

Contents

The Social Construction of Race and Citizenship	2
Economic Change, Inequalities and Race Relations	5
Land Inequalities and Race Relations	8
Migration and Multiculturalism	10
Organized Responses to Cultural Diversity	11
Institutional Reform	13
Gender, Race and Public Policy	15
Racism and Social Justice	16
Agenda	20
Panellists, Chairpersons, Organizers	22

Racism and Public Policy

*Report of the UNRISD International Conference
3–5 September 2001, Durban, South Africa*

The third World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance was held in Durban, South Africa, from 31 August to 7 September 2001. World leaders examined progress made in the fight against racism since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related conventions and resolutions; discussed ways of improving the application of existing standards and instruments to combat racism; reviewed the social, economic, political, cultural and historical factors that drive racism and racial discrimination; and recommended measures to be adopted at the national, regional and international levels for combating racism, xenophobia and intolerance. While the preparatory meetings and the Durban conference itself exposed sharp differences among countries and groups on some of the core agenda items, they also underscored the need for a better understanding of racial cleavages and discrimination in formulating development policies.

The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) invited 30 high-level scholars from various regions of the world to prepare papers and lead discussions at a parallel UNRISD conference held from 3 to 5 September. More than 500 representatives of governments, international agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia and the media participated in the meeting. The conference provided participants with research findings, insights and

policy debates on some of the core issues of racism, xenophobia and intolerance as they affect different groups, countries and regions; and examined the opportunities, problems and challenges of public policies devised for overcoming racist and xenophobic practices in different settings. It focused on four broad themes: the social construction of race and citizenship; the social dynamics of racism and inequalities; organized responses to cultural diversity; and the impact of public policies on race relations. There was an opening, a keynote address and 10 sessions.

Two important public policy issues were highlighted throughout the three days of discussions. The first is the complex ways racial cleavages have influenced the evolution of citizenship, especially in countries with deep ethno-racial divisions. Much of the history of efforts to construct a responsive and accountable public sphere can be seen as struggles to demolish racial barriers and incorporate previously excluded groups into the system of rights and obligations that define citizenship. Struggles for universal citizenship underscore the need to respect cultural diversity and its underlying values of tolerance, accommodation and human solidarity. The second issue is the promotion of social justice and equitable governance, which is seen as a fundamental requirement for achieving stability and consolidating the values of citizenship. However, reforms that seek to promote social justice and equita-



ble governance are often fraught with difficulties as they deal with redistributive issues. They may be seen in zero-sum terms by some citizens. Potential losers may resist or undermine reforms, while those who stand to gain may not be strong enough to defend them. These issues were discussed in 10 sessions and covered a wide range of countries and regions: the Afro-Arab borderlands, Australia and New Zealand, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, Southern Africa, the United States, and Western Europe.

In their opening statements, both Thandika Mkandawire and Mary Robinson stressed the importance of the UNRISD conference in providing a neutral platform for reflection and discussion on issues of identities, inequalities and justice. A disturbing feature of the current world order, Robinson noted, is the rise of inequality between as well as within nations. As she explained it, the World Conference “has helped bring into sharper focus the linkages between inequality of treatment—in terms of status, identity, prejudice, and discrimination—and inequality of outcomes—in income, wealth, education, political power, health, housing, marriage and family formation, and other social goods”. She challenged researchers to engage fully in the implementation of the commitments made in Durban.

The Social Construction of Race and Citizenship

Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance are worldwide problems. Genetic research has discredited the practice of classifying humans according to distinct races. On average, 99.9 per cent of the genetic features of humans are the same; and of the remaining percentage that accounts for variation, differences within groups are larger than between groups. However, a gulf exists between scientific knowledge and popular beliefs about race. Trivial as physical differences may be, scientifically, they structure perceptions and constitute a significant source of prejudice in social relations. Thus discussions on racism generate strong emotions, as they often touch on issues of identity, honour, dignity, justice and historical violations. As a social construct, the key attributes of race are fuzzy and open to multiple interpretations. A coloured person in South Africa may be classified as black in the United States even if he or she has more white than black grandparents, and the designation may be

meaningless in West Africa or South Asia where the racial system that gave rise to such classification does not exist. Even people with roughly the same colour and physical appearance may be categorized as different races in certain contexts. This has been the experience of groups such as the Irish and European Jews in Europe and the United States. And some racial classifications do not account for mixed offspring or recent immigrants.

The construction of race as identity may be linked with ethnicity, especially when variations in physical characteristics coincide with assumed cultural, linguistic and religious differences. Examples include relations between people of Indian and African origin in Guyana and Trinidad, indigenous Fijians and Indians in Fiji, North and South Sudanese, Tutsi and Hutu in Burundi

Trivial as physical differences may be, scientifically, they structure perceptions and constitute a significant source of prejudice in social relations. Discussions on racism generate strong emotions, as they often touch on issues of identity, honour, dignity, justice and historical violations.

and Rwanda, and Chinese and Malays in Malaysia. In Burundi and Rwanda, despite the fact that the two groups share skin colour, language, religion and names, variations in height, body structure and nose shape are used to establish difference. In some contexts, a group may identify itself as a separate race even if there are no clear physical differences between it and groups it seeks to categorize as the “other”. Thus we have concepts such as the “Yoruba race” in Nigeria, the “Italian race” in Europe and the “Chinese race” in Asia. Even when groups do not practice overt forms of discrimination, subtle differences in physical characteristics that may not be visible to outsiders, may be used to construct ideas about the “other”.

Racial ideas may influence discourses on social integration or accommodation, encourage insular or xenophobic practices, and distort perceptions about rights and citizenship. Citizens are supposed to be carriers of equal rights and obligations. In polarized racial settings, however, social solidarity, the cornerstone of citizenship, may be embedded in racial—not civic—networks, affecting the way the public domain is governed. However, it is instructive to note that all communities,

whether based on racial identification or ethnicity, are complex, undergo change, and experience internal diversities and conflicts. Race, in other words, is not only constructed: it is also contested.

Rodolfo Stavenhagen's keynote address and the first two sessions—on race, caste and citizenship and on minorities, indigenous peoples and citizenship—discussed these issues as they relate to experiences in the United States, South Africa, India, Latin America, Southeast Asia and the Afro-Arab borderlands. Stavenhagen traced the historical evolution of ideas and policies on race and citizenship since the establishment of the United Nations. Before the founding of the world body, racism was closely identified with the Nazi pseudo-scientific ideology of racial purity and superiority, which was deeply rooted in numerous strands of Western thought. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 upheld the principle of universal rights and freedoms and barred discrimination on the basis of race and other human cleavages. The next phase of the struggle against racism encompassed the anti-colonial and anti-apartheid struggles of the 1950s and 1960s. The right to self-determination was proclaimed in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 1960, incorporated in the Human Rights Covenants adopted by the General Assembly in 1966. This represented a distinct shift from racist attitudes and ideologies to people's rights and the construction of an equitable world order. However, racism emerged in new forms during the 1970s and 1980s, especially in the industrial societies of the North, affecting the fortunes of racial minorities, migrant labourers and refugees from the South. Changes in the composition of societies affected conceptions of race and race relations: biological distinctions meshed with perceived cultural differences, giving rise to the concept of multiculturalism or the right to be different. The notion of interculturality has also emerged, seeking to strengthen diversity through flexible modes of governance that are not restricted to any one model of the "nation state".

In the United States, George Fredrickson reported, commitment toward universal human rights coexisted with a strong historical tendency to exclude non-white groups from citizenship. The American Revolution appealed to universalistic values of human rights, but the Constitution of 1789 excluded African-Americans and indigenous Indians from citizenship. The immigration law of 1790 limited the right to naturalization

to "free white persons". Throughout the 1830s, 1840s and 1850s, as the debate on slavery intensified, pseudo-scientific racist ideologies were used by defenders of black servitude to prevent blacks from enjoying equal rights with whites. This culminated in the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision of 1857, which declared

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 upheld the principle of universal rights and freedoms and barred discrimination on the basis of race and other human cleavages.

all blacks ineligible for citizenship. However, the Civil War and use of black troops to defend the Union represented the first major effort to extend citizenship to African-Americans. This gain was undermined in the South during the Jim Crow era lasting almost a century, when blacks suffered discrimination, disenfranchisement and torture. Struggles for racial equality intensified between the 1930s and 1960s, culminating in the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965, which made citizenship rights more enforceable. However, formal equality has not led to social citizenship: a substantially higher proportion of blacks than whites are likely to be unemployed, imprisoned, in poverty or destitute.

Fredrickson discussed the experience of the United States in comparative perspective. In the main, the commitment of the United States to a universal human rights tradition distinguishes it from the German tradition of ethnic nationalism, which produced the horrors of Nazi rule and the Holocaust. Also, the US' acceptance of multiculturalism sets it apart from the culture-coded ethno-racial intolerance in France, despite the fact that the latter has not established colour bars to protect white privilege. He concluded that since race has been socially constructed, it should not be seen as natural or inevitable. A process of deconstruction of race is already under way in the United States, as can be seen in the demolition of legalized segregation, racially inspired voting restrictions and discriminatory immigration quotas.

South Africa is comparable to the United States in terms of its historical commitment to institutionalized racism. According to Bernard Magubane, racism in South Africa was associated with the colonial quest for raw materials and the settlement of Europe's social outcasts. Before apartheid, the subjugation of the African

population took two forms: slavery and peonage. Laws devised for indentured white immigrants, free “coloured” workers and emancipated African slaves provided the backdrop for South Africa’s notorious master and servant laws, which from 1910 were transformed into segregation laws, and from 1948 into apartheid, effectively denying the African population citizenship rights. The 1994 constitution and the new Government of National Unity proscribed apartheid, upheld universal citizenship for all South Africans, and committed itself to both racial and gender equality.

