FORGING DIASPORIC CITIZENSHIP

Contents

Introduction

This is the struggle of the people who don't fit or belong neatly.
                                                  – Leyla, in 2003

I wish the people who are in their twenties now wouldn't feel the need to say: "Oh, you were born in Türkiye, ha?" or "Is your family also Turkish?" I mean, I wish it wouldn't matter whether they are Turkish or not. I wish this were the case, but I have a feeling it is not.

                                                  – Arzu, in 2016

Regulating labour migration is becoming harder and harder in a globalized world. The reaction to the inability to control the movement of labour is a nationalist one. The Castle of Europe is collapsing now. We don't know where this is going.

                                                  – Alp, in 2016

After 9/11, there was a curiosity about understanding Islam and the diversity of Muslims. At the same time, there was a critique of US foreign policy ... Theo van Gogh's murder [by Mohammed Bouyeri] in 2004, in Holland, was the turning point. Until then, the Ausländer were Palestinian, Turk, Kurdish, Albanian, and Iranian. On that day, the Ausländer had become Muslims. *The people from Türkiye are now under the roof of the broad* Muslim *category.*

                                                  – Erkan, in 2016

The twentieth and twenty-first centuries have been an age of unprecedented mass migrations from non-Western to Western nations, cutting across not only national borders, but also social lines of ethnicity, language, class, and religion. These movements reflect shifts in the global economy, in labour markets, and in the flashpoints of international conflict. The uprooted and transplanted lives of immigrants challenge a range of traditional boundaries. They introduce new forms of belonging and affiliation within Western society. These migrants typically seek both to establish themselves economically and to become full members of their communities. They often aspire to political membership as citizens, but their ties transcend the nation. Especially in larger cities, this unsettling development of diversified citizenship promises to alter the nature of society.

In our existing political systems, diasporic groups commonly articulate their aspirations as claims to group-differentiated citizenship. One image of such citizenship is *multicultural* citizenship (Holton 2013; Kymlicka 1995). Political sociologist Christian Joppke (2002, 245) describes this as "a mechanism to accommodate ethnic, national and other minorities in theory" through coexistence under a common system of social norms. Another image is *cultural* citizenship, which is concerned with "the maintenance and development of cultural lineage via education, custom, language, and religion, and the positive acknowledgement of difference in and by the mainstream" (Miller 2002, 231). A third image is *differentiated* citizenship, which is commonly presented as a politics of difference that rejects traditional inclusion and envisions a political accommodation of differing social systems for each cultural community (Young 2000). A fourth image is *multi-layered* citizenship (Yuval-Davis 1997, 2006, 2013, 171), which involves recognizing individuals' membership in "more than one community and polity – local, ethnic, national, state and cross/supra-state." However, all of these concepts of citizenship share a common limitation. They all presume that intercommunity relations are matters of binary oppositions between inherently different groups of people. Although each of these concepts tries to be inclusive, their visions for citizenship all imply some kind of hierarchy among groups.

The border-crossing people pose many challenges to modern understandings of citizenship, including the various ideas of group-differentiated citizenship. These people challenge the dominant discourses of identity, difference, and belonging – in which the factor of culture (and a particular way of understanding it) is given priority and the functions of power in determining priorities are masked. With the spread of migrant and settler

communities across many nations, the Western idea of the homogeneous ethnic nation, and of the citizen as grounded in that identity, has become untenable (if it ever was tenable). The subjects who are driving this point home are diasporic subjects, especially those who were born in the country their ancestors migrated to – they are the ones who do not fit or belong neatly.

German-born Turkish Berliners exemplify many migrant populations who, having crossed a frontier, have entered the realm of diasporicity, or the condition of not fitting and belonging neatly. Being born and growing up as "Others" in Germany locates them in a social margin where the concepts of "us" and "the Other" are called into question. In the Western world's increasingly diverse cities, daily encounters between different people convey messages about their historical roots, their experiences of displacement and Otherness, and the problematic legacy of citizenship. Although they are obliged to define themselves by their Otherness, it is their relatedness to German society that seems to transgress traditional concepts of German (and Turkish) identity and citizenship.

The quotes given above express how not fitting or belonging neatly is an ongoing challenge for these German-born, Turkish-background people and how precarious their place in society can be. Although they may have lived in Germany all their lives, they often find themselves re-labelled as the quintessential Others and treated accordingly. The terms of their membership in society can suddenly change. As they combine German birth and upbringing with "foreign roots," these people are especially likely to challenge traditional assumptions about Germanness. They are living proof that political life now transcends the limits of citizenship in a nation. For them, social belonging is something greater than conformity with a particular cultural or national standard. These transcultural people illustrate the growing need for a new vocabulary to describe political subjectivity. When we look at their experiences, acts, and practices, we can discern the types of language they are forging, as their diasporic subjectivity offers a different type of citizenship.

The quotes that start this chapter also reflect the forces that are forging a new condition of citizenship. This is a condition I call *diasporicity*. Diasporicity involves both a quality of not fitting in neatly and an awareness that comes from a transnational, transborder perspective. Diasporicity is the condition for cultivating a new kind of citizenship that is unsettling our traditional understanding of political membership. This kind of citizenship is a creative response, a mode of critique, and a form of transgression among

people whose ties transcend nationality. It is a citizenship of diasporicity –
diasporic citizenship. Diasporic citizens are engaged in a meaning-making
process. They seek to claim full political membership despite and because
of diasporicity. Their presence unsettles any type of political membership
that presumes a binary opposition between communities. Clearly, dias-
poric citizenship is a citizenship of Otherness. But how does it reconcile
difference and belonging? How does diasporic citizenship express itself in
political life?

   In this book, I propose a map of everyday social encounters as narrated
by German-born Turkish-background Ausländer (i.e., foreigners, outsiders).
This map suggests a tension between people's experiences of displacement
and the politics of their accommodation. Exploring this world of tension, I
reflect on the questions these people raise. To theorize diasporic citizen-
ship, I conduct a narrative inquiry to analyze people's narratives about their
social encounters and life experiences. I examine the dynamics of German-
born Turkish Berliners' acts and practices as they make claims to citizen-
ship, express the ways they are rooted, and seek to achieve recognition.

   This book is a product of story gathering, undertaken with the assump-
tion that stories are political. The people who trusted me with their stories
are central in this book. Their stories, however, are woven into themes
and informed by a series of conceptual frameworks. Among the main con-
ceptual frameworks that have shaped my research are scholar of Chicana
cultural, feminist, and queer theories Gloria Anzaldúa's seminal book
Borderlands ([1987] 2007); feminist writer and independent scholar Sara
Ahmed's theorizing of "strange encounters" (2000); historical and political
sociologist and leading name in citizenship studies Engin F. Isin's insights
concerning "being and becoming political" (2002a) and performing "acts
of citizenship" (2008); and Asian North American and Canadian literary
scholar of postcolonial, diaspora, and cultural studies Lily Cho's writings
on diasporic citizenship (2007a, 2007b). Other scholars who shed light
on my analysis include German studies professor Jeff Peck, whose work
explores the complex and ambiguous relationship between German and
Jewish culture (1992); political scientist Ruth Mandel (1989, 1990, 2008);
anthropologist Uli Linke (1999, 2011); and German studies and compara-
tive literature scholar Azade Seyhan (2000, 2001), whose works explore
the relations between Germany and its populations of Ausländer. Finally,
political scientist Rita Dhamoon's framework of "meaning-making and
identity/difference politics" (2009) greatly contributes to this work's theor-
etical underpinning.

