Toleranz sollte eigentlich nur eine vorübergehende Gesinnung sein: sie muß zur Anerkennung führen. Dulden heißt beleidigen[1].

[Tolerance should really only be a passing attitude: it should lead to appreciation. To tolerate is to offend[2].]

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

Introduction:

After the post-WWII era, immigration flow from Turkey to Germany, which began in the 1960s and continued until at least the 1980s, resulted in the occurrence of a Turkish diaspora. This spatial development could have contributed to the intercultural exchange and richness of both cultures in the long term. However, the ethnic and religious otherness of Turks as well as the status of *Gastarbeiter* (guest worker) did not promise the first generation diaspora for a permanent residence in Germany and structured 'Turkish'-'German' encounters in the form of 'employee' and 'employer' or 'guest' and 'host'. Therefore, neither Turkish immigrants nor the German government or mainstream society required any humanistic interaction with each other. One of the first settlements for Turkish guest workers was Berlin's *Kreuzberg* district, which gradually became an 'occupied zone for Turks' that stood in for their home country. Similarly, spreading ghettoisation in other German industrial cities led to a socio-cultural dichotomy that underlined the otherness of Turks in years following.

Half a century after the arrival of the first Turkish guest workers in Germany, one of the most revisited topics in German media is still the integration of 'immigrants' i.e. 'Turkish' and 'other Muslim communities' into 'German dominant culture'. In 2010, then chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, at the CDU/CSU's youth party congress in Potsdam, stated that the objective of multi-culturalism failed absolutely, underlining; "integration does not mean living side by side but rather with each other" ("Multi-Kulti ist absolut gescheitert", 2010). At the same event, several hours earlier, then-CSU party chairman and minister president of Bavaria, Horst Seehofer, had declared multiculturalism as 'dead' and emphasised that foreigners have to learn

[1] Goethe, J.W. & Hecker, M. (Ed.). (1907). *Maximen und Reflexionen. Aphorismen und Aufzeichnungen. Nach den Handschriften des Goethe- und Schiller-Archivs*. Weimar: Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft.
[2] Goethe, J.W. & Hutchinson, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Maxims and Reflections*. (E. Stopp, Trans.). London: Penguin Classics.

German and respect the German *Leitkultur* (dominant culture) ("Seehofer erklärt Multikulti für tot", 2010). Even though Merkel agreed that Islam would also be a part of Germany, she agreed with Seehofer about the maintenance of the German 'dominant culture' that "traces back to a Christian-Jewish past" and was "shaped by humanism and enlightenment"[3] ("Multi-Kulti ist absolut gescheitert", 2010). The emphasis on these common values through a produced knowledge of tradition and history is not specific to the conservative party unions between the CDU and CSU. The populist right political party of Germany, AfD[4], and the right-wing extremist movement, PEGIDA[5], also use similar historical references for their ideological argumentations. For that reason, it is suggested that the conservative parties of Germany, both liberals and right-extremists that garnered the majority of votes in the 2017 elections,[6] almost agree on a common description of 'German identity' based on 'Jewish-Christian tradition', 'humanism' and 'the enlightenment'.

The Turkish diaspora that constitutes not only the majority of 'foreigners' but also 'Muslims' in Germany self-evidently remains outside of this description of 'Germanness'. Indeed, Seehofer had already approved this classification prior to the conference, by pointing out that immigrants from 'other cultural areas' such as Turkey and Arab countries make integration difficult ("Multi-Kulti ist tot", 2010; Lau, 2010). However, the exclusion of the Turkish diaspora is not solely based on religious and cultural otherness. During and after the presidential referandum in Turkey in April 2017, discussions again emerged as to whether Turkish diaspora, the majority of which voted in favour of the presidential system, have actually faith in democracy and other values of Germany and the European Union, since it was claimed that the presidential system would lead to dictatorship in Turkey (Salmen and Hoffman, 2017).