A recurring theme in Southeast Asia, as Lily Rahim reported, is the problematic relationship between the Chinese population and “indigenous” groups. And since

Malaysia’s bumiputera (son of the soil) policy has narrowed the socioeconomic gap between Chinese and Malays, and in the process helped the country to avoid the kind of ethno-racial implosion that occurred in Indonesia.

the economic crisis of the late 1990s, ethno-racial conflicts have also emerged among different categories of indigenous groups seeking rights, autonomy or self-determination. More orthodox Muslims have rejected Indonesia’s *pancasila* (five principles) ideology, raising the spectre of religious intolerance and conflict. Malaysia’s *bumiputera* (son of the soil) policy has narrowed the socioeconomic gap between Chinese and Malays, and in the process helped the country avoid the kind of ethno-racial implosion that occurred in Indonesia. The *bumiputera* policy is, however, challenged by non-Malays as discriminatory. And minorities cynically perceive Singapore’s ideology of meritocracy as a smokescreen for the preservation of Chinese hegemony. Rahim argued that governments have politicized culture, identity and ethnicity. Individuals enjoy full citizenship rights only when they conform to the national imagination of the elite and belong to the ethnic core, which in Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore are the Javanese, Malay and Chinese, respectively.

Racial discrimination has not always thrived only in societies with laws, policies and practices that classify individuals according to biological differences. In Peru and other parts of Latin America, as Marisol de la Cadena reported, nation builders rejected biological determinism and produced a notion of race based on

morality and reason to defend social hierarchies. In this framework, education was vested with the power to dissolve differences based on physical appearances. It gave rise to what has been referred to as “silent racism”, since the bulk of the non-white indigenous population remained excluded from the transformational benefits of education.

In South Asia, according to Vijay Prashad, caste, which is also not based on physical appearance, is derived from ancient practices associated with occupations, marriage bonds, dietary habits and religious customs. It constitutes a significant source of discrimination, which by many accounts is comparable to social practices under apartheid in South Africa and racial segregation in the southern United States. The Dalits, or Untouchables, could “touch” most things owned by the dominant *jati* (ruling groups) if their labour was required, but when they worked for themselves their touch was regarded by the *jati* as social pollution. Caste discrimination has been outlawed in India and, as in the United States and South Africa, affirmative action policies exist to help Dalits bridge the socioeconomic gap. However, the enforcement of laws is lax and discrimination, intolerance and caste-related violence persist. Prashad argued that because 86 per cent of Dalits live off the land and can find work in the formal sector only as public employees, neoliberal policies that advance privatization may constitute “a form of racism”: a large number of Dalits may lose jobs and land.

In the case of countries that straddle the Afro-Arab divide, especially Sudan and Mauritania, Kwesi Prah reported that social relations continue to suffer from the legacy of the Arab conquest of North Africa, fundamentalist Islam, fanatical commitments to Arabization and slavery. War has caused massive population displacement, famine and deaths in much of southern Sudan, where Africans continue to resist Arabization and Islamization. Prah argued that the discovery of oil in the south has complicated the search for a just solution, as vested interests and the central government fight for complete control of the oil resources at the expense of the human rights of the inhabitants. He proposed that Sudanese in general, and southerners in particular, should be allowed to choose freely between two policies for resolving the conflict: separate development or federalism.

The discussion that followed these presentations focused mainly on the problems of race and citizenship

in Sudan, Mauritania, North Africa, South Asia, and the United States, as well as on the question of diaspora communities. The view was expressed that the revolution in information technology (IT) has opened up immense opportunities to link up communities or groups that historically have borne the brunt of racial oppression. One participant noted the potential of IT to improve the quality of education in societies such as Brazil, where the history of marginalized racial groups has long been ignored in school curricula. However, it was pointed out by another speaker that diaspora communities could fuel racial or ethnic conflicts in their home states. This was discussed with respect to the caste problem in South Asia. It was argued that Hindu nationalism has been embraced by large sections of the Indian diaspora community whose activities directly feed back into the policies of the Hindu nationalist government in India, making it difficult to confront the problems of caste discrimination.

Discussion on Sudan produced conflicting perspectives. One contribution stressed the need to understand the power of globalization in fuelling population movements and dissolving national borders, making it difficult to construct neat racial categories in describing

Caste, which is not based on physical appearance, is derived from ancient practices associated with occupations, marriage bonds, dietary habits and religious customs. It constitutes a significant source of discrimination, which by many accounts is comparable to social practices under apartheid in South Africa and racial segregation in the southern United States.

population groups. It was argued that a distinction should be made between government policies, which have in the main proscribed racial discrimination, and entrenched discriminatory social practices that can lead to trauma. Some participants who spoke on experiences in Mauritania and North Africa contended, however, that governments were culpable for the endurance of racial discrimination in those societies: slavery persists in Mauritania; and Berbers are treated as second-class citizens in North Africa.

One participant highlighted the need to discuss the significance of the genocide committed by European settlers against Native Americans or Indians as a basis for

understanding the enslavement of African-Americans and the problematic history of race and citizenship in North and South America. Indeed, Fredrickson had addressed the subject in his paper: “land was stolen so that slaves could be brought to the United States by planters, and it is a crucial part of the story of the construction of race in the United States”. Finally, in responding to a question to compare the experiences of Dalits in India and Gypsies (Romany people) in Europe, Prashad challenged the conference to understand racism and the global expansion of capitalism as simultaneous processes rather than separate events.

Economic Change, Inequalities and Race Relations

The third session explored the economic and social processes that drive racism and discrimination. Racism and inequalities may be linked to discriminatory public policies, the way labour markets are structured, and differential access to governance institutions. Labour markets may be racially segmented because of past public policies, unequal development, or efforts by individuals from specific groups to protect advantages in certain lines of activity. Public policies and market segmentation may lead to physical segregation of groups, further reinforcing racial prejudice and antagonism.

Inequalities can also arise from the impacts of development policies and practices on different groups. When “race” overlaps with social class, inequalities may assume hierarchical race-class dimensions—of the type that may breed xenophobia and violence. Such inequalities may mask other cleavages by creating a racially bifurcated society. Many forms of racial inequalities are, however, ambiguous. Individuals in an assumed racial group may, for instance, rank well in socioeconomic terms, but the racial group may be disadvantaged nationally. Inequalities may occur in education, health provisioning, housing, incomes, employment, infrastructure development and asset holdings, such as land. “Race” may become a powerful tool in the hands of elites and politicians in struggles over public offices and resources.

Rapid integration of economies into the world market, advances in IT, and changes in production systems may alter structures of opportunity and shape the dynamics of race relations. Where economies have experienced sustained levels of growth, as in the United

States, employment and incomes may improve even for disadvantaged groups. However, technological change may reinforce inequalities or introduce a new type of segregation—the so-called digital divide—if excluded groups are unable to access the new technology.

These issues were discussed in three presentations that focused on the experiences of the United States, Malaysia, Indonesia and Southern Africa. Sheldon Danziger discussed changes in the relative economic status of “white non-Hispanics”, “black non-Hispanics” and “Hispanics” in the United States, focusing on the 1970s and the long economic boom of the 1990s, which was associated with dramatic technological change, industrial restructuring and immigration. Employment and incomes increased, poverty fell and inequality stopped rising for all three groups. There was a decline of the official poverty rate between 1993 and 1999, from 15.1 per cent to 11.8 per cent of all groups. However, this rate, as well as inequality in male earnings and family incomes, was still higher than it was in the early 1970s. Besides, different racial groups felt the decline in the rate of poverty unevenly: in 1999, this rate was 23.6 per cent for African-Americans and 22.8 per cent for Hispanics, but only 7.7 per cent for non-Hispanic whites. Labour-saving technology and global competition have contributed to massive earning differentials between the most-educated and the least-educated, and most-experienced and least-experienced, workers. As Danziger pointed out, economic growth is important but not sufficient to correct these gaps. Policy needs to focus “on both removing the barriers to equal opportunity and raising the relative education and skills of minority children”.

Globalization does not only offer opportunities for positive social change. It also creates economic crises and deprivation. One of the most common forms of crisis may occur in the financial sector. Financial volatility or crisis is associated with the opening of the capital accounts of developed and emerging market economies in the 1980s and 1990s. In Southeast Asia, the economic instability that followed the financial crisis of 1997 has ripped the social fabric of countries as jobs, incomes and welfare protection are lost or undermined. As Khoo Boo Teik reported, this has provoked racial and ethnic riots, especially in Indonesia where the Reformasi movement ended Suharto’s three-decade “New Order” regime. However, Malaysia, which has a history of racial violence, seems to have avoided ethno-racial implosion. Instead, the pres-

sure for change has attracted a coalition of parties and groupings drawn from diverse ideologies and religious affiliations. Politicians and analysts attribute Malaysia’s relative success in managing ethno-racial relations to its pre-crisis affirmative action programme—the New Economic Policy (NEP). This redistributive programme favoured the Malays, who were perceived as disadvantaged vis-à-vis the Chinese. However, NEP incorporated other objectives related to high capacities for policy making, state intervention in the economy and other modes of governance associated with East Asia’s developmental state. The effects of the strategy seem to have been the radical recomposition of Malaysia’s class structure, the alteration of the balance of power between different groups, and the empowerment of the state to deliver economic and political outcomes.

