Constraining metaphors and the transnationalisation of spaces in Berlin

Ayse S. Çağlar

Abstract   This paper deals with the impact of the formal principle of membership on the public and scholarly narratives of immigrants' presence in society. It argues that 'ghetto' is a root metaphor of German political culture and explores how this concept, which situates minorities in stigmatised ethno-cultural sites in the city, confines the frameworks and the terminology of immigration debates and the representation of immigrants in the social imaginary in Germany. The ghetto trope of immigrant discourse in Berlin reduces the inscription of difference and belonging in urban space to a simple model of seclusion based on ethnic ties. This constructs a blindness to the transnational spaces of German Turks which provide an arena for the reimagination and negotiation of Turkish immigrants' sociality and belonging to Berlin beyond the given categories of ethnicity and community.

Two approaches to the relationship between models of membership and immigrant incorporation into host polities dominate and divide discussions on immigrants and immigration in Europe. While one focuses on formal citizenship, the other stresses access to substantial rights by resident non-citizens and argues that they often possess identical socio-economic and civil rights as citizens (Soysal 1994). The former highlights differences between polities while the latter emphasises the frameworks in which rights are anchored, the new order of sovereignty in which the nation-state is being decentred by multiple actors from within and above, and constraints on states in making immigration policy (Sassen 1998).

While advocates of formal citizenship engage in a kind of 'German bashing' due to the blood principle of citizenship prevalent in Germany, others draw attention to the disjuncture between the form and substance of citizenship before embarking on an analysis of exclusionary policies. Especially in a polity like Germany, where the model of membership followed until recently (in theory) an exclusivist principle, failure to consider this disjuncture can lead to fallacious conclusions about the structures and processes by which immigrants incorporate into, and are excluded from, the society and polity. With the new citizenship law, which came into affect on 1 January 2000, the *ius sanguinis* principle of citizenship in Germany has been broken. It is an important step toward *ius soli*. Those who are sensitive to this disjuncture emphasise the fact that, despite different political–institutional frames of regulation and integration – and regardless of whether or not a country defines itself as an immigration country – immigrant rights are being standardised across Western Europe. As a conse-

quence, we can talk about a de facto transnationalisation of immigration policy in this part of the world (Bauböck 1994; Faist 1994; Sassen 1998; Soysal 1994).

However, this dichotomous discussion ignores certain dynamics of immigrant incorporation. The fact that there is a disjuncture between the form and substance of citizenship does not suffice to make the membership model obsolete. Although, despite the 'blood principle' which is codified in German citizenship law, citizenship can be and is granted to newcomers, this does not mean that the ethno-cultural understanding of the German model of membership is irrelevant to the way immigrants are incorporated into the polity.

For example, with the crisis of the welfare state, immigration and immigrants carry a potential for politicising welfare policies, and thus for becoming a meta-issue (Faist 1994, 1996). However, the ways in which immigration gains the status of a meta-issue in Germany depend on the rhetoric, metaphors and key terms in which discourses on immigrants are cast. Moreover, the nature of the membership model determines the trajectory of scholarly and public debates about newcomers, as well as integration policies and immigrants' patterns of negotiation. Furthermore, it informs the frameworks, key terms, metaphors, and language of immigration debates, and the representation of immigrants in the social imaginary. If, despite the standardisation of immigration policy, each country produces a system of specific narratives to deal with immigrants, then it is important to examine these narratives of exclusion and their reproduction.

In relation to these narratives, I will focus on how the spatiality of immigrants within the city is imagined. I argue that the ghetto as a secluded cultural enclave – or better to say, fear of ghettos – is the leading thematic image in representing the place and incorporation of immigrants in the city. By limiting immigrants' visibility in the society/city to the confines of ethnic neighbourhoods, this metaphor simplifies the complexities of immigrants' presence in the society in a particular way.

Recent debates on the reintroduction of zoning regulations in Berlin

The data presented below are based on interviews and the written documents of the public discussions on Berlin's future and its major problems. The major part of the data was collected between June 1997 and September 1998.[1] The interviews with the Turkish café and bar owners were conducted during this period. The owners of six such places in Berlin (the most popular ones) frequented by German Turkish youth were interviewed. Other than participant observation in such places I also conducted interviews with some of the youth visiting these cafés and bars. For the discussions on Berlin's future, newspaper articles and interviews with Berlin's politicians and some 'internal' reports on key issues and problems of Berlin are used. As the ghetto discourse abounds in the literature of immigration in Germany, most of the examples on this topic are selected from the recent debates to underline the persistence of this rhetoric in different kinds of discourses on Berlin, Germany and foreigners.

