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This thesis looks at how professionals and volunteers, who work in opposing racism organised under a network of NGOs and individuals, see the field of anti-racism. This is a qualitative study, in which I have conducted interviews and sent out a questionnaire to different anti-racists in order to obtain data. I have presented my findings on how my research group sees anti-racism and problems they face in the work through thorough quoting of the committed anti-racists.

Racism and its effect has been studied extensively for several years now and although racism studies almost exclusively have an anti-racist agenda, I think that also anti-racism needs to be theorised upon, in order to come up with new solutions for tackling racism, as it is difficult to see how different anti-racist projects affect society and what can be learnt from them.

My work is considered with anti-racism in Finland during, what I call a ‘transnational turn’, or a setting of increased immigration and consequences this generates in society. I present how immigration to Finland has taken place in recent years and also different forms of racism, besides these two main concepts, the thesis also deals with multiculturalism and multicultural anti-racism approaches.

I present theories concerning anti-racism and multiculturalism, and categorise my informant’s views on anti-racism within previous categories namely by Alistair Bonnett, as my material has not allowed me to create my own categories. However, I also try write an alternative interpretation of the material, that of radical anti-racism.
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1 INTRODUCTION

This is a study on the challenges of opposing racism in Finland experienced by a group of anti-racists. My work looks at the particular challenges of Finnish anti-racism, which is influenced by global trends in a global world where transnational relations are increasingly important. More precisely this thesis looks at how these challenges are experienced by a group of professionals and active volunteers, whom I call anti-racists, working in different organisations brought together by a network called RASMUS. However, before presenting my research question and setting more thoroughly I will give a brief account on how I have landed at this subject and why I feel it is of great importance in today’s multicultural society.

1.1 Why Anti-Racism?

While racism has been studied extensively, approaches on how to combat racism have been studied surprisingly little in comparison. The field of anti-racism has not been studied even remotely to the same extent as racism (e.g. Bonnett, 2000). However, most racism studies do include a chapter or some paragraphs on challenging racism. Some are more committed and are done not only explicitly, but also expressively in the name of anti-racism, or are carried out with an “anti-racist research agenda” (Rastas 2005 and 2007). In her doctoral dissertation Anna Rastas (2007, 56) states: “My motives to research racism as well as my methodological commitments bring forth a clear political agenda, anti-racism.” Rastas’ research is aimed at offering tools for preventing and opposing racism.

My objectives here are similar, as e.g. Rastas’, but I have chosen to approach anti-racists and to analyse their views on opposing racism instead of interacting with victims of racism. Without taking into account activities carried out in the name of anti-racism and the underlying reasoning for these, current ways of opposing racism cannot develop. This eventually leads the field of anti-racism and its theory and practice to be

---

1 Antirasistinen tutkimusote
reduced to a reactive measure, instead of being proactive and challenging the power hierarchies that lie beneath racism as well as improving the working methods while doing so. I hope this work will help in approaching the important work of anti-racism in at least to some extent new ways. Obviously both racism studies and anti-racism studies are needed in opposing racism, but the latter has until recently been highly undervalued. It is highly important for an anti-racist research agenda, which I aim, and for the presentation of my results to: “sensitively recognise when my own actions as researcher possibly reproduce racist or racism producing way of thinking and presenting, as well as when these are possible to challenge (Rastas 2007, 57).” This anti-racist research agenda thus also includes making interventions when necessary.

I strongly believe that anti-racism needs to be formulated as something more than merely the opposite of racism; a discourse of its own. This needs to be done in order for strategies opposing racism to be efficient. Racism will obviously play a part in constructing anti-racism research. However focusing merely on racism, how it is formed, experienced and built up in a particular society leaves out other important aspects such as equality, justice, democracy, empowerment (see Lentin 2004), which are ‘more’ than direct conceptual opposites of racism, and nevertheless needed for creating non-discriminatory societies. Anti-racism can not be approached without taking into account its goals and only focusing on it being the opposite of racism, otherwise racism is simplified and the multiple ways in which racism should and needs to be opposed are lost. Or simply, just as there are different racisms, also different anti-racisms need to be put in place.

Jari Aro (1999, 29) comes up with two reasons for doing research, either to progress science or to develop practices for the social world. My research is mainly concerned with analysing current anti-racisms in Finland and the aim to hopefully contribute in developing these approaches, which puts me mainly in the latter category as defined by Aro. However, as anti-racism has not been studied lengthily, I also hope that this thesis might bring some progress into how this field of research can be approached.

An example of the under-valuation of research within the field of anti-racism can be
found by typing “anti-racism” to the key word search in the library database such as that of my home university\(^2\). The query “anti-racism” gives merely seven results, while the query “racism” yields 151 search engine hits in several subcategories (e.g. racism in different countries). Similar results are found when going through the list of research conducted around the themes of racism and anti-racism in Finland on the RASMUS website\(^3\). Of the approximately 250 titles on the list, only eight include words such as antiracism, rasismin ehkäisemiseksi\(^4\) and Etnisen syrjinnän ja rasismin vastainen\(^5\). None of the studies includes the word antirasimi\(^6\). Although the title of a research naturally does not give the whole truth about its contents, the overwhelming number of studies (according to the title) on racism compared to that of anti-racism, supports Alastair Bonnett’s (2000) view on anti-racism being a field where there are a lot of new findings to make and approaches to take. Bonnett (2000, 2) writes: “Racism and ethnic discrimination are under continuous historical and sociological examination. But anti-racism is consigned to the status of a ‘cause’, fit only for platitudes of support or denouncement.” New approaches to practical anti-racism are difficult to come up with unless current practices and strategies are challenged and anti-racism is merely treated as a part of racism studies. I wish to participate in this challenge of anti-racism by this work.

Although elements of racism necessarily need to be identified in order for them to be challenged, readers should bear in mind that this is a study on anti-racism, and problems faced by and views expressed by people involved in the field, and not a study on racism. Many issues relevant in for example understanding how racism affects the individual will thus not be discussed in depth in this study. However, some key concepts arising from racism studies such as biological (also scientific or old) and cultural (also new) racism need to be defined in order to understand different anti-racism approaches. Old racism refers to the forms of racism where groups of people are categorised as inferior

\(^2\) [http://tamcat.linneanet.fi](http://tamcat.linneanet.fi)
\(^3\) [www.rasmus.fi](http://www.rasmus.fi)
\(^4\) To prevent racism
\(^5\) Opposing ethnic discrimination and racism
\(^6\) Anti-racism
to others based on genes and biology, whereas new racism is highly culturally relativist
and organises around (usually) ‘western culture' as being far superior to that of others.
Also the different forms and shapes that racism appears in, institutional racism,
ideological racism etc. are of interest when trying to describe the processes of
challenging racism. This terminology will be defined in the chapter Key Concepts and
Previous Research.

Anti-racisms, as are also racisms, are noted in specific places, namely within nation
states, which policies, and internal as well as external relations, are part of producing
racist discourses (Alana Lentin, 2004) where particular social practices are put in place.
Although there might be similarities in forms of oppression or power hierarchies, the
circumstances are never exactly the same in two states. In this work the particular state
which of importance when analysing anti-racism practices taking place within its
boundaries is Finland7. At the same time it is important to bear in mind that policies
affecting Finland are nowadays often defined on a European level and that capitalism
and its inequality-forming entrapping processes act on a global scale. As do also the
nets of vastly increasing transnational relations that are reshaping contemporary
societies.

Although many have foreshadowed the end of nation-states, they, in many ways, still
seem to be guiding stars for people all over the world, and even more importantly have
been that more or less for the last some hundred years. Nation-states and power
hierarchies within them also plays a key role in constructing ‘others’ and is thus closely
related to racism and challenging it. Some researchers see the (e.g. Lentin, 2004) the
state, or more specifically the historically grounded political climate within nation-
states, as the key factor in upholding racism. Lentin (2004, 37) considers, nation-states
to have been the main organisational structure in creating “the acceptance of ‘race’ as a
fundamental organisational principle of national societies by the end of the nineteenth
century.” This according to Lentin (2004, 37) the organisational principle “…is related

7 Due to this, many of my sources are in Finnish, which means that I have done a lot of translation work
in this thesis. Quotes for titles in Finnish or Swedish, as well as for interviews are translated by author,
and the correctness of them solely the responsibility of the author.
to the internal rationalisation of populations and in a second step, the external fortification of the nation-states in which they lived.” This may well be a strong factor for Finnish racisms, as Finland was a highly homogenous society up until the 1990s (see chapter 3) and demographic changes in the population base have been close to exponential since. Several researchers, e.g. Rastas (2005), Outi Lepola (2000) or Tuomas Martikainen, Teppo Sintonen and Pirkko Pitkänen (2006) consider it motivated to approach racisms present in Finnish society as phenomena related to increased immigration since the 1990s.

Studying anti-racism is of crucial importance in Finland, as racist crime is on the rise (see chapter 3.2), and attitudes towards immigrants and people representing different ‘races’ are often hostile, especially so amongst youth. A 2006 study, conducted by Heikki Ervasti in the city of Turku shows that one third of adolescents think that there are: “differences in intelligence based on race [sic].” The shocking attitudes presented in the survey further shows the urgent need for action.

I have had a keen interest in challenging racism for many years. This makes studying the subject highly interesting as well as challenging when trying to be analytical about issues that I have a strong personal conviction about. Hence, research ethics, positioning myself and methodology which I discuss in chapter 5 is of great importance in this work. However, no matter how well I position myself, this is a study with a political aim; to reflect over how some of the ways of challenging racism in Finland, and to present some of the approaches to this topic is as well as some of the challenges in the field. Thus I have an aspiration to develop the work against racism.

Anti-racism is closely linked to multiculturalism and the multi-cultural society, as ‘new racism’ takes the form of comparing ‘cultures’ more than ‘race’ and as this multi-cultural society is a key factor in explaining and mapping racism as stated above. This work looks at the links between this terminology and how anti-racism activities are made up in Finland. Key concepts are defined in chapter two, leading way to the third chapter where my research setting and starting point is defined. The empirical material of this study, which comprises of a variety of data collected namely through half-
structured thematic interviews with people representing networks and NGOs involved in anti-racism and a questionnaire, is presented in chapter 6. The material I have obtained gives me an opportunity to evaluate how well specific theories on racism, anti-racism and multicultural society are suited to explain certain “facts on the ground”. In other words, my data aims to show how self-define themselves as anti-racists see challenging racism in Finland and what hinders or obstacles they face in carrying out their activities. My research process and data collection are described in detail in chapter five, after first presenting my theoretical and methodical approaches in chapter four. Discussing the present struggles and comparing them to existing theories formed on racism and anti-racism will then offer my view on how specific racisms present in Finland should be tackled and eventually bring something new into the discussion around this topic. This will be done in chapter six, where I analyse my data, and then lastly arrive at my conclusions. However, before all of this, I will present my ‘field of study’ more closely.

1.2 RASMUS Network as ‘the Field’ of Research

Before establishing key concepts of this study, I will present ‘the field’ where my research takes place, a network of anti-racism actors within civil society in Finland. This study looks at how civil society organisations involved in challenging racism prevalent in Finnish society – knit together under a particular network; RASMUS – see their work and its challenges. More precisely, the aim of my study is to advocate efficient anti-racism action while mapping challenges within the field of anti-racism in Finland and obtain ‘insider’ views on the work against racism carried out by a particular group of civil society actors. There are numerous actors in Finland defining themselves as anti-racist or as promoters of multiculturalism. A great number of these actors are organisations that play more or less active role in different activities organised under the RASMUS Network, the only wider network as of now in Finland:

---

8 In the 1990s there for example a youth network called Antifa working on these issues, but it stopped functioning in the mid- to late-90s depending on its geographical location. When RASMUS was founded, the urgent need for a network for opposing racism was evident through e.g. the great number of people and organisations attending the founding meeting.
Network against Racism and Xenophobia, a nationwide Finnish network of actors that works against racism and promotes multiculturalism. The Network is composed of NGOs, immigrant societies, religious communities, labour market organisations, government officials, researchers, artists and private individuals. The RASMUS Network is open to everyone. It is not a registered association and has no governing body, but instead a steering group composed of actors committed to the Network. The Finnish League of Human Rights acts as the co-ordinating body of the RASMUS Network.


The network is also the primary forum for cooperation between the different anti-racists according to almost everyone I have interviewed or who have answered my questionnaire. By approaching my research through looking at this network I will be able to get an insight of different groups working against racism in Finland. Although looking at different activities conducted by different actors loosely or tightly bound to this network. The network which was founded in 2002\(^9\) states its mission as:

Many actors carry out valuable work for against racism in Finland. It is vital that actors from different sectors of society work together in the common battle towards a society free from racism and discrimination. By bringing together the resources and know-how of different actors, we stand firm against racism and ethnic discrimination on all levels of society, in any shape or form.


In the founding meeting the network defined its tasks as following:

* To monitor issues related to racism and multiculturalism in Finland and internationally
* To increase information dissemination and cooperation between actors.
* To take initiative and give support in new ways of action.
* To act as a common channel for reaching politicians, authorities and others
* To increase dialogue between different ethnic groups\(^10\)
* To support the normalisation of multiculturalism and to increase the possibility of influence for ethnic minorities.


---


\(^10\) Kansanryhmien
The network is comprised of local groups that bring together actors working on following or challenging racism in a particular area or region. Much of the information on challenging racism in Finland carried out under the local groups or other actors is advertised in a newsletter published by the network. According to the RASMUS webpage\textsuperscript{11}, there are at the moment local groups active in Kajaani, Kouvola, Seinäjoki, Tampere, Turku and Helsinki-region. Further, the network comprises of the thematic groups: RASMUS Artists, RASMUS Children and Youth, RASMUS Researchers and RASMUS Women. All the groups have a coordinator or contact person to organise around the regional or thematic lines mentioned above. The groups and the electronic newsletter of the network are described as follows in the English language brochure:

\begin{itemize}
  \item **RASMUS Researchers**
  is a national network of researchers interested in studying racism. Researchers involved discuss the requirements and development needs of research into racism both through their own e-mail list and in meetings and seminars.

  \item **RASMUS Children and Youth**
  targets everyone interested in matters related to racism that has an effect on the lives of children and young people. The group aims to increase the abilities and knowledge of the participants and to find means to recognise and resist racism and discrimination.

  \item **RASMUS Women Network**
  is open to everyone who is interested. The aim is to promote the participation in society by women belonging to minorities.

  \item **RASMUS newsletter**
  The RASMUS electronic newsletter includes information on events related to racism and multiculturalism. You can order the newsletter by sending your contact details to info@rasmus.fi.

  \begin{verbatim}
  http://www.rasmus.fi/view_wysiwyg_attach/Rasmus_English.pdf?id=155
  (retrieved on 20.10.2007)
  \end{verbatim}
\end{itemize}

RASMUS network organises an annual Week against Racism around 21\textsuperscript{st} of March, the International Day against Racism proclaimed by the United Nations, as its main activity. In the summer time the network has also arranged multicultural sports events. Themes for the week have been: “Imagine a world without difference\textsuperscript{12}” in 2006 and “name-calling” in 2007. According to the Annual Reports (2006 and 2007) by RASMUS

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{11}] http://rasmus.fi/page_view?p=124&l=1&s=6&t=1, retrieved on 15.11.2007
  \item[\textsuperscript{12}] Kuvittele maailma ilman erilaisuutta.
\end{itemize}
network, the Tampere local group has been most active in these. Annual events in Tampere constitute a seminar organised together with the city, a multicultural fashion show, Rock against Racism etc. The main event of the week is a concert against racism in Helsinki.

The multiple areas and perspectives within RASMUS, makes it an interesting study object that encompasses a wide range of organisations in Finland that define themselves as opposing racism. Further, since the network was founded in 2002, it has given me a time perspective to work with. RASMUS has up until now been coordinated by The Finnish League for Human Rights, which has also published reports on racism in Finland since 2000. These reports have given me an overview of some of the different forms racism takes in Finland as well as provided me with useful background information on previous research conducted on, and challenges within, the field of anti-racism in Finland. The League for Human Rights works with the help of a steering group consisting of 29 organisations which are involved in RASMUS work. However, I wish to emphasise that this is not only a study of the network as a social movement or similar, but a study of the different actors opposing racism in Finland and their views on and experiences of anti-racism in Finland. The network has been a catalyst for me to obtain my material and to generate a broader knowledge of opposing racism in Finland than I would have been able to come up with if approaching e.g. different organisations that are not in any way linked. This was clearly seen while conducting my interviews, as all of my informants mentioned names of at least some of the other people or organisations I interviewed. However, as RASMUS is not my research object as such, but a common denominator for the anti-racists I have interviewed, I will not include

---

13 Circa 130 persons with a wide variety of backgrounds attended the founding meeting (http://rasmus.fi/view_wysiwyg_attach/l%40sn%E4ololista.doc?id=3, retrieved on 20.10.2007). Until 2007 about 30 organisations remain part of the Rasmus support group (http://rasmus.fi/page_view?p=72&l=1&s=6&t=1) that offers support to the network and its coordinating party which since the founding of the network has been The Finnish League for Human Rights.

14 Rasismi ja etninen syrjintä Suomessa 2005, Rasismi ja etninen syrjintä Suomessa 2004 (Racism and Ethnic Discrimination in Finland), and Rasismi Suomessa 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 (Racism in Finland). In 2007 the report was called Discrimination in Finland 2006, and included also other forms of discrimination besides ethnic discrimination and racism.
social movement theories in this work. I am studying a myriad of different actors within the network and not the network nor its concrete mobilisations as such. There are, limitations in my study stemming from the fact that I’m choosing one network and as my object of study. E.g. one person who emailed a response to the questionnaire (Appendix 1) I sent out stated:\(^{15}\):

The most efficient anti-racism has for years been carried out by people who do not represent, or do not want to label themselves as representing any organisation in this work.

Based on your first question, one can assume, that your thesis might be merely a bleak picture of want antiracism in Finland comprises of.

Of late it has been fashionable that all political parties and different organisations are polishing their image through anti-racism. Even the True Finns\(^ {16}\) have signed an antiracism contract with the other parties.

How efficient has this work in reality been? Probably not very, as these new and also many of the older actors in the field do not know there opponents, organised racists.

All kinds of official statements can be made, but the truth is that over the last years e.g. racist crime has gotten out of hand.

The respondent indicates that populist right wing parties can not have an anti-racist agenda. Hence it is important to keep in mind that all who define themselves as anti-racists are not necessarily that when looking at the facts on the ground. The second important point the above respondent makes, when referring to individuals who are not or do not want to be part of any organisation is the question of anti-authoritarianism, which for some anti-racists is highly important\(^ {17}\). For the sake of limiting the scope of my work, this study will only include actors working under the RASMUS network where most actors are members of organisations and often representing the organisations in the network. This study will thus not reach people who do anti-racist work and have decided to organise in a different way, nor does it reach everyday resistance where individuals stand up for others e.g. on school playgrounds, at workplaces, in the street or anywhere else. Thirdly, the respondent raises the question

\(^{15}\) All answers to questionnaire, discussions and interviews as well as other documents are translated from Finnish to English by author.

\(^{16}\) Perussuomalaiset, a populist right wing party.

