

Transatlantic discourse on integration: anti-discrimination policies in Germany and the U.S. ; a conference report

Bosch, Nicole; Wiest, Delia

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Sonstiges / other

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Bosch, N., & Wiest, D. (2007). *Transatlantic discourse on integration: anti-discrimination policies in Germany and the U.S. ; a conference report.*. Bamberg: europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms) Institut an der Universität Bamberg. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-350029>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Transatlantic Discourse on Integration

**Anti-Discrimination Policies in Germany and the U.S.
A Conference Report**

Nicole Bosch

Delia Wiest

Bamberg, August 2007

european forum for migration studies

Institute at the University of Bamberg

Katharinenstraße 1

D-96052 Bamberg

fon +49-951-932020-0

fax +49-951-932020-20

efms@sowi.uni-bamberg.de

<http://www.efms.de>



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Contents of the workshop.....	4
2.1	Anti-Discrimination and Integration Policies in Germany and the U.S.	6
2.2	Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level: Local Authorities	8
2.3	Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level: NGOs and Private Corporations ..	11
2.4	International Trends and Developments	14
3	The participants of the workshops.....	16



1 Introduction

On the occasion of “2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities for All” the efms organised the workshop “Anti-Discrimination Policies in Germany and the U.S.” in cooperation with the Office for Intercultural Work Munich. This one-day workshop took place in the premises of the Neues Rathaus in Munich on July 13, 2007. It brought together 45 European and American academics and policy makers, as well as representatives of non-governmental organisations, private corporations and the media.

The integration of migrants is on the top of the political agenda in German Cities. In Munich, 23 per cent of the inhabitants have another than the German citizenship. This means Munich is the city with the third highest percentage of foreign population in Germany. The percentage of people with migration background is around 34 per cent and people from 180 countries are living together in Munich. An integration concept is currently being discussed and will be submitted to the city council for decision in January 2008. A central principle of the integration concept of Munich is the intercultural orientation and opening of the municipality with the aim of providing the services of this municipality on equal footing. This refers to the fact that integration needs openness of people and institution and in a simplified way, discrimination is the denial of this openness. In general, discrimination could be defined as unjustified unequal treatment. One can distinguish the following types of discrimination: 1) individual discrimination, 2) subjectively perceived discrimination, 3) institutional discrimination, 4) statistical discrimination, 5) unprejudiced discrimination, 6) consequent discrimination, and 7) failed support discrimination. Anti-discrimination policies have to touch at least some aspects of these types of discrimination.

The workshop aimed at discussing anti-discrimination policies in Germany and the U.S. with an emphasis on the local level. The role of local authorities, non-governmental organizations and private corporations were particularly highlighted.

The workshop resumed earlier workshops, which have been held within the series "Transatlantic Discourse on Integration":

- ▶ "Barriers to Integration and Efforts to remove them: Racism, Discrimination and Anti-Discrimination", November 2004
- ▶ "Challenges for Local Integration Policy in Germany and the U.S.", April 2006



2 Contents of the workshop

The workshop programme was divided into three sessions: First “Anti-Discrimination and Integration Policies in Germany and the U.S.”, second “Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level”, which was separated in two Parts: “Local Authorities” and “NGOs and Private Corporations”, and the third Session was titled “International Trends and Developments”. Unfortunately one speaker, Dr. Thomas Schwarz, was not able to attend the workshop due to other unforeseen commitments.

- 9.00 – 9.15 Welcome and Introduction
- Friedrich Graffe** (City Councillor of the City of Munich)
- Prof. Dr. Friedrich Heckmann** (Director of the european forum for migration studies)
-
- 9.15 – 11.00 Anti-Discrimination and Integration Policies in Germany and the U.S.
- Prof. Dr. John E. Farley** (Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville)
- Anti-Discrimination, Diversity Management, and Affirmative Action Policies in the United States*
- Prof. Dr. Axel Schulte** (Institute for Political Science, University of Hannover)
- Anti-Discrimination and Integration Policy in Germany*
- Reinhard Gralla** (Bavarian Ministry of the Interior)
- Integration Policy of the Federal State of Bavaria*
- Questions & Discussion**
- Coffee Break*
- 11.15 – 13.00 Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level
- Part I: Local Authorities**
- Uschi Sorg** (Office for Intercultural Work, Department of Social Affairs of the City of Munich)
- Integration Policy of the City of Munich*
- Anton Biebl** (Director of Municipal Administration of the City of Munich)
- Anti-Discrimination Policy of the City of Munich*
- Michael de la Rocha** (Los Angeles City Commission on Human Relations)
- Anti-Discrimination Policies and Activities of the City of L.A.*
- Questions & Discussion**
- Lunch*
- 14.00 – 15.45 Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level
- Part II: NGOs and Private Corporations**



