

countries is made (compared to 23% in the higher education sector), then a discussion about how this can be changed is urgently needed. Unfortunately, of the administrators in national ministries and political decision makers only the Estonian Minister of Education and Research was able to participate in a round-table discussion with the EU commissioner for Research and could be publicly committed to supporting women in science.

These considerations point to a number of missed opportunities in an otherwise highly important conference. As one Czech woman-scientist who was invited remarked, more space should have been devoted to questions and particularly to discussions with politicians and official representatives. But saying that the conference did not completely succeed in 'valorising' the findings of the Enwise Report does not diminish the relevance of these findings. We can only hope that both working scientists and politicians will be inspired and find some time to read parts of the report so that, as Czech woman-scientist put it, the debates that were missing 'might come in the next conferences'.<sup>4</sup>

Dagmar Lorenz-Meyer

## References

Blagović, M., H. Havelková, N. Sretenova, M.F. Tripsa and D. Velichová. (eds.) 2004. *Waste of Talents: Turning Private Struggles into a Public Issue – Women and Science in the Enwise Countries*. Brussels: European Commission.

Daxner, Michael. 2004. 'Brain Circulation: How to Overcome the Drain-Gain-Deadlock.' A presentation at the "Enwise Valorisation Conference: Enlarging Europe with/for Women Scientists", in Tallinn, Estonia 9–10 September 2004.

Harding, Sandra. 2004 "Gender and Knowledge: New Issues." A presentation at the "Enwise Valorisation Conference: Enlarging Europe with/for Women Scientists", in Tallinn, Estonia, 9–10 September 2004.

Nisic, Hervé and Marianne Julienne. 2004. "Femmes de têtes." A documentary film. A synopsis is available at:  
<http://herve.nisic.free.fr/femmes.de.tete/fdt.synopsis.html>, accessed 18 November 2004.

## Notes:

<sup>1</sup> The Enwise stands for Enlarge 'Women in Science' to the East and is the name of an expert group of women scientists from seven Central and Eastern European countries and three Baltic States. The so-called Enwise countries include Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

<sup>2</sup> Note that the Enwise Report was officially launched in January 2004 and hence was available to all speakers six months before the conference.

<sup>3</sup> The honeypot indicator 'quantifies the loss of access to and/or control over R&D expenditure experienced by women researchers *en masse* because they are more likely to be concentrated in the low expenditure R&D sectors or fields of science' [Blagović et al. 2004: 82]. According to the authors 'the score itself is the difference between the expected R&D expenditure per capita pro rata for women and the observed R&D expenditure per capita pro rata for women expressed as a percentage of the expected R&D expenditure per capita pro rata for women' [ibid: n. 25, 82]. It is still not clear to this author how exactly the honeypot indicator is calculated and especially what the 'expected research expenditure' for women researchers refers to.

<sup>4</sup> The Enwise Report is available online at:  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/highlights\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/highlights_en.html)  
 and [http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/women/wssi/publications\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/women/wssi/publications_en.html); a hardcopy can be ordered by sending an e-mail to: [womenscience@cec.eu.int](mailto:womenscience@cec.eu.int). The report is currently being translated into Czech and will be available from the National Contact Centre – Women and Science in Prague.

## Report on the 10th Metropolis Conference – Toronto, October 2005

The International Metropolis Project is a forum for bridging research, policy and practice on migration and diversity. The project aims to enhance the capacity of academic research, encourage policy-relevant research on migration and diversity issues, and facilitate the use of that research by governments and non-governmental organisations. In the decade since its inception, the project has grown to include researchers, policy-makers,

international organisations and NGOs from North America, most of Europe, and much of the Asia-Pacific region. The project is managed by a Secretariat, which is jointly located in Ottawa and Amsterdam. It is also guided by an International Steering Committee made up of approximately forty partners from across the project, who provide advice, direction and an international perspective. Between conferences, the Metropolis network is brought together through shared research projects, publications and informal policy discussion; smaller inter-conference seminars; a website that highlights research and upcoming activities; the *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, which showcases international research on migration and diversity; and an annual publication – *World Bulletin* – which updates the network on partners' various projects and activities. The next conference will be held in Lisbon in October 2006 and in Melbourne in 2007. All relevant information about the Toronto event and the project itself can be found at: <http://www.toronto.ca/metropolis/>