\(^{17}\) E.g. autonomous or anarchist groups
on whether or not the NGOs and other actors that are working under RASMUS are aware of the tactics of organised racists that need to be challenged. However, this is a question I cannot directly answer within the scope of this research. I will however state, that there have been studies on active racism e.g. a book by Vesa Puuronen (ed., 2001) and several others on racist skinheads in Joensuu which anyone can apply when establishing an agenda on how to challenge racism. I will also present views on why some approaches are not necessarily effective in challenging racism.

Political youth organisations (none of which responded to my questionnaire) are also excluded from this study. Mainly because Miikka Pyykkönen’s study *Monikulttuurisuus suomalaisten nuorisojärjestöjen toiminnassa*, published in 2007, covers the field extensively and I feel I do not have the resources here to accumulate the knowledge of that study.

### 1.3 Research Question

Before moving on to previous research surrounding my topic and the theoretical background of this work, I will sharpen my research question from the wider speculations above.

In this work I present theories concerning anti-racism and multiculturalism, namely presented by Alistair Bonnett, Stuart Hall and Floya Anthias, and ask the question: Can the Finnish anti-racists’ views surrounding their social activism be categorised along the lines of anti-racisms presented elsewhere (Bonnett, 2000 and chapter 2.3)?

I further try to answer how different views on multiculturalism (chapter 2.2) play a role in formulating the anti-racist approaches taken by my informants. Is ‘multicultural education’ or a ‘general multicultural approach’ necessarily something that reduces racism? I feel that it is important to deconstruct the ‘multiculturalism’, as it in recent years has become a term to be used widely across the political spectrum, with a number of different meanings. I wish to show that without defining the concept thoroughly it is
just an empty word that might take up even opposite meanings depending on the spokesperson.

In order to answer the above questions thoroughly, I am very interested in what the structural hinders or obstacles in practicing anti-racism are? That is, what are the forms of racism that should be challenged and how is the work organised and funded?

Whether or not the approaches taken within the RASMUS network, can challenge racism at large is a question outside the scope of my research. However, answering the above questions, on how RASMUS’ approaches fit in to a wider theoretical discussion around the matter is a starting point and also the aim of this study.
2 KEY CONCEPTS AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Aside from defining racism (and anti-racism) with terms such as biological and cultural racism (see introduction), several other terms are relevant to my study. Multiculturalism and its relation to anti-racism is a critical issue that I discuss in the theoretical as well as the empirical part of this study. Päivi Harinen and Leena Suurpää (2004) in a memorandum on Youth politics have stated that promoting multiculturalism automatically makes up anti-racism, In this study I look at how these two terms are intertwined and aim to conceptualise their relationship by going through previous studies. Further, both terms are present in the majority of my empirical material as well which makes defining my terminology crucial and something I wish to do before embark on the path of presenting my empirical material.

2.1 Racism as Ideology, Action and Consequence

In order to thoroughly understand the research subject, anti-racism, it is obviously of high importance to define racism as well. Although I have stated anti-racism to be a social phenomena to be theorised on its own and not merely as the opposite of racism, these two concepts are however always intertwined, as the political project of anti-racism would not exist without the subordination, domination and exclusion created by racism. Important to note is that although using the word “racism” it can mean numerous different things, as well as can many other words related to it. Hence, the titles of the three next chapters are in plural. I will start this discussion with more practical notions and develop into more theoretical ones. However, as racism is not my topic, I will not write in depth, but introduce what is meant by racism in this study in order to move on to my actual topic; opposing racism. Thus, numerous concepts, terms etc. used when explaining racism are not included here and I am not describing e.g. ‘ethnicity’ (Huttunen, 2005), ‘whiteness’ (Rastas, 2005) or other categories in detail, although necessarily giving a brief overview of them, as these concepts are intertwined with more relevant issues regarding this study.
The reports *Rasismi Suomessa* (2000-2003) and *Rasismi ja etninen syrjintä Suomessa 2004* and 2005 published annually by the Finnish League for Human Rights have provided me with a useful starting point in defining my key concepts. Mikko Joronen and Annamari Salonen in the introduction to their article *Rasismi ja etninen syrjintä – ajatuksia ja tekoja* in the *Rasismi ja etninen syrjintä Suomessa 2005* -report state:

Defining something that happened, an experience or a situation as racism always depends on the interpreter. There is a strong value-mediation in the word racism which plays a role in why it is so difficult to deal with it. On one hand the use of the charged term racism is avoided but on the other hand it is exaggerated, while describing *e.g.* ageism as age-racism.

Joronen and Salonen (2006, 15)

When something is difficult to discuss it is necessarily difficult to challenge, which further makes my research topic an interesting subject to dwell upon. When issues which are clearly related to one social phenomenon (*e.g.* racism) are described as something else, understanding them becomes vastly more difficult. To shed some light upon this issue, Joronen and Salonen, describe different forms racism can take with the help of a threefold typology; racism as ideology, racism as action and racism as consequence, developed by Timo Makkonen in the *Rasismi Suomessa 2000* -report. This typology is highly useful for me as well, so I will describe it thoroughly.

1) Racism as ideology: racism has traditionally meant an ideology according to which people can be divided into races which define biological and social qualities. Although science decades ago have shown that humanity can not be divided into races, neither the term nor racism based on the concept of race has ceased to exist. A newer form of racist ideology emphasises culture instead of “race” as the differentiator between people. … In this form of cultural racism, differentiating between cultures is described as natural, while supporting the statement through interpreting culture as an absolute and unchangeable category. One should however bear in mind that valuing people based on “race” or culture is not always separable, and that the outcome doesn’t really change. … People who might take distance from traditional racism might support the idea that some cultures are not capable of living side by side with “our” culture …

2) Racism as action: … racism as action, defines an action which is specifically and knowingly conducted in order to deny or endanger a person’s or group’s rights due to the groups actual or imagined characteristics. There are two main types of racist action: ‘traditional racism’ oppresses and cultural racism excludes.

---

18 *Racism and Ethnic Discrimination – Thoughts and Deeds*
3) Racism as consequence\textsuperscript{19}: … Different procedures, functions and societal structures may produce inequality which may leave certain groups without specific benefits or otherwise put them in lesser position. \textit{E.g.} immigrants might be put in a much worse situation on the labour market if they are not provided possibilities to study Finnish or if their educational background is not recognised in Finland. This form of racism doesn’t necessarily require a racist motive. Institutional racism appears in the state bureaucracy and its structures.

Joronen and Salonen (2006, 15 – 17)

It seems obvious that these different forms of racism can not be challenged in the same way, as they and the outcomes of them are of different type. Often racism is also simplified to encompass only one or two of the above categories. Especially anti-anti-racists\textsuperscript{20} are eager not to accept the existence of racism as a consequence, or even try to turn the situation upside down when criticising equal opportunities policies or similar. Therefore it is of great importance to build up different forms of anti-racist strategies when opposing different forms of racism.

The different shapes that racisms take within the setting of a particular racism are at the core also when analysing (old) racism as an anomaly, which it very much should be as the concept of race has been widely discredited on numerous occasions since UNESCO published its booklet \textit{Four Statements on the Race Question} in 1969. On the other hand the separation between old and new, biological and cultural racism is a very fine line. Hence, these anomalies of biological racisms to much extent are still present, and often well masked under the umbrella of culture. Further, the experience of racism doesn’t vary whether it is formulated, takes place behind closed doors or hinders a person based

\textsuperscript{19} Olosuhde. I have tried to give full justice to the terminology used by Makkonen by this translation, instead of using the word structure. This also practical as the word structural racism appears on numerous occasions in this thesis.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{E.g.} exerts from “Citizens Statement for the Kukkia kriittisille –campaign”, “that wishes to present anti-racism as just as problematic as racism” (http://www.suomensisu.org/content/view/65/77/):

“\textbf{What is anti-racism?} Anti-racisms blame people or even state institutions for being racists. However, anti-racists are doing exactly the same thing as they are blaming others for, while ordinary people usually act tolerantly, and in Finland highly tolerantly. Anti-racists discriminate and diminish their own nation and traditions at the cost of others. Anti-racist action praises real or fictive victims of ‘racism’ as better than others… Anti-racism is discrimination of the majority. [sic]”
on issues of ‘race’ or ‘culture’. Rastas in her 2005 article *Rasismi, oppeja, asenteita, toimintaa ja seurauksia*\(^2\) describes the flaws in differentiating between old and new racism. Firstly, the talk about new racism easily misleads one into thinking that new racism would have replaced old racism. However, as Rastas puts forth:

> Old scientifically based racist thought has not disappeared as have not racist acts stemming from these, although legislation and political correctness to some extent prevent these from taking place. Further, it is very difficult to know when, people in their speech and acts are referring to biological difference or when they are referring to cultural difference.

Rastas (2005, 77)

The second flaw in the classification of cultural racism that Rastas (2005, 78) brings up, is the fact, that although some racist discourses are referring to ‘cultures’, this culture-speak is still aimed at individuals who “look a certain way.”\(^2\) Further, noticing differences, thought of as biological, such as skin colour and assigning meanings to them are also culturally relativist.” As this categorisation of old and new racism clearly is problematic new ways of theorising racism studies have been brought about. Rastas writes that racism studies have started to focus more on essentialist thoughts and actions. In her own doctoral dissertation (2007) Rastas has tried to challenge the ‘explanation of culture’, as she has chosen ‘culturally competent’ children and youth as her informant group. Her study group consists of “transnational youth and children”, who are children either adopted to Finland from another region or who have one ‘non-white’ parent, and thus appear ‘foreign’. When studying a target group like this, where cultural competences are the same as for the ‘majority’ in the surrounding society, discrimination, can accurately be narrowed down to clear cut racism.

The above essentialism of ‘other cultures’ has been theorised upon by Pnina Werbner (1997) in the introduction to *Debating Cultural Hybridity – Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. The starting point for Werbner is that magnetism and sensuality of the racialised physical other, leads to an ambivalent position where there is no clear difference between racism and ethnicity, between essentialising discourses of

\(^2\) *Rasism, teachings, attitudes actions and consequences.*

\(^2\) In other words have darker skin colour.
otherness and multicultural identities. Werbner (1997, 16) writes: “Against this conflation of racism with ethnicity, we interrogate here the difference between a shifting, hybridising politics of cultural multiplicity and racism as a violating, exclusionary process of essentialism that ultimately seeks to negate ambivalence.” If culture is sited and negotiated as Werbner claims, this according to her leads to “the possibility of new positive, ethnic, anti-racist identity fusions, transcending fragmentation and beyond cyborg politics.” The core of this cyborg politics is to: “open up borders between differences in ideology, culture, identity, and social positioning.” This is highly important when challenging an issue such as racism which is all pervasive and present in all strata of society, and society itself. Werbner continues in formulating her post-modern position with defining a new post-modern freedom as: “recognising the rights of all – of strangers qua individuals – while at the same time denying the right of anyone to define who strangers are.” This thinking efficiently challenges much racist reasoning or roots for it and also ways of separating people into ‘us’ and ‘them’ (see Rastas 2005), but on the other hand it also leaves room for critique. One criticist of the post-modern perspective is Alana Lentin (2004, 35-36) who states, that this “persistence of racism beyond the Shoah and the official refutation of ‘race’, for many, beg analyses of racism as perennial, or even primordial. In such thought even state policies are reduced to the actions of individual governments and therefore considered in purely behavioural terms.” By doing so the criticism of racist practices within states and especially institutionalised discrimination and violence is: “often thwarted by a depoliticised discourse which culturalises, psychologises, and individualises them so as to relegate them to societal margins [within the state]. (Lentin, 2004, 36)” One of the challenges for different anti-racisms is to politicise these issues of institutional discrimination as come to terms with the issue of ‘primordial sentiments or thoughts'. E.g. Étienne Balibar has done so in developing the concept of “European

23 “Cyborg politics is a term drawn from Haraway’s mythological text to define a politics that seeks to build non-hegemonic resistance movements out of respect for the intersecting particularities of multiple identity positions” (Werbner, 1997, 8)

24 According to the Shoah Resource Centre, this notion became the standard Hebrew word for describing the holocaust in the 1940s http://www1.yadvashem.org/Odot/prog/index_before_change_table.asp?gate=0-2
Apartheid”, when discussing border control in Europe in: We the people of Europe? – Reflections on Transnational Citizenship (2003). Much of contemporary detention centre, immigration right and no-border activistisms around Europe are centred on similar ideas and use similar rhetoric.

When opening up borders between different ideologies, social positioning etc. as suggested above, one important element of racism; class, is often left out of the discussion. As mentioned above, this is not a study on racism, nor on racism and class (although these concepts will play a role in my analysis), so mentioning that this certainly is an issue in challenging racism will do for now. Racism as class struggle is challenging for me as this study looks at an open network (see chapter 4) consisting of numerous actors, representing vastly different political viewpoints and class positions. However, this certainly does not mean that minorities relevant for anti-racism work in Finland would not face hardships socio-economically or, that a non-class conscious anti-racism could not be efficient on some accounts.

This introduction to the topic of racism and what it means in this study, can be concluded as follows: racism is the construction of ‘others’, and the consequences of this, based on genetic or ‘cultural’ traits which are primarily defined by ethnic or phenotypical markers as well as the inequalities that these constructions bring about. In this thinking ‘white’ (Rastas, 2004 and Bonnett, 1997) is the norm that is often seen to exist as a category outside categorisation. Next I will look into multiculturalisms before approaching anti-racisms in the light of these two related concepts.

2.2 Multiculturalisms in a Multi-Cultural Society

This research is taking place in a society that by many and in many different ways is deemed multicultural. Finland has changed from a population-wise relatively homogenous country\textsuperscript{25} to a diverse state due to increased immigration (see chapter 3.1).

\textsuperscript{25} Some might disagree on this, as there are so called old minorities in Finland. However, as my starting point is that increased immigration has changed the racism prevalent in Finland, and brought it up for a
The challenge in discussing multiculturalisms is obvious and stemming from the above discussion around ‘cultural racism’. How can (multi)culture be discussed without it being a highly essentialising category that assigns people to categories that imaginatively or *de facto* possess or lack certain characteristics or behave in a certain way? Answering this is a key factor in challenging racism as consequence in e.g. administration and essentialising cultural racism as ideology where people are seen as representing a certain culture and their whole being, acts and motives are explained based on that categorisation.

In his article *The Multicultural Question* (2000) Stuart Hall draws a distinction between what he calls ‘multi-cultural’ and ‘multiculturalism’. He describes the former as an adjective describing an on hand situation and the latter as a substantive depicting policies, orientations and models of managing “diversity and multiplicity which multi-cultural societies throw up (Hall 2000, 209).” In this thesis, the former thus refers to the setting and the latter to the topic of my research. Important to bear in mind, is the fact that multi-cultural can mean a number of different things, and that this work looks upon its appearance within Finland and social phenomena arising from that. Managing diversity is also not necessarily anything that brings about positive consequences for individuals. Hence multiculturalism should not be seen as a positive (or negative) category *per se*, but one that should be analysed and deconstructed as any other category in order to gain a more thorough understanding of it. In order to get to the core or essence of the term multiculturalism, one needs to understand, that it does not refer to a single set of policies or a political system. Hence also the title of this chapter is multiculturalisms. Hall (2000) lists a number of different multiculturalisms ranging from conservative, corporate or pluralist multiculturalism to ‘revolutionary’ multiculturalism “which foregrounds power, privilege, the hierarchy of oppressions and the movements of resistance” as tools to analyse the social reality. However, before discussing either the concept of multi-cultural or multiculturalism in detail, we need to define the concept of culture, a highly challenging task to do.

discussion in a completely new way, I will argue that Finland has been relatively homogenous up until recently.
As Hall writes, the word ‘culture’ is derived from a Latin word, and means to cultivate, that is to create life. In this context we should take the origin of the word to a different level, to create social life as both ‘multi-cultural’ and ‘multiculturalism’ are terms used to describe either regulating social interaction or a de facto situation in society. Derived from culture, the term acculturation, which means becoming competent within a culture or growing to be a part of it, is also interesting from a multiculturalism perspective. As multiculturalism is necessarily heterogeneous, as Hall points out, how is acculturation then to be carried out and into what ‘culture’? And even more importantly, who is to define how and into what an individual should be acculturated? Is the whole concept of acculturation needed, or are hybridity and hybrid identities more useful in coming up with solutions for multi-cultural societies. These are some of the core problems to be solved when discussing multi-cultural societies based on different forms of multiculturalism. According to Martikainen, Sintonen and Pitkänen (2006) the important thing in this context of analysing multi-cultural societies is the anthropological view of culture, which is an abstract system comprised of both invisible and visible traits. They differentiate between a traditional and a post-modern view, which they do according to Clifford Geertz’s definition of culture. According to the post-modern view, culture is seen as “an ongoing never-ending process which is constructed through social negotiations” (Martikainen et al. 2006, 13). Something that is highly important to bear in mind is that the outcome of negotiations varies greatly according to hierarchies. And here lies one of the challenges for anti-racism.

Päivi Harinen and Leena Suurpää (2004) write that promoting multiculturalism is also always opposing racism. In their memorandum, they state far too many immigrant youth have adopted the position that racism is a part of everyday life, which one needs to learn how to live with, while they also stress the point that experienced racism is a highly difficult issue to discuss or express. However, Harinen and Suurpää (2004, 2) also express that “promoting multiculturalism or integration of specific ethnic groups, although a central aspect of building an equal society, is not enough for a responsible multiculturalist youth policy. More focus should be put on actively opposing the

---

26 Martikainen et al. label their discussion of culture as a key concept in ethnicity research.
everyday racism that youth face.” Similar discussions around multiculturalism are prevalent in Finnish society, and racism is often reduced to the question of individual attitudes and discussing tolerance instead of racism, as e.g. Pyykkönen (2007, 76) writes: “Most of the organizations and associations participating in this study, in the context of youth activities, would like to speak of tolerance rather than racism.” Pyykkönen’s study includes answers from 146 organisations, which makes it quite a huge sample of Finnish youth organisations.

In a study looking at the margins of society and social exclusion (Suutari and Suurpää, 2001, 5) interesting results come up in regard to this tolerance: “The central tension regarding attitudes in Finland as negotiated through small town communality as follows: racist sentiments break the norms of tolerance, while they try to maintain that hostile attitudes towards immigrants have a broader support in Finnish society.” Tolerance is seen as the norm and not racism, although it is an existing social phenomenon in every society in the world. And then as racism is categorised as a deviance the whole phenomena is reduced to individual sentiments instead of a racist society. This makes racism more difficult to tackle and a cause of individual cases that can be solved with particular short-lived projects. In the light of Bonnett’s categorisation of racisms (chapter 2.3) seeing racism as breaking the tolerance in society reflects the liberal tradition where ”racism is regarded as a destabilising influence upon ‘good community relations’, ‘social cohesion’ and ‘national unity’ (Bonnett, 2000, 5).”

In Finland the tradition of ”liberal multiculturalism”, thus seems to be the norm together with, what Hall (2000) deems a ”commercial multiculturalism”. The latter can be located e.g. in the Government Migration Policy Paper27 (2006, 14) where economic growth through immigration is emphasised:

Good ethnic relations between population groups are vital in a society respecting human rights. Multiculturalism and equality, irrespective of ethnic origin, are also important competition and pull factors when striving to promote work-related immigration. A multicultural work community and business environment can act as a major growth platform for innovation. Promoting relations between different population groups also strengthens equality between national minorities in Finland such as the Roma and Sámi and prevents discrimination against such groups.

