Ethnic and Racial Studies, 2015
Vol. 38, No. 9, 1557–1572, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2014.996241

European influence on diversity policy frames: paradoxical outcomes of Lyon's membership of the Intercultural Cities programme

Joseph Downing

(*Received 5 February 2014; accepted 2 December 2014*)

This paper examines the formulation of policy frames towards new minorities in France by analysing Lyon's membership of the European Commission's and Council of Europe's Intercultural Cities programme (ICP). Here, with culture accounting for 20% of Lyon's budget, emphasis is placed on the adoption of the *Charte de Coopération Culturelle* to use cultural institutions to implement difference-orientated policies. Critically, important issues emerge with this strategy. The effort to engage new minorities is hampered by significant apathy from cultural institutions in Lyon, and the limited geographical area of Lyon included in the ICP. Finally, institutions who engage with promoting interculturality co-opt existing organizations, with negative implications for the treatment of diversity in the city. This illustrates the problems with a European framework fostering a policy frame based on recognition for minorities in a context that has yet to fully embrace such policies at the national level.

Keywords: France; Europe; policy; diversity; intercultural

1. Introduction

This paper's objective is to contribute to the emerging literature detailing the various formations and applications of difference-orientated policies in French cities (Doytcheva 2007; Moore 2001; Mitchell 2011; Modood 2010). To make this contribution, this analysis presents an important example of how a European-wide initiative has very mixed, and somewhat limited, impact on how the application of notions of recognizing difference plays out in ongoing debates about shaping the nature of cultural policies and institutions in France (Poirrier 2013). This paper aims to make this contribution by examining Lyon's membership of the European Commission (EC) and the Council of Europe's (CoE) Intercultural Cities programme (ICP) that seeks to create a European framework to '[promote] equal rights for all, combat discrimination and racism, and actively promote constructive interaction between individuals and groups of different backgrounds, cultures and generations' (Wood 2010, 11).

Specifically, it seeks to critically identify the issues presented by Lyon's focus on using its cultural institutions as key instruments in this endeavour through the adoption of the Charter of Cultural Cooperation (*Charte de Coopération Culturelle*) that ties the city's largest twenty-two cultural organizations into playing a key role in

the ICP. Important to note here, in linking this initiative to broader discussion of the management of a wide range of difference, is its diffuse conception of culture. Here, this includes not just notions of the arts, performance and such, but also extends to any means by which intercommunity dialogue can be facilitated, importantly even stretching to notions of religion. However, as identified in the broader literature on Europeanization (see e.g. Hooghe 1996; Knill 2001; Bulmer and Radaelli 2004; Richardson 2006), the implementation of this EU programme has resulted in paradoxical and undesirable outcomes and a general ineffectiveness. In conducting this critical analysis, this paper identifies three key issues with how the engagement of new minorities is operationalized through the adoption of the ICP's Charter of Cultural Cooperation. First, there exists a large degree of apathy from cultural institutions in Lyon that significantly hampers the effectiveness of the ICP in engaging new minorities and thus represents another failure to meaningfully 'democratize' culture in France (Martin 2013; Poirrier 2013). Second, this paper takes issue with the extremely limited geographic area of Lyon that is included in the ICP that excludes the very areas rich in new minorities that the ICP is designed to engage. Finally, this paper identifies a strategy deployed by cultural institutions in Lyon of co-opting existing voluntary associations as a means to engage with new minority diversity. However, this presents significant issues with handling new minority difference amounting to significant degrees of undesirable cultural ascription and 'othering' (Said 1978), again hampering the effectiveness of Lyon's membership of the ICP.

1.1. Between assimilation and diversity: discussing French policy frames

To contextualize this analysis, it is important to have a conceptual framework that can explain how policies are formed and possibly replaced and an empirical link to the French context. In constructing the concepts of policy frames, Bleich (2011) argues that policymakers, in formulating policies on various subjects, gravitate to existing 'policy frames' as a means to guide the shape of future policies. Policy frames, therefore, are 'a set of cognitive and moral maps that orient an actor within a policy sphere' (Bleich 2011, 60). As such, they can be said to:

> help actors identify problems and specify and prioritise their interests and goals; they point actors toward causal and normative judgments about effective and appropriate policies in ways that tend to propel policy down a particular path and to reinforce it once on that path; and they can endow actors deemed to have moral authority or expert status with added power in a policy field. In this way, frames give direction to policy-making and help account for policy outcomes. (Bleich 2011, 60)

Through this process, France has built up a significant and well-established policy frame of assimilation. This centres on the ideas of individual formal legal and political equality in addition to the separation of church and state (*laïcité*) as the sole legitimate guarantors of social integration and equality (Wihtol de Wenden 2004; Hargreaves 2007). Nationally, as Wihtol de Wenden (2004) and Weil (2008) argue, once centralization took hold in the wake of the 1789 revolution, citizenship was

increasingly defined by the suppression of expressions of ethnicity and religion in the public realm in an effort to turn ethnically and religiously disparate 'peasants into Frenchmen' (Weber 1976).

However, despite the very strong path dependency that implementing an assimilation policy frame for so long has set in train, the normative judgements made about the effectiveness of this policy frame demonstrate significant change and contestation. Assimilation's effectiveness has been called into question when examining its inability to assimilate new minorities created by mass immigration from France's ex-colonies in the latter half of the twentieth century. Here, discrimination works on two interrelated levels where socio-economic deprivation is caused through the intersection of class-, religion- and ethnicity-based discrimination against those of minority origin (Hargreaves 2007; Wacquant 2007).