Then and Now: From "We Belong Here" to "You Could Never Be from Here"

For the initial phase of research for this book, I lived in Berlin for eleven months, in 2002 and 2003, and used a *snowball* method as a recruitment technique, in which I asked the research participants to assist me in identifying other potential subjects. I met with about one hundred Turkish Berliners. Of these, I focused on the forty-seven participants who were born and raised in Germany. These participants have a diversity of cultural, economic, and social backgrounds, with a range of educational levels and political outlooks. I also included people with different gender identities and sexual orientations. My meetings with them combined the features of structured and unstructured interview, and followed a particular method of narrative inquiry (Çalışkan 2015, 2018).

Next, after over a decade of intellectual engagement with the topics of diasporicity and of Germany's relationship with its others, I felt a growing urgency to assess what had changed for the research participants, how they had changed themselves, and whether or how they were creating a more vibrant future for themselves. During the summer and fall of 2016, I conducted video interviews via Skype with twelve of the earlier participants who had been highly informative in my first research effort.[1]

Naturally, there have been many changes in these participants' lives. Most of them got married, and many became parents. Some were less active in social justice issues than before. Also, the participants' stories in 2016 illustrated significant changes in German society. In general, Germany has grown much more diverse than it was in 2003. However, a discursive shift has occurred, from labelling Turkish Germans as Ausländer to calling them "Muslim." This change in how the outsider is constructed mirrors a global change in social and political attitudes – toward greater insularity and desire for exclusion of others. In line with this shift, the participants have found that their encounters with Germans involve increasingly explicit encounters with forms of racism as they negotiate their everyday personal and professional lives. In response, the participants have evolved a stronger, more persistent, and sophisticated social consciousness of diasporicity.

These changes in the German context are strongly connected to global realities. Since 9/11, it has grown increasingly common for Western populist leaders to promote a sense of constant emergency, fear, and suspicion of Muslims in general, and of Muslim immigrants in particular. To justify subjecting visible minorities to targeted policing, certain media outlets, far-right political figures, and populist movement leaders argue that growing

threats require greater security measures and stronger social cohesion. In particular, some political leaders have introduced laws to restrict Muslim head coverings and have developed policies for rooting out terrorism. The demands for such measures have encouraged popular attitudes of homonationalism (Haritaworn 2010). For example, in 2004, the French parliament adopted a law prohibiting headscarves in public schools. In 2010, another French law prohibited burkas and other face-covering veils in public spaces. In July 2016, the mayor of Cannes banned the *burkini* on public beaches. These fear-driven policies have indiscriminate effects on whole communities of people who are collectively labelled as threats to society. In Germany, various populations have been lumped together and collectively targeted for extra scrutiny. Both Turks and Arabs have been reidentified as *Muslims* and associated with a globalized entity of *Islam.*

Although Muslim immigrants are not new to Germany or to Europe, the issue of whether Islam can belong in Europe has become much more prominent than when I last spoke with the participants. The global discourse of hatred and fear rooted in 9/11 has become a full-fledged debate among both politicians and ordinary citizens. By 2016, the rise of Islamoracism all over Europe had become a major concern of my participants. Fatma, a social worker, says that the nature of racism has changed: "People have started being Islamophobic openly and without hesitation. But it is a global change too. It is not only in Germany. France is not any different, England is not any different. In Italy, it is the same. And I think it is not toward one race or ethnicity – it is toward religion, I think."

All of this may seem new. Perhaps the globalization of social issues is new, but the response reflects patterns of the past. Alp, a doctoral student of social anthropology, argues that if we want to understand what is happening in Germany, then we need to understand it in relation to the history of colonialism and contemporary globalization: "We can understand anti-Muslim and Islamoracist discourses better if we locate it in European colonial context. This is what we are facing now. This is a result of globalization." Emine Aslan, an anti-racism activist, says (in a media interview) that "Germany has only recently started speaking about its own colonial history There is still no collective memory around German colonialism and how this affects us now" (Sharma 2018, para. 35).

In 2003, the participants described an opening toward non-European cultures. Shortly after 9/11, people wanted to learn about Islam. By 2016, this had changed. As Fatma explains: "They wanted to understand Islam. We had a few projects, like connecting with the mosque, and both foreigners

and Germans were trying to understand each other. But eventually, they started realizing that Islam is different. All the changes in the world I was telling you about happened. There is now clear fear toward Islam. Now, it is like there is a war between the religions." LGBTI+ activist Erkan's response was similar.[2] When I asked about the interest in understanding the diversity within Islam, he said: "Nope, it is finished. We understood that they are all one and the same!"

In 2003, the participants seemed optimistic. They spoke about how they felt part of Germany, how they were changing what being German means, and how Germany had to accept that. But by 2016, while still claiming Germanness in new ways, they showed a sobered mixture of hope and pessimism. I asked Erkan about the feeling among *Türkiyelis* (people from Türkiye), and his response encapsulated a profound change: "You could never be from here. This is very clear I think." There was a certainty in his voice. It was not pessimism, but an it-is-what-it-is kind of resignation. Erkan discussed his profound disappointment with German feminists and the LGBTI+ community for helping to label Germans of Muslim background as enemies of Western freedoms.

At the same time, these new Germans have continued to push boundaries, to claim that they are part of Germany, and to assert that Germany must reinvent itself to include them. For Alp, this is the main difficulty Germany faces today. Tunç, a devout Muslim and a youth worker, puts it this way:

> There is a new normal in Germany. Children and grandchildren of immigrants are at an equal level with white Germans' children and grandchildren now. But this change is not accepted by white Germans. They have worries and fears. They have to give up the superiorities they have taken for granted. They have to share the resources with Black and brown people and with immigrant children. So [white Germans] are seeking superiority in ethnic roots.

Many of the participants explain the necessity of solidarity-building among the Others of Germany. Alp speaks about the need for building spaces of resistance in collaboration with other racialized groups. They speak of alliances for a different kind of politics, beyond the politics of delimited identity.

This book tells a story of evolving, globalized diasporic communities. The actual experience of my participants demonstrates how the practice of

diasporic citizenship is changing what it means to belong in society. The trends I document help to illuminate the emerging realities of diasporic populations everywhere, but these realities can only be grasped in the details of particular people's lives, at particular times and places.

Background of the Case Study

In Germany's past, the right to citizenship was based on *jus sanguinis* (the citizenship of the parents) and not on *jus soli* (the place of birth). Therefore, many foreign-born residents, despite their long residence and work experience, and despite fulfilling their duties such as paying taxes in Germany for many years, were still legally treated as *foreigners.* With a change in the citizenship laws in 2000, the German-born children of foreign-born residents began to automatically receive German citizenship, subject to certain conditions. Residents who had been legally living in Germany for eight years also became eligible to apply for citizenship, on the condition that they demonstrate a good command of the German language, have no criminal record, show economic self-reliance (i.e., they must not be receiving any unemployment or social assistance benefits), and agree to renounce any previous citizenship in another country.

