



M i R e K o c
M I G R A T I O N R E S E A R C H P R O G R A M
A T T H E K O Ç U N I V E R S I T Y

M i R e K o c R e s e a r c h P r o j e c t s 2 0 0 5 - 2 0 0 6

***WORLD CITY BERLIN AND THE SPECTACLES OF IDENTITY:
Public Events, Immigrants and the Politics of
Performance***

Levent Soysal

Address: Kadir Has University Cibali Merkez Kampüsü Istanbul Turkey
Email: levsoysal@khas.edu.tr
Tel: + 90 212 533 65 32
Fax: + 90 212 534 07 41

Koç University, Rumelifeneri Yolu 34450 Sarıyer Istanbul Turkey Tel: +90 212 338 1635
Fax: +90 212 3381642 Webpage: www.mirekoc.com E.mail: mirekoc@ku.edu.tr

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 From Turkey to Europe--A Brief History.....	6
2.2 Labor, Culture and Transnationalism	8
2.3 Integration Question	14
2.4 Symbolic Foreigners.....	19
3. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	22
3.1 Questions and Premises	22
3.2 A Note on Methodology.....	25
4. ANALYSIS	27
4.1 Findings and Results.....	27
4.1.1 Theory and Practice of Spectacle and Plurality in Europe	27
4.1.2 Spectacular Events, Events on Spectacle:	30
4.1.3 Prime Institutional Players.....	34
4.1.4 Classifying the Spectacle.....	40
4.2 Discussion.....	42
4.2.1 Identities of Berlin and Kreuzberg	42
4.2.2 Calendar of Spectacles in Berlin	44
4.2.3 Spectacle is No Longer Unique	45
4.2.4 The Politics of Spectacle	46
4.2.5 Spectacle is What Makes a City a City.....	48
4.2.6 Where Have All the Immigrants Gone?	49
5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	51
6. REFERENCES AND NOTES.....	54
6.1 Notes	54
6.2 Select Bibliography	55

ABSTRACT

This research project concerns the changing meaning and constitution of public events and the performance of identity. I assert that the modes of immigrant participation in Berlin's public spectacles reveal the elaborate connections between the social and cultural spaces of host and home countries. For the Turkish immigrants, these public spectacles occupy a significant place in ordering their (everyday) experiences in the social spaces of Berlin and implicate salient movements between Germany and Turkey, and the margins and the core of Europe. At the locus of this study are the Carnival of Cultures, May Day Parade, and Turkish Day Parade, all of which attract significant participation of Turkish immigrants as audiences and performers. By subjecting public spectacle to anthropological analysis, this research aims to delineate the limits of identity as a concept and praxis, and to understand the changes in cultural production and civic participation in a world now imagined as increasingly "global."

1. INTRODUCTION

This research is part of a larger research project I have been carrying out in Berlin. The larger research expands on my dissertation work and prior research in Berlin, where I have been conducting fieldwork since 1990. This research project concerns the changing meaning and constitution of public events and the politics and performance of identity in the contemporary metropolitan centers of Europe, in particular in Berlin. It is an attempt to map and gather an inventory of the changing landscape of culture in what I designate as the newly emerging WorldCities.

By public events, I mean formally organized cultural, social, and political activities, which aim to facilitate formations of community and solidarity and to expedite participation in local, national, and transnational social spaces. The events I include under this rather broad definition range from political meetings and rallies to concerts and festivals, from panels and workshops to international conferences and fairs. Large and small, these events constitute the cultural fabric of the city and provide the metropolis with an aura of cultural creativity and finesse. Moreover, with the intensification of media attention and the global exacerbation of travel, public events, particularly those that realize dimensions of grandeur, have become indispensable and identifying features of the contemporary metropolitan order. I have launched this project during my tenure in Berlin as a Research Fellow at the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies, Free University in the academic years 2001-2003.

The research site I have chosen for the project, the city of Berlin, is a self-designated multicultural “Open City,” exhibiting myriad public events and home to the largest

immigrant population in Germany. Among the multitude of public events staged annually in Berlin, for instance, certain mega events capture the public imagination: Love Parade (the largest public parade in Europe), the Christopher Street Day Parade (the single most important gay celebration in Europe), the May Day Parade (annual demonstration of multi-ethnic worker solidarity), and the Carnival of Cultures (a multicultural display of diversity). Migrants of Berlin are especially visible as participants and audiences of the mega events that characterize the cultural scenery of Berlin's urban landscape—though the degree of their participation significantly varies from one event to another. While the Love Parade hardly attracts the attention of the immigrant youth of Berlin, the May Day Parade and the Carnival of Cultures are unthinkable without large contingents of immigrant performers and participants and the Christopher Street Day Parade provides a forum for the increasing presence of gay immigrants in public spaces of Berlin. In 2002, at the 40th anniversary of Turkish immigration to Germany, Berlin had its first “Annual Turkish Day” parade, gathering close to 50,000 participants from all corners of Germany.

Is organizing Turkish Day in Berlin a sign of displacement and dislocation, and a marker of nostalgic orientation to “homes” elsewhere? Or does it implicate salient movements between Turkey and Germany, places of “origin” and “destination,” and the margins and the core of Europe? What do public festivals, May Day and the Carnival of Cultures, for instance, reveal about the relation of immigrants to Berlin and the degree of their participation in the economies and social and cultural life of the city? What are the cultural properties and confines of the public displays of identity and diversity? What is the significance of the new styles of performance and diversity for our understandings of and engagements in public life? How do undercurrents of Europeanization, national configurations of culture, and the

transnational connections of immigrants figure into the project of making Berlin once again a cosmopolitan Metropolis?

This research seeks to delineate the consequential affinities between public events, identity, and metropolis and to locate the contemporary transformations in public performance and civic participation within a framework, which exposes Berlin's cultural connections to transnational social spaces emerging within and without Europe. Concurrently, through the investigation of the modes of immigrant participation in public events the research aims to disclose the elaborate connections that are emerging between the social and cultural spaces of host and home countries.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following I provide brief—and selective—accounts of

- (1) the history of Turkish migration to Europe, with specific references to Germany,
- (2) the three major turns in scholarly narratives, public opinion, and policy as regards the immigration in Europe—that is, labor, culture, and transnationalism,
- (3) “integration question,” specifically as it pertains to the perceptions of Islam and women—thus culture and tradition,
- (4) and finally an assessment of the current standing of immigrant as “symbolic foreigners.”

This account is not a literature review in the strict sense of the word. It is intended to contextualize the research at hand and frame its premises.

2.1 From Turkey to Europe--A Brief History:

Turkish migration to Europe begins in 1963, with the signing of bilateral agreements with Germany (and various European states), giving way to what is called the *Guestworker* programs. The official story is an exercise in statistics, registering who entered and left and keeping account of the difference, as it is called, the net migration. Europe wide, the hero in this migration history is the categorical international migrant worker, primarily taking part in an institutionalized worker exchanges.

In this migration, the movement of labor is between countries at the industrialized center of Europe (i.e., Austria, Belgium, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland) and the countries at Europe’s southern periphery (not only Turkey but also Italy,

Spain, Portugal, Greece, the former Yugoslavia, Algeria and Morocco). The direction of the movement is from the latter to the former, from periphery to the center. Also in movement toward the centre (Britain, France, the Netherlands) are migrants from (former) colonies (India, Pakistan, the Caribbean, Algeria, Surinam, Indonesia).

The formal policies of labor recruitment in Europe end in the mid-1970s (in Germany in 1973). By this time, the presence of foreign populations in Europe rises substantially. [1] In 1976, there were about 12 million foreigners in the above-mentioned European countries, whereas in 1960 this number had been only 5 million. Germany's share in the number of foreigners in 1976 was close to 4 million, about 6.4 percent of the total population of then the Federal Republic (Soysal Nuhoglu 1994:22).

The end of formal recruitment did not mean the end of migration. Mainly through family reunification programs and political asylum, the influx of foreign populations, Turks included, continued throughout the 1980s and 1990s, with occasional drops fuelled by restrictive legislation and promotion of return migration. By 1990, the foreign populations in Europe had reached 14.5 million (Soysal Nuhoglu 1994:23). In Germany, the number of foreigners amounted to 7 million in 1994, 2 million of which were from Turkey (Muenz and Ulrich 1997: 84, 93). Since then, the number of foreigners in Germany has remained stable around 7.3 million (SOPEMI 2004).

Today, according to the latest statistics published by the Turkish Ministry of Labor, about 3.5 million Turkish citizens live and work abroad (about 3 million in Europe, with the largest contingent in Germany with 1.9 million, then 220,000 in the US, 100,000 in Saudi Arabia, and last but not least 2,424 in Japan). [2]

2.2 Labor, Culture and Transnationalism:

In scholarly writing, public policy and popular culture, migration story unfolds in three distinct stages: labor, culture and transnationalism. In the first stage, the categorical migrant is a worker and is male. He is a breadwinner. Having left behind a family, homeland and roots, he is condemned to silence and exploitation, living in *Heims* in the *Heimats* of Others. He is the villager in *Die Bauern von Subay*, a hypothetical town in Anatolia, in Werner Schiffauer's sensitive ethnographic account of migration and the struggling worker cited in the classics of immigration literature, such as *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe*.

In Günter Wallraff's best-selling story of exploitation and survival, *Ganz unten* (in its English reincarnation, *Lowest of the Low*, in Turkish *En AlttaKiler*), the immigrant takes the persona of Ali, stressed at the bottom of the German social ladder. In the story, Ali frequently changes jobs, one day a construction worker, next day a part-time cleaning person at McDonald's, and expectedly gets exploited. He lives in dire conditions, experiences oppression, and feels discrimination in the lowest, and segregated, echelons of Germany.

Ali's picture and story convey a starkly different impression than the solemn images of absence inscribed into the migrant photos that beautify the artful pages of *A Seventh Man*. There, John Berger's lyrical gaze marks the migrant in disturbing absences of speech and gesture. There the migrant is not heard and seen, remaining invisible beyond walls that separate him from European imagination. In Wallraff's story, the migrant enters the world of German economy and imagination. The Turkish *Gastarbeiter* now has a face, dark hair, dark eyes, moustache, as well as a place, at the bottom, and he speaks as a member of the dispossessed and underprivileged. The story of Wallraff's Ali identifies a presence,

reconfigures statistical evidence as experiential narrative, and accords a blueprint for the habitual stories of Turkish *Gastarbeiter* experience to come, *ganz unten* and with nowhere to go.