Daniel Bartel (Anti-Discrimination Office Saxony)

The Role of NGOs in Developing and Implementing Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level

Claudia Menne (The Confederation of German Trade Unions)

Anti-Discrimination Policies in Employment – Role and Activities of Labour Unions in Germany

Anika Dietze (IBM Deutschland GmbH)

Activities and Initiatives of IBM to Eliminate Discrimination at the Workplace

PD Dr. Iris Bednarz-Braun (German Youth Institute)

The Intercultural Cooperation of Apprentices in Large Enterprises

Questions & Discussion

Coffee Break

16.00 – 17.00

International Trends and Developments

Dr. Thomas Schwarz (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)

Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level – Good Practices in Europe

Dr. Hans Hesselmann (Human Rights Office of the City of Nürnberg)

European Coalition of Cities against Racism

Questions & Discussion

Adjourn



2.1 Anti-Discrimination and Integration Policies in Germany and the U.S.

The opening presentation was held by **John E. Farley**, Professor emeritus of Sociology from the University of Southern Illinois, Edwardsville. In his first part Farley presented the most important anti-discrimination laws in the U.S., their enforcement and their impact. In the U.S., anti-discrimination laws forbid discrimination on the basis of race, colour, nationality, religion, sex, disability, and other ascribed characteristics. There are anti-discrimination laws on the federal, state and local level. Farley pointed out that private corporations and organisations also often have anti-discrimination policies to comply with, which sometimes even go beyond what is required by law. Anti-discrimination laws are enforced mainly through agencies that investigate complaints of discrimination, like the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Farley pointed out, that this complaint-based enforcement displays striking weaknesses: Many people do not complain, because it might be “too much to bother”, they think “nothing will come of it” or in some cases are not aware that they have been discriminated. Farley argued that “testing” is more effective than complaint-based enforcement. Farley refers to testing as sending out two people with different characteristics (i.e. race or gender) who are seeking jobs, housing, or other services and then compare how they were treated to identify potential disparate treatment or discrimination. However, in the U.S. limited resources have been devoted to testing-based enforcement.

According to Farley, the anti-discrimination laws which were mostly passed in the mid-1960s turn out to be not as effective as expected. Due to the entrenched and institutionalized nature of racial inequality little has changed in terms of the income or economic position of most Blacks and other minorities. This led to Black Power and similar movements and to efforts to find other ways to reduce racial inequality.

In his second part Farley explained possibilities and characteristics of effective diversity management programs. By 1996 nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ of the 500 largest US corporations had some kind of diversity management program. Farley underlined that in business these programs are seen as necessary for profitability, since so many customers and employees are and will be people of colour.

Farley focused in his third part on the opportunities of affirmative action programs. There are two types of affirmative action, as Farley highlighted. The softer type focuses on recruitment efforts to ensure a diverse pool of employees or a diverse student body. The stronger one actively seeks to increase diversity, which includes consideration of underrepresented minority status in hiring or admissions decisions. Farley pointed out that this form is more effective in enhancing diversity, but also more controversial, because some see strong affirmative action as “reverse discrimination”. Results of studies on affirmative action show that the use of the stronger type has increased the number of minorities attending and graduating from colleges and universities, the number of minority and female employees in management and professional jobs and the number of minority and female employees in government jobs. It has also increased the opportunities for private contractors in government held by minorities and females. Farley mentioned that affirmative action is endangered due to a more conservative Supreme Court today and state initiatives to ban consideration of race in college admissions and hiring by the state. Hence, Farley criticised, despite its clear success in increasing opportunities for minorities, strong affirmative action is threatened. Farley views this develop-



ment as unfortunate, since anti-discrimination and diversity management are less effective than affirmative action in increasing opportunities for underrepresented minorities.

The second presentation in this section was held by **Prof. Dr. Axel Schulte**, from the Institute of Political Science at the Leibniz University of Hannover. First, Schulte outlined different concepts and aspects of discrimination and anti-discrimination policies in general referring especially to the European level.

