

Booth and Cole on Chin

Minority Literature and the Discourse of Integration: The Case of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* in the 1970s and 1980s West Germany”

Chin offers a nuanced and interesting case study of initiatives aimed at integrating “guest workers” in West Germany in the 1970s-80s. In particular, the article analyzes the genesis, development, and significance of the important Munich Institute.

The Institute was established in 1978. Associated with the University of Munich, and drawing on funding from the German Academic Exchange and the Goethe Institute, it represented an important effort on the part of the German academic establishment to come to terms with the reality of long-term immigrant communities. The Institute broke new ground by integrating the study of German as a second language with literary expression by non-Germans. The leadership of the Institute conceived of integration as a dialogue: immigrants, by writing in German, would take an active, creative role in the culture of their host country at the same time that the German reading public would be able to appreciate the diversity within its midst and be the better for it.

As Chin describes, the Institute played a prominent role in a broader integration effort. In particular, it accomplished this aim through a series of influential anthologies put out by major publishing houses, and by the establishment in 1985 of the Chamisso Prize for literary efforts in German written by non-native speakers. Awards went to writers with diverse backgrounds, styles, and views regarding the place of foreigners and the desirability and mode of integration. Overall, however, the prize honored literary expressions of “linguistic hybridity and divided identities” and it promoted these “liminal” figures as spokespeople for the integration effort. Chin is careful to trace the ambiguities and complexities of the institutionalization of immigrant literature. At some level the prize legitimated the binary pair of suffering immigrant writer and empathetic German reader. The authors’ works embodied a German-Other distinction at the same time that they dissolved it. In the judgment of Institute academic director Irmgard Ackermann, foreigner literature constituted “an exceptional document of integration” in both the linguistic and cultural senses. The integration project, as Chin notes, was ultimately limited. The Institute’s work did offer individual writers notoriety; it also granted institutional recognition of the cultural work of for-

eigners. But contemporary citizenship laws excluded virtually all foreigners from full participation in German society.

Chin makes a convincing argument that debate on integration in Germany is not novel but rather "as old as labor migration itself." She places the case study within the context of the 1970s when intellectuals and political parties grasped the irreversible nature of what they had previously described as the temporary residence of "guest workers." The ruling Social Democrats, in particular, defined integration as an accommodation on the part of both German society and immigrant populations.

This fine case study reminds us that western European governments have long espoused official policies (as diverse as they might be) of integration with regard to immigrant populations. It also makes us think of the ongoing and important cultural production by immigrants and their children elsewhere in Europe, such as "beur" writing and music in France, Cape Verdean music in Portugal, and Reggae, hip hop, and other musical forms in England. How does the German case compare and contrast other European examples? In her discussion of Deleuze and Guattari's views of the characteristics of what they label "minor literature," Chin does acknowledge a broader debate on immigrant and minority literature. These authors note that immigrant and minority writers can jostle received assumptions regarding language, culture, and populations. But she rightly rejects their sweeping generalizations regarding the radical potential of immigrant literature. The comparative potential of the Institute, however, hinges not on immigrant or minority writers per se but rather on their state-sponsored legitimization through prizes, scholarships, subventions, and the like. Considering the case of the Institute, it would be interesting to learn (1) to what extent other governments have, and have not, promoted integration through the institutional valorization of art and (2) what patterns, if any, emerge from different state policies and cultural traditions.

Chin on Christou

Narrating the Ethnography of Return: Interdisciplinary Contributions to Migration Research

In her interesting paper, Christou asks us to consider a key topic that has received relatively little attention in the emerging field of migration studies: return migration. This phenomenon, she points out, is particularly crucial because it illuminates the relationship between identity ("who I am") and place ("where I am"). Arguing for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of migration, she also asserts that these components of belonging must be seen as social constructions which are contingent on specific historical, social, political, and geographical contexts. She presents a portion of her research based on interviews with second-generation, Greek-American return migrants, emphasizing a "life history" approach that foregrounds their own voices. Christou's paper raises a number of very important questions for scholars of migration, which I want to suggest can be roughly clustered around three narrative categories that emerge from her interviews—"home," "identity" (or self), and "return."

For anyone interested in the experience of migration, the concept of "home" is absolutely central. "Home" is the trope invoked to describe what is being left at the moment of emigration, what is missed or longed for in migration, and what is sought after through return migration. But precisely because of its ubiquity, it is worth thinking more carefully about this term. The meaning of "home" is never stable; its specific contours change over the cycle of migration. Similarly, groups rarely share the same conception of "home"; the ideas about "home" differ from person to person, and context to context. One way to get at the complexities of "home" is to think about the differences between "where you hang your hat" (that is, the physical location where one works or happens to be) and "where your heart is" (that is, a place of emotional attachment). For a temporary migrant worker, this distinction may be relatively straightforward, but for a refugee, the current place of residence may provide more of a feeling of being "at home" even though it lacks the sentimental attachments of the homeland. It is important, then, to differentiate between being "home" and "at home," and consider the ways in which these states relate to one another.

The question of identity is also a central concern for students of the social and cultural aspects of migration. If we proceed from an understanding of identities as perpetually in flux, in the process of being constructed, and determined by context, our task really lies in showing multiple, shifting identities in action-how they work and develop. One way to begin, as Christou suggests, is to look at the intersection of identity and place. In what way does a migrant's sense of self and belonging change as s/he moves across borders? In what specific ways do those identities conform to or refuse traditional nation-state affiliations? And according to what logics or particular social/economic/political contexts can we explain these transformations?

Into this mix, Christou's paper introduces the return phase as a significant but often overlooked aspect of migration. If return is a key component of the migration cycle, it is necessary to make some contextual distinctions. Migrant workers who leave home for a specific job often plan to come home after just a few years abroad. By contrast, immigrants who seek to make a better life for themselves generally leave their homelands with the intention of permanent relocation, but sometimes decide to come back after their children are grown and they have retired. The impetus for leaving often affects the conditions of return, which not only include the length of time between migrations but also the process of readjustment to the homeland. In her discussion of return, Christou further alludes to the fact that the male and female partners of several married couples in her study initially had different attitudes about moving to Greece. This interesting tidbit seems worth exploring in order to trace the ways in which diasporic situations are gendered.

These three issues are even more complicated for the specific group that Christou explores. Second-generation immigrants who return to their ancestral homeland force us to rethink our definitions of "home," "identity," and "return." Christou's interviewees seem to associate "home" unequivocally with Greece, but I wonder how they make sense of their U.S. birthplace. Does the U.S. also constitute a "home" for the return migrants, and if so, how is it understood in relation to Greece? Christou's subjects state that they "rediscover" their "true" identities upon their return to their parents' homeland. This suggests a kind of completion, as if their identities in the U.S. had been incomplete or disjointed. In what specific ways do these return migrants experience a fragmenting or splitting of their "Greek" and "American" identities while they

are in the U.S.? What happens to their "American" identities once they return to Greece? If these identifications do not correspond to nation-state affiliation or citizenship, how do they complicate our understanding of the relationship between being "home" and "at home"? As second-generation Greek-Americans, Christou's return migrants underscore the different modalities of "return." Given that her subjects primarily experienced Greece and Greek culture through short-term visits and interactions with family, return to this homeland appears to be an attempt to realize (make real) idealized experiences relayed by their parents or an abstract notion of "culture, history, music, food, and archaeology." If "going home" requires a reworking of established relationships (between self and community, men and women, husbands and wives, parents and children), it seems crucial to include more detailed information and descriptions of the return migrants themselves and the personal, social, and economic conditions that shape them.