Labour market discrimination is one of the major drivers of racial inequality. Guy Mhone discussed this issue in the context of Southern Africa. Labour market discrimination has assumed three forms: the consolidation of colonial structures that reinforce the reproduction of cheap African labour; the protection of white labour; and the promotion of an alliance of dominant interests that supports the two forms of discrimination. Because of the racially structured labour market, the modern economy has largely been seen as the “other’s” economy with Africans reduced to the role of marginal participants. Whites dominate the formal sector, and in most countries this sector is unable to grow at a pace that is fast enough to absorb the residual African labour force. The informal sector is saturated with

Economic growth is important but not sufficient to correct race-based socioeconomic gaps. Policy needs to focus “on both removing the barriers to equal opportunity and raising the relative education and skills of minority children”.

underemployed labour and grows laterally in a less productive way. And the communal sector, which is dominated by Africans, is gradually unravelling as a residual sector, is marked by very low levels of productivity, and is unable to support the livelihoods of those who depend on it.

Mhone argued that the three forms of discrimination have produced distributive, allocative and microeco-

conomic inefficiencies. Distributive inefficiencies result in unequal access to land, finance, education, training, infrastructure and entrepreneurial opportunities, which are skewed in favour of the formal sector. Allocative inefficiencies are associated with high levels of underemployment in the communal and informal sectors, and high levels of productivity in the formal sector. Microeconomic efficiencies distort resource utilization at the firm and industry levels; because of the weak linkages between the three sectors, market forces are unable to balance the allocation and utilization of resources across them, leading to sharply differentiated prices. Capital-intensive methods of production may coexist with high rates of unemployment and underemployment. The racially segmented labour market produced four types of economies in the region: the settler economies of Zimbabwe and South Africa, and to some degree Namibia; the economies of South Africa's periphery, comprising Lesotho and Swaziland and to some degree Namibia and Botswana as well; the resource-based, rentier, mono-cultural economies comprising Botswana, Zambia and Namibia; and the agrarian economies of Malawi, Tanzania and Mozambique. Neoliberal policies of adjustment, which rule out bold state interventions, have been unable to overturn the racially segmented labour markets that have hindered balanced and progressive development.

The discussion following these three presentations addressed two main issues: how to overcome racial inequalities in the United States, and the role of nationalism and patriotism in tackling the problems of race and class in Southern African labour markets. One speaker highlighted the serious educational backwardness of African-Americans and Latin Americans vis-à-vis their white counterparts as the basis for the high racial inequalities in the United States. He bemoaned the contradiction between the large budget spent on armaments by various governments and the limited money made available for the educational development of poor blacks and Latinos. He concluded that current concerns for military superiority might further undermine efforts to tackle racial inequalities. Another speaker stressed the importance of political will and called for discussion of the political strategies that would be required to convince privileged white groups to support racial justice. On the issue of labour market segmentation, one speaker discussed the problems that new racial minorities, such as mixed-race groups

in Zimbabwe, experience when governments and society refuse to recognize their identities.

In his response, Danziger elaborated on the problems of reducing racial inequalities in the United States. He asked the rhetorical question: "why do Americans tolerate so much poverty and inequality?". The problem, as he saw it, is not just one of race: there would be more poverty and more inequality in the United States than in Western Europe even if African-Americans and

Neoliberal policies of adjustment, which rule out bold state interventions, have been unable to overturn the racially segmented labour markets that have hindered balanced and progressive development in Southern Africa.

Latinos were excluded from the data. The main problem is that Americans put a lot more emphasis than Europeans on attainment of the best service, without thinking about how to protect those who cannot afford the best. In health care, for example, Americans in the top income percentile spend a lot of money to be at the technological frontier, to obtain specialized drugs or surgical procedures and to hire the services of doctors. And in education, even though children in the United States may underperform in maths tests, compared to children in other countries, this may not worry policy makers because American universities can attract the best students from around the world. Danziger argued that there is much distrust of government and a willingness to seek the best for oneself. It is difficult to sustain just social policies in a system that rewards the best, and when people who matter believe everyone is capable of being successful. He further stated that the majority of whites believe that America is in a post-civil rights era; and concluded that the idea of solidarity that underpins discussions of social policy in Western European settings is virtually absent in the United States.

Mhone stressed the importance of elaborating a developmental agenda of transformation in efforts to overcome the legacies of racially defined labour markets. The dynamics of race, gender and class, including the issue of mixed race groups, should not be cast in zero-sum terms: change should not be perceived in terms of who gets the best part of the structures that have been inherited; rather, the interests of all racial

groups should be addressed and the problem should be seen in a regional context.

Land Inequalities and Race Relations

Session four discussed the issue of inequality in relation to land distribution. Colonization produced sharp inequalities in land holdings between Europeans and the indigenous communities they conquered. In the Americas and Australasia, indigenous communities were almost wiped out, except in some parts of Latin America. In Southern Africa, however, indigenous Africans account for an overwhelming majority of the population; but as in the Americas and Australasia, land distribution is heavily skewed in favour of Europeans. In recent years, the land issue has received increasing public attention as indigenous communities demand redistribution. The problem has taken a dramatic turn in Zimbabwe where, with active government support, individuals who participated in the war of liberation, and peasants, have occupied white-owned farms; and an overwhelming proportion of the white community has joined a multi-ethnic opposition party in efforts to oust the government from power and protect their own advantaged position. Race relations in the subregion are likely to be seriously affected if solutions are not found to the land problem. In Canada, the United States and Australia, the land question has focused on monetary compensation and provision of land or reservations to indigenous groups. The debate in these countries also includes defence of the cultural rights of indigenous communities, raising questions about how to balance individual and group rights in democratic settings.

The session focused on Southern Africa, Latin America and Australia. Sam Moyo discussed the political economy of land distribution and race relations in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia—three states that experienced high levels of settler colonialism. In these countries, the black majority remain landless and largely excluded from development. In Zimbabwe, approximately 4,500 white farmers (0.03 per cent of the population) control 31 per cent of the land under freehold tenure, which is about 42 per cent of the agricultural land. In contrast, 1.2 million black families subsist on 41 per cent of the country's land area. In South Africa, 60,000 white farmers own almost 87 per cent of the land (85 million hectares). Meanwhile, at least 12 mil-

lion blacks subsist on only 17.1 million hectares, of which only 5 per cent is potentially arable. Whites own two thirds (36.2 million hectares) of all freehold farms in Namibia, or 44 per cent of the total land, whereas 138,000 black households subsist on only 33.5 million hectares (41 per cent of the available land).

Independence agreements and constitutions in these countries protected the right to private property, ensuring continued control by whites of prime lands. Under these agreements, land could only be disposed of on a willing seller-willing buyer basis. Moyo argued that several myths have prevented land redistribution in Southern Africa: the land rights held by whites are not only legally valid but socially and politically legitimate, even though these rights were acquired by forceful alienation of Africans from their land; the freehold land tenure system in which whites predominate is superior to customary tenure; land reform policies are irrational and undermine food security because they place short-term political problems of imbalances over economic stability; large-scale white farmers are more efficient ecological managers than smallholders, who are said to misuse their land; and white farmers contribute more to the economy than do smallholders.

Moyo discussed the limitations of these conceptions as well as the various demands by social groups for land, which he divided into eight categories: war veterans and ex-detainees, communal households, farm workers (whose demands are tied to citizenship rights), black elites, urban males, women, rural district councils and NGOs, and private investors. He noted that most government establishments have tended to underplay the demand for land. The Zimbabwe land crisis and the surge in land occupation in peri-urban South Africa have underscored the huge, latent demand for land redistribution in the region. He pointed out that pressure for land reform in Zimbabwe has traditionally built up just before elections. To garner votes and give content to their social agendas, various political parties have developed vantage points on land reform. However, Moyo observed that while opposition movements in Zimbabwe have pursued valid demands for democratization within a liberal human rights framework, those demands have limited social democratic content especially in relation to land reform. He concluded that race relations could be improved if donors and former colonial authorities acknowledged the historical and contemporary social justice issues that underpin land distribution in

the region. Former colonial powers should pay for land transfers, and individual white farmers should facilitate transfers. Market-led land reform policies will not solve the problem of land inequalities.

Marcia Langton provided a detailed account of the efforts to expand and consolidate Aboriginal land rights in Australia. The British annexation of Australia was based on the legal doctrine that the land belonged to

Race relations could be improved if donors and former colonial authorities acknowledged the historical and contemporary social justice issues that underpin land distribution in Southern Africa. Former colonial powers should pay for land transfers, and individual white farmers should facilitate transfers. Market-led land reform policies will not solve the problem of land inequalities.

no one. Aboriginals started to enjoy modern land rights only during the last three decades. In the 1930s, the federal government, six states of the federation and the Northern Territory adopted policies of assimilation as a solution to what was seen as the Aboriginal problem: thousands of Aboriginal children were removed from their families and placed in institutions or the homes of white families. Citizenship was only extended to Aborigines after a referendum in 1967 in which white Australians voted to include them in the national census and to extend federal legislative power to their affairs. However, section 25 of the constitution still refers to Aborigines as a separate race.

