

Mapping Minorities and their Media: The National Context – Germany

Ulrich Raiser
Humbolt University, Berlin

The history of migration and the modification of migration policies in Germany since World War II

Compared to large colonial nations like Britain, France or the Netherlands, the German history of migration is somehow unique for two main reasons: First, Germany has never experienced a large postcolonial migration.. In other words, other than Britain or France which had to deal with migration in large numbers from their former colonies to the “motherland”, the post-war history of migration in Germany started in the 50s with the integration of over 5 million refugees from the so called “Ostgebiete”- areas in Poland and the Soviet Union which had been part of the German “Reich” before 1945. Nearly as high – up to 3 million – was the amount of refugees from the GDR until 1961 (Thränhard 2001). Post-war Germany was therefore not dealing with the immigration of people from former colonies - with diverse ethnic backgrounds - but with the immigration of a population that was considered to be part of the German “Volk” in terms of ethnic decent, religion, language and culture.

Second, post-war Germany quickly developed a reputation of having a strong economy and a comparatively high standard of living. Hence, despite the destructive economic consequences of the war, the German society of the late 50s and 60s was highly attractive for immigrants, especially for labour migrants from southern and south eastern Europe. In other words: the first period of immigration by people from diverging ethnic and religious backgrounds started not sooner than in the late 50s with the official recruitment of labour migrants from Turkey. In the following years migration to Germany increased with the official recruitment of migrant workers from Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece (Mahnig 2001; Thränhardt 2001). Those labour migrants were labelled with the term “Gastarbeiter” - guest workers – an expression that precisely defined the position and the status of those groups within the German society. From the point of view of the majority of the German population migrant workers were seen as visitors merely useful in order to fill the gaps of the German labour market. Consequently, they were expected to return back home as soon as their “job was done”. As Schiffauer (1991) has shown for the Turkish labour migrants of the first generation the image of the *guest* worker - portrayed by the public discourse – in reverse met the intentions of most of the first generation of immigrants. Their journey to Germany was usually aimed at earning as much money

as possible within a short period of 3-5 years and then return in order to establish a material existence in their home countries.¹

In retrospective the picture of the guest-worker as the visitor who never intended to stay for good has proven to be an illusory image, nonetheless, it was intensively nourished on both sides. The “real” story is well known: for various economic, social and psychological reasons many of the first immigrants did not return to their homelands but instead decided to bring their families to Germany. Especially after the German government had officially stopped the recruitment in 1973 many families settled down for good (Mahnig 2001). However, neither the German public opinion nor the subsequent governments from the mid 70s until the late 90s have officially acknowledged the fact that Germany is an immigration country. The reality that during the past two decades up to 12% of the over all population were not of a “German” background was either ignored or naively taken as a transitional phenomenon. Thus, the “integration” (an admittedly vague but nevertheless popular term in the German public discourse) of the migrants and their families was regarded as a dispensable issue. This ignorance towards the reality of migration has in fact negatively influenced and hindered an open debate on pragmatic policies related to the issues of minorities and multiculturalism in Germany ever since.

At any rate the middle-left administration in the late 70s introduced an office for immigrant affairs with a consolatory function towards the German government. This rather progressive innovation seemed to mark a slight shift in the perception of immigrants in German politics. In the era of the social democrat-liberal coalition in the late 70s also falls the first official recognition of a constant situation of immigration to Germany. One should also mention the introduction of some liberal policies concerning the social and political rights of immigrants during the late 70s and the early 80s. On a local scale especially Berlin and Frankfurt were a progressive exception from the restrictive rule. Since the late 70s these two cities have proven to be on top of the international debate around minority policies and the design of a multicultural society by introducing active antiracist and pro-multicultural institutions and policies. In Frankfurt the first official local office for multicultural affairs had been funded. With the famous member of the European Green Party,

¹ Figures of a study by Mihiciyazgan (1992) show that 67% of the Turkish migrants of the first generation definitely wished to go home after a couple of years as opposed to only 7% who definitely intended to stay in

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, being one of its leading figures. Berlin was the first state to install an office dealing with the cultural and social issues of migration with a consultory function towards the state government. In this period also falls a campaign for easier access to German citizenship for young immigrants in Berlin (Mahnig 2001). Even though the political impact of those initiatives might have been marginal these campaigns have at least tried to put immigration issues and the debate around multiculturalism on the political and societal agenda. Moreover, in terms of social and civil rights some modifications concerning social security rights and the rights of co-determination for immigrants during the 70s have gradually led to an equal treatment of German citizens and immigrants in that domain (Mahnig 2001; Thränhardt 2001). However, with the 1983 election won by the conservative CDU immigration policies and the societal acceptance of multiculturalism experienced a backlash with the restriction of immigrant rights and the more or less open call for migrants to return to their respective home countries. Consequently, migration experts like Klaus Bade speak of a lost decade in terms of migration policy improvements especially with regards to the 1980s. A significant evidence for this tendency marks the fact that migrants in Germany have until now been denied the right to vote on a local and on a national level. This refusal of a basic democratic right in my eyes marks one of the biggest failures of the German immigrant legislation with long-lasting negative impacts for the communication between migrant communities and the German host society.

The 1990s finally are marked by three crucial developments with different impacts on the debate on immigration in Germany.

1) The collapse of the eastern bloc gave way for a new kind of immigration from Eastern Europe especially from Poland and the former Soviet Union. 300.000 Polish immigrants for instance constitute one of the largest immigrant communities in Germany. Strikingly the Polish and the Russian community in Germany have established in a short period of time a lively network of media and other culturally important places and spaces of identification. Furthermore the aftermaths of the collapse of the Soviet Union led to the immigration of numerous ethnic Germans "Aussiedler" from Russia and the Ukraine to Germany. Finally, beside the decline of

the socialist states, the Balkan wars in the mid 90s made hundreds of thousands of people refugees of which a considerable amount looked for asylum in Germany.