Finally, I believe that Christou's paper would benefit by attempting to integrate the theoretical discussion with the primary sources and interview evidence. As it stands now, the paper covers a number of contemporary debates in ethnographic methodology, but this section remains distinct from the core of the essay—the interviews that she conducts with second-generation return migrants. I would encourage Christou to think more carefully about where the methodological debates surface in her interview transcripts. This, in turn, would help the reader to see how her ethnographic research complicates and pushes forward the debates.

Christou on Dragostinova

The Voluntary and Reciprocal Population Exchange between Bulgaria and Greece in the Interwar Period: Some Issues of Interpretive Reciprocity”

The paper begins with a brief introductory part providing essential historical data and archival information concerning the Bulgarian-Greek population exchange. Theoretical and interpretative observations follow which culminate with governmental concerns and the diplomatic rhetoric. Subsequently, the advocacy discourse and the divergence in rhetoric are presented which concludes the discussion.

The importance of the Bulgarian-Greek convention and its smooth implementation not only for the states involved but as a landmark agreement demonstrating the viability of population management has not received the necessary attention by scholars in Greece, Europe and elsewhere. Theodora Dragostinova's study is indeed a welcome addition to the literature and international bibliography on ethnic and migration issues. The case is revealing of both ethnic politics as well as national identities. Furthermore it can be an illustrative examination of notions of home and belonging, inclusion and exclusion. The researcher has conducted research using a comparative methodology in both Bulgarian and Greek archives and refers to problems encountered. Essential works are identified in the bibliography. One of the many important contributions of Dragostinova's paper is her application of a *reciprocal manner* and the notion of *interpretive reciprocity* which exemplifies a multi-layered and multi-dimensional investigation as well as interrogation of the many diverging points of view within the archives. Moreover, the invocation of an "experiential history" emphasizes human agency and allows for the questioning of the limits of individual choice in so far as possible manipulative actions of historical reality can arise. Dragostinova's exploration of the Bulgarian-Greek exchange as one with unique characteristics of smooth and non-sensational developments that highlights deeper understandings of the dialectic between structure and agency should be viewed as an enlightening exploration of complex interrelationships that involve and revolve around a multiplicity of concepts, actors and structures. Nation-states, national identities, territories, citizens, governments, immigrants, refugees, etc., to name but a few of those concepts and issues paid attention to by the researcher. In conclusion, I find Dragostinova's paper to be an extremely interesting and challenging study that raises many questions and questions many otherwise unquestionable issues.

Pécoud on Gastaut

L'émergence du 'souci' de l'immigration en France à travers les sondages (années 80)

The paper investigates of the importance of the 'immigration' issue in French opinion polls during the last four decades. It briefly discusses the relevance of opinion polls

as a tool to analyse historical processes. While they usefully indicate the beliefs and thoughts of the whole population (and not only of its elite), they are nevertheless strongly influenced by the way the public opinion is shaped. Indeed, the very existence of opinion polls and their organisation determine, to a certain extent, the answers, and so do the media or the political discourses. As a matter of fact, opinion polls themselves are a socially revealing facts since their existence and influence are relatively recent. The issue is therefore whether or not opinion polls represent 'true' opinions or, rather, socially, culturally and politically 'constructed' opinions.

After these methodological considerations, the paper provides a close analysis of opinion polls. This analysis reveals that issues linked to immigration were almost totally absent from opinion polls in the sixties and the seventies. In those years, crucial issues were mostly personal (standard of living, health, children's education, and so on) and did not concern major social or political matters (except for the war in Algeria). The absence of immigration is not surprising given the neat separation between natives and immigrant workers in the early times of labour immigration to Western Europe and the dominant belief according to which immigrants were to eventually leave the country.

Immigration became a political issue at the beginning of the eighties, reaching a first peak in the 1983-1985 years. Accordingly, opinion polls started to show that people were concerned by the number of immigrants living in the country. Racism and the fight against it also became a hot topic in 1990. However, the first preoccupation in the French public opinion remained by far (un)employment. Immigration came behind, along with topic such as social inequalities and the health of the economy.

This analysis thus shows that, to a large extent, employment issues were seen as connected to immigration issues. Solutions to the unemployment crisis were thought to solve immigration problems as well. It also shows that opinion polls are influenced by major political events. Those were notably, in the mid-eighties, the simultaneous emergence of North African immigrants' political claims and the National Front racist political campaigns and, in the early nineties, the headscarf affairs as well as the Gulf War.

One of the questions one might be tempted to ask to opinion polls is 'how right are they?'. The connection that is systematically made between employment and immigration issues is for example quite accurate: research has indeed often stressed that

the sensitivity to immigrants' presence is fostered by economic insecurity. In this respect, it would seem that the French population is right in assuming that the two 'problems' are interrelated. Whereas it is frequently argued that common people's opinions are social constructions and 'wrong' interpretations of reality, this analysis may, on the contrary, show that common sense is partly right.

Another striking fact in this analysis is the total absence of 'culture'. It has indeed become obvious that immigrants' presence is disturbing not only for economic reasons but also because they represent a threat to social cohesion and to the cultural homogeneity of Western societies. Islam in particular is seen as jeopardising the very foundations of 'Western civilisation'. This concern does not appear: does it mean that it does not exist or that polls did not enable it to be expressed? Similarly, concerns about 'security' (that have become unpleasantly overwhelming in contemporary France) do not seem to emerge in the analysis.

It thus seems that, while the connection between immigration and employment is grounded, immigration is almost exclusively perceived as an economic matter. This is somewhat logical since nearly all policy-makers have had the same economic look at immigrants, who were understood mostly as a source of labour. But it remains strange to see that other connections – immigration and culture, or immigration and security – were not made. This would indicate that opinion polls replicate the dominant political vision, and do not allow other perceptions to emerge.

Greenwald on Hegner

Russian Jewish Migrants in Berlin and in Chicago: A Comparative Study

Victoria Hegner's prospectus presents important research on the experiences of Russian-Jewish émigrés in Germany and the United States. Her work proposes that different legal and cultural ideas of citizenship and integration in Germany and the United States produce diverging forms of acculturation. In general, Hegner argues, "cultural homogenization" is not governed by processes that are easily categorized universally; rather, acculturation varies instead according to the social and political context of the site of immigration.