27 Hallituksen maahanmuuttopoliittinen ohjema (2006)
In these multiculturalisms lies the challenge of much of contemporary anti-racism; when is promoting multiculturalism anti-racism? And when so, how can racisms be dissected into various pieces that have their own specific reason and eventually a solution that disintegrates them as well?

Another highly important aspect when discussing multiculturalisms and the multicultural society is the power to define. How can the above notion of post-modern freedom, the exclusion of power to define be included in multiculturalism, when assigning individuals to its sphere very easily becomes essentialising at least to some extent? This of course is especially relevant for youth trying to find their place in society and in relation to family norms in the intersection of different ‘cultures’. Hence, there are people who feel the whole concept of culture needs to be thoroughly challenged. Ulf Hannerz in his essay *Reflections on varieties of culturespeak* (1999, 396) writes: “In anthropology, there have recently been some number of scholars who for various, but partly political reasons, have felt that we would be better off without the culture concept, precisely because it may give too much emphasis to difference, and thereby could indeed lend support to cultural fundamentalist tendencies.” However, Hannerz himself feels that doing away with the concept of culture would not do away with the aforementioned problems. Rather, Hannerz (1999, 397) suggests keeping “a critical eye on the varieties of culturespeak both among ourselves [researchers] and in society at large – and to try to blow our whistles when usage seems questionable or even pernicious.” This is also one of the key aspects if multiculturalism is to be anti-racist as Harinen and Suurpää suggest. Comments where ‘culture’ is used to essentialise people, need to be done away with, and questioning the concept itself is highly relevant in doing so.

Hall’s foregrounding of power and privilege above, is very much present in Floya Anthias (2002) article *Beyond Feminism and Multiculturalism: Locating the Difference and the Politics of Location*. She looks at “different forms of oppression on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity and class”, which presents us with a whole different situation, while introducing many new terms into our debate. Anthias claims that (‘white’) women
as oppressed are also oppressors when measured on ‘a different scale’ that is looking at
*e.g.* ‘race’ instead of gender. Further she argues that the project of feminism cannot
succeed unless also other disparities are done away with. Tackling this should,
according to Anthias, be done by positioning oneself translocationally, according to
specific situations where different roles are played:

A translocational positionality is one structured by the interplay of the
different locations and their (at times) *contradictory* effects. The
“translocational” acts to fissure the certainties of fixed singular locations by
constructing potentially contradictory positionalities. The individuals that are
placed in each category may occupy a different position in the other
categories. …

The focus on location and positionality (and translocational positionality)
avoids assumptions about subjective processes on the one hand and
culturalist forms of determinism on the other. Moreover, it acknowledges that
identification is an enactment that does not entail fixity or permanence, as
well as the role of the local and the contextual in the processes involved. It
becomes possible to pay attention to spatial and contextual dimensions,
treating the issues involved in terms of processes rather than possessive
properties of individuals.

Anthias (2002, 276)

The different forms of oppression presented in Anthias’ text must all be approached
differently. As for my work, where I am mainly concerned with racism and not
primarily other forms of dominance, an interesting idea is to approach also different
forms of racism from different positions or locations based on the form of racism
attacked. Thus racism as ideology should not be challenged in the same way as racism
as consequence or action or *vice versa*.

Ulf Hannerz (1999) presents various uses of the concept of ‘culture’ and ideas on how
to do away with discourses about different ‘cultures clashing’ or ‘culture conflict’. Other uses that he brings up are *e.g.* the ‘cultural celebrationism’ linked to fine art, often
referred to as culture and that of ‘multiculturalism’. Hannerz (1999, 397) sees
multiculturalism to be a heterogeneous concept with the common denominator of
linkage between ‘culture’ and ‘power’: “A collectivity of some sort – mostly, but not
always ethnically or racially defined.” The interrelation between culture and ‘race’ thus

---

28 Hannerz criticises Samuel P. Huntington’s widely debated article *The Clash of Civilisations*?
becomes difficult to challenge as they are intertwined. The difficulty of challenging meanings as well as direct consequences in peoples’ lives is even clearer when including more interrelated terminology to the discussion.

We need to understand how presenting ‘race’ affects ‘ethnicity’ or ‘culture’ and how class and gender aspects play into this, in order prevent production of essentialising stereotypes of ‘others’ based on either ‘culture’ or on biology for that matter. To create a multi-cultural society based on the idea of equal rights, categorisation of people needs to be challenged, and the ‘sameness’ emphasised over the ‘otherness’. Hall (2000) writes about the British case, where the emergence of a multi-cultural society has taken place after the Second World War. Afro-Caribbean and Asian immigrants although conceptualised indifferent terms as non-white, the previous based on ‘race’ and the latter on religion, have both since the 1970s, been given the identity of ‘black’. The term which was initially negative has in the 1990s taken on also another role, that of a positive identification. Hall calls this the “ethnicisation of ‘race’.” However, as the emphasis on biological differences have been more pushed aside Hall points out that cultural difference has also taken a more “violent, politicised and oppositional meaning, which he again calls the “‘racialisation’ of ethnicity.” In contemporary Finnish society Islamophobia or aggression towards Roma people or people with some form of ties to Russia are some of the prime examples of this creating of ‘others’ through ‘racialisation of ethnicity’. Hall claims there are there are two different demands in this situation; for and against recognition of plural values. This shows us how much progress is to be made, in order to shift this multi-cultural society to one that respects all. However, according to Hall this conceptualising of the terminology has already laid the groundwork for social change for the better to take place.

Besides different multi-cultural settings around the world, there are also different multiculturalisms as mentioned above. Anthias (2002) presents liberal multiculturalism, which according to her encompasses almost all multiculturalisms (including Hall’s corporate etc.) and reflexive or critical multiculturalism as the options. She considers liberal multiculturalism to be far too much concerned with group rights at the cost of

\[29\] Criticisms of multiculturalism, such as the Kukkia kriittisille -campaign presented above.
individuals, especially women’s rights as well as having several other flaws. However, the alternative Anthias presents, reflexive multiculturalism also has its shortcomings as:

Critical/reflexive multiculturalism, it is argued, unlike liberal multiculturalism, is concerned with the removal of barriers to the legitimacy of different ways of being and is compatible with transnational and trans-ethnic identities as well as those that have been discussed using the notion of hybridity. Nonetheless, the focus on “culture” may have contributed to issues of social equality being obscured. A starting point for debates on critical multiculturalism is that it must move away from the idea of one dominant culture which lays the frame of reference and the existence of tolerance towards other cultures. As such, it must maintain a view of citizenship where the boundaries of citizenship are not coterminous with belonging to a community in the singular.

Anthias (2002, 280)

Anthias view on different multiculturalisms is quite critical, as they (all) according to her are conceptualised without taking into account gender almost at all. Raising the issue of citizenship again, links Anthias’ thoughts to research of changing citizenships (e.g. Castles and Davidson (2000) or Thomas, (2002)), movements concentrating on e.g. ‘illegal immigration’ or Balibar’s writings on European Apartheid. However, the key issue here is not citizenship, but the notion of one imagined dominant ‘culture’ and submissive ‘cultures’ as well as that of social equality. Understanding transnational identities and especially hybridity, as I have discussed above, are of great importance when combating racism. Hence Anthias’ ideas of different forms of hierarchies being intertwined are very relevant when analysing anti-racism. Social equality being obscured also relates to the concept of diversity management, where diversity or multiculturalism in a given setting is seen as enriching, and e.g. immigrants are reduced to ‘work force’ and not being subjects of their own, while their role in society becomes one of cheap labour.

Multiculturalism, just as the connotation of the term is itself a highly pluralistic notion. Whereas Anthias (2002) separates between two sets of multiculturalisms, Hall (2000)

---

30 However, citizenship categories and immigration controls in contemporary Europe are one very clear expression of cultural and institutional racism. Based on citizenship, people’s lives are easily reduced to an endless border consisting of DNA-testing, outsourced border patrols, detention centres and extraditions.
on the other hand divides multiculturalism into several categories, that is: Conservative, Liberal, Pluralist, Commercial and Corporate (public or private) multiculturalism. From this follows that multiculturalism is not a fixed set of ideals, but something that gets its meaning through its context and perspective, just as the translocational positionality that Anthias has brought forth, and is negotiated in the social sphere and the hierarchies present in society and labour market.

2.3 Anti-Racisms

I will next provide a brief overview of theory surrounding anti-racism, a term which according to Bonnett (2000), is a quite new creation, coined only in the 1960s and later in the 1980s and 1990s developed as part of a broader emancipatory discourse of anti-sexism and gay rights. Although the concept is of newer breed, it is seen as gaining historical depth from as far back a slave liberation in the United States while post-colonialism (see e.g. Fanon, 1967) as a more recent construction has played a role in its development. However, the development of the concept of anti-racism falls outside of the scope of this presentation. And more recent approaches are of greater relevance to me.

Anti-racism as defined by Rastas (2007, 57) is: “not only to oppose all forms of expression for racism, but also the objective, or commitment, to generate knowledge on racism and its impacts.” For me this definition is not directly suitable as I am here interested in the challenges to opposing racisms and not hands on situations or consequences of racism. The existence of racism is where my approach starts, I do not intend to thoroughly map its roots, but take the situation defined in chapters 2.1 Racisms and 3.2 Racism in Finland as my starting point and from there move to an analysis of approaches to, or underlying ways of thinking and challenging, the existing situation. One of my main interests in this work are the interrelations between anti-racism(s) and multiculturalism(s) and how these to are intertwined in the work of anti-racists in Finland, as the latter term is very much present in nearly all contemporary debate on immigration, racism, ethnicity etc. Presenting viewpoints and theories on different forms of anti-racisms is thus my next step.
Anti-racism is a highly controversial subject, or as Bonnett (2000, 1) states: “If one were foolish enough to believe all that has been said on the topic, one would be forced to conclude that it is both extraordinarily rare and all-pervasive, simultaneously integral to the capitalist modernisation and a harbinger of Marxist revolution. Adding to the sense of confusion that surrounds the subject, debate on anti-racism is often confined to the level of polemic.” On a practical level, I see coming up with approaches or tactics that can challenge contemporary forms of racism to be the aim of anti-racism. Hence it relates to the above discussion on multicultural society, as racism is prevalent in all multicultural societies, while all nation states are multicultural to at least some extent. Politicising the subject beyond the level of polemic is a highly important task, as the whole discussion otherwise becomes irrelevant in society at large which means that racism as consequence cannot be tackled. This situation is summarised by Bonnett (2000, 1) as follows: “I have heard anti-racism being celebrated as ‘essential’ and ‘necessary’, as well as being attacked as ‘politically correct nonsense’, even as ‘evil’.” Bonnett concludes that these polemic approaches makes the topic difficult to approach with the historical and sociological seriousness it deserves or for that matter needs in order to rise above a level of discussions that is meaningless for reducing racism.

Besides having an anti-racist agenda at large, it is important to understand this process more in-depth, in order build a political project, and challenge racism in efficient ways. Bonnett provides a starting point for exploring anti-racism activities or thought by identifying seven ways in which racism is commonly deemed bad and unacceptable:

1) Racism is socially disruptive
2) Racism is foreign
3) Racism sustains the ruling class
4) Racism hinders the progress of ‘our community’
5) Racism is an intellectual error
6) Racism distorts and erases people’s identities
7) Racism is anti-egalitarian and socially unjust

Bonnett (2000, 4-7)

While the field of anti-racism is a highly shattered one, also many of the above approaches are almost conceptual opposites, such as “1) Racism is socially disruptive” and “3) Racism sustains the ruling class” where, the former is based on a bureaucratic or
ruling class (liberal) analysis of community relations being disrupted, while the latter (Marxist) focuses on these same elements producing racism as part of capitalist logics. However, there are also several points that are usually interconnected in anti-racism projects. Bonnett (2000, 7) mentions the last three to be: “…commonly deployed as the moral core and intellectual baseline of anti-racism.” As a brief overview of Bonnett’s analysis, the *racism is as intellectual error* approach is founded on the discrediting of scientific racism. It also often includes a point of view, according to which the spokespersons for this form racism do not have enough knowledge of ‘others’ and are ethnocentric as opposed to the cosmopolitanism of anti-racism. The analysis within the paradigm *racism distorts and erases people’s identities* is often: “focused upon the destructive power racism has upon people’s notions of and ability to politically deploy ‘their own’ history, culture and sense of social cohesion. If the victim group is seen as a race, then racism will be cast as subverting that community’s ability to express and fulfil their racial identity (Bonnett 2000, 6).” This paradigm of course is highly controversial, as one based on individual psyche and at a collective level could conclude just as well that the identification of ‘races’ itself is a problem. This latter approach could be seen in the light of Werbner’s writings on power to define, where racism distorts the right to self definition, while at the same time assigning people to particular categories which forge them to behave in a certain way or, alternatively, cannot act or live in a certain manner as they belong to a particular ‘race’. *Racism is anti-egalitarian and socially unjust* as an explanation of the wrongdoings of racism usually draws on political or religious ideology of equality between people, thus making it a common denominator for most forms of anti-racism according to Bonnett. However, these denominators put together, still do not provide anything more than a starting point for an anti-racist project, as they only suggest outlines for the work, as well as are possibly linked to each other in numerous different ways. Including a broader analysis of a particular society is thus necessary to build efficient anti-racist practices, as also racisms take multiple shapes that may or may not be intertwined. As Michael Wieviorka suggests:
...if racism is never pure differentialism or pure universalism and inferiorisation, anti-racist action must also learn how to combine countervailing strategies to combat these two approaches by recognising the cultural bases upon which fear or hatred of the Other is constructed. But it must also take into account the social problems which exacerbate these fears – exclusion, frustration or downward social mobility; poverty, unemployment; the social interests of the better-off – all of which encourage the adoption of strategies of social and racial segregation.

Wieviorka (1997, 143)

The broader analysis I suggest here is to look at anti-racism within the multiculturalist society defined already foreshadowed above. However, besides a multicultural perspective there are also others perspectives relevant to me. Bonnett proposes six ways of practicing anti-racism which I will use in analysing anti-racism work in Finland:

1) Everyday anti-racism, i.e. opposition to racial inequality that forms a part of everyday popular culture.
2) Multicultural anti-racism, i.e. the affirmation of multicultural diversity as a way of engaging racism.
3) Psychological anti-racism, i.e. the identification and challenging of racism within structures of individual and collective consciousness.
4) Radical anti-racism, i.e. the identification and challenging of structures of socio-economic power and privilege that foster and reproduce racism.
5) Anti-nazi and anti-fascist anti-racism
6) The representative organisation, i.e. the policy and practice of seeking to create organisations representative of the ‘wider community’ and, therefore, actively favouring the entry and promotion of previously excluded races.

Bonnet (2000, 85)

I have in chapter 1.2 already discussed why, everyday anti-racism falls outside of the scope of this research, as I am looking at the activities of anti-racists as part of a network. Also some of the other perspectives presented by Bonnet are not applicable for this study. The anti-racist work done under network of RASMUS cannot be seen as tackling racism from perspective of 4) radical anti-racism, as socio-economic power

31 “Differences between races are the basis for, or lead to, irreconcilable cultural differences, with the result that the culture of the racialised group is perceived to constitute a threat to that of the racialising group.” Wieviorka (1997, 143)

32 “Postulating essential differences between human races in order to legitimise prejudices or unequal practices. It is based on a principle of inferiorisation which consists in accepting … the Other … but in a position which enables exploitation.” Wieviorka (1997, 142)

33 One good example of this is the fact that the supporter for the year 2007 (RASMUS-verkoston kummi) of RASMUS network was the Confederation of Finnish Industries (Elinkeinoelämän keskusliitto) a
and privilege are namely not on the agenda of their work, and they work on educating people to get rid of their prejudices, as will be seen in the analysis of my results. E.g. immigrants possibilities to get employment came up several times during my research process, but I encountered no suggestions on how reduce the problems of low-wage exploitation of immigrants in Finland. However, although exploitation in the labour market was not referred to, challenges for immigrants to get particular jobs were mentioned. Further anti-nazi or anti-fascist anti-racism was not something that came up at all during my research. However, comments opposite to this form of anti-racism came up very much as a part of main-streaming racism as a problem. One of my respondents, R3, coined this as follows: “Admitting that racism is present also elsewhere than where neo-nazis and immigrants are fighting... Everyday racism... And it is important that this opens up also to other than 'hippies’ and 'sweet old ladies', etc. And this is about resources, this [anti-racism] is not considered important.” This, although mainstreaming racism, easily leaves its most violent forms out of focus. Further, number six, the representative organisation approach, was not during my interviews discussed as Bonnett presents it, as: equal opportunities policies, like e.g. in Anglo-American countries are not in place in Finland. However, many of my interviewees referred to non-discrimination campaigns etc. which makes also this category interesting. Another interesting issue that could be categorised as belonging to this approach is language education amongst ‘immigrant’ or ‘multicultural’ youth (see e.g. Halonen, 2007). However, this falls outside my focus, as it relates more to the functions of the municipalities and not the RASMUS network.

Leaving out four of the above ways of practicing anti-racism, I have deemed non-descriptive for issues relevant to this work, still leaves me with two ways of categorising and analysing the anti-racism work carried out by the different RASMUS coalition that has been strongly criticised for its neo-liberal views and one of the main targets of e.g. struggles of the 'precarity' or precarious workforce, which non-white immigrants are very commonly part of in e.g. the fast food business, maintenance work and other unskilled, low-paid work (see e.g. Termonen, 2004).
actors I have studied. Numbers two; multicultural anti-racism and three; psychological anti-racism, in the above listing, have provided useful when categorising my empirical material. Presenting these in greater detail as part of presenting my results in chapter 6.2 will provide a more easily comprehensible dialogue between my research material and the above presented theoretical approach.

Before moving on to describe my setting I will briefly mention some concepts related to anti-racism perceived as dilemmas in the work. Important issues that play a role in discussing anti-racism are, how racism is connected to other social phenomena such as feminism, ethnicity, essentialism and ‘whiteness’. These are listed by Bonnet (2000, 116), not as dilemmas that must be solved in order for anti-racism to survive, but as: “the life blood of anti-racism; they animate its debate and provoke the heterogeneity of its activism. Authors around these subjects, influential to my thinking, besides Bonnet (1997 and 2000), include Yuval-Davis (1997), Pnina Werbner (1997) and Rastas (2004).
As I stated in the introduction racism and necessarily also anti-racism, are noted in specific places and their settings. As this work looks on anti-racism over the last years in Finland, it is necessary to describe the Finnish society to some extent. I will do so by referring to studies on immigration, attitudes in Finland, racist crime, racism and transnational flows, that have contributed to making Finland a more multi-cultural state, which together will provide the setting in which my study takes place.