Several of the challenges associated with modern German identity arise, at least in part, from the particularities of the country's recent history. These difficulties include the legacy of the Nazi regime, the postwar repatriation of ethnic Germans from other nations, the Cold War division of Germany into two supposedly hostile states, and the subsequent reunification of these estranged countries. Due to these unusual historical conditions, Germany itself is an example of social and cultural diversity. Many people who are considered German actually regard themselves as displaced people. Berlin has a particular place in this history, as this city was itself physically divided into capitalist and communist zones for decades and then reunited. For this reason, Berliners have experienced an unsettling of citizenship and nationality, which has made their city a socially complex space where many cultures meet and sometimes collide. Therefore, Berlin is "a vibrant sociological site for observing the dynamics of belonging and citizenship within the context of a changing Germany" (Çalışkan 2014, 3).

This once divided and then reunited city is a truly diasporic space. Berlin is Germany's largest city and the second largest in the EU, with 3.77 million people in 2019. It is also one of the most socially diverse cities in Europe. In 2019, over 20.6 percent of the people were Ausländer (foreigners) and 14.4 percent were *Deutsche mit Migrationshintergrund* (German residents with

immigrant background), who originated from nearly two hundred different countries (Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg 2020). Thus, Berliners' experience of citizenship and nationality is unsettling. Any examination of this situation must work through the residents' often traumatic, conflicted, and multi-referential experiences.

In the 1960s, people from Türkiye began coming to Germany as guest workers. Since then, they have become a permanent part of Germany and the country's largest minority group. In 2020, ethnic Turks made up 2.76 million of Germany's 21.9 million people of migrant backgrounds (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung 2021). However, despite their sixty-year history in Germany, Turkish-German people are still defined ethnically, socially, and, until recently, legally as others. The common term for such others is Ausländer, which simply means foreigners. This term may seem to indicate a common non-German identity for all *other people.* However, as political scientist of ethnic and migrant relations in Europe Ayhan Kaya (2012), Mandel (1989), and sociologist Antoine Pécoud (2002) have shown, the Turkish population is itself highly diverse – politically, economically, professionally, religiously, and culturally.

The diversity within Germany's Turkish community has raised a fascinating series of challenges and opportunities regarding the future of German identity and citizenship. As I have argued elsewhere: "Traditional understandings of Germanness, of Germany, and of its nationhood are encountering claims for recognition, both from its Ausländer and from other challenges arising from Germany's own history. Germans increasingly question rigid definitions of nationality, and many of them object to defensive reactions against ethnic diversity" (Çalışkan 2014, 4).

Many other researchers have written about the issues of nationhood, citizenship, exclusion, and cultural politics in the German context. For example, Linke's research (1999, 2011) investigates the aberrant conditions of modernity and global capitalism, and considers how national sovereignties produce borders, subjects, and militarized geographies based on images of Otherness and difference. Linke explores the politics of gender, race, sexuality, and space, and the specific forms of violence (physical, symbolic, judicial) that accompany or sustain the nation-building project.

Kaya's work (2011, 2012) more specifically focuses on how German Turks affiliate themselves with their countries of destination and of origin. Their features of transnational mobility, dual loyalty, and trans-ethnic orientation combine to both challenge and supersede the framework of national citizenship. German Turks constitute a transnational community, which

makes it imperative that the existing institutions of citizenship (in both Germany and Türkiye) respond to their experiences and go beyond the framework of dual citizenship. The German Turks' practices of citizenship transcend national borders, but they must comply with the political, economic, legal, and cultural structures in their countries of settlement. They also need to actively engage in the process of political participation, despite the rising sentiment of Islamophobia (Kaya, 2011). The research participants have directly experienced the political and cultural issues that Linke and Kaya examine. The participants' creative responses involve exploring new forms of belonging for a different kind of society.

As the participants in my Berlin research project are Turkish-background adults who were born and grew up in Germany, I refer to them as *German-born Turkish Ausländer.* I emphasize *German-born,* because the fact that they were born in Germany is vital to understanding the challenges they bring to German identity. The term *Germans* traditionally described individuals or groups who were regarded as *ethnic* Germans. In the official statistics, the category of *German* represents people without an immigrant background, or people with two parents of German ancestry. This word, however, does not represent all people who view themselves as German; nor does it include people with a German forebear who came to Germany after 1945, such as the *Aussiedler* ("members of the German people," as defined in the 1953 Federal Law on Expellees, who lived in specified areas east of Germany) or the *Spätaussiedler* (people of German roots who migrated from the former Soviet Union and were born before 1993) (Groenendijk 1997; Takle 2011).

The participants in my study often refer to themselves with the Turkish word *yabancı,* even though they were born in Germany. *Yabancı* has the same basic meaning in Turkish as *Ausländer* (with an ä) in German – foreigner, from outside, or stranger. "Der Ausländer" is singular in nominative form, while *die Ausländer* is plural nominative. This term is generally used in its plural form in the German context. The participants also refer themselves in the plural Turkish form (*yabancılar*). Throughout the book, I use the *Ausländer* without definite articles *der* and *die,* to mean foreigners, outsiders. As my interviews are conducted in Turkish, the participants refer to both themselves and people of other immigrant groups as *yabancılar.* They rarely use *Ausländer.* Yet I use the word *Ausländer* rather than *yabancılar,* because the participants' Ausländerness is prior to their self-definition as yabancı. The term *Ausländer* represents how German society defines

them. In modern Germany, this word is an important marker of social identity that shapes most aspects of people's lives.

These group designations, even when used in arguments to support social justice for minorities, can be ambiguous, homogenizing, exclusionary, or overinclusive. Using such designations can seem to reinforce the very social divisions that a writer wants to question. However, I have decided to use these designations because they play significant roles in the dominant discourses of political and social life. These labels of identity are widely used in everyday speech, in the media, and in literature. To examine the complex problems and opportunities embedded in these labels, and to deal with the difficulties involved in undoing their problematic associations, we need to name the labels under discussion.

Conceptual Framework

Multiculturalism

In response to conflictual narratives and continued border crossings, various modern discourses on multiculturalism and pluralism have emerged and matured. Such discourses have applied metaphors such as *melting pot* and *cultural mosaic* for speaking of tolerance, difference, and a shift toward accepting heterogeneous rather than homogeneous national populations. Several Western nations have officially recognized a multicultural understanding of citizenship in response to the aspirations of their diasporic populations. Germany, however, has not adopted such a policy, and the Ausländer of Germany have not experienced the type of multicultural citizenship that is promoted in, for instance, Canada.

Why discuss multiculturalism when the term and policy do not apply in Germany? I do so because comparing ways of accommodating the outsider (Ausländer or immigrant) is crucial for understanding diasporic citizenship. Also, a critical comparison between my German Turkish participants' sense of diasporicity and the policies of multiculturalism reveals that multiculturalism's vision of how outsiders and insiders belong together is profoundly different from what my participants actually experience. Understanding these people's experiences is significant for analyzing the kinds of politics that German-born Turkish Ausländer articulate. In discussing multiculturalism, I refer to liberal multiculturalism, as described in works by political philosophers Will Kymlicka (1995, 2007) or Charles Taylor (1994).

