

When do societies become *postmigrant*?

A historical consideration based on the example of Switzerland

Kijan Espahangizi

When and under what conditions do societies become *postmigrant*?¹ While the search for historical starting points is always a delicate undertaking, it becomes most productive when searching for historical genealogies, junctures and moments of upheaval, rather than absolute origins: In the current – predominantly German-language – debate, “postmigrant societies” have been discussed on the whole from the point of view of social and cultural studies.² Yet, a historiographical approach is equally vital to the development of a concept that already bears the mark of historical change in its very name: *postmigrant* societies – in short, societies “structured by experiences of migration”, existing in a space “after migration” (Yildiz/Hill 2015; Karakayalı/Tsianos 2014: 34).

If migration has always been a constitutive factor in history (Bade 1992; Bade/Oltmer 2004), then all modern societies have always been postmigrant. Considering the astonishing temporal expansion of the study of migration history in recent scholarship (Lucassen/Lucassen/Manning 2010), one could even go so far as to agree with historian Klaus Bade that, “migration is a constituent of the human condition such as birth, reproduction, disease and death. The history of migrations is as old as the history of mankind; for *Homo sapiens* has spread as *Homo migrans* across the world.” (Bade 2002: 55). But in adjusting the historiographical lens to encompass this universal horizon, our perspective on more recent historical developments becomes increasingly blurred. As such, the very question of why we now consider migration as a universal component of human history (or

1 This chapter is a translation of “Ab wann sind Gesellschaften postmigrantisch? Wissenschaftliche Überlegungen ausgehend von der Schweiz” in Naika Foroutan, Juliane Karakayalı, Riem Spielhaus (eds.): *Postmigrantische Perspektiven. Ordnungssysteme, Repräsentationen, Kritik*, Campus: Frankfurt a.M., pp. 35-55, 2018. References have been updated. I would like to thank the editors, and Julia Sittmann for the translation.

2 On the contribution of historians to migration research, cp. Gabbacia 2015.

alternatively: how the discussion around postmigrant societies has recently become such a visible subject of societal discourses) begins to fade from view. Terminology thrives on precision: From an analytical point of view, it is not terribly useful to consider all communities and societies with histories of migration as “postmigrant”. Conversely, what would a meaningful historical category look like if it were capable of neatly determining whether a society is “postmigrant” or not? On a time-axis that reaches from the beginning of human civilization to the present, political scientist Naika Foroutan’s proposal – that societies can be characterised as postmigrant the moment they politically recognise their migration reality – is firmly rooted in the contemporary end of the scale (Foroutan 2016). This approach generalises the consequences of the so-called “Süssmuth commission” which, for the first time, officially recognised Germany as a country of immigration in 2001. This marked an important paradigm shift in German politics ending a long period of ignorance under the Chancellorship of Helmut Kohl, during which the lived social reality of the country simply remained unacknowledged. From a historiographical point of view, focusing on the recent German past, what appears to be a plausible and precise criterion, nonetheless, raises new questions. How legally binding, effective, widespread and sustainable does such an act of political recognition have to be in order to function as a recognizable threshold for a society to become postmigrant? How far must the political recognition of the “fact of immigration” penetrate societal institutions as well as everyday culture in order to count? (Mecheril 2011: 50). Compared to the role of migration in the national self-images of “classic” immigration countries such as the United States and Canada, Germany’s self-perception as such remains rather contested. Moreover, current postmigrant approaches clearly emphasise Germany as a case study, which limits the analytical power these approaches have offered so far. Not least in relation to other comparable cases – such as Switzerland – that do not necessarily have a ‘recognition date’ based on a specific governmental act, report or commission. Nonetheless, very similar social processes and ‘obsessive’ media debates around questions of migration and integration can be discerned in the two countries (Spielhaus 2012: 97; on Switzerland: Espahangizi 2019c). Akin to Germany, Switzerland is also an immigration country *à contre cœur* – despite its dominant self-perception (Wimmer 2013: 114).