Aborigines waged a number of struggles for land rights during the 1960s and 1970s. Between 1965 and 1972 the Gringí people demanded the return of land leased to the Victoria River Downs Company; and during the same period, the people of the northeast of the Arnhemland Aboriginal reserve in the Northern Territory petitioned the federal government, and subsequently the Supreme Court, to overturn the leasing of their traditional lands to a bauxite mining company. Persistent pressures for Aboriginal land rights resulted in a report in 1974 that recommended the transfer of all Aboriginal reserves to Aboriginal land trusts. This was a special form of inalienable Aboriginal freehold title that could only be abrogated by a majority of votes in both houses of parliament. However, the land rights legislation was adopted only in the Northern Territory.

Approximately 52 per cent of the land in the Northern Territory is now held by Aboriginal land trusts.

Langton argued that Aboriginal land rights in other states are less well secured. No legislation on Aboriginal land rights exists in western Australia; in Tasmania, only a few small areas have been restituted; in Victoria, with two small Aboriginal reserves, no law on land rights has been introduced in parliament; a statute was passed in 1981 in New South Wales transforming Aboriginal reserves into trusts, but policies of dispossession and depopulation have been extensive; in South Australia, following campaigns by the Pitjantjatjara people in the 1980s, a land rights act was passed granting special freehold title to them. The 1990 land statutes in Queensland provided very little land justice to the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders—an issue that received the attention of human rights organizations that pressured the government to repeal the laws. Further changes were introduced in the Native Title Act of 1993, which offered some land justice to those who could prove that they were the descendants of the group in possession of the land at annexation, and were continuing to practice identifiable native customs. Langton concluded that despite the recognition of Aboriginal land rights in many jurisdictions, Aboriginal participation in the Australian economy remains low. She attributed this in part to the nature of statutory rights to land, which are non-commercial and inalienable. This means that Aborigines cannot leverage land for capital accumulation.

Diego Iturralde's findings on Latin America were very similar to Langton's on Australia, as both deal with cases in which indigenous communities have for the most part been reduced to minorities. Iturralde reported that there are 405 indigenous ethnic groups in Latin America with distinct languages, institutions and cultures; before colonization there were about 2,000 groups. Colonization had three effects on indigenous communities in Latin America: large-scale elimination and displacement of the population; loss of independence; and concentration of native populations in reservations. As in Australia, indigenous groups waged numerous struggles to reclaim their rights to land and autonomy. Even though constitutional reforms in a number of Latin American countries—including Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Nicaragua and Paraguay—in the last 10 years have responded to the claims of indigenous peoples, wide disparities in land holdings remain a central feature of these societies.

Migration and Multiculturalism

The fifth session discussed migration, multiculturalism and the nation state in Europe; and migrant workers, xenophobia and public policies in oil-rich countries of the Middle East. Globalization and modernization are associated with mass migration of people from different regions to countries perceived to offer opportunity for self-advancement. Immigrants may arrive with differences in physical appearance, culture, religion and language, which native populations may perceive as threatening to their values and notions of what a society should be. Especially in Western Europe, migration poses a challenge to traditional conceptions of the nation state. Nationalist struggles in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries established a tight relationship between the state and the nation. Defined as a group of people with shared history, culture, language and territory, a nation was expected to form a culturally homogenous state.

Recent trends in cultural diversity challenge such notions of nation-state homogeneity. Jeroen Doomernik reported that there have been three broad types of European response to immigration. The first stresses the importance of equality before the law for both legal long-term residents and traditional citizens, and grants the former easy access to citizenship. It also acknowledges the ethnic origins of residents and, if they do not conflict with the principle of equality, supports the public display of such differences. This is the multicultural approach. The second is the republican ideal, which also stresses the principle of equality before the law for residents and citizens, but discourages the display of cultural practices that are different from the dominant native culture. The third type is the most exclusionary. It is founded on the old notion of nation-state homogeneity in which only co-ethnics are entitled to citizenship. Illustrative examples of the three cases were the Netherlands, France and Germany, respectively. On issues related to employment, schooling and housing, Doomernik argued that there may not be much difference in policy approaches between countries that subscribe to different philosophies of citizenship. However, the different ways policy makers try to apply these philosophies in different countries may affect social cohesion and the integration of immigrants in host societies.

A related issue is the fate of migrant workers in oil-rich countries of the Middle East. The Middle East, Ray Jureidini reported, has experienced massive waves

of immigrants engaged in short-term work—from household help to highly qualified professionals. The migration of cheap Asian and African workers has produced a racialized secondary labour market in that region. These workers are associated with the dirty, dangerous and difficult jobs, which nationals refuse to do despite widespread poverty and unemployment. A central feature of the contract that underpins labour recruitment for these jobs is its bondage character: workers are not free to access local labour markets without state approval, and are attached to a sponsor for the duration of the contract. Conditions of slavery pertain to many female live-in domestic workers: threats of violence, restriction of movement, exploitative working conditions and widespread abuse. Jureidini thus called for the introduction and enforcement of local labour laws and international conventions to protect such workers.

Several speakers commented on the effects of multiculturalism on race relations. One speaker discussed the dangers of state subsidy of multicultural activities, as illustrated in Doomernik's discussion of

The migration of cheap Asian and African workers has produced a racialized secondary labour market in that region. These workers are associated with the dirty, dangerous and difficult jobs, which nationals refuse to do despite widespread poverty and unemployment. A central feature of the contract that underpins labour recruitment for these jobs is its bondage character.

the Dutch case. State subsidy may confer legitimacy on some groups and not on others, thus limiting the number of groups that can operate effectively. It was pointed out that in the United States, state policy has instead stressed individual freedom—any group of individuals can organize—rather than corporate support for groups. The view was also expressed that the focus on multiculturalism might cloud discussions on racial inequalities. One speaker gave the example of Australia, where, she believed, the emphasis in the last five years has been on portrayal of harmony rather than on tackling deep-seated racial inequalities and discrimination. Doomernik replied that there was much to be said for the US approach toward individual rights. However, states have different traditions: the Dutch state, which has historically played a strong role in the promotion

of social peace, will be different from a state with a republican tradition that has played a limited role in social affairs. In the Netherlands, the basic law guarantees individual rights; but, in addition, if individuals organize as a group they can enjoy certain rights and privileges as an institution. He argued that there was no reason why support for multiculturalism should prevent governments and societies from addressing issues of inequality.

Four other issues relating to multiculturalism were also raised during the discussion: the impact of Europeanization on immigration; the mass migration of people within national borders; the integration of immigrants into the host society; and changes in school curricula to reflect the changes in the ethnic or racial composition of societies. The first looked at the employment-related opportunities and constraints of rapid European integration for immigrants from former colonies. The second examined the waves of rural-urban migration in most countries in the context of resource scarcity and inequality. The third focused on what was alleged to be a tendency by some immigrants in the United Kingdom to import spouses from their countries of origin rather than marry British-born citizens. And the fourth compared experiences in the Netherlands and the United States in using the school curricula to promote multiculturalism. Doornik stated that there was a tendency in the past, at least in the Netherlands, to ignore immigrants from former colonies who arrived in the 1940s and 1950s even though they provided the basis for the triumph of multiculturalism in the last few decades. The promotion of multiculturalism in Dutch education, he argued, has been more visible in the area of rights and institutional arrangements than in content: each organization is responsible for developing the content of the programme they seek to promote. He concluded that the problem of illegal migration can be resolved by legalizing all migration. He believed the fears of mass migration to Western societies expressed in relation to arguments about the adoption of a liberal migration policy are unfounded.

Three comments focused on the problems of migrant labour in the Middle East. The first linked the experiences of the Middle East with the corporate practices of transnational corporations (TNCs), especially in the North American Free Trade Agreement, where TNCs shift production facilities between borders and exploit labour market cost differentials. The second addressed the issues of poverty and race as major factors deter-

mining labour migration flows to resource-rich countries. And the third highlighted the need to tackle the problems of discrimination and rights violations in labour-sending countries. Jureidini responded that labour migration to the countries he has examined is governed by bilateral arrangements: labour is a major export for countries like the Philippines and Sri Lanka and remittances are enormous. He argued that TNCs have not played a major role in attracting labour migrants to the Middle East, and rights violations are largely restricted to unskilled labour. There is a labour market demand in the Middle East for domestic workers because nationals find domestic work unattractive even with widespread unemployment. He concluded that the temporary nature of the jobs migrants undertake increases their vulnerability and denies them citizenship and other rights.

Organized Responses to Cultural Diversity

Racism often needs mobilizers, organizations and a discourse to activate or sustain it. It is important to understand how racist ideas enter the public domain, how different types of social groups get recruited into racist or xenophobic movements, how such movements sustain exclusionary discourses and enjoy legitimacy in sections of society, and how the agendas and activities of racist or xenophobic groups evolve over time. In countries where liberal democracy is entrenched, it has been possible to gauge the extent of popular support enjoyed by racist, far-right or xenophobic movements. In many Western democracies, xenophobic or far-right parties are gaining strength through local, regional and national elections, with some even participating in national governments or governing large cities. These parties often have links with neo-Nazi organizations, which attract a large number of unemployed youths immersed in a subculture of disobedience and intolerance. In addition, there has been a rise of xenophobic and racist groups in the transition economies of East and Central Europe, especially in countries with large Gypsy populations. The Internet offers easy opportunity to attract followers and spread racist literature and hate propaganda.

However, victims and multiracial civil rights groups have always resisted racist and xenophobic organizations. In the 1960s, a powerful African-American-led Civil Rights Movement was instrumental in ending le-

galized racism in the United States. In the 1990s, a coalition of African civil rights groups, trade unions and multiracial civic organizations, which had grown in strength in the 1970s and 1980s, forced white South African leaders to negotiate the end of apartheid. In Western Europe also, anti-racist civil rights groups have grown by leaps and bounds in recent years as immigration, multiculturalism and refugee issues influence the debate on race relations.