3.1 Changes in Population Base and the Transnational Turn

Up until the early 1990s Finland had and by European standards still has a highly homogenous population, consisting of mainly ‘white’ Finns of whom approximately 94 percent spoke Finnish and 6 percent spoke Swedish as their mother tongue and a vast majority belonged to the Evangelic Lutheran Church. The population base is, however slowly changing as Magdalena Jaakkola, who has studied Finnish attitudes towards immigration since 1987, writes in the summary of her 2005 study: “During the period 1987-2003 when the attitude surveys were carried out, Finnish society has changed: Finland’s foreign population has increased six-fold and its ethnic structure is more diversified.” During the years almost 20 years that Jaakkola has been studying this topic also attitudes of the Finnish population have become more positive towards immigration.

The research results showed that the attitudes of Finns towards the immigration of foreigners who come for different reasons and from different countries have become more favourable after the recession (1993). In 1993-2003 attitudes towards foreign labour changed the most: the proportion of negative attitudes decreased from 61 percent to 38 percent. In 2003, when the economy was booming and a labour shortage had been predicted, attitudes towards accepting foreign labour were more favourable than in 1998 or in 1987, when there were only 18,000 foreign citizens living in Finland.

Jaakkola (2005, ix)

36 Other traditional minorities than the Swedish speaking Finns include Sami, Roma, Jews and Tatars, most of whom speak either Finnish or Swedish. The largest group of non-Finnish nationals are originally from areas within the former Soviet Union and Sweden (Jaakkola, 2005).
However, as stated in the quote above, Finland’s foreign population has increased vastly which has led to increased racist actions and consequences although attitudes in general have become more tolerant. In her article *Rasismi – Oppeja, asenteita, toimintaa ja seurauksia* (2005) Anna Rastas states that racism was a silenced topic in Finnish society and studies on racism were very limited until the 1990s. She assumes that the common notion was that racism was absent since there was not a vast number of immigrants in Finland. “Societal phenomena that elsewhere has been described as racism, has in Finland been labelled e.g. discrimination, xenophobia or intolerance (Rastas, 2005, 69).” Rastas concludes that the increase of the number of immigrants in Finland and reactions to this in Finnish society brought forth the discussion about racism in Finland. Also, looking at Jaakkola’s above quote, which is about labour, it does not have any reference to immigrants or other minorities which are not part of the labour force. Thus, attitudes towards e.g. refugees, whom obviously might be part of the labour force, are not depicted above. As I will discuss later on, the labour market is one of the fields in which racisms are present, and people who face most of the documented racism are also often excluded from the (at least formal or official) labour market\(^37\). Also the fact that ‘Finnishness’ is most commonly mediated as the ‘dominant culture’, instead of questioning what it means to be Finnish easily becomes a problem.

According to Noora Ellonen (2006), who has studied racist crime, Finland has been a country of net immigration since 1981. Jaakkola (2003, 5) states that the number of foreign nationals resident in Finland rose from approximately 17,724 in 1987 to 55,587 in 1993 to 107,003 (circa two percent of the total population) in 2003. The numbers have grown since, but the percentage remains about the same, just above two percent. Bearing in mind that a considerable amount of people have gained Finnish citizenship the change from a society comprised of ‘white Finns’ to a ‘multi-cultural\(^38\)’ society has taken place. One should note, however, that the numbers are still small compared to other European countries. The change in Finland’s population base has been

---

\(^{37}\) A considerable percent of immigrant labour works undocumented or in the so called, ‘gray sector’ e.g. in restaurants or at construction sites. See *e.g.* Memorandum of Plenary, 6.2.2008 of the Finnish Parliament.

\(^{38}\) As described by Hall above.
conceptualised by Outi Lepola (2000, 19) as follows: “Finland changed from a monocultural country to a multicultural country where different cultures met.” According to Ellonen (2006, 6) different conflicts became more common as a result of this multi-cultural turn: “Although there has never been a substantial anti-immigrant movement in Finland, the adjustment of immigrants and Finnish people towards immigrants hasn’t been trouble free. Foreign born immigrants as well as traditional minorities have fallen victims to racism.”

In 2007 people living in Finland have a variety of phenotypes and come from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, worship different religions and speak multiple languages. Or as Martikainen, Sintonen and Pitkänen state in their article Ylirajainen liikkuvuus ja etniset vähemmistöt39 (2006, 9):

Finland today is seeking its place in a globalising world which comprises of international mobility and migration. Demographically Finland is more plural than it has ever been before, and there are no signs of this development slowing down. Ethnicity and multiculturalism have risen to a visible role in Finland as elsewhere in the world over the last decades. Although immigration to and ethnic pluralism is present in Finland to a very limited extent compared to elsewhere in Europe, it is already visible in the everyday life of many places, and has political implications.

In this setting of increased pluralism with political implications, anti-racist action is of crucial importance in Finland, as everywhere. As it is important to make sure that people are not labelled as produce of their ‘culture’ but seen as individuals, as everybody should be seen. Or as Stuart Hall (1993) states: “If you live in a society where anti-racist politics is not on the agenda, you are doomed to live in a racist society.” As stated, racism became a much more widely debated subject in the 1990s, and there were also several campaigns against racism at the time. These however, are outside the scope of this research, although they have had a role in forming the contemporary anti-racism agenda.

The processes of globalisation or in the explanation model of more micro-scale interaction, that of transnational relations, are not in any way bound to the nation-state

39 Transnational Mobility and Ethnic Minorities.
of Finland but are global processes far beyond the reach of this study. However to note is that the above processes are creating more and more diverse and difficult-to-classify social relations. Stephen Vertovec has called this setting a world of ‘super-diversity’, in which policy descriptions or doctrines such as multiculturalism are not adequate to describe social reality. Vertovec (2006) argues that this ‘super-diversity’ renders any type of multiculturalist approach impossible, as there are very few shared denominators within groups categorised by e.g. nationality, language or ethnicity, such as immigrants from the same region. Although this is not necessarily the case on a large scale in Finland in 2008, this is definitely something to bear in mind when playing word-games in relation to migration, multi-cultural societies, ‘racialised’ social relations and racisms and certainly the direction of development. In a 2006 presentation, Vertovec proved the above point by presenting different legal classifications for people in the Somali diaspora living in London. When dealing with categories, all of which can also be found in Finland, such as “citizens, refugees, exceptional leave to remain, undocumented migrants, refugee status granted, asylum-seeker in other EU country” it is very easy to realise that traditional multiculturalisms in many ways are rendered hopelessly useless in some settings, and will be that in Finland in the future even more so than now. Thus notions of hybridity and doing away with clear cut simplified ‘black-and-white’ categories seem to become more important as time passes. Same societal models of explaining the social reality of people with highly different social positioning e.g. of citizens of a particular country versus undocumented, ‘clandestine’ or ‘illegal immigrants’ living in the same area, are simply not descriptive or adequate. Thus the challenge of how to remove different forms of oppression becomes highly relevant. In this study, the proposed solution for analysing the different ways on how to combat racisms comes back to the translocational positionality proposed by Floya Anthias. If super-diversity is already present in the web of transnational racisms it is not fruitful to see Finland as being completely outside of this. In a web of transnational relations playing a role in affecting up all societal relations, it becomes more and more difficult to separate elements of culture from each other, as all of society becomes more and more ‘hybridised’.

Vertovec writes about the situation in the UK, where multiculturalism has a very distinct meaning in the realm of policy.
The setting of a multi-cultural society shaped by processes of globalisation and multiculturalisms has formed Finland’s immigration and integration policies as well as started to reshape the labour market. According to Martikainen, Sintonen and Pitkänen (2006), the main focus of these policies have been ‘return-movers’, refugees and asylum-seekers and acculturating them. These groups, beside some of the traditional minorities, especially Roma people, are also most often the victims of racism. However, as the above authors also remind us (2006, 34): “Although cultural and religious difference in the public discourse often appears through problems and challenges, it is clear that also the life of most people who belong to ethnic minorities goes by without greater trouble, or that their problems do not differ from the problems of the majority of the citizens two a great extent.” However, there are a great number of people who suffer from racism in different forms. These different forms are also bound to become more diversified as society itself becomes more diversified and the policies in the public discourse are moving more and more towards debating labour based immigration (see e.g. Government Migration Policy Program, 2006). Although Finland does not at the moment have large population of e.g. undocumented migrants, this will not necessarily be the case in future. In a changing society new hierarchies and forms of oppression are constantly formed, which in the future might create vastly different needs for action. However, as of now, I will deal with currently widely documented forms of racisms and ways of combating them. Next, I will present some of the forms in which this racism and discrimination have appeared in Finland during the last some years.

### 3.2 Racism in Finland

Looking back at the threefold typology on racisms presented above, I will first present attitudes, which I consider linked together to the notion of racism as ideology. Not all attitude studies show a positive paradigm shift as Jaakkola’s study quoted above. Anti-racist action becomes highly important when one looks at the attitudes in Finland,

---

41 Inkerinmaalaiset paluumuuttajat

42 Estimates vary from a few hundred to up to three thousand.
especially among young people, presented elsewhere. In an extensive study of 3500 youths conducted in the fourth largest city in Finland, Turku in 2006, appalling results were found. The study was publicised quite widely and the local newspaper Turun Sanomat stated: “Every fifth youth in Turku believes human intelligence to vary between individuals based on race [sic].” As researcher in charge Professor Heikki Ervasti correctly pointed out in the same article, this is not purely an opinion, but rather a clear misconception amongst the youth. Although wanted or not, this is an ideological flaw.

Also Magdalena Jaakkola’s (2005) thorough inquiry over attitudes in Finland shows racist sentiments to be very much present in contemporary Finland (as in every society). Although she points out positive attitude changes to have taken place, she still presents many findings of grave concern in attitudes in Finland. According to Jaakkola (2005, 92) 45 percent of her respondents fully or partially agree on the statement: “Some races [sic] are not suited to live in a modern society.” There are many more such statements in Jaakkola’s 2005 research where the answers clearly show racist attitudes and thus create challenges for anti-racism to tackle. One of these statements is worth mentioning, as it shows similar attitudes as the study conducted by Ervasti: 35 percent fully or partially agree with the statement: “It should be recognised that some nations are more intelligent than others.” Bearing in mind the primordial sentiments often hidden behind the concept of nation, which links it to ‘race’, it seems to be difficult for a large percentage of the Finnish population to understand that biological racism should be a finished project proved to be utterly flawed. Thus, anti-racisms seem to be challenged, not only by forms of cultural racisms but also by tackling issues of ‘traditional racisms’, which makes the work even more challenging.

As for racism as action, racist crime has been on the rise in Finland as elsewhere in

---


44 “Jotkut rodut [sic] eivät kerta kaikkiaan sovellu asumaan modernissa yhteiskunnassa.”

45 “On tunnistettava se tosiasia että jotkut kansat ovat toisia älykkäämpiä.”

46 For descriptions regarding ethnicity and primordial sentiments see e.g. Huttunen (2005)
recent years. I will focus my analysis of racism as action particularly on violent racist crime. Timo Virtanen’s analysis of how racist crime is becoming rooted in the Nordic countries is not very uplifting as he writes:

Racist violence represents the most frequent, visible, and violent type of bias-motivated conduct. In recent years, racist violence has been reported to constitute one of the most rapidly growing forms of crime throughout European society. Racist violence has been seen as an expression of racism which flourishes in societies where racism has become respectable or at least is not widely and consistently condemned. Racist and xenophobic manifestations seem to be embedded in different levels of society and cultural development, and thus, need to be considered from the point of view of past and present events and manifestations.

The key role of racism has been the denial of social, political and economic participation to certain collectivities and the legitimisation of various forms of exploitation: racism means hatred of the different. The Nordic countries, while having no history of colonialism, have conquered northern areas with groups of indigenous peoples such as the Sami, and carried out racist practices towards old ethnic minorities such as the Jews. More recently, expressions of racist violence do not seem to be less extreme in the Nordic countries than elsewhere in Europe.

Virtanen (2000, 1)

Although the situation in Finland is not as grave as in e.g. Sweden where there are numerous organised extreme-right-wing skinhead groups, neo-nazis etc. parading the streets, Noora Ellonen (2006) and Tanja Noponen (2007) have shown that reported violent racist crime has been on the rise in Finland also in the years since Virtanen’s work. This leads one to make not so uplifting conclusions, that racist sentiments being communicated as racist acts is constantly rising. It is outside of the scope of this research to make assumptions on how racism and immigration are statistically correlated, which leaves me to state merely that since immigration has been on the rise, reported racist crime has been so as well. As for how much this has risen, it is irrelevant as racist violence, no matter to what extent it is taking place is appalling. An example which should be of grave concern to society at large is e.g. a recent shooting in Espoo.

47 See e.g. Antifascistisk Aktion (www.antifa.se), Nätverket mot Rasism (http://www.nmr.nu)
48 http://www.hs.fi/kaupunki/artikkeli/Kaksi+loukkaantui+Espoon+Soukassa+ampumav%C3%A4likohtauksessa/HS20070806SI1KA029ru, retrieved on 20.10.2007. According to the prosecutor four persons took part in a racist motivated shooting. Even in a case like this where a racist skinhead group has been on the
that with most probable cause had racist motivation. Acts like this are likely to provoke future anti-fascist mobilisation, as has happened earlier in Germany (Katsiaficas, 2006), Sweden and elsewhere where anti-fascist action groups have strong mobilisations.

Dealing with racist crime is difficult, as it is difficult to prove a racist intent, as was e.g. the case with the attack on an immigrant operated restaurant in Kajaani where racist violence led to the founding of a RASMUS group in 2005 (Joronen and Salonen, 2006, 41-42). Racist crime is of course not in any way limited to Kajaani. According to Ellonen (2006) 412 criminal complaints, containing a total of 669 suspected crimes, were filed to the police in 2005. As the figures in Noponen (2007) show an increase to 442 complaints filed and 748 suspected crimes in 2006. This increase of about ten percent might be due to a greater frequency of reporting crimes, but as the numbers have been on a constant rise, and only a small percentage of racist crimes are reported this most likely means that racist crime has become more frequent. According to Noponen (2007) only seven percent of immigrants have reported all experienced racist crime, while 70 percent have not reported on single occurrence of the racist acts they have experienced. This figure of people not reporting about their experiences is also shown in the fact that physical assault, and not e.g. verbal abuse or harassment is the most common occurrence of racist crime in Finland (Ellonen 2006 and Noponen 2007). Defining racist violence is also something where there is room for discussion. E.g. Virtanen (2000) has suggested it to be defined broadly:

…it is important to understand the term ‘violence’ broadly, i.e. the violation of peace of mind and rights. Although physical injury is obviously damaging and sometimes life-threatening for victims, and is generally seen as the most serious type of action from the criminal point of view, other non-physical actions may cause equivalent or even greater psychological harm. …thus, it is often more appropriate to speak of ‘racist’ and xenophobic violence and harassment. It should always be understood as implied within the word ‘violence’, which is here employed as the generic term.

Virtanen (2000, 7)

This broad definition can also be seen as an analogue to the logics of biological and cultural racisms, where the previous is more violent, physical than the latter, which is
psychological and socially excluding. Nevertheless, essentialising ‘others’ easily becomes a criminal act of racism when communicated although, a thought as such, is not a criminal deed. Or as described in chapter two, traditional racism oppresses and cultural excludes (through actions, words etc.), both of which can be described as hostile acts.

In recent years also racism on the internet has become a huge problem that has not adequately dealt with:

Although Finnish legislation in theory gives an opportunity to intervene with racist material that is being distributed on the internet, it is difficult in practice. In many cases there is a fine line between legal and illegal material. On top of this, material distributed through Internet Service Providers abroad can not be subpoenaed based on Finnish law.

Joronen and Salonen (2006, 62)

Spreading racist propaganda on the web can according to Joronen and Salonen (2006) be classified into three categories; websites of organisations and parties that promote nationalism, National Socialism (Nazism) and White Power promoting websites and racist websites by individuals. In the case of these, racism as ideology alone is not the adequate typology to describe this form of racism as the ideology is explicitly expressed, thus becoming also a racist action.

The third category defined above; racism as consequence is by far the most difficult to analyse. In Joronen and Salonen (2006) phenomena that fall under this category of racism are e.g. employment and housing. Rosa Puhakainen (2006) in the same report writes about violence faced by immigrant women, who as a consequence do not necessarily have the chance to get counselling services etc. which may be considered as racism as consequence. Also the practices of immigration control authorities and the legislation regarding foreign nationals49 has cause racist consequences e.g. in situations where asylum seekers have been granted a discriminatory type of residence permit50. However, in this study, racism a consequence is mainly referred to in regards to employment. According to Joronen and Salonen (2006, 42) “ethnic discrimination is

50 www.b-lupa.net, retrieved on 20.6.2007, a campaign that has since ceased.
present in the Finnish labour market, and employer’s do have prejudices against foreigners.” They state that discrimination in recruiting is most strongly felt by people whose appearance is most distinguishably different from that of the main population base. “81 percent of Somalis and 64 percent of Arabic-speakers have experienced discrimination in the labour market. Aside from these … 49 percent of Vietnamese nationals have experienced racism in recruitment situations” (Joronen and Salonen 2006, 43). Aside from this also 51 percent of Russian nationals experience a lot of discrimination in employment situations. These findings correlate with employment figures for foreign nationals. According to statistics by the Finnish Ministry of Labour (2007) Somali citizens have a 53 percent, Moroccan citizens a 44 percent, Iraqi citizens a 62 percent and Russian citizens a 30 percent unemployment rate. The highest unemployment percentages for other European nationals (than Russians) are at 23 for Bosnian and Turkish nationals and below ten for all EU-nationality groups except for Italians at twelve. Nationality naturally does not always correlate with phenotype and/or ethnic traits but in a material of e.g. 1345 Somalis, 1075 Iraqis or compared to 8734 Estonians the situation seems quite obvious. At large ‘non-white’ groups who experience racism or discrimination also have very high unemployment rates. However, to note is that, there is very little statistics on informal or ‘grey-sector’ employment by people who are otherwise excluded from the labour market, and thus forced to even more precarious conditions than in formal low-wage jobs.

After presenting the forms racism takes in Finland I will now move on to presenting approaches to and challenges in countering these racisms that came up during my research. However, before presenting findings of my research I will first present my methodological approach.
4 THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

4.1 Epistemology

According to Alasuutari (1993) the notion of science in everyday life is constructed mainly based on the positivist approach arising from natural sciences. In these sciences the objects of study are systematic quantifiable statistical differences between variables. Qualitative approaches to science are different in the sense that the material is usually looked upon as an entity instead of a number of different variables. This means that “All reliable details or facts need to be analysed in a way which is not contradictory to the presented explanation” (Alasuutari, 1993, 29). Qualitative methods are used when positivist natural science methods are for one reason or another not suitable for the research being carried out. This is the case when trying to explain social phenomena where statistical methods cannot be applied. As in the case of this study it is not always possible to find numeric data on social phenomena. It is difficult to analyse human action, its purposes and functions by quantifying. Further, if doing so, the interpretative element which is highly important when studying human interaction is lost. Further the idea of trying to come with universal laws, as in the tradition of positivism, is an utterly impossible thought when studying human interaction in a changing society. Hence my aim is, using qualitative methods, to come up with a descriptive picture of some aspects of social realities in the anti-racism work carried out by people involved in the RASMUS network and these actor’s different approaches to combating racism. “How is racism to be combated?”, “What are the motivations behind these approaches? and “Have they been fruitful or not?” are prime examples of a study in which qualitative methods are needed. The field can only be mapped and hopefully developed by interacting with people who are involved in work against racism, and learning from their past positive experiences as well as setbacks and then forming a theoretical framework for anti-racism in Finland. Egon Guba and Yvonna Lincoln (1998, 195) state that “both qualitative and quantitative methods may be used appropriately within any research paradigm.” I have above argued quantitative methods not to be suitable for my particular research. I have thus defined both my research paradigms to fit into the qualitative tradition.
Guba and Lincoln (1998) raise a number of concerns or “implicit problems” regarding “conventional wisdom” gained through quantitative data. These are context stripping, exclusion of meaning and purpose, disjunction of grand theories with local contexts, inapplicability of general data to individual cases and exclusion of the discovery dimension in inquiry. All these are issues highly relevant in my study as I wish to map out a particular dimension of anti-racism, carried out under RASMUS network, and describe how it is constructed within the particular context of a place in this case a nation state in which transnational relations are of increasing importance in its social relations. The meaning and purpose of my study is set within a specific context and not generally and has an element of discovery in it, just as the word ‘map’, in mapping the field, implies.