If Germany is the only country that can accurately be described as postmigrant, then little is gained analytically. In contrast, Juliane Karakayalı and Vasilis Tsianos suggest a notion of “postmigration” that emphasises “the political, social and cultural transformations of societies with a history of postcolonial and guest worker migration” (2014: 34). From this perspective, it becomes possible to analyse different thresholds within processes of societal transformation rather than specific acts of government – presenting a promising analytical framework through which to understand the contemporary history of Switzerland as well as

that of various other European countries, all of which share a similar ambiguity toward their immigration realities. Such an approach might also help prevent the re-emergence of a narrow methodological nationalism in the name of the postmigrant society (Wimmer/Glick-Schiller 2002). Instead, social dynamics within nation-states must be understood as part of transnational entanglements, resonances and processes of exchange, while at the same time accepting the fact that *society* as a fundamental political frame of reference continues to be actively shaped by nation-states despite – and to a certain extent because of – globalisation. The concept of postmigrant society therefore must be flexible enough to capture the interplay between different levels, national, international, transnational and supranational, spaces of socialisation, communities, networks and life-worlds.

If one considers the many constitutive connections between colonial and guest worker migration since the 19th century (McKeown 2008; Zimmermann 2010), it becomes clear that further conceptual clarification is necessary in order to adequately narrow in on the historical shifts in post-war Europe that are ultimately at stake in the debate on postmigration. The formula “after migration” thus not only refers to previous migration processes (not to an end to immigration), but above all to the specific ways in which social realities resulting from individual and collective stories of immigration, are negotiated in political, cultural, legal and media spheres. In the following, I will elaborate on these dynamics by considering the 20th century history of migration to Switzerland, a case study that provides a useful comparison to Germany in terms of the major patterns of immigration after WWII.

A new insight

Shortly after the end of World War II (and a few years earlier than in Germany), a new era of mass labour migration began in Switzerland in response to the first recruitment agreement signed with Italy in 1948. Until the early 1970s, several million foreign workers arrived in Switzerland, laying the foundation for economic growth and post-war prosperity. Similar to Germany, Switzerland adopted a “rotational model”, in which the foreign labour force was both to remain temporary and seasonal, and to serve as an economic buffer. The legal basis of this Swiss migration regime was the ANAG Act (Bundesgesetz über Aufenthalt und Niederlassung der Ausländer, foreigner admission and settlement act), introduced in the 1930s on the basis of an earlier national referendum. In the interwar period, as in other countries at the time, liberal *laissez-faire* migration policies in Switzerland were replaced by a restrictive immigration and naturalisation policy based on an ethnicised, and to some extent racialised, understanding of the Swiss national state (Kury 2003; Argast 2007). At the end of the 19th century, the number of immi-

grants to Switzerland superseded the number of emigrants out of the country for the first time, due to a growing demand for labour, but also due to the number of people fleeing antisemitic pogroms in Eastern Europe. By World War I, the proportion of foreign residents in Switzerland had risen to over 15 percent of the population; in the cities, it was as high as up to 30 to 50 percent (Kury 2003: 35). Newly established state authorities such as the Aliens Police (1917/19) were supposed to prevent Switzerland's ostensible *Überfremdung* (overforeignisation) – a Swiss neologism that was quickly adopted in Germany (Bürger 1929) – and to guarantee a proper “selection” of immigrants, in accordance with social Darwinist ideas. Restrictive admissions policies and the mass return of foreigners to their home countries during the two World Wars massively reduced the proportion of foreign residents compared to the total population to around five percent by 1945. It was not until the post-war economic boom that demand for foreign workers increased again – this time massively. But as early as the late 1950s, the Swiss rotational model came under pressure for several reasons. Firstly, the growing competition on the European labour market – as a result, in part, of new recruitment treaties signed by Germany beginning in 1955. Secondly, the tapping out of existing sources for “foreign workers” from countries such as Italy without an end to the economic boom in sight. And finally, the influence of international norms and legal obligations toward the countries of origin with regard to the working and living conditions of recruited workers, as well as their increasing average length of stay. Contrary to government plans, members of the foreign workforce also did not necessarily hold themselves to the official rotational model, not least because of employers who, for reasons of efficiency, often had no interest in a permanently temporary workforce (D’Amato 2008). The massive increase in the number of foreigners and the prospect that the Swiss economy would be permanently dependent upon them concerned the Swiss Aliens Police. At their initiative, the Swiss government set up an expert commission in 1961 with experts drawn from the economic and social sciences. Their task was to deal with the so-called “problem of foreign workers” and to develop appropriate policy proposals. The introduction of a quota was expected to “stabilize” the influx of immigrants, while a new “active” assimilation policy for those workers and their families who remained in the country was designed to support the anti-overforeignisation policy of the Aliens Police, which had been established since the interwar period (Espahangizi 2019a). It quickly became clear, however, that the commission’s findings also opened an avenue for the recognition of very different demands, including measures to strengthen inclusion, such as better working and living conditions and greater rights for immigrants in Switzerland.