The sixth session focused on the Civil Rights Movement and contemporary race relations in the United States; political parties, social movements and race relations in post-apartheid South Africa; anti-racist movements and political parties in Western democracies; and xenophobic and far-right political parties in Europe. In discussing the Civil Rights Movement, Manning Marable presented what he believed were two different political narratives that have shaped the evolution of US democracy. He argued that for most white Americans, democracy is about personal liberty, individualism and private property; whereas equality, grounded in collective action, represents the most important value of the black freedom movement. Marable discussed three overlapping protest strategies of African-Americans to structural racism: integration, nationalism or separatism, and transformation. Integrationists campaign

The Civil Rights Movement of 1954–1966 successfully challenged the legality of racial segregation in the court system of the United States. This mass protest movement utilized Gandhian techniques of passive resistance. Although the racial hierarchy was reformed, leading to a rapid growth of the black middle class in educational and decision-making institutions, the liabilities of urban segregation have remained.

for full democratic rights within existing institutions of American society: desegregation of public schools and residential patterns, as well as more equitable black representation in public life. Separatists or nationalists call for the creation of strong institutions, businesses and schools owned and operated by blacks, and identification with Africa. Transformationists focus on the links between racial oppression and class exploitation, and call for wealth redistribution. They attempt to forge cross-racial alliances, focusing on inequalities and everyday forms of violence perpetrated by poverty.

The Civil Rights Movement of 1954–1966 successfully challenged the legality of racial segregation in the court system of the United States. This mass protest movement utilized Gandhian techniques of passive resistance. Although the racial hierarchy was reformed, leading to a rapid growth of the black middle class in educational and decision-making institutions, the liabilities of urban segregation have remained. More than 1.2 million African Americans reside in US prisons. Of the 4.3 million Americans who have lost the right to vote, 1.7 million are black. Although African-Americans constitute only 14 per cent of illegal drug users, they account for 35 per cent of all drug-related arrests, 55 per cent of convictions, and 75 per cent of all Americans imprisoned or jailed for drug crimes. Marable concluded that a new social theory and movement is required that will integrate the liberal democratic impulse and the radical egalitarian tendency.

In discussing the South African case, Tom Lodge reported that at least since 1994, political parties and organizations have attempted to define their programmes in non-racial terms. However, the legacy of apartheid and the two-nation society it created seriously constrain efforts to promote non-racial policies. The African National Congress (ANC) has attempted to achieve socially representative leadership and policies that attract support across racial lines. The acute need for socioeconomic redistribution in favour of blacks, efforts to eradicate poverty, and the electoral unity of the black coalition, which is affected by other cleavages, may be seen as racially biased by the privileged white population. However, the former party of apartheid, the National Party, and white liberal parties that were previously critical of apartheid, may be accused of defending institutionalized racial privileges when they espouse the principle of non-racial discrimination. Lodge argued that trade unions, which historically embraced a non-racial philosophy, and civic organizations in the black townships concerned with social justice, now must play a key role in the promotion of healthy race relations.

The last two presentations, by Hajo Funke and Hans-Georg Betz, focused on Western Europe. Funke examined changes in attitudes on race and immigration in Germany, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Austria, as well as the incidence of violent attacks on foreigners by far right groups in these countries. A new form of exclusionary populism, exemplified by right-wing political parties and movements,

poses a threat to Europe's democratic and liberal order. These parties advocate a restrictive notion of citizenship: only co-ethnics or long-standing citizens should enjoy full citizenship rights. Betz reported that these parties rely on charismatic leadership, political

A new form of exclusionary populism, exemplified by right-wing political parties and movements, poses a threat to Europe's democratic and liberal order. These parties advocate a restrictive notion of citizenship: only co-ethnics or long-standing citizens should enjoy full citizenship rights.

marketing with a pronounced customer or voter orientation, and mobilization of popular anxieties, prejudices and resentments. They advocate a comprehensive programme of social change, which includes strong hostility toward foreigners and multiculturalism, as well as other issues relating to national identity, which tend to vary according to country experiences. The electoral base of these parties encompasses several groups, although young male voters with limited education tend to predominate. Far-right parties have been included in governing coalitions in Austria and Italy. Betz is confident, however, that the institutions of Western democracy and civil society will be strong enough to meet the challenges posed by such movements.

Participants commented on two main issues. The first was the need to place the South African experience of political party behaviour in historical perspective, rather than restricting the analysis to the post-apartheid period. The point was made that even in its early formation the ANC made strenuous efforts to present itself as a multi-ethnic party. The establishment of the South African state in 1910 excluded most non-Europeans. In 1936, the non-European groups of Africans, Indians and coloureds as well as the South African Communist party, which drew its membership from across the colour bar, formed a national unity alliance. It was argued that this tradition of multiracial politics informed the strategy of the ANC when it won power from the National Party in 1994. Several speakers warned of the dangers of taking race out of its historical context: contemporary non-racial or colour-blindness approaches may turn affirmative action policies that seek to correct past racial injustices into reverse discrimination, as has happened in the United States. Lodge agreed with most of the

comments, but insisted that his paper, which specifically focused on the post-1994 period, did not advocate, promote or idealize racial amnesia. He argued that the Liberal Party was the first to use the term "non-racial" as opposed to "multiracial"; and that before the 1950s there were very few organizations that attempted to recruit members across races. The ANC did not recruit non-Africans until 1969 even though whites, Indians and coloureds were already working very closely with the organization.

Conflicting views were expressed on the question of how to deal with the threat posed by far-right parties in liberal democracies. One view, strongly supported by Betz, maintained that such parties should not be proscribed by the state: proscription may drive them underground and make it difficult to monitor and regulate their activities. The point was made that the law could be used to control the activities of such parties or organizations. In the United States, for example, the Ku Klux Klan was bankrupted by court cases. Betz further argued that in Austria, for example, the ascent to power of the right-wing Freedom Party has forced a serious domestic debate on Austria's behaviour during the Nazi era. In addition, he contended, far-right parties are often their own worst enemies: they tend to perform badly in office, causing their popularity ratings to diminish with time. Funke took the opposite position, however, arguing that neo-Nazi parties, especially in the eastern part of Berlin where he lives, constitute a serious danger to the security of foreigners. He therefore called for their proscription.

Institutional Reform

A number of policies exist for tackling racism, racial prejudice, discrimination, xenophobia and inequality. Public policies range from legal instruments and socioeconomic programmes, to educational policies that seek to change behaviour and promote inclusiveness. They may involve increased sensitivity to racial cleavages in devising economic and social policies and reforming governance institutions. Targeted programmes may be adopted to correct historical injustices or to assist excluded groups to get out of poverty and exploit opportunities. Public policies may be implemented in macro- and micro-level settings where groups compete for resources and public offices. They have differential impacts, including among targeted beneficiaries. They are also often contested by different groups, mak-

ing it difficult to predict their overall effects on social change and to draw universal lessons that may be applicable to all situations.

Correcting racism and racial discrimination may involve reform of governance institutions. Session seven of the conference discussed these issues under three headings: governance reforms for minority representation; law enforcement agencies and criminal justice systems; and language and educational reforms for social accommodation and integration. It is often not enough to introduce legal instruments or educational policies to transform the public sector into a non-racial institution. The question of who makes and administers law and public policy is equally important. If the public sector is to function effectively, all groups in society must feel a sense of belonging, representation and shared interest in the institutions that govern their lives. As Ralph Premdas reported, at the core of these reforms is “recognition”: the need to accord juridical and social equality to all communities, including promotion of their languages in relevant educational institutions and public places. Linguistic rights, Neville Alexander affirmed, are inalienable human rights. Mother-tongue education and bi- or multilingual education are necessary components of reform.

Reform instruments to promote equality of representation and participation include proportional representation through List PR electoral rules, grand coalitions of groups in the formation of governments, majoritarian electoral arrangements that may force political parties to seek votes outside of their assumed core racial group, decentralization, reserved seats for racial minorities, and racial or communal roles to ensure some measure of balanced representation in parliament and government. Yet such institutions may not always produce positive outcomes. Indeed, they may generate unexpected detrimental effects on society. As Premdas argued, the peculiarities of the sociocultural environment in which they are applied should, therefore, always be taken into account.

The elimination of racial discrimination and injustice requires competent, neutral, responsive and accountable law enforcement agencies. However, police departments in multiracial societies may constitute part of the problem of racism; in many countries, their preferential treatment of individuals has been queried. Benjamin Bowling discussed these abuses, which include excessive use of force, torture and racist language

against people perceived as different. He used published reports on four police agencies—the Metropolitan Police in London, the New South Wales Police in Australia, the Los Angeles Police Department in the United States, and the South Africa Police Service—as case studies to illustrate his arguments. He suggested

It is often not enough to introduce legal instruments or educational policies to transform the public sector into a non-racial institution. The question of who makes and administers laws and public policies is equally important. If the public sector is to function effectively, all groups in society must feel a sense of belonging, representation and shared interest in the institutions that govern their lives.

several measures that can work toward eliminating abuse of power from police work: creation of a police force that reflects the racial diversity of the community served; promotion of equal opportunity and equal service; establishment of structures that will aid legal, political and community accountability; introduction of civilian oversight and transparent and effective methods for handling complaints; development of ethnic minority staff networks; and innovative educational and training schemes. At the core of required reforms is the need to demonstrate clear and overt commitment to the implementation of what Bowling called “democratic policing”. Police officers should be accountable to the law, the state and the community.