Multiculturalism promises a break from past demands for cultural as-
similation and instead proposes to celebrate both diversity and unity
simultaneously. According to Kymlicka (1995, 2007) and Taylor (1994),
multiculturalism in an expression of the desire to renounce historical prac-
tices of discrimination, exclusion, and misrecognition, and to do so in the
name of liberal justice and egalitarianism. My questioning of Taylor's and
Kymlicka's arguments does not imply endorsement for the ways they have
been critiqued in the German discourse on multiculturalism. Instead, I pro-
pose that diasporic citizenship differs fundamentally from multicultural-
ism. These two responses to diversity differ in how they treat issues of power
and in how they respond to hybridity among social groups and the encoun-
ters between them. Despite the fact that multiculturalism is not officially
embraced in Germany, this approach resembles the prevailing German dis-
course regarding Ausländer and the kinds of hospitality extended to them.

Rita Dhamoon (2009) helps to clarify how theories of multiculturalism
conceal issues of power through their various conceptions of culture and
diversity. She explains that liberal multiculturalism frames the politics of
citizenship as predominantly a politics of culture, thereby mainstreaming
the issues of diversity. As a result, the concept of multiculturalism fails to
offer a rigorous framework for analyzing the issues of power that surround
identity and belonging. Promoters of multiculturalism tend to ignore the
politics of diasporicity that German-born Turkish Ausländer articulate
through their acts and practices of diasporic citizenship, which involve
disrupting and confronting issues of power. For Dhamoon, conventional
multicultural analysis masks the practices of domination, oppression, and
marginalization between social groups. Such analysis also masks the prac-
tices of resistance undertaken by people who are marked as multicultural
others, despite being officially included within the rubric of cultural divers-
ity. Actually, Western immigrants commonly make human rights a major
focus of their activism, but they typically do so as concerned individuals
who cooperate with a variety of social movements.

Dhamoon (2009) suggests that by glossing over the issues of social differ-
ence, multiculturalism fails to directly confront the histories and ongoing
problems of white privilege, racial domination, class exploitation, margin-
alization, and discriminatory immigration policies. In that case, analyz-
ing the experiences of Ausländer as a matter of multicultural citizenship
may result in simply redefining Germanness, by marking diasporic people
as multicultural subjects of the German state. Viewing the Ausländer ex-
perience through the lens of multiculturalism tends to obscure unresolved

issues. Multiculturalism cannot serve as a tool for recognizing how the histories of domination continue to shape the interactions between Ausländer and Germans today.

Multicultural citizenship emphasizes culture as the defining feature of ethnic and national minorities, and then it fosters a multicultural politics focused on claiming rights for these cultural identities. Multiculturalism suggests the coexistence of well-defined, unchanging, homogeneous cultures within one national space. However, as sociologist John Porter (1965) argues, the various cultures are never equal within this framework of cultural diversity. Instead, they are arranged in a hierarchy, with a mainstream culture being superior to the rest. Dhamoon (2009) argues that by narrowly conceiving and overly determining the role of culture, multicultural theory disguises the process of how, why, and by whom certain values are determined to be superior, how these dominant values are resisted, and how the state regulates various modalities of difference.

Even though the word *diversity* may describe a multiplicity of identities, and the affirmation of diversity may signal a well-intentioned stance against prejudice, the multiculturalist understanding of identity has been extensively criticized. As Sara Ahmed (2007, 235) explains, the acceptance of diversity has become a way of treating difference as an abstract concept, or as an essence that exists in the bodies or cultures of others. Literary theorist and author Walter Benn Michaels (2006) observes that the enthusiastic celebration of difference masks and even contributes to neglect concerning the vast and growing economic divisions within societies that celebrate multiculturalism. Diversity offers a false vision of social justice – one that conveniently costs us nothing, while treating culture as a resource owned by individuals, groups, and the state.

In this understanding of cultural diversity, the term *social group* is also problematic. As multicultural citizenship is based on group-differentiated rights, the groups themselves (as defined along ethnic and religious lines) are portrayed as essentially homogeneous groups, between which certain kinds of coexistence and dialogue are desired. Multiculturalism accepts the notion of group-differentiated rights, but it often overlooks the histories of diverse subgroups within ethnic communities.

The context of multiculturalism has also served to promote *multicultural hybridity,* by which groups are treated as "one–other" combinations, such as German Turkish. In such constructions, ethnic and cultural differences are set in contrast to each other. In this kind of multiculturalism, hybridity cannot really be treated as something new, because it is always

just a hyphenated combination of pre-existing identities. Therefore, the hyphenated hybridity of multiculturalism cannot inform the language of diasporic encounters or serve as a site of resistance, because it masks the political potential of diasporic hybridity. In actuality, diasporic hybridity involves an active process of subversion, translation, and transformation. By masking the spaces of hybridity, multiculturalism ignores diasporic experiences that involve critical disruption and the confrontation of binary oppositions.

In Germany, it has grown increasingly common to argue that multiculturalism has gone too far, and that it has caused rather than prevented a breakdown of social order and security. However, as Dhamoon (2009, 9) argues, multiculturalism cannot take us far enough. Multiculturalism invites us to imagine that national polity already accepts heterogeneity, so that the actual systems of inequality can be ignored. I argue that the politics of diasporic citizenship involves exposing how these systems of inequality are produced and how they function through the power relations that appear in the everyday social interactions and practices of diasporic subjects. I call these interactions *diasporic encounters.*

In my approach to examining difference, I analyze the content of actual social encounters. I argue that in learning from encounters we can and should go beyond political theorist Bhikhu Parekh's (2005,19) notion of "a democratic dialogue" between various communities or systems of values. We need a more direct understanding of how different cultural groups actually interact. Supposedly, democratic dialogue is the foundation of multicultural accommodation. However, focusing on the actual experience of diasporic encounters is something far different from trying to conduct an intercultural dialogue. Diasporic encounters are tools for revealing, disrupting, and confronting the power relations behind various claims regarding accommodation and interculturality.

Diaspora Studies and Citizenship Studies
According to writer and editor Bibi Bakare-Yusuf (2008), the condition of diasporicity concerns lived experiences and practices that have been rooted in a place, then uprooted and replanted in another place. Diasporic subjects have to be reoriented and remobilized afresh in each new location. Their awareness reflects the social, cultural, and political conditions that emerge from being uprooted and re-routed. In my analysis, diasporicity is a form of awareness that has two significant functions: it unties the intimate relations between culture and Otherness, and it bridges the tension between diaspora and citizenship.

Diasporicity involves a capacity to see the multiplicity of power relations between citizens and diasporic subjects by looking through the surface of everyday encounters. This kind of awareness involves crossing over lines of identity to see things from several perspectives at once. Diasporicity allows an instant sensing of social situations without conscious deliberation. It involves a sharp awareness that emerges from ongoing dis-positioning and re-positioning in the borderlands between social worlds. Diasporic awareness is a kind of borderland sensitivity. As Anzaldúa explains in *Borderlands* ([1987] 2007, 61): "The one possessing this sensitivity is excruciatingly alive in the world ... Those who are pounced on the most have it the strongest – the females, the homosexuals of all races, the dark-skinned, the outcast, the persecuted, the marginalized, the foreign." Anzaldúa is not referring specifically to German-born Turkish Ausländer, but many of these Ausländer have all of these identities at once. This is why Leyla, a German-born Turkish resident of Berlin, says: "This is the struggle of the people who don't fit or belong neatly."