In the two decades following the end of labor recruitment, the foreigners in Europe have been solidly “*incorporated*” into the available legal, political, economic, social structures and institutions in their countries of residence. [3] They have become part of the labor and investment markets, education and welfare systems, and policy discourses and regimes. They have attained and exercised *as foreigners* rights and privileges that are conventionally reserved to *national* citizens. They have been extensively involved in public life through associational activity, union membership, party politics, electoral practices, and arts and literary production. They also have been part of existing regimes of income inequity, social differentiation, and ethnic and racial discrimination. In short, the foreigners have become *subjects* in a complex terrain of exclusions and inclusions, contention and accommodation, and disenfranchisement and membership.

As the mid-eighties approach, Europe enters the world of “multiculturalism” and the predominant mode of thinking about migration becomes centered on culture and identity. With cultural turn, the *Gastarbeiter* gets re-signified as a *person*, a total being with feelings and culture—not simply a worker and no longer a guest. The protagonist of the story is the Turk (the Other), whose identity is analyzed *vis-à-vis* the German (the native)—within the conventions of cultural otherness and difference. Labor statistics no longer dominate the migration texts but attribute credence to identity stories.

In the same period, policy debates move away from the economics and logistics of labor importation and focus on nebulously defined integration and border controls. While integration involves the “adjustment” of those who are already in, border controls regressively concern limiting further *immigration* into the nation-states that comprise Europe. The integration policies, if they do exist, reify supposed “integration problems,” which are never defined but circularly deployed as proof for the need to integrate migrants to their new society—seasoned with occasional statistics about the number of German friends a migrant has, and the obligatory recitation of cultural differences such as being Muslim or Turkish.

As for disciplinary prowess, Anthropology and Literary/Cultural Studies take over the task of writing migration, which thus far has been a proper subject matter for Sociology and Economics. Their disciplinary trademark being culture, both Anthropology and Cultural Studies emerge as natural candidates for documenting the new migration stories. Relieved from the social analysis of labor markets, Sociology revives studies of citizenship, a historical concern of the discipline, which is apparently amplified by massive migrations and foreignness within nation-states. [4]

It is crucial to note that the cultural version of the migration story differentiates its subject, *the migrant*, along gender lines and women become legitimate topics of inquiry in their own right. At the earlier stages of migration, the proportion of women to male migrants was significantly low, for migration meant recruitment of male factory workers. Later however the numbers of female immigrants have reached considerable parity with men, mostly due to woman-only recruitment policies and family reunifications. Despite this, the woman immigrants remained simply invisible. Migration was perceived as a matter of labor importation—and temporary—women hardly made the public agenda.

In her introduction to the landmark issue of the *International Migration Review*, first-ever special volume devoted to the female migrant, Mirjana Morokvasic rightly remarks that “rather than “discovering” that female migration is an understudied phenomenon, it is more important to stress that the already existing literature has had little impact on policy-making, on mass media presentation of migrant women, but also on the main body of migration literature, where male bias has continued to persist into the late seventies and eighties in spite of growing evidence of women’s overwhelming participation in migratory movements” (1984: 899).

With the cultural turn in migration, that is, with the increased emphasis on culture in terms of rights, duties, and membership of immigrants, it is safe to state that women, and the woman question, came to the fore of the immigration question. In the cultural story, immigrant was no longer male and women had a role to play—but not always following leads suggested in the interventions such as the one in the *International Migration Review*. As categorical Muslims, immigrant women from diverse places (such as Turkey, Pakistan, Morocco, Surinam) and with different social, educational, and cultural backgrounds, have become subjects of *foulard* affairs, headscarf debates. In media representations, they have been immanently portrayed “beyond the veil,” thus silent. Their presumed invisibility, patriarchal oppression, under Islamic traditions have led to, in the words of Stanley Cohen, unremitting “moral panics” (Cohen 1980), especially after the indiscriminate attacks perpetuated by radical Islamist groups and organizations in Europe and elsewhere.

The last episode in immigration story is that of transnationalism. In the late nineties, it has become obvious that in the face of extensive movement of goods, labor and capital worldwide, not only the cultural story of migration is limiting but also the delimitation of

migration by 'nation' is no longer sustainable. Turks in Germany occupy and traverse spaces that defy conventional distinctions of home and host country cultures and economies. A fashion trend in Turkey abruptly travels to Germany. Major Turkish movies have their gala openings simultaneously in Berlin and Istanbul. Staging of a concert, reading, exhibition or play by (famous and not so famous) Turkish artists in Germany is only a commonplace act of culture. Most important Turkish rappers in Istanbul cite as their birthplaces somewhere in Germany.

Quests for political recognition by minority ethnic and religious groups (i.e., Alevites and Kurds) in Turkey and Germany condition the shape of politics and claims making in both countries by way of diffusion of organizational know-how, political activism and discursive strategies. Islamic politics in Germany engenders activism in Turkey and vice versa. German Parliament's decision to condemn Armenian massacre creates the grounds for a political rally staged in Berlin by a variety of Turkish political groups and organizations, with left and right leanings, and both from Germany and Turkey.

Germany is an attractive market for accomplished artists from Turkey and young Turkish professionals from Germany seek jobs and fortunes in Turkey. The immigrants who have led the way to Germany now retire in two countries—six months in Turkey, six months in Germany. Return to Turkey is neither the ideal corrective to the disruptive forces of migration (as in going back home) nor the disruption of a life built in Germany. Return is only temporary in a world that permanently connects Turkey and Germany in more ways than those depicted in linear narratives of leaving home and settling in foreign places.

Last but not least, Turkey's candidacy to European Union, and the consequent negotiation process, affectively reconfigures the political landscapes, cultural debates, and economic ventures in both countries. Turkey and Germany are now more imminently connected than being two nation-states with historical ties, cultural links and migration stories.

Coined and advocated by Nina Glick-Schiller and her colleagues (1994), "transnational migration" is the new name given to story of migration, after the discovery of manifold border crossings and excessive movement of goods, peoples, information and capital—for instance, between Turkey and Germany and Europe. The new story is more demanding than the prosaic labor-culture stories. For we encounter stories of migrancy in unlikely places, the places which we hardly associate with migration—Pakistanis and Turks in Japan, for instance. The new migration numbers overburden inter-*national* statistical exercises beyond recognition. The extent of contemporary movement confuse migration geographies that are mapped into *nation*-states. Transnationalism promises to capture this emergent new narrative in the stories of migrants who traverse the world in inordinate numbers, as (il)legal aliens, and burdened with inequities of travel regulations, market demands, and fortunes and desires. However, a word of caution is necessary: "migration studies," and migration policies, tend to "stay stubbornly loyal to the old dichotomies of homes and host countries, tradition and modernity, Turkey and Germany. The old stories have yet to release their intractable hold on new paradigms" (Caglar and Soysal 2003).

2.3 Integration Question:

Religion is conceivably the most contentious issue as regards to the “integration” of immigrants. In policy and academic debates, religious orientation categorically serves as the measure against which integration should be judged. Compounding the problem, there has been heightened sensitivity since the incident of September 11 towards “Islamic” inclinations of Turks and Arabs in Europe. Revived debates on “veil,” and newly invented ones on “parallel societies” (read as segregated ethnic enclaves) and proclivity of Muslim youths to “terrorism,” bring to fore an underlying anxiety about the potential of Muslims to integrate into “European” societies and values, as well as the civilizational incommensurability of Islam and the West.

The state authorities in Germany—and Europe—are surely in an uneasy relationship with Islam. The inflammatory emphasis on religious orientation as an indicator of “dis-integration” seriously contradicts the discursive emphasis on diversity and cultural rights on the part of European courts and state agencies. While the “security” concerns lead to measures that constrain the activity realm of immigrants, by designating them *de facto* Muslims, and dangerous at that, discourses of diversity promote religion as a cultural right and facilitate provisions for realizing this right.

The state of Berlin, and many other states in Germany, pursues a concerted policy of multiculturalism, relentlessly expressing their support of cultural diversity and funding projects to that end. Multiculturalism at work in Berlin since early 1990’s hardly amounts to an unambiguous conceptual framework and coherent policy agenda. At times the acts of multiculturalism stop short of being a feel-good discursive practice on the part of state

officials and immigrant activists. Nonetheless, as a discursive instrument and policy tool it is shared across the political spectrum, even by certain factions of conservative parties. As it is practiced in Berlin multiculturalism is rather consequential.

A case in point is the teaching of religion in schools. In a latest court case, for instance, Islamic Federation in Berlin won the right to provide religious education in Berlin's schools, establishing parity between Islam and formally accepted Protestant and Catholic churches. The major Alevite association in Berlin, claiming their religious and cultural difference from the Sunnite Islamic Federation, appealed to Berlin State and was granted the right to teach its own religion classes. Now there are after school courses on teachings and rituals of Alevite persuasion offered in a number of schools in Berlin, and taught by educators on state payroll. In addition, the Foreigners' Office, recently renamed as Directorate for Integration and Migration, as part of its effort to publicize the cultural diversity of the City, published a booklet on Alevite culture, adding another entry to the series of forty-plus booklets produced under the generic title of *Miteinander Leben* [Living Together].

Another field of government action where multiculturalism brings about substantial results is youth work. Berlin, for instance, is the *Holy City* of youth organizations. These organizations display a spectrum of orientations and attract representative cross-sections of Berlin's migrant youth. In Kreuzberg, NaunynRitze, a youth center operating under auspices of Kreuzberg's municipal government, operates as the headquarters for hiphop. In the early 1990s, NaunynRitze was home to one of the most successful and long-lasting hiphop posse, *To Stay Here is My Right*. Under the approving supervision of NaunynRitze's social-work team, the posse flourished into a successful "hiphop community" and attracted the prospective stars and hiphop hopefuls to NaunynRitze. Graffiti writing sessions, breakdance practices,

rap courses, and hiphop parties promptly dominated the cultural agenda of the “ghetto” youth attending NaunynRitze. Throughout the 1990s, the hiphop scene in Kreuzberg had produced its prominent names, MC Gio, writer Neco and Sony, DJ Derezon, dancer Storm, and rapper Boe B. Their pictures and words were eminently featured in the stylish pages of cosmopolitan Berlin bi-weeklies. Their stories and art were interpreted, and amplified, as the necessary condition of social harmony and the multicultural unison of Berlin. Like Neco, who has become an important director with three films to his credit, many of these young artists have found themselves niches in the art scene of Berlin.