While the examples of Turkish otherness can vary, the unchanging political discourse can be described as an obsession with the temporality that leads to drawing borders between people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds even though they all live within the 'borders' of

[3] A similar description is also included in Seehofer's 7 Point Plan for Integration. See Merkel erklärt Multikulti für gescheitert (2010, Oktober 16), *Spiegel Online*. Retrieved from https://www.spiegel.de

[4] „Alternative für Deutschalnd" (Alternative for Germany), AfD, also describes German dominant culture as "values of Christianism, humanism and enlightenment" on its official website: www.afd.de/grundsatzprogramm.

[5] PEGIDA, *Patriotische Europäer gegen Islamisierung des Abendlandes* (Patriotic Europeans against Islamisation of the Occident). Similarly, it is mentioned about "maintenance of the occidental culture shaped by Christian-Jewish tradition" on the official website of this far-right organization. See the website: https://www pegida.de/program

[6] See Bundestagwahl 2017: Analyse in Grafiken und Karten-Interaktive. Berliner Morgenpost (2017, September 25). Retrived from: https://interaktiv.morgenpost.de

the Federal Republic of Germany. Thus, Annika M. Hinze (2013) who describes Germany's integration policy as a "mode of gatekeeping for membership in the national community" (p.14), suggests a "third dimension" (lived experiences of the Turkish diaspora in Berlin's Kreuzberg and Neukölln districts) to the discussion of integration (p.28). Hinze's study "Turkish Berlin: Integration Policy and Urban Space" concludes: "[t]he immigrants lived reality reveals that integration includes a spatial dimension" (p.146). Similarly, this paper suggests an alternative to the historicist political discourse in debates about the 'integration and problematic belonging of the Turkish diaspora'. Accordingly, it proposes a spatially oriented approach to the current issue, through an interdisciplinary research about representation of 'Turkish' – 'German' encounters as social and spatial practices in social drama films produced for German television in the last decade. The study, drawing insights especially from media studies, cultural geography and cultural studies, carries out audio-visual analysis of fictive everyday encounters between people of the Turkish diaspora and ethnic Germans, within a methodological framework that treats audio-visual representations as physical, ideological and lived spaces. Therewith, it purposes a contribution to *discovery of contemporary spatiality of Turkish diaspora in the contemporary German television reality*. To avoide a homogeny perspective, it focuses on three central aspects of Turkish diaspora in terms of identity, otherness and spatiality: *home space* (i.e. sense of belonging), *Islamic life* and *inherited Turkishness* in diasporic experiences of the young generation.

Theoretical Framework

To construct a theoretical framework that responds to these objectives, the study builds on primarily Henri Lefebvre's inspirational arguments in his book, *Production of Space* (1991). According to Lefebvre, space can be produced and employed by dominant ideologies i.e. hegemonic power that shape community and every day behaviours and lifestyles. Hospitals, schools, universities, shopping malls, cafeterias etc. are produced spaces where people are supposed to behave in a certain manner. Therefore, in order for one to remain 'inside', s/he must adopt a different manner in each of these produced spaces. Everyday encounters also depend on these produced spaces. Erwing Goffman (1956), who compares any encounter activity to a theatrical play and the participants to stage actors, termed such produced spaces as a "setting" or "front stage". For instance, when a patient meets a doctor, the clinic as a

space produced by modern medical discourse where the encounters occurs shapes the structure of the patient – doctor encounter. Interestingly, the agent of the structure is neither doctor nor patient even if the doctor appears have the authority in the given context. All guidelines to be followed are embedded within the structure of the clinic. Thus, Edward Soja (1996) posits that produced spaces are not only physical but also ideological i.e. imagined and lived. Likewise, spatial concepts such as hometown, home country and national borders are also imagined as physical, which they are. It is assumed an individual citizen of a country has a common frame of nationality that attaches him / her to their compatriots although s/he can hardly know them all personally. One has a concept of home country in mind even if s/he lives only in one of the cities of her/his 'home country'[7]. Social products that might be called private home, neighbourhood, city or country consist of physical and ideological elements having interrelation to each other. Ideological power that dominates the territory produces an imagined space that consists of national and cultural values, national symbols and a common history, all of which are 'protected' again by national boundaries (Bhabha, 1990). Consequently, any space produced for the sake of a nation or any ethno-cultural group constructs standardised social scripts for social behaviours including everyday encounters similar to the example of the clinic that constructs the doctor-patient encounter. Thus, there are idealised attributes that are supposed to be adopted by societal individuals to perform certain roles on social stages during encounters with different people (Goffman, 1956).