Both diaspora studies and citizenship studies theorize the political subject as emerging from a complex interplay of relations between people, communities, and nations. Both fields of study involve a critique of binary oppositions, such as colonizer/colonized, West/East (Braziel and Mannur 2003; Tölölyan 1996), and citizen/outsider (Isin 2002a; Isin and Turner 2002; Kaya 2012). Some studies (Isin 2002a, 2002b) criticize both binary opposition and the logic of exclusion. Other studies explore specific ethnic, racial, religious, and regional collectivities and examine the rights and obligations these groups have toward the multiple polities they engage with (Laguerre 2016; Lowe 2003). Contemporary debates in citizenship studies and diaspora studies have successfully challenged traditional assumptions of homogeneity, stability, and fixity in national identity. Yet so far, any interactions between these two fields have been limited, and few critical works have attempted to bring them together. A collaboration between these fields of study has the potential to capture an especially important pattern of relations, because such collaboration can juxtapose *citizenship* with *diasporicity*.

Diaspora studies aim to interrogate "contemporary forms of movement, displacement and dislocation" (Braziel and Mannur 2003, 3). This interrogation involves rethinking concepts of nationhood and national identity through a discourse on postnationalization, denationalization, and decoloniality. At the heart of contemporary citizenship studies is a concern for the process of responding to the rights claims made by various marginalized

groups. In such studies, the question of what it means to be a modern citizen follows directly from the question of what constitutes a modern nation. However, the question of citizenship depends on the nation's collective identity only if we assume that the nation is the only valid site of citizenship. How does citizenship change if we assume the diaspora as the site of citizenship?

Diasporic Citizenship

The concept of diasporic citizenship suggests decoupling the notion of citizenship from the nation-state. In the social sciences, the idea of diasporic citizenship has been used to articulate other forms of civic belonging that transcend state boundaries. For political scientist Kim Rygiel (2003, 3): "Diasporic citizenship refers to the multiple and simultaneous participation in citizenship practices within and across nation-state borders." Professor of global studies Michel Laguerre (2016) explains that diasporic citizenship is demonstrated by the ways that Haitian communities in the US have built a civil society that could not thrive within Haiti itself.

Current use of the term *diasporic citizenship* treats diasporic belonging as an extension of the citizenship practices related to the nation-state. This use of the term offers a number of possibilities for thinking about transnational forms of identity and belonging. As sociologist Saskia Sassen (2002) would argue, diasporic citizenship is a pluralization of citizenship: it is denational, postnational, neonational, and transnational. It recognizes both the significance and the inadequacy of the national. Cho (2007a, 2007b) seeks to theorize diasporic citizenship by arguing for an uneasy relationship between diaspora and citizenship. Even so, she defines diasporic citizenship as a kind of group-differentiated citizenship that is similar to multicultural citizenship. She suggests that "in order for there to be equality among citizens, there has to be some forgetting of difference" (Cho 2007a, 105). Also, "the question ... is how ... we can fully embrace the differential forms of citizenship, that the nation engenders" (Cho 2007a, 96).

Cho is right to say that diaspora and citizenship do not fit together easily. Diasporas emerge as displaced collectivities, whereas citizenship is grounded in notions of individual autonomy. The diaspora exists uneasily alongside the nation, and citizenship emerges within the nation. The notion of diaspora challenges the amnesia that nationality and citizenship require, and it introduces a broader dimension of social memory. This inherent tension and dissonance between diaspora and citizenship presents a potentially productive opportunity for thinking through the differential histories

of dislocation that citizenship involves and for moving toward an articulation of everyday diasporic politics.

I explore diasporic citizenship as a means of embracing our contradictions and possibilities, but I wish to modify the current use of the concept. What makes my understanding of diasporic citizenship different from other concepts of citizenship (such as multicultural citizenship or group-differentiated citizenship) is that I analyze it through the lived experience, perspective, and awareness (i.e., diasporicity) of transnational people. I argue that diasporic citizenship emerges during everyday encounters, in which the *mis-fits* between diaspora and citizenship are negotiated. In these encounters, the focus shifts from cultural difference to power difference. The acts and practices of diasporic citizenship untie the bonds between culture and identity and the bonds between nation and citizen. These acts and practices are not captured by the myth of homogeneity, and they are not (yet) articulated in the literature of diasporic citizenship.

On many levels, citizenship seems indispensable – unquestionably right and good. But acts and practices of diasporicity have the potential to *oppose* citizenship. Diasporicity involves a certain skepticism about citizenship, even when diasporic people embrace it. Diasporants seek relationship but on their own terms of hybridity, heterogeneity, and flexibility. They want the fullness of civic citizenship, but they are resistant and defiant toward pressure to delimit their identities. The relationship between diasporicity and citizenship is close but complicated; it reveals the multiplicity of power axes.

While acknowledging the indispensability of citizenship, I articulate diasporic citizenship in terms of a politics of belonging that go beyond the limited scope of multicultural interpretations, representative democracy, or liberal citizenship. I argue that through investigating the expressions of diasporicity, we can re-examine the politics of dislocation and accommodation. We can see the citizenship of diasporicity as a tension-prone, problematic relation between cultures. This tension allows us to acknowledge diasporicity as a unique basis for rights claims, as it relocates citizenship from the domain of nationality to the domain of diasporicity. I also locate diasporicity beyond the domain of culture. Indeed, my interpretation of diasporic citizenship questions whether the concept of group-differentiated citizenship is helpful at all.

Both citizenship and diaspora remind us that nations are made, not born, and that they are made in crucially inequitable ways. This awareness raises questions regarding the relationship between citizenship and nation. Such

questions are apparent in the many contemporary forms of resistance that are led by outsiders, immigrants, First Nations, and others who are deemed threats to the status quo. Diasporicity is cultivated in the productive tensions between these diverse movements of resistance and the assumptions of Eurocentrism. The need for understanding such tensions is urgent.

I am seeking to analyze how enactments of diasporicity respond to contemporary social reality and to unbundle the package of national citizenship. Diasporicity challenges the limits of nationality but does not directly oppose it. It is informed by national borders, but considers other forms of belonging as well, whether they are based on ethnicity, class, race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation. Diasporicity does not exclude or replace nationality. Rather, diasporicity is both national and transnational.

Diasporicity, Culture, and Power

In her theory of identity and difference in politics, Rita Dhamoon (2009) argues that it is necessary to analyze the tensions between identity and belonging without assuming the primacy of culture or, conversely, without dismissing culture. Instead, she suggests that we need to situate specific cultural practices in their relevant relations of power. This discussion requires a more critical reflection on why and how culture gives meaning to, or gains meaning from, the many sites of social difference.

Like in Dhamoon's approach, my theorizing of diasporicity involves viewing culture as changeable and multidimensional, rather than treating it as an object with essential traits. The concept of diasporicity allows us to consider how cultural meanings change and to approach culture as just one dimension in the politics of citizenship. In that context, we can view society with a critical eye, noting how and why one mode of difference gains specific meaning in relation to others. In this perspective, no one dimension of identity is treated as the primary, defining feature. Instead of choosing culture, gender, class, race, or sexuality as the central organizing concepts, all of these systems of identification are viewed as integral to one another. Culture is no longer prioritized as the definitive axis of difference.

