

## RESEARCH NOTE

---

### 'You Don't Belong Here in Germany . . .': On the Social Situation of Refugee Children in Germany

PHILIP ANDERSON

*Office for Intercultural Affairs, City of Munich*

This paper looks at refugee children in Germany and is based on an interview-based research project. Areas covered include: how the children learn German and the role of bilingual skills; friendships and contacts at school; the degree of integration in the local neighbourhood; how traumatic experiences are dealt with; the effects of lack of secure residential status; the specific situation of unaccompanied minors. One of the salient features of refugee children's lives is the state of constant uncertainty as regards the future and life planning which this situation entails. It increases the psychological pressure inherent in life stories already characterized by flight, social dislocation and social and cultural uprootedness.

#### **Introduction**

The following paper is based on research done as part of a project carried out by the German Youth Institute (Deutsches Jugendinstitut, DJI) on migrant children's lives in Germany (*Multikulturelles Kinderleben* 1997–2000, project leader Anne Zehnbauer). The research was commissioned by the Federal Ministry for the Family, Youth and Social Policy. The final results were presented at a congress held by the DJI on 19–20 October 2000 (see DJI 2000).

The specific focus of the study was on refugee children whom the researcher interviewed in Munich, Frankfurt and Cologne, along with a variety of experts working with the children in various contexts (social workers, lawyers, asylum lobbyists, youth workers, therapists and teachers). This research report looks at the social conditions faced by refugee children viewed against a human rights background, the emphasis being on those who are resident in hostels. Some of the children had lived in these camp-like forms of accommodation for a number of years. The project team decided to restrict the sample to German-speaking children, which meant that those interviewed had been living in Germany for three years and upwards.

The research for the study *Refugee Children: A Marginalized Group in the Multicultural Milieu* was begun after initial interviews had shown this particular group to have been neglected hitherto in studies of refugees or unaccompanied minors in the Federal Republic. The intention was to provide a practice-orientated publication for those working on a day-to-day basis with the children, thus confronted with their immediate social, educational and emotional needs.

The following areas were covered in the interviews:

- how the children learn German and the role of bilingual skills;
- friendships and contacts at school;
- their role within the family;
- the degree of integration in the local neighbourhood;
- how traumatic experiences are dealt with;
- the effects of lack of secure residential status;
- the specific situation of unaccompanied minors.

This paper will focus on the human rights problems involved in the social isolation faced by the children during their sojourn in Germany, which is characterized by uncertainty at a number of levels over a great length of time at a crucial and formative period in these young people's lives. With due regard for the legal distinction, the terms 'refugee' and 'asylum-seeker' will be used interchangeably in this article because of colloquial usage frequently encountered in interviews in the course of research. Quotations are from transcribed interviews and have been translated by the author.

### *Political and Legal Background*

Germany has continued to receive large numbers of asylum seekers even allowing for the far more restrictive application of the law following the revision of Article 16 of the Basic Law in 1993. This introduced the safe third country rule, exclusion from asylum procedures through the list of safe countries-of-origin and the airport transit area 'fast track' system, which last in particular has been severely criticized in terms of the human rights violations it entails (see Kaufmann 1998; Bosswick 2000). Nonetheless large numbers of asylum seekers find themselves spending long years in the Federal Republic's asylum determination system with uncertain status or as rejected applicants who cannot be removed because of German obligations under non-*refoulement* agreements.

One or two statistics may serve to indicate the pattern of development in numbers of refugees since the passing of the constitutional amendment. The number of refugees in the (old) Federal Republic was officially given as 700,000 in 1987. This had risen by 1993 (i.e. in the enlarged Republic including the new *Länder* of the former GDR) to 1.9 million. By the end of 1998 this had fallen to 1.1 million refugees within the Federal territories. Of those recorded in 1998 182,500 were recognized refugees, 32,000 were Convention refugees, around 10,000 were 'contingent' refugees, about 100,000 were registered as Jewish

immigrants from the successor states of the Soviet Union, 15,000 were stateless persons, 285,000 were officially classed as asylum seekers, there were 370,000 *de facto* refugees and just under 100,000 civil war refugees remaining from Bosnia-Herzegovina (Bericht 2000a; see Augenendt 2000 for a more precise definition of refugee categories under German law). Developments between 1993 and 1998 show clearly how the numbers of asylum seekers have been reduced. By the end of the nineties the number of new asylum seekers arriving annually was relatively constant at 90–100,000 per year (for 1999, 95,113, see Bericht 2000b: 45–47).