2) The economic crisis in the aftermaths of the 1989 revolution led (in conjunction with a number of other social, political and social-psychological reasons) to the rise of national populist and rightist opinions and movements with brutal racist riots in 1992 and 1993 in many parts of Germany (One might remember the attacks on refugees homes in Mölln, Solingen and Rostock in 1992/93). Most of the racist slogans focussed on the high amount of refugees trying to seek asylum in Germany. Moreover they were aimed at intimidating the long settled traditional immigrant communities, especially Turks and Kurds. As a reaction to this apparent public “pressure” the liberal-conservative government strongly restricted the asylum law in 1993.

3) The late 90s have brought about a change of climate and a significant change of policies with the end of the conservative-liberal rule (from 1983 until 1998) and the takeover of the green-social-democrat government in autumn 1998. One of the most radical legislative reforms was a slight modification of the traditional German *ius sanguinis* (which provided citizenship only by decent through blood relations) towards the *ius soli* with the introduction of a new citizenship law in January 2000. This law enables Germany-born migrants to become German citizens given that their parents have lived in Germany for eight years or longer. Unfortunately the law has lost some of its innovatory elements with the obligation for those young immigrants to ultimately choose the citizenship of either their home country or Germany by the age of 23 (Treibel 2001). Nevertheless, for the first time in German history the central functions of decent and blood in terms of political and participatory rights have been substituted by a liberal and modern legislation, partly comparable with Western European standards.

Another fundamental impact on the German perception of the “immigrant issue” goes along with the publication of an official proposal for an immigration law (the first in German history) by an independent commission for immigration in summer 2001. Its suggestion for a fundamental change of German legislation has been widely and intensively discussed in the German media and in the parliament during Summer and Autumn 2001. According to most commentators it marks a deep shift in public perception and policy making. For the first time (over forty years after

the first Turkish immigrants entered the country) the German public has started to acknowledge the fact that Germany is an immigration country and will be in future. Accordingly, the immigration experts Bade and Münz speak of a turning point in the German tradition of immigration (Bade and Münz 2000).

Concluding one could say that despite the continuous ignorance towards immigrant issues in German society at all levels we can observe a couple of fundamental changes in perception and policy making during the past three years. In conjunction with the modest but important changes during the past two decades and the gradual convergence of minority policies on a European level (Tomei 2001) this gradual shift gives reason to a cautious optimism. Along with a stronger impact of European legislation on national policies and a gradual cultural and political cohesion of Europe, the German political class seems to rethink its traditionally rather restrictive and conservative attitude towards immigration and multiculturalism. A consultation of experts from different social institution in January 2002 has shown that a progressive immigration law which considers migration to Germany as a challenge rather than a threat is favoured by institutions and independent groups (trade unions, protestant and catholic churches, NGO's, employer's associations etc.) at all levels of society (Süddeutsche Zeitung 17/1/2002). In the election campaign that has started in January 2002 the debate on immigration has already been put on top of the agenda. One should hope that the growing supportive climate for modern ethnic minority policies would not be spoiled by a defeat of the Green-Red coalition in the elections in Autumn 2002.

Media policies and minority media in Germany

As with most issues around questions of migrant's participation diasporic minority media have not been valued high within the German media context. On the production side many journalists of a migrant background complain about the little proportion of journalists from immigrant communities that play an active part in the German media. Figures speak of only between 1% and 3 % migrants in the print media, radio and TV stations (Goddar 2001). Other than the BBC for instance, the

Federal German Broadcasting Corporations (ARD and ZDF) have never introduced a proportion system to guarantee a fair representation of ethnic minorities in the production of media.

On the consumption side the strong socio-demographic differentiation of the immigrant communities makes a general picture obviously difficult. Moreover, information on the consumption of media by minority groups is hard to find, as scientific research in this field is rare. A survey on the use of media in the Turkish community conducted by the Centre for Turkish Studies in 1996 was the first large scale research carried out on media behaviour of any migrant community in Germany. In 2001 the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government of Germany published a quantitative study about the use of Media and its connection to the integration of the Turkish population in Germany.² The little interest in the use of media by minority groups is even more striking as every immigrant household (as any other household in Germany owning TV or a Radio sets) pays compulsory fees to the Public Broadcasting Corporations.

The first media programmes for immigrants in Germany started in the 60s with the Radio programmes for “guest workers” in the newly funded Regional Broadcasting Corporations. It started in 1961 with a thirty-minutes programme in Italian. Programmes in Turkish, Greek and Spanish in 1964 and Serb-Croat in 1970 followed. The so-called “Gastarbeitersendungen” (guest-worker programmes) became a crucial “part of the daily ritual” for many immigrant families (Kosnick 2000: 319). The Association of the Public Broadcasting Cooperations (ARD) officially defined the function of these programmes as building a “bridge to home”. They were a constitutive part of the public service mission, which included the support of the active integration of migrants via public service media (one of the few active integration policies). According to the UNESCO more than 75% of the migrant workers in Germany were listening to these programmes in the mid-70s (Kosnick 2001).

² The authors of the study conclude that the level of integration is higher amongst the younger generation especially those with higher education. This group uses a mix of German and Turkish media for information and entertainment. Their parents on the other side largely use Turkish media, mostly due to a lack of language skills which in return, according to the authors, leads to a partial or total rejection of the host culture (Press and Information Office of the Federal Government of Germany 2001).