This thesis falls in between two basic belief systems as defined by Guba and Lincoln. I have above argued that Positivist approaches are not suitable for me, nor are Postpositivist, as views in this paradigm are seen to be based on ‘reality’ and not value-mediated. This is for me an utterly impossible setting, as I am researching human interaction, and societal functioning, anti-racism, which goal is to change society. The concepts of positionality, hybridity etc. described above and thus this work in which I describe racisms, multiculturalisms and anti-racisms, are positioned within a different set of paradigms depending on particularities being challenged at a specific moment. Further, this work is value-mediated as it is describing views and ideologies of people working against racism.

According to Guba’s and Lincoln’s (1998, 203, Table 6.1.) presentation of paradigms, this leaves me with critical theory and constructivism to work with. My setting very much depends on the historical perspective on how racism (and anti-racism) has shaped itself over time as a response to racism during the change of the Finnish society stemming from increased immigration. Although the RASMUS network was only founded in 2002, it necessarily works in the same material world where these changes stemming from the transnational turn resulting in a multi-cultural society, are brought about, whereby that brings historicity into my research. The time perspective gives an implication of the historicity present in critical or Marxist approaches, as does its
epistemological view of value mediated findings as anti-racism is necessarily a political struggle as I have stated above. On the other hand looking at what constructivism offers in the sense of ontology, locally and specifically constructed realities and knowledge are relevant in this study. Further, this constructivist approach is also what many of the authors I have quoted in chapter two Key Concepts use to make sense of the world. As I have stated above racism is always bound to a particular place. In constructivism there is also necessarily an emphasis on the interaction between the researcher and the research subject (Guba and Lincoln, 1998, 207). This interaction also necessary moulds my results as I am myself also an active anti-racist when not a researcher. As this is an initial work to map the field limiting myself only to studying e.g. how language of racism can be challenged from a constructivist viewpoint would leave out plenty of important elements regarding realisation of racism in the material world.

When analyzing the paradigm positions on practical issues regarding the research (Guba and Lincoln, 1998, 207, Table 6.2), also there my research seems to fall between the two aforementioned categories, especially regarding the aim of the research. The critical paradigm stresses critique, transformation, restitution and emancipation whereas constructivism emphasizes understanding and reconstruction. Both of these are key elements in a study with political goals such as mine. The aspect of critique should naturally be present in politics of conflicts, that anti-racism necessarily is, while the latter perspective of understanding is important in analyzing potential shortcomings of current approaches to anti-racism. On several other accounts, such as ethics or ‘voice’ Guba’s and Lincoln’s presentation of the two paradigms have close links to each other and further tie me to juggling between the two paradigms and presenting my case from the perspective of both of them. As for critical theory Guba and Lincoln (1998, 2007, table 6.2) present the ‘voice’ in it to be “‘transformative intellectual’ as advocate and activist” while constructivism presents a “‘passionate participant’” facilitating a multi-voice reconstruction.” Both paradigms are presented as having an “intrinsic moral tilt towards revelation.” More concretely, in this thesis, the critical approach means that I am keen on looking at the structures and development of global capitalism in forging these surroundings, and how racism is present in them. On the other hand how things are presented, e.g. multiculturalism without any clearer definition might sound like
something positive, but in particular breeds might just as well maintain status quo, which is why also the rhetoric behind different paradigms or views needs to be analysed, through deconstructing or discourse analysis in order to put forth a more accurate picture of that particular world view.

4.2 Methodology

When presenting methodologies for the different research paradigms, Guba and Lincoln (1998, 202) suggest dialogic and dialectic methods for critical theory: “The transactional nature of inquiry requires a dialogue between the investigator and the subjects of inquiry; that dialogue must be dialectical in nature to transform ignorance and misapprehensions into more informed consciousness.” The meaning of this is to apply “transformational leadership”. The constructivist paradigm suggests the use hermeneutical and dialectical methodology. The aim of this is to “…distil a consensus construction that is more informed and sophisticated than any of the predecessor constructions (including of-course the etic\textsuperscript{51} construction of the investigator)” Guba and Lincoln (1998, 203). This poses challenges as well as great opportunities for me, as anti-racism as such is undervalued as research subject as mentioned above. Having embarked on this research journey is also challenging as I have naturally produced some thoughts around the subject whilst being active, and then re-evaluating these etic constructions while receiving more knowledge and analysing my material.

Vesa Puuronen (2006) states that research within the realm of the critical paradigm is

\textsuperscript{51} The neologisms “emic” and “etic,” which were derived from an analogy with the terms “phonemic” and “phonetic,” were coined by the linguistic anthropologist Kenneth Pike (1954). He suggests that there are two perspectives that can be employed in the study of a society’s cultural system, just as there are two perspectives that can be used in the study of a language’s sound system. In both cases, it is possible to take the point of view of either the insider or the outsider. As Pike defines it, the emic perspective focuses on the intrinsic cultural distinctions that are meaningful to the members of a given society (e.g., whether the natural world is distinguished from the supernatural realm in the worldview of the culture). The etic perspective, again according to Pike, relies upon the extrinsic concepts and categories that have meaning for scientific observers (e.g., per capita energy consumption). Lett, James W. (1996)
comprised of studies that study racism as a historical and cultural produce and that use ethnographic fieldwork methods such as interviews, observation and different documented material. Puuronen concludes that studies within this paradigm in Finland have also included some elements of action research and tried to alter reality through interventions. Elements as such have been present also during my research process, as I have e.g. written a press statement and petition which the RASMUS Researchers group sent out and been involved in the B-permit campaign advertised in the RASMUS newsletter. Studies that Puuronen considers to belong to this category are e.g. Puuronen (2001) and studies on Muslim minorities in the Finnish welfare society conducted by Marja Tiilikainen (2003) and Tuomas Martikainen (2004).

Research which Puuronen (2006, 48) deems constructivist or in other words research that has its foundations in what he calls the “textual shift of social sciences and humanities” are e.g. the aforementioned doctoral dissertation by Outi Lepola (2000) whom writes “I study how the immigration policy debate creates a social reality regarding immigration and Finland”, Puuronen (2006, 49). This social reality discussion is according to Puuronen related to discourse analysis. In this study, I have conducted semi-structured thematic interviews as well as a sent out a questionnaire with open ended questions, both of which have enabled me to analyse meanings through interpreting different discourses around multiculturalism and anti-racism. As I am too much interested in the material world to only focus on language, which can be seen as a produce of society and reproducing already present hierarchies which ultimately are the root cause for racism, my analysis focuses on tackling three elements of racism; racism as ideology, racism as action and racism as consequence. As for an act of racist violence,

52 Toimintatutkimus
53 The petition was about withdrawing Manne-tv, a highly racist television sitcom essentialising, showing in a very bad light and ridiculing Roma people. The statement was publicised in Finland’s biggest newspapers web-edition and later it changed name from Manne-tv to Romano-tv. Manne is a highly demeaning word in the Finnish language.
54 www.b-lupa.net, a campaign against temporary residence permits, handed out mainly to asylum seekers from Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia. The campaign gained widespread support and after pressure from this group and human rights organisations the government had to admit the flaws of the law and start renewing it.
I find it more fruitful to analyse it as an act in the material world, than as a form of language of hate. Although that would definitely be one way of analysing racist action, I am more interested in looking at this as a product of domination and power hierarchy that may or may not be expressed through language depending on the context. This becomes clearer when looking at the structures. Racism as consequence is extremely difficult to explain in the terms of language if looking at e.g. the employment possibilities for a non-white people in Finland. Hence differentiating between constructivism and critical theory is not very easy for me to do. Thus, I will be content by mentioning this and noting that studies stemming from both paradigms have had an impact this study.

4.3 Research Tradition

This is a study of social anthropology, within the wider field of social sciences. My methods of obtaining data are thematic interviews and questionnaires and do not include observation. Conducting ethnography, as developed by early cultural anthropologists, would maybe anchor me more precisely within the specific research tradition of social anthropology. However, it is highly important to remember that research traditions or disciplines are not rigid or fixed concepts, but change over time as society does as well. Sociology and other disciplines of social sciences are important to this work, and I do not find it fruitful to make a great separation between different disciplines of qualitative social sciences as they are necessarily intertwined.

The transnational relations, or the cultural, social and economic flows between different geographically distant locations are present almost everywhere, according to Rastas (2007, 39) leads us to ask: “How local is local?” This question has a political dimension that can be simplified to questions on: “according to who, and how is being Finnish or having the right to be part of Finnish society defined, and how has racism as a worldwide historical phenomenon possibly shaped the conditions for this? (Rastas, 2007, 39)” This historicity and analysis of global structures and hierarchies again is a critical school position, which affects my work in the sense that, justifying diverse ways of being ‘Finnish’ or belonging to society are core questions of the anti-racism I’m trying
to analyse. The concept of critical anthropology, which according to Rastas (2007) tries to question differences presented as authentic, is also important as this is what an efficient anti-racism ought to do. If seeing anti-racism as a paradigm trying to challenge power hierarchies which produce inequalities, then getting to the core of these hierarchies and establishing a multiplicity of ‘voices’$^{55}$ that can struggle for emancipation and equality should be one of its goals.

Elements from various research traditions has influenced my work, as can be seen in the bibliography. Firstly the traditional differentiating factors between sociology and anthropology that of “great emphasis placed on participant observation and fieldwork and through studying chiefly non-industrialised societies. (Eriksen 2001)” These factors are not relevant differentiators in contemporary social science, and the sociological research tradition in many ways affects my thinking and theorisation of my subject. Rastas (2007) reminds us that sociology analyses societal structures, where racism or racist discourses are present, produced and reproduced. Thus, also anti-racisms necessarily need to be addressed sociologically. However, although cultural studies, sociology and especially ethnicity and racism studies within the fields, and various other research traditions have shaped my understanding as well as my approach to my research topic, this is nevertheless a study in social anthropology.

The discipline of social anthropology has its roots in the classical anthropology of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown who formalised the field by making travel narratives that were more narrative and impersonal than those of missionaries etc. who previously had been in touch with ‘exotic cultures’. According to Malinowski there are three types of data to be collected “on the field”, that is observed data, written notes/diary accounts of events and interviews. Though the historical roots of ethnography go back to classical anthropology a lot has changed since. Probably the most important changes in the field of ethnographic fieldwork are the site and the time frame. The Swedish social anthropologist Ulf Hannerz (2003) and his multi-sited ethnography is a good example of this shift of focus between contemporary and classical anthropology. Firstly, Hannerz

---

55 For the concept of ‘voice’ see e.g. Skjelsbæk (2006) who has studied different how different ‘voices’ present war-rapes in Bosnia.
studies contemporary society and an important information node in it; the foreign correspondent who with the help of technology can take us from our armchair out into the real world (opposed to studying a ‘primitive’ society far away). Secondly, Hannerz studies at multiple sites, opposed to that of studying all aspects of culture in a single society, as in Malinowskian anthropology. However, to note also is that studying “all aspects” of any society would hardly be possibly within the context of e.g. a nation-state. Thirdly, the work is not continuous in the same way, but on the other hand it offers new ways of follow up. Hannerz studied the foreign correspondents for altogether more than five years, but the work was not continuous, and after finishing the research project he can still do follow up by reading articles from the correspondents in his study. There are probably several factors that affect this change, one being that research purely for the sake of academia is getting scarcer, societies are changing and new elements of study are constantly evolving. However, this is not something to be discussed within the framework of this thesis.

As I have stated above, my research setting is that of the societal processes in Finland and how racisms are formed in them, and my research interest, that of looking at how these racisms are challenged. The interpretation of my results will be a description of a particular group of actors, how they see their work against racism, its challenges and the challenges in society at large. Although I have not been conducting this study for more than about a year and a half, I have been involved in this field for years. This plays a role in choosing my interviewees, almost all of whom were acquaintances of mine from before and people I knew to be highly involved in this field and carrying out this type of work, which I feel adds to the reliability of this work.

The concept of culture is highly important in this study, as ‘new racism’ is defined through essentialising culture. Thus realising that the anthropological tradition has a long history in practices of defining the ‘other’ I need to be very careful to avoid the above essentialising when describing my work. According to James Clifford readers often lacks elementary information on the background of a research project. Clifford (1997) mentions four aspects, which impacts are usually forgotten when doing anthropological research: 1) the travel to the area where research is done; 2) the capital
which is usually travelled through (this if research is done in another country which Clifford doesn’t see as an assumption per se); 3) the home university; 4) the translation, or how the culture and being in a specific location are negotiated by the researcher. Although not travelling anywhere except between my hometown Helsinki and home university; Tampere, Clifford brings forth a valid point of transparency in research. Hence I have in detail documented how I have carried out my data collection and also positioned myself, which can be seen as the translation phase, where I negotiate my results with my own subjectivity.

In this research I have focused on other methods than observation, those of semi-structured thematic interviews and an open-ended questionnaire, as well as the self definition of RASMUS network in chapter 1.2, through which I have tried to understand the social reality of my research group. I have done so, as I am not interested in the practical procedures in how campaigns or similar are carried out, but of the underlying ideas and ideologies for them.

Whether or not my description is “thick” (Geertz, 1973) is for the reader to decide. However, I feel it gives a good overview of crucial elements present in one sector of the anti-racist work in Finland, and maps the field, while it aims to achieve “thickness”. Further, although conducting interviews with a variety of people, in a variety of surroundings they have all taken place in places very familiar to me and with people who are involved in work with similar goals as some of my previous work and thus take place in setting I know quite well. This puts my study within the realm of anthropology at home. According to Eriksen (2001, 30) field work at home is sometimes criticised for the lack of comparison (which is present if studying ‘another’ culture) and for the fact that the “overall aim of the discipline is to account for cultural variation in the world.” However, these criticisms are rendered irrelevant if one considers the myriad of transnational influences present everywhere, also in Finland, or even more so if assuming the super-diversity presented above to be the setting. On the other hand it offers me ‘cultural competences’ to find contact information, relevant informants etc. much more thoroughly, which ought to provide higher validity for my results.
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5 DATA AND RESEARCH PROCESS

As is often the case in conducting qualitative studies, also my research questions have to some extent been formed or at least further developed in the field. In the beginning my questions sent out in the questionnaire where quite vague, as is seen in Appendix 1. However, while gathering my initial data and starting to conduct interviews, my questions became more precise, and I came to the conclusion, that I need to separate between the different typologies of racism and put great emphasis on multiculturalisms, as racism is a very charged word which in Finland is often avoided and described in other terms. A highly relevant question that came up in all my interviews, but not in my questionnaires, is:” What is the relationship between anti-racism and promoting multiculturalism?” Also the chapter General Challenges is founded on results I did not expect to come across, as my initial idea was to analyse ideas about challenging racism more than structural hinders for the work, as experienced by anti-racists. Studying the particular network has enabled me to give an insight of institutional actors (mainly NGO’s56) in the field, as well as of individuals representing these actors and their views on racism, anti-racism and multiculturalism.

The data in this study consists of two main pieces of information collected; interviews and a questionnaire. During the scope of my research I also conducted a reader survey for the English language magazine Six Degrees, in February 2007. The survey included a few open-ended questions of my own, which I meant to use as supporting material for this work. The survey yielded 127 answers, of which 63 included some sort of response to my own set of racism related questions. However most of them consisted of only a few words and not full sentences, which led to the fact that I was not able to interpret them, nor find a link to the material I gathered specifically for this thesis. The magazine defines itself as follows: “SixDegrees provides information on interesting multicultural topics, events and people. SixDegrees is a stimulating meeting point for Finns and

56 The word in Finnish is kansalaisjärjestö. Whether or not the Finnish civil society mainly consists of Non-Governmental Institutions is debatable as most organisations get their funding from the government.
foreigners, creating a positive arena for the interaction of different cultures. Due to this, I thought that my questions:

1) What do you think should be the most urgent objectives within Finnish anti-racism?

2) Which actors and actions do you consider to make up anti-racism activities in Finland? Are you involved in anti-racism activities?

3) How do you see the relationship between multiculturalism and anti-racism?

Six Degrees Reader Survey 2007, would give me an interesting material on how people who according to themselves (mainly) are not actively involved in anti-racism work, but somehow interested in “multicultural topics” see the field. However, the material did not provide useful, as is was too shattered and imprecise due to the one-word answers and very limited knowledge of the institutional anti-racist field in Finland. Many respondents did clearly also not understand my questions. Thus, the answers from the readers of the multicultural magazine are left out of my analysis and I have focused on the professional or actively volunteering anti-racists I have reached through direct contact.

The objective of this study is to come up with special traits that are and to some extent, that should be present within the discourse and acts of anti-racism in Finland in order to efficiently combat racism, thus to map the field. Key questions asked in both the questionnaire I have sent out and in the interviews I have conducted are: what are the main problems that racism causes in Finland? How should these problems be challenged and what are the main obstacles in doing so. For thorough documentation of the questionnaire see Appendix 1, while a more descriptive documentation of my work can be seen below.

57 http://www.6d.fi/what_is_six_degrees
58 See critique of my research topic in regard to individuals doing everyday resistance above, chapter 1.2.
5.1 Written Feedback

The open-ended questionnaire (Appendix 1) was on May 3\textsuperscript{rd} 2007 sent out to 62 email addresses of contact persons representing the different actors involved in RASMUS-network, or people who attended the annual meeting of RASMUS or referred to in the two latest Rasismi ja etninen syrjintä Suomessa -reports as organisations that carry out anti-racism activities. I put in a deadline of May 25\textsuperscript{th}. Due to unforeseen technical problems I only sent out a reminder to send in the replies on May 29\textsuperscript{th}. The questionnaire was in Finnish, which is the usual language of communication within RASMUS. The analysis was done in Finnish, and I have then translated quotations used here to English, so eventual misinterpretations regarding language are solely on my responsibility. The analysis of the material was done in Finnish for the sake of reliability, and as meanings and constructs of language are of great interest to me as I am partially working on the constructivist perspective in which locally and specifically constructed realities and knowledge are important.

