3. Integration, Intercultural Management, Migration Mainstreaming

All levels of German cultural policy have been engaged in the latest debate on the lack of immigration-related diversity in cultural institutions (Federal Foreign Office 2016, 2020). Although promoting cultural diversity is one of the main objectives of cultural policies and implementation strategies of public funding institutions, the theatre realm, and especially public theatre, is the most prominent subject of such discussions since it is reluctant to respond to demographic changes in a long-standing immigrant country.

This chapter focuses on the interpretation of the phenomenon of "diversity" in German cultural policy, as a critique of the "white multicultural gaze towards to the ethnic other" (Hage, 2000, p. 138), referred to in this work as citizens with a "particular migrant background".

Before investigating the different dimensions of the cultural policy objective of "promoting diversity", the study poses an inevitable question: Why should we concentrate on the meaning of cultural diversity when diversity is self-evident in a country like Germany?[1] Seeking an answer to this question is essentially interrelated with the claim that diversity discourse is semantically vague (Vertovec, 2012) when it comes to cultural policy and theatre. Secondly, it further raises the issue of "what does diversity 'do' when it is 'put into action'?" (Ahmed, 2007, p. 237). And thirdly, in terms of citizenship and civil rights, it concerns the need to explore policy responses to diversity addressing inequality and social justice (Ahmed, 2012; Benhabib, 2002; Cooper, 2004; Faist, 2009; Mouffe, 1992).

Although diversity discourse includes a wide range of contexts, this analysis concentrates on its implementation in cultural policy. The research focuses on the diversity arising from immigration in Germany and distinguishes the long-established patterns of diversity from the newer forms of immigration-generated

1 The research explores various diversity aspects of public and independent theatres in Chapter 3, the politics of diversity in Germany in Chapter 4, and how diversity is understood and addressed by the federal cultural policy funding actors and some of their programmes in Chapter 5.

diversity (Brubaker, n.d.). Since a great deal of diversity discourse in German cultural policy and theatre practice centres around the objective of "achieving diversity", their interest in "being diverse" compels the researcher to delve into the discourse of cultural policy on diversity. Dealing with cultural diversity as a policy objective and its application is thus imperative for this study as it could be a basis for formulating recommendations for an interculturally-oriented cultural policy framework for the German theatre scene, one that could reflect the needs and expectations of an intercultural society.

Searching for a cogent meaning of diversity also requires comprehending the concepts in circulation used when addressing immigration-related diversity in cultural policy. Additionally, varying political stances have to be taken into consideration, as indicated by Thomas Faist:

> Diversity as a concept and a set of not necessarily coherent policies, programmes and routines straddle many worlds: it appeals to those who emphasise individual economic competence and self-reliance of immigrants ('neo-liberals'), to those who cherish the public competence of immigrants in public affairs (republicans), as well as to those, like the European Commission, who push for structural reforms to turn incorporation into a two-way process. (2009, p. 173)

The study focuses on structurally developed cultural policy measures, strategies, and programmes that include all individuals and groups as subjects of diversity discourse and discussions, instead of targeting only "particular" immigrants. Furthermore, it searches for a diversity framework that would emphasise equal opportunities rather than obligations (of "particular" immigrants), one that does not confine those immigrants to inclusion and (cultural) integration schemes. This way of approaching diversity is also connected with the existing degrading formulation of national identity that does not correspond with a liberal democratic perspective since it excludes or marginalises some citizens (Carens, 2015, p. 264).

The researcher ruminates about the critiques of diversity discourses of policy and practice, summarised by sociologist Steven Vertovec (2012)[2], and argues that they reflect to a great extent how German cultural policy perceives, conceptualises, and implements diversity in the theatre sphere, detecting the following:

- It is instrumentalist, conceiving that some people comprise 'the diverse' who are to be managed by someone else.
- It reinforces normativity, with the White, male, able, sexually straight person as the model from which others are different.

2 Vertovec refers to the vast array of critiques uttered by academics, social movements, and community organisers. He stresses that "the critiques themselves are scattered across variegated programmes and meanings of diversity" (2012, p. 301).

- It is patronising, claiming to function for the benefit of some purported downtrodden group.
- It amounts to social engineering, attempting to artificially create a (normatively conceived) perfect team, company or society.
- It equalises differences by way of assuming that, in terms of experiences of discrimination (following this rationale, measures for anti-discrimination), race is like gender is like disability, and so on.
- It dissipates politics (especially of group-based movements), carrying a divide-and-rule logic to extremes of individuals and their innumerable attributes.
- It shifts attention from inequality, placing emphasis on esteem and 'feel-good' measures rather than real improvement of structural conditions.
- It is just a 'formality' or façade for companies or other institutions to make it look like they are doing something positive for minorities.
- It is easily cut-off from other programmes within a company or public institution – that is, just something for the minorities rather than for all.
- It is little more than 'counting people who are different', which some – especially those deemed 'different' – might find offensive. (Vertovec, 2012, p. 300)

The research recognises these critiques as a frame of mind. Starting from the latest discussion on the intercultural opening of cultural institutions, specifically theatres, in the German cultural policy discourse, it searches for a concept of diversity that would provide a dynamic and fluid meaning that narrates the notion of diversity as an ongoing process *in motion*, in line with the contemporary understanding of cultural identity in a transnational world. The need to reframe the meaning of diversity is ultimately interconnected with (a) the accessibility of theatres for "the other" who are categorised as people with a "particular migrant background" and (b) the role of cultural policy in "creating a barrier-free" (Terkessidis, 2013, p. 17) theatre landscape.

3.1 (Cultural) Integration and the Failure of Multiculturalism

Conceiving the intercultural opening of theatres, the researcher calls into question "the rise of loose talk and normative programmes surrounding 'diversity' and the term itself having no clear content or overall aim in public discourse and policy" (Vertovec, 2015, p. 3) in order to envision diversity *in motion* by suggesting a viable cultural policy concept for the theatre scene. This effort requires disputing the role of theatre in the 21st century in which migration is one of the factors most responsible for changing the cultural fabric of society due to the processes of advanced globalisation and the climate of rising conservative populism, right-

wing extremism, and racism. The current condition of transnationalism with its implications in various dimensions (e.g., political, economic, social, cultural) is forcing cultural policies and the cultural sphere to rethink the highly complex, multi-layered facets of (cultural) identity in the face of migration and forced displacement, in an attempt to reconceptualise the phenomenon of cultural diversity.

With the aim of determining the cognitive and political framework of the language of diversity and grasping the grounds of its changing terminology, it is crucial to investigate the policy paradigms of diversity and the perspectives of these paradigms on (cultural) identity and cultural differences, as critical indicators revealing the reversal of the policy discourse on cultural diversity.

Since the 2000s, a clear shift from multiculturalism to interculturalism has taken place in German cultural policy circles, following the same trend present in other parts of the world at the time. Only in the last few years have German policymakers started discussing transculturalism at the discourse level. It should be noted that, in comparison to interculturalism, engaging with the notion of transculturalism is a relatively recent development. There is one mention of "transculture" in the national cultural policy, updated in February 2020, as reference to a brochure provided by the *Goethe Institut* (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 28).[3] As an emerging concept, transculturalism has recently been employed by some funding institutions of the federal government such as the Socio-Culture Fund (*Fonds Soziokultur*; see Section 5.3.2 for the Fund's transcultural perspective) but is yet to be applied as a cultural diversity concept in the German cultural policy context. Hence, the analysis in this chapter only focuses on perspectives related to multiculturalism and interculturalism.