From the mid eighties until today the media sector for migrants in Germany (as a for most minority communities in Europe) has experienced significant changes. . Especially TV and print media have benefited from technological progress and the increasing speed of global communication. With the introduction of cable and satellite TV and the transnationalisation of mainly Turkish newspapers the media market for immigrants has grown on a big scale (Güntürk 1999; Sen 2001). In the late 90s Turkish satellite and cable TV could be received in Germany Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and England - a transnational audience of approximately 60 million people (Becker 1998). As Becker states Turkish TV stations have become a “global player” in the international TV market. The connection of those developments to larger economical, political and cultural transformations on a global scale cannot be discussed here. Yet, for our context it is noticeable that with the introduction of new technologies in the TV and print sector immigrants for the first time have been enabled to choose from a wide range of media on offer. As a consequence PR-companies have started to discover the Turkish community as a huge potential market for TV adverts. Moreover, newspapers produced in Turkey have started to edit European pages (usually based in Frankfurt a. M.) with an emphasis on Germany. Since the early 90s a number of newspapers of the Polish and the Russian community have also been funded in Germany.

The interpretation of these transformations is ambivalent, some commentators talk of a rising Ghettoisation of Migrant communities in Germany as most TV channels proliferate information merely from the home country. In addition to that (Turkish) programmes often have a nationalist or radical religious tendency (Güntürk 1999). The official aim of an active Integration of migrants into the German majority culture becomes therefore increasingly difficult because transnational media allow most migrants to consume Media from their home countries. Especially women who do not speak German but also migrants of the second and third generation with little education become increasingly ghettoised as any outside information is imported from the home countries and broadcasted in the mother tongue.

On the other side some experts claim that the dissociation and the emphasis of cultural difference also in media consumption is a basic precondition for the development of some kind of sustainable Diaspora identity (Becker 1998). For them assimilation to a hegemonic majority culture cannot be a desirable aim for any

migrant living in Germany. Migrant communities instead should first develop a sense of their own ethnic roots in order to be able to creatively mix both cultural influences. In my opinion one has to differentiate between different groups of migrants. Those who have come from Western European countries face different kinds of challenges than those (mostly Turkish) migrants who have come from a non-European country with a Muslim background. As studies by Gerhards (1993) and Ganter (1998) have shown the discrimination of non-European migrants is considerably higher in Germany than the discrimination of European migrants. Therefore I would assume that the Ghettoisation of migrant groups and the move back into the own ethnic community is mainly linked to a still rather hostile reception of especially Turkish migrant in Germany. Media consumption along ethnic lines might enforce the tendency towards segregation and Ghettoisation; however, it is probably not its main reason. Moreover those arguments always have a strange taste of scapegoating from the side of the majority. For other migrant groups on the other side, I would assume that the question of a Diaspora identity becomes increasingly less important with a growing supranational European identity. Hence the consumption of media from the home country will probably gradually lose its relevance for the question of home, belonging and ethnic identification.

However, influenced by the fundamental structural, political and legal changes described above a slight change of perception of the multicultural situation amongst a small number of German and migrant media producers has taken place during the last five to eight years. Mainly the third and fourth immigrant generation has lost interest in the old-fashioned “guest-worker” programmes. They have begun to look for and to create media that reflect their bi-cultural socialisation and life-world. Radio Stations like Radio Multikulti and Funkhaus Europa from the Regional Broadcasting Corporation in Berlin (SFB) and Cologne (WDR) have reacted towards this situation. Their programmes are broadcasted in up to 20 languages, with a mix of (world)-music, cultural and political information on the homelands and issues of the migrant communities in Germany. The Berlin based local Radio station Metropol FM and the Turkish-German TV station Aypa TV are examples of a rising Diaspora consciousness of the younger Turkish- (German) population. The programmes of these stations are broadcasted in German and Turkish and focus on issues related

to a “hybrid” audience. Another example for this novel trend is the newspaper *Percebme* that was founded in September 2000. The articles of a team consisting of Turkish and German journalists are explicitly aimed at attracting a bicultural audience. The language in which the paper is produced varies according to the topics. It is published as a weekly supplement of the rather leftist German newspaper “*die tageszeitung*”. However, as with most multicultural projects in Germany, the editor in chief, Claudia Dantschke is not Turkish but German.

The trend towards bicultural media productions is enforced by an increasing amount of often bi-lingual Internet portals for immigrants of the third and fourth generation. The most popular amongst these are *vaybee.com* (Turkish), *polonium.de* (Polish) or *blackplanet.com* (Afro-German). Nevertheless, as journalist Goddar underlines, the situation for multicultural projects in the media and for initiatives wanting to attract a “hybrid” and ethnically diverse audiences is still not encouraging. Firstly, due to a heavy competition with big TV Stations and newspapers mainly produced in the homelands. Secondly because of the continuous ignorance of a majority of the German population and the German media sector towards multicultural issues (Goddar 2001). As the intercultural council remarks in 2001 most of the old guest worker programmes on the radio have been cancelled. Apart from one programme of the Regional Broadcasting Cooperation in Cologne (WDR) there is not a single line-up in the public service TV that is produced by migrants or directed towards the issues of immigrant communities. The critical undertone of the statement of the Intercultural Council for the Commission on Immigration is therefore not surprising.

Amongst other points the council stresses the necessity of

- A reasonable representation of media producers from an immigrant background in the councils and in senior-level decision making processes. Possibly via the modification of the public service broadcasting legislation.
- The innovative development of new programmes concerned with multicultural issues via a regulated proportional use of the public service fees for the production of migrant programmes
- The transformation of regional stations like Radio Multikulti and Funkhaus Europa into national broadcasting services
- The introduction of a national media award for Tolerance and Integration

(The Intercultural Council 2000)

Finally, the fact that migrants are hardly represented on senior-decision making level even in radio programmes like Radio Multikulti, Funkhaus Europa or Metropol FM indicates that Germany is no more than at the outset of a multicultural media landscape.

