

ESF SCSS Exploratory Workshop Grant

**URBAN TRANSITIONS:
CONSTRUCTING AND NEGOTIATING INTERCULTURAL BOUNDARIES**

FINAL REPORT

Call for proposals 2000 - TOPIC C : European urban space - Starting date : 01/01/2001

Project contractor :

- MTA PTI, Centre de Recherches ethno-regionales,
Orszaghaz u. 9. 1014 Budapest, Hungary.
Contact : **Prof. Andras Gergely**
Tel : (36-1)-375-90-11, agergely@mtapti.hu

Project coordinator :

- Artemisszio Foundation, Budapest,
Naphegy u. 36. 1016 Budapest, Hungary.
Contact: **Zsuzsanna Komjathy**;
Tel/fax :(36-1)375-50-14, artemisszio@mail.mtav.hu

Composition of the coordination team :

- **M. Alain Battegay**, ARIESE/ Groupe de Recherche sur la socialisation CNRS,
Université Lyon 2, France, 5. Avenu Pierre-Mendès France Tel : 33/(0)-4-78-77-23-84,
Alain.Battegay@mom.fr
- **M. Jacques Barou**, CIVIL, jacques.barou@upmf-grenoble.fr
- **Mme. Diana Szanto**, CIVIL, dzsanto@aol.com
- **Mme. Zsuzsa Komjathy**, Université ELTE, Fondation Artemisszio, 1016 Naphegy u.
36. Budapest, Tel : (36-1)375-50-14, artemisszio@mail.mtav.hu
- **Mme. Bodo Julianna** (Roumanie) KAM, Centru de Cercetari Regionale si
Antropologie / 4100 M-Ciuc , Vártér 1. P.O.Box. 81. Romania, telefon-fax: 00-40-
66-171 929, wac @ clmc.topnet.ro
- **M. Antti Karisto** (Finlande) Antti KARISTO, ,Social Policy Department, University
of Helsinki, , University of Helsinki, Box 54, 00014, antti.hakkinen@helsinki.fi

INTRODUCTION

This programme aimed to strengthen an already existing cooperation between Hungarian and French researchers and to enlarge it to other institutions from Romania and Finland. The common field of research was the intercultural relations and their evolution in the urban context.

In Europe, both the disadvantaged inner cities and the popular suburbs are until now peopled by groups of inhabitants socially and culturally different. There is no real ethnic ghettos as in some U.S urban areas. So, these districts are interesting to observe as places of interaction between groups of persons belonging to different cultures, different social classes and different generations. There are original kinds of communications, cultural relations producing new expressions but also risks of conflicts. As wrote Steward Hall, the ability to leave among differences is the main question of the XIXth century¹. Through this program we hoped to explore the question of intercultural relations in an ever-changing urban context on the point of view of human sciences, especially on the point of view of anthropology. In order to consider the originality of this question in the context of the four different participating countries, we have planned four meetings in Hungary and in France and three field visits for young researchers in Hungary, Romania and France. It was unfortunately impossible to organize a meeting or a field visit in Finland but Igor Volovik, young researcher working on the question of ethnic relations in a suburban district of Helsinki could take part to all the meetings and to a field visit in Romania.

During the four meetings, theoretical and methodological questions concerning the different themes of the programme were discussed. What really means “intercultural” in different contexts? Is it a word to name only relations between the majority and some specific groups like the young people originated from migraine immigration in France or some groups of gypsies in Hungary and Romania? In fact, in spite of the very large opportunities to study different kinds of intercultural relations in the contemporary towns of Europe, many researches deal exclusively with marginalized and poor groups of inhabitants.

Is anthropology able to study urban phenomena in contemporary developed countries? The status of such a science is different according to the academic context of the four different countries concerned by the programme and according to the history of the human sciences in each nation and their relations with the political powers. The recent past of Hungary and Romania had some influences on the definition of the fields devoted to anthropology. In France too, the colonial period led the anthropologists to study exotic and traditional societies more often than intercultural relations in the contemporary context.

Is the city a specific milieu generating some particular forms of social relations? Until the most part of the anthropologists dealing with urban phenomena made “community studies” i.e. anthropological approaches of some ethnic or social groups leaving in a town. The town itself is rarely approached as an object of research of the anthropology. Why is urban anthropology an anthropology in the town and not an anthropology of the town?

These different debates which let appear a certain number of common theoretical preoccupations between western and eastern researchers in spite of the different stages of evolution of the question of intercultural relations in the four participating countries are summarised in the following reports of the four meetings hold from February 2001 to January 2002.

¹ S.Hall, « Culture, Community, Nation », *Cultural Studies*, n°7, 1993, p.361.

ESF Exploratory Workshop - I

Between the 17th and 19th of February
Budapest

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

1. Executive summary

The first exploratory workshop in the framework of the ESF programme aimed at laying down the basis of a durable co-operation between research institutions working on the subject of intercultural relations and their transformations in urban contexts. In fact the ESF project is a logical continuation of a previous bilateral co-operation agreement between two parties of the present project : the Hungarian and the French research centres, who already had, by this means, the occasion for exchanging their experiences and for constructing common problematic in this domain. The “Balaton” program was a bilateral intergovernmental support scheme that permitted frequent personal meetings and exchanges between the parties during a two-year period between 1999 and 2000. One of the concerns of the organisers was to maintain a logical coherence between the two projects while encouraging the active participation of new countries and proposing more concrete results. The ESF project is more ambitious than its predecessor also in the sense of implying a relatively large number of young researchers for whom it offers the possibility of visiting foreign homologues in order to get acquainted with different field research methods, as well as with special difficulties and adapted methodologies related to these fields. This is one of the reasons why the organisers of the workshop found it a good opportunity to invite young researchers and students of anthropology to this first co-ordination meeting.

The program started with a general introduction of the participants and research centres they represented. Each researcher and student gave a short account on the research projects he or she were conducting at the moment. Main scientific interests of the participants can be resumed in the following way :

- Ethnicity, interethnic relationships, interactions between cultural groups on the same territory ;
- physical and mental modifications of the city, sociological transformations, economical differentiation;
- migrations and migrants, including temporary and inner migrations
- social relations in urban outskirts and central districts, neighbouring relations, “practising” the neighbourhood.
- housing, public housing;
- (social and spatial) frontiers in the city as well as symbolic frontiers between East and West, visible and non visible frontiers.
- public, private and semi-public spaces
- collective identities, occupation of symbolic spaces and marking of territories.