There were two comments on policing and mother-tongue education. Two speakers discussed the problems that minorities (and civic groups in general) may experience at the hands of police forces in authoritarian states. Furthermore, the point was made that despite the existence of democratic institutions and civil liberty movements in India and Southern Africa, and indeed many other countries, policing methods are still authoritarian. It is very difficult for communities to hold the police force accountable, as the state still uses the police as a paramilitary force. In Zimbabwe, for example, it was pointed out that the police force may fail to protect citizens against violence committed by militia groups. In India, there are the social problems of caste discrimination: during colonial rule, the high-ranking members of the force were British officers and the lower-ranking constables were Indians; since independence, the high-ranking officers have largely been drawn

from the upper castes, while constables tend to come from the lower castes. Moreover, the recruitment of women into the police force has not changed its militaristic approach to the maintenance of law and order. Given these problems, Bowling suggested that perhaps what such societies need in the first instance is independent monitoring, both locally and internationally. He concluded that civil rights groups must continue campaigning for the principle of police officers' accountability to the communities they serve, irrespective of the difficulties encountered in different settings.

Speakers commented on two problems of promoting mother-tongue education in a rapidly changing world: parents may speak different languages from children, and mother-tongue education may breed xenophobia and undermine efforts at social integration. Alexander replied that by "mother-tongue education", he meant the primary language of socialization of a child, which very often may be more than one language; it may also not necessarily be a child's "mother" tongue. He added that combining mother-tongue education with bi- or multilingual education may help break social barriers and xenophobia. While older people may not be as able to learn new languages, the young should be encouraged to do so.

Gender, Race and Public Policy

The eighth session focused on gender, race and public policy. Gender, according to Kum-Kum Bhavnani, is important in discourses on race and public policy for four reasons. First, it allows analysts, policy makers and activists to critically assess the relationship between production and reproduction. Second, it simultaneously opens discussion on the location of women in public and private spheres. Third, it encourages understanding of how sexualities are negotiated. And fourth, it leads to an explicit engagement with women as actors demanding changes and transformations in public policy. The session discussed these issues in relation to South Africa, New Zealand, the United States and the United Kingdom.

The chair of this session, Amina Mama, noted that in general, policy makers have responded to the challenges of feminist, nationalist and anti-racist movements through a combination of strategies that have varied from one national context to another. For instance, gender justice has been pursued through the establishment

of national structures for women and/or gender mainstreaming, and the institution of a national gender policy. Efforts to resolve the interlocking problems of gender and racial injustices have been pursued through structures and policies designed to allow disadvantaged people into the institutions that formerly excluded and marginalized them. Such efforts are variously referred to as indigenization, Africanization, black empowerment or minority representation. Sexual harassment units have also been established, to address patriarchal sexual politics. Mama argued that decision makers and the public should address the extent to which public policy can bring about positive social transformation by tackling the multiple forms of oppression and their manifestations in the everyday lives of people and organizations.

Tracey McIntosh reported that in New Zealand, race, gender, sexuality and class are closely linked. In this regard, there are dangers in imagining a universal "female" or homogenous ethno-racial groups in the formulation of public policies. Maori women, for instance, share with Maori men the scars and disadvantages associated with the European colonization of New Zealand: poor education and health status, low income and employment, inadequate housing, and overrepresentation in crime as both victims and offenders. Maori women and men have played vital roles in improving the legal status, socioeconomic well-being and political representation of the Maori in New Zealand's public institutions. However, McIntosh argued that the preservation of all aspects of Maori culture may disadvantage Maori women, who require more equity in

Race, gender, sexuality and class are closely linked. In this regard, there are dangers in imagining a universal "female" or homogenous ethno-racial groups in the formulation of public policies.

economic and political life as well as access to resources, power and knowledge. Public policy for just social development must improve the participation of Maori women in male-dominated Maori institutions that have evolved to redress Maori disadvantage in public life, as well as in national institutions that regulate the lives of all New Zealanders.

Similarly, Jane Bennett reported that although poor, black South African women were the prime victims of

apartheid's profoundly racialized and gendered policies, and played a central role in the struggle to end apartheid, they have not been the most visible beneficiaries of change. This is because of the liberal discourse that de-links race from gender, as well as the lack of sufficient attention to class distinctions in the formulation and implementation of public policies. A liberal policy-driven approach to gender may reinforce the subordination of poor black women in the social hierarchy.

Although poor, black South African women were the prime victims of apartheid's profoundly racialized and gendered policies, and played a central role in the struggle to end apartheid, they have not been the most visible beneficiaries of change. This is because of the liberal discourse that de-links race from gender, as well as the lack of sufficient attention to class distinctions in the formulation and implementation of public policies.

She used case study data to demonstrate how a race-blind gender policy against sexual harassment may work against black women in a society with deeply ingrained racial prejudices. The case involved the different ways two female interns—one white and one black—reacted to sexual harassment by a male manager of a tourism company in Cape Town. The white intern reported the matter to the sexual harassment officer. The black intern refused to bring charges of harassment, despite the intervention of the sexual harassment officer urging her to do so, for two reasons: the manager had promised to offer a job to her brother, and she did not want to jeopardize her chances of retention in what was her first real job. In the end, the white intern was offered permanent employment in the company, whereas the manager and the black intern were fired.

Bennett concluded that at one level it could be argued that the black intern failed to “play by the company’s policies” or rules when she refused to press charges against the manager; and that the company’s decision to dismiss her was not a racist act: the same decision could well have applied to the white intern if she had been the one who violated the rules. However, as Bennett explained it, any familiarity with the South African realities would reveal that unlike the white intern, the black intern’s life is “enmeshed with the legacies of apartheid where racialization embeds her into a set of material conditions about employment,

kinship responsibilities, and—quite possibly—lack of faith in formal systems of justice to respond to her needs”. The race-blind gender policy against sexual harassment offered the white intern recourse to support; however, it offered nothing to the black intern. The implications are stark, Bennett concluded: the design and implementation of policy that does not protect a woman from sexual abuse because of the circumstances in which her racialization has put her may constitute an act of racism.

Several issues were raised during the discussions following these presentations: how to distinguish race from gender and ethnicity, since all three deal with issues of power relations; the international trafficking of women from some developing countries as a form of gender and racial discrimination; the tensions between culture and gender equality, and how international public policy should approach them; the capacity of women from oppressed minorities, such as Maori women, to organize for social change; and the specific claims Maoris have made on the New Zealand state. Bennett reiterated the need for public policies to take adequate account of the material circumstances of women if racial and gender equality are to be attained. She also underscored the need for serious work on the racialization of the sex trade that has developed around the world tourism industry. McIntosh stressed the need to understand the fluidity of the concepts of race and ethnicity, and how these in turn are influenced by the class positions of individuals. She argued that unless class issues are addressed when discussing race, gender and ethnicity, social and economic disparities will persist. For instance, Maoris have been successful in creating cultural icons and a Maori renaissance over the last 30 years, but social deprivation among their peoples has increased. She discussed specific cases in which Maori women have organized to improve their welfare (through a Maori women’s welfare league) and to end domestic violence in their society. McIntosh concluded that Maoris have generally resisted attempts by the state to settle their claims for justice through a one-off payment—what was called “the fiscal envelope”—but have instead insisted on guardianship of their treasures, as well as the resources of land and sea.

Racism and Social Justice

Public policies that promote social justice are a fundamental requirement for achieving stability and respon-

sible citizenship. The last two sessions of the conference focused on social justice by considering policies that seek to eliminate disparities in health status and environmental racism, and affirmative action policies and anti-poverty programmes in the United States, Malaysia, Brazil and South Africa. Disparities in health status between ethno-racial groups are endemic in societies with a history of racial discrimination. As Varnellia Randall pointed out, they are linked to differences in education, employment, housing options and income, exposure of racially disadvantaged groups to high-health-risk occupations, past discriminatory public policies and, in some cases, racial prejudice by health care providers. Racial prejudice may influence the choices of scientists and industrialists in selecting sites, individuals or groups for experiments and clinical trials. There have been a number of well-reported cases of scientists abusing their professional codes of conduct and causing harm to populations that look different from themselves. While data on ethno-racial disparities in health status are routinely collected in the United States, the health statistics of most countries are not disaggregated according to race or ethnicity. This makes it difficult to fully comprehend the scale of the problem and to design effective policy responses. Randall argued that effective regulation of discrimination in health care will require proactive policies against institutional racism, as well as routine and systematic collection of health status and health care statistics disaggregated according to race, gender and socioeconomic position.

Combating environmental racism in the twenty-first century will require acceptance of environmental protection as a basic human right; non-discriminatory enforcement of existing environmental, health, housing and civil rights laws; closing of corporate tax loopholes that encourage corporations to pollute the environments of the poor and disadvantaged; and the development of effective international regulations and agreements.

Environmental racism provides benefits to corporations that pollute the environment and shift costs to people of colour. Robert Bullard reported that environmental racism influences local land use, encourages lax enforcement of environmental regulations, and legitimizes human exposure to harmful chemicals and risky technology. In the United States, environmental-

ists and local residents have described the Lower Mississippi River Industrial Corridor, whose inhabitants are overwhelmingly African-American, as Cancer Valley. More than 125 companies enjoying a variety of tax breaks manufacture a range of items including fertilizers, gasoline, paints and plastics. Native Indian lands have also been exposed to radioactive waste. And the obnoxious North-South trade in industrial waste products has threatened the health of poor communities in poor countries. Combating environmental racism in the twenty-first century will require acceptance of environmental protection as a basic human right; non-discriminatory enforcement of existing environmental, health, housing and civil rights laws; closing of corporate tax loopholes that encourage corporations to pollute the environments of the poor and disadvantaged; and the development of effective international regulations and agreements.