In conceptualizing diasporicity, I understand culture critically – in relation to the ways that difference and belonging are shaped through experiences of social struggle or social bonding. Naturally, these relationships and interactions involve issues of relative power. Diasporic people may find themselves regarded as powerless strangers in environments that belong to others. In defining themselves as members of the surrounding society, they must renegotiate the terms of power, both in relation to the structures of

society and in terms of their relations with colleagues and neighbours. Diasporicity is concerned with how power functions in the experiences of diasporants and, in this case, the experiences of German-born, Turkish-background Ausländer.

Rita Dhamoon (2009, 10) explains power in Foucauldian terms, "as a relation and as a capacity that is spread throughout the socio-political body, rather than as something that is possessed or held by a sovereign subject or the state." As philosopher and political activist Michel Foucault (1980, 158) argues: "Power is quite different from and more complicated, dense and pervasive than a set of laws and a state apparatus." Consequently, the acts and practices of diasporicity analyzed here reveal how power actually works, not only through citizenship, which is closely connected with how the German state accommodates German-born Turkish Ausländer, but also through other social structures as they are encountered daily.

Foucault (1995, 194) suggests that "we must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes,' it 'represses,' it 'censors,' it 'abstracts,' it 'masks,' it 'conceals.' In fact, power produces: it produces reality, it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth." In my exploration of everyday encounters, I use the perspective of diasporicity to interrogate the functions of power and how they are justified. I explore Ausländer as a historically generated category and a kind of subjectivity, but also as a term whose meaning is subject to change and challenge. I explore how members of a particular diasporic community negotiate their own forms of citizenship. Power is a force that can be both creative and oppressive. I explore how power creates Ausländer and how the Ausländer themselves are wielders of power. They are both controlled by power and exercise it through their daily interactions with others.

Everyday social encounters reveal how power provides occasions for resistance to marginalization. Such encounters involve socio-political entities performing as subjects who interact with power. Instead of seeking to eliminate power, Ausländer seek to disrupt and redirect power in their human relations. They contest the discourse of power that generates favouring or reprimanding for specific understandings of Germanness or Ausländerness, or of other categories of difference that lead to social hierarchies.

In my view, diasporicity is not some new ideology for directing or managing people's lives. It is a kind of critical perspective that exposes and disrupts the ways that categories of difference manifest themselves. In fact, responding to these categories is what creates the diasporic citizen. Diasporicity is a creative response to being identified as a diasporic subject.

Identity and belonging in this context are both claimed and renounced. These things are treated as fluid but also as things that "can never be erased" (Dhamoon 2009, 12). Identity and belonging are contestable but not always sources of contestation.

This account of diasporicity is not an attempt to determine the categories of difference that the term *Ausländer* carries but is, rather, an exploration of how and why these categories are constructed and maintained, and their resultant effects. I examine how material and structural inequalities are integral to the construction of very particular understandings of Ausländerness. As Dhamoon (2009, 13) writes, discourse "shapes the actual lived experiences of people, [and] social structures shape discourse. Given this, radical social change on the level of discourse effects social change on the material level and vice versa." For example, the articulation of Germanness is premised on racialized, gendered, class-based, and heteronormative meanings, which are formed as contrasts with Ausländerness. According to these constructed meanings, some kinds of Ausländer are less desirable than others. Such meanings affect people's legal status, job opportunities, family relationships, and where they can live.

In analyzing the axis between hostility and hospitality toward "foreigners," I aim to go beyond treating this relationship as a binary interaction. Instead, my proposed model (of hostility/hospitality) involves an interrogation of how power works in building the perceived differences of Ausländer and how such meanings are created. First, I examine how formations of social differences are conditional and then show how alternative meanings for these differences are possible. By examining the acts and practices of diasporic citizenship, I show how messages of hostility and hospitality are laden with connotations of power in everyday social encounters. In studying such encounters, I seek not to smooth over differences but to confront them directly. My analysis thus contributes to an understanding of Ausländerness as something that evolves – "how it is made, how it changes, and how it is operationalized in various penalizing and privileging ways" (Dhamoon 2009, 13).

I argue that the acts and practices of diasporicity serve to demystify how subjects and identities are formed. These practices represent people's searches for alternative understandings of identity, difference, and belonging, which are inherently political. In this sense, diasporic citizenship is "a *mode of critique* that illuminates possibilities for political change" (Dhamoon 2009, 13; emphasis in original). As Ausländer identify and examine the mechanisms that produce their Otherness, they become activists, transformed from being mere objects who are marked as different. The practices

of diasporicity interrupt the labelling and the norms or values behind the labels. These practices point to a potential for understanding and experiencing difference, identity, and belonging in new or renegotiated ways.

Although my account of diasporicity aims to disrupt the politics of culture, it also acknowledges the reality of culture. As Dhamoon (2009, 16) states, the existing culture "is individually, collectively, and legally important" in people's lives. Culture is especially salient when its claims are tied up with notions of nationhood, community, home(land), and displacement. Such notions clearly apply for Turkish Ausländer in general, and for the study's participants in particular. Their reports of hostile encounters, rooted in systems of fear and hatred, reveal that they understand culture as both a vital place of belonging and a resource for resistance. In Germany, culture is relevant to the Ausländer, because their citizenship status and the ongoing practices of their social exclusion are clearly related to the cultural context.

However, precisely because of the ways that Germanness and Ausländerness have been constructed, the historical context of German nation-building is the place where an analysis of culture needs to start. In Germany, this context has long involved exclusion and marginalization. The process of nation-building has involved constructing a delimited collective identity. German national identity has been premised, at least partly, on the attempted eradication, exclusion, and suppression of the Other. This attempted exclusion has applied to Ausländer, their ways of life, and even their physical presence. As the German nation has been (and still is) defined by ethnocentric norms, many Germans feel that the very existence of the nation-state is challenged by the Ausländer.

Diasporicity provides both a critique and a reconceptualization of how the politics of citizenship can operate. This reconceptualization has the potential to open up theoretical and political considerations that have been closed off by assumptions regarding multiculturalism and especially by considerations related to the constitution of power. Therefore, the alternative perspective of diasporicity radically repositions the analytical focus away from culture and toward the processes of meaning-making. My analysis demonstrates that this conceptual shift has the potential to expand, interrogate, and complicate the study of identity, difference, and belonging in our social and political lives.

The *Culture* of Accommodation

Understanding culture as a fixed identity seems to serve two main purposes. It gives legitimacy to the defence of culture as a valuable commodity, and it

reinforces the idea that cultures are entities whose boundaries can be de-
fined and defended. For political scientist Patchen Markell (2003, 171), cul-
ture is both an object (that individuals can have) and a background of choice
(for a way of life). To be denied access to one's culture or to be prohibited
from acting in accordance with it are forms of injustice. According to Taylor
(1994) and Kymlicka (1989, 1995), we deserve recognition of our culture-
based differences, because such recognition enables self-realization. Culture
provides a multigenerational collective resource for identity formation.
These observations seem to affirm cultural boundaries as a human right,
and such affirmation seems to free liberalism and citizenship from the
legacy of exclusion. In affirming differences between cultural groups, the
liberal state seems to stand above prejudice. However, the role of political
interests in defining cultural groups remains unexamined (Hall 1997).

As Rita Dhamoon (2009, 47) argues, viewing culture as a solid entity ig-
nores the differences within a culture among its members. This view solid-
ifies a binary oppositional distinction between *modern* and *traditional,* and
between us and them. Paradoxically, by accommodating the Other through
hospitable encounters, the dominant members of society maintain their
self-image of being in control, yet tolerant and accommodating. In such en-
counters, a regulated boundary remains between the Other and the norm.