Regarding the recognition of cultural diversity, in the last two decades, many scholars have been discussing the differences and similarities between the concepts of multiculturalism and interculturalism in policy terms, mostly in Canada, Australia, and Western Europe, albeit from different aspects, but most often in contexts surrounding the claim of the "failure of multiculturalism" (Barrett, 2013; Bharucha, 1999a, 1999b; Bouchard, 2011; Cantle, 2012; Girishkumar, 2015; Hammer, 2004; James, 2008; Kymlicka, 2010; Levey, 2012; Mani, 2005; Meer & Modood, 2012;

3 The brochure consisted of a brief introduction to transculture which offered a working definition for the term: "Transculture describes a dynamic understanding of culture in which different cultural influences meet and blend with one another. We no longer speak of clearly defined differences, but of a set of diverse cultural influences that are simultaneously effective not only in a country but also in individuals themselves. This diversity is often only present subconsciously since the coexistence of people is characterised by certain norms and values. Recognising and differentiating cultural diversity is always dependent on a process of reflection" (Wolfram & Föhl, 2018, p. 2).

Modood, 2014; Modood & Meer, 2013; Parekh, 2007; Schönwälder, 2010; Taylor, 2012; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010; Weinstock, 2013; Wood et al., 2006). As stated by Nasar Meer and Tariq Modood, "in both theoretical and policy discourses, multiculturalism means different things in different places" (2012, p. 179). Notably, the key features of Canadian and Australian multiculturalism distinctly differ from the European interpretations since immigration has different roots in the two environments; European countries have significantly varying historical, political, and legal legacies and sociocultural structures. Hence, "dealing" with immigration includes a wide range of strategies and perceptions, contrasting those of their Canadian and Australian counterparts.

When the term multiculturalism emerged in Canada and Australia in the 1960s and 1970s, it was linked to the liberal values of individual freedom, social justice, and the promise of equal citizenship on a non-discriminatory basis (Meer & Modood, 2012, p. 180). In the earlier years of the post-war mass immigration to Europe, multiculturalism was first determined by race, and the arrival of migrants provoked resentment and hostility within the host societies (Cantle, 2012, p. 55). In France, Germany, and Britain, although in different forms (a more liberal approach in Britain until pre-Brexit), the multiculturalist view was unanimously associated with integration policies (Cantle, 2012; Collinson, 1998; Schönwälder, 2010). However, different models were adopted; while France favoured assimilation, Germany leaned towards the form of "guest worker" in which long-term citizenship and rights were denied (Cantle, 2012, p. 112), while the Netherlands, Sweden, and Britain advocated for the recognition of a "multiracial" society (Collinson, 1998, p. 154). Meer and Modood write:

> In Europe [multiculturalism] came to mean, and now means throughout the English-speaking world, and beyond, the political accommodation by the state and/or a dominant group of all minority cultures defined first and foremost by reference to race, ethnicity or religion, and, additionally but more controversially, by reference to other group-defining characteristics such as nationality and aboriginality. (2012, p. 181)

However, the multicultural perspectives of Western Europe have been described as unable to respond to integration-oriented plans of different policy areas (e.g., social, education, etc.) and associated with the issue of ethnic segregation. In his book (2007) *Abschied von Multikulti* (Farewell to Multiculturalism), political scientist Stefan Luft refers to multiculturalism as the cause of the development of "ethnic colonies" which resulted in the "integration crisis" of German immigration policy. This apprehension foreshadowed the current consensus on the "failure of multiculturalism", which has been blamed on the inability of third and fourth-generation migrants (more specifically, Muslims) to live up to European standards

– standards to which they remain entirely external – which also illustrates the assumption of why they are the target of racist attacks (El-Tayeb, 2015, p. 296).

Charles Taylor, one of the proponents of multiculturalist policies in Canada, Quebéc, argues that this "ghetto-inducing idea of the point of multiculturalism is widely shared in Europe" (2012, p. 414). The semantics around the failure of multiculturalism in Europe, according to Taylor, are a case of misinterpretation:

> Anti-multicultural rhetoric in Europe reflects a profound misunderstanding of the dynamics of immigration into the rich, liberal democracies of the West. The underlying assumption seems to be that too much positive recognition of cultural differences will encourage a retreat into ghettos and a refusal to accept the political ethic of liberal democracy itself.
>
> (…) Consequently, the European attack on 'multiculturalism' often seems to us a classic case of false consciousness, blaming certain phenomena of ghettoisation and alienation of immigrants on a foreign ideology, instead of recognising the home-grown failures to promote integration and combat discrimination. (2012, p. 414)

As a matter of fact, Germany has not practised an active multicultural strategy (Kymlicka, 2012), and no present or past federal government nor the *Länder* have inscribed a deliberate multicultural agenda; multiculturalism has so far mainly existed at the level of discourse but not a consistent political programme (Kraus & Schönwälder, 2006, p. 202), especially not on the federal level (Schönwälder, 2010, p. 152). Wasmer expresses that the German public debate about the "multicultural society" usually refers to the existence of a multiplicity of cultures rather than a particular public policy approach of multiculturalism (2013, p. 170).

As pointed out by Sarah Collinson, "there is little reference to the notion of multiculturalism in official circles in Germany; the emphasis is placed firmly on improving immigrant minorities' social and economic status rather than on cultural matters" (1998, p. 162). Indeed, almost 20 years later, the latest federal policy document reveals that the need for cultural policy to specifically address fostering cultural participation in terms of the impact of the cultural contribution of citizens with a "migrant background" is still not explicitly on the agenda of diversity strategies of the federal government (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020). Moreover, the abandonment of the term multiculturalism is evident in the formulation of the national cultural policy. There is one vague mention of multiculturalism in the policy document referring to the debates around it without specifying what these discussions were about, only emphasising the importance of furthering intercultural understanding as one of the crucial aspects of cultural policy at all levels of government in the coming years, for the purpose of strengthening national cultural cohesion (CoE & ERICarts, 2016, p. 20).

In order to progressively frame the discussions around interculturalism/interculturality[4] and be able to conceptualise the term and the development of related strategies and implementation plans of the *Länder* and municipal governments under the ongoing motto of "valuing cultural diversity", it is essential to first grasp the way German cultural policy and politics perceive multiculturalism.

The aim of this research is not an in-depth analysis of the political and historical setting of the rejection of multicultural approaches. However, a brief examination of the existing (incomplete) elements of multicultural policies provides a valuable insight into the official policy not favouring an active promotion of minority rights and identities and being antagonistic to immigration and institutionalised plurality (Schönwälder, 2010, p. 153). Understanding multiculturalism is a prerequisite for gaining knowledge about how this negative aspect of immigration-related cultural diversity can direct the development of an explicit intercultural policy framework, particularly considering the acceptance of intercultural discourse but the absence of it in practice.