According to Schulte, discrimination implicates an unequal treatment which hurts the principles of equality and equal treatment and proceeds with disadvantages for the victims. Discrimination refers to unequal treatment on the ground of certain characteristics which are common or ascribed to a group of people and socially important for them, i.e. language, gender, religion, disabilities, race, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, age, political opinion. Schulte outlined two forms of discrimination and racism: institutional discrimination on the one hand and discrimination of part of the society on the other hand. The first type can be caused by legal norms or institutional mechanisms and attitudes within the sphere of public institutions. The second type of discrimination occurs through social and political attitudes and behaviour of private or social groups.

Schulte outlined that anti-discrimination policies are necessary because discrimination violates basic principles and ideals of democratic and multicultural immigration. According to Schulte anti-discrimination policies should be determined by human rights as well as by political and cultural objectives and principles like integration and cohesion, the utilization of human resources, civilization, and tolerance and diversity. Schulte mentioned that it is a difficult and complex challenge to combat all forms of racial discrimination. There is a need for a “combined, multi-pronged strategy”, which combines different measures, levels and actors. Important elements of such a comprehensive and effective anti-discrimination strategy are laid down in international law. Important documents Schulte referred to are the conventions of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) or the conventions of the International Labour Organization (ILO) as well as the EU Treaty of Amsterdam and the EU Race Equality Directive.

In his second part Schulte focused on integration and anti-discrimination policies in Germany. According to Schulte, the anti-discrimination policies in Germany during the last decades can be described as patchy and limited. There existed only single provisions in different legal areas. However, in August 2006 the General Equal Treatment Act (Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz AGG), the first comprehensive anti-discrimination law in Germany came into force. The AGG was passed to transpose four EU equality directives (including the Race Equality Directive) on August 18th, 2006 - after several years of political debate and more than 3 years after the deadline for transposition of the EU Race Directive. In his opinion, the AGG is – despite certain weaknesses – a big step forward in the direction of non-discrimination and equal treatment.

In contradiction to this positive assessment, Schulte argued that the integration policy in Germany still displays striking deficits regarding the liberal, democratic, social and cultural dimensions of the equal liberty concept. Comprehensively understood, anti-discrimination and integration policies should aim at reducing institutionalized differences and tensions between citizens and non-citizens in immigration countries. According to Schulte’s analysis, the German governmental policy towards foreigners still contains discriminatory elements. Therefore Schulte required among others a perma-



ment residence permit for young people with a migration background, born and grown up in Germany including free, equal and unlimited access to the labour market as well as the right to vote.

To summarize, Schulte called for a comprehensive strategy in the fight against discrimination which should be embedded into a general policy which aims at promoting the integration, participation and cohesion of the whole society.

Reinhard Gralla, from the Bavarian Ministry of the Interior, presented measures of the integration policy of the federal state of Bavaria. He stated that 18.9 per cent of the Bavarian population have a migration background. According to Gralla, language is key for integration and for participation within the economic and social life. In the beginning of 2005 Bavaria established so called "Integration courses" and more than 30.000 migrants participated in these integration courses until the mid of 2006. The quality inspection is undertaken by the Federal Office for Immigration and Refugees (BAMF). The courses consist of 600 lessons about practice knowledge in the German language and additional 30 lessons about the legal system, history and culture of Germany. In order that every migrant is able to afford the courses the participant has to contribute one Euro per lesson only.

Gralla pointed out that there are promotion programmes for children, because experience has shown that pupils with migration background are over-represented among those who leave school without any qualifications. Children with migration background have to pass language tests before they are enrolled in schools. As a result, 90 per cent of the children were able to be enrolled regularly. The other 10 per cent received extra support.