The 10th Metropolis conference was held in Toronto, Canada on 17–25 October 2005 under the title 'Our Diverse Cities: Migration, Diversity and Change'. According to organisers, this was the most attended event of the Metropolis conferences, hosting some 1300 participants, mostly from North America, Australia and Europe (almost exclusively from the UK and Scandinavia). The Metropolis Project was also celebrating its tenth anniversary. The fact that the conference was held in Canada and that participants were mostly from North America heavily marked the basic perspective from which the problems of contemporary migration were seen. Another important feature was the visible presence of participants from various governmental organisations, although academics and some non-governmental organisations were present, too.

While the European approach, though it varies from one country to the next, shows a certain dilemma, which centres on whether

Europe needs migrants and is stuck on the 'us and them' distinction that stems from the nation-state patterns of European societies, the Canadian approach is about how to manage migration for the prosperity of all the sides involved. As the mayor of Toronto stated, the number of migrants Canada 'imports', according to a pre-defined immigration policy at the national level, is equal to 1% of the total Canadian population each year. Or, as the novelist and essayist John Ralston Saul put it, Canada benefits from the stupidity of other states. Generally, the conference was conceived as an illustration of Canada's understanding of itself as a country of diverse societies, as a mosaic, with the accent on communities, which remain free to express their differences, while at the same time creating a Canadian identity. Day one was therefore dedicated to study tours, ranging from themes such as Toronto's Multicultural Media and the Act of Becoming Canadian to *Pride and Prejudice: 'Diversity Our Strength'*. Within the first study tour, the participants had an opportunity to discuss the citizenship procedure at Toronto's George Brown College with the presiding citizenship judge and community advocates, and to witness an actual citizenship ceremony. From that point of view, Canadian society seems like a highly inclusive one, as the period for obtaining citizenship is roughly three years, compared to fifteen years in the Czech Republic (with uncertain results). The other conference days always began with two plenary sessions in the morning, and continued with dozens of community-based and conference-based workshops. Unfortunately, both parts were organised in such a way that left almost no time for questions and answers. While community-based workshops were held at various spots in the city of Toronto, the conference-based ones were more of an academic nature.

The first day was dedicated to the subject of diversity in contemporary cities from the perspective of mayors (with mayors, deputy mayors, vice mayors and former may-

ors of Toronto, Zeeburg, Sao Paulo, Vancouver, Lyon, Malmö and Stockholm taking part in the discussion). The second plenary session focused on the role of government and employers in ensuring a barrier-free workplace. The complete list of workshops and plenary sessions is available at the conference website, so here mention will only be made of those the author personally attended, accompanied by commentary on the plenary sessions that the author found relevant from a professional perspective and from the Czech point of view.

A workshop called 'Balancing Gender Equality and Religious Diversity: Muslim Women in Western Societies, Islamic Law and the Justice System' treated a number of relevant topics: religious vs. civil marriage, the complexity of the gender problem at the intersection of Islam and Western societies, and faith-based arbitration in family law. Audry Macklin from the University of Toronto argued that faith-based arbitration in family issues is essentially the same process as mediation, commercial or non-commercial, which is common in civil arbitration. She also pointed out that the legal system, which should establish gender equality, allows for different forms of discrimination, most often for economic reasons (women with children unable to make choices because they have to face major economic obstacles). Therefore, she did not see how Canada's recent decision to abolish faith-based arbitration could be justified. It should be of no concern to the state whether we choose a religious or a secular institution for arbitration. This was strongly opposed by Alia Hogben from the Canadian Council of Muslim Women, who welcomed the government decision because, as she said, it recognised that faith-based arbitration meant a greater danger of the exclusion of women from the community, and seriously diminished the status of Muslim women as Canadian citizens because of the different regime they were being exposed to. In this regard, especially painful in Europe is the issue of 'limp marriages', marriages that

are divorced according to individual European legal systems, but are still not divorced according to the law of Muslim countries, some of which do not recognise divorce initiated by women. These women, and their children, are then in danger when they decide to travel to such countries.