The procedure after arrival for asylum seekers is regulated at federal level. The initial reception centres are run by the Federal Office for the Recognition of Foreign Refugees, which conducts the preliminaries following the application for asylum such as fingerprinting, health checks, examination of route to Germany. This may lead to immediate repatriation through the Federal Border Control or (after a statutory maximum stay of three months) to allocation to asylum hostels at local level, numbers of which are set according to regional quotas.

### **German Language Acquisition and the Role of Bilingual Skills**

When refugee children first arrive in Germany with their families they are faced with the same problems as adults in adjusting to a new environment: they must come to terms with a new language, culture and often climatic differences as well as dealing with the turbulence and painful dislocation (and not infrequently traumatic experience) associated with the period before flight.

In contrast to their parents, however, the children generally have the chance to learn the language quickly as well as to gain some form of access to German mainstream society through going to school. Regulation of education is a *Länder* competence, and although refugee children do not have a legally determined right to schooling, in practice the great majority do attend school. In most *Länder* children are registered for attendance in transitional preparatory classes as soon as the family has been allocated to a particular region. Here they will receive their initial language grounding before changing over to the orthodox state system, in which the young refugees are likely nonetheless to be at a substantial linguistic, cultural and social disadvantage for some time; they may never catch up. First, teachers are largely unaware of and ill equipped to deal with the specific problems faced by refugee children. There is little provision of support teaching or extra mural teaching through the schools. Secondly, the children themselves are unwilling to be the focus of inordinate attention and will thus do their best to conceal their learning difficulties (see Apitzsch 1996; Heun and Wiesenfeld-Heun 1993: 96–108; Holzapfel and Dietz 1999: 197–220).

In the interviews conducted the children indicated the importance of the residential hostels in learning the German language. They are the ones in the family who establish contact first. In often extremely cramped living conditions they join the other children to play in the corridors or outside the block. They

attempt to communicate from the outset. German will as a rule be the *lingua franca*. An Eritrean girl described how her best friend in her first hostel had been a Bosnian girl, who had taught her German. She was very sad when her friend had to go back to Bosnia during the wave of forced repatriation from Bavaria of 1997–98. When she subsequently went to school she had some difficulty mastering her German, which she learnt primarily through two German fellow pupils. It was pointed out to her that her sentences were sprinkled with incomprehensible terms: ‘Bosnisch’ (Bosnian), as it turned out. That is to say that in order to communicate satisfactorily with her Bosnian friend she had developed her own linguistic hybrid which had long stood her in good stead.

Other young interviewees confirmed how important contact with other children in the hostels was in helping them to learn German. Beyond this they were very aware of assuming the role of interpreter for their parents from early on, whether with social workers in the hostels, on visits to the doctor with the family or in contact with local authority offices, or indeed in the context of asylum procedures. They were the ones who self-evidently were learning fastest and best, and their parents expected them to assume the interpreter role.

### **Friendships and Contacts at School**

Generally speaking the children living in residence hostels have a clear awareness of the limits of the ‘social space’ in which they live. They tend to stay in the hostels or to play in the immediate vicinity. Playgrounds in the immediate area might be regarded as ‘out of bounds’; youth centres in the local area, too, may be seen as unfriendly territory, already ‘staked out’ by other local children of German or of resident migrant origin. It was clear from interviews that the refugee minors have had experience of being made to feel outsiders by other children. Equally, refugee children in the hostels might experience rejection on the part of those from their countries of origin who are members of established migrant communities. The residential hostels are often notorious in the area as cramped, loud and dirty, characterized as centres of petty crime often socially off-bounds for other residents in the area. Thus migrant non-refugee children may reflect a need to distance oneself from those ‘at the bottom of the heap’. Conversely the young refugees will stay away from places where previous unpleasant experiences might recur.