Furthermore, the view on multiculturalism is indispensable when observing the continuous relation between cultural diversity and inclusion policies associated with cultural policies after the enactment of the Immigration Act in 2005. This study argues that the oversight of the multicultural viewpoint at fault for the failed integration policy (referring to the cultural integration of "particular" immigrants) are the futile attempts to integrate people into one culture, which brought forth the overlooked aspect of cultural identity (of those "particular" immigrants) as a critical resistance factor responsible for the failure of such plans.

Until the early 1990s, integration was to a large extent affiliated with economic benefits; therefore, the strategy of incorporating diversity into the German economy was focused on the integration of immigrants into the labour market (Bendel, 2014, pp. 2–3). Over the last decades, integration has been perceived as the structural integration of immigrants, while issues of cultural and religious diversity have received less attention (Wasmer, 2013, p. 169). Thomas Röbke and Bernd Wagner stressed that neglecting cultural policy in the debates around a "multicultural society", despite cultural issues being immanent to the social integration of immigrants, was partly a consequence of the inability of cultural policy actors to recognise the significance of the arts and cultural work in integration (2003, p. 51).

4 Both terms are used by policymakers and cultural scientists in various countries and related literature. The author employs the term "interculturalism" in some cases and in others "interculturality" to make reference to their usage by policymaking bodies and scholars. For instance, in the German policy discourse, the term "interculturality" is applied instead of "interculturalism".

According to the *Bundesministerium des Innern, für Bau und Heimat* (*BMI*; Federal Ministry of the Interior, Building and Community), although there has been a significant change of tone in integration discourse and the inclusion of the cultural sphere in integration policies, the core areas of action of the Immigration Law of 2005 remain more or less the same and immigrants are expected to fulfil numerous duties while not getting access to a broader range of rights:

> Integration should ensure that immigrants have equal opportunities and chance to participate in all areas, mainly social, economic and cultural life. To do so, people who come to Germany intending to stay must learn the German language and acquire basic knowledge of our history and our legal system, in particular, the significance of Germany's free and democratic order, the party system, the federal structure, the welfare system, equal rights, tolerance and religious freedom. Moreover, they should be familiar with Germany's constitution and laws and should respect and abide by them. (BMI, 2019, para. 2)

In terms of recognising cultural diversity and ethnic differences, although the claim about integration places "an emphasis on mutual exchange and living together" (Schönwälder, 2010, p. 154) and is described as "a two-way process" (BMI, 2019, para. 3), the rhetoric of "promoting the integration of foreigners" is still in use (BMI, 2019). In that respect, Wasmer writes that little was done to increase the majority's acceptance of culturally different groups. A change in this direction could lead to a positive recognition of diversity – a clear sign of multiculturalism (2013, p. 170), which could ultimately contribute to the alteration of perceiving some German citizens as "foreigners".

In the German political sphere, the struggle of multiculturalism is to some degree affiliated with the incompatibility of dominant political views and the ideas at the core of multiculturalism. These ideas suggest that, for example:

> Many cultures should live together without being merged into one or subsume under a superior, overarching culture and an appreciation of cultural diversity, which compares favourably to all other supposedly monoculturalist views that resist or at least lament the diversification of national cultures. (Fernández, 2013, p. 52)

In Germany, supporting national identity, embellished with the reformulated idea of *Kulturnation*, is still actively promoted by cultural politics and policy without considering what it means to be "German" and what to make of cultural and artistic practices in an intercultural society. Almost 20 years earlier, Röbke and Wagner reflected on the exclusion of immigrants from cultural policy discussions: "Cultural policy is fixated on the conventional, Eurocentric cultural heritage, whether in the form of traditional cultural and educational institutions or its sociocultural expansion" (2003, p. 52).

Today, in general, immigrants are held responsible for the failure of their integration, and accused of self-segregation; primarily, the allegation about Muslim immigrants being closed off from the majority society brought Islam to the centre of public debates on multiculturalism (Wasmer, 2013, p. 172). Setbacks in "successful" integration plans, concerning the unwillingness of "particular" immigrants such as Muslims to integrate into the majority society provided a ground for conservative parties to base their strategies on an image of a German society they aim to construct. The claim voiced by Karen Schönwälder on the political rejection of multiculturalism indicates how the concept was exploited by politicians:

> Attacks on multiculturalism are, to a certain extent, rhetorical and not necessarily accompanied by a consequent move to abolish any pluralist intervention. Indeed, Christian Democratic attacks on multiculturalism may mainly be directed at their own supporters. By creating an imaginary picture of a multicultural past, they can present their own policies as innovative and distract from the fact that, rather than breaking with a multicultural past, they have revised their own policy. (2010, p. 162)

In light of this firm connection between the discourses of politics and policy, the public statement of the German Chancellor, AngelaMerkel, on the failure of multiculturalism makes more sense. At the *CDU* meeting in Potsdam in 2010, the Chancellor said that the attempts at creating a multicultural society in Germany have utterly failed (Siebold, 2010). Her verdict caused little controversy, received by the public, as El-Tayeb writes:

> (…) as the belated official recognition of something already part of common knowledge, namely the end of tolerance for those never considered real Europeans in the first place – labour and postcolonial migrants from the Middle East, Asia, and Africa, and their descendants – and a return to a less fractured, more simple and true notion of European culture. (2015, p. 286)

A proclamation of failure displays another picture when integration and multicultural policies and (the absence of) cultural pluralism are considered in the German context. The rationale behind the rejection of multicultural policies (based on the definition of Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka)[5] described by Kraus and Schönwälder confirms the above argument of El-Tayeb. The authors provide powerful insights into conservative political views, which recognise the "cultures"

5 They refer to policies which "go beyond the protection of the basic civil and political rights guaranteed to all individuals in a liberal-democratic state, to also extend some level of public recognition and support for ethno-cultural minorities to maintain and express their distinct identities and practices" (Banting & Kymlicka, 2006, p. 1).

of those "particular" immigrants as a threat to stabilising "Germanness" and "Europeanness":

> Elements of multiculturalism policies do exist in Germany – albeit not within a concept characterised by a commitment to minority rights and public support for the maintenance and expression of distinct identities. Objections to more fully developed multiculturalism policies arise mainly from three sources. First of all, such policies usually require an acceptance of the minority groups as longer-term parts of a given society. Second, the retention of national or ethnic group solidarities is often seen as backwards-looking and anti-modern, unnecessary for the realisation of individual rights, and occasionally even as hindering individual development. Thirdly, stronger, more visible, and vocal ethnic communities are seen as a danger to the overall cohesion of modern societies and as parallel societies[6]. Finally, recent transformations of the German welfare state might encourage a shift towards a more assimilationist orientation. (Kraus & Schönwälder, 2006, p. 220)

For some time now, German politics and cultural policy have distanced themselves from the term multiculturalism; "it is now almost exclusively used as a negative image of the past, as a synonym for the ills and illusions of a liberal left that allegedly caused many of the problems German society currently faces" (Schönwälder, 2010, p. 152). Nevertheless, there has been a strong correlation between the rejection of the multicultural approach and the embrace of intercultural approaches in political and policy circles. Interculturality is treated as a reconciliatory concept since its interpretation is based on dialogue between "conflicting cultures", and the notion is thus understood as advocating for the respect and appreciation of all cultures. From this perspective, interculturality shifts the attention from the negative connotations around multiculturalism in Germany, and it allows the possibility of contact between those assumed to be fundamentally different cultures. However, local and regional policies with intercultural features seem to mingle intercultural approaches with multicultural ones:

> Official political acceptance of immigration co-exists with negative attitudes towards ethnic diversity, including the widely held opinion that immigrants should adjust to German ways. At the same time, there is scope for partial pragmatic acceptance of diversity. While, on the national level, official policies recognising and promoting ethnic plurality are non-existent, several cities have

6 The authors are referring to the debate of *Parallelgesellschaft* (parallel society) from 2004 and 2005. The term summarises the fear that "ethnic communities were contributing to disintegration by withdrawing into secluded communities or parallel societies" (Kraus & Schönwälder, 2006, p. 213).