This notion of relations between cultures simultaneously obscures the
similarities between different groups and overlooks the ethnic, national, and
linguistic differences within groups. It privileges certain kinds of differ-
ences over other kinds, and it overdetermines the bounds of group identity.
At best, this understanding only partially captures the complexity of politics
surrounding identity, difference, and belonging. At worst, this understand-
ing mislabels, obscures, or erases the multiple dimensions of people's social
relations.

As political scientist Anne Phillips (2007, 21) suggests: "When culture
becomes the catch-all explanation for everything that goes awry in non-
Western societies or minority cultural groups, while remaining an invisible
force elsewhere, something has gone wrong with the use of the term." So
the hospitable overemphasis on culture promotes a unidimensional analy-
sis of difference that contributes to what social psychologist Valerie Purdie-
Vaughns and psychologist Richard Eibach (2008, 377) call "intersectional
invisibility." In this kind of simplified analysis, the interactions among dif-
ferent categories such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and sexuality be-
come hidden. Similarly, scholar of law and critical race theory Kimberlé
Crenshaw's critique (1991) of single-issue frameworks shows the problems

of oversimplification that arise when struggle within one category is isolated from or prioritized over struggle in other categories, thereby producing a tension between culture-based forms of identification and other aspects of identity. In that case, the tension between different aspects of identity may appear irreconcilable, as seen in the tensions created between Ausländer's sexual orientations and their culture.

Philosophers Seyla Benhabib (2002) and James Tully (1995, 2002) attempt to expand the boundaries of the cultural centre to include Others who were previously excluded. They do this by reconceptualizing culture as a mode of identity and practice that is constantly changing, that is meaningful for different people in different ways, and that is situated within relations of power. These authors regard culture not as a passive and de-racialized identity, but as something constituted, experienced, and changed through the exercise of social influence. They treat culture not as an object of difference, but as an intersubjective, contested site in which differences are constituted and transformed. All of these insights are helpful, but Benhabib and Tully continue to assign primacy to one dimension of difference (culture) and to underestimate how discourses on culture can constitute regulatory paradigms. Although we cannot abandon the relevance of culture, we cannot make culture so central that other forms of difference are ignored.

In practice, our understandings of what culture means are diverse, constantly shifting, and contested. As Dhamoon (2009, 29) explains: "Cultures do not possess people, but people actually create, enact, and iterate cultural practices, symbols and differences." Sociologist, cultural theorist, and political activist Stuart Hall (1990, 226; emphasis in original) adds that cultural identity is "not an essence but a *positioning*." Professor of literature, public intellectual, and a founder of postcolonial studies Edward Said (1978) reminds us that viewing the East and West as two opposite cultures, monolithic and homogeneous, is a classic Orientalist gesture. A diasporic culture challenges such perspectives, as such culture is always remade in the context of differing nations and cultures. When people move, their identities, perspectives, and definitions change. That sort of change involves a negotiation of different positions – subjectively, politically, and publicly.

Grounds of Accommodation and Displacement

In the various theories of accommodation, culture becomes an umbrella term to describe specified ethnic, national, religious, or linguistic groups whose members are assumed to share a common identity. However, as political scientist Barbara Arneil (2007, 51–58) notes, culture has been

interpreted in numerous ways – as civilization (as opposed to nature), as constructed and relative, as a contested terrain, as an object made up of incommensurable entities (as in current discourses on the cultural wars of religion versus secularism), and as a fluid category that goes beyond ethnic and national differences to include categories of colour, sexual orientation, and disability.

Traditionally, the dominant norms within a given culture were assumed to be central for everyone in the group. In that view, preserving the particular practices of the culture became a shared responsibility. Everyone belonged to one culture or another and could not move between cultures, although they could enjoy other cultures. In these perspectives, it is assumed that national identities are pre-given. Such assumptions ignore the ways that cultural identities emerge from the political production of differences, and the way the very notion of culture-as-nationality changes with ongoing shifts in government, emigration, and loyalty. Theories of preset cultural identity also assume that other kinds of identity, such as sexuality, class, race, and gender, are also products of culture. In general, the claims of culture are often separated from and prioritized over other claims. Cultural claims erase some aspects of difference altogether in the interests of social cohesion, as defined through a unified cultural identity.

As Dhamoon (2009, 25) explains, when culture is treated as a given fact of identity or as a pre-existing entity with a fixed set of characteristics, the differences between groups of people seem permanent and absolute. Cultural difference becomes the site of trouble that must be remedied. When the differences between people become problems, it is assumed that these differences should be regulated to preserve social cohesion and achieve accommodation. In the German context, for example, culture serves to define those who are viewed as incompatible with Germany's liberal values of tolerance and equality. Cultural qualities are treated as the explanation for social relations, and these qualities are understood as coherent essences that differentiate *them* from *us.* Intense public scrutiny of specified Ausländer cultures further legitimizes regulation of people marked as being too different in their Ausländerness. Specific cultural identities become the prevailing focus. In that case, the political contexts from which these modes and degrees of difference are generated remain underanalyzed.

Methodology: Politics of Narrating Everyday Encounters

Through everyday social encounters, people's complex understandings of social identity and belonging find expression. Such encounters may involve

spontaneous interactions that open ephemeral ruptures in people's perceptions of social reality. The effects of such encounters may be fleeting, but over time they can form patterns that subtly shift the context of social life. By examining the social encounters of Turkish Berliners (through their own narratives), we can see how their lives are conditioned by social relations far larger than their immediate encounters. Their narratives about their encounters are purposeful, and designed for effect on their listeners. Therefore, narration itself can be a political act.[3]

As sociologist Francesca Polletta (2006, 34) states: "Stories are more than strategic devices ... We tell stories to persuade but also to make sense of the unfamiliar. Stories assimilate confusing events into familiar frameworks while recognizing that things are no longer as they were and we are no longer who we were." Furthermore, as sociologists James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium (2012, 33) point out: "Multiple voices can be heard in any single speaker's voice." This observation suggests that stories can carry not just people's personal experiences, but also the shared experiences of others. Through a conversation with one person, we can understand the intersectionality of various issues and discover opportunities for marginalized groups to be heard. Collecting such stories can catalyze change in the ways a community sees itself.

In studying diasporic acts and practices, I am concerned more about how people experience the challenges and successes of their lives, and less about the objective, technical truth of their observations. As Holstein and Gubrium (2012, 41) note: "[Stories] are non-specialized. If technical accounts depend on expertise, stories, in my observation, depend on imagination." In essence, stories are about experiences rather than concrete studied truths. Therefore, collecting stories creates an interconnecting web that can help a researcher discover the themes and issues surrounding a research question, rather than seeking to define a decisive causation. Polletta (2006, 34) argues that "stories contain rather than resolve ambiguity." They also have the power to rally people around what they share. Polletta often references the Black civil rights movement: each protester's story was unique, but they all involved shared experiences of oppression and struggle. Activists tell stories to build community. As political scientist Frederick Mayer (2014) shows, stories have an incredible capacity to inspire collective action. As stories are at the centre of mobilizing socio-political beings, it is vital to learn about diasporic citizenship by gathering stories.