Though prominent, hiphop of course does not exhaust the range of creative cultural projects migrant youths of Berlin produce and consume. They stage concerts, poetry readings, parties, dance shows, and plays. They dance through the streets of Berlin the entire day in the Carnival of Cultures, print poems on love and justice in short-lived literary periodicals they publish, write articles on bi-lingualism, and take part in rallies to protest the drastic budget cuts proposed by the state. In turn, their pictures and words get eminently featured in the stylish pages of cosmopolitan Berlin bi-weeklies and their stories and art get interpreted, and amplified, as the necessary condition of social harmony and the multicultural unison of Berlin.

This does not preclude intensive—and increasing contentious—debate over Turks and Islam, and the prospects of a multicultural society. The cover of a recent issue of the journal *Focus*, which styles itself as ‘the modern news magazine’, was headlined ‘*Die Multikulti-Lüge* [The Multikulti-Lie] against a stencilled figure of a woman in headscarf (10 April 2006). The *Focus* was not alone in spotlighting ‘multikulti’ as *the* problem of Germany. It was simply following suit and highlighting the usual stories: headscarves, youth gangs,

segregated men's coffee houses, segregated high-rises with seventy percent immigrant inhabitants, soaring crime figures, low language skills, unemployment and extremism of various kinds—indeed a bleak picture.

What ignited the latest integration debate was the brutal murder of Hatun Sürücü, a young twenty-three year-old Turkish woman, by her brothers for disgracing her family. Hatun's guilt was to leave her husband and attempt to raise her child as a single mother—hence bringing shame to her family. The murder of Hatun Sürücü galvanized the long entrenched doubts and questions about the compatibility of Turkish (or Muslim) traditions with western norms, western ways of life, particularly as regards to the place of women in Muslim societies and culture. The debate did not simply brought Germans against Turks but generated a multi-vocal questioning. Turkish feminist activist, Necla Kelek, for instance, condemned honour-killings in an article published in the pages of the renowned intellectual weekly, *Die Zeit*, and made a plea to the Muslims to question their traditions and change. Her call for reform in Islam was answered in the same newspaper with a strongly worded rejoinder from sixty prominent German and Turkish ethnographers, intellectuals, immigration researchers and activists, mainly calling attention to the complexity of the debate and the dangers of blanket condemnation of immigrants (as Muslims) at a time when there is increasing anti-immigrant sentiment, both among the populace and the policy-makers.

Without going further into the details and merits of such polemics, I would like assert that what lies at the locus of all this debate on integration—and divergent positions as regards to gender equality and culture—is the woman question. In the post-nine-eleven era, the term Muslim has attained a status of unqualified infamy, making every Muslim person perceived as no less than an adherent of uncivilized, non-modern culture, if not a terrorist. Muslim

women, not coincidentally, have always been at the center of the debates on Islam and its place in European social spaces.

In Europe today, imprinted on the female body, the headscarf empirically discriminates foreignness (as in being non-Western) and authenticates it, mostly, as Islamic. When the subject matter is immigration or Islam, pictures of women with headscarves invariably accompany newspaper articles, television coverage, and academic works. The image provides the necessary visual accreditation to the written and spoken word.

Though intuitive, this cultural take, and undue emphasis, on headscarf—thus on Islam—renders invisible the extensive participation of immigrant women in the social, cultural, and the economic life of the countries in which they reside. Their accomplishments, and their resilience, inventiveness, and activism since they have surfaced in the imaginary of the European mind, become captive to reified categorical identities (Turkishness and Islam).

Germany, and Europe, at this juncture in the history of migration seeks to reconcile managing diversity with achieving security, both highly charged discursive and policy agendas. The apparent conflict between these two agendas seems to stay with us for sometime to come and will afford grounds for a continuing debate on the potential integration of immigrants in Europe.

2.4 Symbolic Foreigners:

The incorporation of immigrants in Germany has proceeded rather rapidly and without exceptional controversy. The amplified talk of integration today is more about maintaining the categorical integrity of national order and fighting the ghost of civilizational enemy than remedying empirical inequalities, which are more often than not subsumed under the foreignness of migrants and erased from social agendas. In other words, heightened but undue attention to the cultural “problems” associated with migration disregards the processes of incorporation and the difficulties of maintaining foreignness in a globalizing world.

What we end up having is an elementary story of integration, in which the parameters that make difference and identity are taken to be national/ethnic—Turkishness, Germanness, Islam being three principal ones. Rather than attending the complex layering of inequities and affinities within and without the nation-state, the incessant talk on integration concerns itself with apocalyptic cultural fragmentations, parallel societies, and ghetto narratives. In the end, “ironically, as immigrants are increasingly incorporated into the membership schemes of European host polities, the debate over how well they ‘adjust’ intensifies, and their cultural otherness is accentuated. Guestworkers become *symbolic* foreigners” in Europe (Soysal Nuhoglu 1994: 135).

As symbolic foreigners (Turks in Germany, Indians in Britain, Arabs in France), the contemporary immigrants are confined to an unyielding past—the past of their home and culture—and a persistent present—the present of their host country and their Otherness. They are considered to be bounded by their nation (or religion) in nations of others and in this boundedness they live in permanent diasporas. Lost are *futures, dreams, and competencies*,

along with possibilities for achieving more homes than one, and living with-out nations. All stories of migration turns into stories about homes, pasts, and tedious repetitions of the present and contemporary migration simply becomes a cultural economy of movement between peripheries with edenic pasts and centers with affluent presents, or between the nothingness of underdevelopment and the wealth of advancement.

Europeanization, that is, Turkey's accession to European Union, only complicates the story of migration. This is a hotly debated issue in Europe today—and perhaps for years to come. On December 17, 2004, the current leaders of the Union decided on future of European Union-Turkey relations and agreed to initiate formal negotiation talks on Turkey's accession. The public imagination in Europe is already saturated with a heightened debate on the Europeanness of Turks and Turkey. Although where the Turks belong culturally is the question (possibly an unanswerable question because it is political rather than an empirical matter), the real pressing item is migration—the potential flood of Turks overburdening Europe's stagnant labor markets and welfare institutions. The expert opinion on this is divided. While the opponents of Turkish accession forecast an eminent disaster, those who favor draw attention to the decreasing and aging population of Europe and welcome the promise of a young labor force as fresh blood.

The question that needs to be posed is slightly different one: What will happen to our understanding of migration when Turkey becomes a member of the Union? With the Union, in effect with Turkey's accession talks, comes the “free movement of people” and with the “free movement” the term “immigrant” becomes redundant. The matter for negotiation is not the number of Turks who could migrate but when Turkish citizens—then also European citizens—would be allowed to move freely in Europe search of their fortunes and futures.

Aren't we witnessing a superfluous debate on immigration and integration of Turks in Europe? This question anticipates the end of the migration story of Turks in Germany and Europe.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Questions and Premises:

What drives this research, as well as my scholarly agenda, is a general interest in the formations of identity and politics of performance, particularly among immigrant groups, in Europe. The new Europe to which I refer includes but is not exclusive to the European Union. I take Europe not as a unit of analysis in and of itself but as a social, institutional, and cultural formation in the making and conclusively connected to the Middle East. In this process, Germany, a “central” European nation-state which is undergoing a unification process of its own former East and West, and Turkey, a Middle Eastern nation-state about to become a formal member of the European Union, comprise the two nodes in a complex set of transformations unfolding in Europe and the Middle East. At these restive sites of ethnography, with their precarious and difficult affinities and connections, it is viable to capture the simultaneous processes of consolidation and unsettling of Europe and the Middle East, both as supranational political and economic entities and as emerging cultural formations and identity.

My prior work has focused on the cultural projects of Turkish migrants—and youths in particular--in Berlin, Germany, their responses to social change, and their reactions to the discourses of in-betweenness. Although the prevalent discourse of in-betweenness fixes Turkish migrants on a bipolar axis of the modern and traditional, they are not simply passive recipients of change in an alien landscape. Their cultural projects are not simply revivals of an essential Turkishness (or Islam) in response to alien formations of modernity. Rather, as active participants at several social and cultural borders, they cultivate their projects and

engender spaces of self and belonging, drawing on a repertoire of contemporary discourses and signs of identity through processes of selection, modification, and enactment. As actors at the intersections of local, national, and transnational environs (Kreuzberg, Berlin, Germany, Turkey, and Europe), they partake in the construction of the social and cultural landscape of the new Europe and enter into dialogues with global flows of youth culture. In my work and publications, I argue and show that these connections and competencies condition their productions of culture and provide them with means to conceive and cross boundaries—thus unsettling national configurations of belonging and conventional conceptions of Otherness.

In my new research, of which MiReKoc funded project is an integral component, I focus on public events and their role in the making of WorldCities. The compelling characteristic of public events staged in Berlin, as well as in other metropolitan centers of Europe, is that they predominantly aim to cultivate a civic sense of plurality and advocate tolerance, multiculturalism, and diversity. Employing markers of ethnicity, culture, gender, youthfulness, hip and coolness, such public events delimit and present identities and celebrate cultural particularisms within an imaginary of diversity. In other words, metropolitan public places become stages for what I call the *Spectacles of Identity*. I argue that this emergent genre is a symptom of the identifiable shifts in the conceptualization and performance of identity, in public manifestations of expressive culture, and in definitions and practice of urban experience. The new spectacle is profoundly animated by the pervasive amplification of culture and identity discourses, follows the transformation of city space into a stage for production and performance of global spectacles, and is facilitated by the dialectical impact of global cultural flows on local expressions of culture. In this sense, the new spectacle and its

permutations are responses to transnational processes in as much as they are reflections of local, regional, or nationally situated specificities.