Subsequently, the senior researchers gave a report of their respective fields. Concrete descriptions of varying contexts evoked the question of the limits of comparativity. Doubts emerged even concerning the existence of a common vocabulary. In fact, the acceptance and extended use of a particular term or concept is strongly attached not only to the particular historical, geographical context, but also to the evolution of the

profession country by country. The necessity of working consciously on the "history of use of the concepts" was acknowledged by all participants. A proposal was also accepted that in the framework of the project each national team would prepare a paper on the meaning and history of anthropology in their own country.

In the series of presentations of research projects, Diana Szanto and Zsuzsa Komjathy described their joint comparative research conducted respectively in two districts in France and Hungary (the district of "Berriat", Grenoble and "Terézváros", the VIth district of Budapest). Despite the obvious differences, these two localities present in fact some very similar characteristics. Both were built originally out of the walls of the town receiving and a settling down an important part of the proletariat pushed out of the city as well as inner immigrants flooding towards urban centres from the countryside. Gradually they developed towards centrality until the inner city incorporated them more or less completely. Their history made both of them a territory of fascinating intercultural coexistence, that incontestably makes part of their present identity. Finally, and most importantly from the point of view of the ESF project, both of them represent today an important urbanistic challenge : they are going through a dynamic transformation the final result of which is not yet certain. Their future will probably be determinant for the development of the whole town inside of which they are situated. This long term research, the bases of which were laid down during the "Balaton" programme, can be a good example of bilaterally managed thematic sections foreseen in the ESF project.

In the afternoon we discussed the pertinence and feasibility of the reciprocal field visits of the young researchers and students. Everybody agreed that such a possibility of getting acquainted with a different professional context, building up personal relations in a foreign country could mean a precious support in the training of young researchers. Nevertheless, some participants expressed their concern about keeping the effectiveness of these visits and avoiding their transformation in "holiday trips". In order to ensure that these exchanges be really useful it seemed necessary to define the kind of report visitors would be required to produce after their return. At this point the students and post-doctorants present had the occasion to speak about their own researches in the perspective of receiving an interested homologue from one of the three other participating countries.

Imre Lénart has been working for several years now with homeless people as a social worker and as an anthropologist.

Júlia Károlyi is doing observations in playing gardens with regard to interethnic relations between Hungarian and Gypsy children and their parents.

Tessza Udvarhelyi has just finished a work on social representations of a brand new Shopping Centre at the Western Railway Station and intends to continue working on public spaces, especially markets.

László Hajnal is combining his passion for photography with his anthropological interest, realising photo reportage amongst a gypsy community of the inner town.

Ádám Bethlenfalvy is studying the public manifestations of a Hassidic Jewish group in Budapest.

As a matter of a fact, as a result of a workshop in urban anthropology, directed by Zsuzsanna Komjáthy last year; all the field-work of the junior researchers can be attached to a global study of the VIth. District of Budapest.

In the last part of the meeting the co-ordination team defined the orientation of the next phase of the project, giving proposals for the constitution of a possible common publication as well as for the organisation of a final symposium to be held in December 2001.

2. Scientific content of the event

The workshop was also an excellent occasion to define the baselines of a common approach. In the centre of the problematic is the observation that European cities grow ever bigger and at the same time go through important transfigurations. As a result, old districts in town face new challenges. They are often wavering between two equally possible destinies : emphasising their centrality and opting for gentrification or accepting a decline towards an ever increasing proletarianisation , the effects of which go soon out of the control of public policies. In general there is however a considerable amount of energy and means deployed in order to avoid such a turn of the situation. It is because the centre has got a big symbolic importance, for public authorities as well as for the actors of the process who are the inhabitants. As it is the identity of the district which is at stake an impressive machinery of identity production is set up, referring often to contradictory values, like the bright past and the not less bright mirage of modernity. The question that life puts to urbanists is an essential one : what makes a district pleasant to live and to linger in? What is the ideal combination of modernity and nostalgia, of cultural diversity and social homogeneity?

But of course, there is a limit to these speculations, as there is to the efficacy of the public interventions. Urban districts are organic social structures with their own logic of development that escape easily from the offensives of political will. A convincing example can be the rather sad example of the story of the "outskirts" districts in France. It is exactly at this point that anthropology can prove to be an interesting support to analysis with its own tools to understand the interactions between the spontaneous social dynamic of a neighbourhood and the official policy of development.

Another interesting question is the relationship between the actual social transitions and their public representations. Often we find that in public discourse the diversity is valued, with a big emphasis on the necessity of respecting the difference. In reality though, difference is frequently bothering and lower class populations despite of an apparent consensus on their right to stay, are gradually pushed out of inner districts after renovation. The question is how anthropology can give an account on social transformations and on the discrepancies between the actual games of actors, collective representations and their use and manipulation by political ideologies of development.

Bearing these considerations in mind, the co-ordination team unanimously decided to direct its researches towards central districts going through intensive transformation in the four participating European countries : Hungary, Rumania, Finland and France. National teams will chose one or several districts in their towns of predilection to conduct their researches the results of which, in the form of monographs, will be presented at the occasion of the symposium to be organised in December, probably in Lyon, France.

During the workshop appropriate methodology was also extensively discussed. Beside traditional methods (interviewing, collecting life stories) experimental techniques were also proposed : visual approaches involving family photos and objects or the co-production of information by the anthropologist and the informant demanding the active participation of the latter (city plans drawn or photos taken by the informant, peripatetic interviewing, etc.).

3. Final programme

Saturday 17/04/2001

Arrival. Installation.

P.M. Short visit of the town

17 h Coordination meeting. Definition of the working method and accord on the schedule

19 h Supper

Sunday 18/04

9.30 h Introduction of the coordination team, introduction of the participants and the organisations. Presentation of the ESF Project, its objectives and the expected results. Discussion on the possible links between the programme Balaton (a previous scientific cooperation between two partners of the present project, that came to an end last year) and the ESF project.

12.30 h Lunch

14 h Discussion- debate : the scientific perspectives of the project. Presentation of the already existing research projects, piloted by the participating organisations, potentially linked by the ESF project. Possible cooperation between young researchers. Proposal of a common publication. Discussion on the proposed structure and content of the publication. Confirmation on the organisation of the next period (until June).

19h Visit in the Castle of Buda

Monday 19/04

10 h Visit in the ethnographic museum of Budapest. Presentation of a research project conducted by the museum in the framework of a european scientific cooperation programme („A house in Europe”). Projection of the film presenting the results of the research.

