



**Winfried Ellingsen**

**Social integration of ethnic groups in Europe. How can concepts of place and territoriality help explain processes, policies and problems of socially integrating different ethnic groups in a European context?**

**Abstract**

International migration is changing the spatial and social topography of European cities. This paper represents an attempt to apply concepts of place and territoriality to the issue of integration of ethnic groups into a European context. Based on three examples from Oslo, Paris and Duisburg it is argued that the place concepts of *location*, *locale* and *sense of place* can provide a comprehensive framework for understanding current processes and problems regarding integration. The concept of territoriality directs attention to the different readings of integration, which, from the perspective of the host population aims at assimilation. From the perspective of the immigrant population on the other hand territoriality is concerned with internal control, resulting in segregation.

This working paper has been presented as a lecture on the 17<sup>th</sup> of January 2003 as a partial requirement for a Ph.D. degree. The topic has been set by the Ph.D. committee.

## **Social integration of ethnic groups in Europe. How can concepts of place and territoriality help explain processes, policies and problems of socially integrating different ethnic groups in a European context?**

### Introduction

Geography, asserts Tim Cresswell (1997: 361), rarely takes mobility as seriously as it does place and territory. Even the sub-field of migration studies is more concerned with forces operating in places of departure and arrival in terms of push and pull factors. Post-modern approaches fill this gap with the metaphor of the nomad or the traveller. Emphasising mobility and fluidity, the nomad is seen as transgressing the rigidity of spatial boundaries and the delineation of territories, being 'dislocated' and therefore unbounded. The nomad is an unsocial being, unmarked by geography, ethnicity, gender and class. This position is problematic for several reasons. It flattens out difference by a "tendency to over-generalise the global currency of the so-called nomadic, fragmented and de-territorialized subjectivity" (Ang, 1994: 4). The emergence of hybrid or creolised identities may be one possible condition of European societies and some people may be 'melting pots' themselves (Massey & Jess, 1995). However, to impose hybridity on all migrants disregards empirical variations in adaptation processes, structural conditions in the host country and a whole range of issues from citizenship rights to local schemes of upgrading the physical environment in parts of cities with a high newcomer population. It certainly ignores altogether the uneven distribution of resources between sending and receiving areas, and differences within migrant groups as well as within places.

Most problematic, in my view, is the perspective from no-where, effectively announcing the end of place. In this, postmodernism is a continuation and perhaps exaggeration of modernisation theory, which has gone a long way in stressing the declining role of communities and neighbourhoods in the everyday life of modern society. With the application of new transport and communication technologies, propinquity seems irrelevant as a meaningful framework for integration. People may have more contact with someone located in a different country than with one's immediate neighbour. It is assumed that the expansion of social relations that transcend place causes a decline of local solidarity and networks. This implies that in a world of time-space compression place is becoming obsolete, spatial boundaries are eclipsed and social relations are

dictated by choice of activity and lifestyle rather than location. Neighbourhoods are characterised by a segmentation of lifestyles and the timetables of its inhabitants. Social homogeneity, wherever it exists, is a consequence of the types of housing attracting particular types of residents and households. Accordingly, the fluidity of discrepant attachments has replaced the impact of places and neighbourhoods on the lives of individuals. The mental space of post-modernity thus precludes the possibility of 'home' and the discovery of common experiences. The physical environment with its notions of relative stability, means of orientation and security and its manifestations of shared or contested symbols is largely ignored.

The experience of migration brings with it a shift of perspective: place effectively involves a series of places and encounters, and senses of place are not necessarily bound to the local. Migration studies have taken this issue seriously and frequently focused on chain migration in order to explain preferences of different ethnic communities. From their own history many European countries are acquainted with chain migrations to the 'new world' across the Atlantic, as well as chain migrations to its own territory, leading to specific patterns of population concentrations. It is reasonable to argue that by taking place and territory seriously we can arrive at a better understanding of mobility, whether the term implies identity formation, social class or migration itself. Migration flows are always place-specific. In everyday life questions of 'where are you from?' and 'where you are at?' still bear significance. Despite an increase in global communication, place continues to be "the first of all things" and remains a salient empirical issue for migrants and the host population alike. The consequences of migration are pertinent in every major European city, indicating that place may not be as fixed as suggested by postmodernism. In fact we can witness the re-making of European cities.