The plenary session on day three addressed the topic of globalisation and security. In the face of arguments claiming that multiculturalism is essentially a weakness, because it allows people to migrate freely while allowing them freedom of denomination, association, and so on, which creates room for abuse by violence-oriented groups. David Wright-Neville from Monash University in Australia argued the very opposite, that a strong and equal community will always be a much better barrier to extremists than any measures of repression or police activity. So the argument goes that a truly self-confident community is more likely to take responsibility for the security of society as such and for its own security. He illustrated this with a few examples from Australian community life.

The plenary session the next day was dedicated to the issue of diversity as a competitive advantage. Phil Wood from COMEDIA in the United Kingdom conducts research on the relationship between the treatment of culturally heterogeneous employees and company competitiveness. He said that if a connection could be established, it would be a strong argument for multiculturalism. (Unfortunately, there was no time provided to ask him what happens if the relationship cannot be established or if the relationship is found to be random.) He criticised Richard Florida, famous for his research on the close relationship between technology, talent and tolerance and prosperity for the US, Canadian and EU societies, arguing that Florida overestimates the importance of creativity in the contemporary economy.

Especially interesting, in the light of current events in Paris, was a workshop on Immigration, Gang Activity and Criminality.

Research conducted by Scot Wortley from the University of Toronto and supported by Scott Decker, a top US criminologist from the University of Missouri – St. Louis (who was also involved in the EUROGANG project), showed a considerable relationship between the physical ghettoisation of immigrants in contemporary Western cities and gang/criminal activity. That raised the question of whether and how governments should intervene in preventing the segregation of groups on the basis of territory and national/racial marks.

Given that each workshop lasted for three hours and had many speakers, the variety of workshops did not make much sense, as they all took place at the same time and involved again more lecturing than discussions.

At the first plenary session on the last day the role of NGOs in building social capital was discussed. Fariboz Birjandian from the Calgary Catholic Immigration Society talked about the role of NGOs, focusing exclusively on the integration of immigrants, the so-called immigrant service agency and refugee community organisations. The aspect of voluntary work was heavily stressed. Irene Bloemrad from the University of California in Berkley treated the question of political incorporation from the perspective of two equally dysfunctional systems based on the assumption of neutral government: the first she labelled as French republicanism and the second as American market pluralism. Her argument was essentially that political decisions are collective actions, such as in parties and lobbies, and that there is no reason to impose a hierarchy on what kind of collectiveness is and is not acceptable (as in the case of cultural collectivities).

A special treat for all the participants was the presence of Lord Bhikhu Parekh from the London School of Economics (and the House of Lords), an important author in the field of political and social science in reference to multiculturalism (MC). He lectured on four contemporary anti-multiculturalism discourses, the first three from the right-

wing perspective and the fourth from the left. The first of these claims that multiculturalism leads to terrorism – this position negates all the merits of MC because of some of its detrimental aspects. The second one claims that MC is about Muslims and is a version of 'the clash of civilisations' theories – it inflates the importance of those Muslims who are extremist and relates crimes to Islam. At the same time it neglects the vast majority of those Muslims who have a hard time trying to live their lives as ordinary believers. The third one claims that our experience tells us that we should stop immigration and that MC encourages it – this position is empirically obsolete and normatively wrong; all the prosperous countries were built on immigration. The fourth position tells us that MC undermines class solidarity by breaking classes into national/cultural groups.

Parekh also attacked the common interpretation of MC as the non-judgmental co-existence of cultures and offered his own definition: that MC means that no culture is self-contained or self-sufficient and therefore that we need institutionalised intercultural dialogue. To conclude in a somewhat poetic manner, I will refer to an anecdote that Parekh told: Christian missionaries came to an Indian province, where it was the custom to invite guests to dispute religious issues with the community priests in front of the ruler. First the guests ask the questions, then the hosts. So, the missionaries asked the priests: Do you believe that God is one or many? They answered: Your question is absurd and blasphemous; it is absurd because you assume that God can be either one or many, and it is blasphemous because you attempt to reduce God to human categories. The missionaries in this anecdote refused to continue the conversation. And Parekh added that MC is about asking questions, but also about taking questions from others; and it may be added the Metropolis conference provided a good framework for this activity.

*Selma Muhić Dizdarević*