P.M. Departure

4. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field

During the meeting the following agreements were reached:

Participating organisations will make proposals towards the general co-ordinator (Artemisszio) of the project concerning the persons of young researchers and students that may participate in the field visits as well as concerning the destination of these visits. The general co-ordinator will put in contact the visiting and the receiving partners and after confirmation of the dates from both sides will put the necessary amount at the disposal of the visiting party who will be in charge of organising his/her own trip. Receiving partners

however are expected to make arrangements for accommodation and catering. They are also responsible for preparing a program for the visiting colleague, including field visits and formal occasions for theoretical and methodological exchanges. The visiting partner is supposed to produce a report on his visit that he will communicate to all the co-ordinating organisations not later than one month after his/her return. The reports should develop at least three main issues :

- the discovery of a neighbourhood as an anthropological field
- the commented description of the methodology used by the field-researcher
- personal observations and difficulties.

After discussion with the national co-ordinators, it became evident that the complete symmetry of field visit exchanges cannot be maintained. Eventually, a field visit will be proposed to senior researchers, too, but the intention of implying as many junior researchers as possible will be maintained.

The programme will be closed by a symposium in December 2001. All members of the co-ordination group will be expected to present a communication at this occasion. As a more far-reaching objective and depending on complementary financial resources, the co-ordination team proposes the organisation of a joint publication regrouping the communications of the symposium. A possible structure of the publication can be the following :

1. Urban transitions. An introduction.
2. Old districts in city centres : monographs.
3. The frontiers and the minorities of the empire : situational analysis.
4. The national traditions of anthropology, with a special interest in urban anthropology.

Although authors are free to chose a form of presentation of their field-work a basic organisational line is recommended for the monographs :

1. Urban history
2. Presence of cultural groups and frontiers
3. The policy of development at stake and the game of actors
4. Recomposition of use of space and practises
5. Symbolic marks of territory.

5-6. Final list of participants and statistical data

Hungary :

Prof. András Gergely, Scientific director. MTA PTI, Center of Ethno-regional Researches

Address : Országház u. 9. 1014 Budapest Hungary. Tel: +0036-1-375-90-11/240;

agergely@mtapti.hu, Age category : 40-50

Zsuzsanna Komjathy, Associated researcher. Project coordinator. Artemisszio

Foundation. 1016 Naphegy u. 36. Budapest, Tel : (36-1)375-50-14, artemisszio@matavnet.hu.

Age category : 20-30.

Tessza Udvarhelyi, Undergraduate student, University ELTE, Department of anthropology, Piarista köz 1, Budapest 1052. Artemisszio Foundation, benevolent.

pasa101@mail.datanet.hu. Age category : 20-30

László Hajnal, Undergraduate student, University ELTE, [hajnal@matavnet.hu](mailto:hajnalle@matavnet.hu). Age category : 20-30.

Ádám Bethlenfalvy, Remete út 4., Budapest 1121, Hungary. Phone: (36) 30 919-2156
Undergraduate student, University ELTE. bethlen@elender.hu, Age category : 20-30

Júlia Károlyi, Undergraduate student. University ELTE, simdav@freemail.hu. Age category: 20-30

Imre Lénárt, Undergraduate student, University ELTE. Tel.: 06 36 30 9702 454
lesnartes@freemail.hu. Age category : 20-30

Rumania :

Bodó Julianna, Scientific director. KAM, Centre for Regional and Anthropological Research, Centru de Cercetari Regionale si Antropologice / 4100 M-Ciuc , Vártér 1. P.O.Box. 81. Romania, telephone-fax: 00-40-66-171 929, wac@clmc.topnet.ro. Age category : 30-40

France :

Alain Battégay, Scientific director. ARIESE/ Groupe de Recherche sur la socialisation CNRS, Université Lyon 2, France, 5. Avenu Pierre-Mendès France Tel : 33/(0)-4-78-77-23-84, Alain.Battégay@mom.fr. Age category : 40-50.

Jacques Barou, Scientific director. CNRS. CERAT (Centre de Recherche sur le politique, l'administration, la Ville et le Territoire) Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Grenoble. Laboratoire CIVIL. 1030 Avenue Centrale, 1030 Avenue Centrale, Domaine Universitaire – BP 45, 38402 St Martin d'Hères Cedex . jacques.barou@upmf-grenoble.fr. Age category : 40-50

Diana Szántó, Associated researcher. CERAT-CIVIL, Grenoble. dzsanto@aol.com. Age category : 30-40.

Finland :

Igor Volovik, Kalastajankuja 1A4, 02230 Espoo.

Associated researcher. Social Policy Department, University of Helsinki, Box 54, 00014, volovik@boojum.hut.fi Age category : 20-30

ESF Exploratory Workshop - II

Between the 04th and 07th of October 2001
Lyon

1. Executive summary

The working sessions were divided in different moments in order to cover four major themes :

a. Report on field visits done by young researchers in the previous period

In the period since the last workshop in Budapest young researchers participating in the programme have started the prospective field visits. So far 3 visits of ten days each have been realised. Two of them (Zsuzsa Komjathy (Hu) and Diana Szanto (Fr)) were done on a reciprocal basis and were integrated in a long term collaboration project between the two national teams. The objective of these visits was to make acquaintance with the districts concerned in the two towns and with the working methods of the local researches. Consequently, the programme was mostly made up of personal exchanges, methodological discovery of the districts' urban structure with a special attention to "central" places, symbolic markers and public usage of space. A few appointments were also taken with local decision makers (at the municipality) and with representatives of local associations and social services. The reciprocal exchange between Rumania and Finland proved to be difficult to realise for organisational reasons. Young researchers participating in this exchange programme (Igor Volovik (Fi), Zoltan Biro (Ro) and Blanka Balint (Ro) did not find a real shared research direction. Decision was therefore made to organise these visits rather as individual exploratory trips questioning a particular theme corresponding to the personal interest of the participating young researches. Igor Volovik spent 10 days in Csikszereda in the month of august. He was mainly interested in interethnic relations between local Hungarians and Rumanians (the particularity of this town in Transylvania is that it contains a population 90% Hungarian with a Hungarian municipality). Accompanied by his two hosts he managed to realise a few interviews with representatives of both ethnic groups. Ms Balint and Mr Biro will be received in Grenoble by Diana Szanto in a few weeks time. Igor Volovik who momentarily stays in France will play the role of the second host.

b. Presentation of actual collaboration programmes between national teams realised in the framework of the ESF project

As it was mentioned under the previous point only one reciprocal collaboration was initiated in the framework of the programme. This collaboration project envisages the parallel extensive investigation in two districts, respectively in Grenoble and Budapest (Berriat, Terézvaros) with the aim of producing a comparative description of the role intercultural networks play in the local social organisation and in identity production. It is foreseen that beside a classical research report a joint exposition will also be organised at the end of the project with the implication of the inhabitants and with the collaboration of two

photographs. The exposition will present fragments of the life stories collected by the ethnologists, as well as family photos gathered from the inhabitants. Two museums have declared interested in the project : The “Musée Dauphinois” in Grenoble et “Ernst Museum” in Budapest. In December a small exposition is proposed in Grenoble based on the work of the two photographers.