This means initial friendships formed in the hostels are very important. As in the example quoted of the Eritrean girl, these may be formed across linguistic and cultural boundaries. However, bonds of kinship as well as of ethnic, regional and national affinity maintained by the grown-ups (e.g. ties between Kosovo Albanians from a particular area) will have a strong influence on the children’s social networking. This may mean the children transmit the conflicts which have been formative for their parents. But they do tend to be more adventurous and more multicultural than their elders, less trammelled by adult preconceptions and prejudices. An example of this from an interview situation: in a hostel four young interviewees aged seven to eleven were two sisters from Eritrea and

a brother and sister from Afghanistan. Over a period of four years they had become close friends, and their families often ate together, their initial contacts having been in a mixture of Russian and first scraps of German.

Contacts developed at school take on signal importance for the children in a world in which they experience great isolation. An Afghan boy of eleven who had been in Germany for a number of years talked with evident pride of his friendship with a German pupil in his class. This pride was set against the background of discrimination from other pupils which he had experienced at school:

Yes, they said, you little foreigner you don't belong here in Germany, piss off out of our country, we don't need people like you here.

In the course of time, however, he has developed friendships, he is sometimes invited to other pupils' houses, and there is his friend, Philip:

... he invites me the most, because he's German, and he's a very good pupil and one of my best friends right until now [...] we play games or football. He goes in goal and I shoot at him. He's a good goalie. But sometimes—then I support him too. 'Cos he always supported me, since the first class, he's not one of those kids who says, you don't belong to us... Because he knows if he [was somewhere else] it would be terrible for him.

The attitude adopted by their teachers in class is equally important for the young refugee children. The children revealed very sensitive antennae as regards the teachers' behaviour toward them, especially at the beginning. It was important that teachers showed themselves to be welcoming, but without drawing too much attention to the children's difference from their fellow pupils. The opportunity to say something about their home area was appreciated if the context was appropriate (e.g. a project on different cultures and countries of origin). Demonstrative 'refugee-friendly' statements on the part of teachers were, however, seen as being superfluous or embarrassing.

### **The Children's Role within the Family**

The children's role within the family is often ambivalent. On the one hand they are conscious of playing an active role in helping the family to cope with a variety of challenges in Germany, primarily as interpreters. On the other they experience an inversion of the hierarchy of responsibility. It is especially the fathers who have the greatest problems with their sudden loss of authority and of their role as breadwinner. They often have serious health problems of a physical or psychological nature as a result of experiences before flight, such as torture. The flight itself will frequently have been existentially threatening. Having arrived, the family is confronted with the full realization of loss of possessions, work and social status in a cultural environment in which the old social and professional and (frequently) linguistic skills and contacts are devalued if not redundant. In addition, the fathers in particular often experience acute guilt feelings for 'getting the family into this situation':

what will become of the children's education, for example? The daily material realities of this new way of life compound this sense of failure and loss of human dignity: life in a mobile housing unit on meagre social security, the last trace of autonomy removed with the provision of food packets—the family is thus no longer able even to choose what it can eat (this is the case in Bavaria).

Until very recently asylum seekers were prevented from working for a period of three years (in November 2000 the Federal Government reduced this period to one year), a forced inactivity creating severe social and psychological tensions within the families already living under cramped and stressful conditions close to penury in the residence hostels. The mother in the family is generally more likely to find some kind of part-time work, thus further undermining traditionalist structures in those refugee families in which the man has hitherto been regarded as the breadwinner. (One Kosovo Albanian father was prompted to comment bitterly in broken German as an aside during an interview with his children: 'So much is done to give our children a chance, language courses, school, youth clubs. Well, what about us grown ups?')