More specifically, the inventory and analysis of spectacles of identity, on the one hand, afford a way to assess the scope and content of the social and cultural spaces occupied by and designated for migrants, youth, and other identity groups and collectivities in the city. The presence or absence of migrants and minorities in these public spectacles are signs of their responses to the discourses on and about them. Their protests and participation reveal the politics and policies of inclusion and exclusion. On the other hand, the inventory and typology of public performance, particularly the manifestations of spectacular mega-events, serves to certify the City's standing or self-image as a global and ordered metropolis, inhabited by cosmopolitan natives and catering to transnational *flâneurs*. The contemporary topography of public events allows us to understand the relationship between these two constitutive but apparently incommensurate facets of the new spectacle.

To this end, I seek to discern:

- Parameters of legitimate collective action in public spaces (which collectivities and performances are celebrated, authorized, or repudiated; what characteristics make a proper spectacle),
- Prerequisites of patronage for public events (who promote, underwrite, and manage the spectacle; the extent to which public and/or private funds are allocated; which spectacles draw preferable funding and support),
- Cultural and political articulation of identity (what is the content and limits of the sayable, creative, and defiant; which signs and artifacts constitute the expressive repertoire of identity), and
- Changing modulations of the local, national, and global (to which extent the new public spectacle departs from being national in content and local in form; to whom the spectacle caters; who are its audiences and participants; what are the markers of diasporic or cosmopolitan projections in the new spectacle).

3.2 A Note on Methodology:

As I have indicated, this project was launched during my tenure in Berlin as a Research Fellow at the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies, Free University in the academic years 2001-2003 (funded by Social Science Research Council and Free University). The larger research is designed as an ethnographic inquiry, with participant-observation as the primary research method. During my residency in Berlin, I devoted my time to observing the preparatory stages of the festivals and drawing up an inventory of minority groups, governmental offices, and private and corporate concerns involved in the process—at the local, national, and European levels. Starting with May Day Parade in the spring of 2002, I have participated in public festivals taking place in Berlin, including the Carnival of Cultures, Turkish Day Parade, the Christopher Street Day Parade, and Love Parade.

The episodic nature of the spectacles has allowed me to carry out the participatory and observational tasks of the research, while allowing me to devote substantial time to taking inventories and documenting the landscape of public performance in Berlin. I have recorded my participation by writing field notes, taking pictures and slides, and, most importantly, videotaping the events. I have extensively used video as an instrument of note taking and accumulated substantial film footage covering a variety of public events.

An important part of the research design involves conducting open-ended, in-depth interviews with the leaders of the formal associations or collectivities which organize the spectacles, members of various groups performing in the festivals, officials from

governmental bodies providing resources and services, leaders of immigrant and minority associations, and officials of governmental and private cultural organizations, media outlets, and sponsoring agencies and corporations. With MiReKoc grant, I carried out interviews included in the roster of officials responsible for organizing, managing, and sponsoring the events, as well as representatives of immigrant groups taking part in the events. I also followed some of the major public events that coincided with the grant period.

Another important aspect of this research concerns its reliance on public debates on a variety of topics regarding immigrants, city, and culture. Public debate is not taken simply as a contextual element of the research but as its primary material. To this end, I have extensively followed the media, both print and visual, and assembled and utilized large collections of data on public debates over the place of immigrants in Berlin, Germany, and Europe, the prospects of Berlin as a WorldCity, and major European and German political controversies and performances.

4. ANALYSIS

With its methodological emphasis on visual material and media and public debate as primary data, this research abide by the dictums of “thin ethnography” (Marcus 1998). It also differs from conventional migration studies in its utilization of experimental presentation techniques (Marcus and Fischer 1986). In so doing, it follows recent trends in doing and writing ethnography. Accordingly in this section, I first present the findings and results of the research I carried out during my tenure as the recipient of MiReKoc fellowship and then present a discussion based not only on the current findings but also on the results of larger research I have been carrying out.

4.1 Findings and Results:

Under MiReKoc funded part of this research I made various trips to Berlin, during which I conducted interviews, followed spectacles staged in the city, and organized and attended a conference on spectacle at Humboldt University. In this section I provide an account of my findings in the order I carried out the research, starting with the conference on spectacle. I will also give a brief account of the classification exercise I have taken up as part of this research.

4.1.1 Theory and Practice of Spectacle and Plurality in Europe:

The primary purpose of my research trip in May 2005 was to participate in the symposium on the new European carnivals, which I had been co-organizing with Michi Knecht of Humboldt University and our research team at the Department (funding for the symposium was granted by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation). The title of the symposium, which took place at Humboldt University between May 13th and 15th, was “*Performing Policy –*

Enacting Diversity: European Summer Carnivals in Comparative Perspective.”

Conceptually, the symposium was designed to inquire into the contemporary urban summer carnivals—the new urban spectacles of diversity and identity—in different European cities and in the context of new forms of political regulation, changing migratory regimes and progressive processes of Europeanization. Symposium provided an opportunity to observe the limits of the scholarly work on the new spectacles in Europe and to learn from the major practitioners/organizers of multicultural festivals in London, Bremen, Brussels, and Rotterdam.

The first panel opened the conference with inter-temporal as well as intercultural comparative analyses. In the second panel, the notion of *Spectacles of Identity* was at the center of discussion. Following Levent Soysal’s interpretation of these spectacles as a symptom of the remarkable shifts in the conceptualization and performance of identity, as well as the changes in the public manifestation of expressive culture and urban experience, the panel focused on subject positions, participation structures and displays of citizenship. The third panel discussed interconnections and relations between summer carnivals and processes of Europeanization, seeking answers to the question of how political programs for recognition of “unity in diversity” get converted into structures of urban events, into specific cultural practices, emotions, identifications, strategies of in- and exclusion. The final session was an open forum in which the conference revisited the questions of “Comparison and Transfer.”

The most important aspect of the conference was the participation of practitioners/organizers of carnivals: *Noting Hill Carnival* in London, *Zinneke Festival* in Brussels, and *Sommer Carnival* in Rotterdam, and *Carnival of Cultures* in Bremen. Carnival practitioners included Marcel De Munnynck (*Zinneke Parade Brüssel*), Ruth Tompsett

(Noting Hill Carnival, Middlessex University of London), Gré Ploeg (Zomercarnaval Rotterdam), Paul McLaren (Carnival of Cultures-Bremen, Shademakers Carnival Club), and Patricia Alleyne-Dettmers (Noting Hill Carnival, Universität Hamburg). The organizers of the *Carnival of Cultures* in Berlin did not attend the conference because of their involvement with the daily tasks of the Carnival of Cultures, taking place in the streets of Berlin that weekend. It is crucial to note that all the cities represented at the conference have large and established immigrant populations and vibrant immigrant economies.

It became clear from the discussions at the conference that diversity was the driving concept behind all the carnivals in question. According to the organizers, the carnivals were showcases for the diversity of their cities, contributing to tolerance and enriching the city life. What was being understood by diversity and what kind of diversity was being promoted, however, significantly differed from carnival to carnival:

- In Bremen, the emphasis was placed on artistic merit and the carnival of cultures was seen as a showcase of the aesthetic accomplishments of individual artists—not necessarily of ethnic origin but surely creating works that derive their inspiration from carnival arts and performances.
- In Brussels, while the artistic aspect of the carnival was at the fore and promoted, the emphasis was placed on the creative potential of the *cityzens* and educational value of the festival event, inculcating a secular and universal understanding of *cityzenship*.
- As expected, London's Noting Hill Carnival was understood as an alternative event launched by the Afro-Caribbean British communities within the context of anti-racial politics and policies in Britain—though, it was argued, the carnival has been turning into a stage for entertainment than resistance in the last decade or so.
- In Rotterdam, carnival, being one of the many summer events, was partly a stage for attracting tourists to the city and partly a stage for the Caribbean community for forging transnational ties to the Islands.
- In Berlin, the organizers of the Carnival of Cultures were placing the emphasis on the community participation and self-organization—even though this was

seen as the reason for the amateurish floats and performances abundantly present at the carnival. It was also the case that Berlin carnival was consciously staged as a policy instrument to further tolerance and multiculturalism.

4.1.2 Spectacular Events, Events on Spectacle:

In the month of May, with the help of my research assistant, I followed several public events, which took place in Berlin. Among them, three were important for the purposes of this project: Turkish Day Parade, Walk-of-Islam Fashion Show, and the Conference on the myth of Kreuzberg, called Mythos Kreuzberg.

4.1.2.1 Turkish Day

Turkish Day was the fourth instance of the event since its inaugural at the 40th year of Turkish immigration to Germany. As in the previous occasions, immigrants from various parts of Germany gathered in Berlin for the event. A citizen's committee, comprising of immigrants who represent various cities in Germany, organizes Turkish Day. However they receive support from DITIB (Diyanet Isleri Turk Islam Birliđi/Turkish Islamic Union of Religious Affairs), a union of mosque organizations in Germany associated with the Office of Religious Affairs in Turkey. They are organized and have branches throughout Germany. In fact, mosque organizations of DITIB hire buses and bring Turkish immigrants to Berlin. They walk under DITIB banners representing their cities. Although the DITIB is the major sponsor of the event, as the years pass, other organizations, for instance Ataturkcu Dusunce Dernegi (Association for Ataturkist Thought) have begun to participate in the parade, as well as independent citizens.

Turkish Embassy in Berlin supports the parade, albeit does not take part in the actual organization. Ambassador or Council General of Berlin always delivers a speech to the participants, mostly celebrating multiplicity of cultures and urging immigrants take German citizenship—thus become citizen ambassadors of their country of origin. German politicians also attend the Turkish Day. Aside from the Director of the Foreigners' Office, many high level politicians appear on the stage and welcome the contribution of immigrants to German society, praise diversity, and call for tolerance and understanding. Inviting Turkish immigrants to take up German citizenship is their message, too. At this year's parade there were a larger contingent of politicians, anticipating the important role Turkish vote would play in the upcoming elections in September.

