrants and asylum seekers. It should be remarked that the ideological and political orientation of local politicians does not often play a role in their discursive practice toward the topics immigration and asylum.

Another aspect that has to be taken into consideration, is the historical background of tendencies of racism in rural areas. According to experts there seems to exist a relationship between racism in some villages and small towns throughout the countryside and the influence that the Nazism once achieved in those regions. This hypothesis is supported by the rise of racism in Burgenland, Austria and in some villages and towns throughout the
countryside Germany, Sweden and Denmark. Although this hypothesis is very difficult to be verified it should not be underestimated. Particularly in Germany, experts support the thesis that the lack of a collective confrontation with the Holocaust in the former GDR has contributed to the development of tendencies of racism in East Germany.

Research

There is a lack of studies on the relationship between economic, social and political development paths and immigration flows, as well as on the living conditions of immigrants and patterns of discrimination and racism throughout the countryside in Europe.

The lack of research on migration and racism in the countryside is related to the fact that racism is more invisible in rural areas. Research and political discourse has concentrated on patterns of immigrant settlements and racism in cities and metropolitan areas. This absence of research is connected to the stronger visibility of immigrants in big cities. Because of the lack of infrastructure supporting immigrants and members of ethnic minorities, it is less likely that topics related to racism and immigration become a topic among public opinion. This situation might be also related to the position of researchers as local dwellers and to the fact that it seems to be easier to mobilise authorities of big cities to join the discussion on immigration and integration reforms than it is to mobilise politicians and stakeholders from rural areas.

There is a large amount of literature on transformation processes in rural areas in the European countries. Most of these studies have been carried out in the field of human geography and concentrate on the analysis of the changes in social patterns as a result of industrialisation processes and the urbanisation of rural areas. With the exception of research conducted in Spain, most of these studies do not research immigrants or social changes connected to immigration flows.

Only few studies on patterns of immigration and discrimination in the countryside have been carried out in the different member states. These studies focus on different topics according to the different patterns of immigration flows.

With the exception of a few research efforts such as the project ACCEPT, conducted for the European Commission or the seminar Strategies for the Local Community in the framework of the Stockholm International Forum Combatting Intolerance (January 2001), which have attempted to cover the
phenomenon on the European level, there is still a lack of studies from a comparative perspective. A further lack in the research is the absence of interdisciplinary approaches. Most studies do not integrate research approaches from other disciplines that would improve the outcomes of the analysis.

**Anti-racist work in rural areas**

The work of anti-racist and immigrant organisations is insufficient to cover the necessities of the immigrant and ethnic minority population and to contribute decisively to its integration in the reception societies.

The work of anti-racist and immigrant organisations throughout the countryside varies according to the situation and to the necessities of the immigrant and ethnic minority population in the Member States. In Eastern Germany, for example, the fight against neo-Nazi structures and the assistance of victims of racist violence form a central part of anti-racist work. In Burgenland, Austria, anti-racist work is connected to the historical confrontation with the Nazi past. In rural areas in Portugal, the intermediation of conflicts between the autochthonous population and members of ethnic minorities, particularly Gypsies, have been central in order to tackle the spread of racist tendencies in the communities.

Although there are in almost all countries of the European Union anti-racist and immigrant organisations working in rural areas, it is evident that there is a lack of efforts from the civil society to tackle the racist discrimination in the countryside. It is also necessary that anti-racist groups from cities close to villages and small towns invest more efforts in rural areas.

Anti-racist organisations have to recognise and address the particularities of the forms of expressions and effects of racism in rural areas as well as the special approaches required.

**Recommendations**

- Rural racism will remain a problem in the Member States until the governments do not take steps to satisfy the essential necessities of the immigrant and ethnic minority population. That means legalizing and regulating undocumented labour immigration and protecting the rights of the immigrant workers, instead of criminalizing them. That means introducing changes in the asylum law enabling asylum seekers to a free movement, to work and to carry out activities that guarantee the exercise of their civil rights.
• The necessary infrastructure for the attention of the basic necessities of the immigrant and ethnic minority population should be established. That implies the access to the housing market and to health services as well as the implementation of additional courses in school for the support of the immigrant children.

• Particularly in countries with problems of racist violence, the protection of immigrants and members of ethnic minorities by the police should be improved. In some cases, the intervention of police units from other communities or even districts should be necessary. In some countries, particularly in Eastern Germany and in the UK, it has been reported that the local police often has not taken resolute action against perpetrators of racist violence because of personal links between police personal and perpetrators. This is also a particularity of rural racism, since this kind of loyalty is unlikely to be found in bigger cities. It is also necessary to implement training courses to improve the inter-cultural competence of the police and officers in rural areas.

• It is necessary to promote associations of immigrants and members of ethnic minorities and networks between them in order to fight their isolation in rural areas. It is also important to promote international networks among immigrant and ethnic minority associations and anti-racist organizations working in rural areas in order to promote the exchange of information and experiences.

• It is necessary that the governments of the Member States recognise and address the problem of rural racism, take measures and implement programs in co-operation with local authorities, anti-racist and immigrant organisations to tackle racist discrimination in rural areas.

• Research on patterns of immigration and racist discrimination should be expanded. A larger extension of the research should contribute to identify the necessities of the immigration and ethnic minority population as well as factors strengthening racist discrimination throughout the countryside.
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26.1 General Statistics and Data


Source: B.I.V.S., based on data by Eurostat 2001
Fig. 26.2: Sparsely Populated Areas in Europe [Persons/km²]

Source:
Fig. 26.3: Employment in Agriculture, 1997 (in % of Total Employment)

Source: Eurostat 2002
Fig. 26.4: Regions with Highest Employment in Agriculture, Industry or Services, 1997
(Top 25 Regions)
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Table 26.1 & Fig. 26.5: Employment in Agriculture and Fisheries in 1999 [\% of total employment]

*Source: labour force survey Eurostat 2000, SOPEMI 2001*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total population</th>
<th>non-nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>3,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>17,3</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU average       | 4,5              |
Table 26.2: Threats against a Person, based on Police Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria (1)</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (2)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (3)</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>-74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (4)</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (6)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>348.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (7)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (8)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td>222.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (9)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td>15,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes aggravated assault, assault, bodily injury, attempted aggravated assault, attempted murder and attempted manslaughter. The data is mainly based on the offences reported to the police.
2 Includes data on violent assaults (täliche Angriffe, Anzeigen nach § 283 StGB), bodily injury (Körperverletzungen) and damage to property (Sachbeschädigung; Sonstige Anzeigen StGB).
3 Includes violence to a person reported to the police. In 1999, 15 cases out of 33 lead to charges.
4 Includes data on violent assaults (violence) with racist, xenophobic or anti-Semitic motivation.
5 Includes data on violent assaults with bodily injury (Körperverletzungen), attempted homicide with a proven or suspected right-extremist, xenophobic or anti-Semitic background.
6 Includes court convictions based on racial grounds.
7 Includes damages to a person with or without physical violence; M. Sorice (1999/2000).
8 Includes assaults (mishandeling) with racist, right-wing extremist or anti-Semitic motivation.
9 Includes assaults with and without bodily injuries (ataques c/incendio and lesiones). / NGO data included cases of racist or xenophobic violence against immigrants and friends of immigrants, as well as actions of neo-Nazis; CIPIE (2000).
Includes assault (misshandel), aggravated assault, and attempted murder of a xenophobic or racist nature. Clear and doubtful incidents in the category majority against minority.

11 Includes racially-motivated violent assaults in 1996, and racially aggravated other wounding and common assault in England and Wales since 1 April 1999.
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