In the years that followed, a new understanding emerged, which can be traced back to the early 1960s and the aforementioned study commission. A position paper, released by a second, now permanent Federal Consultative Commission

on the Problem of Foreigners in 1970, articulated the discussion around this new “insight”:

Notwithstanding the differences of opinion surrounding the number of foreigners to be admitted to Switzerland, the insight has prevailed in recent years that foreigners who have been admitted here and whose presence appears to have been consolidated should be offered the possibility of far-reaching integration into the social, economic and cultural life of Switzerland, and that their integration process should be promoted by all appropriate means. (EKA 1976: 1)

The final report of the first expert commission, completed in 1964, however, made clear that it was not a symbolic act of political recognition akin to the 2001 German Süßmuth commission, but instead a multivocal, even contradictory document that contained both proposals for inclusion (*ius soli*) as well as a racialised paranoia about overforeignisation reminiscent of the 1920s and 1930s (BIGA 1964). Although the text’s polyphony can be interpreted as a materialised expression of the power relations between those individuals, institutions, positions and interests who were involved in the drafting of the report, it does contain one major common denominator: an understanding of the unforeseen reality of immigration. The “incorporation” (*Eingliederung*) of foreigners was now understood as a task for Swiss society as a whole, to which all members, foreigners and nationals, were required to contribute – albeit not to the same extent and from different positions (Espahangizi 2019a).

Ultimately, the polyphonic and ambiguous nature of the report by the Swiss commission on foreign workers in the 1960s offers a more powerful historical model for understanding the “postmigrant condition” (Schramm/Moslund/Petersen et al. 2019) than the German Süßmuth commission. This particular historical lens allows instead for an understanding of the genesis of postmigrant societies as a genealogy of different paths toward “realising” immigration realities, rather than a single origin story punctuated by a decisive act of government. The recognition of immigration is then by no means synonymous with a political awareness of the need for inclusion. In fact, the formation of anti-immigrant discourses in Switzerland since the 1960s (Skenderovic/D’Amato 2008) has also been a major contributor to *acknowledging* the social reality of immigration – to perceiving it, to thematizing it, reacting to it and making it ‘real’ – emerging in tandem with other voices arguing for “integration”, in the sense of participation and inclusion. By focusing on the broader concept of *realisation* (both in terms of cognitive insight and the practical dimension of constructing reality), it becomes possible to consider the different social contexts and genealogical threads of a postmigrant society in the making – both individually and inter-relationally (Espahangizi 2021; Mecheril 2011; Jasanoff 2004). In Switzerland, for example, not

only state actors and government institutions, but also civil society actors, such as the media, arts and culture, trade unions and the churches – often through international and transnational exchanges between NGOs, for example within the ecumenical Churches Committee on Migrant Workers in Western Europe – and ultimately also immigrants themselves began to face the reality of a society “after immigration” in the 1960s and 1970s. Here, too, insight into one’s own immigration reality was not necessarily a given, but the result of individual and collective processes of realisation and shifts in perspective. The diverse and complex forms of diasporic, trans- and post-national life plans and the multiple forms of belonging that subsequently emerged would increasingly come into conflict with the discursively dominant “choice” of “arrival” or “return”. Opposition to anti-immigration and xenophobic popular initiatives (an instrument of direct democracy in Switzerland) against “overforeignisation”, as well as the battles against discrimination, for equal rights and a better life – especially for one’s own children – played a central role in the realisation of individual immigration realities (Maiolino 2011). The introduction of the notion of a “second generation”, members of which increasingly became the focus of education policy initiatives in Switzerland in the 1960s and 1970s, into the popular discourse created a bridge between various contexts, including the implementation of government programs, the experience of individual immigrant families and the pursuit of research studies on the subject (Eigenmann 2017; Espahangizi 2019b). The powerful binary interpretive scheme of *settling down/returning home*, often embodied by the figure of the “foreign child”, is closely associated with a form of realisation and acknowledgment that has gained importance in recent historiography on migration: the production of knowledge on the subject of society during and after migration (Harzig/Hororder/Gabaccia 2009; Hahn 2012; Gabaccia 2015). In the following, this aspect will be examined in light of the emergence of migration and integration research in Switzerland in the 1960s and 1970s.