c. Discussion and Debate on the situation of Urban Anthropology in the respective countries : history, main subjects, problems, potential research fields, relation between Urban Anthropology and intercultural studies

One major advantage of the ESF scheme is the possibility to organise thematic personal meetings between specialists of the same field coming from different countries. These discussions are conducted in a rather informal way and they are essential in order to create a real synergy in the coordination team. No other communication method could have substituted these exchanges. It permitted the participants to get to know better the historical development and present directions of the discipline in the participating countries as well as to initiate a joint reflection on the role and position of Urban Anthropology amongst the contemporary social sciences. For a short description of the content of this discussion see Point 2. (Scientific content of the event)

d. Definition of the final product : table of content of the proposed publication

The members of the coordination team reaffirmed their common decision to conclude the ESF project with the publication of a collection of articles. The canvas of the publication had already been defined at the previous meeting. This time the perspective authors presented their texts under work. These presentations served as well to launch the debate. Articles can be classified in two main categories : a, theoretical papers presenting a retrospective of the discipline and prospecting the future directions, b, monographies describing actual researches going on. For the accepted structure and table of content of the publication see the previous Report.

2. Scientific content of the event

The starting point of the discussions was the recognition that Urban Anthropology constituted a relatively new discipline in all the four participating countries. The social sciences until very recently were marked by the absence of researches on urbanity. However a clear gap can be observed : interest in urban phenomena appeared with a considerable delay in Eastern Europe for the simple reason that here until the political changes of the late 80'ies even classical anthropological studies were banned from the academic disciplines.

This difference in the history explains the different approaches reflected in the theoretical papers. Jacques Barou chose to speak rather about the “anthropologists in the town” giving an account of the development of French urban sociology/anthropology from the times of colonial explorations to the comprehension of the dynamics of contemporary societies. The Romanian team, on the contrary, adopted a more local point of view. Their

paper focuses on the researches of the Anthropologic Research Centre of Csikszereda in the 90ies. The urban researches in Rumania find their origins in the early 30ies. During the communism the analyses of particular cities continued in a typical socialist framework questioning the repartition of the space and the transforming sociological composition of towns and villages (corresponding to a time of mass desertification of villages). The "Bucharest school" played a major role in the transposition of the sociological interest from rurality towards urbanity. The Hungarian team adopted a resolutely historical point of view, following the process of urbanisation starting with the medieval donation of "right of town" to settlements. In more recent times despite of a certain sociological interest to the city as a mixture of populations resulting from rural migration, here as well as in Rumania, the interest of ethnographers transposed very slowly from villages to small towns. In France, on the contrary, the theme of rural migration is practically missing in researches.

It is interesting to notice how the town becomes an object of the research at a particular moment. To present this passage different methods confronted in the group. The first proceeded through the actual research descriptions (Rumania). The second through the critical bibliography of existing literature with the superposition of different approaches : sociologic, geographic, historic, ethnologic, etc.(Hungary). The French team preferred to represent the discipline through the description of the current academic themes, actual questions, most common orientations of calls for proposal. It was pointed out that the contemporary phase of urban anthropology started 20 years ago as a result of a few new social phenomena : explosion of the suburbs, growing immigration, demographic boom amongst second generation immigrants. As a result of these newly recognised social problems Urban Anthropology in France "entered the town" by the Suburb. This remark is also true as far as urban intercultural researches are concerned. The notion of "Intercultural" is mainly linked to marginalized populations, despite the fact that the town has many other ways to become "multicultural". For example the consequences of the Interpol's establishing in Lyon seems to engender no ethnological interest. "The intercultural in France remains an intercultural of the poor". More recently though, a few studies appeared on more global phenomena, investigating the process of internationalisation, globalisation, questioning the identities of towns.

In conclusion, it looks that Urban anthropology everywhere faces a paradigmatic difficulty : having developed a methodology capable to give fine descriptions of supposedly homogeneous mikro-localities it is necessarily in trouble having to draw pertinent conclusions concerning huge complex communities. If it wants to be faithful to classical ethnological methods sooner or later it has to pose the question : "how is it possible to study a town of 25 million inhabitants through 4 families"? To find a way out of this dilemma only two ways seem to be open. An Anthropology that wants to be genuinely urban has to innovate in its methods finding cross paths with other neighbouring disciplines, such as history or human geography, or it has to reconsider the construction of its very object.

3. Final programme

Thursday 04/10/2001

Arrival. Installation.

P.M. Coordination meeting. Definition of objectives and schedule

20 h Supper

Friday 05/10/2001

A.M. Working session. Evaluation of the proceedings of the programme. Establishment of a timetable for the next period

12.30 h Lunch

P.M. Working session. Discussion-Debate on different national developpements of Urban Anthropology

20h Dinner

Saturday 06/10

10 h. Working session. Proposals for the structure of the publication. Preparation of the seminar in January.

P.M. Visit of the old town of Lyon and field visit : „community associations in the district of the Crois Rousse ”

Sunday 07/10

Departure

4. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field

The discussions the group had during the working sessions led the participants to question the very notion of Urban Anthropology. When defining a research field one important point is to select the pertinent objects. For a long time one of the predominant objects in urban studies was the locality, district or neighbourhood, imagined as a discrete stock of population. Another way of putting the same question was to point out the community rather than the locality, but by doing so a strong relationship was still maintained between the two. This vision of Urban anthropology was in fact shared with the ethnology of the exotic world and it led both to a minor crises. A different way of investigating social formations is to concentrate rather on social relations cutting through real and imagined frontiers. This in fact seems to be a method more adapted to study phenomena like internet or virtual communities. But in these circumstances is it still possible to speak about Urban Anthropology, should not we rather speak about Anthropology of Communication? In this context one major question of anthropology in urban space seems to be the following : How does the city communicate with the people, i.e. how does the town generate certain types of social relations? To answer this question observation of “minor behaviours” become important. Here anthropology can rely on its strengths. In fact, participant observation can play an important role in this respect.

Parallel to this paradigmatical shift new subjects emerged related to :

- migration and mobility (including the internalisation of the networks),
- practices and special events, like football matches,
- special (“central”) places, like railway stations and commercial centres,
- industrial “fallow lands” (abandoned industrial sites in search of new usage),
- Social Fragmentation of the city : violence, security, (ex. “gated communities)

Despite the multiplication of research focuses it has to be noted that certain themes are still missing. There is still no anthropology dealing with urban notables, or with the new elites.