2.2 Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level: Local Authorities

The Concepts of the Integration Policy in Munich was presented by **Uschi Sorg**, from the Office for Intercultural Work, Department of Social Affairs of the City of Munich. This office is the link between administration, associations and organisations and performs city-wide coordination and networking activities. At first Sorg explained the vision of the conceptual framework: "Munich is a solidly united urban society in the responsibility of everyone. The communication between the various social groups is providing the base of integration. Measures and services of the City are strengthening the existing capabilities of all persons living in Munich, irrespective of age, colour, religion, cultural and social origin, disability, philosophy of life as well as sexual identity. Children and youths deserve special attention. The participation of each and everyone in social life, local government decisions and access to resources are guaranteed on equal footing." Sorg mentioned that integration policy has to be understood as a cross-department task and a long-term process. She highlighted two out of eleven basic principles of the integration concept: 1) Integration means to combat discrimination and racism, and 2) the precondition of integration is intercultural orientation and the intercultural opening of institutions. According to Sorg, the conceptual approaches are the linking between the cross-departmental task intercultural orientation and intercultural opening with the cross-departmental tasks gender mainstreaming, people with disability and sexual identity. She outlined that the aim is not just to achieve intercultural competence of the individual office staff but also a structural evolution of the organisation: intercultural organisational development, intercultural quality development and intercultural human resources development. Sorg explained the structure of boards for intercultural opening. Firstly, she mentioned the Working Committee on Integration (mu-



nicipality), which is responsible for the implementation of projects, coordination of departmental objectives and measures and if required formation of temporary task forces for cross-departmental arrangements. Secondly, Sorg noted the Council Commission for Integration (stake holders), which leads the dialog between local affairs and social actors to enhance intercultural orientation and opening in the city community and to promote integration in general. As an indicator for this attitude people with migration background have free access to all sections of the municipality. Sorg pointed out that there are specific efforts to recruit apprentices with migration background and intercultural vocational training of employees of the municipality.

To conclude, the Integration Concept of the City of Munich for the first time combines all above mentioned activities and makes the intercultural opening obligatory for all departments of the municipality. Furthermore, the concept enables migrants to access basic societal institutions of the city on equal footing.

After Uschi Sorg explained the city's integration concept, **Anton Biebl**, Director of Municipal Administration of the City of Munich, presented the Anti-Discrimination Policy of the City of Munich. He first exemplified the legal framework and anti-discrimination directives on the European, national and city level. Biebl illustrated the directive of Munich for equal opportunities and against discrimination in the working world in more detail. This was established in January 2006 acting with the city as an equal opportunities employer and service provider. There are intercultural training programs, advisory offices and disciplinary measures to combat racism and discrimination. Biebl outlined several capacities within the municipality, which deal with anti-discrimination. To name just a few he outlined the: Equal Opportunities Division for Men and Women (Gleichstellungsstelle für Männer und Frauen), Discrimination Complaints Unit with regard to gay, lesbians and transgender (Koordinierungsstelle für gleichgeschlechtliche Lebensweisen), Advisory Council of foreign Citizens (Ausländerbeirat), Munich Alliance for Tolerance, Democracy and Constitutional State (Münchner Bündnis für Toleranz, Demokratie und Rechtsstaat) and the Complaints Coordination Centre for Cases of Discrimination (Beschwerdestelle für Diskriminierungsfälle). According to Biebl, all these institutions are responsible for individual support and assistance, documentation, analysis, objectives and projects. They are also in charge of coordination, networking, lobbying, public relations, exchange of experiences, corporate education and training, and reporting to the city council.

At the end Biebl argued that there will be no effective implementation of the directives and regulations without human, financial and material resources. According to the various target groups, he stated that it is necessary to set up various units and integrate the different strategies and responsibilities within a central coordination.

Michael de la Rocha, from the City of Los Angeles Human Relations Commission, started his presentation with demographic and diversity facts of the City of Los Angeles. L.A. is the largest city within the state of California by population (over 4 million inhabitants) and second largest in the US. The Greater L.A. area even estimates 17.7 million people. According to de la Rocha, 42 per cent of L.A.'s residents were born outside the U.S. (which is the second-largest foreign born population of any major U.S. city) and more than 225 languages are spoken in L.A. He pointed out that currently Los Angeles has no majority population. Beyond nationality and race De la Rocha mentioned that 20 per cent of L.A.'s population have a physical disability, more than 10 per cent are lesbian, gay, bisexual



or transgender (LGBT). He also highlighted that over 600 distinct faith communities have established congregations in the L.A. area.

In his second part de la Rocha dealt with federal laws and policies and their implementation in the City of Los Angeles. De la Rocha mentioned the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (CRA), which prohibits employment discrimination based on five different bases: Race, colour, religion, national origin and sex. Throughout the years several bases have been added at federal level, others at state and local levels. The City of Los Angeles recognizes twelve different bases, also referred to as protected classes: Race, colour, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability (physical or mental), age, marital status, medical condition and HIV/AIDS. De la Rocha explained that charges of discrimination and harassment must be based upon identification or perceived identification within a protected class.