The primary role given to the members of the imagined community is the identities of belonging such as nation, ethnicity or religion. Attributes of these identities are again determined by the ideological space. Thereby, produced space constructs certain identities for the habitants to adopt. However, it is not possible for every individual living within the produced community borders to perform these imposed roles. This is the lack of certain attributes for the performance. The inability of the performance, the so called "failure of impression management", which would approve the incapability to respond to norms and values, causes the individual to be categorised as "discredited" by space and ideology (Goffman, 1963, p.4). Thereby, space simultaneously produces 'others', who remain outside the category of idealised identities.

Hegemonic powers and their produced spaces have always been the unchanging agents of othering, even though otherness could appear in different forms depending on the context.

[7] Therefore, Benedict Anderson (1983) describes nation as "imagined political community" (p.6.).

The colonial powers constructed a racial otherness producing a 'backward and wild Africa' where 'it was necessary to fight against uncivilized local people to civilize the area'. Similarly, Eurocentrism as an outcome of Enlightenment from the 18th century developed a geographical and religious otherness by producing a Western space through certain common values, history and science and an 'Orient' as inferior of the Occident (Said, 1978). All of these produced spaces were both physical and ideological, which constructed dichotomies in terms of racial, religious or cultural differences. Thus, they also produced imagined 'encounters' depending on power relations and space within binary oppositions such as 'European' vs. 'native', 'white' vs. 'black', 'occidental' vs. 'oriental', 'civilized' vs. 'uncivilized' and so on.

These imagined colonial and orientalist encounters were followed by increasing immigration flows from the so-called 'third world' to the industrially developed Western countries from the 19th century. Thereby, people of different cultures, religions and ethnicities came across on another in metropolises. These post-modern encounters could have challenged the imagined encounters of the colonialist and the Eurocentric hegemonies because they included lived immigration experiences and the individual encounters with the 'other'. However, produced spaces of the Western metropolises excluded immigrants because they were not qualified to perform the role of nation on the stage of the imagined community. Therefore, they were confined to 'ghettos' that isolated them from 'the majority'. These spatial re-productions of certain districts in the Western metropolises were not different from the orientalist reproduction of the East, which "confined the whole East" to an imagined 'Orient' (Said, 1978, p. 55). More precisely, the postmodern hegemonic power produced innovative forms of otherness and racism such as cultural otherness that supports the impossibility of co-existence of different cultures, termed by as "new racism" or "differentialist racism" by scholars (see; Barker, 1982 and Balibar, 1991).

Consequently, contemporary ideological spaces of immigration countries exclude people of different cultural backgrounds from 'the role of nation' unless they are appropriated by the hegemonic power to mimic the "original" culture to take part in the theatre. The enforcement of 'integration' into the main stream culture reveals *mimicries*[8](Bhabha, 1994), who struggle

[8]Bhabha (1994) describes mimicry as an imperfect imitation of the "original culture", which derives from the "desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (p.85).

to be a member of the dominant society rejecting some and adapting other cultural elements. The mimicries are never completely included and always remain -so called- side characters, who perform as 'good foreigners' on the stage. However, they are more welcome than those who reject or cannot adopt the imposed social roles. Thereby, hegemonic power constructs different forms of otherness, which are comparable and contrastive with each other. For that reason, it is not possible to talk of parallel and stable othernesses. Thus, Avtar Brah (1996) points out that all these forms of stigmatisation including cultural otherness are "intersecting modalities of differential racialisations marking positionality across articulating fields of power" (p.182). Brah, using the concept of *diaspora* instead of 'minority', approaches to identity and otherness intersectional rather than parallel. In her book *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities* (1996), Brah highlights the multidimensionality of power that is not adequately regarded because of conceptualising social relations in terms of dichotomies such as minority vs. majority. Brah's diasporic perspective that points out power relations going beyond dichotomies and echoing Lefebvre's and Soja's arguments inspires the current study to use concept of 'Turkish diaspora' instead of binary expressions such as 'Turkish minority' and 'German majority'. Therewith, the study adopts a discourse that surpasses dichotomies and suggests an open space where "boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, of belonging and otherness, of 'us' and 'them' are contested", termed "diaspora space" by Brah (1996, p.208). More precisely it approaches the audio-visual 'Turkish'-'German' encounters as interactions, dialogs or conflicts among people described and categorized by hegemonic power depending on their cultural, religious, ethnic, socio-economic and other attributes. Therefore, the study prefers to term these encounters 'diasporic encounters' as alternative to 'Turkish-German' encounters.

