

AMSTERDAM MEETING MINUTES

TALKING ABOUT TABOOS

DECEMBER 4 & 5, 2014



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. Responsibility for the content of this publication (communication) reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission is not responsible for any use of the information contained therein.

DAY 1 – DECEMBER 4, 2014, VENUE: CWI, SCIENCE PARK 123, AMSTERDAM

At 10:00 prof. Arjen de Vries welcomed us to the venue. He gave a short introduction on CWI. Then Onno (EF) explained how also in this national adult education centre the project's topic – social exclusion – is a topic.

During the review of the agenda it was suggested and accepted that the presentation of the Polish and Dutch results would take place in the Polish slot while the Dutch slot would be used by Beatka (FCP) to start a small performance.

Vera (EL) then asked what the NA reactions were to the partners' individual Midterm Reports. It occurred that no noteworthy negative comments had occurred.

The French presentation was by Vera and Clara. Vera told us about one activity session that had taken place involving big pictures. Participants were asked to describe what they saw on the pictures and – as it turned out – only produced political correct answers. Vera made clear that she wants to look into this political correctness as a potential obstacle for talking about taboos.

Minna presented the Italian overview of activities. She told us that related projects were analyzed for useful results to work with in this project. Vera and Onno stressed that activities to test out good practices need to be undertaken.

Junaid and Rikesh showed the progress of the UK partner. They have been promoting a young Asian to get into the football establishment – but did not succeed. Quite a few good practices appeared to have been tested – but they were not made very explicit. Vera and Onno asked the UK partner to make them very explicit.

The Polish and Dutch partners were represented by Onno. He presented four concrete good practices – (1) promoting individuals saying three sentences that induce reflection; (2) dialogue training C2C; (3) introducing slow dialogue online and (4) publishing essays and questionnaires – and he evaluated their usefulness.

Beatka then presented everybody with white masks with black outlines on them and with markers. All were asked to augment their masks in a very limited time. Then all participants gathered in the hallway and one by one held their masks in front of their faces. This was part of the performance: Everybody has their own Black Pete.

Dave then gave a new tour to the improved project platform. The platform was now ready for testing by the partners.

- All promised to enter the platform and upload at least one blog and one article on the platform.

Dave was asked to change the TAT logo on the platform.

Lunch and a guided tour through Amsterdam followed by an evening conference on the project theme concluded day 1.

The evening conference consisted of four blocks:

- Sport and social exclusion
- Talking about social exclusion
- Arts and social exclusion
- Framing social exclusion

DAY 2 – DECEMBER 5, 2014, VENUE: BERLAGE MEET AND WORKSPACE, OUDEBRUGSTEEG 9, AMSTERDAM

The meeting started off with a short evaluation of day 1. Then all moved on to talking about the activities that remained to be done within the framework of the project.

Onno expressed his worries over the project framing. He said that it had been a conscious choice to decentralize the project but that now a common frame needs to be brought back in – or at least a common understanding of the key concepts. In the UK, for instance, a situation is labeled 'racist' if one person, who does not have to be a participant of the situation, labels it 'racist'. It is different in different countries.

Vera came up with the idea that all should write a paragraph on national policy on the subject of social exclusion and a description of mainstream interpretations of key concepts. All agreed.

All partners then agreed to write a next paragraph stating their own position vis-a-vis national and mainstream interpretation, serving as a justification for the choice and means of testing of the good practices.

The next aspect to be described would be the choice and testing of good practices – and its outcome.

After these texts are ready a paragraph needs to be written noting similarities and differences between the partner cultures and their potential implications for the applicability of good practices stemming from other cultures.

The next big subject was the next meeting and the final conference. Junaid made it clear that the conference would be organized in Rugby.

Three big issues were addressed:

- For whom should the conference be
- How should the conference look like
- Should the conference and the meeting be on the same day

It was decided that Junaid has to service his own target groups in situ. Thus, there will be representatives from the local government, NGOs, minority groups and the sports sector. It will be hard to serve them all with one program. Thus it was established there will be two parts that constitute the conference:

- Workshops provided by the French, the Italian and the Polish partner
- A dialogue on stage facilitated by the UK partner and moderated by the Dutch partner

It was also decided that it would be good to have the conference first and then, a day later, the last project meeting so that everything that might happen during the conference could still be discussed.

Three action points resulted from the discussion on the conference:

- All partners make clear within two weeks when they are not available for the meeting and conference in May
- Junaid checks availability options in Rugby
- The Dutch and Polish partner check availability of optional conference guest Zygmunt Bauman