On 1 April 1998, Berlin's Minister of Interior proposed to introduce a *Zuzugssperre* ('quota', literally, a ban on moving in) for *Ausländer*, or 'foreigners', in certain municipalities of Berlin that have a high percentage of *Ausländer* residents, for instance Kreuzberg, Wedding, Tiergarten and Schöneberg.[2] The need for such a regulation, according to the minister, lay in the danger of

Überfremdung, 'extensive foreignisation', in some areas of Berlin, and the anxiety this situation would create for the native German population (*Tageszeitung*, 4 April 1998). The proposal was described as a necessary precaution against ghettoisation. In fact, a regulation banning *Ausländer* from taking up residence in some districts of Berlin (namely Kreuzberg, Wedding and Tiergarten) had been in effect from 1975 to 1990. Thus, it was a question of reintroducing the regulation. This time, however, there would be a difference: the 1975 ban covered all *Ausländer*, whereas the newly proposed quota regulation targets only non-EEC members in Germany. EU citizens are conspicuously excluded from the definition of *Ausländer* in Germany.

Shortly after the heated debates about this regulation, the mayor of Berlin, Eberhard Diepgen, explained in an interview with a major daily (*Der Tagesspiegel*, 11 April 1998) that in certain school classes in Berlin the number of *Ausländer* children had reached 60 per cent. In order to improve the language competency of both German and 'foreign' children, the mayor wanted to introduce quotas for *Ausländer* so that their share would not exceed 25 per cent in any one class. This, also, is not new. In 1982, such quotas were introduced in Berlin's schools with an amendment to the School Law. The amendment remained in effect until 1995.[3] Again, it is a question of reintroducing legislation rather than of policy innovation. These debates are noteworthy within the changed context of the social, economic, legal and civil rights of immigrants, as well as of immigrants' self-image and perceptions about their bonds to Germany, Europe and their home countries.

Furthermore, since the fall of the Wall in 1989, Berlin has undergone substantial change in terms of its place and status within Germany and Europe.[4] It is the capital of the economically most powerful country in united Europe, and the restructuring processes the city is experiencing are believed to exceed that of any other European metropole (Schneider 1998). These processes are defined by an image of being constantly in flux.

In the face of multi-dimensional streams of change and the homogenisation of immigration policies throughout Europe, how do we explain the persistence of spatial metaphors which situate minorities in stigmatised, ethno-cultural sites? Why, despite the immense change in Berlin since 1989, are the terms by which the location and presence of immigrants in the city are known still cast in the concepts, images and discourses of the 1970s?

In discussions about expanding the boundaries of the polity to include newcomers to Germany, immigration is always operationalised in such a way as to assign culture the key role. The ethno-cultural understanding of citizenship in Germany – which grounds membership in the polity in cultural terms, that is, in terms of ancestry, custom and language[5] – links the issue of immigrant incorporation to the question of acquisition of cultural and social competencies, solidarities and loyalties (Faist 1994). The central question thus becomes how to culturally incorporate immigrants into the German polity without endangering the national and social cohesion of German society.

In Germany, not only the labour market but all spheres of life are highly regulated and co-ordinated with an extensive provision of social services. Within this context, the moral aspect of immigration – that is, the question of who is eligible for inclusion in the polity – immediately turns into a question of newcomers' loyalty and solidarity (Faist 1996). The crucial point, then, is the intertwined relationship between solidarity (loyalty) and cultural difference. As

a result of this interrelationship, the question of dual citizenship in Germany has been treated as a question of dual (and conflicting) loyalties (Çağlar 2001). Once the maintenance of cultural difference is interpreted as a sign of non-solidarity and non-loyalty, the project of integration takes the form of a taming of cultural difference. The task of integration, in Germany's regulated economy and society, is seen as the systematic co-ordination, regulation and modification of cultural diversity in the public domain so as not to endanger civil society (Schiffauer 1997; Vertovec 1996).

Within this framework, Turkish immigrants' persistent ties with the homeland have come to be conceptualised as a major obstacle to their integration in German society.[6] Against the background of the German model of membership, German Turks' multiple and intensifying ties to Turkey, which are believed to exacerbate the cultural distance between German Turks and Germans, are interpreted as a sign of the development of a *Parallelgesellschaft* ('parallel society') within the borders of Germany but beyond the state's control. The ethno-cultural understanding of citizenship is at the root of this kind of problematisation. Membership in the German polity requires a degree of cultural similarity (or, at least, a controlled and domesticated kind of cultural diversity).