This multifaceted exclusion and the resulting burst of social unrest in French cities has led to several important instances of the adoption of recognition-based policy frames in France. However, engaging with issues of discrimination through 'recognition'-based (Taylor 1994) multicultural or intercultural policy frames remains significantly problematic. Both the terms 'multiculturalism' and 'interculturalism' remain multivalent, 'discursively fluid' and 'multifarious' terms and policy tools (Brahm-Levey 2012; Meer and Modood 2011; Uberoi and Modood 2013). Brahm-Levey (2012) and Meer and Modood (2011) are correct to identify the similarities, and near inseparability, of 'multiculturalism' and 'interculturalism'. Here, it is argued that both have rejected an enshrined separateness to concentrate on the need for continued dialogue and interaction between different groups, as stipulated by the ICP (CoE 2008). However, such assumptions about defining particular groups as such have been the subject of sustained critique as 'paternalist' (Littler and Naidoo 2011), enshrining gender inequality (Phillips 2009) or abandoning overarching national identities (Modood 2010). However, several developments render the wholesale abandoning of such policies as highly unlikely. Questions of race and ethnicity remain at the centre of debates about national identity and heritage in Europe (Littler and Naidoo 2011), making discussions of citizenship, discrimination and ethnic group dynamics highly salient. In addition, public displays of minority culture and group mobilization remain opportunities to remake and unsettle existing conceptions of identity, citizenship and power relations (Hall, Evans, and Nixon 2013).

The application of recognition-based polices in France has occurred both nationally and locally. Nationally, Modood (2007, 2010) cites the creation of the French Council of the Muslim Faith (CFCM, *Conseil Français du Culte Musulman*) to represent all Muslims to the government in matters of worship and ritual and the creation of France's first national black association (CRAN, *Conseil Représentatif des Associations Noires de France*) as important evidence of a possible shift towards multicultural policies in France. This demonstrates the complexity of the picture at the national level, given the well-established strategy of the use of national bodies to interact with minorities, a trend beginning with the creation of a national Jewish association (CRIF, *Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France*) over fifty years ago. In addition, it also demonstrates the variety of ways that such difference-orientated policies emerge in the French context, with CFCM coming from the 'top down' at least partially through the desire of the French state to control Muslim

communities and their relations with the state (Modood 2010). Conversely, CRAN emerges out of a 'bottom-up' process in response to an increased perception of discrimination against those easily read as 'black' in several aspects of French society, including employment (Modood 2010). Further to this, locally a more dynamic and diverse repertoire of policy measures has been noted (Moore 2001; Doytcheva 2007; Raymond and Modood 2007). This has included taking measures such as the funnelling of resources to minority populations under the guise of urban renewal in Paris (Doytcheva 2007) and through municipal policies such as the creation of the interreligious forum *Marseille Espérance*[1] and the municipal funding of minority associations in Marseille (Moore 2001).

As such, these diverse recognition-based activities tie into the broader observations about public action in France, which is an extremely diverse and varying, yet extensive phenomena (Duran 2010; Hassenteufel 2011; Lascoumes and Le Galès 2012). Domains, territories and actors are extremely diverse and represent a significant challenge to contemporary governance because of their wildly divergent interests (Duran 2010). As such, public action attempts to deal with issues both well established and emergent, including a range of issues relating to the management of migrant difference (Hassenteufel 2011; Lascoumes and Le Galès 2012). This includes issues of urban governance such as discrimination, housing and security (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2012). However, not all social issues become issues for public action. Here, it is important to understand why public culture has become part of the state's arena of action to further decode the processes at work in Lyon's membership of the ICP.

Cultural policies have been in the domain of public action since the creation of a Ministry of Culture after the Second World War. In this period, it has been argued that cultural policy has been at the very centre of France's obsessions with its self-image in light of the republic's crisis of identity owing to diversity and globalization (Poirrier 2013). As such, the central state has articulated significant ambitions to bring high culture to the masses with direct government policy intervention (Ahearne 2002; Poirrier 2013) through ideas of democratizing culture (Martin 2013; Poirrier 2013). The observation that the democratization of culture in France has largely failed (Martin 2013) is important here. Within this analysis, Poirrier (2013) identifies that efforts to widen the activities of mainstream cultural institutions to take account of new audiences and cultural forms in France have largely failed and have been abandoned. This is at least partly due to rolling out a notion of appropriate culture that has been criticized for being overly directive, bourgeois (Ahearne 2002) and not reaching out to minorities and subcultures (CoE 2008). Here, this tallies with a Council of Europe audit that criticized Lyon for having 'little cultural activity that has taken place outside of established activities for the majority ethnic middle classes, such as opera and theatre' with 'very little outreach of urban sub-cultures or to new audience groups' (CoE 2008, 3). It is against this backdrop that the ICP is attempting to bring recognition-based policies to Lyon.