Television Studies Aspect of the Research and Selection of the Texts

Regarding the contemporary interactivity between everyday life and audio-visual media that has already destroyed the boundaries between the 'reality' and the 'fictional', the study reinterprets the proposed spatial approach in the audio-visual context. Indeed, audio-visual technologies give audiences access to spatial experiences and knowledge regardless of physical and temporal distance. For that reason, contemporary spatial imaginary of society is constructed mostly by audio-visual media products while imagined characteristics of spaces

thereby become more visible. Especially TV fiction produces simultaneously visual and physical spaces for everyday encounters, which can include even the audience, blurring the lines between fiction and reality. While these televisual narratives can appear in different genres and formats, German social dramas produced for television audiences, which adopt a didactic and emotional tone, constitute a research interest for the representation of diasporic experiences. This television genre, the origin of which can be linked to Fassbinder's *Angst Essen Seele Auf* (1976) as the first social problem film about immigrants in Germany, inspires the current study with a research question on the influence of the generic conventions of social drama on the fictive diasporic encounters and televisual spatiality of the Turkish diaspora. The selected social drama films; *Wut* (Range, 2006), *Die Neue* (The Newcomer, 2015) and *Nachspielzeit* (Extra-Time, 2015) that deal with the representation of three aspects of Turkish diasporic experiences; *sense of home*, *Islamic life* and *living the Turkish heritage* are supposed to provide a broad perspective for the research.

The selection of these TV films as the primary sources of the current study is besed on two of their major characteristics. Firstly, they enable approaching the Turkish diaspora from three perspectives; sense of belonging and home; 'Turkish' religion i.e., Islam; and inherited 'Turkish' culture. Although the main Turkish characters live in the same city and constitute the Turkish diaspora, each represents completely different identities through relating different diasporic experiences. The three perspectives embodied by the characters and that are both individual and interrelational with each other highlight the heterogeneity of the diaspora and suggest a broader perspective than mere clichés and stereotypes for a discussion on the representation of diasporic Turkishness. Thus, analyses of these films also should provide a deeper insight into the audio-visual spatiality of Berlin's Turkish diaspora.

Secondly, the genre, namely social drama, contributes an alternative perspective to the study, which separates it from the previous research that deals mostly with represenations on German TV comedy. Analysis of these films, which can be suggested to have specific generic conventions such as didactic and melodramatic storytelling, allows an observation of social drama on representations of diasporic encounters and Turkishness. Consequently, the collected corpus also contributes a generic perspective to the literature of representations of the Turkish diaspora in Germany. Therewith the study ought to reveal the relationship between TV reality, generic conventions and representations of 'Other' in German audio-visual culture.