> committed themselves to 'intercultural' policies, and policies that may be regarded as components of a multicultural approach do exist on the local or regional level.[7] (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010, p. 25)

Within this framework, a search for a new concept of diversity (i.e., intercultural dialogue, the intercultural opening of public institutions) could be discerned as part of a sufficient cultural integration policy that aims to give culture a mediating role for community cohesion.

The research argues that the confusion around the multicultural perspective on a political level in Germany is also related with marginalising differences by focusing on ethnicity and religion. The critiques pointed out by Christian Fernández outline the German political and policy backlash against multiculturalism, exhibiting aspects of ethnocentricity, discrimination, national chauvinism, cultural repression, and its inability to provide a conceptually and normatively appropriate theory of how to accommodate cultural diversity (2013, p. 52). A retreat from multiculturalism is also, according to Kymlicka, "partly driven by fears amongst the majority group that the accommodation of diversity has 'gone too far' and is threatening their way of life" (2010, p. 32).

The ethnicity and religion-oriented reading of the multicultural approach perceives cultures as homogeneous and fixed essences belonging to different cultural groups, disregarding other markers of identity. Accommodating diversity is inseparable from the identity dimension of culture since promoting diversity (through concepts and associated plans and strategies) requires explicit recognition of not only the community/group components of identity but also its individual strands. Culture is not fixed, instead constructed (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1992c), and therefore has to be seen as dynamic and continuously renegotiated (Sandercock, 2004). Correspondingly, identity is a process (Brah, 2007) that changes and transforms as it is increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multifaceted (Brah, 2007; Hall, 2000; Parekh, 2006; Sen, 2006) and intersectional (Crenshaw, 1989; Hall, 2000). In this respect,

> Some of the components of identity feature more strongly in the overall conception and vary in strength at different times and in different contexts, including the way people define themselves in relations to employment, language, culture, faith, ethnicity, nationality and locale. (Cantle, 2012, p. 36)

A static comprehension of identity fails to recognise the complex nature of culture and confines it to a national framework. Consequently, in this case, the value attributed to culture is exceedingly restrictive; it is determined as a set of qualities of a specific culture. Moreover, this comprehension does not embrace the existing

7 Examples of this are examined in Section 3.3.

cultural diversity as normality; instead, it contributes to the separatist view of "us" and "the others". Amartya Sen argues that "putting people in boxes in this way or representing society as a federation of communities can create sectarian extremism and deny people the capacity to interact with each other as citizens" (2006, p. 164). In that sense, constructing such categories based on (mainly ethnic and religious) group identities operates as a justification for the different treatment of some people with a "migrant background" through policy measures. This way of seeing society as an agglomeration of disparate group identities described by Sen reveals that German cultural politics and policy are concerned with "how society should be, but not society as it is" (Terkessidis, 2010). That being the case, diversity remains an empty word for the ones who are targeted by diversity plans and programmes as articulated by Volkan T. from the *Akademie der Autodidakten*:

> Why is there no sense of diversity in my life? What is this diversity supposed to suggest and above all, what do I have to do with it? I am not a colour, not diversity; I am an individual. Why are we always being turned into a political issue? Why cannot we simply live but must explain and justify ourselves? What does this diversity bring us? Diversity is just an alibi word without substance. Just like integration. What does integration mean? I mean, we already live in German society. (2017, p. 5)

Furthermore, acknowledging culture mainly based on ethnic group identity is an approach that turns its face obsessively to a shared past and is far from providing room for a sense of belonging and appreciation of a collective future. In this regard, the appeal of interculturality, with respect to valuing diversity as a new cultural policy concept, requires further investigation, especially concerning its relation to cultural identity.

3.2 The Rise of the Intercultural Approach in Cultural Policy

Although interculturalism is not a new term, the conceptualisation and definitions vary across the globe; its perception in Europe considerably differs from that of North America. The discourse of European interculturalism can be traced back to the French and Dutch responses to multiculturalism in the 1980s and 1990s (James, 2008, p. 2). The departing point of the early form of European perspectives on interculturalism was the effort to create contact between the majority society and migrants. Hence, considering the issues that were regarded as the results of immigration (the "inability" of some immigrants to integrate into "host society"), the adoption of interculturalism as an alternative to multiculturalism has become omnipresent for managing ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity in Europe. From the late 1990s, the European model of interculturalism aimed at encouraging

dialogue between different cultural groups in order to reduce prejudice (James, 2008, p. 3).

Advocates of the British model define five main features of interculturalism: openness, interaction, process, dialogue, and mutual learning (Cantle, 2012; James, 2008; Wood et al., 2006). However, the overlapping elements of interculturalism and multiculturalism and the lack of a clear distinction led to the interpretation of interculturalism as an updated variation of multiculturalism (Lentin, 2005). Similarly, Bhikhu Parekh identifies interculturalism as a model of "interactive multiculturalism" (2007, p. 46). Gérard Bouchard, on the contrary, calls Quebéc interculturalism "integrational pluralism" (2011, p. 468) and sees this model as the integration of minorities and immigrants into a framework of accepting fundamental values of the Quebec society (gender equality, secularism, and the French language; 2011, p. 437); a model based on integration within a single nation (2011, p. 439).

Meer and Modood discuss "political interculturalism" (referring to the assumed critique of multiculturalism in a political framework in contexts of cultural diversity; 2012, p. 177), and they outline and evaluate four overlapping positive features supported by advocates of interculturalism contrasted with multiculturalism:

- first, that as something greater than coexistence, interculturalism is allegedly more geared towards interaction and dialogue than multiculturalism,
- second, that interculturalism is conceived as something less "groupist" or more yielding of synthesis than multiculturalism,
- third, that interculturalism is something more committed to a stronger sense of the whole, in terms of aspects such as societal cohesion and national citizenship, and
- finally, where multiculturalism may be illiberal and relativistic, interculturalism is likely to lead to criticism of illiberal cultural practices (as part of the process of intercultural dialogue).

Following their evaluation, Meer and Modood conclude that interculturalism is not an updated version of multiculturalism; however, they argue that positive qualities such as encouraging communication, recognising dynamic identities, promoting unity, and challenging bigotry are also characteristic of "progressive multiculturalism" (2012, p. 192), which resembles the intercultural approach in Germany. They state that interculturalism requires an original political perspective on concerns regarding complex identities and matters of equality in order to excel multiculturalism.