Empirical instances of migration encouraged social science to approach the issue theoretically. The human ecology of the Chicago School was the starting point for systematic research on spatial segregations, where both initial segregation and later dispersal and assimilation into the host country are treated as natural strategies of adaptation. In Western Europe, research into the spatial patterns of population groups received more attention after it became clear that a majority of the guest workers that arrived in the 1960s and 1970s did not plan to return to their native countries. From then on continuous waves of immigrants and asylum seekers from economically peripheral

countries to the developed world of Europe raised the spectre of the once so distant American ghetto with its high unemployment and crime rates and its concentration of ethnic minority groups. Plainly, immigration became to be perceived as problematic.

I will, in the following, attempt to show how concepts of place and territoriality can be useful tools in analysing contemporary social processes related to immigration in Europe. The objective is not to produce a full-scale comparison of European countries, which is beyond the scope of this paper, but to use selected examples from a limited number of countries in order to expose some differences and similarities with regard to processes, policies and problems of integration. I will focus on two geographical scales: the national level and the city, which is the preferential settlement site of the majority of migrants. Greater Paris for instance attracts one out of three immigrants to France. It is therefore paramount to emphasise the important role places, neighbourhoods and communities continue to play in everyday life.

#### Conceptualisations of Place and Territoriality

In order to conceptualise place and develop the category generically we can distinguish three complementary dimensions of place, namely *location*, *locale* and *sense of place* (Agnew, 1987). Location may have various connotations in geography. According to Agnew (ibid.) it implies the impact of the wider world on place. But location can also mean the spatial distribution of activities and objects and thus the material environment at a given place, which consists of the material inventory such as buildings, streets, green areas, mountains, rivers, human bodies and so forth. In this sense, location corresponds to physical space and this is how it is interpreted and employed here.

The second dimension refers to place as 'locale', designated as the "setting of interaction" (Giddens, 1984). Locale points to the physical properties of particular places but specifies the modes of utilisation from which locales derive their meaning. Various rules and resources may be activated in different locales and the term thus focuses on social practice. As setting of interaction, where routine activities of individuals intersect, locale retains the 'container' perspective, where place is a mere external frame. But a different reading of 'locale' is possible. Locale designates the immediate arena of inter-subjective practices and as such it has references to

community. The significance of communities is constituted through particular practices, institutions and ideas within distinct territories.

The third dimension, sense of place is an existential dimension of place, which refers to place as a profound centre and condition of human existence and the locus of experience and felt value (Relph, 1976, Tuan, 1977). Sense of place has connotations of the idiosyncratic, but senses of place can never be purely individual, being based exclusively on individual biographies. Rather, senses of place are products of social interaction mediated through individual subjectivities. "Senses of place are never purely individual or purely collective. They are never purely individual because life world is always reproduced, negotiated and rationalized through a process of communicative action" (Butz & Eyles, 1997: 6). This implies that senses of place are contingent to changes in cultural, social and material circumstances. A sense of belonging and community may be ordered around the social centrality of particular places. Attachment to place is seen as a result of affections through repeated encounters and complex associations that are integral to self-definitions. Place is thus an important element in the construction of individual and collective identities. For Eyles (1985: 4) "place is a negotiated reality, a social construction by a purposeful set of actors. But the relationship is mutual, for places in turn develop and reinforce the identity of the social group that claims them".

Territoriality can be defined as 'appropriation of place'. Territoriality is the appropriation of a location through reiteration of certain social practices on the basis of a distinct cognitive image of place, a sense of place, which links personal identities and projects to a community and a territory, and naturalises these links. To appropriate means to 'make one's own', to internalise, and as such it is closely related to sense of place. Territories are social constructions that are embedded in the social and cultural processes that give it meaning. Thus territories are tied to cultural identity and it is reasonable to argue that territoriality is a process that constitutes place. In this sense the city or the country takes on the qualities of its inhabitants. Territoriality can therefore provide important clues on the aspirations of various culture groups to re-define the relations between social practices and the material environment. To that effect boundaries are of vital significance. In the context of international migration, territoriality and the maintenance of physical and social boundaries exposes the

asymmetrical power relationship between minority and hegemonic majority perceptions of how a particular territory can be utilised.