Besides the phenomena of discrimination and harassment, De la Rocha illustrated the phenomena of hate crimes. According to California State Law, hate crimes include bias, hatred, or prejudice based on the victim's real or perceived race/ethnicity, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, gender, or sexual orientation. The 2006 Hate Crime Report shows a decrease in the total number of hate crimes by 6 per cent in L.A. County in, which is the second-lowest ratio in the past 17 years. However, hate crimes against the LGBT community increased by 7 per cent. There is also an increase in anti-immigrant slurs and hate crimes targeting African Americans which rose by 3 per cent in 2006. African Americans, De la Rocha highlighted, comprise nearly 60 per cent of all racial hate crime targets, even though they represent only 9 per cent of the population. The Report also shows that in 2006, minors were 43 per cent of hate crime suspects, which increased from 32 per cent the year before. Furthermore, there was a 33 per cent increase in hate crimes in which gang members were suspects. Nearly 18 per cent of all hate crimes involved gangs.

De la Rocha finished his presentation illustrating the major pro-active activities which have proved of value in the fight against discrimination, harassment and hate crime in L.A. Firstly, he emphasised the education and empowerment of youth and communities: This means access to information and resources, constant public, private and community education and training with the aim to promote and increase civic engagement and public education initiatives. Secondly, De la Rocha emphasised the need of partnering governmental agencies with the minority communities. Furthermore De la Rocha mentioned the necessity to assure the enforcement and accountability of the agency, entity or neutral body in charge and to support and assist them in their daily work through adequate training and education.



2.3 Anti-Discrimination Policies on the Local Level: NGOs and Private Corporations

Daniel Bartel presented the work of the Anti-Discrimination Office Saxony in Leipzig which is emphasising the role of NGOs in developing and implementing anti-discrimination policies on the local level. The office was founded in December 2004 as a bottom up initiative and aims to establish a culture of anti-discrimination and diversity using strategies of empowerment and raising awareness. Its easy access is only one of the office's characteristics: It is free of charge, local and has no further barriers. The three main fields of work are: 1) Support, counselling and advocacy for people who were discriminated against, 2) Training on the "General Act on Equal Treatment" (AGG), diversity, racism etc. and 3) Information on public events, publications and presentations. The anti-discrimination office acts as the bridge between governmental bodies and the civil society and takes sides for the people suffering from discrimination.

However, Bartel characterised the cooperation between NGOs and local authorities as challenging: In most cases local authorities do not have a long-term strategy concerning the fight against discrimination. But for a continuous and sustainable work NGOs need continuous funding and support. On the other hand, Bartel pointed out, NGOs have its own difficulties with governmental funding: In order to fulfil their mandate as victim support organisation, NGOs need to insist on their independency and resist the risk of compromises.

At the end of his presentation Bartel introduced the *Antidiskriminierungsverband Deutschland (advd)* which was founded in May 2007 and consisting of seven members with working backgrounds in anti-discrimination and anti-racism. The agenda of the *advd* is to establish an anti-discrimination culture, define quality standards, to coordinate strategies and to systematically document discrimination.

Anti-discrimination in employment and the role and activities of Labour Unions in Germany were worked out by **Claudia Menne**, from the Confederation of German Trade Unions. Menne first summarized the actual situation about anti-discrimination in employment. She mentioned that the new legislation, the "General Act of Equal Treatment" (AGG) since August 2006 has been in place with an integrated approach and is strongly supported by the trade unions. By this act individual rights are strengthened. Menne outlined that now the burden of proof lay with the employer, which means the employer has to proof that there is no discriminatory practice. But she criticised that there are still no developed collective rights: The anti-discrimination law does not foresee a strong collective associations' right for representative action (Verbandsklagerecht) to either complain or to go to court.

According to Menne, trade unions offer support in these cases by consulting, legal advice or negotiation (conciliation with the employer to avoid a legal case). All in all the new legislation improves the pro-active approach to create a non-discriminatory environment. Like political organisations, trade unions play an active role on local or regional level for creating an anti-discrimination-culture and as social partners they will be represented in the consultation body at national level.