These changes effect also the consideration of interculturality in town. Traditionally the concept of “intercultural” was attached to the anthropology of the poor. There are though different, less discriminating ways to question the consequences of the co-presence of different cultural influences. We can ask for example : how people adjust to one another without sharing the same culture? Or to put it the other way round : how a minimal shared cultural basis is created out of such a disparate cultural input? The advantage of this approach is that it does not limit itself of the migrants.

Beyond these different questions concerning the possible role and status of Urban Anthropology it is not difficult to perceive a more important question related to the identity of Anthropology as such. What indeed makes its specificity? In reality the borderline becomes thinner and thinner between anthropology and qualitative sociology. Possible conjunctions can be found more between paradigms than between neighbouring disciplines. Ethical problems appears in the same way concerning their usage. Ethnology, though, more often than sociology is invited by political authorities to construct or consolidate local identities, considered as a useful antidote against some perturbing phenomena, like urban violence. This poses the question of the relation of the anthropologist with the political power : is there a particular notion of public “welfare” to defend, or shall we content to appropriate the speech of the marginalized?

These questions will certainly reappear in the theoretical papers to be written for the publication. The other type of articles that we called “monographies” will be rather detailed descriptions of actual research fields. The “monographies” will treat respectively : the town of Csikszereda (Ro), the “neighbourhood” of Berriat, Grenoble (Fr), La Place du Pont (Fr), The district of Terézvaros, Budapest (Hu), and a suburb dwelt by Russian speaking immigrants in Finland. Some practical questions related to the publication are left open, like the system of bibliographic reference to be chosen, the same for the treatment of quotations. A short Introduction of authors will be demanded as well.

At this point it became evident that the group will not have the necessary resources to finance the edition of this work. It was decided that the Hungarian team continue to Prospect the local publishing facilities. Andras Gergely will take contact with L’Harmattan, Hungary before the next meeting. The group met certain difficulties to find a suitable date for the next workshop in December. Consequently, Diana Szanto engaged herself to ask for permission from ESF to extend the program until January.

5-6. Final list of participants and statistical data

Hungary :

Prof. András Gergely, Scientific director. MTA PTI, Center of Ethno-regional Researches

Address : Országház u. 9. 1014 Budapest Hungary. Tel: +0036-1-375-90-11/240;

agergely@mtapti.hu, Age category : 40-50

Zsuzsanna Komjathy, Associated researcher. Project coordinator. Artemisszio

Foundation.1016 Naphegy u. 36. Budapest, Tel : (36-1)375-50-14, artemisszio@matavnet.hu.

Age category : 20-30.

France :

Alain Battégay, Scientific director. ARIESE/ Groupe de Recherche sur la socialisation

CNRS, Université Lyon 2, France, 5. Avenu Pierre-Mendès France Tel : 33/(0)-4-78-77-23-84, Alain.Battegay@mom.fr. Age category : 40-50.

Diana Szántó, Associated researcher. CERAT-CIVIL, Grenoble. dzsanto@aol.com. Age category : 30-40.

Finland :

Igor Volovik, Kalastajankuja 1A4, 02230 Espoo.

Associated researcher. Social Policy Department, University of Helsinki, Box 54, 00014,

volovik@boojum.hut.fi Age category : 20-30

Rumania :

Bodó Julianna, Scientific director. KAM, Centre for Regional and Anthropological Research, Centru de Cercetari Regionale si Antropologice / 4100 M-Ciuc , Vártér 1. P.O.Box.

81. Romania, telephone-fax: 00-40-66-171 929, wac @ clmc.topnet.ro. Age category : 30-40

ESF Exploratory Workshop - III
Between the 23rd and 27th of January 2002
Grenoble, Lyon

1. Executive summary

This last meeting was shared between two towns : Grenoble and Lyon. The reason for this choice is that one part of the team is working on a joint project of comparative research in two “neighbourhoods”, respectively in Budapest and Grenoble. Consequently, the programme started in this last town, in order to permit the interested parties to organise a special working session on this theme. As the project makes part of the ESF scheme and touches directly important methodological questions concerning everybody, all participants to the coordination team present were invited to this session. The timing of the meeting permitted that another special occasion could be included in the program. With the help of the Municipality of Grenoble a small exposition of photos was organised in a local library with the aim of presenting the project publicly. The opening ceremony took place in the evening of the arrival of the guests on the 23thd.

During the same period the last field trip in the framework of the scheme took place. It concerned Laszlo Hajnal, student of anthropology in the University ELTE (Budapest) and author of one part of the photos exposed. In this way he could meet for the first time the whole French team and participate actively in the methodological debate. This discussion which was organised in a nearby museum under construction (one of the members of the team is in charge with the elaboration of the museological programme) was dealing essentially with the complex relationship between photography, ethnology and museology. Members of the joint team exposed their working methods, the problems they encountered during field work and a minimal programme was accepted in view of preparation of a substantial common exposition in 2003.

Because of lack of time the “Musée Dauphinois”, one of the leading ethnological museums in France which is due to receive the exposition in question, could not be visited. Instead, a quick visit was organised in another local museum (Musée de la Résistance et de la Déportation de l’Isère) belonging to the same scientific management and sharing the same engagement of a “musée de société” (Musée de la Résistance et de la Déportation de l’Isère). The objective of this visit was to furnish material for the subsequent discussion on the role of the museography in the presentation of sociological facts.

Working sessions in Lyon were consecrated completely to an overall evaluation of the programme and to the presentation of the working papers resuming the main themes raised during the common work. At the same time, the field reports produced by Blanka Balint and Zolan Biro, young researchers from Rumania having realised a field trip in Grenoble in the month of October 2001 were presented to the coordination team.

2. Scientific content of the event

The last working session in Lyon was an occasion to present the work realised during the programme, in the form of working papers. These papers can be considered as a conclusion of the ESF exploratory workshop scheme and will constitute an annex to the present report, so it is not necessary to detail their content. We shall content ourselves to highlight here the main line and some basic ideas of the presentations.

In the order of the presentations we respected the structure fixed for the publication, differentiating the “theoretical texts” and the “monographies”, consecrating half a day for both subjects.

Jacques Barou in his exposé examined the question : how did the city appeared as an object of the research in France. He pointed out that Urban Anthropology emerged in the French social sciences with a considerable delay. He found two principal reasons for this time-lag. The first one is related to the history of France that induced researchers to find their working fields out of the scopes of modernity, essentially in exotic fields the access of which were facilitated by the colonialist past and secondly, “anthropology at home” if it was practiced at all, concerned rather the rural world. The second reason has to be found in the relationship of anthropology with the other social sciences resulting in a system of division of labour in which sociologists appeared to be legitimised to deal with the phenomena of urbanity. The first genuinely modern approaches of urbanity were deeply influenced by the work of the “Chicago school”, the first anthropological investigations realised in the tradition of “community studies”. The first moment of institutionalisation of the field is also attached to this influence with the creation of the “Laboratoire d’anthropologie urbaine”. The researches continued to focus mostly on the communities or on the local unit of habitation : the “district” or “neighbourhood” (le quartier). The effects of this development are still sensible in the actual practice of the discipline.