In creating naturalised links between places and people, nation-states play a major role. One of the hallmarks of a political state is the authoritative power over a delimited territory. Power is an inherent quality of territoriality exercised in the control of state boundaries with the aim of excluding non-nationals or at least control their access, and with internal socio-spatial control, the social and symbolic construction of 'us', which aims at the maintenance of social order (Paasi, 1996). The ideal of a homogeneous population loyal to the state, a rare reality indeed, has been transcended by international migration. The differentiation between 'us' and the 'other', the core of all codes of collective identities, has become part of our cities, our schools and workplaces. Co-habitation of various ethnic groups is the rule rather than the exception. The irony of these times of multi-lateralism is that as actual territories and places seem to become more blurred and indeterminate, ideas of culturally and ethnically distinct places become more salient. Europe, the heartland of the so-called civilised world, built on philosophy, science and art exposes this contradiction in all its brutality. Northern Irish Protestants would not even allow Catholic school children to walk through their territory. And with boundary re-shuffling in the former Yugoslavia, ethnic cleansing as a purification strategy has become part of the colloquial vocabulary. This exemplifies that mental constructions of place impinge on the material environment. Fortress Europe is another term that clarifies that power is at stake in territorial relationships. This physical demarcation enacted by the Schengen treaty includes a metaphorical perspective and can therefore also be understood as an expression of common social and cultural practices and identities.

Once individuals have slipped through border controls they become subject to various discourses of recognition. In the public sphere the politics of universalism emphasise the equal dignity of all citizens and the content of these politics has been the equalisation of rights and entitlements. We consider non-discrimination a fundamental virtue, but this view has been criticised for being blind to the ways in which citizens actually differ. It is argued (Bader, 1997) that this kind of neutrality requires immigrants to conform to European standards and therefore aims at cultural assimilation. France is possibly the most prominent showcase of this view in Europe. Based on a strong

centralist state and a common language most historical ethnic variation has been suppressed and the politics of acculturation remain unquestioned even in the wake of huge migrations from Northern Africa.

What has been described as the politics of difference requires that we make differences the basis of differential treatment in order to achieve the ideal of non-discrimination. Immigrant groups are usually marginalised with respect to economic performance, education and housing. The question is whether the state should take affirmative action to correct these differences, at least temporarily. Ethnic redistribution politics have been implemented in some European countries, especially in Scandinavia, favouring for instance access to social housing and kindergartens in order to ease the integration of immigrants into the host society. These measures are not uncontested and may be met with resentment by the local population. Legal problems are encountered in the issue of dual citizenship. It is argued that providing dual citizenship to Turkish guest workers in Germany would ease integration and the adoption of the new territory as their homeland, as it offers full-fledged participation in the German polity. The current processes of ethnification and segregation could thus be avoided.

#### Integration, Segregation and Assimilation

At first glance the triplet of *integration*, *segregation* and *assimilation* appears to be an unproblematic categorisation. Assimilation refers to the unilateral adaptation of the value system of the host society by minority populations. Integration can be defined as the inclusion of individuals or groups into mainstream society or various social arenas on equal terms (St.meld. nr.17, 2000-2001). It is usually acknowledged that integration aims at mutual accommodation. The civic and cultural codes between Europe and non-Western immigrants differ and may engender numerous problems concerning food and dress at public institutions, religious rules and traditions and the issue of ethnic cultures of marriage and sexuality. A growing acceptance of a Western sense of self particularly amongst second-generation migrants brings the differences between a culture of honour and a culture based on individual dignity to the forefront. Although spatiality is not explicitly addressed in these definitions, it is assumed that, following an adaptation to the values of the host country a dispersal of immigrants will eventually take place. Segregation on the other hand refers both to the processes of social differentiation and to the spatial patterns that result from such processes, which are usually located at the

urban scale. Segregation is usually conceived of as a failure of integration policies. Integration in particular is a term that may have several connotations depending on the perspective taken. While assimilation is viewed as 'national integration' by the state and the cultural mainstream, it is ethnification or 'ethnic integration' often coupled with spatial segregation from the perspective of minorities.