Menne outlined that at company level, discrimination in the workplace takes place in forms of harassment and sexual harassment, equal payment and career opportunities. Trade unions provide



training for works councils in anti-discrimination policy and practice. They encourage people to stand up for their rights, disseminate the necessary information and investigate the discriminatory practice. Work councils at company level act as negotiator and control body to defend individual and collective rights. Menne stated that they act on the level of collective agreements, information policies and the right to take initiatives.

During the workshop the question came up whether the General Equal Treatment Act (AGG) also applies to public administration. This point caused uncertainties in reference to the interpretation of the new legislation but no solution was found during the workshop. In an Email exchange after the workshop **Karl Moehl** clarified the view of the Federal Anti-Discrimination Office (ADS): The public administration, as an employer, is subjected to the AGG. This means if a person, who has applied for a job in the municipality, feels discriminated because he or she was rejected on the basis of his or her ethnic origin, the person can refer to the AGG. However, concerning administrative acts of public services in relation to its citizens, Moehl stated that public administration is not subjected to the AGG. **Dr. Günter Max Behrendt** from the Anti-Discrimination Body of the City of Hannover disagreed with this perception. He referred to an article by **Prof. Dr. H.-J. Bauschke** from the Federal University of Applied Administrative Sciences. According to Bauschke, the AGG is in force both in the interior field of public administration, as an employer, and in the external field of public administration, as service provider for customers. Consequently it turns out that there is no well-defined construction of the AGG relating to the issue of public administration.

Activities and initiatives of a private corporation to eliminate discrimination at the workplace were presented by **Anika Dietze**, from the IBM Deutschland GmbH. This national company of the IBM Corporation has its headquarters in Stuttgart and consists of approximately 21.000 employees in 2006 and around 40 branch offices. Dietze mentioned that diversity does not only include minorities, but every single person, because everyone has a different social background. She outlined that the diversity and inclusion issue at IBM, had already been started in September 1953 when T.J. Watson Junior signed an IBM Policy Letter, which already focused on equal opportunity. Dietze pointed out that when it comes to the issue of diversity and inclusion there are not only social drivers but also business drivers: 1) The global marketplace within customers, suppliers and strategic partners are increasingly multi-cultural, so business must position itself to communicate and market to a diverse internal and external population, 2) Customers have diverse needs and businesses have to reflect their diverse population in order to be responsive to customer needs and expectations, 3) The competition to attract and retain top talent is increasing and employers must be employer of choice to attract, develop and retain key skills, and 4) Competitive advantage comes through being a leader in innovation.

Dietze explained several diversity and inclusion instruments existing also at European and global level. There are three bodies: the Diversity and Inclusion Leader, Diversity Network Groups and Diversity Executive Sponsors. Furthermore there are several training programs for managers and employees concerning diversity, inclusion and cultural awareness. A third instrument is the way of communication via intranet, videos, events and the kind of communication between the employees, manager, sponsors and directors. Dietze added that there are programs for all diversity and inclusion



constituencies (gender, gay-lesbian-bisexual-transgender, disability, cultural differences, multigenerational workforce, work/life balances) reaching internal and external audience. In cases of discrimination employees can call several contact points at IBM, for instance the Diversity and Inclusion Leader, Diversity Network Groups, HR Leaders, the intranet, the Legal Department, the Works Council or the representative body for disabled employees.

With the implementation of the “General Act of Equal Treatment” (AGG) in August 2006 IBM Germany set up an AGG task force to go through all documentations and communications of the company and it turned out that there was not much to reform, because IBM already had the right attitude through its diversity and inclusion programs. The Director of Human Resources informed employees about the AGG in conjunction with diversity and inclusion policy. Dietze herself, the Diversity and Inclusion Leader, held employee information sessions. An AGG Intranet page was set up and an interactive AGG E-Learning system was developed.

At the end of her presentation Dietze introduced an IBM video about diversity and inclusion, which will be distributed to all employees in Germany. This video aims at internal education and mindset awareness training concerning the issue of diversity and inclusion.