As a consequence, the notion of the 'ghetto' is the dominant topos in the discourse on *Ausländer* integration in Germany.[7] The so-called cultural enclaves are considered to be the ultimate expression of this refusal and/or the German state's failure to manage cultural diversity so that it would not pose a threat to the solidarity of the imagined community. The spatial inscription of immigrants' presence in urban space by means of a ghetto image, and the fear of ghettos, are based on this metaphysics of sedentarism, which is responsible for the conceptualisation of immigrant and diasporic populations 'as a spatial and temporal extension of a prior, natural identity rooted in locality and community' (Malkki 1992: 7).

Berlin was until recently a city under the occupation of the Allied forces and was divided into four sectors (American, French, British and Russian). Eighty thousand Americans in Berlin, mostly military personnel and their dependants, were concentrated in the American sector, mainly in the districts of Dahlem and Zehlendorf. Neither of these districts, however, was ever problematised as a ghetto. Nor have they ever been subject to zoning regulations. In the post-war period, the ghetto image was (and still is) reserved for those areas densely populated by immigrants and, in particular, by Turks (the largest immigrant group in Germany and in Berlin). Inner-city districts like Kreuzberg, Tiergarten, Wedding and Schöneberg are areas believed to face the danger of ghettoisation.

Structural changes which, in part, resulted from the social, economic and spatial reconfiguration of Berlin fuelled the recent revival of ghetto imagery in the narration of ethnic and immigrant presences in Berlin. Although ghettos are seen as the outcome of immigrants' refusal to integrate, the economic and social transformations that Berlin has undergone since reunification are responsible for the increased concentration of *Ausländer* in certain areas of the city.[8] Instead of contextualising the socio-spatial differentiation process in Berlin within the altered economic, political and geographical position of this city in Germany and Europe, and developing strategies to cope with these structural changes, images and metaphors that were used in the 1970s and 1980s to spatialise ethnicity and immigrants have been recycled in the late 1990s. The same is true of 'preventive' regulations like quotas.

Drawing on Ortner's (1973) concept of 'key symbols', that is, symbols which provide cognitive and affective categories for conceptualising and sorting out experience as well as for developing strategies, I argue that the notion of the 'ghetto' organises other elements and symbols of cultural diversity in the German polity and political culture. It plays a key role in the internal organisation of the discourse on *Ausländer* and immigrants in Germany. It is an important component of German political culture and a 'root metaphor' operative in sorting out experience, making it communicable to others and translatable into ordinary action.

The trope of the ghetto captures the imagination (quite literally) not only in public debates and in social policy-making, as seen in the discussion about the reintroduction of quotas in certain districts and schools, but also in scholarship on immigrants. The idea of cultural enclaves preventing the full incorporation of immigrants in German society pervades the work of scholars involved in debates on the integration of Turkish immigrants. All the parties involved in these discussions, regardless of whether they find ghettos threatening to social cohesiveness (Heitmeyer *et al.* 1997) or endorse them as a means of accelerating integration (Elwert 1982; Heckmann 1981), remain trapped within the same topos of the ghetto coupled with ethnicity and/or spatialised cultures. In the same vein, practices of Turkish immigrants become a topic of research within a framework informed by an either/or logic. This logic attempts to sort out and categorise the ties and cultural practices of German Turks into a set of oppositions, German or Turkish, in order to prove or disprove the 'loyalty' of German Turks on either of these seemingly opposed sides (see Zentrum für Türkeistudien 1992, 1993, 1995).

Meanwhile, Turkish immigrants have adopted the ghetto metaphor as an important component in the repertoire used to define their situation and their relationships to Turkey and Germany. From this perspective, the way German-Turkish rappers play on the notion of ghetto is noteworthy. Of course the Turkish youth in Germany do not simply adopt all the concepts of the dominant discourse. Rather, they transform these while making their own. However, their discourse still remains confined to the ghetto trope. The threat to retreat into ghettos due to exclusionary policies targeting immigrants is commonly deployed by spokespersons of various Turkish organisations and associations in Germany.[9] Through adoption by different categories of actors, the ghetto metaphor has gained the force to be interpreted and reinterpreted, and to feed back alternative significations into the symbolic system.

In short, the notion of the ghetto and, by the same token, persistent ties with the homeland have become the touchstones of *Ausländer* loyalties to, and sense of belonging in, the German polity. This topos is shared by the media, politicians, scholars, and immigrant spokespersons. As a root metaphor of German political culture in dealing with cultural diversity and *Ausländer*, the ghetto is the organising trope in the public debate about immigrant incorporation and of the spatial structuring of the social imaginary.