In the city, global impulses, national ideals and policies and local particularities converge. Here national political identity finds its most affective expression in public rituals and monuments that are highly ethnocentric. The city is a paradigmatic example of contemporary processes of cultural politics and identity discourses and the material base on which these discourses are constructed. In the following three examples from Norway, France and Germany are presented to illustrate how concepts of place and territoriality help us understand processes of integration. (It should be noted that the presented examples do not provide a full picture of the current situation in these countries.) Net immigration has been a longstanding feature of all these countries for several decades prompted originally by the demand for manual labour in the growing industries. Since segregation is a powerful indicator of otherness and usually perceived as problematic by the majority population and a hinder to integration, its study provides a useful starting point. Two alternative interpretations of segregation are usually presented: voluntary clustering is related to cultural preferences, whereas forced segregation is based on conflicts over resources. The concept of territoriality is therefore a reasonable approach to these processes. The relative importance of these factors may vary with size and character of the minority group and it may vary over time according to developments within the ethnic group, and within the host society.

Based on Boal's (1999) re-conceptualisation of the processes and patterns of intra-urban ethnic segregation, four types of migrant communities can be anticipated:

1. Areas of assimilation-pluralism, where the host society is a large element in the population, but does not form a majority.
2. Mixed minority areas, shared by two or more ethnic groups.
3. Polarised areas, with one minority group substantially encapsulated, forming at least 60 per cent of the population.
4. Ghettos are characterised by a high degree of concentration of one minority group. In addition a large share of the total minority population lives in this area.



Politicians and the media use the term 'ghetto' indiscriminately with respect to the situation in Europe. The term evokes negative connotations and indeed polarises more than can be substantiated by the factual situation. Recent publications on Paris (Simon, 1998) and Greater London (Johnston et al., 2002) suggest that ghettos do not exist in these cities and it is therefore reasonable to assume that types 2 and 3 are an adequate description of segregation in Europe.

### The Case of Oslo

Oslo represents the example from Scandinavia, which is associated with a well-developed welfare system and intentional planning policies to achieve egalitarian ideals. In Norway, the State Housing Bank provides favourable conditions for all residents to build a one-family house, but in the capital housing structure, particular in the working class districts in the inner-eastern part of the city, prohibits the mixing of housing types. From the early 1970s a new immigrant group, Punjabi Pakistanis, moved into the traditionally blue-collar boroughs, situated near the city centre. A recent study shows that there has been a slight increase in residential segregation in the period from 1988 to 2001 (Blom, 2002), due to the continuing growth of the immigrant population. Analyses of intra-urban migration indicate that there is a new trend of net-flows of minority populations to suburban dormitory boroughs, particularly on the eastern side of town. A transition from renting to owner-occupancy and a wish for larger dwellings are likely explanations for this movement. On the other hand, the pattern of western immigrants to Norway is characterised by dispersal rather than segregation.

Usually, three models of explanation for residential segregation are identified, the economic, the institutional and the cultural. The economic explanation assumes that differences in housing prices between various areas in the city coupled with low economic resources in the minority population lead to segregation. The institutional explanation relates segregation to discrimination in the housing market and administrative measures channel minorities to certain enclaves in the city. The cultural explanation assumes that voluntary segregation takes place because minorities seek together in order to preserve cultural, religious and linguistic distinctiveness. And, we could add, to keep internal control over their wives and daughters. Discrimination in the housing market and particularly economic reasons were found to be the most relevant in the Oslo case. Related to place concepts we could argue that location in the form of the

material environment determines in some way minority preferences in Oslo.

Discrimination can be seen as an attempt by the majority population to preserve their locales and their senses of place. But as the Oslo report uses population register data we get to know very little on minorities' cultural preferences which I relate to a combination of sense of place, their feeling of home and identity, and locale, their need for engaging in practices with like-minded people. The report however suggests that local political engagement is higher in ethnically segregated areas than among immigrants otherwise. On the other hand, segregated living leads to less integration into mainstream society as children have more friends from the same ethnic group and are being less socialised through the use of the Norwegian language.