This loss of paternal authority leads to tensions within the family. Conflicts arise because children assume almost a 'parental' responsibility in situations where they must interpret (often treating topics which are too much for a child's sensibilities into the bargain, such as experiences during flight). As a psychiatrist pointed out, the parents can become increasingly apathetic, reflecting an almost infantile need for care and provision, failing to learn the language and thus signalling a longer term reliance on their increasingly self-sufficient children. Thus the family is almost certain to become dysfunctional in developing a pattern of relationships which is stressful for all concerned.

There is one further poignant aspect of life for this nuclear family-in-exile. As pointed out by an Ethiopian interviewee who had lived in Germany with his family for many years, these are migrants who grew up within the extended family. When faced with generation conflicts back home the grandparents might often play an intermediary role between the generations. Feeling less compelled to be as strict as they perhaps were as parents, mellowing with hindsight, the grandparents often play a crucial role mending fences. Here in central Europe they are usually missing. The interviewee described conflicts with his 16-year-old daughter when he insists she be home at 8 p.m. on a Saturday evening. He gets angry when she is late, fearing for her welfare in a central European, in his view overly permissive, culture. They argue bitterly because his daughter cannot understand his strict attitude when her friends' parents are so much more liberal. What can he say? He concludes that they both would need his parents to turn to as intermediaries. This would be the normal thing in African culture, he stated, but the grandparents are so far away.

### **The Degree of Integration in the Local District**

One characteristic of refugee children's lives in residential hostels is the sense of geographical and social isolation. Many of those working with the children

pointed out that their charges often feel a sense of shame about living in these centres. This shame may be manifested in the fact that the children do not invite friends to their homes for birthday parties or simply to play. They do not have the space, facilities or resources to be good hosts. Equally, the smaller children especially will often have their well-worn paths to and from home which their parents advise them to stick to. This reflects the fact that parents may fear for their children's safety in what they regard as a threatening environment. In one interview there was a graphic sense of the unease which parents may pass on to their children. In the following short extract an eleven-year-old child describes her mother's fear that her children might be 'stolen':

Child: 'We should stay inside more, because she [the mother] is afraid here in Germany.'

Interviewer: 'What does she think?'

Child: 'Yes, sometimes on TV, children get stolen, that's why my mother says, stay inside.'

Interviewer: 'She's afraid the children could get stolen?'

Child: 'Yes. For example my mother doesn't calm down until we've all come home from school. But she's most afraid for me because I have to go by underground.'

This sort of unease, a fear that their children might be prey for unscrupulous or dangerous strangers, is of course familiar to all parents, but asylum seekers in the hostels, with their limited contact with what may be an actively hostile environment and their frequently modest language options and devalued social and professional skills, feel their own vulnerability acutely and project this fear in enhanced form onto their children. It is thus little wonder that the children sense their parents' anxieties regarding their movements in the local area and develop some of their own.

A head of a hostel with many years of experience described a case of the manifestation of insecurities arising out of this situation. A local youth centre had devised a programme specifically for teenage refugee girls in the hostel, focusing on linguistic and social skills as well as issues of special gender and ethnic concern. The girls were willing to take part but it became clear that they were loathe to walk the five minutes to the centre to attend, even in a group. A special arrangement was made for a social worker to accompany them to and from the centre and with a lot of persuasion and support the parents allowed their daughters to take part in the course. But the parents' fears for the (undoubtedly moral as well as physical) welfare of the female adolescents remained a constant theme.

### **How Traumatic Experiences are Dealt With**

Children of asylum seekers or unaccompanied minors are dependent on empathy and specialist psychological skill in evaluating whether trauma experience is a significant factor in a child's behaviour and which therapeutic

needs arise out of this.<sup>1</sup> In this study interviews were conducted both with institutions providing individual or group therapeutic help for victims of trauma, including minors,<sup>2</sup> and with therapists working on an individual basis specifically with young refugees who are victims of trauma. A number of points were made about the difficulty of treating young traumatized patients from varied cultural backgrounds and living a life in Germany determined by the vagaries of the asylum process. Here we shall mention three: warning signs confronting care and youth workers, themes treated in the context of a behavioural therapeutic approach and the danger of 're-traumatization.'