In Germany, memories of the Shoah, as well local conceptions of ethnicity and nationality have a strong effect on the Russian-Jewish immigrant experience. Migration laws passed in the 1990s granted Soviet Jews the right to permanent residence in Germany and therefore served both as a form of reparation and a symbol of the “*new Germany*.” Accordingly, this immigration policy is designed to create a new, distinctly Jewish community. The *Einheitsgemeinde*, the first German-Jewish organization created after the Second World War, expects these immigrants to be Jews according to *Halacha*, orthodox religious law. Immigrants who do not fit this definition are not served by the new migration laws of the 1990s. Although the *Einheitsgemeinde* attempts to represent the German-Jewish community with one voice, many Russian immigrants have formed dissenting associations that oppose the *Einheitsgemeinde*’s emphasis on complete assimilation into *its* definition of German-Jewish culture. While these organizations do emphasize a standardized definition of Jewishness, Hegner’s research indicates they prefer to base this definition on an eastern European or Russian Jewish culture that is, in theory, not tainted by a direct relationship to the Shoah.

Unlike the Russian-Jewish community in Berlin, its Chicago counterpart is decentralized and recognizes multiple definitions of Jewishness. The more than 120 self-identified Jewish communities there reflect the American discourse of equality within diversity: it is possible to identify oneself as religiously or ethnically Jewish without the approval of American orthodox congregations. In addition to the wide-ranging definitions of Jewishness, Chicago’s Jewish population itself is heterogeneous in its origins. While eighty-five to ninety-five percent of Berlin’s Jews are Russian émigrés, only ten to fifteen percent of Chicago’s are from the former Soviet Union. Thus, although the legal basis for Russian-Jewish immigration to the United States is similar to Germany’s — memory of the Shoah and the exigencies of the Cold War —the process of acculturation in the States offers a wider range of possibilities for creating a new identity. For example, there is less pressure in Chicago than in Berlin to shed previous identities and conform to halachic practice. While some immigrants join Hasidic congregations and make a concerted effort to distance themselves from American society, others make an equally strong effort to find their own niche as new Americans. Hegner suggests that there is less need in the American Russian-Jewish community to distinguish Jewish culture from the host culture.

“Soviet Jewish Migrants in Berlin and Chicago” is a good beginning to an important book-length manuscript, but I do have some suggestions: In addition to moving her description of her research parameters toward the beginning of the paper, I would also like Hegner to focus more on the different roles she played as anthropologist in Berlin and Chicago. She makes a point of noting that immigrants in Berlin projected their fears of Jewish life in Germany onto her as they tried to negotiate their own individual identities in the face of socially prescribed roles; in addition, she recognizes that there is an inherent hierarchy in her relationship to the Berlin immigrants since Hegner has citizenship, while Russian-Jewish immigrants have only residency status. U.S. citizens in Chicago, on the other hand, identified Hegner as a representative of the “land of the persecutor” that was changing for the better and thus allowing for foreign redefinitions of German identity. Although Hegner begins to address the different responses of her subjects to her over the course of her field work, I would like to her to reflect more on how her position as German citizen influences the data she gathered. How does the relationship of Russian-Jewish immigrants to their guest reflect or perhaps even influence their ideas about the immigration experience and their definition of citizenship, nationality, and religious identity?

Hegner on Lomsky-Feder/ Rapoport

Recollection and Relocation in Immigration: Russian-Jewish Immigrants „Normalize“ Their Anti-Semitic Experiences

The paper by Tamar Rapoport, Edna Lomsky-Feder and Angelika Heider focuses on Russian Jewish immigrants` representations of the past as a way to resist anticipated ideas of the legitimate newcomers` self understanding and to thus open the scope of grand narratives that structure Jewish identity as well as the political self-allocation of the country of residence. The three authors concentrate on the grand narrative of anti-Semitism and the immigrants` strategy to “normalize” their experiences of discriminations against them as Jews. By analyzing a sample of interviews with immigrants who either settled down in Israel or Germany in the early 1990s, the sociological study provides an illuminating comparative perspective on biographical narratives through which immigrants not least establish the legitimacy of their own life history

and cultural capital. In this context the study portrays the *resourcefulness* and *flexibility* of the cultural schemes and interpretative models that immigrants bring into play when finding their way into the new society.

To bring about the openness to as well as the dynamics of social, political and moral formula of immigrants, the researchers used a interview method which was rather unstructured and in-depth and thus in itself flexible enough to provide time and space for spontaneous, sometimes by the interviewer unexpected thoughts or narratives. Hence, interviewees never specifically asked to recall anti-Semitic experiences – the interviewees themselves provided those stories while telling their biography.

In the first part of the paper, Tamar Rapoport, Edna Lomsky-Feder and Angelika Heider define four key stories through which Russian Jewish immigrants tell their anti-Semitic experiences. There, the authors emphasize, that re-collections of discriminations against oneself as a Jew are not core narratives and do not shape the personal immigration history in all respects.

The *first* typified *key story* complies with the grand narrative of anti-Semitism. Hence, the interviewee describes and outlines how the anti-Semitic experiences in Russia changed his life and made him want to leave the country. The three other key stories rather deconstruct and even refuse the grand narrative of anti-Semitism and portray experiences of discrimination as a Jew as secondary in life and certainly not as something that made oneself suffer or wish to immigrate. By defining only *one* key story that reproduces the grand narrative, but *three* which refuse the latter in one way or the other, the authors point to the fact, that the majority of Russian Jewish newcomers resist the normativity to conceptualize anti-Semitic experiences in the past as something traumatizing and humiliating and thus as a decisive element of Jewish self understanding. Within the analysis of those key stories the reader is given the chance to listen extensively to the interviewees' own voices. Through this kind of refreshing balance between the narratives of Russian Jewish immigrants and the researchers' analytical comments one gains a very personalized and vividly detailed insight into the migration process.

The second part of the paper draws attention to the tactics of "normalization". There, Tamar Rapoport, Edna Lomsky-Feder and Angelika Heider describe four ways of Russian Jewish immigrants in Israel and Germany to neutralize and deactivate the importance of anti-Semitism within their own life history.

The first way of normalization is defined as *obscuring*. It describes the attempt to disguise and doubt the occurrence of anti-Semitism. There, Russian Jewish immigrants provide a rather contradictory tale on personal experiences of discrimination against them as a Jew or express a general sense of danger but do not reflect upon it as an outcome of the social and cultural context they were living in. Sometimes interviewees “normalize” their anti-Semitic experiences by saying that is difficult to say whether discrimination derived from anti-Semitic sentiments or simply antipathy. The authors define the other forms to neutralize anti-Semitism geared against oneself as *self-exclusion* (“It happened to others and not to me”), *vindication* (“They did not know any better”) and *essentializing stigma* (“I carry my face with me”). Especially with the analysis of the last tactic, which includes forms of self-hatred, the researchers show clearly that “normalizing” and devaluing the importance of anti-Semitism do not coincide with no or hardly any Jewish self-understanding. On the contrary, Ela, who never wished to be a Jew but sees herself never pass as a non-Jew because the stigma symbol is engraved in her body, developed a strong Jewish self-understanding and became a member of a national-religious group in Israel. There, she separates her anti-Semitic experiences strictly from her understanding of Judaism.

