

SUMMARY

MIGRATION and NATION STATE / Eds. T. Baraulina, O. Karpenko. SPb: Centre for Independent Social Research. 2004.

The catalyst for this volume was an international interdisciplinary workshop "MIGRATION and NATION STATE" which was held in St.Petersburg on 19-20 May, 2002. The workshop was organized by two partner organisations: CENTRE FOR GERMAN AND EUROPEAN STUDIES (ZDES, Bielefeld/St.Petersburg) and CENTRE FOR INDEPENDENT SOCIAL RESEARCH (CISR, St.Petersburg). Both the workshop and this volume would not be possible without the generous funding provided by CENTRE FOR GERMAN AND EUROPEAN STUDIES (ZDES, Bielefeld/St.Petersburg).

The workshop was aimed at initiating the discussion on different theoretical approaches to international migration in modern nation states. A particular focus was on the role of a migration policy and citizenship legislation in constructing international migration in terms of political, social or ethnic problems. An intention was to go beyond the classical standpoint of migration research, which takes national boundaries for granted. In contrast to "methodological nationalism", contributions to the workshop conceptualise nation states not only as territorially bounded sovereign political units but mainly as symbolically and socially bounded political communities. The discussion addresses the following major questions : How symbolic and social boundaries of the "national" are institutionalised within administrative and political dimensions of migration policy? In which ways do the state institutions adopt and modify the strategies of national exclusion?

Part I

MIGRATION POLICY

EXCLUSION OF "OTHERS"?

Aleksandr Ossipov

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION OF MIGRATION IN RUSSIA

In Russian public opinion migration policy appears to go through positive changes. The former hyper-liberal, chaotic, and contradictory policy of Eltsin seems to become "normalized" by Putin's new citizenship and migration legislation. The article challenges this view. It raises the question: On which type of "normalization" is Putin's migration policy based? Legislation and practice dealing with migration in the Eltsin era were indeed inconsistent. On the one hand, after the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia adopted the most liberal citizenship and immigration law in Europe. On the other hand, a large number of people found themselves without definite legal status. Most of them were migrants from former Soviet republics and refugees from Russian conflict regions. The author claims that the factual illegalization of migrants with Soviet passports stems from the restrictive passport system, which remained almost untouched by the liberalization reforms in the Eltsin era. Especially the institution of 'propiska' (registration of residence by the local administrations) has been used to exclude migrants. Due to Putin's reforms opportunities to settle in Russia and to obtain full citizenship were legally restricted. Nevertheless, the new legislation did not clarify the situation of semi-illegals. On the contrary, the so-called "normalization" of migration policy has to be seen as merely legitimising the exclusion of migrants from social participation, which was already practised by passport system. In contrast to many nation states, this exclusion is not based on national concepts of belonging but on situational criteria depending on political convenience or the arbitrariness of bureaucrats.

Tatiana Baraulina and Juegen Feldhoff

GERMANY'S NEW IMMIGRATION LAW - A CRITICAL INTERPRETATION

National migration politics are widely perceived to be based on contradictory principles. The article argues that migration politics in Germany overcame contradictions by a strategy of "organized hypocrisy". Germany declared itself a non-migration state with citizenship based exclusively on ethnic origin. In spite of this rhetoric, West Germany accepted and incorporated millions of migrants with different cultural and social backgrounds. After the reunification, Germany adopted a more inclusive citizenship law. Furthermore, in 2000 a new immigration law was drafted by the new left-wing government, which was generally seen to be the next step towards a more liberal migration policy. The authors claim, however, that this conclusion is premature. The new draft law only declares openness but simultaneously reduces opportunities for immigration. Nevertheless, labour migration increases. Thus, the system of organised hypocrisy - legal denial of immigration versus its informal acceptance - seems to

endure. The authors assume that such a strategy allows modern nation states to maintain their symbolical power based on national exclusiveness and simultaneously to cope with the demands of a globalised economy.

Part II

COROLLARY OF THE STATE DEFINITION OF "OURS" AND "OTHERS".

Oksana Karpenko

WHOM AND WHAT DO MIGRANTS THREATEN? LANGUAGE GAMES ABOUT "GUESTS FROM CAUCASUS"

Public opinion in Russia sees migration as a threat to social security and migrants as a source of many social problems. Even liberally oriented minds do not question this. Analysing the national and local press, the article aims to explain this radical anti-migration discourse. The author seeks the answer in the performative logic of public discourse, which distinguishes between them and us. Descriptions of migrants' otherness are based on the distinction between "locals" and "newcomers". These are categories of belonging to locality. Migrants are being described as a source of trouble because they have no emotional and social relationship to the place, and therefore to the community, they want to settle in. The discourse of migrant illoyalty to the local community is built on the metaphor of "home, hosts and guests". The author claims that this metaphor transforms the public question of migrants' rights into a private question of hospitality and proper behaviour. As a result the migration

Vladimir Malakhov

ETHNICIZING MIGRATION IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE AND INSTITUTIONS: COMPARING RUSSIA AND GERMANY

The article covers different dimensions of the contemporary migration policy of Russian Federation and compares it with the German approach to the issues related to migration. The author argues that, in acute contradiction to the official rhetoric celebrating multinational nature of the state, the emerging trend of the migration policy and the concomitant legislation in Russia is characterized by a shift towards an ethnocentric model of the state as a community of "common descent", implying one all-encompassing cultural identity and exclusion of people of "wrong" origins. According to the author, the current public discourse promotes ethnicization of the Russian migration policy. Parallels between German and Russian policy in the field of migration, drawn by V.Malakhov in conclusion to the article, suggest that notwithstanding apparent similarities, recent developments in Germany indicate a tendency to reconsider an ethnocentric vision of national community, whereas Russian legislation reinforces the ethnocentric model.