What comes “after migration”?

The realisation of immigration in post-war Switzerland was followed by a strong desire to know and understand. In different social contexts, people wanted to know more about the nature of social realities “after immigration”. Interests ranged from a technocratic desire to register the resident foreigner population and control various processes of assimilation, to social-liberal paternalistic concerns for the socio-cultural integration of foreigners in general and the “second generation” in particular, all the way to demands by foreign worker associations such as the Federazione Colonie Libere Italiane in Svizzera for data and political

arguments in the service of self-empowerment and specific campaigns for integration and social justice (Baumann 2014; Espahangizi 2017b).

In the early decades of the 20th century, debates on the subject of immigration were mostly based on legal opinions and demographic calculations. In the 1960s however, sociology became the leading discipline for the study of “integration” (Piñeiro 2015; Espahangizi 2019a). Inspired by the work of the 1960s-era Swiss commission on foreign workers, numerous papers on questions of integration were produced. Groundbreaking empirical studies by Rudolf Braun (1970) on “the socio-cultural problems of integration” and Hans-Joachim Hoffmann-Nowotny (1973) on the “sociology of the problem of the foreign workers” were the first to examine “both sides”, namely, the mutually transformative relationship between immigrants and their Swiss host society, thereby laying the narrative foundation for a new discourse on integration. In short: integration is not a one-way street. These studies had a significant impact within Switzerland but also, in the case of Hoffmann-Nowotny’s work, on German migration research (cp. Thränhardt 1975; Bade 2017: 34). Hans-Joachim Hoffmann-Nowotny’s life and work are particularly revealing for our understanding of the role of transnational epistemic entanglements in the formation of postmigrant societies such as Switzerland and Germany.³

Hoffmann-Nowotny was born in Germany, the child of Polish immigrants. He studied in Cologne under the renowned sociologist René König, moving to Switzerland in 1966 for his doctoral research. Although he habilitated at the Institute of Sociology at the University of Zurich in 1973 and continued to work there until his death in 2004, he also remained engaged in the German debate on migration and integration. Between 1996 and 2000, for example, he chaired the commission in charge of producing the German Federal Government’s Sixth Family Report.⁴ Even before the publication of the Süssmuth Commission’s report, this report declared that any meaningful policy had to be based on the “diversity of life-worlds”, “the irreversible immigration process” and “factual development” of social reality in Germany. Hoffmann-Nowotny’s work not only personifies the coupling of academic realisation processes in Switzerland and Germany, but also illustrates the international context of knowledge on migration and integration produced since the 1960s.

Hoffmann-Nowotny’s interest in integration issues was first shaped during studies abroad in the United States in the early 1960s. In exchanges with his mentor Hannah Arendt, he considered the racial divide and the Civil Rights movement

3 The following section is based on research conducted as part of a larger article on the history of migration and integration studies in post-war Switzerland, see Espahangizi 2019a.