In addition to these various readings, there is also the dialogue-based European Commission model of interculturalism. The Commission declared the year 2008

as the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue with the aim of facilitating an exchange of views and opinions between different cultures. According to the latest assessment of the European Commission, "unlike multiculturalism, where the focus is on the preservation of separate cultures, intercultural dialogue seeks to establish linkages and common ground between different cultures, communities, and people, promoting understanding and interaction" (2019, para. 2).

In Germany, the roots of the term "interculturality" can be found in the field of education. The recommendations of the *Kultursministerkonferenz* (*KMK*; Conference of the Ministers of Education) on intercultural education and training in schools in the *Länder* date back to 1996. The main objectives of the *KMK* were to develop openness towards others, acquire intercultural competencies of respecting other cultures, foster skills for dealing with cultural conflicts, actively oppose discrimination, and promote the linguistic skills of students growing up multilingual (KMK, 1996, pp. 3–4). Intercultural education is still not officially part of the school education policy; it is only carried out by some educational institutions (CoE & ERICarts, 2016, p. 62).

In 2003, the *Institut für Kulturpolitik* (*IfK*) *der kulturpolitischen Gesellschaft* (*KuPoGe*; Institute for Cultural Policy of the Cultural Policy Association) published the *Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2002/2003* (Yearbook for Cultural Policy), an extensive document on interculturality. In the introduction of the yearbook, Oliver Scheytt, the former president of the *KuPoGe*[8], stated that culture requires a new perspective if the long-standing German cultural policy objective of "culture for all" and cultural civil rights are not only limited to the citizens of German descent (2003a, p. 12). Röbke and Wagner also discussed the Canadian model of interculturalism applied to German cultural policy (2003, p. 20). The collection of texts dealt with a wide-ranging spectrum of the concept of interculturality, highlighting intercultural work as a task of the cultural policies of the *Länder* (Frankenberg, 2003; Kröger & Sievers, 2003; Vesper, 2003) and municipalities (Flierl, 2003; Magdowski, 2003; Manthey, 2003; Markwirth, 2003; Scheytt, 2003b), interculturality as a new political task for cultural integration, and the requirements of intercultural work in various fields such as political education (Krüger, 2003), cultural education (Böttger & Ruppelt, 2003; Fuchs, 2003), theatre (Heilmann & Ciulli, 2003), socio-culture (Knoblich, 2003), and the demand for the renewal of cultural institutions (Terkessidis, 2003).

Later, Scheytt (2007) announced that the future of cultural policy is intercultural, without explicitly explaining what he meant by the term. However,

8 The *KuPoGe* was founded in 1976 as a platform for cultural policy discussions in theory and practice. It stands for the principle "cultural policy is social policy", and is a partially politically independent nationwide association for the promotion of education, science, and research in the fields of art, culture, and cultural policy (KuPoGe, n.d.). The federal government partly subsidises the *KuPoGe*.

he emphasised the importance of cultural policy for the cultural and social integration of people who live or want to live in Germany regardless of their origins, religious beliefs, and cultural orientations (while acknowledging the existing system of values in Germany); from this perspective, intercultural work is understood as crucial for the implementation of the *National Integration Plan* of 2007 for peaceful coexistence (Scheytt, 2007). Nevertheless, the latest national cultural policy provides neither an interculturally-oriented perspective nor structurally planned implementation strategies (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020).

In association with cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue has been supported at the federal level. The recently updated national cultural policy document conveys a commitment to intercultural dialogue. National/international intercultural dialogue is understood as a vital element of promoting cultural diversity (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 28). The policy report states that "the intercultural dialogue in Germany relates both to conversations within the country (with groups of the population who have a "migrant background" [emphasis added]) and those at the international level" (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 29). Be that as it may, there is still no comprehensive national policy planning or strategy to promote internal intercultural dialogue; instead, it is supported through isolated measures such as additional funding programmes[9]. Against this backdrop, in the early 2000s, the term "interculturality" entered the inventory of the *Länder* and local cultural policies, albeit its conceptualisation and implementation varied depending on the regional and local priorities; the term is still sometimes used interchangeably with intercultural dialogue.

3.3 The Modes of Intercultural Orientation at the *Länder* and Municipal Level

The demand for intercultural orientation and the opening of public administration was articulated in the early 2000s, and there have been concrete suggestions of strategic approaches (Handschuck & Schröer, 2002). According to Sabina Handschuck and Hubertus Schröer, intercultural orientation aims at the recognition and participation of different cultural groups in social shaping processes (2002, p. 1), and supports a socio-political stance that strives for equal opportunities and social justice (2002, p. 3). Hence, the implementation of intercultural orientation requires the intercultural opening of social services, which would entail changes in the structural and procedural organisation, offers, and

9 See Chapter 5 for the analysis of various programmes and their outcomes.

infrastructural measures (Handschuck & Schröer, 2002, p. 2). Accordingly, they emphasised that intercultural work needs to be distinguished from immigration social work, which is strongly deficit-oriented:

> Immigration social work aims to facilitate systematic structural inclusion. We see it as problematic that the approach conceptually implies that immigrants are per se the target groups of social work. This approach runs the risk of being insufficiently address-oriented. Immigrant groups, including those of the same nationality or ethnicity, are not homogenous; they differ in their orientation systems. (…) Differences disappear behind the target definition of immigrants. (Handschuck & Schröer, 2002, p. 5)

Although intercultural openness addresses all members of society, most German cultural policies still inaugurate measures that associate immigration-generated diversity with alternative forms of cultural integration which focus on the alteration of attitudes, improvement of mutual understanding, and building competencies and skills for respecting different cultures. Parallel to this line of thought, intercultural programmes and projects are often designed for immigrant communities (Terkessidis, 2010), sometimes in the form of theatre pedagogy with educational intentions (Soufi-Siavash, 2011; see Section 5.3 for an in-depth analysis). Intercultural projects are frequently aimed at creating dialogue between immigrant and non-immigrant communities to reduce prejudice against "the other". This rendering interprets immigration as a deviation (Regus, 2009, p. 158), and therefore the cultural deficits of those who "came from elsewhere" need to be corrected through special treatment (Terkessidis, 2013, p. 14).

Nonetheless, some of the *Länder* and local governments have been searching for an up-to-date meaning of cultural diversity, and have been very active in implementing intercultural concepts and programmes. *Länder* and cities with a high immigration ratio are usually more engaged in promoting intercultural works. This section examines the new modes of addressing immigration-related cultural diversity, intercultural understanding, and the conceptualisation of interculturality at the *Länder* and municipal level.[10] Notwithstanding the fact that most examples examined here comprehend the concept of interculturality as a resource for a democratic model of integration and social cohesion, they illustrate some invigorating perspectives and engagement with the notion of self-reflection of a plural society through the renewal of public cultural institutions.

10 The examination is limited to various regional and city approaches since the national government does not offer any intercultural policy perspective, plan, or strategy. However, some organisations at the federal level are actively involved in exploring the potentiality of intercultural perspectives for strengthening community cohesion. Those are also mentioned in the analysis reflecting the efforts towards interculturality.