### The Case of Paris

In a study of the French model of integration, Simon (1998) addresses explicitly institutional discrimination. Institutional practices provide information about the norms of the majority population. The focus is on neighbourhoods because, under conditions of rising unemployment, the workplace is no longer the dominant synthetic setting of social relationships. The management of the territoriality of social inequality is an attempt to control a segregative system, whereby populations are confined to specific areas according to their socio-economic status or to their position in the hierarchy of ethnic origins. Urban marginality expressed in the outbreak of riots and looted supermarkets undermines the foundations of the republican ideal of the nation-state and leads to ethnic tensions and the rise of the right-wing National Front. Immigrant neighbourhoods, whether in old, rundown housing in the inner city or in the soulless suburbia of high-rise apartment blocs in the periphery, trigger a downward spiral of social stigma and physical degradation. Gentrification of city centres and the investment into property by French middle-class households actually contributed to increasing segregation, reinforcing the social division of the city, as it left many ethnic households dependent on the public housing allocation system.

Becoming the focus of public policies, the 1991 'Orientation law for the City' aimed at promoting diversity in terms of housing and population. The myth of 'social mix' was revived to enhance interaction between the different populations. The aim was not to grant freedom of residential choice to ethnic groups but to create a patchwork by dispersing them throughout the city. This policy specifically intended to counter the

concentration of immigrants in one area by discriminating certain groups from some public housing programs. Opting for desegregation however set new obstacles in the path of immigrants wishing to move. Under the pretext of avoiding concentration, households are banished to areas with a bad reputation or refused access to social housing altogether. The gap widens between certain ethnic groups such as South East Asians that are gradually becoming integrated into mainstream society and others that are rejected and separated from the rest of society.

Interpreted on the basis of place concepts and territoriality it can be argued that the French example illustrates the domination and control exercised by the state, disregarding the specific problems of immigrants. They are considered potential troublemakers and a very visible proof of the existence of social inequalities. The state however is keen to preserve an image of equality, but policies of ‘divide and rule’ with the purpose of denying subordinate cultures to develop a base from which to reproduce their own culture has not been successful. These territorial policies expose the predominance of a French sense of place where foreign locales are perceived as a threat to national values, and after “9-11” perhaps even as a threat to national security.

Integration is always selective. Immigrants would prefer integration into the economic sphere, but may reject integration into other locales of social life. In France it seems that integration is translated as assimilation by the host society. The territorial claim by a state to a certain territory is coupled to an impulse to seek conformity and sometimes even uniformity within spatial limits. Once initiated, the many mainstream fears and prejudices towards outsider groups feed into concrete social practices through which distinctions between majority and minority are reproduced and sometimes rendered more acute. These concrete practices commonly boast a spatial dimension of inclusion and exclusion. Public assertions of plurality therefore merely serve an ideological role in conveying a false sense of harmony.

The movement of immigrants to neutral areas may dismantle the relationship and community networks based on social or ethnic affiliation. The migratory process, whatever motivated it, seems to enhance the sense of solidarity among migrants, who are often united by bonds of kinship and ethnicity. Cultural symbols serve as a reminder of their origin, while at the same time marking them as outsiders. Forced desegregation

denies these groups their locales and community structures and renders them invisible as a distinctive collective, in fact denies them collective and individual recognition. This process is not always synonymous with integration or emancipation. It can lead to a loss of reference points and cause people to withdraw into their close family locales instead of joining mainstream society. It blatantly denies ethnic groups their own sense of place and the creation of adequate locales that are more supportive of their identities. In France, the possibility of affirmative action directed towards the upgrading of the location, the physical environment is restricted by egalitarian ideals.

### The Case of Duisburg

The German example from Duisburg (Hanhörster, 2001) explores the relationship between physical and structural changes in a neighbourhood and the changing perceptions of its inhabitants. The borough of Marxloh grew as a residential area for nearby coal and steel industries. The high percentage of ethnic minorities, of which 70% are of Turkish descent, is a direct consequence of a large proportion of industry-owned housing. Due to structural changes unemployment is high and housing stock has been left to deteriorate. As a result, households with the economic option of moving elsewhere did so, further marking the area as a Turkish community. The mostly elderly German residents, who were once part of an ethnic majority feel now that their place in society is being questioned. As the Turkish population establishes itself in the neighbourhood, the place they once knew is changing. The former feeling of belonging has been replaced with a feeling of exclusion and loss of security. German stores have been replaced with Turkish ones and as the new group uses public places more actively, elderly Germans limit their participation in public life. The parts of the neighbourhood where ethnic minorities live are in a state of neglect and avoided by Germans. The process of polarisation in the borough has been aggravated by formulation of a dike policy by housing associations, which resulted in ethnically homogeneous wards.