Care workers and education professionals described how they come with experience to recognize signals indicating a background of trauma. Such children may complain of the sudden onset of intense nightmares, or draw attention to themselves in the class through hyperactivity. One head teacher described the case of a young Bosnian girl who was unprepared for a trial fire alarm during which the classes had to assemble in the school playground after the siren had sounded. She was so terrified that she ran away from the school, because she expected planes to start bombing immediately. At the other end of the spectrum a child may cease to communicate, retreating into a world of silence because of the horror of what they have experienced.

Refugio, an organization providing therapeutic help for the victims of torture in Munich, reports that teachers in schools often have very little awareness of the specific situation of refugees and hence cannot interpret these symptoms in the right way. Thus it may be some time before a child is referred for therapy. One healing approach is a variation of psychoanalytic treatment requiring specialist linguistic skills and knowledge of the problems surrounding trauma. Therapists with this combination of qualifications are few and far between, but organizations like Refugio provide an essential networking service, putting clients in touch with those therapists and care-workers with the skills and commitment to work with this complex of problems. Often there is the additional difficulty that the health insurance system may well not cover this kind of treatment, because asylum seekers are as a rule ineligible for anything more than emergency treatment.

A Croatian behavioural therapist with considerable experience of treating children with traumas emphasized the importance of painting in the work with the children: visual expression in the form of crayon or paint and paper can give a child another 'voice', an outlet for pain for which they are unable to find verbal expression. This may enable the child to begin to talk about the experiences, or it may be appropriate to let the visual image just speak for itself. She described another activity with children from the former Yugoslavia who had experienced bombing raids in underground shelters and were afraid of the darkness and sudden sounds of the tube. They spent time just watching and listening to the underground trains as a group, becoming acclimatized to the hustle and bustle, interplay of bright lights and cacophony of sounds.

A psychoanalyst with great experience of treating unaccompanied minors described one of the most serious problems facing children who spend long



years in Germany in the asylum procedure: that of constant uncertainty about the future. Not only do they not know what the future may bring from one month to the next, but also if they are eventually removed there is the very real danger of retraumatization. First, they suffer a second uprooting in their young lives, from the country, culture and network of relationships in which they have lived for some years and often managed to adapt to with considerable success. Second, they may be being returned to a situation in the country of origin which is objectively dangerous, or certainly which they remember as being such: the power of emotional memory may well override 'rational' and 'objective' information about an improved situation to which they are obliged to return. Together with other specialists such as care workers, this interviewee concluded that the result may well be that the young people try to escape imminent removal by going underground with the help of countrymen. Alternatively, these are the candidates for illegal (re-) entry to Germany in the foreseeable future.

### **The Effects of Lack of Secure Residential Status**

Following on from this point the general problems created by a lack of secure status for the children can be summarized. The most concrete difficulty of which they are aware is the lack of freedom of movement. Under German law they are limited by asylum seeker status to the precincts of the local authority. This means they are often unable to visit a relative living in another part of Germany, let alone elsewhere in the European Union. This is clearly a frequent subject of discussion in the families living in hostels, not least because of the importance of telephone contact, which was often mentioned. Moreover, it is difficult for the children and their parents to make plans regarding schooling and training not only for the longer term but also the immediate future. In interviews children would express uncertainty about where they might be next year and what they could do in job terms: would it be possible to stay long enough to get a German school certificate, could an apprenticeship be completed? These are the questions bearing on the minds of the parents, their children or unaccompanied minors and their care workers and guardians.

There is a further, more psychological aspect to this lack of a secure status and perspective for the future. The children have as a general rule an acute awareness of where they come from as a sense of homeland to which they cannot, for the foreseeable future, return. One question asked in the interviews with the children was. 'Where would you go on a long journey with your best friend?' Not infrequently the reply was along the lines of 'I would like to show my friend my home country, home area, but I can't, because we can't go back.' This indicates that the children are often struggling at some level to find an identity between cultures. In the housing unit or cramped flat in a hostel in a cold central European country they hear their parents talk of a life 'back in the real home', which they, the children, are unlikely to recall—if at all—with the same intensity or with comparable associations. Their parents are very likely to

convey the feeling that that is the place where they all really belong. Yet in their daily life at school, in youth groups, with care-workers or therapists they will have the importance of linguistic, social and cultural adjustment to central European norms constantly impressed upon them. This sets up a tension in the form of a yearning for identity or a sense of clearly belonging somewhere which is very difficult to resolve. A lack of secure status reinforces this insecurity at every turn in the children's lives.