Ghetto imagery and its discontents: narratives of immigration in Berlin

When organised around the ghetto metaphor, the terms and images of the debate about the presence of immigrants in Berlin enforce particular positions

and pre-empt others. Ghetto is a powerful representation and like all representations

> by revealing only specific aspects of the city and focusing our attention on these instead of on others, (this image) has the power to limit the courses of action which we will follow or to frame the problems in such a way that only certain solutions are likely to occur to us. (Shields 1996: 237)

Alternative representations may open up other lines of questioning and argument. In the context of immigration, Sassen (1996) asks us to approach this phenomenon within the general framework of a transnationalisation of finance, labour and cities. This, then, is a plea to explore immigration and the internationalisation of capital in their interconnectedness. According to Sassen,

> there are two different narratives attached to each [informal immigrant and advanced economies]. One presents itself as part of the global economy, suffused in internationalism, the other, while international in its origin, is promptly constituted as a local vernacular form. One is read to be dis-embedded … transterritorial to the point of being thought of as spatial through such conceptions as the information economy and telematics. The other is read as deeply embedded in an economic, social and cultural territory of neighbourhoods and particularistic traditions. (Sassen 1996: 24)[10]

Failure to connect immigration and ethnicity to a series of processes having to do with the globalisation of economic activity, of cultural activity and of identity formation results in a blindness to the border-crossing nature of the lives, formations and social spaces of immigrants other than ethnic ties. This failure is particularly striking in the approaches to Berlin and its immigrant population. Especially after 1989, in the discussions and representations of Berlin's repositioning in Europe, a discourse on Berlin which underlines and valorises the new quality and intensity of the city's border-crossing relations has become predominant (see Schneider 1998). Thus, Berlin is not only imagined to be in flux, but this flux is assumed to be of a transnational character.

In the context of this rhetoric, the devalorisation of immigrants on the basis of their border-crossing transnational ties and solidarities is striking. And the endurance of particular images of immigrant visibility is even more striking in the context of the discourse within which Berlin is portrayed as a city in transformation. Narratives about Berlin's repositioning in Germany and Europe, and about immigrants living in the city, diverge from each other, creating a clear hierarchy between the valorised transnational urban space of finance and economy and devalorised immigrant spaces (or valorised only within the framework of multiculturalism) imagined through the metaphor of the ghetto.

Transnationalism of immigrant social spaces

The complexities of immigrants' multilocal institutional incorporation, their intertwined social spaces criss-crossing the boundaries of nation-states, the formation of new cultural spaces which enable the development of non-unitary identities, and the structures and frames in which immigrants ground and secure their emergent identities, all these cannot be analysed within a model of immigration that is linear and accumulative. The ghetto concept reduces the inscription of difference and belonging in the urban space to a simple model of seclusion and constructs a blindness to the transnational spaces of immigrants that cannot be conceptualised as the spatial extension of prior communities

rooted in locality. Trapped within the ghetto imaginary, we can understand neither the transformations reshaping urban cultures in Berlin nor the different forms of appropriation of urban space by immigrants beyond cultural spatialisation. Thus, a narrative which reduces immigrants' spaces in Berlin to ethnic neighbourhoods centred around the stigmatised ghetto image is bound to miss the complex transnational networks that orient, for instance, German Turks' lives and the strategies they employ in their struggle over access to full participation in German society.

Current scholarship on transnationalism provides a new analytic optic which makes visible the increasing intensity and scope of circular flows of persons, goods, information and symbols triggered by international labour migration. It allows an analysis of how migrants construct and reconstitute their lives as simultaneously embedded in more than one society (Basch *et al.* 1994; Glick Schiller *et al.* 1995; Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Vertovec 1998). Most importantly, it connects the narratives of the processes and formations of immigration with those of the transnationalisation of the economy and finance within the same framework.

The social space of Turkish immigrants in Germany and Europe is increasingly transnationalised (Amiraux 1998; Çağlar 1995; Faist 1998; Kastoryano 1998). The homeland and transnational ties of Turks in Germany are diverse and multifaceted. Although in the debates on *Ausländer*, Turkish immigrants' homeland ties are brought to the fore to underline their inadequate commitment to German society, Turkish immigrants' ties are, in fact, increasingly multilocal rather than bifocally directed toward Turkey and Germany alone. German Turks sustain a multiplicity of involvements in more than one place. They organise on regional, national and European levels. For instance, with regard to transnational business ties, the TIDAF (European Federation of Turkish Businessmen Associations) is an example of organisations at the European level. Its members are engaged in business practices across Europe, including countries that do not host a recruited labour force of Turkish immigrants. It is noteworthy that the new Executive Committee of the TIDAF includes one member responsible for Poland (though based in Berlin) and one for England.[11]

Kurdish, Islamic and Alevi networks that criss-cross Europe, and link Turkey and Europe, are well documented in the literature on political transnationalisation (Amiraux 1998; Faist 1998). The border-crossing media networks which target Turkish immigrants in Germany and Europe, such as MED TV (a Kurdish satellite television station based in London and Brussels) and TRT-INT (the Turkish state broadcasting company), are mobilised in Turkish immigrants' attempts to define their presence and identity both within the country of residence and across the transnational space of Europe. Without a doubt, these media connections accelerate the transnationalisation of Turkish immigrants' social space in Berlin and Germany.