PD Dr. Iris Bednarz-Braun, from the German Youth Institute (DJI), presented empirical findings from a project which surveyed the intercultural relations among apprentices in large enterprises. Bednarz-Braun mentioned when it comes to integration, migration and intercultural coexistence, public debates mostly stress problems, i.e. about so called parallel societies or racism and xenophobia. She emphasised that there indeed can be observed successful intercultural collaboration and coexistence among people of the host society and people with migration background living together in Germany, which is the result of mutual integration efforts. Both natives and immigrants are involved in this and it takes place on the individual level as well as on the level of institutions and organisations like companies and enterprises.

The study Bendarz-Braun presented was conducted in four large enterprises of the German metal industry: Bosch, Deutsche Bahn, Deutsche Werft and Ford. On average, 41 per cent of all trainees in these companies had a migration background. Bednarz-Baun pointed out that 85 per cent of all polled trainees have integrated well with their co-trainees of other cultural origins and this is even more true for apprentices with migration background (90 per cent). According to Bednarz-Braun, the reasons for the positive intercultural relations are on the one hand that many trainees have grown up in an intercultural environment and achieved the key qualification called “intercultural competence”. On the other hand enterprises themselves try to promote good intercultural relationships among their trainees by holding seminars and practise “social control” by preventing severe conflicts. The category “respect”, as Bednarz-Braun stated, plays in general an important role in intercultural settings. Concerning this issue the findings again show positive insights, because the majority of the polled agreed that they are respected by their colleagues.

It also turned out that many of the trainees meet each other outside of work. Half of the trainees spend their leisure in an intercultural composition, the other half meet with colleagues of their own cultural origin only. Especially migrant trainees meet with colleagues, who do not belong to their own ethnic culture. Above all, the majority (76 per cent) has further intercultural friends.



Despite these positive findings, problems and conflicts between trainees exist. The DJI-survey identified the following two major reasons: 1) “horseplay” among colleagues disturbing the learning situation, which has nothing to do with intercultural relations, and 2) using the mother tongue in presence of colleagues, who cannot understand the language, which make them feel uncomfortable and excluded in a situation.

To conclude, Bednarz-Braun pointed out that the majority of the polled trainees prefer an apprenticeship in intercultural composition, which is notably true for migrant trainees. The findings also present that trainees of intercultural groups are much more content with their situation than those of mono-cultural groups. Referring to the public discourse, Bednarz-Braun stated, the study does not confirm the opinion that migrants want to withdraw to their ethnic communities.

2.4 International Trends and Developments

Dr. Hans Hesselmann, from the Human Rights Office of the City of Nuremberg, highlighted the cities’ responsibilities according to anti-discrimination policies on the local level. Aiming at supporting cities in implementing anti-discrimination policies, the UNESCO established the “European Coalition of Cities against Racism” in 2004 in Nuremberg, an international network of municipalities against racism. A “Ten-Point-Plan of Action” was adopted, too. The Human Rights Office of the City of Nuremberg was given the task of acting as the Coalition’s Administrative Secretariat. Other parts of the organizational structure of the coalition are the Steering Committee which is the decision-making body and a Scientific Secretariat located at the UNESCO in Paris. It is also decided that the Coalition will be established as a registered association and thus given a legal basis. This decision makes sure, that cities which join the association will not only sign the “Ten-Point-Plan of Action”, but actually implement it afterwards. By now the network compasses over 70 municipalities from 15 European countries. The main four goals of the coalition are: 1) fighting discrimination and racism at the municipal level and thus making a contribution to safeguarding human rights, promoting integration and respect for diversity in Europe, 2) supporting member cities in this task via the “Ten-Point-Plan of Action Against Racism” and assisting them in establishing priorities, optimizing their strategies and intensifying co-operation, 3) strengthening co-operation with institutions and organizations which are also committed to fight against discrimination and racism, and 4) representing and promoting common interests of member cities at the European Union, the Council of Europe and with governments of the European states.

Hesselmann presented some of the points of the “Ten-Point-Plan of Action”. This plan lists ten core fields of activity, including the labour market, the housing sector and the education system. Four of them will be explained in more detail now. Point 5 refers to the labour market and suggests that all municipal contracts and licences should include anti-discrimination clauses and local corporations should actively support to fight against racism and discrimination. Point 6 commits the city as an employer and service provider to safeguarding equal opportunities and equal treatment. This includes promoting intercultural competence of municipal employees and increasing the representation of people with a migration background and from discriminated groups among the city’s members of staff. Point 7 suggests possibilities for combating discrimination in the housing sector, referring to codes of practice or guidelines for municipal and private bodies involved in renting and sell-



ing accommodation, and for active support granted to people looking for accommodation. The last point, which is presented here, is Point 8 and refers to the educational system and demands measures for sustainable improvement of equal opportunities in the field of education and for promoting education in mutual tolerance, in respect for human rights and in intercultural dialogue, i.e. by rewarding schools for exemplary anti-racist activities.