4 Due to Hoffmann-Nowotny’s serious illness, Klaus Bade would stand in for him on the commission (cf. Bade 2017: 49).

in the United States, including the American parallel of black workers, who had migrated from the south to the industrial cities of the north. Although these reflections were foundational to his early studies on foreign workers in Europe, traces of this transatlantic connection would fall away by the late 1970s (Goldberg 2006; Lentin 2014). International debates in the 1960s also shaped Hoffmann-Nowotny's thesis of the social "sub-stratification" (*Unterschichtung*), in which a host society is undergirded through labor migration, in particular the work of Swiss development sociologist Peter Heintz (Hoffmann-Nowotny came to Zurich as his assistant). Since the late 1950s, Heintz had been active as an expert for the UNESCO Social Science Division in supporting the establishment of sociological research institutes in Latin America under the leadership of the British sociologist Thomas H. Marshall. During his time as director of the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) in Santiago de Chile, Heintz was involved in what has subsequently been called the "discovery of world society" within the history of sociology (Greve/Heintz 2005). Together with his colleagues at FLACSO, he developed a theory of social stratification and structural tension based on an analogy of national and international stratification systems (for example, with the FLACSO Secretary General; Lagos 1963). It was in this context that Hoffmann-Nowotny, under Heintz's doctoral supervision, developed the model of sub-stratification through immigration in Zurich between 1966 and 1969. By the 1970s, this approach had become an influential reference point for the study of guest workers in Switzerland and Germany. Hoffmann-Nowotny's life also illustrates the importance of personal migration experiences for knowledge production on the subject of migration and integration (Espahangizi 2017a; Lässig/Steinberg 2017): His emphasis on the need for structural integration through labour, law and – above all – education is reflected in his own experience of upward social mobility as a child of Polish immigrants in Germany.

An analysis of Hoffmann-Nowotny's work also reveals a specific historicity in his perception of migration, which has subsequently become almost universal. The very word "migration" did not enter the German-speaking academic discourse until the late 1960s and did not become part of everyday language until the 1990s.⁵ In fact, Hoffmann-Nowotny's doctoral thesis is the first German-language sociological monograph with the word *Migration* in the title, instead of the expected *Wanderung* which seems to mean the same in German, but holds much more traditional connotations (Hoffmann-Nowotny 1970). This semantic shift was not

5 For earlier uses of this word, cp. Hahn 2012: 24; for a rough orientation, see the frequency with which the concept of migration has appeared in German-language books since 1800, available at <https://books.google.com/ngrams>. In Switzerland in the early 1960s, the term was only systematically used in the context of the international networks set up by migration commissions within the churches.

purely superficial but points instead to a tectonic shift between the 1960s and 1990s in terms of how global mobilities are thought of, perceived and reacted to. The notion of a bird's eye view on "international migration", initially developed in the interwar period and freed from the weight of its traditional prefixes, *emigration/immigration* (Stricker 2017), gained a new quality in the post-war era and, in particular, over the course of decolonisation. For Hoffmann-Nowotny, migration was the mechanism that provided the necessary structural relief in a new world order made up of national states that, according to post-war modernisation theory, were at different stages of development. He thereby introduced the notion of structural functionalism, borrowed from development sociology, into the public German-language debate on guest workers. Within the Swiss state, the concept of migration was not deployed until the mid-1980s, when it first appeared in two specific contexts: First, the Federal Statistical Office started to model Swiss population growth scenarios, which for the sake of greater accuracy was no longer based primarily on the legalistic distinction of Swiss nationals and foreigners and included a sociological perspective on migration (Haug 1988). This development ultimately led to the introduction of the category of "population with migration background" around 2000 (Rausa-De Luca 2005). Second, by the end of the 1980s, migration was introduced as a conceptual umbrella for two traditionally distinct areas of state regulation: foreign workforce admission and asylum law. A new "integrated migration policy" was demanded to control and coordinate the admission and residency conditions of both foreign workers and asylum seekers and refugees, whose numbers had risen sharply in the 1980s in the wake of global "migration flows" and "growing migration pressure" (Bundesamt für Industrie, Gewerbe und Arbeit/Bundesamt für Ausländerfragen 1991: 16, 87).

Parallel to this gradual implementation of a sociological concept of migration within official Swiss policy in the 1980s, Hoffmann-Nowotny extended his notion of migration to all of human history, anticipating Klaus Bade's "homo migrans" (Kubat/Hoffmann-Nowotny 1981; Hoffmann-Nowotny 1988). The increasing universalisation of migration as a "total phenomenon" (Hoffmann-Nowotny 1970: 49) in recent decades, including in the historiography (for Switzerland, cp. Holenstein/Kury/Schulz 2018), has undoubtedly obscured the historicity of the concept of migration after World War II.