1.2. Research context: bringing interculturalism to Lyon

The ICP emerged out of the 2008 European Year of Interculturalism proposed by Jan Figel, European Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture and Youth (Wood

2010). It was conceived to 'promote awareness of the ways in which intercultural dialogue can help create strong and cohesive communities in an increasingly culturally diverse Europe' (Wood 2010, 12). Thus, the ICP represents a different means by which a policy frame of recognition is being formulated and applied at the local level in France to those identified by the scholars discussed above. This is because it does not simply involve the flexibility of local policymakers as a key means by which policy is formulated and applied. Rather, it also demonstrates how transnational European governance is influencing policy at the local level in France. This is because the ICP is a joint project of the EC and the CoE that includes twenty-four cities across Europe including Lyon. While it clearly does not include every city with significant new minorities in Europe, it is an important example of a possible beginning in a convergence in European minority policy for new minorities as that which has already been put into practice that seek to guarantee cultural rights for national minorities (Kraus 2011). As such, the aims and rationale for the ICP are ambitious:

> Cities require policies and projects that ensure the practice of equal rights for all, combat discrimination and racism, and actively promote constructive interaction between individuals and groups of different backgrounds, cultures and generations. Unfounded myths and prejudices about minorities need to be dismantled, and certain existing civic systems and strategies must be challenged if they are to promote equality of access, participation and opportunity. The distinctive essence of an *intercultural* approach to cities is its focus on the engagement of all citizens; it emphasises collective responsibility and action. (Wood 2010, 11, original emphasis)

The programme uses this rationale as a means to test, validate and enhance a model for intercultural governance and management at the local level (Wood 2010). Within this, an important caveat regarding their discussion of diversity is the importance of focusing on internalizing interculturalism dialogue and embedding it within the local context. As Pascual et al. (2009) note in their analysis of several intercultural programmes across numerous member cities, simply namechecking a 'foreign' cultural form is not considered interculturalism because of its lack of regard to local residents, audiences and users. As such, the focus must be not just on an abstract notion of cultural diversity to be considered successful in fostering interculturalism in this sense; rather, it must be tethered clearly to how this applies to the residents in the local context.

In this regard, Lyon engages with this process as a city with significant concentrations of new minorities that has experienced significant social problems integrating them into the city's broader socio-economic fabric (Dikec 2007). While giving exact figures about the make-up of post-migration communities in Lyon is complicated by the lack of official data on ethnicity and religion in France, recent statistics from *Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques* (INSEE, the French national statistics agency), gave estimates of those living in France who have at least one parent of immigrant origin as a proxy to estimate ethnic minority populations. The report came up with a total of 11.8 million foreign-born and second-generation individuals living in France, accounting for approximately 19% of the total

population (Borrel and L'hommeau 2010). Out of this, 5.5 million had European origin, and 4 million had origins in the Maghreb (Borrel and L'hommeau 2010). Interestingly, the report also cites the fact that 'the youngest of the descendants [of immigrants] have parents with origins more varied and from further afield [than previous generations]' (Borrel and L'hommeau 2010). This tallies with the broader observations of scholars such as Vertovec (2007) that increasingly Western Europe is experiencing 'super-diversity' where existing, well-established ethnic minority populations such as those from the Maghreb in France are supplemented by many new, smaller, scattered, multiple-origin communities not necessarily experiencing the same connections to France through colonization.

This is increasingly striking, given the location of these individuals. Hargreaves (2007) states, from INSEE statistics of foreign-born populations, that 57.5% of ethnic minorities reside in only three regions of France – Ile de France (with Paris at its centre), Rhône-Alpes (with Lyon at its centre) and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur (with Marseille at its centre). The Rhone-Alpes region centred on Lyon contains 11% of the foreign-born population residing in France and, as such, a significant proportion of the country's post-migration diversity of those of the second and third generations born in France. However, it is not just sheer numbers that render the discussion of how municipal authorities are managing diversity in Lyon relevant; it is also the significant socio-economic difficulties that such communities in the city face. A key aim of the ICP is the breaking down of socio-economic barriers encountered by new minorities in Europe through the process of intercultural dialogue (Wood 2010) that can combat such issues as racial discrimination in the job market.

The need for policies to combat socio-economic marginalization in Lyon is readily apparent in the literature. Hargreaves (2007) cites the disproportionate concentration of those from post-migration communities in Lyon in the large suburban housing estates surrounding the city proper, in a similar fashion to Wacquant's (2007) characterization of Paris as the 'dual city' with a wealthy, predominantly white French centre and poorer, mixed suburbs with high concentrations of post-migration communities in marginalized high-rise estates. Also noteworthy, and again similar to Paris, these two worlds of the 'dual city' are separated to a large extent by the administrative boundaries of the 'Grand Lyon' metropolitan area where the wealthy city centre exists administratively as 'Lyon', the city proper, with the poorer suburbs as separate 'communes' existing outside of the administrative jurisdiction of the city. This characterization of Lyon as a 'dual city' with its suburban concentrations of poverty also necessitates an examination of another aspect of the relevance of the study of the policy responses to diversity in the city because of the recurring bouts of social unrest seen in these suburban estates. Lyon has rioted regularly since the 1970s, having episodes of unrest in its large high-rise housing estates in the 1980s, 1990s and during the large-scale unrest that swept across 274 French towns in 2005 (Dikec 2007; Hargreaves 2007).

While these inequalities are key in any discussion of the management of difference in Lyon, there is also the related problem of sociocultural discrimination experienced by new minorities that the ICP sets out to address. Particularly important is the process identified by Hargreaves (2007, 35) of the discursive 'othering' in politics and the media of those of minority ethnic, post-colonial, origin as not committed to the

dominant values of French society. This stands in variance to the actual picture of minority ethnic individuals firmly ensconced in the dominant values and culture of France (Hargreaves 2007, 3). Therefore, rather than being a reality, claims about minority ethnic populations in France as somehow existing outside of French society are erroneous. It is therefore more accurate to assess such claims as part of the powerful and multifaceted discrimination those of minority ethnic origin experience.