In terms a further development of minority media a lot will depend on the active media policies on a national bases. However, global technological transformations, the increasing dynamic of transnational media communities and the rising significance of the internet for the process of identification of migrant communities also in Germany (mirrored in the set up of a variety of migrant websites during the past two years or so) will probably in long run reduce the importance of national policies. Instead we might face the simultaneous existence of various transnational spaces for media production and consumption leading to a further differentiation and hybridisation and the even quicker transformation of audiences.

Brief case study: The Open channels

For Migrants it is very hard to get access to German TV or Radio Stations. Exceptions are the Open channels “Offene Kanäle” which were funded in 1984. They work on a local scale and can be received via cable and digital TV. Open channels are funded by the Regional Broadcasting Corporations of the “Länder”. They provide free access to TV and Radio studios and broadcasting time to any private persons or groups under the condition that the facilities are used for non-commercial purposes. Open channels are seen as one possibility for the mundane population to produce media of their interest and focus. According to Hans-Dieter Drewitz, one of the funding “fathers”, these alternative TV programmes want to improve the communication amongst mundane citizens. They are seen as a means for democratic communication, as a part of a lively urban culture, of social and political education and as a way to improve the competence in the use of media amongst the “normal” citizens. Programmes have to be produced by the users themselves; furthermore the users are responsible for their own production. Besides a variety of German speaking productions most of them broadcast TV and Radio

programmes produced by Migrants for Migrants. The access to the studios and the equipment is free of charge and programmes are usually produced in the respective language of the community. The Open channel in Dortmund, for instance, hosts two Tamil, two Iranian and a Russian production. In the Open channel in Hamburg an even bigger variety of programmes is created, reaching from Latin-American music or a Kurdish cultural magazine to Informations on South-East Asia. Central part of the self understanding of the open channels is the attempt to provide the means of production for programmes on a grassroots level with very little external control and therefore a big creative potential. However, its reception only via cable or digital technologies strongly limits potential audiences.

The aftermaths of Sept. 11 have left their fingerprints on the censorship policy of the Open channels. In the federal state of Hessen migrant producers now have to submit a description of the content of the programme before it can be broadcasted. The management of the open channel Berlin most recently started to ask for translations of programmes into German and restricted live broadcastings.

As far as I know, no research has yet been conducted in terms of the influence of the open channels on the identity formation of regional and local migrant communities in Germany. It would be worthwhile looking at those productions from an identity perspective as the “Offene Kanäle” constitute in my eyes one of the few, though not very well known, grassroots institutions that reflect the genuine interests of minority groups in the different regions of Germany.

Mapping diasporic media in Germany – Conclusions

I will focus on two issues in the following. Firstly, the complications in getting access to information on diasporic media in Germany, which (besides time constraints) led to largely non-comprehensive and non-representative data. Secondly, despite the thin data one can cautiously propose the existence of two core patterns that divide the main migrant communities roughly into two groups. This division might help to gain a very rough preliminary overview of the structural differences concerning diasporic media in Germany.

On the first issue: During my various attempts to find valuable data on minority media in Germany I had to realise that official German authorities have hardly any

systematic information. As already mentioned the only official studies that have been carried out by the Federal Press and Information Office concentrated merely on the Turkish population. Unfortunately neither the Federal Press and Information Office nor the Federal Office for Immigrant Affairs could give any further substantial data. The numerous websites I visited during my research focussed largely on German newspapers. Most migrant associations heavily encouraged the project; however at the same time admitting that they had only very limited information on migrant media to offer.

The most valuable source of information were the different editorial offices of Radio Multikulti. The editors were well informed and able to give at least some (though not systematically ordered) important information for their respective ethnic communities. Thus, the mapping is the result of a combination of coincidental findings and other more systematic information, which I was gradually able to collect by combining a variety of different sources like phone calls, e-mail, internet, personal meetings and rare research.

In my view those difficulties can somehow be interpreted as a reflection of a continual condition of marginalisation of diasporic media in Germany. In other words, one can take them somehow an evidence for the fact that the gradual societal and political process towards recognition of the identity claims of different ethnic and cultural communities in Germany has had only limited impact on the sphere of media production and consumption. Many journalists from a migrant background confirm the great difficulties migrants have within the German media market. This picture is enforced by the small representation of members of ethnic minorities in the media production in Germany. As already stated above commentators speak of only 1-3%. The proportion on senior-decision making level is most likely to be even worse.

On the second issue: One should be careful to draw conclusions from non-representative and non-comprehensive data. Nevertheless, I will try a preliminary conclusion. In my eyes the sphere of minority media in Germany with regards to the largest migrant communities is roughly divided into two large groups with diverging patterns. The first group consists of the traditional “guest-worker” communities from Turkey, Spain, Greece, Italy and the former Yugoslavian countries. In terms of TV and Radio one can observe that these communities have not established a

significant network of media produced in Germany. Instead during the 60s and 70s until the mid 80s they have concentrated on the weekly “guest worker” programmes on the German Radio. For the last 10 to 15 years private, satellite and pay TV have started to replace the “guest-worker”-Radio programmes. The introduction of those novel modes of TV consumption has led to a larger reorientation towards the homeland (especially in the Turkish community) with the increasing use of homeland based TV channels. Within this group there are only few small Radio or TV stations run by migrants of the third and fourth generation that are entirely based in Germany. One example would be the Berlin based Turkish “Metropol FM- Radio”. As far as I can see their influence is still very small, especially amongst the first and second generation of labour migrants.