Vladimir Ilyin

RELIGIOUS PRACTICES OF ETHNIC GERMANS IN GERMANY

Ethnicity is one of the the social resources that Germans from the former Soviet Union use to get a legal immigration permit to Germany and to claim German citizenship. Membership in one of the „German“ churches used to be seen by immigration authorities as an important marker of belonging to the Volk. In the procedure of examining Germanness both the religious membership and the ethnicity of newcomers are being constructed. Religious faith plays an important role also after arrival. Church membership fosters social and cultural integration. At the same time, the Russian Germans' way of practicing religion leads to cultural boundaries between them and the "old" parishioners. The religious practices of ethnic migrants from the former USSR is the main subject of the empirical research presented in the article. The research is based on qualitative interviews with ethnic Germans in Bielefeld, Hamburg and Frankfurt-am-Main conducted in the period from 1999 to 2002.

Part III

STATE IN THE WORLD WITHOUT BORDERS NEW PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION AND EXCLUSION

Olga Brednikova, Markus Kaiser

TRANSNATIONALISM AND TRANSLOCALITY: COMMENTS ON THE USAGE OF TERMS

The article provides an overview of new developments in migration research which goes beyond the 'container perspective' on society. Until recently migration studies focused primarily on the integration of migrants into a national society. Migration appeared to be a unidirectional movement from one location to another. On the periphery of migration research, however, new views on the phenomenon were tested. For example, studies on

regional labour migration redefined it as a circular movement, as migrants attempt to extend the space of social possibilities. In the last few years, other competing approach to the classical migration theory rose to prominence. One of them is transnationalism. It claims that social ties of migrants, which extend over sending and receiving societies, transcend cultural and social boundaries of the nation state. A variety of empirical research was inspired by transnationalism. One perspective focuses on national borders as social contexts generating transnational spaces. Another invents a concept of 'translocality' which is interested in the changes of migrants connection to place, tradition and ritual. The authors conclude that transnationalism forces social theory to rethink the concepts of space and nation state.

Michael Bommes

THE SHRINKING INCLUSIVE CAPACITY OF THE NATIONAL WELFARE STATE: INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND THE DEREGULATION OF IDENTITY FORMATION

The article offers an alternative explanation of the increasing cultural plurality in modern nation states. Until now multiculturalists and transnationalists have been taking this phenomenon as evidence for a decline of national exclusion. Extreme versions of such an interpretation claim the demise of the nation state and its power to exclude "others" and produce cultural homogeneity. Arguing from a structural perspective, the author detects in the plural forms of collective solidarity changing mechanisms of political inclusion. Modern welfare states, whose action capacity is curtailed by globalization, have ceased to define their members on the basis of the emphatic categories of national, ethnic or cultural belonging. They are transforming themselves into service providers for tax payers and for socially reliable inhabitants. The winners in the labour market and economy become core members of the state. The losers, on the other hand, receive minimal social help in exchange for their loyalty. Modern welfare states divide their people not in nationals and aliens but in advantaged and disadvantaged, in the core and periphery of their interests. Migrants can in principal belong to both groups. But the structure of traditional migration to the European welfare states is likely to place migrants in the periphery. Whereas in the past, orientation to assimilation promised migrants upward mobility, this orientation is now only a matter of individual taste. The new basis of belongig in the modern welfare states does not motivate migrants to assimilate. This is the reason for the 'deregulation of collective identities' - which multiculturalism and transnationalism overlook.

Frank-Olaf Radke

BETWEEN DEREGULATION AND DISCRIMINATION. THE DILEMMA OF THE GERMAN WELFARE STATE IN DEALING WITH MIGRATION

Presently, all European welfare states adopt a neo-liberal ideology as a new effective governance paradigm. However, their migration policies preserve the old conservative ideology of the exclusiveness of national belonging. The article aims to explain the ongoing exclusion of migrants from political and social participation in Europe. On the basis of Luhmann's system theory the author identifies a declining capacity of welfare states to regulate social inclusion. In an era of globalisation, welfare states are confronted with the choice for financial bankruptcy or redefining their ideological foundations. They are not able to guarantee equality anymore. Welfare states react to this loss of power by restricting access to state-membership. By reinventing 'national belonging' as a main criterion for social and political participation, welfare states maintain an illusion of being able to act effectively. However, as the author points out, the conservatism of welfare states has real consequences. It legitimises the institutional discrimination of non-members: migrants, foreigners, and aliens. In this perspective multiculturalism appears to be a public ideology of cultural difference, which misses the core problems of welfare states related to migration.