As such, not only are post-migration communities at a distinct disadvantage economically, they also experience significant 'othering' in both the French media and in their day-to-day interactions with a wide range of actors in French society, from the government-run school systems (Lorcerie 2003) to the identity card checks enforced by the police (Hargreaves 2007). However, the discrimination experienced in this milieu demonstrates a significant degree of intersection between ethnicity and class that should not be ignored. As Wacquant (1992) rightly contends, there is a significant overlap between negative notions of both ethnicity and class that characterize youths of ethnic origin in France. Dikec (2007) builds on this observation in the context of Lyon in his discussion of a 'thirst for citizenship' among youths marginalized by the intersection of ethnicity and class in the predominately working-class estates of Vaulx-en-Velin neighbourhood in the greater Lyon region.

Data collection for this article began during fieldwork in Lyon in 2011–12 that included visiting cultural organizations and events and conducting interviews with policymakers and organization staff. This fieldwork also directed the author to conduct ongoing archival research from 2012 onwards. This involved examining policy documents, event schedules and documents held by organizations in Lyon (often available online) and newspaper reports about the particular activities of local actors. As such, appropriate deductive examples have been selected as illustrations of the broader claims made about the participation of Lyon in the ICP and the problems that occur throughout this process. As such, the examples presented here are intended to paint a coherent and analytical picture of Lyon's participation in the ICP during a particular time.

2. Problems with cultural cooperation: reluctance from formal institutions

The participation in the ICP represents an opportunity for Lyon to harness European resources and expertise to formulate and apply a novel policy frame of recognition to its significant social problems. So far, however, the effectiveness of this process has been somewhat limited, in line with observations about European actions being stymied by existing administrative cultures (Knill 2001; Bulmer and Radaelli 2004). Pascual et al. (2009) make this broad observation about a conflict between existing administrative cultures and the European project of the ICP. Here, they argue that out of all of the members of the ICP, Lyon had the most difficulty in mainstreaming the idea of interculturalism and the need to facilitate a dialogue between groups in society; this is due to the political sensitivity in France of such a notion that transgresses the focus on individual legal equality insisted upon in the republican tradition.

This is not to say, however, that the ICP is having no effect. Rather, Lyon has implemented a raft of measures that have led to the CoE (2008) praising the city for

ongoing commitment from local policymakers. An example of such an activity has been the creation of the annual 'Our Cultures of the City' (*Nos Cultures de la Ville*) days in which experts and policymakers from the city council are brought together to discuss how to approach cultural diversity and make it part of the sustainable development of the city (Ville de Lyon 2012). In the 2011 edition, there was a discussion held on 'The Richness of the Other: The Construction of our Identities' (Ville de Lyon 2011) where the programme included the discussion of the construction of France and the reality of the multiple identities that people have in French society. However, a vague notion of 'commitment' from local policymakers does not necessary translate into significant action.

However, one must question the robustness of this commitment and how it translates into more substantive policy actions. Key in conducting such a critical analysis of Lyon's membership of the ICP is an issue that commonly limits the ability of European-led initiatives in how such initiatives engage with existing institutional and administrative cultures (Knill 2001; Bulmer and Radaelli 2004). This feeds into the broader discussion of public action in cultural policies in France that have themselves failed to meaningfully democratize culture (Ahearne 2002; Martin 2013; Poirrier 2013). Here, the ICP faces a significant hurdle in attempting to engage with, and indeed drastically change, such an entrenched administrative culture.

This process of existing administrative and institutional practices resisting Europeanization can be seen in perhaps the largest expression of the inclusion of interculturalism in local policy – the citywide Charter of Cultural Cooperation. This charter ties the twenty-two largest cultural organizations in Lyon into a commitment to be part of the implementation of an intercultural policy frame based on the recognition of new minorities. This focus on using culture to pursue the goals of interculturalism may, at first glance, seem somewhat lacking, and indeed sociocultural multiculturalism that seeks to offer public recognition as a means to fight discrimination can only accomplish so much in the face of hard socio-economic deprivation. However, Lyon as a city spends 20% of its total annual budget each year on activities relating to culture (Gnedovsky 2009). This predominantly goes into running, maintaining and investing in the city's formal culture institutions such as its opera and large museums (Gnedovsky 2009). This renders the inclusion of new minorities in this domain an important issue owing to this significant resource allocation towards the cultural industries in Lyon from the local state. Within this, the Charter of Cultural Cooperation defines the role that the city's cultural institutions have in providing recognition-based policy frames to new minorities in Lyon. There is a clause in the latest draft of the charter, ratified by all of the city's large, flagship cultural institutions, committing them to the positive valorization of diversity, the increased visibility of minorities, and the use of interculturality to introduce new arrivals to the city (Ville de Lyon 2012, author's translation).

Lyon's effectiveness in formulating and applying a policy frame of recognition to new minorities through the Charter of Cultural Cooperation has encountered some significant problems, beginning with commitments made in the charter to implement interculturality. Results have been somewhat mixed with some cultural institutions forming stronger intercultural commitments than others. Several of the large cultural institutions that have signed up to the Charter of Cultural Cooperation as part of the

ICP have made no commitments to cultural diversity as such including the *Opera National de Lyon* and the *Musée d'art contemporain* (Museum of Contemporary Arts) (Ville de Lyon 2012). This does not mean, however, that they do not have explicit commitments to expand access in more general terms for disabled people or for those from parts of Lyon that they do not currently serve. However, this falls short of the more direct engagement with the ideas of interculturality central to membership of the ICP and to the possible application of a policy frame of recognition to the new minorities of Lyon.