The study fascinates by the way it portrays Russian Jewish immigrants as politicized members of the “new” society who challenge collective memory and national identity and thus contribute intensively to the discourse on Jewishness within the new societal context. There, the study differs decisively from other researches on Russian Jewish immigration which describe newcomers of the 1990s in terms of their “little Jewish self-understanding” and “difficulties of acculturation” and which are often written in a style of “handbook” for “finding a way to successful integration” and do not go beyond that kind of socio-political rhetoric. Hence, the sociological study by Tamar Rapoport, Edna Lomsky-Feder and Angelika Heider is an important contribution to the still underdeveloped discourse on Russian Jewish immigration.

By focusing in their research on two countries, which differ immensely in their history as a land of immigration and in their relationship towards Jewish people, the authors break a still new ground of systematic comparison in the field of *qualitative* and very time consuming social research. However, in this particular study, one gains the impression of an imbalance between voices from Russian Jewish immigrants in Israel and Germany. When defining the *four key stories* on anti-Semitic experiences *three*

immigrants in Israel but only *one* from Germany are portrayed. Ofer, a Russian Jewish immigrant, who now resides in Israel, has lived in Germany. Still, the transition must have shaped his narrative, personal stories and re-collections – is he a voice from Israel or Germany, or both ... In the second part, which analyzes the tactics of “normalization”, it is sometimes not clear, whether the reader is listening to a voice from Germany or Israel (Mark, Sasha, Maja). If there would have been more clarification the reader could easier follow the final conclusion that there are hardly any differences between the country when it comes to the way Russian Jews re-formulate and thus challenge the grand narrative of anti-Semitism.

All in all “Recollection and Relocation in Immigration: Russian-Jewish Immigrants „Normalize“ Their Anti-Semitic Experiences” is a solid qualitative study which challenges ideas on immigration and Jewishness and fosters further discussions in this field of study.

Lomsky-Feder/Rapoport on Mihaylova

How Pomaks from South Eastern Bulgaria cross borders: Nesting transnationalism and migration

Mihaylova’s study is about the Pomaks – a Muslim religious minority from South Eastern Bulgaria. Embarking from this case study, she discusses the linkage between the loosening of national borders, the constitution of identity frontiers, and immigration. Studying the Pomaks enables Mihaylova to deal with major anthropological issues concerning movement and transnationalism, ethnic identity, and national belonging. Exploring the Pomaks she unveils identity shifts and struggles in the wake of the fall of the Iron Curtain. This political transformation loosens the borders in the Balkans. Mihaylova is especially interested in how the loosening of borders between Bulgaria and Greece is manifested in the establishment of cross-national contacts and movements, as well as in the construction of ethnic networks and identity. Her analysis shows how these macro processes have implications on the re-making of identity and on the opening of new opportunities for immigration, but not in the “expected” directions. Listening to and observing the Pomaks who stayed “at home” and following their movement in time and space both inside and outside Bulgaria, Mihay-

lova discusses the subjective and collective meanings of both domestic transition and border-crossing movements. She offers a multi-layered explanation to these sometimes contradictory movements: historical and economical, cultural and contextual.

Mihaylova's analysis focuses on the manner in which state national policies and antagonistic developments in the Balkan's nationalisms weaken ethnic identification and hinder the re-establishment of networks and links across borders to a point of no return. In my case, she says, while arguing with the anthropology of borderlands and transnational literature, I do not find cross-border hybridisation of identity or the evolvment of common ethnic identity, but rather inter-ethnic engagement in distinction making across the two sides of the border. Loosening of cross-national movement, Mihaylova claims, does not necessarily produce transnationalism. The Pomaks tend to escape the ethnic stereotyping in the Balkan countries by immigration to the West. They are not transnationals.

This is most probably the case of other groups too. In the case of the Russian Jewish immigration to Israel that we have explored, escaping ethnic stereotyping in the native home entails the paradoxical movement of homecoming in a transnational era. The spatial gathering of indigenous Jewish Israelis and Russian Jews in Israel availed by the fall of the same Iron Curtain, entails the emergence of mutual stereotypes between locals and newcomers within one ethnic group. In our case as well as in Mihaylova's case, exploring the "unexpected" problematizes the issue of ethnic and national belonging related to cross national movement. Both cases show the complex link between ethnic and national identity in immigration.

Mihaylova enables us to visit an ethnic group to whom we, or most of us, have been largely blind and deaf. Her study corroborates the theoretical and socio-political importance of studying a seemingly insignificant minor ethnic group. It is precisely the meticulous work of revealing the intriguing identity struggles of a small ethnic minority group that guides Mihaylova in tackling "greater" anthropological issues and in confronting contemporary post-structural anthropological premises. Reading her thorough ethnographic study and careful, yet daring, analysis we gain new insights that challenge prevalent post-structural academic postulations. It teaches us, among other things, that the socialist state and regime, and the nation state as such, are not necessarily and simply rejected by suppressed groups after their dissolution, that ethnic affinity and identifications across borders are not always activated nor are a

desired option, and that centralized engineered operations of collective identity of an ethnic group have multiple and contradictory consequences.

At the same time, the study corroborates “the success of the nation state in imposing antagonistic nationalist project,” as well as the contextualized nature of ethnic identity -- they shift together with the change in social relations and situations. The paper also substantiates the already established assumption about borderlands as fertile grounds for the study of identity borders and borderlines and transitional identities.

The fate of the anthropologist who is not from the “first world” (or who conducts her research outside the “first world”) is to provide a long and detailed description of the case study she explores. What is self-evident when one’s writing is intended for the hegemonic community of scholars turns into a problem, a puzzle that needs explication when it is designed for “outsiders.” This is our fate when we write about Russian Jews immigrants in Israel, this is Mihaylova’s fate too.

Until we read Mihaylova’s paper we always considered the recurring request of editors to “provide more information about the case study” as a burden. We resisted, yet complied with the hegemonic rule of the contemporary, stratified academic world. Yet, reading Mihaylova’s elegantly and beautifully written thick description and her skillful and analytical account of the Pomaks and the ‘Pomak question’ caused us to change our mind. We are fortunate this rule exists. In a world where post-structural jargon is obscuring the clarity of ideas, it is a pleasure to read Mihaylova’s narrative, which interweaves theoretical issues, evidence, and description in a delicate balance. At the same time although we are distressed by contemporary trends towards over-reflexivity in anthropological writing, we would like to know more about Mihaylova’s positionality in the field she explores. We also think that her important theoretical underpinning stands to gain a great deal from further elaborations.

Mihaylova, we thank you for intriguing us to more and better understand the Pomaks and cross national movement in and outside the Balkan region.