The first step in narrative analysis is to allow room for people to relate their lived experiences. The particularities of personal narratives tend to

contradict any assumptions that people represent compartmentalized singular or even binary identities. Noting the particularities of their narratives leads toward a larger picture of belonging that includes a fluid multiplicity of identities.

Narrative analysis allows us to examine the complexities of interaction in at least three ways. First, rather than treating all members of a social group as equally dominant or equally subordinate, narrative analysis enables the perception of differences within and between social categories. A critical examination of such narratives exposes how discursive messages operate through multiple forms of relative dominance.

Second, narratives expose the relational processes of Othering. They can show what is at stake in producing an undifferentiated category of Otherness and thereby masking a multiplicity of political effects. Narratives expose the ways in which dominance is made manifest; they reveal the interactive systems of normativity and the multiplicity of differences. As Dhamoon (2009, 141) puts it, an analysis of narratives can reveal how the "meanings (or standards) of Otherness" serve to "re-entrench specific sets of interactive norms" that privilege certain qualities, be they whiteness, masculinity, capitalism, or heteronormativity. This form of analysis attends to the conditions by which dominant meanings are organized and upheld.

Third, narrative analysis exposes the interrelatedness of different issues. In my analysis of my participants' accounts, it becomes evident that various social hierarchies are deeply interrelated, such that it is not possible to undo one particular mode of subordination without addressing them all (Fellows and Razack 1994, 1998). For example, as Dhamoon (2009, 141) argues, racist systems of meaning-making intrinsically involve other processes of domination, such as sexism and class privilege. Noting this does not imply that, for example, "gender or class are reducible to race, whereby race-thinking is [just] another name for all other modalities of difference." Instead, social differences are ontologically variable in their characters and effects. We cannot organize all social issues around only one or two forms of oppression, nor can we claim that one form of dominance is universally more significant than another.

Furthermore, focusing on the relationships between interactive processes allows us to examine social differences without entering a debate over which groups are most oppressed. Such competition tends to focus on "gaining the attention and political support of dominant groups as [oppressed groups try to] pursue policy remedies, leaving the overall system of stratification unchanged" (Hancock 2007, 68). Therefore, as Dhamoon

(2009, 142) notes, the overall system of stratification has to be confronted so that the habitual process of "privileging and penalizing representations of difference" can be dismantled.

In using narrative analysis in a study of diasporicity, we cannot assume that all Othered subjects will "automatically be allies or, conversely, that they are inevitably different" (Dhamoon 2006, 142). For Dhamoon (142), narrative analysis serves as an account of meaning-making, which provides "a way to detect potential political alliances without assuming either that all struggles are fundamentally similar," or presuming that all Othered subjects are sisters and brothers. Of course, many commonalities exist among subjects who fall into any particular category of Otherness (race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality), as we see in the case of German-born, Turkish-background Berliners. In many cases, these various Othered people may desire some form of community and solidarity. However, their narratives still indicate great individuality. Understanding their particular narratives involves learning to respect both people's personal differences and the relationships between their struggles.

The socio-political struggles that diasporic people's narratives describe do not end with any official recognition of a minority by the state, or with an assignment of differentiated rights, or with any radicalized practices of inclusion. Instead, the changes that these Othered people long for arise through their own actions, as they themselves disrupt the ways that representations of difference are maintained.

The everyday encounters that arise in narratives can be analyzed in three ways. The first is to examine the processes that differentiate dominant subjects as the *norms*, and the subordinate subjects as the *Others*. In this approach, we need to look at how differentiated people relate to existing discourses about inclusion and exclusion. We need to listen to people's own accounts of how the general categories of *Otherness* are produced and how the varied meanings of these categories affect their lives. Second, we can study "how self-directed and externally imposed meanings are produced" (Dhamoon 2009, 14) in social life at the individual, intergroup, and intragroup levels. By examining how these interactions play out through the discourses of belonging and Othering, we can see how differences are regulated through dominant norms or challenged by participants who are marked as others. Third, we can take account of the relational processes within dominant discourses. We can look at the gradations of inclusion, exclusion, and belonging, noting the degrees and forms of penalty or privilege. This type of analysis allows us to explore relational differences in the

context of "mapping out confrontations." In summary, a narrative analysis of everyday encounters seeks to account for interrelated social processes that include a) differentiation in general (rather than just the singular objects of difference), b) the ways that the meanings of differentiation are made operational (by the state or by members of society), and c) the interrelated processes of confrontation that contest differences among social groups (cf. Dhamoon 2009, 14–15).

Chapter Synopses

Chapter 1 develops the theoretical model anchored in the key term diasporicity, in relation to social tensions involving two axes of discourse. The first axis is the politics of accommodation for foreigners, as effected through the discourses of hostility and hospitality. The second axis is the politics of displacement, as effected through the discourses of homelessness and homesickness.

Chapter 2 examines the process of creating Germanness and outsiderness. This chapter offers a brief account of how the German nation was created and the significant role played by Ausländer (foreigners) in the process. It then turns to the politics and interpretations of the Turkish Ausländer experiences since these people began arriving in the 1960s. This account follows their careers as *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers), their lives in the period from the end of recruitment until the end of the Cold War era, and the significance of the wall for all Berliners. It discusses the racist attacks that have occurred since unification and the citizenship debates of the late 1990s and 2000s. It also considers the impact of Islamoracism since the early 2000s.

Chapter 3 analyzes the context of accommodation in greater detail, showing the graded degrees of inclusion granted to German-born Turkish Berliners, although they remain located as outside Germanness. This chapter examines everyday discourses in which the participants are judged by their skin colour, gender, or styles of clothing such as headscarves. I examine the discourses of ignorance by which Ausländer are (mis)recognized. Although German discourse about the Ausländer swings from hostility to hospitality, an underlying externalizing question is constantly posed: "Woher kommst du?" ("Where do you come from?").

Chapter 4 analyzes the diasporic experience of displacement in greater detail. It considers how the participants articulate the contradictions of being German-born Turkish Ausländer. I explain their experience as an ongoing negotiation of homesickness and homelessness. This chapter explores

the complex and contradictory meanings of having a homeland, and the connections that Ausländer have with that land. Their experience of displacement enables the participants to identify social distinctions or ruptures at both subjective and societal levels. In that process, the whole notion of Germanness is opened for re-examination.

Chapter 5 investigates how Ausländer experience the struggle for identity and belonging as a subjective conflict. Some participants describe how they have sought to bring their Turkishness and Germanness together as a whole, while others have come to realize that they do not have to choose any combination of these two identities. They have the option of not choosing, because identity is multidimensional and ever-changing.

Chapter 6 concludes the account by exploring the notion of diasporic citizenship in greater depth. The participants show how their daily social encounters open ruptures with cultural expectations, thereby challenging prescribed roles and practices. Moreover, by interrogating the practices of exclusion, the participants change themselves. They come to understand their complex condition as a new type of citizenship. This chapter summarizes the social, cultural, and political characteristics of such diasporic citizenship, and it offers a broader understanding of what citizenship means in an increasingly multinational, multi-ethnic Western society.

The concluding chapter presents a review of the various ways this book contributes to studies on citizenship and diaspora. It reassesses the ways that communities of struggle can learn from diasporic citizens. Finally, it summarizes the reasons why Germany needs to redefine citizenship beyond the realm of the nation-state.