This lack of uptake of the principles of the programme hints at enduring problems identified in the CoE's (2008) earlier assessment of Lyon's membership of the ICP, where it cited the constraints of a 'republican tradition in which issues of multiple identity and diversity are still taboo' as a major shortcoming in Lyon's intercultural strategy. As such, as Bleich (2011) identifies, there will be a significant degree of path dependency once a particular policy is in place and motion. This is exemplified by the institutions included in the ICP maintaining an assimilation policy frame where other forms of non-ethnic diversity, such as territorial or physical disabilities, are far easier to overtly embrace in a policy platform than cultural and ethnic diversity.

3. Intercultural Lyon: reproducing urban segregation

However, even when organizations take a more active role in implementing a policy frame of recognition to new minorities through the Charter of Cultural Cooperation, their efforts are hampered by the problematic form that Lyon takes as part of the ICP. The geographical area included in the programme represents only a small part of the broader Lyonnais agglomeration, incorporating only a small area of the central city that contains only 25% of the total population (CoE 2008). Mignot et al. (2013) highlight that the central urban core of Lyon (corresponding to the area included in the ICP) has a significantly higher share of wealthy residents and economic activity than the suburban areas of deprivation hosting the majority of the city's post-migration communities**.** This reproduces this spatial segregation and ensures that the deprived neighbourhoods rich with post-migration communities are completely excluded from the area participating in the ICP.

Reproducing this spatial segregation has a direct impact on how the ICP and the Charter of Cultural Cooperation can fulfil their aims of fostering intercultural dialogue, thus implementing a policy frame of recognition. This is a trend evident in the conduct of Lyon's largest single act of public culture, the festival of lights (*Fête des lumières*), another signee of the Charter of Cultural Cooperation (Ville de Lyon 2011). The festival's origins lie in a spontaneous display of candles by citizens of Lyon in 1852 to celebrate a storm clearing during the inauguration of a statue of the Virgin Mary. This has developed into one of the largest cultural festivals in France, which draws around an estimated 3.5 million visitors each year to see over twenty large-scale lighting projects throughout the city. Each year, different lighting installations are projected onto notable buildings and landmarks in the city, including the town hall, the police headquarters, churches and the city's two rivers. However, its 2013 programme demonstrates some interesting trends. While it gives scant attention to the festival being a 'living tradition, rich in values of sharing and solidarity', it goes

on to publicize associations with the states of Japan, Hong Kong and Dubai (Fête des lumières 2013) without mentioning how it is engaging with local diversities.

Continuing this trend of a lack of engagement is the location of the installations themselves, given the commitment made by the festival to give specific attention to engaging with '*quartiers prioritaires*', areas defined as socially deprived and as such eligible for particular financial assistance under the nationally decided *Politique de la Ville* (Ville de Lyon 2012). As such, the vast majority of the more than 100 exhibition sites over the four nights of the event in December 2013 are still located within the historic central districts, with few installations taking place in these deprived neighbourhoods. One exception was 'Agorama', where portraits of local residents were projected onto buildings in the economically deprived la Duchère neighbourhood (Fête des lumières 2013). However, there is a complete lack of installations or wider involvement from the more isolated and outlying districts, which contain the bulk of the cities post-migration 'new minorities' and socio-economic deprivation that the intercultural programme sets out to engage with. Also, there is no mention in the Fête des lumières (2013) programme of facilitating a dialogue between different cultural groups drawn from within the city that is so central to its commitments to interculturality. This demonstrates some interesting issues with the formation and application of a policy frame based on recognition within a context such as Lyon that does not have a national backdrop of such policies to draw on for expertise. In addition, the fragmented nature of urban boundaries also presents specific problems for such international cooperation agreements, as the areas that are most in need of engagement by membership of the ICP are outside of Lyon proper. Vénissieux, Vaulx-en-Velin and Villeurbanne are all significant parts of the wider agglomeration that are connected to Lyon by commercial and infrastructural links, but all exist as separate administrative communes. They are also home to large high-rise estates containing large proportions of the city's new minorities and have experienced significant social deprivation, unemployment and unrest since the 1970s. As such, they are examples of areas that would be most likely to benefit from intercultural dialogue, yet they are excluded from the programme and any consequent formulation and application of a policy frame of recognition.

4. The application of interculturality in tandem with local non-governmental organizations

There are also examples where institutions that are part of the Charter of Cultural Cooperation have attempted to formulate and apply a policy frame of recognition in line with the principles of the ICP. Here, there is an emergent trend for large cultural events and institutions to engage active parties in society that are already engaged with applying recognition-based policy frames to Lyon's post-migration new minorities. As such, there is some evidence of the ICP creating a degree of 'institutional channelling' (Ireland 1994) where the minority attempts to provide for their emotional and social needs are co-opted and incorporated by the state. This is especially significant given the nature of the organizations co-opted here, as *loi du 1er juillet 1901* associations[2] have played an important role in articulating the demands of new minorities since the middle of the twentieth century in France (Leveau and

Wihtol de Wenden 2007). However, in response to the demands made by associations, municipal authorities have sought to co-opt and subsume them as a means to channel these demands along better-established institutional channels (Ireland 1994; Leveau and Wihtol de Wenden 2007). As such, to illustrate this trend and its action under the auspices of the ICP, two examples have been selected here due to their status as the only associations that deal specifically with the issue of new minorities that are currently part of Lyon's Charter of Cultural Cooperation. In selecting these two associations, it is intended to illustrate the broader issues that arise with such co-option and channelling of non-state actors by the local state.