### **The Specific Situation of Unaccompanied Minors**

For reasons of space only one aspect of the specific problems faced by unaccompanied minors will be mentioned, one which came up often in interviews with experts, that of the *secret task*. This possibly melodramatic term conceals what may be a painful dilemma for all those responsible for the care and welfare of young unaccompanied refugees. Two specific forms of secret task, that is, one which the young people have been given before departure but instructed not to reveal, are common. One is the 'story' they must tell: regardless of the fact that they or their families have suffered real persecution precipitating the desperate measure of flight on their own, they have been told that only a particular version of the truth will enable them to remain, '... because this is what the interrogators want to hear'. Regardless of whether this conforms to the exact truth or not, the young persons are therefore under enormous pressure always to get the details exactly right and keep them consistent—otherwise they will 'fail'. They will be aware of the responsibility involved, because they have often been 'chosen' (by deliberate family decision or simply by circumstances) for a chance of another life, a European education and a future denied to others back in the home country.

Carers will often become aware of inconsistencies in what their charges have told them, but the awareness of what is at stake in a young person's life creates great pressure to maintain complicity for the sake of the asylum application. So the secret mission may become a secret shared.

The second variation of this secret may be the fact that asylum in the receiving country is meant to be a stopping-post: the minor will be expected to move on at some point to another country to relatives. But the asylum procedure does not allow this to be divulged. Again the young person must live with this concealed fact and an accompanying sense of guilt and ambiguity toward those whom he or she comes to trust.

### **Conclusion: Refugee Children, a 'Stolen Future'?**

A number of points on the social situation of refugee children which became evident in the course of the study may be summarized as follows. They tend to be the members of the family who learn German most quickly and easily and the ones who establish contacts with other children in the hostels. Thus they

are the prime intermediaries for initial social contact. The school is the central meeting point with mainstream society, a fact which gives teachers as social brokers and role models an enormous importance of which they are frequently all too unaware. On account of the children's adaptability, they often assume a degree of responsibility within the family which is out of kilter with their 'normal' role in the received family structure.

The predominant fact which determines so much in the children's lives is, however, their insecure legal status which causes severe emotional and social strain. This may follow on the heels of an individual history of painful or traumatic migration experience, giving rise to symptoms of disturbance and stress. It will largely be a matter of good fortune whether this psychological and (probably) behavioural difficulty is recognized for what it is, depending on the competence and experience of the professionals dealing with the child.

Insecurity about the future is a constant feature of the children's lives. They and their families are constantly fearful of whether their temporary right to remain will be extended the next time. This is particularly painful when an adolescent faces removal shortly before finishing school or vocational training. All the professionals and volunteers working with minors confirmed the horror of this experience: young people in despair when faced with the arbitrary machinery of removal from an adopted home with no hope of postponement once all available options have been exhausted. As already stated, the danger of re-traumatization is great. The effects of this kind of forced repatriation, particularly on minors, became all too apparent to many working in the field with the enforced mass return of Bosnians from Germany in 1997–98.

Social workers and teachers working with the minors pointed out how hard it is to work with this constant insecurity in their charges' lives. What will become of the relationships and friendships in which they have invested so much? How can the young people cope with the ambivalence of schooling, training and acquisition of social skills equipping them for life in a central European country when their future may be somewhere else? In short, are professionals preparing the young people for a 'stolen future'?

A further dimension to this insecurity of status can only be briefly mentioned here. As the channels of regular migration have been closed down throughout the European Union so migratory pressure has increased. Children live with the real need (and family expectation) to remain mobile; ethnic networks within and outside Europe thus assume greater importance as tomorrow's breadwinners are obliged to move on to where they may have a better chance.