The growing transnationalisation of immigrants' activities encompasses all spheres of life. The cultural sphere, especially the popular culture of German Turks, is highly transnationalised. Turkish youth cultures in Berlin and in Germany exhibit multiple and multilocal sources. For instance, several music groups such as Cartel, Culture Clash and Islamic Force are popular among the so-called second- and third-generation German Turks. A particular type of music, style of entertainment and collective identity has been formed around these bands and their music, which mixes various musical elements, instru-

ments, styles and traditions from Turkey and Germany. However, it would be misleading to reduce the heterogeneity of this musical style to a simple crossover between Turkish and German elements. Rather, images, styles and elements from black, Asian and world pop music are part of the mixture as much as anything else (see Çağlar 1998). Thus, together with German and Turkish, the English language is an integral part of this style.

Among the second generation of Turkish immigrants who produce and consume this style, efforts are made to identify a ground other than ethnicised culture to position oneself in society at large. In this search for other identity bases, one alternative has become to define belongingness in relation to one's city of residence rather than to Germanness, Turkishness, or a mixture of the two. In the journal *Kauderzanca*, published by second-generation immigrants (mainly of Turkish origin), the concept 'German Turk' is criticised on the ground that it still designates and discriminates people as 'Turks'. In order to overcome this stigmatisation, *Kauderzanca*'s publishers explicitly stress that they want to identify themselves as simply belonging to Berlin – 'We are all Berliners' (Schmidt 1993). The publishers express a desire to be treated and accepted like, and in no way different from, German youth (Bilgi 1995).

This type of effort, in which belonging is connected to an urban space rather than a nation (or ethnic cultures/communities), is common among the Turkish youth of Berlin. Although discussions about the cultural transnationalisation of Turkish immigrants often concentrate on Turkish rap groups, and particularly on the case of the successful group Cartel, I would like to draw attention to new sites and spaces of cultural and spatial transnationalisation popular among Turkish young people in Berlin. These play a crucial role in reimagining their membership and they elude scholarly and public attention in the discourses about the inscription of immigrants in the urban space of Berlin.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, Berlin has seen a multiplication of 'Turkish' café-bars, clubs and discos which enjoy immense popularity among Turkish youth. In terms of location, ambience, types of music and self-image, these sites differ from the 'Turkish' places that were, and still are, located in Berlin's 'Turkish neighbourhoods'. Although the new places mainly cater to Turkish customers (about 90 per cent according to owners), they are located in 'non-ethnic' neighbourhoods. In fact, they are located in the former 'downtown' of West Berlin, where there are at least seven such café-bars (Disco Limon, Bardak Bar, Café-Bar Nostalji, 1001 Café-Bar, Kestane Bar, Club Simarik, and La Isi Live Music-Bar).

One is immediately struck by the great effort made to downplay a canonised version of self-presentation in the image of 'Turkishness'. In terms of ambience, café-bars do not differ from other such places in the area. However, they should not be confused with cafés and restaurants run by Turks, and which also seem to flourish in the 'non-ethnic' neighbourhoods of Berlin, but which cater almost exclusively to German customers. The latter carry no trace of references to Turkey either in their menus, music, interiors, or in terms of their staff and the languages spoken there (for example, Schnell in Savigny Platz or A-Train on Bleibtraustrasse). In the new café-bars, although downplayed, Turkey and Turkishness are present. Not only are the customers mainly Turks but Turkish is spoken and Turkish pop music is played. However, the presence of Turkey in these sites is complex and definitely different from the folkloric 'Turkishness' that characterises the restaurants, clubs and cafés located in 'immigrant neigh-

bourhoods' such as Kreuzberg's SO36. The references to Turkey in these new sites are very selective and, most importantly, all refer to metropoles and urban sites in Turkey. The spatial references are not to Turkey as a cultural space but to urban spaces in Turkey.

The menu of the 1001 Café-Bar well illustrates this emphasis on the urban. It lists a mix of international and 'Turkish' cuisine and drink[12] – in particular, eight types of *pides* (Turkish pizza prepared with different garnishings) named after districts in Istanbul: Pide Sariyer, Pide Ortak–y, Pide Bebek, and so forth. In addition to these pides, the hamburgers on offer are all named after soccer teams in Istanbul: Fenerbahce, Galatasaray, Besiktas, and so on. I asked a customer at 1001 whether the multiple references to Turkish urban spaces like Istanbul and Izmir could be seen as expressing a kind of nostalgia. He answered,

> You know, here we turn toward Istanbul and Izmir, but in fact we are catching up with New York via Istanbul. Here we are part of all these places. At 1001, I feel like I am in Istanbul, Berlin, Europe and New York at one and the same time.