I gathered the email addresses to which the questionnaire was sent through homepages of NGOs, the RASMUS webpage and the RASMUS sub-group contact information presented on it. My questionnaire was also posted in the RASMUS newsletter 20/07, on May 10\textsuperscript{th}, which has around 1500 subscribers according to the annual report\textsuperscript{59} of RASMUS Network, after an employee at The Finnish League for Human Rights suggested this to me. Later on there was also a reminder to reply to my questionnaire sent out in RASMUS newsletter 22/07 on May 24\textsuperscript{th}. My questionnaire was also forwarded to the ETMU-list which is an email list for researchers within the fields of ethnic relations and migration studies, but this did not yield any responses to the questionnaire. The respondents to both the questionnaire and informants in my interviews are documented in appendix 2.

The aim with the questionnaire was to gain a greater understanding of the ideologies and ideas behind anti-racism work, experienced challenges of racism, as well as challenges in the concrete work done within the civil society actors in Finland that

\textsuperscript{59} http://rasmus.fi/view_wysiwyg_attach/Toimintakertomus2006.doc?id=140
explicitly state themselves to work against racism. These replies also generated background knowledge for the interviews I conducted later on in my research process. I also inquired about motives for doing anti-racist work.

The questionnaire, which was adjusted after consulting with my thesis supervisor, at the time, yielded fourteen filled in questionnaires and two replies in which there was not answers to my questions but comments on my work, as well as two persons volunteering for being interviewed. Further I received three mails where the respondent told me that they didn’t feel that their organisation was really involved in anti-racism to the extent that they would have wanted to answer, one response where the person stated that he wasn’t involved in anti-racism anymore, and that he therefore didn’t want to answer individually since his involvement in anti-racism had been as part of an organisation he did not longer work for. Two of the addresses (obtained from web pages of organisations listed in the appendix) that I tried to email were not correct and my mail bounced. I did however reach both persons through phone, and one of them later gave me an interview. Nine of the fourteen answers came after either the reminder sent to the RASMUS list or personal reminder I sent out. All my email correspondence regarding the research remains archived in my digital filing system for possible reference later on. Of the fourteen answers, six were from people representing one of the twenty-nine organisations listed as the Support Network for RASMUS. Counting in the interviews conducted and replies not resulting in a filled in questionnaire I reached representatives for thirteen out of 29 organisations listed as the support group of RASMUS. I further reached seven persons who are or have been coordinators of one of the subgroups in RASMUS. And important thing to note is that the same respondent might be active in multiple different organisations and thus fit many of the above mentioned categories of respondents.

Although fourteen filled in questionnaires isn’t very many, out of potentially 1500 subscribers to the RASMUS newsletter and above 60 personal requests and reminders sent out I am still doing qualitative work, and not primarily interested in quantifying data, but rather to find meanings and map different ways of doing anti-racist work.

60 http://rasmus.fi/page_view?p=72&l=1&s=6&t=1
Thus, although my coverage is not all-encompassing, I received enough responses to categorise them into a coherent story. The validity of my responses was further strengthened through my interviews. Hence I feel they can be used to describe certain elements regarding anti-racism in Finland, and review particular theories regarding anti-racism based on my material. However, as the answers have come from a very narrow group of respondents the capacity to generalise based on this study is limited, and my theoretical formulations are based on the specific material I have gathered and not by analysing great amount of actors that work on anti-racism, as in e.g. survey style questionnaire gathering described in Allard and Anderson (2005).

One reason for not receiving so many answers could be the fact that this questionnaire was mainly designed to reach organisations, and that individuals might thus have felt that they cannot speak for an organisation (e.g. due to internal hierarchies or similar), as indicated in the quote in chapter two. Another reason suggested to me in one of the commenting emails sent to me by an employee of University of Jyväskylä was that, I was lacking credibility due to using an email address that does not indicate my home university. However, I have a very difficult time to believe this, as my full name is visible in the sender field and I had included a background letter as well as my phone number. Further, I have difficulties understanding the lack of credibility in my request as it was published in the RASMUS newsletter, which is an edited electronic news publication for people involved in opposing racism.

As mentioned my questionnaire was sent out in Finnish, as it is the primary working language in RASMUS. This might limit my answers from persons not fluent in Finnish. On the other hand practically all communication in the RASMUS newsletter and in the network itself (meetings, annual meetings, annual reports etc.) is carried out in Finnish which to some extent indicates, that the key actors in the network whom I expected to answer would have been capable of responding in Finnish.
5.2 Lengthy Conversations

I conducted a total of six interviews with different anti-racist actors who have been involved in the different sub-groups of RASMUS and in various organisations that have close ties to the network and where the person has either been coordinator of a sub-group or otherwise involved in projects carried out under RASMUS. My interviews with the informants did not include detailed information on the backgrounds of the interviewees, as my interest primarily is not to map why they are involved in anti-racism activities. This can also be explained in the light of me not being interested in identity-politics in the sense that actors build an identity based on collective movement and external categories such as education background, age or similar. I am nevertheless interested in collective action based on a shared political or ‘cultural identity’, around which a movement or efficient actions and practices can be built. However, many interviewees remembered different events or campaigns they have been involved in, which revealed also personal information and also informed me about why or when becoming involved with the topic.

Based on the interviews conducted, many of the other organisations other interviewees represent were mentioned, which shows that my interviewees are highly relevant and at the centre of institutionalised anti-racism work in Finland. More specifically the European Network against Racism (ENAR Finland), the All Different All Equal campaign (KEKS\textsuperscript{61}), The Finnish Red Cross and RASMUS, as well as Human Rights organisations in general, were all mentioned numerous times during the course of my interviews, when discussing the issue on who are doing meaningful anti-racist work in Finland.

Although I had some questions outlined, in the questionnaire (appendix 1), as background for my interviews\textsuperscript{62}, there were naturally several questions inserted that are not included in the questionnaire, and many questions were not asked, as they had often

\textsuperscript{61} Kaikki erilaisia, kaikki samanarvoisia.

\textsuperscript{62} The questions in the Appendix as well as those regarding multiculturalism were the ‘themes’ of my thematic interview.
already been thoroughly answered during conversation around some of the other questions I presented. I also asked questions regarding multiculturalism, multicultural society etc. and what the respondent understands with this and how these play a role in the task of combating racism. Conducting the interviews after receiving the responses to the questionnaires, guided me in the sense, that I placed a quite large emphasis on discussing the relationship between multiculturalism and anti-racism.

The interviews lasted between one and one and a half hours, which yielded me with a quite extensive 55 page material of transcribed interviews (on top of the 25 pages of questionnaire responses) to analyse. I conducted the transcription of the first three interviews in early June 2007 immediately after the interviews in late June and July, but for the latter three only in October. However, as I am primarily interested in world views, ideologies, actions and textual analysis, emotions do not play as a big role as in e.g. life history interviews, family ethnographies or similar, and therefore I feel that my research was not compromised by this delay of transcribing. Most other material I have used is found on the www.rasmus.fi webpage.

Before moving on to the analysis of my material, I will mention something on my position as researcher and research ethics.

5.3 Researcher or Activist?

When engaging in qualitative research positioning oneself is of crucial importance. I’ve had a keen interest for anti-racism for many years, which makes studying the subject highly interesting as well as challenging. Being analytical about issues that one has a strong personal conviction is always challenging. Further, keeping in mind that I am naturally part of the very same power hierarchies that I wish to play a role in challenging, and writing from a position of privilege being ‘white’ and male, are issues of importance in my positioning. As well as realising that the entire research tradition of anthropology carries some of the burden of colonialism and playing its part in the tradition of essentialising ‘other’, distant, cultures. As my space is limited, I do not have the possibility to dwell upon this in depth, nevertheless it is important for the reader to
keep in mind as well as for me in analysing my results. Recognising structural inequalities is the first step in trying to challenge them.

However, despite these challenges thorough application of research methods and documentation of one’s work helps in achieving reliability in a situation as such. I am documenting some of my views, presented elsewhere, in this thesis in order for the reader to gain insight towards my views, and thus give a better chance of being critical towards my analysis. It is then up to the reader to evaluate how my arguments for anti-racism are valued on a theoretical level. I will position myself by a letter to the editor by me, published in Aamulehti on December 17th 2006. This letter gives a general idea on how I saw the use of language as a factor in reproducing racism about one year before writing this particular chapter of my thesis in December 2007. Although I have translated quotes from my informants, I will present this text in Finnish as it focused on the role of (the Finnish) language in reifying racist attitudes, which is to some extent left out when translating responses into English.
I have over the last years been involved in some campaigns that are in one way or another related to challenging racism or fighting for immigrant’s rights. However, I have tried to separate this research from my personal activities through the narrowing down of my research object to RASMUS, under which I have not been active, although some active groups in RASMUS have also been contacts or involved in campaigns that I have participated in. Although, trying to separate my anthropologist self from my other selves, it is naturally not possible to do so completely. As Sarah Pink (1998, 11) writes: “Fieldwork is a very personal experience, and its results represent the anthropologist’s best attempts to communicate his/her subjectivity to particular audiences. The personal and professional selves, identities and agendas of development workers, like anthropologists are inextricably interwoven and cannot be divorced from their creativity in producing texts, practices and policies.” Therefore I am also quite content to state this work has the agenda of advancing anti-racism or combating racism, and that my views have been part of formulating the research question, choosing the research object, analysing the setting which this object is present in and so forth. However, as I am documenting, analysing and interpreting according to specific methods, this is a work of social science and not merely a pamphlet of my thoughts. Nevertheless, as Guba and Lincoln point out (1998, 202) everything written is a human construct, in their paper a construction of theirs, and in my thesis one of mine.

5.4 Research Ethics

When studying a subject where the researcher has a strong personal conviction, questions of ethics are of even greater importance than otherwise. By this I mean, in order for the results of the research to be valid and relevant, there needs to be transparency in how the research is conducted and the results are achieved. I have therefore above described my research process in depth, and tried to produce something of a thick description, as coined by Clifford Geertz (Allard and Anderson, 2005), of my research process as well as of the research subject itself.

The responses to my questionnaire were not gathered with anonymity, as this would have been very difficult to do when using email, which for economic and time reasons
was the only alternative. On the other hand anonymity is often considered to be of great importance when carrying out social research. In this case, where my respondents are people who are outspokenly working against racism, this is not necessary the case as many of them have appeared in media or do so frequently, give lectures or otherwise campaign for their cause. Further, many people reflect over a professional identity in their answers as they are employed through projects or NGOs which work in opposing racism in one way or another. This information is usually also publicly available on e.g. websites of the organisations. However, when finding out views and ideas common to all my respondents, I have concluded that it is not important which particular organisation an individual respondent is working for, and thus left the answers anonymous. Also, trying to campaign for a common goal is necessarily a collective struggle. Hence I feel it is not necessary important to refer to particular individuals involved in the work by name or organisation as their work is collective. By quoting my respondents’ answers were relevant and presenting particular parts of the answers in detail I am able to give a clear picture and give evidence of the all-encompassing findings of my research. However, presenting the reader with information on who has answered my questionnaire or been interviewed is important for the sake of reliability. I have chosen to present the names of the organisations (Appendix 2) people, whom I have received answers from or have conducted interviews with, represent.
6 ANALYSIS

An interesting point regarding problems of social sciences can be described through an anecdote told by Ulla Vuorela during an anthropology lecture I attended in February, 2006. She mentioned a paragraph in Erlend Loe’s novel Supernaiv, in which the main character (a Norwegian national without bonds to the U.S.) is walking his brother’s dog in New York City, and plays with the thought that everybody who sees him probably will assume *him being* a New Yorker walking *his* dog. One classic theory surrounding this is that of Ervin Goffman in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Allard and Anderson, 2005) in which he puts forth the metaphor of the stage and the actors, and that all public appearance is an act and that the true essence of a site is impossible to reach without reaching the back stage where spontaneous acts are performed. In the above work this means, that while performing an act that also ‘locals’ in New York perform the novel character is assumed by others to be a New Yorker. This becomes relevant in this work in the sense that I have not been observing my informants while they have been carrying out their work. As I have an impression of their anti-racist work and that my views surrounding this has affected my ability to formulate questions, while I have no way of evaluating how the views presented by my informants are materialised in the everyday work or interaction at their place of work, where less ‘public’ acts are most likely performed. However, I do find my results credible of depicting the anti-racism work as the different responses I have obtained show a great similarity in regard to some aspects.

All of my interviews (as well as the questionnaires) started with questions regarding in which groups, networks, NGOs or similar the respondent was working. Most of the informants have paid positions in organisations or public sector bodies concerned with issues of racism. Some, such as the people involved in the different branches of RASMUS, do specialised volunteer work in anti-racism, such as research, organising seminars *etc.* or have contacts and insight which relates to their professional identities such as working with asylum seekers or coordinating immigrant activities on municipality level. Although the RASMUS groups consist of a large groups of professionals from many different fields, (education, social work, administration,
research etc.) the network is nevertheless based on non-professional volunteer work. Coming in contact with informants who have a professional approach to their involvement in anti-racism, is limiting, as mentioned above as everyday resistance to racism amongst individuals and political groups or such fall outside the scope of this research.

I will next present the main findings of my research and key aspects and challenges of anti-racism in Finland as defined by my informants; the people I have interviewed and the respondents to my questionnaire. My presentation will be carried out by showing two core issues which have been raised by nearly all my respondents, that is the focus of funding for their work and the challenges of multiculturalism as anti-racism, thus filling the saturation point relevant for qualitative studies. After this I have chosen to present a common critique regarding anti-racism, that of absence of the radical anti-racist position. The presentation of my findings is done by presenting them as a ‘dialogue’, based on the responses of respondents and then commenting upon this. On some occasions I have included my author’s voice (by including my questions) to make the “discussion” flow. The ‘discussion’ should not be seen as ‘directly quoted’, as I have exerted them from “lengthy conversations”, to some extent out of the context in which they were discussed and translated them into another language. It should rather, be seen as an attempt to present my material in a new form that gives justice to my informants stories after my translation of them.

I have chosen to present my material thoroughly like this, in order to give the reader a clear picture on just how similarly my respondents see the field of anti-racism on some core issues important for the work. On the other hand, many things encountered in my interview and questionnaire responses, where clear cut conclusions could not be made, have been left out (as always when analysing a large material) and I have focused on the

63 I have indicated the change of respondent in the narrative with a new code number or letter and the letter R and Q, as many of my interviewees would be easily identified due to their professional volunteer work position if even their organization was mentioned. Presenting so much of my interview findings, through these edited quotes, in dialogue form gives a thorough picture of anti-racism in Finland and the everyday problems these actively involved people face in their work.
issues where there has been a consensus and concrete issues to grasp and analyse. However, presenting my material thoroughly in the form of quotes should not only be seen as quotes from my interviewees as they are also a product of my translation (Clifford, 1997). Although Clifford talks about translating cultures and not words, my translation (into English) obviously also includes also a translation on how I have understood the responses I collected for this work. When presenting them in a fictive dialogue or narrative form they give a clearer picture of the data I have obtained than would theoretical categorisations which this work is full of. When placing the bits of text, I interpret as well as translate the data, which thus includes my analysis. However to note is, that the meanings of my respondents might to some extent have been altered no matter how precisely I have tried to translate them, which of course is on my responsibility.

6.1 General Challenges of Anti-Racism in Finland

I will first look into specific societal and organisational issues that play a key role in opposing racism in Finland, as this was the main finding of this work. Through the below conversation between my interview respondents (R) and questionnaire respondents (Q) I will show that the lack of resources is something that the people I have been in touch with a deeply troubled over, and how funding and the topic being “difficult to approach” affects also the contents of the work.

R2: People have a limited amount of time and good will, but work this important, cannot be left only to volunteers. Who does it benefit to have good equality-plans unless their demands are being met and nothing is done to achieve the goals set forth in them? This just becomes another endless cycle of meetings. The problem is that networks and similar do not get funding, laws and plans are good, but this is not adequate if problems are not challenged. Despite all the networks, the work still seems quite shattered. Maybe a common magazine or something similar could help.

R5: Resources are important, we can’t hire even one person, and this work takes a lot of time, almost every weekend. We need to employ someone, maybe with the help of the city [Helsinki]. Then there are the other human rights organisations and organisations that work against racism. It is very important for us to work together, so that there won’t be competition, and take advantage of the scarce resources. E.g. the B-permit campaign was excellent because we had a common goal that was important for all. It was not important who did what, but what was done. What is important though, is that everyone who wants to can be involved.
R6: And then on the other hand the structures of governance. Finland is a small country, and I mean, if anti-racism work wants to be carried out thoroughly, it needs to be financed so that people can work on these issues full time. In Finland all the financing goes to Helsinki and to governance, (from e.g. EU). It’s very difficult to get any money out to the ‘field’. We’ve tried for ages, but it stays there. These are structural issues that belong to Finland.

Dan: have you tried to apply for an EU funded project?

R6: We haven’t applied, because the self-financing proportions are so grand. But EU gives the Ministry of Labour some money for issues like these, but that stay in the big projects, they don’t divide it up into smaller projects and the ‘field’. Everything has its place, but I feel that those people who are active on a local level should be supported. It is really important. Things like this cannot be Helsinki centred.

R4: We have the Ministry of Education who gives out peanuts, but there is a lack of cooperation between ministries, mutual plans of action and financing on this issue. This is a marginal thing in high level politics. And in Finland there is a lack of high level politicians, ministers, prime ministers etc. who outspokenly and expressively have an anti-racist agenda. Silence of authorities is the norm. The ministries do not hand out money. That is a fact. They have money, but they do not distribute it locally or regionally. No, they use it up between themselves, and there are this EU projects which are only visible in Helsinki.

Dan: What about EU-money?

R4: It’s possible, but the problem is that grassroots actors do not have people to apply for this money. Who coordinates, administers and from where do we get the self financing. E.g. ERF, European Refugee Fund used to be one without self financing demands in cash. We could do small projects through them. The Ministry of Labour administered them, and it was quite simple. Volunteer work was enough for self financing but when it needs to be 30-50% it makes it impossible for all us small actors (one RASMUS local group).

R1: I think we are too small to get financing. And also otherwise, anti-racism is financed very little. Maybe when the action has evolved and we are a much broader (RASMUS) network we could apply. But up until now, no! This is the catch. We cannot become broader without resources that we cannot get if we are not broad enough.

Funding for NGOs that carry out anti-racist projects is a common cause for anger and grief amongst anti-racists. Especially people who work on a local level feel that this work is not financed at all, and all EU and ministry funding is only realised in the capital Helsinki. However, also grassroots organisations in Helsinki feel the same way about issues regarding funding. To note here, is that state funding is a key pillar of the
so called\textsuperscript{64} NGO sector in Finland where, the tradition of ’hugging to death’ non-radical and to some extent also radical movements to as well as for movements to organise as formal registered legal bodies, is very strong in Finland and its nordic model social-state (e.g. Pyykkönen 2007). Within the social-state also funding for civil society activities is regarded as the norm, while NGOs in many areas operate in functions legally the responsibility of the (social) state. Often the reasons for organising as registered organisations are specifically related to the issues of funding. Thus, by changing funding criteria, the direction of highly institutionalised movements may be strongly altered and possibilities of obtaining funding become more difficult which might lead to problems.