Turks themselves engage in the same process of withdrawal into their own locales. They have appropriated place but at the same time lost the right to more extensive participation in the host society. It can be suggested that this process of withdrawal is a reaction to ongoing discrimination and based on a desire to obtain a sense of security and orientation by creating a closed group in a bounded area. But this territorial appropriation is an uneasy one in the Turkish case, since many Turks are dissatisfied

with the location, and suffer from the social exclusion experienced in the disapproval of their community by the majority. Thus their own sense of place is not a positive one, and upwardly mobile Turks - particularly those that are born in Germany and whose lifestyle choices and attitudes are adapted to the majority population - chose a strategy of assimilation. They express this choice territorially by leaving the Turkish neighbourhood.

One of the possible policies of affirmative action that can aid integration processes is to improve the physical environment. Since 1993, Marxloh has received funding by a regional programme called 'Urban Neighbourhoods with a Special Need for Renewal' and by the European Commission's Urban Programme. In short, the policies included an economic profile, creating jobs and improving housing conditions, coupled with bottom-up strategies by supporting resident-managed activities. Unfortunately Hanhörster (2001) does not explicitly analyse the effects of these programmes, but it seems that the programme has not succeeded to improve location and locale. Sub-standard housing and lack of physical resources, and the lack of communication and contact between the groups adds to the stigma attached to this neighbourhood. The segregated neighbourhood of the Turks is however part of a larger community. As intra-ethnic communication is maintained over large distances, it represents a diaspora community. Consequently, with a background in a general economic decline and shortages on the housing market, the process of appropriating place leads to conflicts along ethno-cultural lines as different groups fight for a place in the neighbourhood hierarchy. Germans react with resentment to the occupation of their place, while Turks react with resignation or flight to the process of being marginalised. Segregation and assimilation are the result rather than integration.

The problem may lie in the shifting connotations of the term integration itself, as it can mean different things to different people. European culture politics accept minor deviations from the norm, for instance with regard to religious traditions, but the tenor is on adaptation to the new homeland. Segregation and a discussion of its positive and negative effects is often evaluated according to its acceptability for the majority as a discourse of power, and not its meaning for ethnic groups themselves. It can be argued that segregated immigrant cultures may even strengthen the dominant culture as it exposes their own distinctiveness. And it is supportive for immigrants because it eases

the difficult transition to a new society and a different environment. Insularity, the assertion of local distinctions and the privatisation of life around family and ethnic group are natural reactions to a wider world over which people may have little if any control. Initial clustering has been reinforced by chain migration to bridgeheads established by the first immigrants, which has strengthened the bonds within the community and provided the base for interaction with a group of significant others. The emergence of a distinct sub-economy and community infrastructure emphasises the positive aspects of concentration. The community is able to offer religious facilities, shops and services that provide employment, reinforce ethnic values and constitute a framework for a recognised way of life. The segregated ethnic community provides support and protection for the immigrant, where social capital not only depends on the acquisition of material goods, but also on religious and cultural observances that provide the basis for the cohesion of the community. Familiarity, the perpetuation of norms and security are key terms that indicate the appropriation of place.

Senses of place include not only perceptions of the environment but also senses of self. Boundaries help define identities by marking difference. Physical segregation reinforces the pre-constructed prototypical image of Turks or other ethnic groups. The Oriental as the antithesis of European culture sticks to deep to be remedied within one generation. Immigrants are strangers by choice and ascription and it seems as if segregation is often forced as well as voluntary. Stereotypical ascription considers immigrants as homogeneous and the presented examples do not address identity processes within ethnic groups – such as intergenerational conflicts - and between immigrant groups. Bauman (1996) analysed the formation of a pan-South Asian identity in Southall. This inclusive self-categorisation can be seen as a reaction to discrimination and racism by providing a positive hybrid identity for young Bangladeshis and Indians. Mandel (1989) described the pecking order of foreign guest workers in Berlin and the processes of redefinition taking place between Alevi and Sunni Turks and Kurds in exile. Defining Germans as the ‘other’ seems to ease tensions that formerly existed.