Mihaylova on Motte/Ohliger

Visualizing and Representing Migration History: Images of the Other – Other Images?

This paper is an insightful example of linking social science and practice through the focus on representation and visualisation of the past. The authors draw from both critical historical approaches and experience in order to suggest one possible way of constructive and systematic representation of migration history. The paper begins with a thorough analysis of the scholarly debates about the meaning of history and the role of historiography in identity construction and making of commonality. It then provides a novel approach in how to create migration history in order to include and integrate in and unite the European communities without falling into the traps of bounded, exclusive and essentialist national narratives. It offers a straightforward yet under-utilised way of how historiography could become a tool for writing immigrants into collective European identities. The solution is found in the production of a more diverse and subjective attitude to writing history, which will incorporate migration history as an equal part of all European societies' history. This task is indivisible from the urgent attention needed to representation and visualisation of all types and all historical periods of migration.

The contribution of this work does not stop here and provides a further insight into already existing efforts to establish migration history. The first efforts seem to be in the representation of migration history and, hence, in creation of museums of migration in most of the European countries. These efforts are probably the most direct access to widening people's way of thinking about their own history as one that incorporates migrants' history. However, the paper points critically to the yet fragmented efforts in this sphere and, thus, to the huge responsibility that historians face in order to integrate migration history into their own vision and then into the vision of all European people.

Furthermore, the paper provides a through analysis of the German case – of both the positive and negative experiences in migrants' representation on which to build future efforts. The most innovative and provocative part of the paper is the last one, which

offers one possible way to challenge existing misrepresentation or insufficient representation of migrants' history. They take the German case and stage a 'drama' – the story of migration in Germany through pictures that in my opinion truly provoke an empathy and catharsis, which could indeed lead to changed attitudes towards migrants' history. The main approach used is to move ahead of empty rhetoric as well as to give the parole to migrants themselves to present their versions of the past so far mostly silenced. It is crucial to surpass the stereotypical vision and provoke a different point of view and the authors lead the viewers skilfully through images with extremely diverse and fragmented yet insightful and logical dramatic line of reliving migrants' pasts.

The authors have demonstrated that true historical competence, such as theirs, could be a powerful tool in the efforts to create social cohesion today and that migration studies of the past have a lot to offer to the contemporary society. The paper is a brave political statement as well as a highly professional piece of history writing and representation of migration history. Only in five images they have managed to achieve two major aims: firstly, to challenge the majority society (that has so far remained largely closed to migrants' experience and role) that it is time to consider 'the other' (in this case the migrants) as part of the self and to give them the parole, and, secondly, to demonstrate that migrants have something very important to say about the past (and thus about the present too) that concerns us all.

What really inspires in the way the paper is written is that the authors challenge the reader to continue the drama (it is intentionally left without an end) or to offer their own version of the drama. This is an excellent way to offer a possible direction that poses so many questions and then step aside to leave oneself the freedom to continue the search alone and provide their own solutions. With me this paper inspired an intense reflection on how to construct and represent the history of Pomak (Muslim Bulgarians) migrants. In the case of Pomaks we see that they would often prefer to merge into the larger society and silence (or cover up) the past themselves as not to have their origin or past uncovered. Thus, in many cases, they would not want to be represented openly as migrants with a history even if the aim would be to integrate them better. Some of them would express a concern with uncovering their undocumented migration and in some rare cases they would even prefer to forget their past

as migrants completely. Such exceptional cases demonstrate even better the great contribution of this paper –its call that it is high time to finally address critically and highly professionally such complex issues.

Ohliger on Pécoud

Self-employment and Immigrants' Incorporation

„Does self-employment contribute to immigrants' ,integration'?“ is the first sentence and the central question of Antoine Pécoud's paper „Self-employment and Immigrants' Incorporation“. Full incorporation (whatever this term might stand for and indicate) into the receiving country's labor market is usually seen as crucial step toward the integration of labor migrants. However, scholars disagree as to whether this incorporation should rather occur by way of entering and penetrating the structures of the receiving society or by way of establishing independent structures within it, i.e. the emergence of an ethnic economy and ethnic entrepreneurs. Two camps of scholars offer diametrically opposed arguments. Optimists see ethnic entrepreneurship as economically and culturally beneficial, while pessimists claim that it is detrimental for immigrant incorporation. The following matrix illustrates these positions graphically (thus summarizing Antoine's outline):

	optimists	pessimists
soci-economically	ethnic businesses have positive outcome on insertion in host society by way of offering economic perspectives for immigrants	ethnic businesses jeopardize migrants' position on the labor market by leaving them in marginal positions
culturally	ethnic businesses indicate willingness to establish oneself in the receiving country	ethnic businesses lead to the establishment of ethnic ghettos and thus isolate immigrants from the receiving society

The author applies an anthropological approach to shed new light on the question and thus shake up the binary and dichotomous perception prevailing in the literature. He draws upon the case of labor immigrants from Turkey in (West) Germany to discuss the underlying questions and provides us with some ethnographical insights drawn from his field of investigation. His argument runs that neither the optimistic view (epitomized, for instance, by the German-Turkish scholar Faruk Sen) nor the pessimistic interpretation (uphold by the Turkish scholar Nermin Abadan-Unat) captures the ambiguity that is associated with ethnic entrepreneurship. The author points to the (limited) role of markets play in establishing intercultural, inter-social and inter-ethnic relations and makes the argument that markets as well as trade can be an insufficient or at least ambiguous indicator for immigrant incorporation: „Trade can only serve as the lowest common denominator between these groups and the links it fosters are quite limited.“ This argument actually challenges longstanding beliefs and convictions on ethnic entrepreneurship and ethnic business or economic incorporation of labor migrants. If the argument holds true, researchers of ethnic entrepreneurship might be well advised to portray their future findings in a more modest light when talking about such big concepts as integration and be rather careful when giving advice to policy makers (the latter might especially be true for economists). Actually, the establishment of ethnic businesses (as the author argues) can lead to variable outcomes: it can support or undermine integration or be of little consequence. This, however, leads to a rather obvious question: which are the factors that determine particular outcomes? In this paper the author still leaves us without a clear answer to it.

When reading the paper a couple of other questions popped-up; these may be worth discussing at the conference:

Firstly, I was wondering how the work of an anthropologist is greeted by the ruling class of economists who usually jealously exercise hegemony over the field of economic research and do not seem to be particularly keen on listening to neighboring disciplines (do they actually know that there is such a thing as social and cultural anthropology?).

Secondly, I was wondering about the concept of ETHNIC business as a category of analysis. What is it actually that makes businesses ethnic? Antoine deconstructs the notion himself when arguing that market shares of ethnic businesses reach out into mainstream society thus, cutting cross ethnic groups. Maybe it would be a step forward to bring the work of scholars of ethnicity and nationalism together with those who analyse ethnic entrepreneurship within migration studies to further weaken or specify the ethnic notion in this field of research.