The problem might become that project funding has its foundation on short term procedures, where the target is usually some acute and concrete problem, which a particular project is aimed to solve. Although good results may be achieved in regard to a single target group, it is nevertheless a fact that issues such as social exclusion can not be solved within a three year period. On the contrary, a lot of times there is need for a new project and thus a vicious circle is born. Instead of increasing basic services on a municipality level, insecure outside funding is used, while already developed know how might be lost once the project ends.

Järvinen and Janhukainen (2001, 131)

The above sentiments regarding funding in many ways define the content of the work, as my respondents feel, that the money spent for anti-racist work in the structures cannot be seen in the field. However, some of my respondents also work in projects with immigrants and other minority groups involved, where many other issues are prioritised over anti-racism. I will discuss these issues and how they relate to the funding of projects next. It seems to be problematic, that there is no continuity in certain types of projects that are funded and their objectives cannot necessarily be achieved as ‘wrong’ things are addressed. More importantly though, the lack of funding is related to, or depends on, structural issues such as the ‘general attitude’ seeing racism as something difficult to approach and a dirty thing not suitable for discussion or debate:

\textsuperscript{64} In Finnish ’kansalaisjärjestö’, which is commonly translated into NGO does not denotate separateness from state as does ’Non-Governmental’ in NGO. Civil Society Organisation, would thus be a more adequate translation, but for the sake of common practice I have chosen to use NGO.
R3: We have such a small budget. The project appears like the organisation wants it to, which isn’t good. I’ve created action plans, ideas etc. but as I cannot finance the actual work and employees to carry it out I don’t know how it will look like. There is no such thing as: “Oh, you have this coming up here is 2000€ for the expenses.” As I am ‘only’ able to distribute t-shirts and some other material people feel that they do not need to report to me, which means I have difficulties following up on the plans at large. I still know that a lot of things are going on, but I have to say it’s more of this multiculturalism, equality etc. and not racism as such. I very seldom hear that somebody would have specifically worked on opposing racism. It’s more of this, kind of, dealing with difference…. If I look at my own work, I’m a bit disappointed in how few immigrants have gotten involved in this project. I’ve clearly not succeeded in this. Racism has very much been left out of the focus, as it has been on pluralism. And trying to understand the discourse of exclusion, because that is what racism is about also… The problem is that when you ask organisations, everybody supports anti-racism, but when you look at allocation of resources, the situation is completely different and other issues are prioritised.

QM: The greatest challenge in opposing racism, at the moment, is the clearly visible tendency of project funding shifting from anti-racism work to e.g. bettering ethnic relations and equal opportunities. This looks good on the surface but brings forth the problem that racism is seen as a malignant side effect of other things, although attitude change for people needs clear cut anti-racist work. Let’s take Great Britain as example; ethnic relations have taken the place of racism in nearly all public debate, although the problem field of ethnic relations stems from deeply racist and xenophobic attitudes. My personal wish for anti-racists in Finland is for them to keep talking about racism as the key problem... This is also a problem in regard to the funding bodies of the work, which seem to think that racism should be only one element, besides ethnic relations, in carrying out projects. I feel racism should be discussed as racism and not narrowed down to “problems in ethnic relations”.

QK: In our organisation the lack of resources (funding, time) has up until now hindered us from broader activities. Anti-racism work in Finland is difficult as multicultural activities among the main population base are not financed. Racism is not going away by producing ethnic art groups to cultural events. Emphasising ‘the other’ as exotic does not challenge prejudices that are present at e.g. the laundry room in a suburb in Helsinki. People need opportunities for open interaction where they acquaint themselves with other people in day-to-day interaction and learn to understand other people’s thoughts and manners.

QG: The allocation of resources in a very important thing; what kinds of projects are funded as multicultural activities? If racism would be seen as shaping the society at large, and would not be considered only something for special groups or the NGO sector to deal with, we could affect discrimination in employment (which is one of the most acute problems). However, I don’t think anti-racism should (or could beneficially) be nationalised. We need to find a balance between the state and the third sector.
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QL: Cooperation is necessary. The problem is the never-ending lack of resources, real or imagined. Financial and time allocation resources are what usually make cooperation fail. Racism is also considered an unpleasant subject, who nobody wants to touch. It’s easy to lure people to multicultural and equality projects but not to anti-racist ones. The word racism is avoided, problems are not discussed and everybody likes foreign food or music as long as racism is not on the agenda.

R1: Racism affects all people, this is everybody’s problem. Falling victim to racism can happen to anyone, citizens and residents, basically to all of ‘us’. This does not affect only people with immigrant background. No, this affects everyone, and putting forth this message is difficult.

The above quotes can not easily be tied into different ways of practicing anti-racism described above. However, as Rastas (2005, 69) has stated: “Racism is highly difficult to oppose if we do not want to or know how to identify and name it.” My research findings show a tendency towards this, as my respondents clearly feel that they have a lack of funding for their work. The respondents also criticise the funding for certain ‘pluralist’ projects at the expense of clear cut anti-racism. This on the hand is a bit controversial as we will see in the next chapter, where multicultural education and similar approaches are offered as solutions for tackling racism. According to Bonnett’s categorisations these multiculturalist approaches are a form of anti-racism which brings forth the specific issues mentioned as problems above, whereas radical anti-racism (Bonnett, 2000) or approaches that could be categorised as such were not discussed almost at all by my respondents, although problems in the employment sector were identified as highly important. I will describe this in more thorough detail below, after first presenting a study which shows results very similar to my study and how the approaches presented by respondents can be categorised.

6.2 Promoting Multiculturalism and Psychological Anti-Racism

After discussing some of the structural general problems behind doing anti-racist work above I will now present different findings on how the target group of my research see the content of their work and how ‘multiculturalism in a multicultural society’ (see chapter 2) plays a role in this work. More specifically, this chapter presents how this affirming multiculturalism and raising consciousness relate to anti-racism. Bonnett’s (2000, 85) categorisation on how to practice anti-racism is highly useful in providing a
theoretical background for my empirical material. Multicultural anti-racism, with its roots in relativism, might as defined above take different forms ranging from conservative to revolutionary. Finland, as all nation states are to some extent multicultural, as defined in chapters two and three. According to Bonnett (2000, 91), this is a widely accepted fact on governmental level where: "Multiculturalism appears a pervasive component of government and administration, a component designed to achieve a sustainable state and economy. However, multiculturalism may also be defined with other aims in mind, namely the eradication of racism and/or the recognition and affirmation of cultural plurality." However, what according to Bonnett (2000) almost always remains, is the fact that ‘culture’ is used as an euphemism for ‘race’ as does the view that valuing other cultures will reduce racism. This at large is a very individualistic view, failing to take into account structural inequalities which will not go away by education on how to become ‘good people’. Structural issues that create a hierarchic labour market, due to e.g. rigid immigration laws and practices forcing non-nationals into desperate life situations, not accepting foreign degrees, demanding fluency in Finnish language etc. play a role in having e.g. African engineers as janitors, or importing Filipino medical doctors and nurses to Finland to perform aid nursing tasks\(^67\) due to “their culture of respecting the elderly and eagerness to serve.”

According to Bonnett (2000) multiculturalism, as anti-racism, tries to tackle the cultural exclusion characteristic of ‘new racism’. A recent study on youth work and specifically on “multicultural youth”: Yhdessä vai yksin erilaisina\(^68\) show that most youth interviewed hope for more efficient informational work and: “clear cut anti-racism action instead of vague multicultural education (Honkasalo, Harinen and Anttila 2007, 11).” Most of the informants in this study put forth racism as big problem, without being specifically asked about it. Although the categorisation of the youth in this study as multi-cultural is problematic in itself, as this definition is given by the researchers based on country of birth and citizenship of parents, the results are very clear. Nearly half (17/38) of all respondents had experienced some form of racism and/or prejudicial

\(^{67}\) Ulkolinja: Vientiutotteena hoitajat (2008), Yleisradio: Helsinki. Documentary on imported lease-labour, CEO for Esperi Care, when interviewed about importing labour for elderly care. 

\(^{68}\) Together, or alone different?
behaviour towards them. Some experienced this in interaction with fellow youth and friends others with teachers and youth workers. Many also stated that their families or family businesses experienced racist problems, others that dealing with civil servants in welfare offices, hospitals or the police as well as when applying for jobs. The informants who experienced racism felt that they have been excluded and rejected.

Problems regarding racism mentioned by my informants are very similar, which shows that discussions transferred to researchers from victims of racism have also been communicated to or experienced in the ‘field’ by anti-racists. The problem is that anti-racism approaches have not been studied to meet the demands the hands-on reality puts us in. My informants described the problems as follows:

R2: Concrete problems are related to housing, working and studying opportunities, as well as participating in society. It is difficult to get a chance. There are all forms of guidelines from the state, but what about the follow-up? There is no point in producing papers just because of the law; plans need to be followed-up, every half year or so. What if surveys were conducted at places of employment, how are different people met? And have their needs been taken into account. And then, also language training is important and then also the language skill demands. It’s important to have oversight in this if the Finnish language is not needed to perform a certain task.

R3: The acute problems...? These are exclusion experienced by youth, name-calling, they are really rough experiences. It’s not always violence it’s also symbolism, what is communicated and how it’s communicated that: “you don’t belong here.” Youth workers and teachers intervene in the use of the “n-word”, but there are so many other things that feel just as bad. We need to understand that there are numerous other things going on besides beating and name-calling (which also happen a lot). And then there are these institutional issues, when youth are quarrelling or fighting racism is rarely identified. When one party states that there is no racist motivation the issue is forgotten, although racist slurs or similar have been a big part of the disagreement.

These comments very well match the reality faced by youth as described by Harinen (2007, 37) who in the above mentioned study states that: “The experienced rejection is founded on group pressure, collective conflict and static impressions of ‘cultures’.” In a situation as such, where youth participating in multicultural activities together with ‘white Finns’ or people belonging to the ‘majority population’, one is forced to ask: what is the point of multicultural education and activities if they are utterly useless, and
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emphasise differentialism more than sameness, leading to the racialism (see Wieviorka in chapter 2.3 above) and its nasty consequences? Obviously multicultural education is not aimed at producing static views of ‘cultures’, but if that is the consequence experienced by ‘multicultural youth’ (as Honkasalo, Harinen and Anttila 2007 shows), maybe sameness and self-definition (hybridity) should be emphasised and not difference (‘multiculturalism’). Bonnett (2000) reflects over this and states that, multiculturalism is characteristically concerned with more than simply learning about others. The point of multicultural education is to enable people to ‘see things from others’ point of view. This brings forth an interesting irony, affirming and reproducing difference but for universalist ends as Bonnett puts it. How the world and humanity are one is commonly emphasised while still maintaining and reproducing ‘cultural differences’.

Focusing on the multiculturalism aspects was commonly present amongst my informants a few of whom which stated as follows:

R5: The foundation of racism is ignorance about immigrants, other cultures, other people and this generates prejudice. E.g. between immigrant groups there can also be racism. This is one point. There is not only racism between immigrants and ‘majority-Finns’ but also between immigrant groups. Increased multiculturalism increases tolerance, it is quite important that people get knowledge about other cultures, and know what is good in them. Many say that Islamophobia is on the rise, one way for people to get closer to each other, is to increase knowledge about each other.

R3: I don’t have any other method than education and increasing contacts to tackle this. What is important is that this cannot be based on volunteerism for teachers or after school or on an after-school multiculturalism club. This is exactly the roaming about in the peripheries, when this should clearly be an all-encompassing principle. If you think on how racist attitudes are present in schools, especially for boys. I think it is incomprehensible, horrible, that our school system raises such intolerant racist children. It feels like nobody speaks out about these issues: “look at this and what it tells about our society.

R2: I think... I mean racism is mainly associated to prejudices and fears. People are afraid of “otherness.” It’s very easy to oppose something and be afraid of something when you experience it as a threat. Racism is per definition related to ethnic inequality, one “race” being different from another. But if you don’t see it like this but from a broader point of view, if this otherness is brought closer to us it stops being frightening. This is where I see that multicultural education can have an impact.

R1: We need tolerance training to authorities, but primarily we need trainings at basic education schools, vocational schools, universities. Multiculturalism
and diversity trainings have to be attached to curricula and be done over the years. And then for these existing authorities need to be given multiculturalism-training on the side of their jobs. This has already been done and the laws have been passed\(^71\). However passing the law always doesn’t change attitudes. Training does and education, which is one of the absolutely best ways.

Dan: You mean multicultural education?
Yes!

Dan: What do you mean by this?

It can include anything, *e.g.* in health care it can be basic treating immigrant patients. If we take another example, police or border control, *e.g.* recognising victims of human trafficking and or dealing with different diverse clients in a way that enables the client to feel that he/she has been treated equally with dignity.

*E.g.* Huttunen (2005) argues that cultural groups do not form clear-cut, self-reproducing, exclusive entities. Why then are ‘cultures’ often presented as entities in multicultural work or as seen above, when educating how to treat immigrants, in tolerance training to police *etc.*? Although my informants seem to have identified structural problems such as housing, employment, education and general denial of racism, it still seems the solutions offered to challenge racism is training and education and not structural adjustments. On the other hand, this could be explained with the structural situation itself (chapter 6.1). If forced to do certain kind of work due to funding aspects, this might play a role into how the work is approached.

Tying the above ‘culturally’ focused approach to my study object, the RASMUS network, *e.g.* the annual Week against Racism activities, by the Tampere group\(^72\) under the network, in later years have included all kinds of events emphasising difference in a positive way, such as ‘exotic’ fashion shows in Koskikeskus; exhibits, food or music events by a certain national group *e.g.* an Afghanistan cultural exhibit in 2007 that I visited; and a pub quiz with questions about geography, food and “how large percentage of the worlds population is white?” Events such as these can be seen as promoting difference (although trying to do so in a positive way) instead of sameness, universalism. This is problematic, as it easily becomes, not self-definition of these

---

\(^71\) Yhdenvertaisuuslaki, tasa-arvolaki, kotouttamislaki, ulkomaalaislaki

\(^72\) http://www.rasmus.fi/tampere/ohjelm.html, retrieved on 20.11.2007
different groups, but an ‘exotic’ presentation of particular ethnic or national groups. The multicultural fashion show was described in one of my interviews as follows:

R4: Well, from start, we haven’t had one main goal, but something for everyone. That’s why the diversity of this network is so good! That we really have traditions that we have church concerts and sermons related to this theme (during the week). And other things, evening activities at clubs with a livelier vibe and multicultural setting. Then we for long have had this fashion show which is meant for regular townspeople as I passing by idea that: Hey, there’s different kind of people. It has been visible, and people are expecting it already. It has usually been organised at Koskikeskus maybe 3-4 times the same show.

The key here is the part, different kind of people, which \textit{per se} is not a problem. However, what might become a challenge is when this difference is understood as the main thing to perceive and it is portrayed over sameness on a certain issue which can form a collective identity for anti-racist struggle. However, also other ideas came up. When I asked for a definition of multiculturalism one interviewee stressed this on a general level: “R4: Well kind of, when making this separation, or emphasising difference, inequality is ‘produced’ and maybe fear of other cultures. Maybe that’s the reason why I don’t want to talk about this.” Still in all of my interviews it came up that one main goal is to present “different people”, which to me seems unexplainable in sense that \textit{e.g.} R4 above realises this will produce inequality. Sara Ahmed (2008, 1) proves a similar point in regard to multiculturalism, when she comments on how speaking about liberal multiculturalism has become hegemonic:

\begin{quote}
I would argue that multiculturalism is a fantasy which conceals forms of racism, violence and inequality as if the organisation/nation can now say: how can you experience racism when we are committed to diversity? In my research project on diversity in organisations, when Black staff spoke about racism, organisations often responded by pointing to their race equality and diversity policies, as if these policies were the point. Black staff spoke of how they deal with whiteness everyday and how diversity and equality as organisational ideals get in the way of reporting these experiences. You are asked to be a tick in their box by smiling with gratitude, adding colour to the white face of the organisation. Diversity as an ego ideal conceals experiences of racism, which means that multiculturalism is a fantasy which supports the hegemony of whiteness.
\end{quote}

Thus, according to Ahmed, the whole speech about liberal multiculturalism and diversity to some extent reifies racism and the hegemony of ‘whiteness’.
However, also a differing point of view, from the commonly accepted idea of presenting diversity, was presented by my informants who also stated that it is difficult to find common specified objectives for the work and wished for more centralised functions in order to make the work more efficient. High level of diversity within the work is partially seen as problematic, as it is difficult to put out a collective message:

QM: I feel cooperation is important, but a bit problematic as we are lacking common denominators in the work, This on the other hand is understandable, taking into account the diversity of the network, but personally I wish that RASMUS network could be a bit more centralised, and to define the focal points on a national level. I believe this would enable better visibility and effectiveness of the work.

E.g. Werbner (1997, 247) argues that the only way to come up with efficient anti-racisms is to take into account power relations, while the “thrust of multiculturalism is towards fragmentation of solidarities” which cause clashes of interests between oppressed ethnic groups. Thus anti-racism needs to tackle the: “suppression of cultural differences between victims of racism. The search thus continues for a hybridising, essentialising allegory which can mobilise a wide constituency of anti-racists positively, label after label, narrative after narrative is rejected (Werbner, 1997, 247).” In summary this could be said to be an approach where common struggles are identified and fought without emphasising ethnicity and ‘race’ but hardships faced a group who have the common denominator of facing a certain hardship (in this case e.g. employment). This however is difficult to do as funding in the midst liberal multiculturalism hegemony, as referred above, is tied to promoting multicultural events and bettering ethnic relations, thus promoting the ‘lifting up’ of ethnicity. However, reducing the ‘diversity’ of the forms of work might make the work more efficient through identifying common challenges to be campaigned against, as QM states above.

The other form of anti-racism approaches presented by Bonnett (2000, 97) relevant in my study is that of: “psychological anti-racism, raising consciousness, affirming identities.” In this approach the methods emphasised are “racism awareness training and the creation of ‘positive racial images’.” This approach has been present in Finland, and also within my research, through my informants replies but also in the intervention I participated in regarding the television show Manne-tv made by RASMUS researchers.
The television show producing a stereotypical image of an ethnic minority; Roma people, can be seen as being a conceptual opposite of creating ‘positive racial images’, and hence harmful. This approach just as that of multicultural anti-racist is founded on the idea that, “anti-racism best be effected on the level of consciousness: that to change how people feel about others and themselves is tantamount to changing society (Bonnett, 2000, 97).” The difference in the two approaches is that the psychological approach is more universalist in its approach. Essential sameness of people and their emotions is emphasised more that ‘differences of culture’ or similar. Trainings on e.g. the route of the refugee socio-drama, the human library -project and similar approaches referred to by my interviewees at some stage during the interviews are an element of this psychological approach, as they try to get the participant of the training event, to put themselves in the position of the ‘victim’ or a person who faces racism and hardship. Similar emphasis, although a different approach can be seen in the campaign to collect prejudices, as written down on a piece of paper by the members of the public, in a paper bin, organised by RASMUS during the Week against Racism in 2007 (interviews with R1, R2 and R4). In this approach again the individual psyche as producing racism is emphasised, while the ‘collective’ of power hierarchies and exploitation stemming from them is not addressed.