As in the previous years, the participants carried Turkish flags in abundance, along with German and EU flags. In numbers there was no comparison: German and EU flags stood isolated within a red-and-white sea of flags carried and t-shirts worn by the participants. Again as expected, this emphasis on Turkish flag raised concerns among the politicians present there over the integration of Turkish community. Regardless of political orientation and ethnic background all the politicians and activists with whom I talked shared this concern. However, when examined as a whole, the flags signify less of an isolationist and national attitude but more of a multiculturalist twist. Flag comes as the only apparent and respectable sign of Turkishness. Moreover flag is not the only sign exhibited. Flag accompanies the Mehter band, Turkish pop, and folk dances, all read as the customary signs of cultural difference.

The most anticipated part of the Turkish Day was the popular concert staged at the end. This is what the young people wait for—seeing their most celebrated singers on stage.

Over the years, major pop stars like Sevtab Erener and Kenan Dogulu took the stage to the cheers of their audiences. Turkish Day stage is also a stage for dance and music groups from Berlin and other cities of Germany, at times displaying modernized folkdances and folk music of Turkey, at times doing modern dance to the tunes of arranged Turkish melodies. Most often than not these are amateur performances but semi-professional acts also take the stage. The concert is fast becoming the most important of the element of Turkish Day, with its audiences growing every year. After the concert, participants of the Turkish Day, particularly those who come from afar, wander in the streets of Berlin, mostly in Unter den Linden, and do things customarily done by tourists in the area—visiting landmark historical sites, buying Berlin curios, and drinking coffee and having ice cream. Having done the tourist things, they embark the buses that brought them to Berlin and return to their own cities.

As such, Turkish Day is a replica of other multicultural festivals staged in the public places of Berlin. Turkish Day adds a New York style parade to Berlin's repertoire of festivals, the celebrating Turkishness as a color added to the multicultural richness of the city. This the attraction of the parade for the organizers, politicians, and activists. This is what they revel in their speeches and interviews they give to the media.

4.1.2.2 Walk-of-Islam

The Walk-of-Islam is a fashion show launched by an entrepreneurial Turkish youth interested in pursuing a career as a designer. This year's event, a small scale happening in its second installment, was far from meeting the expectations its name and fliers had generated (a woman in headscarf walking the catwalk). The organizers intended to launch the event as a

multicultural design show but failed to attract customers. Despite the disappointing turn out, when seen through the lens of the arguments made in this research, the event signifies the extent to which multiculturalism has become an organizing and inspiring feature of social and economic life in Berlin. (Unfortunately we were not successful in arranging an interview with the organizers in order to get their assessment. This interview will be carried out during one of my future trips to Berlin.)

4.1.2.3 Mythos Kreuzberg

The conference *Mythos Kreuzberg* was organized by Kreuzberg Municipality and Heinrich Boll Stiftung, both committed to diversity and multiculturalism. The goal was to assess and celebrate Kreuzberg's claims of diversity and alternative life styles. Not surprisingly the outcome was less of a critical appraisal but enshrining the reputation of Kreuzberg as *the* multicultural district in Berlin. The pamphlets distributed in a bag under the apt title of *Mythen in Tueten* [Myths in a Bag] exemplified all the usual suspects—multicultural youth centers, Kreuzberg Museum, social work organizations, Kreuzberg branches the Greens, Social Democrats, the Left Party (as it is now called), Turkish associations, art galleries, theaters and alternative music and dance venues. The message was that Kreuzberg was alive and well, and committed to diversity. The conference rendered visible (once again) the willingness of the political actors in Berlin in promoting diversity and the extent of institutional and discursive resources devoted to its advancement.

What is important for the purposes of this research is the self-awareness and self-reflexivity on the part of the organizers as to the mythical place and essence of Kreuzberg for

Berlin and its diversity. Although, as it appears on the title of the conference, *mythos* suggests a critical stance, the participants of the conference were busy and content with affirming the *mythos*. Nonetheless, whether affirmative or critical, conference highlights the fact that even for its proponents, multicultural *mythos* of Kreuzberg cannot be taken for granted but needs reaffirmation in order to be realized and continued.

4.1.3 Prime Institutional Players:

During this phase of my research, one of my major goals was to conduct formal interviews with the prime players in the reconfiguration of the cultural topography of Berlin in the unification period. In this period, new semi-private, semi-autonomous funding institutions have been founded and they have been instrumental in shaping Berlin's cultural policies and re-establishing funding priorities according to what they see fit for advancing a new profile for the up-and-coming WorldCity Berlin.

Among others, three institutions stand out as the "prime players" in Berlin's new cultural landscape: *Hauptstadt Kulturfonds*, *Berlin Tourismus Marketing*, and *Berlin Partners*. With their funding and advisory powers, they effectively determine the parameters of what counts as legitimate, useful, and appropriate cultural event. With my assistant Martina Klausner we carried out interviews with the directors of each organization. In the case of Berlin Partners, the director responsible for funding cultural events and devising cultural policy sent her assistant as her replacement in the last minute. This interview, though took place, did not reveal any substantive insight to the workings and policies of the institution. This interview will be attempted again in the future.

4.1.3.1 Hauptstadt Kulturfonds

As it is apparent from its name, Hauptstadt Kulturfonds funds cultural event scene of Berlin as they see fit to a capital city. Its outgoing director, Adrienne Goehler had been a very controversial figure. Her decision to fund an exhibition on RAF (Red Army Fraction) as to shed light on Germany's recent past—and her determination not to back off in the face widespread criticism from all circles—made her celebrity on her own right. She also opposed the destruction of the Palace of the Republic, East Germany's seat of Government and Parliament, against all the favorable opinion for getting rid of this sign of Germany's socialist experience from the center of the city. This didn't earn her any credits. She recently published a book entitled *Verfluessigungen*, in which she shares her experiences as one of Berlin's cultural movers and advances her ideas on how to revive the capital and its art scene as Berlin moves from Welfare State to Culture Society.

The money for the Hauptstadt Kulturfonds has two sources: Federal Government and Berlin City State, approximately in the order of 10 million euros until 2007. When compared to Berlin's debt, somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 million euros, this is a substantive amount—though within the larger city and national budget, the amount is merely negligible. The final decisions on which projects to fund are made by a committee of two representatives from the Federal level and two from Berlin. Funding is project-based and distributed through competitions held twice a year.

According to the director we interviewed at Hauptstadt Kulturfonds, Berlin's budgetary problems meant trouble for Berlin's art and culture scene and hardship for the thriving artist community. Consequently, for the director, the lack of funding money would gravely damage

the image of Berlin as the scene of artistic innovation and creativity. In order to compensate this situation, she made her priority to subsidize and fund projects coming from young artists who constitute the “informal” art scene in Berlin. For her, it was “the unofficial Berlin was alive and represented the future.” She made clear they were funding mega projects but only reluctantly. Funding priority was to support projects by young artists, who have “innovative” edge and potential for “national and international influence.” In a sense, funding was seen as a mechanism to supplant the disappearing welfare instruments and create the necessary environment for the survival of young artists—thus, further the image of Berlin as creative city and city of creativity.

Among the mega art events sponsored and funded by the Hauptstadt Kulturfonds on a continuing basis are *Tanz im August*, an annual international dance festival during the month of August and *Karneval der Kulturen* (Carnival of Cultures), the major venue for displaying the multicultural of Berlin. The reasoning behind funding this dance event was explained as to make Berlin center for modern dance in the next three years. The second event, initiated by the Werkstatt der Kulturen, a cultural center founded by Berlin’s Directorate of Foreigners’ Office, recently renamed, as Directorate for Immigration and Integration, was first launched in 1996 and celebrated its tenth anniversary in 2005. Both events, plus a number of smaller events supported on a regular basis, receive the lion share of the funding budget of the Kulturfonds, about 2 million euros, one fifth of the budget.

Karneval der Kulturen is the sign of city’s and Kulturfonds’ commitment to diversity. Steadily growing each year, both in terms of participant organizations and audiences, Karneval gathers together community associations, youth centers, cultural centers, social work and help organizations, youth, women, and gay groups with social messages into the

fold of a three-day carnival, with food and artwork stands, music and dance stages, a night for sound-systems, and a parade with floats displaying the diversity of cultures in Berlin. Diversity here means many things, not at all homogeneously defined, and ranges from strictly folkloristic depictions (Kurdish or Bolivian folk dance groups) to ironic takes on culture (Soviet or German culture on floats), and from strictly carnival acts a la Brazilian carnival (at times represented by actually Brazilian Carnival groups) to sound-systems and DJs on floats.

To the disappointment of its organizers, Karneval does not attract many participants from organized Turkish groups. They attend the Karneval as spectators in large numbers (after all, Karneval takes place in Kreuzberg where they live). They sell food and artwork. They perform on the Oriental Stage, one of the four stages reserved for the dance and music performances (the other three stages thematically represent Asia, Europe, and the (Latin) Americas). When it comes to represent “Turkish Culture” in the parade, they scarcely come with a float of their own—and if they do, with very mediocre one, at that. Over the years, there have been only a few Turkish floats in the parade. Some Kurdish organizations participate with a float each year but their acts do not come close to anything spectacular, either. When the Turks appear in the floats they do so by participating in the success of the floats of organizations with which they are associated such as youth centers, sound mobiles, and gay self-help organizations.

In short, Turks in Berlin, as well as the Kurds from Turkey, do not respond to what is expected of them: appearing on the parade as proper “cultures” within the diversity display that is the Karneval der Kulturen. This is variously interpreted as unwillingness of Turks in participating in Berlin’s multiculturalism but this interpretation ignores the fact the major constituency of the Karneval is in fact the Turkish residents of Berlin. Their participation as

audiences, artists, and entrepreneurs is essential to the Karneval but they refrain from taking part in the diversity display. They prefer to be present in the carnival stage as citizens of Berlin.

4.1.3.2 Berlin Tourismus Marketing

Berlin Tourismus Marketing is new among the influential institutions of culture makers in Berlin. Their influence comes from the place assigned to tourism in creating the future of Berlin as a seat of creativity and culture—thus as a place of attraction for capital, creative industries, and talent—in Europe and in the World. The office is not new in the sense that it had a predecessor organization, which was organizationally located under Berlin's Public Transportation Office (*Verkehrsamt*). In 1994, the tasks that were carried out by the Transportation Office were transferred to the newly created, semi-private Berlin Tourismus Marketing.