By stressing the non-ethnic sources of the self, young people in places like the 1001 Café-Bar criticise the common binary opposition used in discourses on German Turks, and the belongingness and cultural formations that confine them either to German or to Turkish culture. We might see these places as sites and stages where taken-for-granted scripts of (ethnic, national, etc.) belonging are challenged, and alternative forms of belonging and participation in German social life are imagined and negotiated. What we have is, to use Sassen's (1997) phrase, the 'unmooring of identities' from what have been traditional sources of identity (such as the national). This unmooring envisages new notions of community, membership and entitlement that cannot be conceptualised within a topos of *a priori* spatialised cultures and their spatial extensions through ethnic communities and ghettos.

Moreover, through these transterritorial sites (which are connected to other sites not geographically proximate), these young people make claims to the 'non-ethnic' spaces of the city from which they had been excluded. They are struggling to inscribe their presence in the urban space beyond the given terms (namely ethnic) and conditions of visibility available to them. These places become an arena for the reimagination and negotiation of Turkish immigrants' sociality and belonging to Berlin beyond the given categories of ethnicity and community. The kind of belongingness that is constructed at and around these sites is not based on the person's national entitlement. In Benedict Anderson's (1998) words, it is based on an 'unbounded seriality' in which the person speaks to us as a member of a series that is not based on entitlement. She or he is not speaking as a member of a diasporic collectivity, but as a local member of the unbounded series.

Acknowledging immigrants' presence in these sites and their claims to these parts of the city is crucial to recognising the terms of membership. First, it includes other kinds of rights in the public sphere, namely civil, socio-economic and cultural. But more than that, these sites could be seen as the lived space of emergent forms of membership. What they challenge and negotiate are more than the substantial aspects of citizenship, that is, the array of civil, political and cultural rights people possess and exercise. They might be seen as referring to the performative dimension of membership, which contests conventional mean-ings and practices of belonging to a society. The young people who frequent

these sites weave their collective identities out of multiple affiliations and positionings. They link their cross-cutting belongingness with complex attachments and multiple allegiances to issues, peoples, places and traditions beyond the boundaries of their resident nation-states. By challenging the existing 'geographies of exclusion', they attempt to alter the structure which determines the opportunities German Turks have for participation in the life of the society at large on their terms.

Symbolic politics and models of membership

The formal ethno-cultural principle of membership in Germany not only sets the terms of debate about incorporation, it also eases 'the symbolic use of immigrants in political conflicts' (Faist 1994). It is a symbolic use because, for example, in the most recent discussions, all the parties involved knew very well that quotas and regulations had not solved anything in the past and that their reintroduction would do just as little in the future. Thus, quotas for school classes, for instance, remain meaningless unless one takes language competency, and not passports, as the fundamental standard for quotas. When *Aussiedler* (ethnic Germans from the former Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries, who automatically receive German citizenship and thus carry German passports but who frequently lack German language skills) count as Germans when sitting in a school class, the reintroduction of quotas for *Ausländer* will have no effect in solving the language problem in Berlin schools. However, as the recent debate on the reintroduction of quotas illustrates, these issues, although cast in the terms and metaphors of the 1970s and 1980s, still have radical currency in German politics.

Populist exclusionary efforts such as quotas appeal to the 'native' population, and the German ethno-cultural principle of citizenship is crucial in this context. This principle set the terms and images which are still the crucial components of the political repertoire in Germany. It was no coincidence that the issues regarding immigrants, which turn on the ghetto metaphor, re-emerged quite powerfully in the political debate of the 1998 general elections in Germany. This 'symbolic politics', which thus plays on a root metaphor of German political culture, draws attention to local idioms about the *Ausländer* and the immigration 'problem' in Germany – or rather, to German 'cultural intimacy' (Herzfeld 1997). The symbolic use of immigrants in political conflicts is valid currency because public and scholarly debates about immigrants in Germany are trapped in the conceptual imaginary of the German membership model, which haunts the imagination of the public, of politicians, and of scholars, as well as of immigrants themselves. It is this ethno-cultural principle of citizenship which paved the way for the astonishing persistence of certain spatial metaphors despite the flux (real, imagined, or discursive) Berlin found itself in after the Wall.