Another plan, which was adopted, was a mid-term strategic plan for the Coalition. It includes the following tasks: 1) to organize symposia, workshops and conferences to proactively promote the sharing of best practice in implementing the “Ten-Point-Plan of Action”, 2) to create a website for the Coalition to facilitate and provide communication and the exchange of experiences, as well as best practice examples, 3) to develop transparent criteria for the evaluation of the implementation of the “Ten-Point-Plan of Action”, 4) to identify a member city in each European country which undertakes to promote and co-ordinate activities of the Coalition on national level, and 5) to develop a proactive public relations strategy aiming to inform about the goals of the Coalition and to wake the interest of local authorities in Europe by participating in this communal network against racism and discrimination.

To summarize, Hesselmann argued that the “European Coalition of Cities against Racism” might be a contribution to bring cities one step closer to the vision of a Europe where people may live with equal rights and opportunities and in mutual respect. He closed with the words: “One precondition for this is that as many European municipalities as possible should join the Coalition and implement the “Ten-Point-Plan of Action” in real life. We are working on it!”



3 The participants of the workshops

A list of participants is compiled on the basis of the *efms* database of cooperation partners, networks and related institutions. This serves as a pool for invitations for all workshops, and will be continuously broadened and modified with regard to the varying workshop topics.

Karl Auwärter, City of Munich

Daniel Bartel, Anti-Discrimination Office Saxony

Anna Bauer, Law Firm BR Rechtsanwälte

PD Dr. Iris Bednarz-Braun, German Youth Institute (DJI)

Dr. Günter Max Behrendt, Anti-Discrimination Body of the City of Hannover

Anton Biebl, Director of Municipal Administration of the City of Munich

Simone Bloem, Office for Intercultural Work, Department of Social Affairs of the City of Munich

Nicole Bosch, european forum for migrationstudies (efms)

Michael de la Rocha, Los Angeles City Commission on Human Relations

Anika Dietze, IBM Germany GmbH

Sonja Dudek, Federal Anti-Discrimination Office

Prof. Dr. John E. Farley, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

Dr. Maria Gavranidou, Department of Health and Environment of the City of Munich

Friedrich Graffe, City Councillor of the City of Munich

Reinhard Gralla, Bavarian Ministry of the Interior, Munich

Patricia H.H. Guy, General Consulate of the United States

Prof. Dr. Friedrich Heckmann, european forum for migrationstudies (efms)

Dr. Hans Hesselmann, Human Rights Office of the City of Nuremberg

Julia Hieber, University of Oxford

Elmar Huss, Office for Statistics of the City of Munich

Birgit Jagusch, Information and Documentation Centre for Anti-Racism Work (IDA)

Dr. Eva Jüsten, Department of Social Affairs of the City of Munich

Kerstin Meerwaldt, BMW Foundation Herbert Quandt

Claudia Menne, The Confederation of German Trade Unions (DGB)

Karl Moehl, Federal Anti-Discrimination Office

Christal Morehouse, Bertelsmann Foundation



Andrea Müller, University of Tübingen

Regina Ober, Department of Social Affairs of the City of Munich

Prof. Dr. Berndt Ostendorf, America Institute, University of Munich

Monica Prestel, Council for Foreigners of the City of Munich

Prof. Dr. Axel Schulte, Institute for Political Science, University of Hannover

Uschi Sorg, Office for Intercultural Work, Department of Social Affairs of the City of Munich

Franziska Szoldatits, Confederation for Intercultural Work Bavaria (VIA Bayern)

Alexander Thamm, German Marshall Fund of the United States Berlin (GMF)

Dalibor Vukadin, University of Ulm

Dr. Britta Waldschmidt-Nelson, America Institute, University of Munich (LMU)

Delia Wiest, european forum for migrationstudies (efms)

Xandra Wildung, German Youth Institute (DJI)

Richard Wolf, european forum for migrationstudies (efms)

Magdalena Ziolek, University of Munich