### Concluding Remarks

All the examples presented indicate that besides this process of withdrawal and closure, while being important to many immigrants, integration processes do take place. These may lead to various hybrid identities as well as to assimilation. The defiant mullah

preaching the inferiority of the majority group's cultural and social norms may boast the identity of the audience but is as little helpful to integration as are discriminatory practices by the host population. Integration will depend on the development of links between different cultural dispositions and ideologies. But even in plural, liberal societies mutual cultural accommodation cannot be symmetrical since power is not distributed equally. Integration into certain locales such as the workplace, public schools or sports clubs occurs on a regular basis. Establishing mixed neighbourhoods, if necessary through political measures and municipal planning, is proposed as a means to further integration. This is reasonable since the neighbourhood as a small-scale locale is of major importance in the socialisation of children and contacts between various groups. From the point of view of location, residential segregation however can have positive effects if residents have the opportunity to help improve the urban infrastructure and bring in social and cultural capital. From the point of view of 'sense of place', planning for integration is expressed in the dominant discourse and there clearly is a need to engage the sense of place of immigrants themselves.

Conclusively, I argue that the application of the three concepts of place opens for a more comprehensive analysis of contemporary processes pertaining to the integration of ethnic groups in Europe. Instead of fragmentary approaches concerning either institutional frameworks, housing policies, the quality and distribution of the infrastructure or various cultural representations and identity politics, these approaches may be combined to achieve a more holistic representation of the processes at work. It is important to notice that these place concepts are complementary. Territoriality in particular, by paying due attention to ideologies that internalise material place, can expose power relations, internally within the various groups and between hegemonic and minority practices and discourses. The concept helps to deconstruct integration as the hegemonic myth for assimilation on one hand, and internal control expressed in segregation on the other. The position in between is negotiated from locale to locale.

## References

- Ang, I. 1994 'On not speaking Chinese: Postmodern Ethnicity and the Politics of Diaspora' *New Formations*, No. 24
- Agnew, J. 1987 'Place and Politics' Boston: Allen & Unwin
- Bader, V. 1997 'The Cultural Conditions of Transnational Citizenship' *Political Theory*, Vol. 25, No.6
- Bauman, G. 1996 'Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-ethnic London' Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Blom, S. 2002 'Innvandrenes bosettingsmønster i Oslo' Oslo: Statistisk Sentralbyrå
- Boal, F. 1999 'From Undivided Cities to Undivided Cities: Assimilation to Ethnic Cleansing' *Housing Studies* 14(4): 585-600
- Butz, D. & Eyles, J. 1997 'Reconceptualizing senses of place: social relations, ideology and ecology' *Geografiske Annaler*, 79 B(1), 1-25
- Cresswell, T. 1997 'Imagining the Nomad' in Benko, G. & Strohmayer, U. (eds.): *Space & Social Theory, Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity* Blackwell: Oxford
- Eyles, J. 1985 'Senses of Place' Warrington: Silverbrook Press
- Giddens, A. 1984 *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. London: Polity Press
- Hanhörster, H. 2001 'Whose neighbourhood is it? Ethnic diversity in urban spaces in Germany' *GeoJournal* 51: 329-338
- Johnston, R. & Forrest, J. & Poulsen, M. 2002 'The Ethnic EthniCities' *Geography of Ethnicities* Vol. 2(2): 139-162
- Mandel, R. & Gonzales, N. & McCommon, C. (eds.) 1989 'Ethnicity and Identity among Migrant Guestworkers in West Berlin' in 'Conflict, Migration, and the Expression of Ethnicity' Boulder: Westview Press
- Massey, D. & Jess, P. (eds.) 1995 'A Place in the World? Places, Cultures and Globalization' Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Paasi, A. 1996 'Inclusion, exclusion and territorial identities – the meanings of boundaries in the globalizing geopolitical landscape' *Nordisk Samhällsgeografisk Tidskrift*, 23
- Relph, E. 1976 'Place and Placelessness' London: Pion
- Simon, P. 1998 'Ghettos, Immigrants, and Integration: The French Dilemma' *Netherland Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* Vol.13, No. 1
- Tuan, Yi-Fu 1977 'Space and Place. The Perspective of Experience' Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Stortingsmelding No. 17 (2000 – 2001) 'Asyl- og flyktningpolitikk i Noreg'