3.3.1 Cultural Diversity as an Integrative Cultural Policy Concept

One of the crucial initiatives addressing commitment to intercultural work is the *Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt* (National Council on Cultural Diversity).[11] In 2005, with the involvement of the *KuPoGe* and the German UNESCO Commission, the *Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt* was established as a federal cultural association of interculturally active institutions. The organisation aims to address the challenges of an immigrant society and its effects on cultural and artistic practices (Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt, n.d.). The initiative's most important project is the *Federal Congress on Interculture*. Together with the *KuPoGe*, they launched the first federal intercultural congress in Stuttgart in 2006 with the title "Cultural Diversity for All. Differentiating Instead of Generalising". The second congress ("Cultural Diversity and Participation") was held in Nuremberg in 2008, followed by Bochum ("Open for Diversity – Future of Culture") in 2010, Hamburg ("DiverCity. Realities-Concepts-Visions") in 2012, Mannheim ("Moving Homes") in 2014, and Braunschweig ("Land in Sight – Intercultural Visions for Today and Tomorrow") in 2017. In addition to organising intercultural congresses, the council formulates recommendations for measures of practical action in urban and rural areas and for other social institutions for shaping diversity (Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt, n.d.).

Those congresses generated the formulation of some exemplary intercultural documents. For instance, the *Stuttgarter Impulse zur kulturellen Vielfalt* (Impulses of Stuttgart to Cultural Diversity) is the earliest intercultural document produced after the first intercultural congress in 2006. It proposed significant guidelines and recommendations to political decision-makers at the federal, *Länder*, and local level. The guidelines included: (a) the development of policy framework conditions for the recognition and appreciation of cultural diversity, (b) perceiving diversity as a cross-cultural task of related fields (i.e., education, youth, culture, social affairs, and interreligious dialogue), (c) approaching diversity not only from the group identity perspective but also taking into account the individual aspects of identity, (d) initiation of concrete action programmes in line with the international agreements such as the Agenda 21 for Culture, the Millennium Development Goals, and the UNESCO 2005 Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt, 2006). The *Stuttgarter Impulse* also proposed 13 areas of action (Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt, 2006, pp. 2–4):

1. Integration of cultural diversity into all concepts of cultural policy.
2. Intercultural opening of media institutions.

11 The Secretariat of the Nationwide Advice is located at the *KuPoGe*.

3. Active implementation of the UNESCO 2005 Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in local cultural policies.
4. For the respect and recognition of diversity – thinking of interculturality together with internationality.
5. Accommodation of cultural diversity in the staff, audiences, and programmes of all cultural institutions.
6. Creation of new forms of funding structures and cooperation models that support not only projects but also processes.
7. Strengthening diaspora groups and their political, cultural, and economic participation in Germany.
8. Cultivation of multilingualism and appreciation of languages of the immigrants' origin.
9. Implementing intercultural mainstreaming in education.
10. Networking schools into the local communities.
11. With the aim of reinforcing the intercultural opening of youth work – access of immigrant organisations to funding bodies and a strong presence of immigrants in all political positions, including leadership positions.
12. Enhancing the active participation of women in intercultural and interreligious dialogue.
13. Developing systematic methods and strategies for furthering dialogue and forms of communication between different religious communities.

The recommendations of the *Stuttgarter Impulse* differ from many other approaches related to interculturality, often affiliated with one-sided integration plans. For instance, Baden-Württemberg is strongly impacted by immigration; 33.4% of the population had a "migrant background" in 2018, and the city of Stuttgart had the highest number of immigrants in this federal state, with 36.3% in the same year (Destatis, 2018). Hence, the interpretation of interculturality introduced by the *Stuttgarter Impulse* could be considered as pioneering in the sense of perceiving the concept as a mutual learning process and taking into account the individual dimension of identity as well as suggesting areas of action which would facilitate diversity as the norm of society.

In 2008, another important document, the *Kölner Appell* (Cologne Appeal) declared by the *Städtetag Nordrhein-Westfalen* (North Rhine-Westphalia Association of Cities), emphasised that cultural diversity should be promoted from an intercultural perspective, specifically at the municipal level, using the Basic Law as the normative basis. However, the sustainability of promoting diversity through cultural policy was understood as enhancing intercultural dialogue between different ethnic-national groups; thus, cultural policy was referred to as integration policy (Städtetag Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2008, p. 2). The necessity of

implementing the UNESCO 2005 Convention at the city level is also underlined in the *Kölner Appell*, accentuating the promotion of intercultural work in budget decisions, intercultural opening of programmes and repertoires of municipal cultural institutions, fostering participation of immigrants, and strengthening civic engagement for the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue (Städtetag Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2008, pp. 2–3). North Rhine-Westphalia is also one of the *Länder* with a high percentage of the immigrant population; inhabitants with a "migrant background" made up 30.4% of the population in 2018 (Destatis, 2018). Düsseldorf with 32.6% and Cologne with 30.6% were the cities with the largest immigrant population in the region in the same year (Destatis, 2018). Compared to the *Stuttgarter Impulse*, the *Kölner Appell* did not offer a consistent programme; nevertheless, it identified interculturality as an overarching local policy objective.

3.3.2 The Professionalisation of Intercultural Project Management

Roughly within the same timeframe, North Rhine-Westphalia introduced the *interkultur.pro*, a project aimed at the professionalisation of intercultural art and cultural work.[12] The state-wide project *interkultur.pro* was carried out between 2007 and 2011, and it focused on achieving systematic intercultural project management. In order to develop new strategies, the project was divided into several areas: network-oriented project management, data-facts-living worlds, press and public relations, theory-practice-discourse, flying workshops, and financial management; the programme brought together various stakeholders including artists, managers of intercultural projects, employees of cultural administrations, local politicians, and journalists (interkultur.pro, 2008). The core focus of the module data-facts-living worlds was to obtain knowledge about the cultural habits and expectations of the immigrant population based on the latest empirical surveys as a basis for creating appropriate cultural offers (interkultur.pro, 2008, p. 14). The flying workshops entailed assisting projects and institutions in intercultural contexts, particularly in phases of acute crisis such as intercultural misunderstandings between different parties, communication issues between administration and political decision-makers, as well as dealing with decision-making structures and management styles (interkultur.pro, 2008, p. 15). The most inspiring event series,

12 North Rhine-Westphalia was the first federal state to establish a department for intercultural work in 2002. The first pilot project *Kulturelle Vielfalt in Dortmund* (Cultural Diversity in Dortmund) took place in 2007, followed by an empirical survey in 2008, titled *Lebenswelten und Milieus von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland und Nordrhein-Westfalen* (Living Environments and Milieus of People With a Migrant Background in Germany and North Rhine-Westphalia; Ministerpräsident des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2010).

theory-practice-discourse, acknowledged that "the term interculturality means neither multiculturalism nor simply the integration of people with a 'migrant background' [emphasis added]" (interkultur.pro, 2011, p. 1). In the final event of this module, participants tackled the questions of what exactly "intercultural" means and what the prerequisites of the intercultural opening of the cultural sphere are. One of the focal points of the discussions was raising intercultural awareness and providing training to bolster public institutions in their intercultural opening. The following fields were identified as areas that require systematic professionalisation and the consolidation of offers (interkultur.pro, 2011, p. 4):

- local, regional, and international orientation,
- development of research and knowledge transfer,
- high-profile marketing,
- future of cultural institutions in a society marked by immigration, and
- expansion of networks of intercultural actors.