Thirdly, building upon my second question, I was wondering if ethnicity is a useful category of analysis at all when analyzing economic activities of labor immigrants. One could argue, that scholars walk on very thin ice when lumping together entrepreneurs just on the basis of their shared ethnicity. To illustrate this with an example: What does Vural Öger, the successful Turkish-German entrepreneur in the domain of mass tourism have in common with the owner of my favorite Döner shop at Bahnhof-Friedrichstrasse just 'round the corner from my Berlin office? Or to ask this question in a more systematic way: How does class and social stratification within immigrant communities and among ethnic entrepreneurs come into the picture when analyzing economic activities and ethnically segmented labor markets? Does ethnicity really help to explain anything? Or does it only camouflage things?

Fourthly, I liked the author's careful arguments about historical and social contingencies and contextuality when pointing to the fact that there is not one answer (or model) to all questions regardless of time and place. Applying theories and methodologies which were (mostly) developed within American research contexts might not always be a legitimate and useful transfer of ideas to European cases. As Antoine emphasizes, the French model of immigrant incorporation might work completely differently as a consequence of France's love affair with state intervention into market processes and state-run entrepreneurship. This argument could probably also be further spelled out for the particular case the author is referring to, that is economic (non-)integration of labor migrants from Turkey into the German economy. One wonders whether the lack of state intervention in the field of immigrant incorporation had an impact in the otherwise rather interventionist and *étatiste* German economy.

Fifthly, this raises the normative question regarding which role states SHOULD (or should not) play when aiming at integrating migrant populations into their national economies. It is a question which is actually implicitly raised by Antoine in the very last sentence of his conclusion when he states that „the impact of self-employment on immigrants‘ incorporation would be at best neutral and other solutions should then be envisaged to reduce the gap between immigrants and the native population.“ The question of what kind of solutions ought to be considered in both scholarly and political terms opens up yet another can of worms – albeit an important and interesting one.

Dragostinova on Plyer

A Village Divided: Integration of Sudeten Germans in Eastern and Western Germany 1945-1989.”

Ségolène Plyer’s paper discusses the intersection of national assimilation and social integration in the case of the Sudeten Germans in Eastern and Western Germany after World War Two. She pays special attention to the differences and similarities of the integrative process in the two Germanies as the Iron Curtain became less and less permeable. The Allies as well as the two German governments assumed that the “Germanness” of the new citizens would make the assimilation relatively easy. As a result, the GDR and the FRG dealt with the expellees’ problems as internal, administrative matters that required mostly economic support. In effect, there was no questioning of the nationality of the new inhabitants who were considered ethnically German according to the flexible definition of a wider German identity based on language and culture. Subsequently, by the early 1960s the integrative process was largely completed according to the two administrative apparatuses. However, the fact that after 1989 the Sudeten Germans reconstituted their organizations and demanded financial compensations for lost property in the Czech Republic shows that an idiosyncratic identity has developed among this group. Implementing oral history methods and archival research, Plyer explores the way these identities worked and transformed in the period under study.

In Plyer’s analysis, both East and West Germany tried to improve the economic standing of the expellees. In the East this was done in the framework of the socialist agrarian reform that meant to restructure the whole society while in the West the

refugees were allotted compensations according to their social status and the property they had lost in Czechoslovakia. This trend was characteristic of the ways the East and the West German states envisioned the functioning of their societies, and the paper could benefit from a more systematic analysis of the differences in terms of state ideology. Plyer seems to imply that the West “integrated” while the East “assimilated” the population but it is indicative that many Sudeten Germans in the East were willing to stay there and not immigrate to the West exactly because of socialist initiatives that provided them with land in the GDR. Indeed, Plyer analyzes the process of integration on many levels, that of socio-economic standing, cultural identity, and political motivations, and a more methodical discussion of the conflicting ideological tendencies in the two countries would help to emphasize the peculiarities of integration in both Germanies.

Despite the perceived successful integration of the expellees, there existed an awareness of a specific “Sudeten identity” that people would identify with long after resettlement. In both Germanies, the Sudetens were encouraged to forget their origins and identify with their wider, German loyalty. In the FRG the Sudeten identity was reserved for the free time and people justified their existence with the contribution to the general wealth. In the GDR, however, the Sudeten origins became a taboo after the normalization of the relations with Czechoslovakia. In addition, the closing of the borders in 1961 affected the way people were allowed to communicate with their relatives in the West, and thus the silence about the Sudeten Germans was perpetuated.

It seems to me that there is a marked change in policies and perception before and after 1961, and I would like to see an emphasis on this change in the broader historical context of the Cold War. Plyer concludes that the adjustment of the Sudeten Germans in the West was due to economic growth while in the East it was a result of the sealed frontiers yet the available information in the paper does not fully support such a supposition. This might be true for the period following 1961 but economic integration was crucial and quite successful in the East before the 1960s. A clear discussion of the chronology of the developments would definitely illuminate how the dynamics of the integration changed according to the political climate. The link to the broader context seems quite evident in the period after 1989 when the different organization mentioned in the paper emerged, and I also wonder how much the prospect for restitution or financial compensation could have triggered the identification with a Sude-

ten identity. Finally, the paper title suggests that the topic would be analyzed until 1989 but there is very little information on the events after the middle 1960s.

As far as the nationality of the Sudeten Germans goes, I am particularly interested to learn more how these Germans differed from the old Germans in terms of their “cross-pollination” with the Czechs. It is especially interesting to see how they considered themselves Czechoslovakian citizens before World War Two yet with the end of the Nazi regime their stay in Czechoslovakia became more and more problematic. I wonder if the “feeling of belonging” with the German state was not created so quickly after 1945 largely as a result of their forced migration that left them with no real choices. I would suspect that many might have been ready to make compromises with their national identity had they been allowed to stay in Czechoslovakia. These are all questions that are clearly not the focus of this paper but they could be interesting issues for discussion.

Sammartino on Stephens

Goods and People: Drugs, Immigration and the German *Ausländerproblem* 1960-1975

In a clearly written and persuasive narrative, Robert Stephens explores both the history of drug trafficking and its representation in the German public sphere as part of the German discourse on foreigners during the 1960s and 1970s. The paper begins with an exploration of the shifts that occurred in drug production and distribution during this period. Contrary to conventional wisdom, he argues that the growing importance of worldwide networks of growers and traffickers was primarily driven by demand, misguided attempts at enforcement by western powers and political instability. As Western powers (led by the United States) tried to crack down on the production and distribution of illegal drugs, they only succeeded in driving the drug trade underground to places and routes that were even more difficult to police or monitor. All told, the story that Stephens narrates is one of unintended consequences—for example, cracking down on the use of prescription drugs by Hamburg youth in 1972 drove these addicts first to synthetic narcotic methadone and then to heroin. In addition to complicating narratives about the drug trade, Stephens shows how anti-drug rhetoric

in the Federal Republic easily shaded over into anti-foreigner rhetoric. In the second section of his paper, he presents evidence depicting how both the police and the press associated drugs with a “foreign” threat and emphasized the perfidy of international drug cartels who targeted “innocent” German youth.