Affirmative action policies are associated with efforts to correct socioeconomic disabilities, which certain groups may have suffered as a result of past discriminatory public policies. They focus on issues of employment, admission into educational institutions, government contracts, and broad areas of social policy. Their content and application may vary according to whether the targeted population constitutes the majority group and has strong access to policy making institutions, or whether beneficiaries are a minority whose influence on lawmakers, the executive branch of government and administrators is limited. Policies are thus likely to vary considerably in countries as different as the United States, South Africa, Malaysia and Brazil. Jomo K. Sundaram assessed the extent to which the Malaysian government has been able to redistribute incomes, assets and other resources to the Malay. Inequalities, he reported, have narrowed between Malays and Chinese and poverty rates have declined, but the poor may not have benefited to the same extent as rich Malays. The growth of interethnic business coalitions in which the ethnic Malay partner secures rents for gaining access to government-determined business opportunities, with the ethnic Chinese partner providing the business acumen of getting the job done, has encouraged cronyism. Sundaram applied the economic arguments on infant industries and targeting to advance a case for affirmative action in countries that have experienced long periods of deliberate racial discrimination, such as in the United States and South Africa. He concluded that such policies should be applied efficiently if they are not to generate discontent and waste.

Renosi Mokate reported that a key feature of the current South African government's agenda is the formulation of policies aimed at the redistribution of power and resources. The constitution, the bill of rights and several social and economic programmes adopted since 1994 affirm the need for social justice. It is easy to see why: 67 per cent of non-urban Africans and 61 per cent of coloureds in non-urban households live in poverty; the average annual income of African-headed households is R23,000, compared to R32,000 for coloured-headed households, R71,000 for Indian-headed households and R103,000 for white-headed households.¹ Black rural women are particularly disadvantaged. Mokate argued that South Africa will not experience long-term social and economic stability without removing the structural constraints created by apartheid. There are bound to be painful choices, especially in a context of slow economic growth, pressures to maintain macroeconomic stability, and the reluctance of groups that benefited from apartheid to support far-reaching redistribution of incomes and assets.

Antonio Guimarães reported that racial inequalities between blacks and whites are also very sharp in Brazil, as is the incidence of poverty, which falls disproportionately on blacks. Compared to whites, blacks

Attitudes toward affirmative action tend to divide along class lines: most whites oppose it; support for it diminishes among middle-class blacks as they move up the income ladder; and the majority of the poor support it. Racial peace in Brazil is a product of a "black and white privileged pact".

obtain about half as many years of schooling, and have less than half of their per capita income. White men and women earn average incomes far higher than black men and women; black women earn the least; and the unemployment rate reflects a similar pattern in race and gender terms. Market forces and government policies, Guimarães argued, impose a double disadvantage on blacks: employers prefer graduates of free public universities, which set high entry standards; children from poor black homes cannot afford the fees of private secondary schools, which the children of the rich attend. Survey data suggest that attitudes toward af-

firmative action tend to divide along class lines: most whites oppose it; support for it diminishes among middle-class blacks as they move up the income ladder; and the majority of the poor support it. Guimarães concluded that racial peace in Brazil is a product of a "black and white privileged pact".

Given the history of institutionalized racism in the United States, Loury contended that the effects of race-blind or race-indifferent policies should be evaluated asymmetrically; those that harm blacks or minorities should be repudiated, while those that assist blacks and minorities should be seen as necessary to the achievement of just social development.

Affirmative action policies have come under considerable attack in the United States in recent years: sections of the white population see them as open-ended commitments, reverse forms of discrimination, and a violation of individual rights. As Glenn Loury reported, the dominant ideology that drives opposition to affirmative action is liberal individualism, which espouses a policy of colour-blindness: the practice of not using race when carrying out a policy. Loury argued that colour-blindness should be distinguished from race-indifference: the practice of not considering how a chosen rule might impact various racial groups. Both can ameliorate or exacerbate the social disadvantage of blacks and other minorities. However, given the history of institutionalized racism in the United States, Loury contended that the effects of race-blind or race-indifferent policies should be evaluated asymmetrically; those that harm blacks or minorities should be repudiated, while those that assist blacks and minorities should be seen as necessary to the achievement of just social development. He concluded that it may require a reordering of moral concerns: racial justice before race-blindness or race-indifference. It may also require rejection of the idea that racial equality has already been achieved. Racial discrimination and injustice, which spanned a period of about 400 years, cannot be overcome in a few decades of implementing affirmative action policies.

Participants raised two issues on the presentations that focused on health and environmental racism: the relative weights of class and race in explaining differential access to health care and clean environments; and the role of organized groups, such as trade unions and en-

¹ R1,000 = \$80, approximately.

vironmental movements, in advancing the agenda of environmental justice. Randall responded that although class is important, in most studies of the United States race has been found to be the key variable that explains ethno-racial health care disparities. She argued that commentators often make the mistake of comparing individuals of the same ethno-racial group with different class backgrounds, which would certainly show the importance of class over race. However, when individuals of the same class background but with different ethnicities are compared, the significance of the ethnic or racial factor is unmistakable. In other words, middle-class blacks, on average, are worse off than middle-class whites on indices of health care; and working-class blacks are worse off on those indices than working-class whites. Bullard buttressed Randall's points by stating that at least 64 studies have demonstrated that race is the most potent variable determining where people live, where industries are located and where environmental law enforcement is lax. He also discussed the activities of the environmental justice movement, including the coalition it is building with organized labour.

The discussion on affirmative action and poverty addressed three issues: whether capitalism as a system of economic and social organization is capable of overcoming racism and promoting far-reaching redistributive and anti-poverty programmes; whether there is an alternative system that can be invented for the task of attaining social justice; and whether calls at the World Conference for reparations to be made for the crimes of slavery and racial injustice are appropriate. Loury affirmed that even though a historical link can be established between capitalism and racism, there is no guarantee that racism will disappear with the elimination of capitalism. He argued, in

capitalist order because the minority Afrikaners used the state to suppress opposition and counteract competition, including entrepreneurs who wanted to break the restrictive apartheid order. Sundaram disagreed with Loury's characterization of apartheid South Africa as non-capitalist. He argued that there was no single road to capitalism, and that the project of the Afrikaners was unabashedly capitalist. He stressed, however, that today's world is resigned to the reality of capitalism: it would be wrong to assume that the only policies that can be effective in dealing with racial and other inequalities are those that are pursued under anti-capitalist regimes. There are varieties of capitalism, and it should be possible to promote one where the most rapacious characteristics of capitalism—such as racial and gender inequalities and oppression—are eliminated or substantially reduced.

Loury then pursued the theme of reparation and social justice, arguing that legalistic claims for reparation cannot be an appropriate response to the crimes and injury of slavery. It is impossible, as he explained it, to put a price tag on, for instance, damage to African-American family relations and structures perpetrated by the slave system over generations. One danger of reparation, he continued, is that sceptical Americans who have no deep emotional tie to the lives of poor black Americans would be able to say after reparation that the debate about injustice and poverty had been settled. However, Loury argued, there is a historical claim for past injustices: this should constitute an open commitment by society to reckon with the consequences of the history of slavery, "come what may, and no matter how much it costs", because the fact of racial inequality is a moral affront given the facts of US history.

One danger of reparation is that sceptical Americans who have no deep emotional tie to the lives of poor, black Americans would be able to say after reparation that the debate about injustice and poverty had been settled.

fact, that the capacity to implement racism through state policy is greater in countries where there is state dominance of the economy, than in liberal economies with multiple centres of economic power. On this basis, he concluded, apartheid South Africa was not a

Agenda

Monday, 3 September 2001 (Durban Exhibition Centre)

- 9:00–10:00 Welcoming remarks and introduction — *Thandika Mkandawire*
 Opening address — *Mary Robinson*
 Keynote address: What Kind of Yarn? From Colour Line to Multicoloured Hammock: Reflections on Racism and Public Policy — *Rodolfo Stavenhagen*

10:00–10:15 BREAK

THEME ONE: *The Social Construction of Race and Citizenship*

- 10:15–11:45 **Session One: Race, Caste and Citizenship**
 Chair — *Njabulo Ndebele*
 The Social Construction of Race and Citizenship in the United States — *George Fredrickson*
 The Social Construction of Race and Citizenship in South Africa — *Bernard Magubane*
 Cataracts of Silence: Race on the Edge of Indian Thought — *Vijay Prashad*

- 11:45–13:15 **Session Two: Minorities, Indigenous Peoples and Citizenship**
 Chair — *Angela King*
 The Racial Politics of Culture and Silent Racism in Latin America:
 A Case Study of Peru — *Marisol de la Cadena*
 Race, Discrimination and Citizenship in Southeast Asia — *Lily Zubaida Rahim*
 Race, Discrimination and Citizenship in the Afro-Arab Borderlands — *Kwesi Prah*