This has translated to such initiatives as an event dedicated to 'the religious minorities of Lyon from the Middle Age to the present' (Musées Gadagne 2013), which was held in the historic Musées Gadagne, a site in historic Lyon that holds three different museums, including the official museum of Lyon. The event included discussions of the Armenian Christian, Jewish and Muslim presence in the city, with a session discussion of how a 'Lyonnais Islam' has been represented over the decades by community associations such as the Rhône-Alpes Council for the Muslim Faith (Musées Gadagne 2013). Key in this was the co-production of this event by the museum itself and a long-standing civil society group, the Abrahamic group of La Duchère. La Duchère was populated by working-class French and North African families, who were joined, on the independence of North Africa, by a large number of *Pied-Noirs* returnees of Spanish-Jewish origin mainly from the Oran region in Algeria (CRPL 2012). The Abrahamic group emerged to facilitate the sharing of worship spaces in La Duchère before adding interfaith activities and discussions to their remit in 1986. From 2002, the group has organized public lectures and visits to religious buildings in an attempt to foster better inter-communal knowledge as a means to foster better community relations in the neighbourhood (CRPL 2012). Here, it is important to note how this intervention from the ICP has brought such an organization, after many years of operation outside of a formal framework, into the formal process of cultural representation and recognition in the city.

A second example of this application of a policy frame of recognition by the state partnering with organizations in society has been the *Tout L'Monde Dehors* ('Everyone Goes Out') festival. Now in its twelfth year, the festival features over 150 free spectacles, including film screenings, concerts and dance, all out in the open. An objective of the festival is to 'promote living and doing together' and 'valorise artists and actors local to the [Lyonnais] agglomeration' (Ville de Lyon 2013). Within their commitments to the Charter of Cultural Cooperation, this festival has followed a similar path to the Musées Gadagne discussed above in forming a cooperation agreement with an existing actor in Lyon dealing with promoting a policy frame of recognition for new minorities. Within this, the festival has engaged with the *Centre des Musiques Traditionnelles Rhônes-Alpes* (Rhônes-Alpes Centre for Traditional Music, CMTRA) to provide World Music Thursdays (Ville de Lyon 2012) in which they bring acts that they have discovered through their project work to perform in Lyon.

CMTRA, as part of the ICP, has been working to apply a policy frame of recognition by documenting and giving public recognition to the cultures of Lyon's new minorities. Their work centres on conducting in-depth studies of the cultural

forms exhibited in some of the most economically deprived and socially marginalized areas of the city. CMTRA has been operating for over twenty years from a base in the Villeurbanne area of Lyon, outside of the boundaries set by the ICP – one of the few examples of the ICP reaching outside of its small geographical remit. It expresses its mission as recognizing the traditional music and dances existing in the Lyon region by 'valorising heritage and recognizing the cultural diversities of the territories of Rhone-Alps' (CMTRA 2012) through the ethnographic collection of music to produce sound achieves. CMTRA's output consists of publications, documentaries and events and a growing web presence where these achievements can be readily stored and accessed by the general public for free, most recently in the form of interactive sound atlases.

One of CMTRA's sound atlases is of the Gulliotiýre neighbourhood, an economically and ethnically diverse neighbourhood in the city centre. The Gulliotière makes an interesting case study because of its economically and ethnically mixed nature, being comprised of both private and public housing, and French and post-migration communities. The area also contains the Grand Mosque of Lyon. The sound atlas is web-based, and is free and open to all. It was accomplished over a two-year period by a team of researchers who lived in the area while they conducted the study. They employed anthropological ethnographic methods to document the stories, daily lives and music of musicians in the area, including meeting them in their houses and taking pictures of their houses for publication online. In total, the atlas showcases thirteen acts from Africa, South America, the Arab world and the Caribbean. Each act has its own page with biographical information, several tracks and their location on the map of their area to show where they are in the city. Here, however, the project demonstrates some weaknesses in its treatment of the ethnocultural difference presented by new minorities.

Vital to the principles of the ICP is to provide recognition for local artists while not reinforcing an 'othering' of new minorities by presenting them as still foreign and somehow outside of the cultural boundaries of Lyon. CMTRA's sound atlas falls somewhat short here because, while it does offer some degree of recognition to new minorities, this exists within their depiction as still 'foreign'. This is paradoxical because in one sense the sound atlas details that featured musicians have lived in Lyon's 8th Arrondissement for decades and have intertwined their artistic and daily routines with the physical space of the city. However, in another sense, the sound atlas fails to tie these artistic forms to the city as an integral part of being Lyonnais or French, or to describe these cultures as somehow benefitting Lyon or contributing to its culture. Rather, the cultures of new minorities are depicted as outside of the constructs of France and Lyon and are as such subject to ethnic ascription and 'othering' (Said 1978). Here, they are depicted as outside of both the local and national narrative, which is counter to the goals of the ICP that are centred on the notion of incorporating difference as an integral part of the local landscape.

An example of this ethnic ascription and othering (Said 1978) can be seen specifically in the treatment of Mouradia, a group of musicians who meet weekly in restaurants and cafes in Lyon. They play the very hyphenated music of Algiers, *chaabi*, which celebrates its mixed influences from different cultures including Andalusia, Berber and European. are detailed as being in Lyon since the 1960s. In

Lyon since the 1960s, they play the characteristic music of Algiers – this is after possibly fifty years of living and playing in the city and despite an interview in which they explain that one of the key themes of their music is living through exile from Algiers, demonstrating that their traditional art form has been changed by their residence in France. The sound atlas makes no attempt to explain this in any detail or to attach it in any way to the city of Lyon, even though it is being in Lyon that has changed the subject matter of Mouradia's cultural production.