I think everyone at this conference will probably accept Stephens’s contention that the “war on drugs” has had many missteps and that blaming foreigners, especially Turks, for Germany’s drug problem is simplistic at best and racist at worst. At the same time, I found myself wishing that he had gone further in his analysis to actually explore the meaning of the metaphor of the Turkish drug trafficker, the significance of this image for German understandings of foreigners and ultimately what his work makes us understand better or rethink about the history of the Federal Republic. As these are all issues that I am sure that Stephens develops further elsewhere in his work, I would merely ask that he make these connections clearer for us. In the second part of this comment, I’ll just list a number of questions that this work raises for me, in the hopes that we can discuss them further at the conference.

Stephens states “the connection between Turkish residents and drug dealing had a powerful effect on the public image of the foreigner.” (p. 26) Yet, he does not explicitly explore what this effect was. Were Germans more likely to think ill of Turks because of their supposed complicity with drug trafficking? In what way did the image of the Turkish drug smuggler fit in with the host of negative images of foreigners (and Turks in particular) circulating during this period? Is it similar? Did it differ? How? What does the image of the Turkish drug trafficker reveal about German stereotypes about foreigners? How, for example, does it connect with the history of German images of foreigners? (I can certainly see ways that this seems related (at least on a discursive levels) to anti-Semitic stereotypes about Jewish peddlers and Jewish attempts to poison the German people, is this actually relevant? If so, how?) What connection, moreover, does he wish to draw between the internationalization of the drug trade with international movements of population? As it is, the two sections of the paper are not really linked. How does Stephens want to link them? Are the stories of “guest workers” and drug trafficking connected on anything but a discursive level? For example, did this sensationalization of drugs have actual effects on policy?

At one point, Stephens makes the comment that “in the end, it was much more important to the Bonn government to protect legitimate trade than to quash the smuggling of illicit drugs.” (p. 18) I wonder how policymakers and police reconciled these

two issues—allowing “legitimate” trade while restricting “illegitimate” trade? If Stephens is correct that the Bonn government placed the goals of trade above that of stopping the flow of illegal drugs, then, it would seem to me that the sensationalism of accounts of drug addicted German youth and the evil foreigners that preyed upon them needs to be seen in light of the fact that Germany was inexorably becoming more caught up in the world. German anxieties about being both a “land of immigrants” and a “land of consumption” were both expressed in the hysterical anti-drug/anti-foreigner rhetoric that Stephens explores. Ultimately, however, this rhetoric calmed down (and I wonder what caused that shift). Moreover, it seems, at least from Stephens's text, even at its height, this rhetoric seems to have had little effect on actual policy. That being the case, I would like to hear about how people reconciled these two issues (the need to stop drugs but allow trade). I am also curious about how, if at all, the sensationalizing of drug narratives affected the ways that people felt about and responded to migrants in Germany? I know that these are difficult issues to answer, and the answers may be more impressionistic than conclusive. Nonetheless, I believe that the connections between anti-drug and anti-foreigner rhetoric need to be contextualized and analyzed if this study is to help scholars to understand the history of the Federal Republic.

Stephens on Vermeulen

Organisations and community structure: Migrant organizations in Amsterdam 1960-1990

In this paper, Floris Vermeulen compares the creation of “ethnic civic communities” among Surinamese and Turkish immigrant groups in Amsterdam by investigating the growth of registered civic organizations associated with each group. He finds, in the end, a marked contrast between the two: while postcolonial immigration by Surinamese, particularly immediately after independence in 1975, led to organizational strategies that favored isolated and ultimately unstable “civic community,” the transformation of Turkish immigration from guest workers to “permanent” residents and efforts to retain Turkish cultural tradition promoted groups that were better integrated, creating a stronger sense of “civic community.”

Vermeulen wants to look historically at the ways in which communities have been built and to explain why the Turkish community in Amsterdam at the end of the century seems to be thriving, while the Surinamese community is faced with decline. After an examination of the pertinent literature on ethnic communities, Vermeulen argues that three sets of factors explain the differences between Surinamese and Turkish civic organizing: social and historical characteristics of the groups, institutional opportunities allowed by the state, and influences of the country of origin. For example, the sheer number but relative fragility of Surinamese civic organizations can be explained, according to Vermeulen, by the ethnically divided (African and Hindustani) groups within colonial Suriname, the sizable subsidies paid during the first decade after decolonization but then removed, and the traditional "distrust" of civic organizations in Suriname itself. By contrast, Turkish organizational success has much to do with the ability of Turks to overcome or at least minimize internal ethnic and religious conflict, the preliminary lack of state subsidy and subsequent recognition of Turks as an official minority entitled to certain rights, and both the foundation of groups by Turkish-based organizations and the continued intense interest in Turkish politics and culture by the immigrant community.

At the end of his paper, Vermeulen raises some interesting question for further research. He notes that, "Of course a civic community is much more than just the number of migrant organizations; their internal networks maybe more important" (28). This rejoinder seems particularly important. Obviously, officially registered organizations can only tell us so much about the practice of ethnic "civic communities." Certainly, kinship systems, religious communities, and others also act as powerful catalytic forces in the formation of communities among immigrant groups. Furthermore, the number of groups, even when divided by the number of members of each community (the "organizational density"), tells us little of the actual social and gender make-up of the groups and even less about the relative power of the groups to construct community or to create the institutional space in which civic community can thrive. Certainly the number and types of groups is significant, but we need to know more about how they function and relate to each other and to the state, particularly at the level of the quotidian. Finally, we need to know more about the historical context in which this organization occurs; Vermeulen is most insightful when he steps away from general frameworks and tells us about the details of organization, the historical context, and the changing relationship of ethnic groups to the state.

This paper raises some important questions about the role of ethnic organizations in constructing community. These questions almost invariably lead to the archive. Answering the difficult questions of internal organization and inter-group coherence can only be undertaken at the level of the everyday, forcing the scholar to confront the difficult and often ambiguous conflict between structures of power and the agency of groups and individuals.