13:15–15:00 LUNCH

THEME TWO: *The Social Dynamics of Racism and Inequalities*

- 15:00–16:30 **Session Three: Economic Change, Inequalities and Race Relations**
 Chair — *Mark Suzman*
 Poverty and Prosperity: Have Racial/Ethnic Minorities Been Left Behind in the United States?
 — *Sheldon Danziger, Deborah Reed and Tony N. Brown*
 Economic Crisis and the Politics of Race Relations in Southeast Asia — *Khoo Boo Teik*
 Labour Market Segmentation and Race Relations in Southern Africa — *Guy Mhone*

16:30–16:45 BREAK

- 16:45–18:15 **Session Four: Land Distribution and Race Relations**
 Chair — *Lee Sweeney*
 Land Distribution and the Politics of Race Relations in Southern Africa — *Sam Moyo*
 Land Distribution and the Politics of Race Relations in Latin America — *Diego Iturralde*
 Land and the Politics of Race Relations in Australia — *Marcia Langton*

Tuesday, 4 September 2001 (Royal Hotel, Durban)

- 9:00–10:00 **Session Five: Migration and Multiculturalism**
 Chair — *Peter Schatzer*
 Immigration, Multiculturalism and the European Nation State — *Jeroen Doomernik*
 Migrant Workers, Racism and Xenophobia in the Middle East — *Ray Jureidini*

10:00–10:15 BREAK

THEME THREE: *Organized Responses to Cultural Diversity*

- 10:15–12:15 **Session Six: Social Movements, Political Parties and Racism**
 Chair — *Reed Brody*
 Structural Racism and US Democracy: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on the Civil Rights Movement — *Manning Marable*
 Exclusionary Populism in Western Europe: A Threat to Democracy and Civil Rights? — *Hans-Georg Betz*
 Political Parties, Civil Rights Movements and Racism in South Africa — *Tom Lodge*
 Anti-Racist Movements and Public Policies in Western Democracies — *Hajo Funke*

12:15–14:00 LUNCH

THEME FOUR: *The Impact of Public Policies on Race Relations*

- 14:00–15:30 **Session Seven: Institutional Reform**
 Chair — *Frene Ginwala*
 Ethno-Racial Divisions and Governance: The Problem of Institutional Reform and Adaptation — *Ralph Premdas*
 Policing and Human Rights: Eliminating Discrimination, Xenophobia, Intolerance and the Abuse of Power from Policework — *Benjamin Bowling, Coretta Phillips, Alexandra Campbell and Maria Docking*
 Language, Education and Race Relations — *Neville Alexander*
- 15:30–15:45 BREAK
- 15:45–17:30 **Session Eight: Gender, Race and Public Policy**
 Chair — *Amina Mama*
 Race, Women and Public Policy in the United States and the United Kingdom — *Kum-Kum Bhavnani*
 Contested Realities: Race, Gender and Public Policy in New Zealand — *Tracey McIntosh*
 Gender, Race and Public Policy in South Africa — *Jane Bennett*

Wednesday, 5 September 2001 (Royal Hotel, Durban)

- 9:00–10:00 **Session Nine: Health, Environmental Racism and Public Policy**
 Chair — *Alejandra Pero*
 Race, Health Care and the Law: Regulating Racial Discrimination in Health Care — *Varnellia Randall*
 Confronting Environmental Racism in the Twenty-First Century — *Robert Bullard*
- 10:00–10:15 BREAK
- 10:15–12:15 **Session Ten: Social Equality and Poverty Eradication**
 Chair — *Pierre Sané*
 Racial Justice and Affirmative Action Policies: The Superficial Morality of Color-Blindness in the United States — *Glenn Loury*
 The Economics and Politics of Affirmative Action Policies in Malaysia — *Jomo K. Sundaram*
 Racial Inequalities, Black Protest and Public Policies in Brazil — *Antonio Guimarães*
 Redistributive Policies, Anti-Poverty Programmes and Race Relations in South Africa — *Renosi Mokate*

Panellists, Chairpersons, Organizers

Neville **ALEXANDER** • Director, Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa,
University of Cape Town, South Africa

Thomas **ANSORG** • Research Assistant, UNRISD, Switzerland

Yusuf **BANGURA** • Research Co-ordinator, UNRISD, Switzerland

Jane **BENNETT** • Senior Lecturer, Gender / Women's Studies, African Gender Institute,
University of Cape Town, South Africa

Hans-Georg **BETZ** • Professor, Political Science, Canadian Centre for German and
European Studies, York University, Canada

Kum-Kum **BHAVNANI** • Professor, Sociology / Senior Editor, **Meridians**,
University of California Santa Barbara, United States

Khoo **BOO TEIK** • Associate Professor, School of Social Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Benjamin **BOWLING** • Lecturer, Criminology, School of Law, King's College London, United Kingdom

Reed **BRODY** • Advocacy Director, Human Rights Watch, United States

Robert **BULLARD** • Professor, Sociology / Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center,
Clark Atlanta University, United States

Sheldon **DANZIGER** • Professor, Social Work and Public Policy / Director, Social Work Research
Development Center, University of Michigan, United States

Marisol **DE LA CADENA** • Assistant Professor, Anthropology, Department of Anthropology,
University of North Carolina, United States

Jeroen **DOOMERNIK** • Senior Researcher, Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies,
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

George **FREDRICKSON** • Professor, United States History, Department of History,
Stanford University, United States

Hajo **FUNKE** • Professor, Political Science, Otto-Suhr-Institut für Politikwissenschaft,
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

Frene **GINWALA** • Speaker of Parliament, South Africa

Antonio S.A. **GUIMARÃES** • Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of São Paulo, Brazil

Diego **ITURRALDE** • Coordinator, Applied Research Unit, Inter-American Institute of
Human Rights, Costa Rica

Ray **JUREIDINI** • Associate Professor, Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences,
American University of Beirut, Lebanon

Angela **KING** • Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations Department of Economic
and Social Affairs, United States

Marcia **LANGTON** • Chair, Australian Indigenous Studies, School of Anthropology and Geography,
University of Melbourne, Australia

Tom **LODGE** • Professor, Political Science, Department of Political Studies,
University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

Panellists, Chairpersons, Organizers

- Glenn **LOURY** • Professor, Economics / Director, Institute on Race and Social Division,
Boston University, United States
- Bernard **MAGUBANE** • Professor, Sociology, South African Democracy Education Trust, South Africa
- Amina **MAMA** • Chair, Gender Studies / Director, African Gender Institute,
University of Cape Town, South Africa
- Manning **MARABLE** • Professor, History and Political Science / Director, Institute for Research in
African-American Studies, Columbia University, United States
- Tracey **MCINTOSH** • Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of Auckland, New Zealand
- Guy **MHONE** • Director, Graduate School of Public and Development Management,
University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa
- Thandika **MKANDAWIRE** • Director, UNRISD, Switzerland
- Renosi **MOKATE** • Director, Economic and Social Analysis Group, Human Sciences
Research Council, South Africa
- Sam **MOYO** • Director, Southern African Regional Institute for Policy Studies, Zimbabwe
- Njabulo **NDEBELE** • Vice-Chancellor, University of Cape Town, South Africa
- Alexandra **PERO** • Programme Advisor, United Nations Development Programme, United States
- Kwesi **PRAH** • Director, Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society, South Africa
- Vijay **PRASHAD** • Director, International Studies Programme, Trinity College, United States
- Ralph **PREMDAS** • Professor, Public Policy, Department of Behavioral Sciences,
University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago
- Lily Zubaidah **RAHIM** • Senior Lecturer, School of Economics and Political Science,
University of Sydney, Australia
- Vernellia **RANDALL** • Professor, Law, Institute on Race, Health Care and the Law,
University of Dayton, United States
- Mary **ROBINSON** • United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Office of the
High Commissioner for Human Rights, Switzerland
- Pierre **SANÉ** • Assistant Director-General, Social and Human Sciences, United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, France
- Peter **SCHATZER** • Director, External Relations, International Organization for Migration, Switzerland
- Rodolfo **STAVENHAGEN** • Professor, Sociology, Department of Sociology,
El Colegio de México, Mexico
- Jomo K. **SUNDARAM** • Professor, Economics, Faculty of Economy and Administration,
University of Malaya, Malaysia
- Mark **SUZMAN** • Policy Advisor, Office of the Administrator, United Nations
Development Programme, United States
- Lee **SWEPSTON** • Chief, Equality and Employment Branch, International Labour Organization, Switzerland

The **United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)** is an autonomous agency engaging in multidisciplinary research on the social dimensions of contemporary problems affecting development. Its work is guided by the conviction that, for effective development policies to be formulated, an understanding of the social and political context is crucial. The Institute attempts to provide governments, development agencies, grassroots organizations and scholars with a better understanding of how development policies and processes of economic, social and environmental change affect different social groups. Working through an extensive network of national research centres, UNRISD aims to promote original research and strengthen research capacity in developing countries.

Current research programmes include: Civil Society and Social Movements; Democracy, Governance and Human Rights; Identities, Conflict and Cohesion; Social Policy and Development; and Technology, Business and Society.

A list of UNRISD's free and priced publications can be obtained by contacting the Reference Centre, UNRISD, Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland. Phone +41 (0)22 9173020, fax +41 (0)22 9170650, info@unrisd.org, www.unrisd.org

UNRISD work for the Racism and Public Policy conference was carried out with the support of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). UNRISD also thanks the governments of Denmark, Finland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom for their core funding. This Conference News was written by Yusuf Bangura, with the assistance of Thomas Ansorg and Anita Tombez.

**United Nations Research Institute
for Social Development (UNRISD)
Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland**

**Phone: +41 (0)22 9173020
Fax: +41 (0)22 9170650
info@unrisd.org
www.unrisd.org**