In terms of print media one can observe that most newspapers read by those traditional labour migrant communities have until today been imported from the homeland. In the early 90s some of the papers like the Turkish “Hurriyet” or the Serbian “Vesti” have introduced European pages. Others like the Croatian “Vicernji Leist” include pages dealing with migrant issues in Germany. Yet, newspapers entirely produced in Germany are difficult to find amongst the “guest-worker” communities. Again one can find exceptions like the newly founded supplement of the German newspaper “die tageszeitung” called “Percembe” or the regional monthly paper “Toplum” or the local Turkish magazine “Merhaba”. In a similar way to the Radio and TV stations third and fourth generation migrants of a Turkish background mostly produce these Germany based papers. Thus, with regards to the traditional “guest worker communities” we might speak of a transnational or even diasporic setting, hereby following Van Hear’s definition of the terms (Van Hear 1998). That is to say, many of those migrants maintain sustained relationships to their home via the consumption of media, which are not produced in the host country but in the homeland. They therefore enforce the increasing relevance of transnational or Diaspora communities.

The second group contains the “new” communities from the former Eastern Bloc, especially migrants from Poland and Russia. Despite their similarly strong transnational ties both have developed a reasonably large network of print media, which are produced and consumed in Germany. The contents of those productions (mainly newspapers) concentrate on issues of the particular ethnic communities.

Being very popular amongst the migrant population, some Russian papers for instance reach a distribution of up to 50.000. Thus, quicker and more efficient than the traditional “guest-worker” communities the large migrant groups from Eastern Europe have managed to set up an original landscape of newspapers exclusively produced in Germany. It might be worthwhile to find out more about the structural, political and cultural reasons for this noticeable division between the traditional and the new migrant communities.

Nothing has been said about the Chinese or the Vietnamese communities, which do not fit one of the two categories, yet also appear to have a stable network of media based in Germany. In order to verify my conclusions it might be worth carrying out quantitative and qualitative research on a larger scale. Nevertheless, I do hope that the mapping and my preliminary conclusions can be used as an incomplete picture of a difficult, incoherent and sometimes disillusioning situation for migrant media in Germany.

The Main Diaspora Minority Groups in Germany: 1.1.2000

Criteria: Over 100.000 population with the exception of Russia, just below the 100.000 line, but being a visually very present community with a large newspaper network. This counts especially for Berlin.

- From Europe
 - Bosnia Herzegovina (167.690)
 - Croatia (213.954)
 - Greece (364.354)
 - Italy (615.900)
 - Poland (291.673)
 - Portugal (132.623)
 - Russian Federation (98.363)
 - Spain (129.893)
 - Yugoslavia (737.204)
 - Turkey /Kurds(2.053.564)
- From Asia
 - Iran (116.446)

(Source: Council of Europe 2000: 275)

Mapping Diasporic Media

The list is neither all-inclusive, nor representative. Most of the information has been collected via Internet, e-mail, phone calls, or direct meetings with editorial staff etc. I am sorry for the lack of addresses and phone numbers. However, the addresses I could find out are indicated.

1) By Ethnic Group and /or Language and Kind of Medium

Print Media

Arabic

AL-QUDS AL-ARABI

AL HAYAD

DAILY AUSAF

ASHARQ AL-AWSAT

Bosnian

OSLOBODJENJE (daily)

NASI DANI (weekly)

Chinese

SINGTAOEU

NOUVELLES d'EUROPE (produced in France)

HUASHANGBAO (two-weekly)

Croatian

VICERNJI LEIST (daily) (pages on the Croatian migrant issues in Germany)

SLOBDNA DALMACIJA (regional) (daily)

NACIONAL (weekly)

GLOBUS (weekly)

Italian

IL GIORNO

LA STAMPA

LA REPUBBLICA

IL MESSAGERO

CORIERRE DELLA SERA

Jewish

AUFBAU

JÜDISCHE ALLGEMEINE (weekly)

Kosovo / Albanian

FAKTI

BOTA SOT

KOHA DITARE

Kurdish

ÖZGÜR POLTIKA (daily) (In Turkish on issues concerning the Kurdish community)
Lausitzer Str. 10, 10999 Berlin

Tel. 030-61073301

HIWA (magazine) (monthly)
Produced in Frankfurt a.M.

HALABEE (magazine)

Persian

ETTELA "AT
NIMROOZ (weekly)

Polish

ANGORA (weekly)
Adress: Postfach 101723, 44017 Dortmund, Germany

POLONICA KURIER
Adress: Wartenburgstraße 18a, 10963 Berlin, Germany

INFO UND TIPPS (weekly)

SAMO ZYCIE (weekly)
Adress: Beckumer Str. 34, 59229 Ahlen, Germany

KURIER KOLOWA
Adress: Torstraße 66, 10119 Berlin, Germany

RZECZPOSPOLITIA

Russian

CARAVAN-INTERNATIONAL (weekly)
Adress: Kurfürstendamm 226, 10719 Berlin, Germany
Tel. 030-88 67 81 52
Fax. 030-88 67 81 51

EVROPAZENTR (Europe center) (two-weekly)
Adress: Rankestr. 34, 10789 Berlin, Germany
Editor: Jury Zarubin

KOMMERSANT WEEKLY
Potsdamer Strasse 100, 10785 Berlin, Germany
Editor: Elena Nusinowa

KONTAKT (two-weekly)