Notes

1 I say mostly because this research draws on a series of studies I have done on German Turks in Berlin at different periods before June 1997 and after September 1998. For the studies before 1997, see Çağlar (1994, 1995, 1997a, b). As my interest in the topic continued after 1998 I have conducted further research, for example on the media consumption of German Turks in

Germany. Hence some data collected after 1998 are also incorporated into this article. For the studies after 1998 see Çağlar (2001). However the main corpus of this article's data is collected during the earlier period.

2 Some 34.4 per cent of the population of Kreuzberg, 29.9 per cent of Wedding, 27.3 per cent of Tiergarten and 22.5 per cent of Schöneberg are so-called *Ausländer*. These are also the districts in which some 150,000 Turkish immigrants are concentrated.

3 According to this amendment, the share of *Ausländer* in any one school class was not to exceed 50 per cent; if it did, an *Ausländer*-only class would have to be set up.

4 This account of post-Wall transformations in Berlin is based on a recent expert report on the city by Häußermann (1998) and the 'Berlin Study' (unpublished), a group project conducted in 1998. From the latter, I have relied on sections written by Schneider (1998) and Reissert and Schmid (1998).

5 The fact that language is an important aspect in the grounding of belongingness in the German polity is apparent in the concepts that are taken for granted in German daily life. *Deutsch für Ausländer* ('German for foreigners') is one such concept. It is not 'German for non-German speakers': those who cannot speak German are automatically identified as *Ausländer*.

6 Here it should be noted that, ironically, both German and Turkish states contributed – through their policies – to the maintenance and strengthening of Turkish immigrants' homeland ties.

7 By no means do I argue that the notion of ghetto is specifically German. It is neither a genuine invention of seclusion nor solely a German praxis. The first ghetto emerged in Venice in 1516. For the different origins of the word ghetto, see the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971) and Schoeps (1992).

8 *Ausländer* comprise 13 per cent of Berlin's population, with some 150,000 Turks as the largest group. The Eastern and Western sections of Berlin display great variation when it comes to their resident *Ausländer* population. In the East, 5.65 per cent of the population are *Ausländer*, whereas this proportion climbs to 17 per cent in the West, with some Western inner-city districts having an *Ausländer* population in excess of 30 per cent. Moreover, *Ausländer* are over-represented in the child and adolescent population of Berlin. In 1996, 37 per cent of all children and adolescents were not German citizens. This figure reaches 50 per cent in those areas that are densely populated by *Ausländer*.

9 For a recent example, see the interview with the representatives of Berlin–Brandenburg Türk Toplomu in *Der Tagesspiegel*, 26 April 1998.

10 For a critique of using a creolisation concept that is restricted to ethnic sources and origins, see Çağlar (1997b).

11 See 'Merhaba', *Stadtmagazin für Berliner Türken*, 15 January 1999: 12.

12 This contrasts to the menus of places that are run by Turkish immigrants but which lack references to Turkey. They do not carry any 'Turkish food and drink' items. The menus of folkloric Turkish café-bars, on the other hand, offer almost exclusively 'authentic Turkish' cuisine.

References

Amiraux, V. (1998) 'Transnationalism as a resource for Turkish Islamic Associations in Germany'. Florence: European Forum Seminar Paper MIG/25.

Anderson, B. (1998) 'Nationalism, identity, and the world-in-motion: on the logics of seriality', in Cheah, P. and Robbins, B. (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 117–33.

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N. and Szanton Blanc, C. (eds) (1994) *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Amsterdam: Gordon & Breach.

Bauböck, R. (1994) *Transnational Citizenship: Membership and Rights in International Migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bilgi, F. (1995) 'Die zweite Generation ist nicht so viel anders', *Kauderzanca*, 12: 10.

Çağlar, A. (1994) 'German Turks in Berlin: migration and their quest for social mobility'. Montreal: McGill University, Department of Anthropology, unpublished PhD thesis.

Çağlar, A. (1995) 'German Turks in Berlin: social exclusion and strategies for social mobility', *New Community*, 21(3): 309–23.

Çağlar, A. (1997a) 'Hyphenated identities and the limits of "culture": some methodological queries', in Werbner, P. and Modood, T. (eds) *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity, Community*. London: Zed Books, 169–85.

Çağlar, A. (1997b) '"Go Go Dog!" and German Turks' demand for pet dogs', *Journal of Material Culture*, 2(1): 77–94.

Çağlar, A. (1998) 'Popular culture, marginality and institutional incorporation: German-Turkish rap and Turkish pop in Berlin', *Cultural Dynamics*, 10(3): 243–61.

Çağlar, A. (2001) 'The charm of dual citizenship: citizenship ties, trust and the "pink card"', in Elkana, Y., Randeria, S., Karstev, I. and Macemo, E. (eds) *Unravelling Ties*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, in press.