Vermeulen on Ayse Caglar

Mediascapes, advertisement industries and cosmopolitan transformations: Turkish Immigrants in Germany

In her paper *Mediascapes, advertisement industries and cosmopolitan transformations* Ayse Caglar takes up an important subject; the manner in which the relationship between the media (in Germany, but also in Turkey) and Turkish migrants in Germany has changed recently. Different types of media have become more receptive to Turkish migrants. Turkish people are more and more addressed in the Turkish language in television- and radio programs, articles and ads of German companies. New Turkish newspapers, radio stations and television channels are emerging to cater the Turkish community in Germany; in their own language and sensitive to the everyday experience of German Turks. The international satellite television channel TRT-international (owned by the Turkish state) and the independent Turkish radio station Metropol FM (based in Berlin) are good examples of this emerging Turkish media especially set up for Turkish migrants in Europe and Germany in particular (the country in which the largest Turkish population is concentrated). Caglar explains these emerging Turkish media by several factors. First, the fact that German businesses have found out that Turkish migrants in Germany form an important consumer group. Surveys show that the annual net income of 1.85 million German Turks in 1995 reached 18 billion DM and that 97% of this amount was spent in Germany. Contrary to the popular belief that German Turks prefer cheap goods, German Turks spend more on quality and designer products. German Turks were characterised as loyal and conscious consumers who believed very much in advertisements. Second, Caglar points to the growing market for ethnic media around the world (for instance: *Zee TV*, *MBC*, and *Telemundo*). The third factor that Caglar mentions is the

peculiarities of the media landscape in Germany, which provide special opportunities for Turks to gain a foothold in the German media. Germany's media system is very decentralized; it has a very strong regional press and just a few national papers. Due to the strong regional press, it was relatively easy to target Turkish-speaking migrants that were not evenly distributed in the country as consumers. In addition, the rise of new Turkish press, radio and television channels made the German public media more aware of the Turkish audience, which resulted in more attention to and programs for German Turks.

These three sets of factors are responsible for the rise of Turkish media and Turkish programs/articles in Germany. Caglar takes the radio station *Metropol FM* as an example of a new Turkish media initiative, especially designed for German Turks, and she analyses what this radio station tells us about the development of the Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Metropol FM* is the first radio broadcaster in Turkish outside of Turkey, which is on air 24 hours a day. It has employees who speak German and Turkish and who are familiar with Berlin, German Turks in Berlin and Germany. The case of *Metropol FM* illustrates how the view of German Turks is changing as a result of their settlement in German society; more and more German Turks have become what Caglar calls 'localised cosmopolites', which basically means that German Turks have attachments to several places in the world (Berlin, Germany, cities in Turkey, but also other metropolises in the world). Looking at the way *Metropol FM* functions, Caglar feels that Turkey loses its function as a yardstick for understanding and evaluating the life-styles and the cultural formations of German Turks. It becomes only one of the multiple references of this translocal group.

Caglar's analysis of the Turkish media landscape in Germany provides a lot of interesting insights and questions. She places her story in a global spectrum, which enables her to make better sense of the transformation that take place within the German Turkish community. She is very positive and optimistic about the results of this transformation. She envisages a transnational European space in which Turks from all over Europe will have more opportunities to express themselves. This transformation process will make the German State more and more polyglot. 'Though motivated by economic concerns initially, these developments alter the opportunities and the terms of German Turks participation to the life of the society and consequently the nature of the public sphere itself to a certain extent'. Moreover (if this statement is not

optimistic enough), 'the flourishing Turkish media in Germany also have consequences for the recognition of German Turks as a group in itself with distinct interests and identities in Turkey. In Turkey too we see some attempts to incorporate German Turks into the wider public sphere'. For which the most important indication is the inclusion of 'impure' German Turkish into the media in Turkey. These two statements are interesting and hopeful statements, but I believe we need more evidence than just media initiatives in Germany and Turkey to be able to say that German society is opening up for Turks and that the German Turks as a group have become more important in Turkey. If it is indeed the case that Germany and also Turkey have become more and more receptive and inclusive towards German Turks as a group, this would also have to be visible in other domains (for instance: political, or social; how does for example Germans youth appreciate their Turkish class-mates, are they more positive towards them than before? Is there more opportunity for Turks to participate into the public sphere on schools? The same questions can be asked for the political domain, have Turkish politicians in Germany recently gained a stronger position on the national and local level?). Caglar might include insights from these domains in her paper to make her argument more convincing.

Yildirim on Booth/Cole

Migration, Domestic Labor, and Family in Sicily

Anthropologists, sociologists, demographers and economists study migration phenomena from different perspectives. Where economics is concerned, immigrants are now given more attention in terms of their relation to the ever-flourishing informal sector, a field that has already become an autonomous field of study. I know of at least four dissertations completed recently in which the integration of immigrants to the unregulated sectors of Istanbul's domestic economy has been studied. Istanbul similar to many major European cities has become a haven for immigrants from various countries over the past decade. Immigrants can be spotted in street corners awaiting to be picked up as day workers, working as street hawkers, and women working in night clubs as prostitutes. A more recent tendency among the female immigrants of

Eastern European origin is to work in households cleaning homes and caring for the disabled or the elderly. To the best of my knowledge, there is no study of the conditions under which the foreign immigrants are preferred over the Turkish nationals for such jobs and certainly no study of the effects of such tendency upon the traditional Turkish family structure. The study on hand by Prof. Booth and Prof. Cole has much to inspire –in terms of research method and argumentation—the Turkish scholars for designing such a study. They juxtapose the demand and supply sides of immigration phenomenon in Sicily, more specifically in Palermo, with a view to discerning “southern European patterns of transnational labor movements and segmented labor markets”.

The paper is designed to cover the both sides of the story and the authors have especially done a superb job in surveying the local conditions that created the demand for immigrants. Their principal unit of analysis is the family which, in their view, has become “the only secure refuge for many Sicilians” owing to a number of historical circumstances. Authors provide a very comprehensive overview of these circumstances, paying due attention to their implications upon the family structure. We are persuaded that no matter what the circumstances are, the members, especially the youth, of a typical Palermon family are very conservative in terms of their perception of domestic work, which the two authors eloquently describe. Domestic work is considered an undesirable job in many respects and that creates a niche for the immigrants. And there is certainly enough immigrants, be they women or men, to fill in this niche. Here one of the original findings of the authors should be emphasized. That is, it is not only the female immigrants but also the male immigrants that go for domestic jobs. That may be unique to Sicily. Because neither in big Greek cities nor in Turkish cities, where foreigners are known to be hired for domestic work, males are not considered for domestic work at all.

The demand on the part of the locals for immigrant labor has been really very well-documented. But I think the best part of the article is found in the authors’ perceptive approach to the supply side of the story. The life-worlds of immigrants have been neatly documented with due attention paid to not only to the advantages but also to the impediments experienced by them. The authors also recount “push” and “pull” factors that have caused these people to end up in Sicily.

I have a few technical comments to add. Firstly, each subsection has a historical background information, which gives the impression that each section addresses a totally different aspect of the issue under consideration. However, that is not the case. Therefore all the historical background information dispersed throughout the paper should be gathered in one section at the outset. Secondly, the first two subsections on the vicissitudes of the Sicilian family and the demand for foreign domestic workers are in fact inseparable so are the following two subsections on the foreign domestic workers in Palermo and the immigrant families. Subsections are intended to make the job of the reader easier but here they do not serve this purpose. Thirdly, the information gathered by the authors from interviews could be used to inside the preceding section to support the argumentation instead of being given under a separate section. That section looks more like an appendix than an integral part of the paper. Leaving all these aside, I think this is a solid paper that makes an excellent case study of the migration phenomena as experienced by the immigrants themselves and the host population.