The office sees itself as a Public-Private Partnership. Its primary partners come from the tourism sector. These are the Association of Berlin Hotels, with 40 percent share, KaDeWe, the major supermarket in Berlin (in the order of Harrods in London, La Fayette in Paris, and Saks Fifth Avenue in New York) and by itself a tourist destination, with 10 percent share, and *Messe Berlin*, the city's fair and trade centers, with 5 percent share. The remaining 15 percent share belongs to Berlin Senate. (Note that Hauptstadt Kulturfonds is also branded as a PPP organization. Its director, however, was very dismissive of the idea, stating "PPT does not make sense when the only private partner was Schering," the chemical conglomerate.) The annual budget of the organization is about 10 million euros, with 2

million coming from the Senate. Of the budget, 20 percent covers the overhead and 80 percent goes to operational items.

The Director of Culture of Berlin Tourismus Marketing imagines Berlin as an international city, not particularly as a national city—though he admits at present the major portion of tourists in Berlin arrives from national destinations. For him, tourist is a universal category. His eyes are on the mega events, the likes of Love Parade, *Berlinale* (Berlin Film Festival), Berlin Marathon, *Festtage* at the Opera, special exhibitions such as MOMA in Berlin and Goya Exhibit, and various trade shows such as ITB (International Tourism Bourse), IFA (International Electronics Show), and ILA (International Airplane Show), and last but not least the WM (World Football Championship). The Karneval der Kulturen does not make the initial list but confirmed as important when specifically asked.

The list of events considered important for Berlin is almost endless. According to the Director, about 14 to 15 hundred events take place every day in Berlin. Winter is the dead season and things pick up in the summer. February is the time for Berlin Film festival; March is for International Tourism Bourse. The Director firmly indicates that they do not believe in branding the City. For them, Berlin is already a brand, if anything.

It was evident from the interview that the vision of Berlin upheld by the institution—that is the vision of what makes Berlin significant and hence attractive—was rather academic. Put differently, the vision outlined by the Director of Culture at the Tourismus Marketing is no different than the depictions of Berlin's significance as a WorldCity in the works of Jane Kramer, Brian Ladd, and Levent Soysal. For the director, the three elements that make and should make Berlin a point of attraction on a world scale are as follows: The first element is

Berlin's lively cultural scene, itself a tradition. The second is Berlin's history—as in Weimar's Cultural Capital in the 1920s, Capital of Third Reich and Holocaust, Divided City of Cold War, frontier of East-West conflict, Capital City of Unified Germany, and finally a modern metropolis. For him this history is neither unified nor can be unified as German history but it comprises not only German but also world history. It is only controversial and there lies its attraction. Third element is Berlin's tradition as a trend city for design, music, and clubs, and potential for becoming a center in an international creative network.

As for the multicultural potential of Berlin, the Director volunteers the following when asked: “Berlin is surely a multicultural city and this is an asset but only within Germany. When considered worldwide, there are other cities that fit the description much more than Berlin.” The conclusion drawn from this is that though multiculturalism is an asset of Berlin but it is not something to build upon on a world scale; there exists “more multicultural cities in other countries.”

4.1.4 Classifying the Spectacle:

In Istanbul, together with my research assistant Özlem Aslan, we had undertaken the classification of the newspaper archive I had had assembled on carnival, immigrants, and the city. In this exercise, we essentially utilized the new classification scheme I had been crafting—namely, *Spectacles of Identity*, *Spectacles of Migration*, *Spectacles of State*, *Spectacles of Dissent*, and so on. It has become apparent during the exercise that this new classification scheme is more reflective of the changes and shifts in the form and content of spectacles under the new regimes of diversity, multiculturalism, and Europeanization.

We have also carried out the codification of the visual and textual material collected so far, using the same classificatory scheme as the basis. Here we primarily focused on what constitutes a legitimate collective action in public spaces (which collectivities and performances are celebrated, authorized, or repudiated; what characteristics make a proper spectacle), who promotes, underwrites, and manages the spectacle; the extent to which public and/or private funds are allocated; which spectacles draw preferable funding and support, the specific ways identity is articulated, which signs constitute the expressive repertoire of identity, and the ways the new public spectacle departs from being national in content and local in form.

A preliminary analysis of the event scene in Berlin and visual material collected indicate the following:

- The two main key words that organize and authorize the new spectacle emerge as *diversity* and *creativity*. The first implies and legitimizes the social and moral good of the spectacle, while the second marks its individual and commercial potential.
- Any spectacle, which makes the grade in terms of its diversity and creativity potential, receives a welcome from governmental and funding organizations and finds itself a space within the cultural scene that is Berlin. Any sign that implies *conflict* is strictly avoided—though Berlin is a city of controversies.
- Identity, as it plays out in the spectacles, most often than not, is understood and represented as cultural identity—ethnic, religious, or otherwise. This does not mean politics of identity is the only formal playing field. Various forms of cosmopolitanisms weaken the premium placed on cultural identities.
- *National* is simply out, although the city is the Capital of the Unified Germany. All events embrace a vision of the City as a world-level metropolis and aim for approximating world-level standards and ideals. In this respect, any act that recalls national signs and ideals on the part of immigrant populations is seen as suspect, even though the very emphasis on cultural identities facilitate the branding of ethnic, religious, and national repertoires of signs and signatures, flags being the most important ones.
- Mega events are becoming the norm because of the economies of scale and because of the budgetary troubles of Berlin as a City and State.

4.2 Discussion

As indicated before, the discussion that follows draws upon not only the empirical research carried out under the grant provided by MiReKoc but also benefits from the material collected and analyses carried out over the years I have undertaken this research. I start with the identities of Berlin, continue with the content and politics of the new spectacle in relation to the city, and end with the place of migrants in the city.

4.2.1 Identities of Berlin and Kreuzberg:

In the short time span between the emblematic fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the official unification of the two Berlins and the two Germanies in the October of 1990, more than the physical impediments that had divided the city disappeared. Also gone was the narrative of the Divided City that had organized the lives of Berliners for more than four decades. On October 3rd, Berlin was figuratively inaugurated as a WorldCity. As re-unified Berlin has adapted to the narrative of the metropolis and underwent reconstruction at an extraordinary scale, it has been re-mapped in the image of a *Hauptstadt* of the unified Germany, *Kulturstadt* in a unified Europe, and *Weltstadt* in a cosmopolitan world. New identifications have replaced the old idiosyncratic Berlin stories of a Divided City.

In the new spatial and narrative configuration of the city, Kreuzberg was no longer a desolate margin next to the Wall—a *Gastarbeiter* quarter, where the (Western) City literally met its borders. It has suddenly moved to the center, neighboring the historic *Mitte* (the mid-City) and the Government and Business Centers, under construction along the axis of the new

Potsdamer Platz and Reichstag. With this move, Kreuzberg has become the ceremonial ghetto for the metropolis.

Note that Berlin's current population is about 3.2 million, of which approximately 12 percent are foreigners. Migrants from Turkey comprise the largest and the most visible minority group, nearly 4 percent. Of the Turks in Berlin, 36 percent are between the ages of 10 and 20, a fairly young population, crowding schools, streets, youth centers, work places, as well as unemployment and drop-out statistics. While Turks live and work in other parts of Berlin almost in equal numbers, Kreuzberg is known variously as the "Turkish ghetto" or "Little Istanbul."

In its ghetto guise, Kreuzberg is cast not as a zone of excessive criminality and utmost poverty but one of cultural pluralism and alternative lifestyles. The widely available youth guide, *Berlin for Young People*, for instance, describes the district as a "multicultural mix of peoples, Turks [living] along with students, 'alternatives,' punks, and perfectly normal Berlin families," and "off-movie houses and theaters, wonderfully dingy bars, affordable restaurants and second-hand shops." This vision of Kreuzberg is extremely popular and quasi-official.

Parallel to the reconstruction of Berlin, Kreuzberg has also undergone gentrification and is now facing competition from the "newly" discovered alternative neighborhoods, such as Prenzlauer Berg of the "East." Nonetheless, Kreuzberg remains in the (self-)portrayal of the city as the locus of hip and diversity. What is significant – and consequential– for our purposes is that in the intervening years hipness and diversity have come to identify and edify not just Kreuzberg but the whole Berlin.

Coda 1) In the process, Kreuzberg—and the ghetto narrative—has lost its singular place in the imaginary of the city and become normalized. Now Berlin aspires to be a WorldCity and compete with other WorldCities such as London, New York, and Tokyo. Kreuzberg is its stage for displaying diversity and multicultural flavor and color. Immigrants do have a prominent place in the staging of diversity—hence the charisma and allure of Kreuzberg.

4.2.2 Calendar of Spectacles in Berlin:

The Carnival of Cultures (the multicultural display of diversity) is by all means not the end of the Carnival season for Berlin but signals a beginning. May Day, the annual celebration of working people—and annual day of ritualized fights between the *antifa* youths and the police—precedes the Carnival and in a way opens the carnival season. Then come the Christopher Street Day Parade (one of the earliest and important gay celebration in Europe) and Love Parade (claiming to be the largest public parade in Europe—for the moment), along with a variety of neighborhood and street festivals, and occasional shopping and fashion fests on major avenues such as Ku'Damm.

Every summer for two months Berlin puts itself on display (*Schaustelle Berlin*) as a self-designated Open City (*öffentliche Stadt*) and offers cosmopolitan ambience to its blasé natives and curious visitors. As such, the city itself emulates spectacle and competes with the spectacular performances taking place on its terrain. Museum Insel Festival brings together music stars from around the world to stages set in the space between Alte Museum, History Museum, and Pergamon Museum, while Heimetkloaenge becomes a stage for world music during the summer months.