Adress: Postfach 3406, 30034 Hannover, Germany
Editor: Wladimir Marjin

MIR MEDIEN IN RUSSISCH (Media in Russian) (two-weekly)
Adress: Gutenbergstrasse 1, 15838 Wünsdorf-Waldstadt, Germany
Editor: Vladimir Sokolov

RUSSKIJ BERLIN / RUSSKAJA GERMANIJA / RHEINKAJA GAZETA (weekly)
Adress: Potsdamerstraße 100, 10785 Berlin, Germany
Editor: Boris Feldmann

SEMLJASKI (monthly)
Adress: Am Lehmstich 4, 32689 Kalletal, Germany
Editor: Gerog Loewen

VOSTOCHNY EXPRESS (monthly)
Adress: Postfach 2154, 59209 Ahlen, Germany
Editor: Nellie Kossko

Serbian

VESTI (daily)
Office in Bad Vilbel, Germany
Tel. +49-(0)610-158660

Spanish

EL MUNDO

EL PAIS

Turkish

HÜRRIYET (daily) (with between 5-7 European pages)
Adress: Knesebeckstr. 99, 10623 Berlin, Germany
Tel. 030-312 66 61
Fax. 030-312 90 80

TÜRKIYE (daily) (with 7 European pages)
Adress: c/o Orhan Tozlu, Am Eichenquast 58, 12353 Berlin, Germany
Tel. 030-605 77 48
Fax. 030-605 77 48

MILLIYET (daily)

ZAMAN TURKISH INTERNATIONAL NEWSPAPER (daily)
Adress: Dreieichstr. 5a, 64546 Mörfelden-Walldorf, Berlin

Tel. 06105- 91 17 19 20
Fax. 06105- 14 71

MILLI GAZETE (daily)
Adress: c/o Mendres Singin, Koloniestr. 22 A, 13359 Berlin, Germany

EVRENSEL (daily)

DÜNYA HAFTA (weekly)

CUMHURİYET-HAFTA (weekly)
Kaiserin-Augusta-Allee 34, 10589 Berlin

KILIM (regional newspaper)
Adress: Neustr. 14, 66740 Saarlouis
Tel. 06831- 88 04 13
Fax. 06831- 88 03 64

MERHABA (two-weekly) (regional magazine) (Turkish and German)
Adress: Bülowstraße 55-57, 10783 Berlin
Tel. 030-23 55 2516
Fax. 030-23 55 2510

PERSCHEMBE (weekly)
Charlottenstr. 1, 10969 Berlin
Editor: Inkum GmbH
Tel. 0049 30 / 25291230
Fax. 0049 30 / 25291231
e-mail: Persembe@web.de; www.PersembeGazeti.de

TÜRKİS NEWS
Adress: Temiztürk Verlag Werbeagentur, Waldstr. 45, 63065 Offenbach/M
Tel. 069- 823 670 58
Fax. 069- 823 670 59
htemiztuerk@t-online.de

RUHR-POSTAS

TOPLUM (regional newspaper) (monthly)
Adress: Postfach 1133, 63201 Langen
Tel. 06103- 52 560
Fax. 06103- 92 92 25
www.hessen-toplum.de

YENİ POSTA (regional magazine)
Adress: Neue Str. 3, 89077 Ulm, Germany

Vietnamese

ANDAN CHUA (catholic magazine)

VIEN GIAC (budhist magazine)

Radio Stations

Albanian

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (two programmes, one every day, the other once a week)

Arabic

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme three times a week)

Croatian

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme five times a week)

Greek

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme five times a week)
In cooperation with Bayrischer Rundfunk (regional Bavarian broadcasting cooperation)

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme once week)

Italian

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (two programmes, one once a week, the other everyday in Cooperation with the Italian Radio RAI UNO)

Iranian

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme twice a week)

Kurdish

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme three times a week)

Polish

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme five times a week)

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme seven times a week)

Russian

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme five times a week)

Programme coordinator: Jürgen Maintz,

Tel: 0049 30 3031 1640

Fax: 0049 30 /3031 1696; Programme: "Programma na russkom jasykje", Mo-Fr
19.00-19.30

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme every day)

Serbian

RADIO MULTIKULTI SFB 4 (one programme three times a week)

South Slavic (Croatian, Serb, Bosnian)

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme once a week, chooses one of the
three languages every week)

Spanish

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme five times a week)

In cooperation with Bayrischer Rundfunk)

Turkish

RADIO MULITKULTI SFB 4, (one to three programme every day)

Adress: Masurenallee 8-14, 14057 Berlin

Programme coordinator editorial office: Aras Öran

Tel. 0049 30 3031 2140

Fax. 0049 30 3031 1696
www.multikulti.de
e-mail: multikulti@sfb.de

FUNKHAUS EUROPA (one programme every day)
Adress: WDR 5, FunkhausEuropa, 50600 Köln,
Tel. 0049 (0) 800 5678 551
Fax. 0049 (0) 800 5678 551,
www.wdr5.de/funkhauseuropa/
e-mail: funkhauseuropa@wdr.de

RADIO LORA MUNICH (regional radio station)
"MunihFM" (once a week)
Adress: Gravelottestr.6, 81667 Munich
Tel. 0049 89 / 480 28 51
Fax. 0049 89 / 480 28 52,
www.lora.de
e-mail. info@lora924.de

94,8 METROPOL FM (Turkish and German)
Adress: Potsdamer Str. 131, 10783 Berlin
Editorial office
Tel. 030- 21 79 70-0
030- 21 79 70 40

Vietnamese

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme twice a week)

TV-Stations

Greek

KALIMERA TV
Adress: Rudower Chaussee 4, Haus 12, 12489 Berlin
Tel. 030-67 01- 22-82
Fax. 030-67 01-21 26