General Structure of the Paper

Accordingly, the first chapter constructs a framework that combines the concepts of diaspora, audio-visuality and everyday encounters within a spatial approach. For that purpose, after the introduction of Lefebvre's and Soja's suggestions shaping the framework, the second section adjusts the proposed spatial approach to television studies which is necessary for the process of spatial analysis in the selected texts. Thus, in this part, the concept of 'televisual space' is introduced for an approach that highlights the ambiguity of 'real' and 'fictional' spaces. The third section describes and discusses the concept of diaspora in the frame of spatiality. After revising contemporary definitions of the concept from different perspectives, the paper conceptualises Brah's (1996) "diaspora space" as a diaspora –oriented spatial approach for the current study. Following the same framework, the subtitle 'Construction of Diasporic Identities Through: 'Home', 'Religion' and 'Heritage' discusses the identity construction in diaspora through lived experiences including sense of 'home', religious life and inherited traditions and culture. In the final section, 'encountering' as an everyday life activity, is treated not only as a social but also a spatial practice through the combination of sociological and geographical perspectives. In this process, the paper discusses 'encountering activity' through Goffman's dramaturgical approach that takes everyday encounters as structured interpersonal rituals depending on time and space. His arguments are discussed in the framework of spatiality to strengthen the identity and ideology aspects of the theory. Thus, under the title 'Spatiality of Everyday Encounters', the paper follows Michael Foucault's (1980) arguments to draw a link between knowledge, power and space that theorises construction of idealised identities and 'others' of dominant ideologies in settings of everyday encounters. Thus, the subtitle 'Abstract Spaces of Everyday Encounters and Identity Construction' describes this relationship that draws societal borders through labelling 'insiders' and 'outsiders' depending on the interests of the hegemony. Furthermore, the paper contrasts this constructivist approach with Brah's diasporic perspective through Laclau's and Mouffe's (1985) suggestion of 'struggle of discourses' that argues the impossibility of an ultimate hegemony of a specific discourse. Therewith the chapter introduces a further conceptual tool, 'diasporic encounters' that adds a spatial dimension to everyday encounters besides the ideological and sociological ones. Finally,

diasporic encounters are discussed in terms of three aspects: home, religion and cultural heritage – that can potentially repeat or challenge the produced otherness of encountered people.

The second chapter examines the aspect of television studies in the theoretical framework. It describes the concepts of 'television drama', 'television drama film' and 'social drama' as a sub-genre of TV film in German television. These descriptions are essential for the theoretical framing of the generic conventions of the selected texts, which could influence representations of fictive encounters to be analysed. After the description of the general characteristics of television drama in the first section, the second discusses 'television film' as a special format of German TV drama with its didactic and entertaining aspects. The third section introduces social drama as a hybrid sub-genre of TV drama films comparable to Reiner W. Fassbinder's cult film *Angst Essen Seele Auf* (1978) that deals with the diasporic experiences of a guest worker, *Ali*, in West Germany. Through the revision of the previous textual analysis on Fassbinder's film, the paper outlines conventional characteristics of social drama that can influence the representation of diasporic experiences and spatiality of characters.

The third chapter constitutes the study's empirical part. The first section of the chapter reviews turning points in history of the Turkish diaspora that influenced the home space, religious life and cultural heritage of Turkish people in Germany. In the second section, the paper outlines previous studies about the audio-visual representations of the Turkish diaspora in cinema and on television. Following the conclusion of the literature review, section three describes the methodology applied during the analysis and illustrates the corpus content in chart form. The final three sections of the chapter consist of the textual analysis of the encounter scenes of the selected television films. Accordingly, section four analyses Züli Aladag's film *Wut* (2005), focusing on representation of 'home' in diasporic encounters while section five, which deals with the analysis of Buket Alakuş's *Die Neue* (2015), studies the representation of 'Islam' in the diaspora through analysis of the main character *Sevda*'s encounters with people in and outside of school. Finally, section six focusing on the representation of inherited Turkishness in ethnicity and culture provides a detailed reading for encounter scenes, especially among people of different diasporas in Andreas Pieper's film *Nachspielzeit* (2015). Besides detailed analyses of all the texts, illustrations of the scenes through screenshots and citations of relevant dialogs from the scenes, the paper also provides a brief summary and discussion of observations at the end of each empirical section.

The final chapter begins with a summary and revision of the outstanding implications of the analysed texts. Thus, it firstly outlines the observed conventional and contextual characteristics of the films that influence the representation of the diasporic encounters in the analysed scenes. Secondly, it discusses spatial representations and identity constructions of the characters, comparing them with the previous analysis of audio-visual representations of the diaspora in other texts. In the following paragraphs, the chapter discusses the meaning of the study's outcomes and implications for spatiality of the Turkish diaspora in the televisual reality and the political discourse about 'belonging' in Germany.