

Migrant Workers and the Integration of Legal Migrants

Ayhan Kaya

Istanbul Bilgi University

ayhank@bilgi.edu.tr

In my presentation, I will refer to the recent usage of the security discourse with regard to migration, the response of migrants to the recent debates revolving around heterophobia, the rise of the culturalist discourse and the negligence of the concept of deindustrialization in portraying the problems of migrants, transnationalizing integration as opposed to the recent return of assimilationist and homogenizing attempts of integration, the use of liberal citizenship regimes to integrate migrants, the importance of double citizenship, and finally the issue of internally displaced people in the OSCE region.

Securitization of Migration by the States: A Form of 'Governmentality'

The recent usage of the term 'security' goes beyond its conventional limits. Security used to be defined in political/military terms as the protection of the boundaries and integrity of the state and its values against the dangers of a hostile international arena. However, nowadays, security concerns are not only reduced to the protection of states against ideological and military threats; they are rather related to several different issues such as migration, ethnic revival, religious revival (Islam), and identity claims. Lately, migration has been presented within the OSCE space as a security threat which must be managed. One could argue that modern states tend to extend the fear of 'migrants' and 'others' by categorising, stigmatizing and coupling migration together with unemployment, drug trafficking, human trafficking, criminality and terrorism. This tendency is reinforced by the usage of a rather xenophobic and heterophobic terminology, which de-humanizes migrants.

Securitization of migration has become a vital issue after the events of 9/11.

The new security discourse conceals the fact that ethnic/religious/identity claims of migrants and their reluctance to integration actually *result from* existing structural problems of poverty, unemployment, discrimination, xenophobia, heterophobia, nationalism and racism, but not the *reason* of those problems. It seems to me that states tend to employ the discourse of securitization as a political technique with a capacity to integrate a society politically by staging a credible existential threat in the form of an “enemy within” like the migrants, minorities, or Muslims. The main rationale of the security discourse seems to have shifted from *protecting the state* to *protecting the society*. Thus, the protection of society against any kind of ‘evil’ has become the pillar of the security discourse in a way that has popularized the term ‘security’ in all spheres of life. Immigration resulting from poverty and anti-democratic regimes in the countries of origin has become one of the principal worries of the western countries. Thus, lately immigration has been defined as a threat, not to the survival of the state, but to societal security.

Modern state has unfortunately turned into only a kind of security device, withering away from social, cultural, economic and even political spheres of life. It seems that neo-liberalism and the new right political economy have so far unequipped modern nation-states to look after social and economic problems of contemporary societies. Both the security discourse and neo-liberal socio-economic policies have dominated the OSCE public space in a way that has concealed the discussion of deep-rooted structural problems like deindustrialization, unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, discrimination, unequal political representation, hypersegregation, nihilism, anarchism, violence and global injustice.

The Response of Migrants: Ethno-Cultural and Religious Resurgence

The withering away of the redistributive justice of the welfare state as well as of the state’s parental authority has further isolated those subordinated migrant origin communities from legitimate political grounds. Leaving the issue of social and political integration of migrant origin communities to free market conditions has

unfortunately brought about an essentialist form of resistance by migrant communities. This essentialist form of resistance has so far been displayed in the form of ethno-cultural and religious resurgence. One should not forget that exclusion of some social groups from legitimate political grounds may prompt those groups to generate an alternative discourse of politics in the form of ethnic, religious and cultural resurgence.

I would also like to address the recent debate on Islamic resurgence, which has become very peculiar in the context of migration.-Discussions revolving around the killing of Theo van Gogh, the Cartoon Crisis, several bombing incidents by so-called "Islamist terrorists", and the provocative speech of the Pope seem to reveal the fact that Islam is no longer only a faith but has become more than that. Islam has become the voice of the counter-hegemonic global resistance, or to put it differently one of the languages of global resistance. It has rather become a political discourse. Thus, as long as the global structural problems of poverty, socio-political exclusion, injustice, unemployment, uneducation, migration, child poverty, feminization of poverty, and aging are there to be resolved, ethno-cultural and religious revivals will continue all over the world.

The Culturalist Discourse and Deindustrialization

One should not mix up symptoms and reasons. Lately, it has often been claimed that the main reason for the so-called "incapacity" of migrants to integrate into the social, political and economic spheres of life of the receiving society, and thus to become more affiliated with ethnicity, religiosity and violence is their ethno-cultural and religious distinctness from that of the majority society. The rise of such an ethno-culturalist and religious discourse conceals deep-rooted structural problems such as deindustrialization, poverty, unemployment, exclusion, racism, xenophobia, heterophobia and xenophobia, which actually distance migrant communities from integrating. It should be borne in mind that it is actually the processes of globalization and deindustrialization, or post-industrialization, which have

eventually led to the rise of ethno-cultural and religious identity formations on the part of uneducated, unqualified, unpropertied, subordinated and alienated immigrant communities as a reaction.