The influence of Hoffmann-Nowotny's work on the academic study of modern immigration realities underscores the necessity of considering transnational entanglements in a postcolonial world and the role of knowledge production in the contemporary emergence of postmigrant societies, thereby illuminating those discursive changes that are fundamental to the formation of postmigrant societies in post-war Europe. The emergence of a new discourse on migration and integration – its narratives, images, figures, concepts, research programs, knowledge and data sets – is crucial to this development. From this perspective, migra-

tion and integration are not universal categories in human history, but rather very specific epistemic forms of perceiving and acting upon those social realities that have undergone a process of transformation in Switzerland and Germany since the 1960s. In short: Migration research plays a constitutive role in the history of postmigrant societies (Dahinden 2016; Haug/Kreis 2017). Thus, the conceptual approach developed here takes into account the epistemic foundations of the societal “migration-integration complex” (Espahangizi 2019c) that has emerged in recent decades. This migration-integration complex refers to the heterogeneous social infrastructure, the assemblage of forms of realisation and obsessive problem management, that developed in the second half of the 20th century in countries such as Switzerland and Germany and revolved around the signifiers of migration and integration.⁶ This knowledge-power complex demarcates the socio-political terrain on which forces of inclusion and exclusion compete, shifting and rearranging the lines of national, ethnic, cultural, and racial belonging (Espahangizi et al. 2016). It is important to underline here that the term “postmigrant society” is therefore not synonymous with “post-racist”, “post-racial” or “multicultural society” (Chin 2017).⁷ It refers instead to an analytical perspective that allows for the examination of the extent to which the notions of migration, integration, diversity, racism, multi-, inter- and transculturality have, in recent decades, created not only new opportunities for inclusion (for some), but also new distinctions and configurations of exclusionary structures (for example Lentin/Titley 2011; Ahmed 2012).

Ambivalences of migration and integration

Naika Foroutan rightly stresses that ambiguity and contradiction are fundamental characteristics of postmigrant societies. As the 1964 report by the Swiss Study Commission demonstrates, ambiguity can be understood as a symptom or snapshot of ongoing processes of negotiation and struggle whose outcomes are by no means pre-determined. The postmigrant perspective is not teleological: The future of any given society is as uncertain as it is contested. Global developments and specific events, such as economic crises of the mid-1970s, the marked increase in asylum and refugee migration in the 1980s and 1990s (as a consequence of various wars and crises, and the fall of communism), the rise of political Islamism

6 In this sense, the notion of a migration-integration complex is not congruent with that of a migration regime aimed at regulation and governance, a concept used in a study group at IMIS in Osnabrück (<https://migrationregimes.com>).

7 The corresponding critique of the concept of postmigrant societies thus misses the mark; cf. El-Tayeb 2016.

after the Iranian revolution, the *cultural turn* in the humanities and social sciences, and popular and public debates (Espahangizi 2021), as well as post-9/11 terrorism and various “refugee crises” have all ultimately contributed to transformations of the climate and parameters for negotiation and struggle in postmigrant societies such as Switzerland and Germany. Moreover, national migration and integration discourses and regimes are becoming increasingly interlinked – a process observable on a European and a global level (Pecoud 2014).

Since the 1980s and 1990s, new multicultural integration programs have been implemented in Switzerland and Germany, negotiated between migrant and non-migrant actors, civil society associations and state authorities (Piñeiro 2015; Chin 2017). The transition toward migration and integration policies based on an inclusive acceptance of immigration and diversity has opened up new spaces for political recognition both in Switzerland and in Germany. But these gains have been paralleled by counter-reactions, as the new migration and integration discourse has been mobilised both for projects of inclusion as well as exclusion. This dynamic becomes evident in the notion of individuals with a “migration background”, a category that initially emerged at the turn of the millennium. What can be used to broaden national identities in one context (to be *German or Swiss* with a migration background) becomes a means of drawing new lines of difference in another (German or Swiss *with a migration background*). In government statistics, migration background is a “color-blind” category (Lentin 2014), although within everyday acts of racism, it has become increasingly tied to racist markers such as appearance, name, and language (Supik 2014). Statistical tabulations are one thing, but which individuals are singled out as carriers of a migrant background is another entirely: Who is addressed, problematised and scandalised in everyday life, in the media and public discourses as such? Correspondingly, the discourse of migration and integration has produced very different subjectivities and identities that must be understood as historically variable stakes in social negotiation processes.