Andras Gergely analysed the beginning of Urban Anthropology in Hungary through a critical retrospective of the specialised bibliography. He underlined that the city started to become a subject of interest from the beginning of the twenties, questioning the relationship of the different social groups with the political power. Another way of addressing the same subject was a trial of categorisation of the different units of locality from “Tanya” (hamlet) to big town. The first authors were not necessarily specialised : they were recruited from writers and other intellectuals. The period from the sixties to the eighties was characterised by a solid socialist point of view, despite of the variety of the subjects. In this paradigm culture or ethnicity could not play a role. Researches were more interested in sociological problems like the effects of the system of housing distribution. At the same time it is not possible to understand the position of urban studies in Hungary out of the context of the long intellectual debate between “westerners” and “rurals”, in the core for almost a century of conflicting discourses on national identity. No wonder that during socialism the second tendency achieved more attention and encouragement from the power. From the early nineties a new wind blew also in the social sciences. Cultural, ethnic phenomenon provoked a bigger interest. Completely new subjects emerged as well, like the questions of “regionalisation” or “europanisation”. Despite this new opening though ethnology still has some difficulties to prove its legitimacy on the town facing serious concurrencies from the part of sociology and historical anthropology.

The situation is not very different in Rumania either with the nuance that here anthropology had to engage in a longer and tougher struggle to strengthen its position facing a communist dictatorship much harder than the one instituted in Hungary. After a

first explosion of sociological thinking inspired by the “Bucharest school” all sociology was simply eliminated from the fifties. It was only in the seventies that sociology and ethnography were reborn under the guardianship of the party, turning essentially toward the countryside with a marked interest in the collection of “beautiful objects”. Anthropology appeared completely underground far from the classical academic circles on the initiative of a few non-conformist intellectuals organised in informal “workshops”. The “workshop” of Csiksztereda is one them. In these circumstances it is understandable that foreign scientific support proved to be priceless. Bilateral collaboration programmes were created, mainly with France, making possible the implication of well known specialists like Althabe. The Anthropological workshop of Csiksztereda became official after 1989, at the same time attesting the explosion of the town : in a few years it grew from 12 000 to 50 000 inhabitants. Amongst the main actual research subjects we can mention : “use of the habitation in rural conditions”, “public celebration in urban milieu”, “strategies of ‘using space’”, “socialist urbanisation”.

The comparison of the three historical exposés made it clear that despite the evident differences some recurrent similarities can also be found between the case studies. First of all, it seems that the particular direction Urban Anthropology takes is everywhere closely linked to the geopolitical context of the country where it develops. These developments cannot be understood without analysing the political stake they represent. Secondly, Anthropology of the urbanity, too tightly linked to its origins practiced in exotic fields amongst small-scale societies often pictured as the depositors of discrete cultures, has not yet satisfactorily solved the dilemma formulated by Ulf Hannerz : how to quit the tendency of “anthropology in town” and start doing real “anthropology of the town”. This unsolved problem explains its difficulty to define itself and to defend its legitimacy amongst other social sciences.

After this section dealing with the history and actual fields of interest of the discipline, the members of the team presented their concrete research projects recently realised or in way of realisation.

The first description coming from Alain Battagay presented a research project conducted on a public square in Lyon, the “Place du Pont” , considered as a space of interculturality in town. The first question to be put in this respect is : what are the arguments in favour or this definition. M. Battagay found three arguments the first of which bringing him back to the reconsideration of the French development of Urban Anthropology.

The development of Urban Anthropology in France effectively arrived to a phase of expansion from the eighties with the translation of the authors of the “Chicago school”. . Until then the town was uniquely regarded as a place where the traditional cultures dilute. The impetus given by the Chicago school helped researchers to imagine that it can also be a space where the construction of a special culture is taking place. This new academic interest in urbanity as a way of life coincided with the emergence of some contemporary urban phenomena. The most dramatic of them was the “explosion of the suburbs” (banlieus) from the seventies, accompanied by the emergence of a new figure : that of the “Young”. The apparently neutral denomination often served as a euphemistic formulation of an ethnic category, standing for “young male belonging to the second generation of North African origin”. With the appearance of this figure as a social problem to which public authorities failed to find a solution, in reality it was the republican model of integration of France was challenged. In this context “intercultural” quickly became a politically correct way of speaking about specific urban tensions involving different

ethnic groups, if it was not the term to signify a certain type of social-cultural animation, using the folklorisation of culture as a generator of social peace (intercultural de couscous). It follows that it is extremely difficult today to put the question of intercultural in a scientific way, surely for its political connotations, but probably also because of the original metaphor of the town as a mosaic, picturing each “neighbourhood” as the representative of a singular way of life and the immigrants as authentic depositories of their culture of origin. A less outdated intercultural approach of the town should be able to think rather the identity transformations of the migrant and the numerous identity strategies the scenery of the town is offering the possibilities for. The diversity of the scenery permits to study various “cultural distributions”. La Place de Pont in Lyon can be described as an intercultural space in this sense. It has got no administrative frontier, it is still easily definable in the structure of the town. Traditionally it is characterised by the concentration of “strangers” : rural immigrants coming from the Ardèche region, but also Sefarad Jews, becoming from the sixties a famous meeting place for North African immigrants. In the nineties the place becomes the scene for an important “local development” project which aims at “containing the neighbourhood”, i.e. creating a great façade to hide the interior of neighbourhood from the much better-off inhabitants dwelling in the bourgeois houses by the river side. The objective is only partly achieved : the neighbourhood is certainly “contained” but it becomes increasingly “maghrébinised”. This affirmation is valid less related to the inhabitants, who are relatively few (only 1000), but to the aspect of the whole place, partly produced by a rich network of a highly specialised ethnic commerce, partly by the a mass of clients coming every day from the whole agglomeration to visit these shops. This example teaches us that in the contemporary French town the ethnic character is not a phenomenon of concentration, rather that of diffusion. It also invites us to rethink the notion of culture that seems to loose its compact appearance. Culture as a synonym of tradition, as opposed to modernity, does not describe any more the social reality.