Racism as ideology thus seems to be challenged through these multicultural (namely cultural exclusion) as well as psychological approaches put in place to make people realise effects and emotions caused by racism. These approaches most probably also play a role in reducing racism as action, outspoken ‘racial’ slurs or other forms of violence. Hierarchic societal relations and exclusion from society at large seem to produce the most challenging form of racism (as consequence), as it is ‘invisible’ and is ‘nobody’s fault’, and thus very difficult to challenge. While governmental funding is very difficult to obtain, (chapter 6.1) the funding available is allocated to bettering ethnic relations and not directed in structural change. A key challenge to communicate thus seems to be the fact that racisms are present in society at large and its foundations and institutions, although its acts are performed by individuals. Reducing the societal divisions to reasons of individual prejudice, seems to be something that my research group a concerned with. Several authors, e.g. Lentin, 2004, have also focused on the
fact that the ethnocentric nation state is racist in its foundations. Or as R4 puts it: “This [anti-racism] is a marginal thing in high level politics. And in Finland there is a lack of high level politicians, ministers, prime ministers etc. who outspokenly and expressively have an anti-racist agenda. Silence of authorities is the norm.” Concluding on this, problems regarding racism that are identified are in many ways those of structural challenges reifying racisms present in society. The following exert from my interview with R5 gives a good picture of how my respondents see these structures:

Then another problem, there are too little resources for anti-racist work. There are more and more immigrants in smaller and smaller places and preventive anti-racism work hasn’t been done in these smaller places. This leads and will lead to more and more violent crime just as the report by Poliisi AMK in 2005 has shown. And Finland, which needs the immigrant workforce in the near future, needs to focus on this as nobody will move to these small places that need the workforce. These are the two great challenges.

Dan: So you mentioned preventive anti-racism, as something that needs resources. What kind of discussions around this topic have there been in your organisation?

The greatest problem at the moment is the attitudes of authorities. People who are civil servants, authorities can not have racist or intolerant principles or beliefs, whether a police officer, social worker, municipality employee or anyone employed by state or local authority. Carrying out such a role demands attitudes to be pluralistic and accepting. It’s quite a big problem to hear about racist police or social workers. This is very sad, as it is their job to serve society neutrally and evenly.

Individual racism is not so individual when located in the institutions of the social state. I will next present an alternative approach, namely that of the radical anti-racism point of view, according to which, challenging structural issues with multicultural approaches is not suitable to tackling individual racism.

6.3 Reflections over Radical Anti-Racism

According to Bonnett (2000, 104) radical anti-racism, usually does not depict revolutionary praxis, but “is seen as the same thing as ‘social critique’. Within this latter area of activity, anti-racism is construed as something that ‘questions’, ‘deconstructs’ and generally ‘challenges’ the presence of racism within society.” To change the structures of society where racism is present one of course needs people to be aware of
the structures being flawed. Identifying racism as present everywhere in society to one extent or another is where to start, or by the words of my respondents. Regarding challenges for anti-racism my respondents stated:

R6: I don’t know, or I mean societal and global power hierarchies, and that the world is somehow getting harsher... That is kind of how inequalities start to shape, and then it’s always simple to name a group that’s members are in a sense ‘less worth’ than other people. If we make people coming to Finland from elsewhere ‘less worth’, this means that attitudes become harsher in everything else as well. How you influence global power hierarchies is a different story, but I just can’t see events as excluded or singular cases. They are part of global structures. But then there are concrete issues we can talk about, such as employment and how it relates to power structures and people’s attitudes in Finland, or to the attitudes of those in power. I mean you hear these comments, e.g. a friend of mine heard an executive at the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities say that this place should be kept clean from ‘mud faces’. I mean this is not even in the political sphere anymore, but deep in the administrative structures where decisions are made. How can we challenge this?

QG I think the most challenging thing is deconstruct or even realise the everyday, commonly accepted us-them division. Racism is about power relations, privileges and discrimination. Racism is most commonly discussed in Finland in relation to attitudes (or then crime), which makes the problem to be the “mainstream population’s” attitudes towards “others.” It sometimes feels, that this kind speech, although meant to oppose racism enforces it, makes it more difficult to discuss and makes it an ideology or anyway something that one can completely choose or abandon. Of course one can choose and commit to anti-racism, but often racism is also but things more difficult to perceive (such as who takes space, who is listened to, who is asked, who is considered an expert etc.) that do not necessarily have anything to do with an outspoken racist ideology.

QD I see structural racism as a very large challenge. I run into it almost daily in e.g. permit policies, and civil servant attitudes. Of course also everyday racism poses challenges.

QA The challenge is whether we discuss e.g. racism faced by immigrants. We already have different looking Finns, such as Roma people etc. How is the selection made when discussing racism or discrimination? How can everybody be included? How can victims of racism be empowered to speak for themselves? Now they are often only a target group for the majority population. Also the contradiction between research results and barometers showing hopeful signs, while victim studies give a completely different picture, just as unemployment percentages do.

My respondents seem to be highly concerned about challenges regarding structural inequalities. As the quotes above show, racism is not a societal process taking place in

73 Kuntaliitto

74 “Mutakuono”, a highly derogative term used as racial slur towards dark-skinned persons.
vacuum, but something ever prevalent and thus extremely difficult to challenge, without
taking materialistic, economical relations on the agenda as radical anti-racisms propose.
Eetu Viren (2007) when presenting Alessandro Dal Lago’s thoughts around the subject,
proposes, that the whole cultures clashing debate instigated by Samuel P. Huntington
has its foundations in old colonialist thought reflecting an ideology of ‘primitive
cultures’. However Dal Lago (Viren, 2007) sees the foundation of this essentialising
thought somewhere completely different, as an indicator of the worries several western
politicians and researchers have over some ‘developing countries’ being able to
maintain political forms and objectives that are radically different from European or
American. Thus there according to Viren (2007) is a hegemonic battle of within global
capitalism and different cultural and political forms it takes, while Huntington’s concept
of clashing civilisations is merely an attempt to mask these hegemonic battles. What this
means for anti-racism activities in Finland is difficult to foresee, but the rhetoric
concerning cultures clashing or the way of opposing this through “presenting ‘cultures’
in a positive way” according to many, need to be challenged adequately by bringing
capitalism and dominance of the social order and struggles against this into the debate
as well as racism which is intertwined with the latter. All of these processes are taking
place in a setting of increasing transnational relations, constantly restructuring societies
all around the world and thus further increasing the challenges of inequality.

Tying similar ideas as above to different way of practicing anti-racism, Bonnett (2000)
concludes the chapter on practicing anti-racism, by stating that many believe that anti-
racism may be carried out as reformation of modern societies to create racial equality,
while ”others see anti-racism as a revolutionary activity. Most anti-racist activity is
firmly within the former camp (2000, 115).” Hence radical anti-racism aiming at more
emancipatory project is often charged with trying to monopolise anti-racism to its own
political ends, while multiculturalists, psychological anti-racists, that are premised on a
”framework of democratic, advanced capitalism” are deemed naive because of their lack
of understanding on how a dominant social order produces racism. The reformation
aspects are the ones present within the RASMUS network, thus reducing the debate
outside the field of economy and state control over this. Yuval-Davis has conceptualised
how ethnicity and racism relates to civil society and state powers (1997, 193):
Racist discourse is defined involving the use of ethnic categorisations (which might be constructed around biological, cultural, religious, linguistic or territorially based boundaries) as signifiers of a fixed, deterministic genealogical difference of ‘the Other’ … Ethnicity relates to the politics of collective boundaries, dividing the world into ‘us’ and ‘them’ around, usually, myths of common origin and/or common destiny, and engaging in constant processes of struggle and negotiation. These are aimed, from specific positionings within the collectivities, at promoting the collectivity or perpetuating its advantages by means of access to state and civil society powers.

Challenging access to state and civil society or particularly the exclusion of this when approached in the light of multiculturalism, leaves out aspects of e.g. class, gender: “The whole debate on multiculturalism stumbles on the fact that the boundaries of difference, as well as the boundaries of social rights, are determined by specific hegemonic – perhaps universalistic, but definitely not universal – discourses (Yuval-Davis, 1997, 199).” Whether or not the approaches taken within the RASMUS network, can challenge racism at large is a question outside the scope of my research. However, I have analysed how their approaches fit in to a wider theoretical discussion around the matter. This is for sure a starting point and also the aim of this study.

I will next draw some conclusions of the above presented challenges or dilemmas in practicing anti-racism in and summarise this work on how a particular group of actors are approaching racism in Finland.

**6.4 Conclusions**

I have in thesis presented different forms and shapes racisms take in Finland, under a setting where increased transnational relations and multiculturalism over the last 15-20 years have reshaped society. I have also presented the problematic concept of multiculturalism in the light of different theoretical approaches to the subject. After doing so I have then reflected over my subject of study, social anthropology or more broadly social sciences and different epistemological and methodological background relevant in this study.
However most importantly, I have in this work introduced the reader to approaches on anti-racism presented by Bonnett (2000), Rastas (2007 and 2005), Werbner (1997) and some other researchers, and tried to analyse how their theoretical framework is suited to analysing the findings I have made by analysing interviews and questionnaire responses by people actively involved in opposing racism under the umbrella of the RASMUS network. As the network consists of a variety of actors, I have not been able to come with an all-encompassing ‘grand theory’ or thorough documentation on what their approaches are to combating racism. However, I have been able to identify some common causes for grief amongst these anti-racists and sort their views on their own work according to Bonnett’s previous categorisation and also presented a critique of these forms of approaches through an alternative analysis of the anti-racist work, that of radical anti-racism. Alternative stories told or dilemmas of anti-racists that e.g. Bonnett (2000) refers to, that to some extent could have been debated in this thesis could have been about anti-racism versus ethnicity, but as my respondents were not eager to discuss ethnicity to a great extent, I felt that this would not have done justice to my empirical material. This is also the case for anti-racism versus feminism, which Bonnett presents to be one of great questions to be answered in anti-racism. I have chosen not to deepen this work to include these dilemmas and present my material through the categorisation on how to practice anti-racism. My material and my starting point for this work, was to map the field and find out about approaches to combating racism, and have done so by identifying the work of RASMUS network to fit within that of affirming diversity and enabling empathy of multicultural anti-racism, which in itself is a highly vague concept as ‘multiculturalism’ can be defined in many different ways. However, within a hegemonic position of ‘liberal multiculturalism’ also a ‘multicultural anti-racist’ approach is likely to lack the tools on many accounts.

By this work I hope to contribute to building up a theoretical framework for how anti-racism is carried out in Finland, and what the underlying views for this work are. This is necessary in order to come up with new ways of combating racisms and building up efficient anti-racisms in Finland in the future. One thing which definitely needs to be taken into account is the fact that the hegemony of liberal multiculturalism or the hegemony of uplifting liberal multiculturalism (Ahmed, 2008) is not a clear-cut solution.
to reducing racism. Sara Ahmed (2008, 1) clarifies the problems caused by reducing racism to something to be solved by education while leaving out class matters:

In such a fantasy, racism is ‘officially prohibited’. This is true. We are ‘supposed’ to be for racial equality, tolerance and diversity, and we are not ‘allowed’ to express hatred towards others, or to incite racist hatred. I would argue that this prohibition against racism is imaginary, and that it conceals everyday forms of racism, and involves a certain desire for racism. Take Big Brother and the Jade Goody story. You could argue that Big Brother’s exposure of racism functions as evidence that political correctness is hegemonic: you are not allowed to be racist towards others. But that would be a gross misreading. What was at stake was the desire to locate racism in the body of Jade Goody, who comes to stand for the ignorance of the white working classes, as a way of showing that ‘we’ (Channel 4 and its well-meaning liberal viewers) are not racist like that. When anti-racism becomes an ego ideal you know you are in trouble.

The ignorance of white working classes in an environment of ‘whiteness’, however involving diverse participants (as the Big Brother show did in the UK), is reduced to ignorance of the individual although this particular television show, as most others merely reproduce social constructions as they are. Ben Pitcher describes the problems of approaches that are not concerned with the material and social constructions at the same time:

The theoretical commitment to anti-essentialism that is dominant in the field of contemporary race thinking does not appear particularly well-equipped to deal with the social facticity of race, or to engage critically with many current sites of racial practice. The present relationship, for example, between racialization and the cultural, political and territorial reconfigurations of global capitalism seems to demand just such a materialist supplement given the way that pluralist models of race and culture alone appear to operate quite comfortably within the ideologies of neo-liberalism and the logics of capital.

Pitcher (2008, 50)

Pitcher’s above quote fits in within the discourse of transnationalism (chapter 3) and raises the questions to ask in opposing racism that, neither I nor anyone else have an answer to, but need to be collectively worked out. However, what is certain is that without doing away with capitalism altogether, the opportunities for anti-racism remain narrow and offer little possibilities for wider emancipation, which people representing a radical, universalist, position are striving for already. I will conclude this thesis with a few quotes that say it the best. Daniel Jewesbery (2007, 9) writes: “Racism is an effect of capital, and in order to confront capitalism one must confront racism (and vice versa). Therefore the argument extended for ‘strategic essentialism’ is redundant: any call to
rally around the undeconstructed signs of one’s exclusion merely defers a greater struggle, one which, likewise, is not ‘prior’ to the anti-racist or anti-colonial struggle, but which is logically inseparable from it.” Further, during a lecture on 5.3.2008 at the Old Student house in Helsinki, Immanuel Wallerstein, presented a view selecting the least evil, in elections, day-to-day life etc. whereas at the same time collectively participating in processes on challenging the world order. This of-course includes challenging liberal multiculturalism as being a part of the hegemony of neo-liberalism assisted by state control. Or finally, as Jewesbery (2007) states: “Multiculturalism is a term that has never had a stable meaning. It has been both attacked and stalwartly defended by critics at all points on the political spectrum, identified as a central rhetoric in a dominant organisational hegemony, a cynical mechanism through which everyone can be kept in their place while the ‘centre’ is shored up, or a relativist, cultural studies inspired attack on materialist readings of class and politics; for others still, it is simply a pernicious expression of political correctness, yet another means by which national cultures and values have been undermined.”

From this follows, that multiculturalism in itself not be a useful concept for defining anything, as it merely defines a multi-cultural setting as seen by the spokesperson for that particular multiculturalism. Hence, multiculturalisms necessarily do not affect the persistence of racism in any way. In the worst case merely contribute to reifying racist structures.
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Appendix 1, Questionnaire

Hyvä vastaanottaja,

pyytäisin apua rasismin vastaisen työn kartoittamisessa.

Tee Pro gradu tutkimusta Tampereen yliopiston sosioLOGIAN laitoksella aiheenani antirasismi Suomessa. Tutkimukseni valmistuttua työni on käytettävissä rasismin vastaisen työn kehitämiseen ja toivon, että näin voin tehdä oman panoksen rasismin vastustamiseksi. Tarkoituksenani on selvittää minkälaisesta toiminnasta ja toimijoista antirasismi Suomessa koostuu ja kirjoittaa kuvaelmaksi siitä.

Lähestyn teitä, koska järjestönne/organisaationne on osa RASMUS-verkostoa, olitte läsnä RASMUS-verkoston vuosikokouksessa 15.2.2007, osallistuitte Rasismin vastaisen viikon ohjelmaan tai teidät on mainittu Rasismi Suomessa –raporteissa rasismin vastaisen toiminan yhteydessä, ja oletan teidän näin kuuluvan tutkimukseni kohderyhmään. Olisin kiitollinen jos vastaisitte kysymyslomakkeeni kysymyskokeeni kysymyksiin tai välittäisitte viestini eteenpäin järjestöön sisältä rasismin vastaisesta työstä vastaavalle henkilölle.

Toivoisin vastaukset sähköpostitse 25.5. mennessä.

Ystävällisin terveisin,
Dan Koivulaakso
meckii@gmail.com
0445066613

Tietoa kyselystä

Tutkimuksessani kunnioitan vastaajien yksityisyyttä, ja käsittelen yksilöiden vastauksia järjestöitä tulleina vastauksina. En tule mainitsemaan kenenkään nimiä, mutta järjestöjen/organisaatioiden nimet tulevat näkyvään tutkimuksessani.
(1) Mitä järjestöä tai tahoa edustat?

(2) Mikä on roolisi organisaatiossa ja työskenteleekö siinä muita henkilöitä rasismin vastustamisen parissa?

(3) Miten edustamasi järjestö osallistuu rasismin vastaiseen toimintaan käytännössä, eli minkälaisella toiminnalla / miten vastustatte rasismia?

(4) Onko rasismin vastustaminen / antirasimi jollain tavalla määritelty järjestön peruskirjassa, säännöissä, toimintaohjeissa tai vastaavissa?

(5) Minkälaita yhteistyötä järjestösi tekee muiden rasismin vastaisten / antirasististen toimijoiden kanssa?

(6) Kuinka ja millä tavalla tärkeänä koet mahdollisen yhteistyön muiden toimijoiden kanssa? Onko mahdollisesta olemassa esteitä yhteistyölle?

(7) Oletko osallistunut rasismin vastaiseen toimintaan muutoinkin kuin nykyisessä toimintaympäristössä? Kuinka kauan olet osallistunut rasismin vastaiseen toimintaan? Miksi osallistut rasismin vastaiseen toimintaan?

(8) Mitkä ovat omasta ja/tai järjestösi mielestä suurimmat haasteet rasmin vastustamisen saralla Suomessa?

(9) Minkälaisiin asioihin rasmin vastustamisessa tulisi kiinnittää erityisesti huomiota?

(10) Minkälaiset asiat mielestääsi vaikuttavat rasismin vastaisen työn mahdollisuksiin omassa järjestössäsi sekä yleensä yhteiskunnassa?
Appendix 2, List of organisations

List of organisations and affiliations represented in my questionnaires and interviews as stated by the people involved themselves. Some respondents or informants fit into multiple categories. Numerous NGOs and people approached did not respond to my questionnaire.

- Allianssi ry.
- Becoming More Visible, Tampere
- CEREN (Etnisten suhteiden ja nationalismin tutkimuskeskus), Svenska social- och kommunal-högskolan, Helsingin yliopisto
- ENAR Finland
- Join In -yhdenvertaisuusprojekti
- Helsingin yliopisto, Koulutus- ja kehittämiskeskus Palmenia
- Hämeenlinnan setlementti ry.
- Ihmisoikeusliitto ry.
- Individual respondent * 2
- Kulturföreningen etnokult Kulttuuriyhdistys ry/RF / FACES Etnofestival
- Länsi-Suomen Etnisten suhteiden neuvottelukunta
- Moniku-hanke (sosiaalinen vahvistaminen monikulttuurisessa varhaiskasvatuksessassa) Espoon, Helsingin, Kauniaisten ja Vantaan yhteinen hanke.
- Monikulttuuriyhdistys Kulttuurikameleontit ry.
- Opettaja / tutkija yliopistolla
- Pirkanmaan rasismin vastaisen työn tuki ry.
- Pohjois-Karjalan maakuntaliitto
- RASMUS Kouvolan * 2
- RASMUS Tutkijat * 2
- RASMUS Tampere * 3
- RASMUS Lapsen ja nuoret
- Suomen Afganistanilaisten yhdistys
- Suomen Punainen Risti (Keskustoimisto)
- Suomen Punainen Risti, Kotopolkun-hanke
- Suomen YK-liitto
- Vanhustyön keskusliitto / IkäMAMU -toiminta