The fall and winter have their fair share of festivals. First there is the official celebration taking place on the Day of Unification on the 3rd of October every year since 1991. Halloween and “traditional” Pumpkin fests merge into each other towards the end of October. Come November, the Christmas season starts with Christmas Markets and ends with the climactic fireworks, both official in the shadow of Brandenburg Gate and unofficial on every street corner. February is the time of Berlinale, annual movie spectacle with celebrities, prizes, and parties. Berlin’s traditional Carnival in February—a “tradition which has come to life lately—to be exact, with the moving of Germany’s Capital and bureaucratic classes from Bonn to Berlin

Coda 2) As one character says in Tom Schreiber’s film Narren, a poignant reflection on Kölln carnival, there is no end to the carnival. Now life in Berlin is a year-around, non-stop event. Turkish Day Parade is a newly added item to the Parade list, commemorating migration and migrants, and celebrating the friendship of the natives and foreigners.

4.2.3 Spectacle is No Longer Unique:

The fact that it is difficult to distinguish festivals from each other is not just a case of a naming practice perpetuated by travel inserts. Berlin’s contemporary carnivals are hardly local or particular. As the presentations of scholars and practitioners of carnival testify in the symposium on European carnivals, the new spectacles borrow from each other, they mimic each other, and they approximate each other. Unlike performative genres that come to world attention at the time of nation building, the carnivals of today attract attention inasmuch as they resemble other events of their kind in content and form. Nations want their festivals to

be unique; in a globalizing world claim to uniqueness does not necessarily amount to capital—of monetary and symbolic kind.

Coda 3) Today it is possible to assemble these diverse and dissimilar event under the same category, speak of them with the same vocabulary, bring them together in the same imaginary of the spectacle—as shown by the calendar of events assembled above and as done by our interviewees in Berlin. Aforementioned Carnival of Cultures, Noting Hill Carnival, Zineke Festival, and Sommer Carnival all operate with the same premises of diversity and pluralism. In the same vein, Turkish Day is no different than its counterpart in New York, from which the organizers borrowed the form and content of Berlin version. Lacking uniqueness, Turkish Day does not stand out as a national celebration but falls under the fold of multicultural spectacles.

4.2.4 The Politics of Spectacle:

Carnival theory, more often than not, locates the politics of performance in the constitutional elements of the spectacle: Politics emanates from the practice of grotesque, inversion, and wonder. Contemporary spectacle, on the other hand, is successfully elusive in this respect. Its politics is proclaimed as lacking from the outset or reduced to a plasticity that can only be experienced or practiced as an aestheticized cliché.

This new politics of the spectacle is tightly connected to the process of Europeanization. Here Europe is taken as a supranational cultural and political entity, taking shape in the general geography of the Europe Union—and beyond—and shaped by the enfolding realities of regional, national, and global order. As Europe becomes a supranational

entity, existing national identities are increasingly contested and “normalized” (Soysal Nuhoglu 2002) both by emerging notions of “Europeanness” and by the proliferation of regional and minority identities. While European identity claims an encompassing, inclusive formation, regional and minority identities project cultural pluralism within the boundaries of the newly imagined Europe.

It is in this Europe the new spectacle, and its ephemeral politics, is taking shape. It is no coincidence that the goals stated by organizers of new festivals and conveyed to public through carnival slogans and publicity material correlate with the civic virtues and tales of morality the new Europe desires to foster: Understanding, tolerance, and cooperation among peoples within and without Europe. In this sense, the new spectacle becomes an instrument of making the new Europe, contributing to the production of what Chris Shore (2000) identifies as a “European’ sense and sensibility of self” and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soysal (2002) terms as “*affective* Europeanness.” Like cultural policy and education, respectively the sites of realizing Europe in Shore’s and Soysal Nuhoglu’s work, the space of spectacle is yet another site for contention and affirmation of “multi-cultural,” “diverse” Europe. Here on the site of carnival—the site of food, dance, music, and togetherness—the “diverse” peoples of Europe are expected to share and enjoy culture, forge bonds with each other, and “imagine” (Anderson 1991) a new Europe.

Coda 4) In the aestheticized politics of European festivals we discover the longings of Europe for identity, and the banishment of particularisms (Europe’s own particularity included) into the hegemonic realm of the spectacle (form, so to speak), morality, and universalism. Berlin’s spectacles are part of the repertoire of the new spectacles in Europe. Exhibition of immigrant particularities—food, dances, and arts—at the Turkish Day or Carnival of

Cultures serve to exemplify diversity and affirm multiculturalism, rather than being signs of national displacement or isolation. With their festivals, the immigrants join the ranks of the new Europe.

4.2.5 Spectacle is What Makes a City a City:

Since Saskia Sassen's *Global City* (1991), we are more attentive to the fact that the global character of metropolitan centers intensifies at the expense of national configurations. Berlin, London, Rotterdam, Istanbul, and other major urban centers project themselves beyond the nation-state within which they are located. The cities less and less come to prominence by being the capital or industrial hub of a nation-state, say of Germany, United Kingdom, or the Netherlands, and seek their fortunes and fame elsewhere. More and more they fashion themselves as "world" or "global" cities and under tutelage of marketing companies they strive to develop themselves as "brands," as cities of culture, art, fashion, science, sports, and various other forms of entertainment. The brand "European (Culture) City" is one instance of being and projecting an image of a City beyond the conventional geography of local or national import and achieving global stature.

At this juncture, we observe the reorganization of public spaces and the proliferation of carnivals and public spectacles of all sorts in metropolitan centers. Ranging from street festivals, carnivals, and concerts to international conferences, fairs, and sports gatherings, these events have become the identifying features of the contemporary metropolitan order and provide the metropolis with an aura of cultural grandeur and finesse. Olympic Games, for instance, are no longer an arena for "national" (or cold war) rivalry but a stage for literally and figuratively remaking a city a WorldCity.

Coda 5) Spectacles provide the raw material for creating a brand name for the city by catering to contemporary “life styles” and to the demands of media and global travel. At the same time, they aim to facilitate formations of community and solidarity and allow for participation in local, national, and transnational social spaces. Politics and economies of launching public events do not oppose but compliment each other. Immigrant spectacles have become indispensable instruments of making a city a worthy of branding itself WorldCity. For immigrant is categorically the sign of diversity and cosmopolitanism.

4.2.6 Where Have All the Immigrants Gone?

Spectacles such as the Carnival of Cultures, Love Parade, Christopher Day Parade, Turkish Parade, if we take Berlin as our case, signal the advent of a new performance genre, which I referentially call *spectacles of identity*. Employing markers of ethnicity, race, culture, gender, and other particularisms, the spectacles of identity delimit and present *identity groups*, and perform and celebrate *in public* their *cultural specificity* within an imaginary of *diversity*.

The discourses of plurality, on the other hand, intensify the pronunciation and delineation of cultural particularities and ensure the public visibility of the genre. The legitimacy of claims for a distinct cultural identity—and, therefore, the right to be recognized as an identifiably discrete group—lies with the existence and ownership of marked domains of customs, traditions, food, rituals, dances, music, costumes, and other cultural artifacts. Once an identity is legitimated and formalized as distinct, its public performance becomes integral to the social movement(s) that embrace and cultivate that particular identity. The vocabulary and activity routines of social movement(s), in turn, put the identity spectacle on public

stages, progressively magnifying its visibility and negotiating its cultural content.

Thus, we have Turkish culture and its performances by Turkish immigrants reigning on the stages of multiculturalism in Berlin. However, once they reach the stage and multiply, they get normalized within the elusive discursive spaces of Europeanness. The signs and signatures of uniqueness get captivated in the sameness of the spectacles that celebrate universalized diversities.

Coda 6) Immigrant cultures—performed as identity spectacles—are neither absent from the social and cultural spaces of diversity in Berlin. Nor they are sanctioned to be visible as distinctly different. This seeming paradox is ingrained in the working definition and moral content of diversity displays as universally imagined and performed today.

5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

I have taken up this research because of an interest in the participation of immigrants in their countries of residence. At the early stages of the immigration to Europe emphasis on matters of labor overshadowed any concern—scientific or otherwise—regarding the daily lives of immigrants. With the cultural turn, immigrant has entered the imaginary of Europe as a human being with cultural needs and rights. Even then, under the clouds of raging integration debates, the participation of immigrants in the everyday economies and politics has been largely overlooked, if not ignored.

The findings of this research clearly show that immigrants have long been participants in the public spaces of Berlin, the self-designated Open City, with a large Turkish population and self-declared policy of multiculturalism. At the Carnival of Cultures and May Day Parade immigrants have been regular participants as audiences and performers. It is impossible to think May Day Parade and the Carnival of Cultures without the involvement and contribution of substantively large groups of immigrants. Then there are numerous small events and performances staged by immigrants in the informal cultural scenes of Berlin. With the now annual Turkish Day parade, Turkish immigrants have managed to produce their own spectacles, however small and unprofessional, in the likeness of ethnic parades staged in other metropolitan centers such as New York City. They are requisite fixtures of—and immanently featured on—the stages of diversity, tolerance, and solidarity in the WorldCity Berlin.

This project has also emerged from a concern regarding the changing meanings public spectacles and performance of identity within the new cultural topography of the metropolis. The task has been to delineate the affinities of Europeanization with the burgeoning urban

festivals and carnivals, interrogate the policies and processes that lead to the proliferation of urban spectacle, and map out the contours of the newly emerging expressive culture of the contemporary metropolis.

The larger research I have undertaken firmly indicates that public spectacle underwrites the re-organization of public spaces and the metropolitan order. Cities are now unthinkable without a large body of spectacles. The totality of these events constitute the cultural fabric of the contemporary metropolis, set the stage for much creative industries, and often aim to facilitate formations of community and solidarity within the framework of diversity. In this process City has become a novel spectacle in its own right. In the new metropolitan order, the city itself emulates spectacle and competes with the spectacular performances taking place on its terrain. With its stupendous architectural monuments designed by brand name architects, diversity displays that duly commemorate metropolitan plurality, and renovated (and scaled up) living spaces and designer lifestyles, the city today offers cosmopolitan ambience to its blasé natives and curious visitors.

In this City, organizing a Turkish Day in Berlin is not a sign of displacement but of civic participation. For the norm for participation is the spectacle and the contemporary urban spectacle articulates the commanding discourses of our times. Hence, in the new city what is expected of the citizen is to take part in the spectacle, contribute to it by displaying their culture, and enjoy the cultural proceeds that materialize. Through Turkish Day, and various public spectacles they stage and take part in, Turkish immigrants do exactly that: contribute to the new formations of culture in the metropolis. Whether they are audiences in Karneval der Kulturen or active participants in Turkish Day, their presence on the city stages is an asset for

diversity displays that make the city a proper city. In other words, their involvement contributes to the making of Berlin a cosmopolitan metropolis and WorldCity.