On the subject of the opening of cultural institutions, it was established that interculturality is not a single field to be promoted through particular intercultural programmes; it must be an integral part of cultural policy planning, strategies, and funding structures (interkultur.pro, 2011). During the final session, Mark Terkessidis stated that interculturality demands a new concept of culture, one that opposes integration:

> Interculture offers a new perspective. It is not about "improving" certain population groups towards a norm. Nor is it primarily about different ethnic groups, but rather about creating a shared space in which individuals, regardless of their origins and circumstances, can move without barriers. The focus lies on opening and changing institutions. (interkultur.pro, 2011, p. 5)

After intensive and productive work within the project, two intercultural academies were founded in North Rhine-Westphalia, the *Interkulturelle Akademie* (Intercultural Academy) in Oberhausen in 2010 and the *Zukunftsakademie NRW* (*ZAK NRW*; Future Academy North Rhine-Westphalia) in Bochum in 2013.[13]

The *Interkulturelle Akademie* intended to promote content on interculturality and develop it further through cultural projects. Its four fundamental components were (Stadt Oberhausen, 2010, p. 5):

- the networking of diverse approaches and projects,

13 Both academies contributed to the discussions around promoting diversity through the intercultural approach but could not provide cultural policy impulses on how these perspectives could be put into action.

- creativity in developing something new together,
- intercultural exchange and the cooperation of different actors in Oberhausen and the region, and
- a cultural policy that takes these issues into account and cultural institutions that act as an engine in this process.

The *ZAK NRW*, on the other hand, was founded and financed by the Ministry of Culture and Science of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia, the Mercator Foundation, the City of Bochum, and the *Schauspielhaus Bochum*. The institution was based in Bochum but operated throughout Germany. It was thought of as a centre, striving towards equal access to culture, cultural education, and cultural institutions for people of various cultural backgrounds, supporting cultural institutions in becoming diverse, and providing diversity training and advice (ZAK NRW, n.d.). Although the *ZAK NRW* was actively involved in knowledge transfer, organised many events and workshops, and started a large number of collaborations mostly with public theatres with the objective of strengthening the structures that would enable openness towards cultural diversity, the founders decided to dissolve the association at the end of 2019.[14]

3.3.3 Intercultural Integration and Gender Mainstreaming[15]

In 2010, a new concept, intercultural integration, was introduced by the city of Munich. Immigrant residents comprised 44% of the total population in 2018 (Statistisches Amt der Landeshauptstadt München, 2019)[16]. In 2010, the municipality presented an intercultural integration report, *München lebt Vielfalt* (Munich Lives Diversity). The report underlined the oversights of systematic integration of immigrants as well as significant inequalities in the educational system that have been going on for decades (Landeshauptstadt München [LHM], 2011, p. 13). It also reflected on the intercultural orientation and opening of the city administration, the measures taken by the departments within the framework of the intercultural opening process, and the plans for the coming

14 According to the press release issued by the sponsors, the project idea, which was born in the Capital of Culture year of 2010, could not be further implemented for structural reasons, despite the continued relevance of the topic of diversity (Westfalenspiegel, 2019).

15 Gender mainstreaming is a concept developed almost four decades ago, then applied from a binary perspective on gender; the researcher, however, applies the term in a way inclusive of the entire spectrum of gender identity.

16 Residents with a "migrant background" made up 16% and foreigners the remaining 28% of the total population in 2018. The term "migrant background" refers to German citizens with origins other than German, and the term foreigners applies to residents who hold citizenships other than German (Statistisches Amt der Landeshauptstadt München, 2019).

years. The report analysed core areas of integration in six fields of action and aimed to reduce discrimination through these measures: the intercultural opening of public institutions, promotion of social participation of inhabitants with a "migrant background", education (and further education), training, labour market, and language support for children with a "migrant background" (LHM, 2011). According to the report, the concept of intercultural integration referred to intercultural opening, understood as equal participation opportunities and equal access conditions to public administrative services for all city residents (LHM, 2011, p. 21). The intercultural opening was seen as a process that involved all inhabitants and city administration, and the basis for all actions and strategies of the city of Munich (LHM, 2011, p. 10). From 2011 onwards, action plans of the cultural department of the municipality included offering intercultural training courses for employees and managers in cultural institutions, implemented by the *Stelle für interkulturelle Arbeit* (Office for Intercultural Work) as well as workshops for fostering intercultural competencies of the administrative staff of the municipality (LHM, 2011, p. 33).

Although the report highlighted that intercultural work was intended not only for the residents with a "migrant background" – immigrants described as the subject of the primary areas of action – the intercultural integration plans targeted mainly immigrants. Intercultural integration conclusively aspired to discover the unused potential of immigrants through the opening of institutions to them (LHM, 2011, pp. 16–22). The intercultural orientation of inhabitants of German descent, however, was limited to the development of intercultural competencies and skills of the administrative workforce of the city.

München lebt Vielfalt provided one of the rare cultural integration concepts in Germany that in detail thought about and intended to tackle structural discrimination, and introduced fundamental ideas such as equal access conditions for all and gender mainstreaming. Nevertheless, strategies for gender mainstreaming and the concept of cultural diversity as the norm were not connected to one another. Handschuck and Schröer suggest that intercultural orientation should be combined with comparable approaches in cases such as gender mainstreaming and managing diversity:

> Where gender mainstreaming is already well developed, the intercultural orientation can use structures, experiences and instruments that are available and thus also benefit from synergy effects. Where managing diversity is in the foreground, an attempt can be made to change goals and strategies in such a way that economic interests do not dominate but that socio-political ideas also gain weight. For the intercultural orientation and opening up of administration and social services, as well as for gender mainstreaming, it makes sense to use the ongoing (administrative) reform processes. (2002, p. 8)

This connection could have been beneficial since "gender mainstreaming and diversity management both aim to reorganise, improve, develop and evaluate decision-making processes in all policy and work areas of an organisation" (Handschuck & Schröer, 2002, p. 6), enabling the principle of equality to be acknowledged as part of the process of pluralisation.

3.3.4 Intercultural Exchange as a Way for the Development of Intercultural Practice

In 2010, Baden-Württemberg published a comprehensive future-oriented policy document titled *Kultur 2020: Kunstpolitik für Baden-Württemberg* (Culture 2020: Art Policy for Baden-Württemberg). The art policy focused on the immigrant character of the state and the requirements of intercultural orientation.[17] The report highlighted the necessity of cultural education and intercultural perspectives in cultural and art policies in an immigrant society. The document stressed four main pillars of art policy (Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst Baden-Württemberg [MWK BW], 2010, p. 38):

- liberality: The state has no influence on the content of the arts with respect to the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of art.
- plurality: Art policy must allow a diversity of art forms, a broad spectrum of artistic expression and manifestations, and a wide range of offers.
- subsidiarity: The state provides secondary financial support when a specific state interest is determined. Municipalities play the most prominent role in this regard.
- decentrality: The arts must be experienced everywhere across the country, not only in larger cities and metropolitan areas but also in rural areas.