Against this background, experts made a number of salient points when asked which would be the most important changes to improve the social and human rights position of refugee children in Germany. This is a summary list of the main points made:

- The welfare of the child should be anchored in the code of Aliens' Law.
- The Federal Republic's reservations regarding ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child should be put aside and the convention fully applied.

- Securing of residential status for adolescents is essential in order to complete vocational training before removal so that they have a qualification before being repatriated.
- A ruling regarding length of stay as a basis for according a right to remain for children and adolescents who have had temporary status for at least three years, as they have spent formative years in Germany
- A ruling for asylum seeker families and individual asylum seekers to have leave to remain once they have been in the country for a certain number of years (*Altfallregelung*).<sup>3</sup>

The background to these recommendations is that refugee children have almost unnoticed become an integral part of multicultural life in most large European towns and cities, a fact which governments and large sectors of European society have as yet studiously ignored. Research could usefully be continued on the social issues in young refugees' lives touched on in this report—a comparative analysis between European Union countries would be particularly useful. It is time to acknowledge the plurality of obligation to the young people concerned, which their presence in European societies entails. That means creating a future for these minors based on maintenance of human dignity and acknowledgement of economic, educational and social rights.

1. With thanks to Dr. Malik (Frankfurt am Main) for consultation on psychoanalytic therapeutic approach with traumatized children. See Holzapfel and Dietz 1999:100–105.
2. For example, the organization Refugio e.V. (Munich), comparable in many ways to the Medical Foundation for the Care of the Victims of Torture in the UK, which was a model for this NGO set up in the early Nineties.
3. With special thanks to the 'Supporters' Group for Children and Adolescents Threatened with Removal' in Cologne.

**APITZSCH, G.** (1996) 'Der Umgang mit minderjährigen Flüchtlingen. Ein blinder Fleck der interkulturellen Pädagogik' ('Provision for refugee minors: a blind spot in intercultural pedagogy'), *Jahrbuch für Pädagogik* (Frankfurt am Main), pp. 99–119.

**AUGENENDT, S.** (2000) *Studie zur Umsetzung der im Statement of Good Practice genannten Standards zum Umgang mit unbegleiteten Minderjährigen in der BRD* (Studies on the implementation of the standards of the Statement of Good Practice in dealing with unaccompanied minors in the FRG), Berlin.

**BERICHT** (2000a) *Bericht der Beauftragten der Regierung für Ausländerfragen über die Lage der Ausländer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Report by the responsible government officials on the situation of aliens in Germany), Bonn/Berlin.

**BERICHT** (2000b) *Bericht des Flüchtlingsamtes München* (Report of the Munich Refugee Office).

**BOSSWICK, W.** (2000) 'Development of Asylum Policy in Germany', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 13(1): 43–60.

**DJI** (Deutsches Jugendinstitut) (2000) *Kulturenvielfalt aus der Perspektive von Kindern. Abschlußtagung des Projekts* (Multiculturalism from children's perspective), DJI-Arbeitspapier 6-160, München.

**HEUN, H. D.** and **WIESENFELD-HEUN, A.** (1993) *Unbegleitete minderjährige Flüchtlinge in Deutschland* (Unaccompanied minor refugees in Germany), Limburg.

- HOLZAPFEL, R.** and **DIETZ, B.** (1999) *Kinder aus Familien mit Migrationshintergrund* (Children from families with a migration background), Materialien zum 10. Kinder- und Jugendbericht Band 2. München: Opladen.
- KAUFMANN, H.** (1998) (PRO ASYL) 'Flüchtlingskinder in Deutschland. Eine Bilanz der deutschen Politik nach sechs Jahren Kinderkonvention' ('Refugee children in Germany: a balance sheet of German policy after six years of the Convention on the Rights of the Child') in *FORUM Jugendhilfe*, 3/98: 4-10.

*MS received October 2000; revised MS received April 2001*