The Finish example is based on a case study conducted in a suburb of Helsinki. It concerns the “ingrien” minority present. These are Russian speaking Finish who had been living in the region of Saint-Petersbourg from the 18th century and recently regained the mother country. Many of them do not even speak the language. These people who had been for a long time considered as “second zone” citizens in the Soviet Union had been keeping a strong Finish identity that was supposed to help them integrate quickly the host society. Instead of that they had to realise that again they are in a minority position. This situation is all the more frustrating since it is connected to a high rate of unemployment, entailing a degradation of their social position (in the ex-Soviet Union many of them were engineers or highly qualified professionals). In order to build a positive identity facing a society perceived as hostile, the “ingrien” minority of the Helsinki suburb has a tendency to exacerbate their Russian origins. As a result of this strategy, the community is closing to itself, making the communication with the “autochthon” Finnish ever more difficult. There is apparently a vicious circle building up. This is just another example to show that it is quite illusory to speak about identity as a definitive construction. Identity strategies are in fact quite malleable and context-dependent.

The Rumanian case study is of a different order, more of a historical approach. It presents the special transformations of the town of Csikszereda through half a century put in parallel with the variations of symbolic appropriation and social practice of its inhabitants. Three main phases can be differentiated in this respect. The first one starts with 1968, date when the town became the “capital of the department”. An extensive

development, together with a heavy tendency of urbanisation characterised this period, without changing the structure of the town. The population followed this development with a relative satisfaction. People were proud that their town became bigger and more important. The period of 70-80 corresponded to a national movement of demolition and huge reconstructions in Rumania. Csikszterada took part in this tendency, the centre of the town was completely redesigned, its symbolic significance completely changed. People were more critic related these changes but their resistance were passive. Their strategy was double, on one part they created a distance with the newly built elements, on the other, they profanised them symbolically through nicknaming. After 89 the public constructions completely ceased. At the same time there is an abundance of monument production (more than 40 new monuments in a few years). Passive resistance against the centralised political power lost its sense. People learnt to appropriate the formerly avoided places. At the same time a segregation in the usage of the space can be observed. Everything that was "mixed" before, became separated : between rich and poor, young and adult, etc.

Zsuzsa Komjathy and Diana Szanto presented the two complementary sides of their joint research project implying the comparative description of intercultural relations, social organisation and network system in two "neighbourhoods", respectively in Budapest and Grenoble. Since actual research has been started only recently instead of advancing the perspective results they contented to give a global ethnographic and historic description of the two fields in question pointing out some working hypothesis which serve as the starting points for the work.

3. Final programme

Tuesday 22/01

Arrival in Grenoble. Installation

P.M. First meeting. Accord on the programme

20 h Supper

Wednesday 23/01

A.M. Visit of the town

12.30 h Lunch

P.M. Working session for the bilateral team „Berriat-Terézváros”. Preparation of the photo exhibition.

18h Inauguration of the exhibition in the district library of Berriat

Thursday 24/01

A.M. Visit to the “Musée de l’houille blanche” under creation in Lancet. Working session : questions of methodology in view of preparation of a joint exposition.

P.M. Visit to the « Musée de la Résistance et de la Déportation » in Grenoble. Departure for Lyon.

Friday 25/10

Closing session and seminar

A.M. Synthesis and evaluation of the programme. Presentation of the “theoretical texts” produced in the framework of the programme.

P.M. Presentation of the field researches. Exploration of the possibilities of continuation of the cooperation.

Saturday 26/01

Participation to the manifestation “Hamam en fête”, different events and cultural programmes connected to the institution of the “hamam”, realised by the collaboration of local associations.

Sunday 27/01

Departure

4. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field

Regular meetings and the respect of a tight working program made it possible to compare the development of Urban Anthropology in the participating countries, confront the methods and the major subjects of interest, as well as to understand the main regularities and to define the main problems and obstacles connected to the study of intercultural phenomena in urban context.

Personal engagement of the participants also permitted to realise a certain number of actual field researches, most of which will be further developed in the future. The collection of the articles written in this framework gives a good picture of the state of knowledge of the discipline at a given moment. However, actual research collaboration programmes were difficult to elaborate and initiate partly because of the shortage of the resources, partly because of the important differences in the approaches. In fact, only one such collaboration is going on actually between the French and the Hungarian teams. At the working meeting realised at this last occasion however it was underlined that even in this case communicational difficulties, lack of consensus on methodology and social realities very far from each other make the comparative approach often problematic. Paradoxically, the very concrete objective to realise a joint exposition, although introducing an additional constraint, helps to create a common ground on which it becomes possible to start working together.

The reciprocal exchanges between young researchers were the most difficult to realise in the form it was originally planned. Young anthropologists working on a special subject in their own countries found it difficult to find a corresponding research programme going on in one of the three other countries participating in the programme. Field visits became in this way rather a means to get acquainted rapidly with another social reality, and the scene for an professional exercise that can be resumed in this way : how much can we learn in ten days of the life of a foreign town without any preliminary studies and most of the time without speaking the language? Young participants of the programme took advantage of this possibility and returned home with interesting observations. Discussions on the experiences with the hosts proved to be sometimes quite enlightening for these.

In conclusion, appreciation of the results of the programme is definitely positive by the members of the coordination team as well as by the participating young researchers. Only one real shortcoming was pointed out at the evaluation. The coordination team found it regrettable that the institutional participation of the Finnish partner proved to be very poor. The Finnish scientific coordinator could not come to any of the meetings, he delegated all the work to the young researcher representing Finland. This later nevertheless did his best to meet the expectations of the programme and assured that despite the lack of a real institutional support the working plan could be respected.

5-6. Final list of participants and statistical data

Hungary :

Prof. András Gergely, Scientific director. MTA PTI, Center of Ethno-regional Researches

Address : Országház u. 9. 1014 Budapest Hungary. Tel: +0036-1-375-90-11/240;

agergely@mtapti.hu, Age category : 40-50

Zsuzsanna Komjathy, Associated researcher. Project coordinator. Artemisszio Foundation. 1016 Naphegy u. 36. Budapest, Tel : (36-1)375-50-14, artemisszio@matavnet.hu.

Age category : 20-30.

France :

Alain Battegay, Scientific director. ARIESE/ Groupe de Recherche sur la socialisation CNRS, Université Lyon 2, France, 5. Avenu Pierre-Mendès France Tel : 33/(0)-4-78-77-23-84, Alain.Battegay@mom.fr. Age category : 40-50.

Diana Szántó, Associated researcher. CERAT-CIVIL, Grenoble. dzsanto@aol.com. Age category : 30-40.

Finland :

Igor Volovik, Kalastajankuja 1A4, 02230 Espoo.