While, in the early 2000s, it might still have been empowering to do away with the designation of “foreigner” and to refer to oneself instead as a “migrant” (a term that did not become prevalent as a autonym in German until the 1990s),⁸ the tone of the word has by now shifted away from empowerment toward stigmatisation, both in Switzerland and in Germany.⁹ Even the calls for a historiography “from the point of view of migrants” (Skenderovic 2015) and the emphatic turn toward the migrant and nomadic subjects in critical theoretical discourses since the 1990s

8 See the use of the term in the newsletter published by the Movement for an Open, Solidary, and Democratic Switzerland (Bewegung für eine offene, solidarische und demokratische Schweiz, BODS).

9 Accordingly, Mecheril's (2014) criticism of the concept of the postmigrant also misses the point.

(see Flusser 2007) have taken on a new, more ambiguous “migrantological” flavour against the backdrop of recent shifts in the discourse (Bojadzijev/Römhild 2014: 10; Dahinden 2016). Finally, the re-articulation of exclusionary forces in recent years, filtered through the new semantics of migration and integration, has become the starting point for – and here the historical circle closes – new political and academic debates on the concept of the postmigrant – a term taken up in Germany in the early 2010s and in the years that followed in Switzerland and beyond (Espahangizi 2016).

Two sides of the same coin

The starting point of this chapter was the search for a meaningful historical periodisation of “postmigrant societies”. In light of the considerations outlined above, it can be argued that postmigrant societies emerge within a process of transformation during which different social or institutional organisations and actors – each with their own interests – realise that society is changing due to immigration and acknowledge the existence of a change that had hitherto not been part of their self-perception. This contested process takes place in the context of an expansive discourse on migration and integration, which in recent decades has increasingly become a central form of social self-understanding and self-perception in Switzerland and Germany. Given that more and more social issues have fallen under the rubric of issues related to migration – from public security to gender relations – it can also be said that disputes over the issue of migration represent a new constitutive mode of socialisation (*Vergesellschaftung*) in postmigrant societies. Migration is indeed becoming a “norm”, but not in the sense of a politically inclusive acceptance and socially valued integration of immigrants. Instead, we are witness to the rise of a permanent problematisation of the figure of the migrant that has in particular gained momentum recently in the context of the digitalisation of (social) media communication. Ultimately, Hoffmann-Nowotny’s characterisation of Switzerland as a “non-immigration immigration country” (Hoffmann-Nowotny 1995) appropriately sums up the constitution of various postmigrant societies. Postmigrant societies are in a state of uncertainty, wherein two opposing interpretative regimes have superimposed themselves on society: Migration and diversity are seen as integral to society *and* as foreign to it – as threat *and* enhancement, as risk *and* potential. Through diverse entangled historical processes, these contradictory, even antagonistic, perspectives have merged to form two sides of a coin. Or to use a different image – to form two poles of a discursive oscillator capable of generating regularly recurring *moral panics*.

The modern history of Switzerland is illustrative of the reality that one cannot assume a linear history of progress, in which a society that initially does not see

itself as a country of immigration becomes reasonable and gradually transforms itself into a “immigration society”. The example of the United States since the end of the 19th century illustrates that developments can also move in precisely the opposite direction, and that national immigration narratives do not automatically immunise against populist anti-immigration reactions. As in the United States and Germany, deeply contentious social debates on immigration and assimilation took place in Switzerland around 1900 (Kury/Lüthi/Erlanger 2005; Zimmerman 2010). On both sides of the Atlantic, it is possible to identify elements of a *postmigrant condition* already over a hundred years ago. The process of nationalisation, which intensified in Switzerland with the outbreak of World War I, pushed back these developments to the side until they were revived after World War II. A similar trajectory can also be observed in the United States, where the narrative of the land of immigrants only regained in strength in the 1950s (Handlin 1951; Kennedy 1959).