Elwert, G. (1982) 'Problem der Ausländerintegration: Gesellschaftliche Integration durch Binnenintegration?', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 34: 717–31.

Encyclopedia Judaica (1971) 'Ghetto'. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 542–6.

Faist, T. (1994) 'How to define a foreigner? The symbolic politics of immigration in German partisan discourse, 1978–1992', in Baldwin-Edwards, M. and Schain, M.A. (eds) *The Politics of Immigration in Western Europe*. London: Frank Cass, 50–71.

Faist, T. (1996) 'Immigration, integration, and the welfare state: Germany and USA in a comparative perspective', in Bauböck, R., Heller, A. and Zolberg, A.R. (eds) *The Challenge of Diversity*. Aldershot: Avebury, 227–58.

Faist, T. (1998) 'International migration and transnational social spaces', *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 29(2): 213–47.

Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L. and Blanc-Szanton, C. (1995) 'From immigrant to transmigrant: theorizing transnational migration', *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1): 48–65.

Guarnizo, L.E. and Smith, M.P. (1998) 'The locations of transnationalism', in Guarnizo, L.E. and Smith, M.P. (eds) *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 3–34.

Häußermann, H. (1998) *Sozialorientierte Stadtentwicklung: Gutachten im Auftrag der Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, Umweltschutz und Technologie*. Berlin: Kulturbuch Verlag.

Heckmann, F. (1981) *Die Bundesrepublik: Ein Einwanderungsland? Zur Soziologie der Gastarbeiterbevölkerung also Einwanderer-Minorität*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Heitmeyer, W., Müller, J. and Schroeder, H. (1997) *Verlockender Fundamentalismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Herzfeld, M. (1997) *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*. New York: Routledge.

Kastoryano, R. (1998) 'Transnational participation and citizenship'. Oxford: ESRC Transnational Communities Programme Working Paper, WPTC-98–12 (www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk).

Malkki, L.H. (1992) 'National Geographic: the rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees', *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1): 24–44.

Ortner, S.B. (1973) 'On key symbols', *American Anthropologist*, 75(5): 1338–45.

Reissert, B. and Schmid, G. (1998) 'Politikfeld Arbeitsmarkt'. Unpublished report from the Berlin Studie: Arbeitsgruppe Berlin, Zivile Wege in das 21. Jahrhundert.

Sassen, S. (1996) 'Rebuilding the global city: economy, ethnicity, and space', in King, A.D. (ed.) *Re-Presenting the City*. New York: New York University Press, 23–42.

Sassen, S. (1997) 'Whose city is it? Globalization and formation of new claims', *Public Culture*, 8(2): 205–24.

Sassen, S. (1998) 'The de facto transnationalization of immigration policy', in Joppke, C. (ed.) *Challenge to the Nation-State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49–85.

Schiffauer, W. (1997) 'Islam as a civil religion: political culture and the organization of diversity in Germany', in Modood, T. and Werbner, P. (eds) *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe*. London: Zed Books, 147–66.

Schmidt, K. (1993) 'Was heißt hier *Ausländer*?', *Kauderzanca*, 11: 10–11.

Schneider, B. (1998) 'Politikfeld kultur'. Unpublished report from the Berlin Studie: Arbeitsgruppe Berlin, Zivile Wege in das 21. Jahrhundert.

Schoeps, J.H. (1992) 'Ghetto', in *Neues Lexikon des Judentums*. Munich: Bertelsmann Lexikon Verlag, 271.

Shields, R. (1996) 'A guide to urban representation and what to do about it: alternative traditions of urban theory', in King, A.D. (ed.) *Re-Presenting the City*. New York: New York University Press, 227–53.

Soysal, Y. (1994) *The Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vertovec, S. (1996) 'Berlin multikulti: Germany, foreigners, and "world-openness"', *New Community*, 22(3): 381–99.

Vertovec, S. (1998) 'Conceiving and researching transnationalism', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 447–62.

Zentrum für Türkeistudien (1992) *Konsumgewöhnheiten und wirtschaftliche Situation der türkischen Bevölkerung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Essen: ZfT.

Zentrum für Türkeistudien (1993) *Konsum on Videofilmen innerhalb der türkischen Bevölkerung Nordrhein Westfalens mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Videofilmen mit islamisch-fundamentalistischen Inhalt.* Essen: ZfT.

Zentrum für Türkeistudien (1995) *Medienkonsum und Medienverhalten der türkischen Wohnbevölkerung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.* Essen: ZfT.

Author details

Ayse Çağlar is Assistant Professor at the Für Ethnologie Freie Universität in Berlin, Germany.

E-mail: caglar@zedat.fu-berlin.de