Associated researcher. Social Policy Department, University of Helsinki, Box 54, 00014, volovik@boojum.hut.fi Age category : 20-30

ESF Exploratory Workshop Scheme 2001

REPORT ON THE FIELD VISITS ORGANISED IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PROGRAMME

In the original proposition 8 field visits had been foreseen altogether. As the program went by it became increasingly clear that this objective would not be possible to maintain. First of all because of the very limited participation of our Finish partner, but also because optimal timing for reciprocal exchanges proved to be difficult as each participant had to take into consideration his or her normal work constraints in accordance with the availability of his/her hosts. Also, direct correspondence between research subjects could not be found, except for one case.

Despite these difficulties 6 field visits were organised and successfully realised by young researches during the program. The beneficiaries were students of anthropology or young members of the coordination staff. The visits lasted each about 10-12 days during which all costs of participants were taken in charge. Exchanging partners were entirely responsible for the organisation of the trip and for the planification of the program which proved to be a good means to actively engage the young participants and to create complicity between the receiving and visiting party. One long term impact of the project will certainly be the maintenance of these personal and professional relationships, the strength of which we could already verify in the period passed since the field trips.

No formal instructions were given to participants as to how to build their scientific program during their stay and how to write their report. Nevertheless, they were asked to keep in mind two objectives : try to learn as much as possible on the context of the host city (eventually working out hypothetical research subjects) and secondly, to compare their own and their colleagues' research fields, working methods and difficulties. In the cases where no direct correspondence were found between on going researches participants chose mainly observation and interviews with the "indigenous" population to develop a kind of mini-research as a methodological exercise. This was the case of the Finnish and the two Rumanian young researchers. Igor Volovik (Fi) used their hosts both as translators and informants in order to form a picture of representations on the implicit interethnic conflict between Hungarian and Rumanian populations in Transylvania. The two Romanian visitors in France, aware of the language barrier, tried to find subjects where they could rely entirely on observation. In this way, Blanka Balint chose a local square and market as field for an ethnographical description, while Zoltan Biro made his observations in the cemetery of the town. Despite the difference between the two fields, both of them were working mainly on the structure and social usage of public spaces.

French and Hungarian young participants of the program found themselves in a rather different situation, as now they form a common team in a joint research program that could be defined and ultimately developed due to the ESF scheme. Members of the team work together on a comparative analysis of intercultural relationships in two districts respectively in Grenoble and Budapest (Berriat- Terezvaros) with the objective of preparing an exposition and a joint publication. Consequently, they used the possibility of the field visits more for exchanges and debates on methodological and theoretical guidelines of the work and to acquire a basic knowledge of the field of their counterparts. The last field trip in Grenoble was an occasion for a global team coordination meeting.

It has to be mentioned that most young researchers made also their contribution to the corpus of texts proposed for a publication worked out as a result of the ESF program.

Summary of the actual field visits realised in the framework of the project :

| Date | Visiting partner | City/country | Receiving partner | City/country | Theme of the visit |
|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 2001 May | Zsuzsa Komjathy | Budapest/ Hungary | Diana Szanto | Grenoble/ France | Presenting the research going on in the "Berriat" district |
| 2001 June | Diana Szanto | Grenoble/ France | Zsuzsa Komjathy | Budapest/ Hungary | Presenting the research going on in the „Terezvaros“ district |
| 2001 August | Igor Volovik | Helsinki/ Finland | Zoltan Biro Blanka Balint | Csikszereda/ Rumania | Observations on interethnic conflicts and representations of national identity between Hungarian and Rumanian inhabitants of the town |
| 2001 October | Zoltan Biro Blanka Balint | Csikszereda/ Rumania | Diana Szanto Igor Volovik | Grenoble/ France | Ethnographic observations on structure of urban spaces and their social usage (in the local cemetery and on a public square) |
| 2002 January | Laszlo Hajnal | Budapest/ Hungary | Diana Szanto | Grenoble/ France | Photographic exposition on the "Terézvaros research" Coordination meeting between the members of the two national teams participating in the cooperation program |

EVALUATION

The main object of exploratory workshops is to give to different researchers the possibility to discuss about theoretical and methodological questions concerning their common fields of investigation. It is also to give them the opportunity to exchange ideas in order to build a problematic for a future comparative research. In this way, the ESF programme is a successful one. The meetings between Hungarian, Romanian, French and finish teams, though the latter was represented by only one junior researcher, allowed interesting debates concerning the main concepts used in the field of intercultural studies and fruitful discussions concerning the specific approach of the urban anthropology.

The field visits organised in France, Hungary and Romania completed the vision of the particularities inherited in each of the countries on the point of view of intercultural relations. Though the researchers had not the same interests concerning the question, the theoretical exchanges and the concrete discovery of the research-fields of their colleagues helped them to precise their problematic and to improve their methodology. The past and present political contexts of the different countries and their consequent influences on the urban evolution could be so taken in account.

Workshops and visits gave also the participants the opportunity to meet the actors of urban life in the studied areas: associations of inhabitants and political representatives. They had the possibility to discuss with other researchers who conducted research projects on very neighbouring fields like the European project "A house in Europe" realised by the ethnographic museum of Budapest in cooperation with other national teams. In Grenoble they had the possibility to contact anthropologists working in some famous museums of societies like the Musée Dauphinois, which is an official partner of the Berriat/Teresvaros project. These anthropologists have realised different expositions linked to researches in different fields. So, the participants of the ESF programme could learn how the results of a research are showed to the public through the bias of an exposition. The question of the restitution of the research to the inhabitants of the studied districts could be analysed and will probably in the future inspire a new way to make research projects with a more acute care to concern a larger public.

The main results of the ESF programme for the participants are the following ones.

Firstly, the joint research project already partly elaborated in the framework of the Balaton programme could become more precise and benefit of the theoretical discussions and of the concrete observations realised during the fields visits. This project implies the comparative description of the intercultural relations in two neighbourhoods in Budapest and in Grenoble. These ones are settled in changing central areas. The chosen approach is the anthropological one. So, the ESF Programme was a good mean to strengthen the cooperation of the French and Hungarian teams around their future comparative research and to enlighten their problematic with the examples described by Romanian and finish teams. This comparative research now engaged implies also a certain number of young researchers, especially in the Hungarian team who could take part to the meetings.

Secondly, the last meeting in Lyon was the occasion to organise a symposium wherein were presented different working papers realised during the programme. Some of them were "theoretical texts" and others were "monographies" but they both try to answer the different questions evocated during the preceding discussions and to analyse the fields visited. These texts could represent a good an concrete conclusion of the ESF programme and we hope they will be published because they deal with a question becoming a central one for the future of the urban areas in a more and more multicultural Europe as well in its western part than in its eastern one.