The document perceives interculturality as a mutual dialogue between different cultures, a process that could be a valuable contribution to a successful integration (MWK BW, 2010, p. 44). Culture is understood as homogeneous, and immigrants are seen as representatives of the "cultures" of their countries of origin even if they have had no personal migration experiences. Nonetheless, what is implied by "successful integration" is a sufficient cultural mediation that utilises the participation of more people with a "migrant background" as artistic creators as well as audiences in the cultural life of the region (MWK BW, 2010, p. 44). In achieving this goal, the intercultural opening (diversification of the staff, programme, and audience) of traditional cultural institutions such as operas,

17 In 2018, one in three residents in this state were residents with a "migrant background" (Destatis, 2018).

museums, theatres, and concert halls was considered vital as it would reflect the reality of German society (MWK BW, 2010, p. 44).

The *Kultur 2020* emphasised three dimensions of the development of intercultural orientation. First, it pointed out that interculturality should be understood as a cross-sectional task (not only of the cultural sector but also the media) which requires a broader approach of observing what takes place in academia and practice, collecting information, and evaluating the present perspectives on the promotion of cultural diversity. In that sense, networking and regular intercultural exchange between various actors, the examination of municipal mechanisms and existing calls for proposals, prizes, funding and award guidelines, and the encouragement of research projects were considered crucial (MWK BW, 2010, p. 45). The document identified funding policy as the second central aspect of putting intercultural principles into action. The document recommended specific support measures for intercultural projects that would give diverse cultural expressions a platform until promoting cultural diversity becomes an overarching funding guideline (MWK BW, 2010, p. 45). Lastly, intercultural education was deemed vital in strengthening intercultural competencies and intercultural understanding as well as promoting diversity of artistic and cultural expressions (MWK BW, 2010, p. 46).

Towards the end of the report, it was expressed that intercultural opening requires systematic concepts and programmes and structural changes, and that interculturality is not a partial aspect of cultural work or a self-contained artistic genre; it must be integrated into all areas of the arts and culture as a comprehensive concept (MWK BW, 2010, p. 356). However, this intensive assessment of intercultural orientation did not provide knowledge on how these ideas would be put into practice – they remained recommendations. Furthermore, some of the articulations were in contradiction to one another. On the one hand, the document accurately pointed out that intercultural opening means a change for everyone and for all sorts of institutions:

> Intercultural work is not a niche topic but a strategic cross-cutting task for all areas of cultural work; it affects all forms of culture, divisions, and genres. (…) Intercultural work neither refers to marginalised groups nor is a cultural policy instrument solely for integration policy purposes. It is about "culture for all", a cultural policy based on the realities, needs, and challenges of a culturally diverse society in a world characterised by migration and globalisation. The addressees and actors are, therefore, people with and without a "migrant background" [emphasis added]. (MWK BW, 2010, p. 359)

On the other hand, while referring to the engagement of some municipalities, institutions, and associations with intercultural work, it emphasised that overarching intercultural planning at the state level would not be attainable due

to high financial expenditures and time requirements (MWK BW, 2010, p. 359). Although the document offered a robust intercultural approach, this perspective puts the willingness and commitment of the state government to intercultural opening into question, since it was assigned only as a task for the municipalities.

3.3.5 Migration Mainstreaming and Administrative Reform

Mannheim, the second-largest city in Baden-Württemberg, is one of the municipalities committed to interculturality. In 2007, the local council joined forces with the *Netzwerk Interkultur* (Network Interculture) – a network comprising public institutions, artists, NGOs – to develop the *Handlungskonzept Interkulturelle Kulturarbeit* (Concept of Action for Intercultural Cultural Work). For the first time in Germany, in this report, migration mainstreaming was identified as one of the leading strategic principles for an entire urban policy (Stadt Mannheim, 2007). The paper innovatively formulated equal rights and opportunities, social justice in the context of migration mainstreaming, and its dependency on interculturality. It underscored that the equality of participation of immigrant people must be taken into account in the planning, implementation, and analysis of cultural measures and projects (Stadt Mannheim, 2007, para. 5). The action plan listed the following objectives (Stadt Mannheim, 2007, para. 8):

- to anchor intercultural work in cultural institutions; to facilitate access to cultural institutions for people with a "migrant background" and to enable their participation in the cultural offer,
- to recognise and promote the diversity of cultures, artists, and people living in Mannheim,
- to strengthen the intercultural competencies of organisers and visitors of cultural events,
- on a further level, for migration mainstreaming to promote the discussion of migration processes in arts and culture, and
- to take a greater account of immigrants in personnel policy and planning.

Pursuing these goals called for employing concrete measures that would enable cultural institutions to look for answers to the following key questions (Stadt Mannheim, 2007, para. 9):

1. How can access to publicly funded cultural institutions for people with a "migrant background" be improved?
2. Is the cultural activity of artists with a "migrant background" being recognised, promoted, and presented?
3. How can a dialogue between different cultures be developed in the city?

4. How can the majority of society gain better access to the cultures of immigrants?
5. How can the various communities be reached?
6. How can it be ensured that the concept of action is carried out (i.e., that the goals are being implemented, and who would be making sure they are)?

The action plan identified some of the issues of implementing intercultural work, and proposed migration mainstreaming in cultural institutions. However, it did not provide concrete measures such as diversity criteria or indicators, or a funding scheme following the objective of migration mainstreaming. It also failed to involve monitoring for the evaluation of the progress made in the direction of interculturality during implementation, and pinpoint particular areas that needed improvement. Instead, cultural institutions were expected to develop specific measures themselves by making a change in their organisational structure, programming, and audience composition (Stadt Mannheim, 2007, para. 16). Moreover, as in many similar examples, immigrants were conceived as members of homogenous groups, holding only collective identities.

In 2008, Mannheim initiated an ambitious administrative reform, launching the first phase of a new programme, *Change² I* (2008–2013), with strategic goals and according administrative action with clearly defined guidelines. These strategic objectives – binding for the whole city administration – included: (a) strengthening urbanism, (b) attracting talent, (c) increasing the number of enterprises and (qualified) jobs, (d) maintaining tolerance, (e) improving educational justice, (f) promoting creative economy, and (g) reinforcing civil society commitment and participation (Stadt Mannheim, 2008). After evaluating the first phase, the second phase of the reform programme, *Change² II* (2014–2019), was put into action. The readjusted version included consolidating the modernisation process, focusing on the systematic development of the city administration departments, personnel, and instruments (Stadt Mannheim, 2014). Though both stages of the administrative programme sought to change the city administrations' organisational culture, neither of them proposed strategies or measures to enhance the intercultural awareness, competencies, and skills of the municipality's administrative workforce.

Moreover, there was no correspondence between the concept of action for intercultural work and the modernisation of the city administration. The intercultural action plan, developed in 2007, was not a component of the series of administrative reforms; migration mainstreaming for the municipality administration was mentioned neither in *Change² I* nor *Change² II*. There was also no review or evaluation report on the results of the strategies and programmes related to the concept of intercultural work available to the public. The impact

this conceptualisation made on the cultural institutions in Mannheim remains unknown. This sort of rhetoric of becoming intercultural demonstrates that intercultural opening is not substantively prioritised, it is not offered any systematic approach, nor is it understood as a long-term process that should be incorporated into the administration reform strategies.