In light of these significant issues with the membership of the ICP it remains to be seen how effective these measures will be. However, it is clear that a cautious move is occurring to the implementation of a recognition based policy platform. This, however, requires further study as it evolves and matures before a full assertion can be made that a well-developed policy frame of recognition is being applied in the public cultural policy of Lyon.

5. Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated some of the issues encountered in the attempts of the EC and CoE's Intercultural Cities programme to formulate and apply a policy frame of recognition to new minorities in the context of Lyon. Key in this has been issues with European bodies with limited jurisdiction and resources attempting to foster policies that offer recognition to difference in a context that does not have previous experience of practising such policies explicitly at either the national or local level. As such, while some activities are taking place in Lyon as part of its membership of the ICP, it seems that the dominant administrative culture with which the programme is interfacing maintains the upper hand. Key in this has been a significant degree of apathy from local actors. As such, although Lyon has been in the programme for over six years, its Charter of Cultural Cooperation, ratified in its latest edition for the 2012–16 period, still does not commit some of the city's major institutions to engaging with new minorities. In addition, the ability of willing cultural institutions to engage is hampered by the fundamental and paradoxical geographical weakness of the ICP in Lyon. Here, the geographical boundaries of the programme are drawn in a way that reinforces the spatial segregation of the new minorities that it sets out to engage with, cutting them off from direct access to the programme. In addition, institutions that have attempted to use cooperation with existing local actors to bolster their engagement with new minorities have done so with mixed results with potentially negative implications for the treatment of diversity by reinforcing 'otherness'. Again, this is an unintended and paradoxical outcome of a commitment to a programme whose aims are the opposite of this. Given that Lyon spends around 20% of its annual budget on cultural output and institutions in one form or another, a significant allocation of municipal resources, how to better engage these actors in fostering a recognition-based policy frame for new minorities remains an important issue. Again, this comes back to difficulties inherent in attempting to challenge both a policy path dependency based on assimilation, and the related preferences of institutions and power hierarchies.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. *Marseille Espérance* brings together the leaders of Marseille's principle religious communities to discuss social issues and to mediate inter-communal disputes.
2. The *loi du 1er juillet 1901* regulates the creation of associations of more than two people who must be non-profit making and separate from both church and state.

References

Ahearne, J., ed. 2002. *French Cultural Policy Debates: A Reader*. London: Routledge.

Bleich, E. 2011. "Social Research and 'Race' Policy Framing in Britian and France." *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 13 (1): 59–74. doi:10.1111/j.1467-856X.2010.00439.x.

Borrel, C., and B. L'hommeau. 2010. *Etre né en France d'un parent immigré* [To be Born in France to an Immigrant Parent]. http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/document.asp?reg_id=0&ref_id=ip1287.

Brahm-Levey, G. 2012. "Interculturalism vs. Multiculturalism: A Distinction without a Difference?" *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 33 (2): 217–224. doi:10.1080/07256868.2012.649529.

Bulmer, S., and C. Radaelli. 2004. "The Europeanisation of National Policy?" Queens papers on Europeanisation (no. p0042), Queens University Belfast, Ireland.

Centre Des Musiques Traditionelles Rhone-Alps (CMTRA). 2012. *Official Website and Program of Events Past and Present*. http://www.cmtra.org/.

Centre Resource Prospective du Grand Lyon (CRPL). 2012. *Groupe Abraham de la Duchére* [The Abrahamic Group of la Duchére]. http://www.millenaire3.com/Affichage-de-la-ressource.122+M51a10fb25bd.0.html.

Council of Europe (CoE). 2008. *Intercultural Cities Joint Action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission, Lyon, France, March 2008*. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/Lyonprofile_en.pdf.

Council of Europe (CoE). 2012. *Projects and Policies that Help to Make Lyon a Lively Cultural City*. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/lyonprojets_EN.asp.

Dikec, M. 2007. *Badlands of the Republic: Space, Politics and Urban Policy*. London: Blackwell.

Doytcheva, M. 2007. *Une discrimination positive a la Française? Ethnicité et territoire dans les politiques de la ville* [A French Positive Discrimination? Ethnicity and Territory in Urban Politics]. Paris: Broché.

Duran, P. 2010. *Penser l'action publique* [Thinking about Public Action]. Paris: Broché.

Fête des lumières. 2013. *Programme Fête des lumières Lyon* [Programme of the Festival of Lights, Lyon] *6–9 Decembre 2013*. http://fetedeslumieres.event.orange.fr/Programme-complet_BD.pdf.

Gnedovsky, M. 2009. *Intercultural Cities Program Report on the Visit to Lyon*. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/GnedovskyICCLyonReport_en.pdf.

Hall, S., J. Evans, and S. Nixon. eds. 2013. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.

Hargreaves, A. 2007. *Multi-ethnic France: Immigration, Politics, Culture, and Society*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Hassenteufel, P. 2011. *Sociologie Politique: L'action Publique* [Political Sociology: Public Action]. Paris: Armand Colin.

Hooghe, L., ed. 1996. *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ireland, P. R. 1994. *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity: Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. doi:10.4159/harvard.9780674498839.