These findings have serious implications for the ways the local or national governments approach integration. Still under the spell of conventional immigration models that take national as the primary determinant, officials, activists, and social workers responsible for devising immigration and integration policies dutifully search for immigrant cultures that lie elsewhere, in home countries and villages located away from the amenities and imaginary of modernity. They do not entertain the idea that immigrants may very well be adjusted to living in and have the competencies for shaping the life of a contemporary metropolis after four decades of praxis as residents of Berlin, Germany.

Consequently policies devised for integration ignore the already existing integration and get embroiled in heated debates on superfluous parallel societies, immigrant ghettos. The time is ripe for new beginnings and recognizing immigrant populations for what they are: civic participants in the everyday economies, politics, and public stages of the new Metropolis.

WorldCity is inconceivable without their presence and participation. Only then immigrant integration becomes a policy field for advancing the immigrants' quality of life with novel approaches, rather than a quagmire of endless argumentation over abstract, categorical differences between East and West, tradition and modernity, and Turkishness and Germanness.

6. REFERENCES AND NOTES

6.1 Notes:

Section II/Literature Review

[1] The term “foreigner” refers to persons belonging to a wide array of differentially organized membership categories, including third-country (non-European Union) citizens, European citizens (holding citizenship in a country other than their host country), asylum seekers, dual citizens, holders of various temporary and permanent residency permits, and illegal aliens. Surely, not all foreigners are equal.]

[2] See the official website of Turkish Ministry of Labor at http://www.csgeb.gov.tr/birimler/yih/istatistik/sayisal_bilgiler.htm.

[3] In her *Limits of Citizenship*, Soysal Nuhoglu defines incorporation as “a process whereby a guestworker population becomes a part of the polity of the host country,” independently of the degree of the individual migrant’s adaptation “to the life patterns of the host society” (1994: 30). In this sense, incorporation is different than integration and assimilation—the other two terms widely used in immigration debates and research. Furthermore, the incorporation of migrants is primarily dependent on host country structures and institutions and world-level universalistic discourses of personhood and human rights—not to “home” country culture and traditions as commonly asserted.

[4] In the last two decades, there has been an explosion in migration studies, covering all continents of the world and focusing on numerous ethnic groups, their movements and cultures. Among this corpus, the literature devoted to studying Turks in Europe is rather significant both in terms of its topical and theoretical expanse and representativeness of the field. See the selected bibliography of this essay for a sample of studies on migration, culture, and identity regarding Turks in Europe, with varying degrees of emphasis on, and analytical significance attributed to, culture.

[5] See *Die Zeit* (1 February 2006 and 2 February 2006) at <http://zeus.zeit.de/>.

6.2 Select Bibliography

The larger research is interdisciplinary in nature and derives its theoretical inspiration from recent scholarship spanning many disciplines, in particular work on globalization, performance and expressive cultures, immigration, and space and urban theory. The following list includes a select bibliography of works that frame the theoretical premises of the larger research, a representative sample of the literature on Turkish immigration to Germany, as well as references cited in the report.

Abadan-Unat, Nermin, ed. 1975. *Turkish Workers in Europe, 1960-1975: A Socio-Economic Reappraisal*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Adelson, Leslie. 2005. *The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature: Toward a New Critical Grammar of Migration*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Argun, Betigul Ercan. 2003. *Turkey in Germany: The Transnational Sphere of Deutschkei*. New York: Routledge.

Bade, Klaus, and Myron Weiner, eds. 1997. *Migration Past, Migration Future: Germany and the United States*. Providence: Berghahn Books.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller and Cristina Szanton Blanc. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Trans national Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Langhorne, Pennsylvania: Gordon and Breach.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Beeman, William O. 1993. The Anthropology of Theater and Spectacle. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22: 369-393.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2004. *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton University Press.

Berger, John. 1975. *A Seventh Man: A Book of Images and Words about the Experience of Migrant Workers in Europe*. Baltimore: Penguin.

Boissevain, Jeremy, ed. 1992. *Revitalizing European Rituals*. London: Routledge.

Borneman, John, and Nick Fowler. 1997. Europeanization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 487-514.

Brubaker, William Rogers, ed. 1989. *Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Caglar, Ayse S. and Levent Soysal. 2003. Introduction: Turkish migration to Germany—forty years after. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 28-29: 1-18.

Carter, Donald Martin. 1997. *States of Grace: Senegalese in Italy and the New European Immigration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Castles, Stephen and Godula Kosack. 1973. *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe*. London: Oxford University Press.

Castles, Stephen, and Mark J. Miller. 1998. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Second edition. New York: The Guilford Press.

Chambers, Iain. 1994. *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London: Routledge.

Chaney, David. 1993. *Fictions of Collective Life: Public Drama in Late Modern Culture*. London: Routledge.

Cohen, Stanley. 1980. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of Mods and Rockers*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cohen, Abner. 1993. *Masquerade Politics: Explorations in the Structure of Urban Cultural Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eickelman, Dale F., and James Piscatori, eds. 1990. *Muslim Travelers: Pilgrimage, Migration, and the Religious Imagination*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

George, Kenneth M. 1996. *Showing the Signs of Violence: The Cultural Politics of a Twentieth-Century Headhunting Ritual*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goddard, Victoria A., Josep R. Llobera, and Cris Shore, eds. 1994. *The Anthropology of Europe: Identity and Boundaries in Conflict*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Goehler, Adrienne. 2006. *Verfluessigungen: Wege un Umwege vom Sozialstaat zu Kultargesellschaft*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Gupta, Akil, and James Ferguson, eds. 1997. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Handelman, Don. 1990. *Models and Mirrors: Toward and Anthropology of Public Events*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. New York: Routledge.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, David, and Eva Kolinsky, eds. 1996. *Turkish Culture in German Society Today*. Providence, Rhode Island: Berghahn Books.

Jelavich, Peter. 1993. *Berlin Cabaret*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kaplan, Temma. 1992. *Red City, Blue Period: Social Movements in Picasso's Barcelona*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kastoryano, Riva. 1986. *Être Turc en France: Réflexions et Communauté*. Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

2003. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kaya, Ayhan. 2001. "Sicher in Kreuzberg": *Constructing Diasporas. Turkish Hip-Hop Youth in Berlin*. Berlin: Transcript Verlag.

Klopp, Brett. 2002. *German Multiculturalism: Immigrant Integration and the Transformation of Citizenship*. London: Praeger.

Kramer, Jane. 1996. *The Politics of Memory: Looking for Germany in the New Germany*. New York: Random House.

Ladd, Brian. 1997. *The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mandel, Ruth. 1996. A Place of Their Own: Contesting Spaces and Defining Places in Berlin's Migrant Community. In Barbara Daly Metcalf, ed. *Making Muslim Space in North America and Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Marcus, George E. 1998. *Ethnography through Thick & Thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marcus, George E., and Michael M. J. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as a Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moore, Sally F., and Barbara G. Myerhoff, eds. 1977. *Secular Ritual*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

Morokvasic, Mirjana. 1984. Birds of Passage Are Also Women . . . , *International Migration Review* 18.

Muenz, Rainer and Ralf Ulrich. 1997. Changing Patterns of Immigration to Germany, 1945-1995. In Rainer Muenz and Myron Weiner, eds. *Migrants, Refugees, and Foreign Policy: U.S. and German Policies toward Countries of Origin*. Providence: Berghahn Books.

Richie, Alexandra. 1998. *Faust's Metropolis: A History of Berlin*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers.

Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: New Press.

Schiffauer, Werner. 1987. *Die Bauern von Subay: das Leben in einem Tuerkischen Dorf*. Stuttgart: Kleff-Cotta.

Schiffauer, Werner, Gerd Bauman, Riva Kastoryano and Steven Vertovec, eds. 2004. *Civil Enculturation: Nation-State, School and Ethnic Difference in the Netherlands, Britain, Germany and France*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Shore, Chris. 2000. *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.

Soekefeld, Martin, ed. 2004. *Jenseits des Paradigmas kultureller Differenz: Neue Perspektiven auf Einwanderer aus der Türkei*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

SOPEMI 2004. German Report on International Migration (written by Barbara Froechich).

Soysal Nuhoglu, Yasemin. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1997. Changing Parameters of Citizenship and Claims-Making: Organized Islam in European Public Spheres. *Theory and Society* 26: 509-527.

2000. Citizenship and identity: living in diasporas in post-war Europe?' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1: 1-15.

2002. Locating Europe. *European Societies* 4(3): 265-284.

Soysal, Levent. 2001. Diversity of Experience, Experience of Diversity: Turkish Migrant Youth Culture in Berlin. *Cultural Dynamics* 13(1): 5-28.

2002. Beyond 'Second Generation': Rethinking the Place of Migrant Youth Culture in Berlin. In Daniel Levy and Yfaat Weiss, eds. *Challenging Ethnic Citizenship: German and Israeli Perspectives on Immigration*. New York: Berghahn Books.

2004. Rap, HipHop, and Kreuzberg: The Institutional Topography of Migrant Youth Culture in the WorldCity Berlin. *New German Critique* 92: 62-81.

Sen, Faruk and Andreas Goldberg. 1994. *Türken in Deutschland: Leben zwischen zwei Kulturen*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck.

Tertilt, Hermann. 1996. *Turkish Power Boys: Ethnographie einer Jugendbande*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Turner, Victor W. 1987. *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications.

Wallraff, Guenter. 1985. *Ganz unten*. Koeln: Verlag Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Werbner, Pnina, and Tariq Modood, eds. 1997. *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community*. London: Zen Books.

White, Jenny. 1997. Turks in the New Germany. *American Anthropologist* 99: 754-769.

Wikan, Unni. 2002. *Generous Betrayal: Politics of Culture in the New Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willis, Paul. 1990. *Common Culture: Symbolic Work at Play in Everyday Cultures of the Young*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Wolbert, Barbara. 1995. *Der getoetete Pass: Rueckkehr in die Tuerkei*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.