Russian

RTVD GmbH

Adress: Merseburger Str. 3, 10823 Berlin
Tel. 030-787 05 155
Fax. 030-787 05 156

Turkish

A Y P A - T V (70% in German, 30% in Turkish)
Adress : Neuendorfer Str. 90, 13585 Berlin
Tel. 030-336 66 66
Fax. 030-373 20 66

CINE 5 TV
Adress: Nürnberger Str. 12, 63450 Hanau
Tel. 06181- 25 25 12
Fax. 06181- 21 563

KANAL 7

MULTI-CANAL (Turkish Pay-TV)
Adress: Hohenstaufenring 44-46, 50674 Köln
Tel. 0221- 95 57 555
Fax. 0221- 95 57 575

TD 1 (Cabel-TV in Turkish and German)
Adress: Pankstraße 53-54, 13357 Berlin
Tel. 030-465 20 11

TRT-INT
The Turkish Radio Television Corporation
Tel. 893 50 30 / 893 52 30
Fax. 893 33 70
Paderborner Str. 1
10709 Berlin

2. In relation to space / the place of production and language

Transnational

(where nothing is indicated I was not sure where the media have been produced, neither in which mode of appearance they are published.)

Arabic (produced outside Germany)

AL-QUDS AL-ARABI

AL HAYAD

DAILY AUSAF

ASHARQ AL-AWSAT

Bosnian (produced outside Germany)

OSLOBODJENJE (daily)

NASI DANI (weekly)

Chinese (produced outside Germany)

SINGTAOEU

NOUVELLES d'EUROPE (produced in France)

HUASHANGBAO (two-weekly)

Croatian (produced outside Germany)

VICERNJI LEIST (daily) (pages on the Croatian migrant issues in Germany)

SLOBDNA DALMACIJA (daily)

NACIONAL (weekly)

GLOBUS (weekly)

Italian (produced outside Germany)

IL GIORNO (daily)

LA STAMPA

LA REPUBBLICA

IL MESSAGERO

CORIERRE DELLA SERA (daily)

Jewish / German (produced outside Germany)

AUFBAU

Kurdish (produced outside Germany)

ÖZGÜR POLTIKA (daily) (In Turkish on issues concerningsh community)

Kosovo / Albanian

FAKTI

BOTA SOT

KOHA DITARE

Persian (produced outside Germany)

ETTELA ' AT

NIMROOZ (weekly)

Polish (produced outside Germany)

RZECZPOPOLITA

Russian (produced outside Germany)

RTVD GmbH - TV

Spanish (produced outside Germany)

EL MUNDO (daily)

EL PAIS (daily)

Turkish (produced outside Germany some with supplementary pages produced in Germany)

CUMHURIYET-HAFTA (weekly)

HÜRRIYET (daily) (with between 5-7 European pages)

MILLI GAZETE (daily)
DÜNYA HAFTA (weekly) (with supplement for Germany)

MILLIYET (daily)

TÜRKIYE (daily) (with 7 European pages)

ZAMAN TURKISH INTERNATIONAL NEWSPAPER (daily)

TRT-INT – TV

CINE 5 TV

National (produced in Germany)

Greek

Kalimera TV

Kurdish

HIWA (magazine) (monthly)

Polish

ANGORA (weekly)

POLONICA KURIER

INFO UND TIPPS (weekly)

SAMO ZYCIE (weekly)

KURIER KOLOWA

Russian

CARAVAN-INTERNATIONAL (weekly)

EVROPAZENTR (Europe center) (two-weekly)

KONTAKT (two-weekly)

MIR MEDIEN IN RUSSISCH (Media in Russian) (two-weekly)

RUSSKIJ BERLIN / RUSSKAJA GERMANIJA / RHEINKAJA GAZETA (weekly)

SEMLJASKI (monthly)

VOSTOCHNY EXPRESS (monthly)

Serb

VESTI (daily)

Turkish

PERSCHEMBE (weekly)

TÜRKIS NEWS

TD 1 (Cabel-TV in Turkish and German)

A Y P A - T V

Vietnamese

ANDAN CHUA (catholic magazine)

VIEN GIAC (budhist magazine)

Regional (produced in Germany)

Albanian

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (two programmes, one every day, the other once a week)

Arabic

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme three times a week)

Croatian

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme five times a week)

Greek

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme five times a week)
In cooperation with Bayrischer Rundfunk (regional Bavarian broadcasting cooperation)

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme once week)

Iranian

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme twice a week)

Italian

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (two programmes, one once a week, the other everyday, in Cooperation with the Italian Radio RAI UNO)

Kurdish

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme three times a week)

Polish

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme five times a week)

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme seven times a week)

Russian

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme five times a week)

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme every day)

South Slavic (Croatian, Serb, Bosnian)

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme once a week, chooses one of the three languages every week)

Serb

RADIO MULTIKULTI, SFB 4 (one programme three times a week)

Turkish

KILIM

RUHR-POSTAS

TOPLUM

YENI POSTA

RADIO MULTIKULTI

FUNKHAUS EUROPA

Vietnamese

RADIO MULTIKULTI SFB 4 (one programme twice a week)

Local (produced in Germany)

Turkish

MERHABA (two-weekly) (local Berlin based magazine)

RADIO LORA Munich

94,8 METROPOL FM

RADIO FLORA /local Radio Hannover

Not sure where produced

Kurdish

HALABEE (magazine)

Russian

KOMMERSANT WEEKLY

Turkish

EVRENSEL (daily)

MULTI CANAL (Turkish Pay-TV)