Knill, C. 2001. *The Europeanisation of National Administrations: Patterns of Institutional Change and Persistence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kraus, P. 2011. "The Politics of Complex Diversity: A European Perspective." *Ethnicities* 12 (3): 3–25. doi:10.1177/1468796811426952.

Lascoumes, P., and P. Le Galès. 2012. *Sociologie de l'action publique: Domaines et approaches*. Paris: Brochés.

Littler, J., and R. Naidoo. 2011. *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of* '*Race*'. London: Routledge.

Leveau, R., and C. Wihtol de Wenden. 2007. *Le Beurgeoisie: Les trois ages de la vie associative issue de l'immigration* [The 'Beurgeoisie': The Three Ages of Immigrant Associational Life]. Paris: CNRS.

Lorcerie, F. 2003. *L'école et le défi ethnicque: Education et intégration* [School and the Ethnic Challenge: Education and Integration]. Paris: Broché.

Martin, L. 2013. "La démocratisation de la culture en France: une ambition obsoléte? [The Democratisation of Culture in France: An Obsolete Ambition?]" In *Démocratiser la culture! Une histoire compare* [Democratise Culture! A Comparative History], edited by M. Poirrier. de politiques culturelles. http://tristan.u-bourgogne.fr/CGC/publications/democratiser_culture/Democratiser_culture.html.

Meer, N., and T. Modood. 2011. "How Does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism?" *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 32 (6): 1–22 doi:10.1080/07256868.2011.618266.

Mignot, D., A. Aguiléra, D. Bloy, D. Caubel, and J. Madre. 2013. "Urban Forms, Mobility and Segregation in France: A Lille-Lyon-Marseille Comparision." In *Dialogues in Urban and Regional Planning Volume 5*, edited by M. Hibbard, R. Freestone, and T. ølvin Sager, 163–186. London: Routledge.

Mitchell, K. 2011. "Marseille's Not for Burning: Comparative Networks of Integration and Exclusion in Two French Cities." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101 (2): 404–423. doi:10.1080/00045608.2010.545290.

Modood, T. 2007. *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. London: Polity Press.

Modood, T. 2010. *Still Not Easy Being British: Struggles for a Multicultural Citizenship*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Moore, D. 2001. *Ethnicité et Politique de la ville en France et en Grande-Bretagne* [Ethnicity and Urban Politics in France and Great Britian]. Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Musées Gadagne. 2013. *Les Minoritiés Religieuses a Lyon de Moyen Age a Nos Jours* [Religious Minorities in Lyon from the Middle Ages to the Present]. http://www.gadagne.musees.lyon.fr/index.php/histoire_fr/Histoire/Programmation/Conferences-colloques/Histoire-de-Lyon/Histoire-des-eglises-a-Lyon.

Pascual, J., E. Courouble, and J. Bonniel. 2009. "Interculturalism in the Cultural Policies of European Cities." Council of Europe. Accessed February 2, 2014. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/CULTURAL.policy_en.pdf.

Phillips, A. 2009. *Multiculturalism without Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Poirrier, 2013. *La Politique culturelle en débat: Anthologie 1955–2012* [Cultural Politics in Debate: An Anthology 1955–2012]. Paris: Comité d'histoire du Ministère de la culture/La Documentation française.

Raymond, G., and T. Modood. 2007. *The Construction of Minority Identities in France and Britain*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Richardson, J. ed. 2006. *European Union: Power and Policy-making*. London: Routledge.
Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
Taylor, C. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Uberoi, V., and T. Modood. 2013. "Inclusive Britishness: A Multiculturalist Advance." *Political Studies* 61 (1): 23–41. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00979.x.
Vertovec, S. 2007. "Super-diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6): 1024–1054. doi:10.1080/01419870701599465.
Ville de Lyon. 2011. *Our Cultures in the City Days Programme*. http://www.polville.lyon.fr/polville/sections/fr/les_thematiques/culture/les_journees_nos_cu/?aIndex=0.
Ville de Lyon. 2012. *Charte de Coopération Culturelle* [Charter of Cultural Cooperation]. http://www.polville.lyon.fr/static/polville/contenu/Culture/CHARTE%20%203.pdf.
Ville de Lyon. 2013. *Tout L'Monde Dehors 2014 direction des evenements et de l'animation* [Everyone Go out 2014 Direction of Events and Animation]. http://www.tlmd.lyon.fr/static/tlmd/contenu/TLMD%202014/Appel%20a%20projets%202014.pdf?&view_zoom=1.
Wacquant, L. 1992. "Banlieues françaises et ghetto noir américain: de l'amalgame à la comparaison [French Suburbs and the Black American Ghetto: Amalgam and Comparison]." *French Politics and Society* 10 (4): 81–103.
Wacquant, L. 2007. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Weber, E. 1976. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France*, 1870–1914. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Weil, P. 2008. *How to be French: Nationality in the Making since 1789*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Wihtol de Wenden, C. 2004. "Multiculturalism in France." In *Governance in Multicultural Societies*, edited by J. Rex and G. Singh, 70–80. London: Ashgate.
Wood, P. 2010. *Intercultural Cities, Towards a Model for Intercultural Integration: Insights from the Intercultural Cities Programm, Joint Action of the Council of Europe and the European Comission*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

DR JOSEPH DOWNING is Guest Teacher at the European Institute and LSE100 Fellow in Nationalism, London School of Economics and Political Science.
ADDRESS: European Institute, LSE, Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE, UK.
Email: j.s.downing@lse.ac.uk