Transnationalizing Integration

There is lately a tendency to reduce migration to cultural assimilation, which corresponds to a process portrayed by the return of assimilation and homogenization. One could challenge such a tendency in at least two ways: *Firstly*, one could say that this is a rather outmoded definition of integration, which fails to include structural, political, civic, marital, identificational, and behavioural components of integration.¹ *Secondly*, one could also argue that the integration of migrants can no longer remain a one-way process in the age of globalization. It should rather be transnationalized with the involvement of not only the receiving country but also the sending country and supranational or international organizations like the European Union, Council of Europe and the OSCE.

Let me add a few more words about the concept of *transnationalizing integration*. It is accurate to claim that international migrants are both subjects and objects of the processes of globalization. Contemporary technological developments of transportation and communication provide them with the chance to dwell in “both banks of the river”: *actually dwelling* in the country of destination and *symbolically living* in the country of origin. Thus, most of the contemporary international migrants have constructed a *third space* in between the homeland and hostland, i.e., a *transnational space* characterized by a constant social, political, cultural and economic

¹ Types of Integration: (1) cultural or behavioural integration (acculturation); (2) structural integration, which involves entrance into organizations and institutions of the host society at the primary group level; (3) civic integration (generating a shared identity of citizenship); (4) marital integration (amalgamation); (5) identificational integration (creation of a sense of peoplehood at the societal level); (6) attitude receptional integration (absence of prejudice); (7) behavioural receptional integration (absence of discrimination).

interaction between at least two locations, or sometimes even more. Thus, immigration countries should not limit their efforts of integration of migrants to nationally bound policies; they should rather transnationalize integration in a way that engages not only state-run institutions and civil society organizations of the receiving countries but also relevant agents of sending countries (media, ministries, NGOs) and the migrant associations are somehow involved in.

Liberal Citizenship Regimes

The awarding of citizenship to migrants can very well be an efficient integration tool. Immigrants attain the fullest degree of political rights if they become citizens of their country of settlement. Granting migrants the right to elect and to stand as a candidate on top of their social, civil and cultural rights (civic citizenship, or denizenship) has a great potential to prompt them to keep away from mobilizing themselves along with ethnic, cultural, religious and traditional lines, and thus to mobilize themselves along with political parties of the country they reside in.

On the other hand, one could also claim that *liberal citizenship regimes are more welcome by migrants and their children*. Western democracies and citizenship regimes seem to fail in treating minority claims as a *quest for justice*. Immigrant groups who feel alienated from the larger national and religious identity are likely to be alienated from the political arena as well. Traditional citizenship rhetoric is inclined to advance the interests of the dominant national group at the expense of migrants. So, it is unlikely that the classical understanding of citizenship can resolve issues of co-existence of 'culturally discrete' entities. In order to avoid the potentiality of conflict and alienation, there is an essential task to be undertaken: *citizenship laws must not be based on prescribed cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic qualities*. Moderate and democratic citizenship laws to be formulated in line with the task stated above can be anticipated to resolve the emphasis made on ethnicity, religiosity and nationality by migrant groups.

Double Citizenship

Another issue to be taken into account along with the institution of liberal citizenship with respect to the integration of migrants is the issue of double citizenship. Granting migrants the right to citizenship may not be enough though. Some migrants do not seek naturalization because they would lose citizenship in their country of origin, or because they would give up hereditary titles or the right to own immovables there. Thus, the introduction of double citizenship becomes a necessity for migrants to integrate politically. Please, let me also not here that in some countries naturalization is considered to be the result of a migrant's full cultural integration. Language and other tests are being used to measure the level of integration of applicants. Such tests, however, may discourage a migrants' motivation to naturalize.

Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons

The international community has recently begun to acknowledge the plight of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and is taking steps to address their needs. The issue of internal displacement originating from ethnic cleansing, terror, and violence has also become a pivotal issue in the OSCE region since the early 1990s. Internally displaced people prefer to migrate to urban spaces. Apparently disadvantaged circumstances with which IDPs are confronted within their new urban settings bring about diverse problems and conflicts, which not only threaten their own existence, but also that of socio-cultural, economic as well as political development and stability of the wider society.

In this regard, new scientific approaches are needed to analyse individual and structural conditions that would enable, or hinder, the fulfilment of preconditions necessary for an effective integration of migrants into both the local as well as national economy. Further, such scientific researches should also analyse to what extent the return projects are feasible. Furthermore, the guiding principles of the United Nations regarding internal displacement (1998) are wide enough to also serve

as guiding principles for the OSCE region since they address the key principles relating to protection from displacement, protection during displacement, humanitarian assistance, and return, resettlement and reintegration.

Thank you...