KANAL 7

3. Multicultural/Multiethnic media by technology

Radio and TV

RADIO FLORA /local Radio Hannover (local radio station)

Adress: Zur Bettfedernfabrik, 130451 Hannover

Tel. +49 0511 219790

Fax. +49 0511 2197919

FUNKHAUS EUROPA, WDR 5 (one programme every day)

Adress: WDR 5, FunkhausEuropa, 50600 Köln,

Tel. 0049 (0) 800 5678 551

Fax. 0049 (0) 800 5678 551,

www.wdr5.de/funkhauseuropa/

e-mail: funkhauseuropa@wdr.de

RADIO LORA MUNICH (regional radio station)

Adress: Gravelottestr.6, 81667 Munich

Tel. 0049 89 / 480 28 51

Fax. 0049 89 / 480 28 52,

www.lora.de

e-mail. info@lora924.de

RADIO MULTIKULTI SFB 4

Programme coordinator: Jürgen Maintz,

Tel: 0049 30 3031 1640

Fax: 0049 30 /3031 1696

Various open channels (4 out of 77in total throughout Germany)

OFFENER KANAL BERLIN
Voltastr. 5
13355 Berlin
Tel. 0049 – 030 – 464005-0
Fax. +49-030-46400598
e-mail: info@okb.de

OFFENER KANAL BREMEN
Findorffstr. 22-24
28215 Bremen
Tel. +49-421-350100
Fax. +49-421-3501050
e-mail: info@ok-bremen.de

OFFENER KANAL ESSEN
Wilhelm-Nieswand-Allee 104
45326 Essen
Tel. +49-201-83444-83
Fax. +49-201-331274
e-mail: mail@ok43.de

OFFENER KANAL HAMBURG
Stresemannstr. 375
22761 Hamburg
Tel. +49-40-8969070
Fax. +49-40-89690711
e-mail: info@offener-kanal-hamburg.de

Literature

- BADE, Klaus and MÜNZ Rainer (2000)In: Migrationsreport 2000, ..
- BECKER, Jörg (1998) Die Ethnisierung der deutschen Medienlandschaft – Türkische Medienkultur zwischen Assoziation und Dissoziation. In: Siegfried Quandt and Wolfgang Gast (eds.) Deutschland im Dialog der Kulturen: Medien Images, Verständigung. Konstanz: UKV Medien
- CENTRE FOR TURKISH STUDIES (ed.) (1997) Medienkonsum der türkischen Bevölkerung in Deutschland (Deutschlandbild im Türkischen Fernsehen). Bonn: Press and Information Office of the Federal Government of Germany
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2000) Recent demographic developments in Europe
- GERHARDS, Jürgen et al. (1993) Wir und die Anderen. Ethnozentrismus in den zwölf Ländern der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. In: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Jg. 45, Heft 2, S. 238-253
- GANTER, Stefan (1998) Ursachen und Formen der Fremdenfeindlichkeit in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Research Institute of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung: Duesseldorf
- GODDAR, Jeannette (2001) Kontakt der Kulturen. Journalist, Vol 8, 2001, pp. 10-13
- GÜNTÜRK, Reyhan (1999) Mediennutzung der Migranten – mediale Isolation ? In : Christoph Butterwegge et al. (eds.) (1999) Medien und multikulturelle Gesellschaft. Opladen : Leske und Budrich
- KOSNICK, Kira (2000) Building bridges. Media for migrants and the public-service mission in Germany. European Journal for Cultural Studies, Vol. 3 (3) p. 319-342
- MAHNIG, Hans (2001) „Ist Deutschland wirklich anders?“ Die deutsche Integrationspolitik im Vergleich. In: Edda Currie, Tanja Wunderlich (eds.) Deutschland – ein Einwanderungsland? Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen. Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius
- MIHICIYAZGAN, Ursula (1992) *Das Gold und die Zukunft. Ueber Zukunftsvorstellungen tuerkischer Migrantinnen*. In: M.Schulz (ed) Fremde Frauen. Von der Gastarbeiterin zur Buergerin; Frankfurt/Main: Verlag fuer interkulturelle Kommunikation

PRESS AND INFORMATION OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF GERMANY (ed.) (2001) Mediennutzung und Integration der türkischen Bevölkerung in Deutschland.

SEN, Faruk (2001) Freie Auswahl, Journalist, Vol. 8, 2001, pp. 17-19

SCHIFFAUER, Werner (1991) Die Migranten aus Subay. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta
SÜDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 17/1/2002

THRÄNHARD, Dietrich (2001) Einwanderungsland Deutschland – von der Tabuisierung zur Realität. In: Ursula Mehrländer and Günter Schulze (eds.) Einwanderungsland Deutschland. Neue Wege nachhaltiger Integration. Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz Verlag

TOMEI, Veronica (2001) Das Einwanderungsland Deutschland und die Europäisierung. In: Edda Currle, Tanja Wunderlich (eds.) Deutschland – ein Einwanderungsland? Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen. Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius

TREIBEL, Annette (2001) Von der Anwerbestoppausnahme-Verordnung zur Green Card: Reflexion und Kritik der Migrationspolitik. In: Edda Currle, Tanja Wunderlich (eds.) Deutschland – ein Einwanderungsland? Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen. Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius

VAN HEAR, Nicholas (1998) New Diasporas. The mass exodus, dispersal and regrouping of migrant communities, London: UCL Press

WELT, Jochen (2001) Von der gesellschaftlichen Selbsttäuschung zum Zuwanderungs- und Integrationskonzept. In: Ursula Mehrländer and Günter Schulze (eds.) Einwanderungsland Deutschland. Neue Wege nachhaltiger Integration. Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz Verlag