There are powerful lines of continuity, as well as major historical path dependencies, on various discursive, epistemic, institutional and legal levels that extend from the Swiss immigration debates at the turn of the 20th century to the 1960s, the 1970s and beyond. And yet the post-World War II migration and integration debates took shape in a fundamentally different historical context, both within Switzerland and globally, demarcated by catchwords such as decolonisation, modernisation theory, developmentalism, Cold War, the United Nations, human rights and economic globalisation. As discussed above, a perspective that draws on the history of knowledge can sharpen our ability to tease out shifts in the discourse, but it must be supplemented by perspectives from social, cultural, media, economic and political history. Instead of searching for a unambiguous birth date for any given postmigrant society (or all of them), it is instead much more meaningful to understand this concept as a productive approach to the present, which allows for the possibility of understanding its multiple genealogies, each with specific temporal and spatial logics. Furthermore, an overview of the early 20th century also makes clear that considering only the turning points and moments of upheaval in the processes of realizing and acknowledging immigration realities is also shortsighted; it is equally vital to understand the myriad processes of *de-realisation* – of forgetting, repressing, learning to forget, marginalizing and sometimes also suppressing immigration realities. In so doing, postmigrant approaches might also be able to create a space for new discussions that also engage with the debates surrounding the question of “(post)colonial amnesia” (Albrecht 2010; Falk/Lüthi/Purtschert 2012).

A consideration of Switzerland as a case study of a postmigrant society highlights the fact that such societies are always constituted within transnational interdependencies and complex temporal structures. The simultaneity of the non-simultaneous, as Ernst Bloch called it, can be observed throughout Europe

in the national migration and integration debates that the media has long since connected to each other, both socially and politically, in spite of their different historical trajectories. Against this backdrop, the postmigrant perspective can also be understood as an opportunity for a transnational dialogue – for a critical multivocal reflection on the reorganisation and constitution of society in the era of migration, integration and right-wing populism in Europe and beyond.

References

- Ahmed, Sara (2012): *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Durham, NC: Duke UP.
- Albrecht, Monika (2010): "(Post-)Colonial Amnesia? German Debates on Colonialism and Decolonization in the Post-War Era". In: Michael Perraudin/Jürgen Zimmerer (eds.), *German Colonialism and National Identity*, New York: Routledge, pp. 187-196.
- Argast, Regula (2007): *Staatsbürgerschaft und Nation. Ausschluss und Integration in der Schweiz, 1848-1933*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bade, Klaus J. (1992): *Deutsche im Ausland – Fremde in Deutschland. Migration in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, München: Beck.
- Bade, Klaus J. (2002): "Historische Migrationsforschung". In: Jochen Oltmer (ed.), *Migrationsforschung und Interkulturelle Studien. Zehn Jahre IMIS*, Osnabrück: Universitätsverlag Rasch, pp. 55-74.
- Bade, Klaus J. (2017): *Migration – Flucht – Integration. Kritische Politikbegleitung von der 'Gastarbeiterfrage' bis zur 'Flüchtlingskrise'*, Karlsruhe: von Loeper.
- Bade, Klaus J./Oltmer, Jochen (2004): *Normalfall Migration*, Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Baumann, Sarah, (2014): ... und es kamen auch Frauen. Engagement italienischer Migrantinnen in Politik und Gesellschaft der Nachkriegsschweiz, Zürich: Seismo.
- Bojadzije, Manuela/Römhild, Regina (2014): "Was kommt nach dem 'transnational turn'? Perspektiven für eine kritische Migrationsforschung". In: *Labor Migration* (ed.), *Vom Rand ins Zentrum. Perspektiven einer kritischen Migrationsforschung*, Berlin: Panama Verlag, pp. 10-24.
- Braun, Rudolf (1970): *Sozio-kulturelle Probleme der Eingliederung italienischer Arbeitskräfte in der Schweiz*, Erlenbach: Rentsch.
- BIGA/Bundesamt für Industrie, Gewerbe und Arbeit (1964): *Das Problem der ausländischen Arbeitskräfte. Bericht der Studienkommission für das Problem der ausländischen Arbeitskräfte*, Bern: BIGA.

- Bundesamt für Industrie, Gewerbe und Arbeit/Bundesamt für Ausländerfragen (1991): Bericht über Konzeption und Prioritäten der Ausländerpolitik der neunziger Jahre, Bern: BIGA.
- Bürger, Gottfried (1929): Das Problem der politischen Überfremdung der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Eine Anregung zu bevölkerungspolitischen Maßnahmen gegen die politische Gefährdung des deutschen Reiches, Leipzig: Universitätsverlag Robert Noske.
- Chin, Rita (2017): *The Crisis of Multiculturalism in Europe: A History*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dahinden, Janine (2016): "A Plea for the 'De-Migrantization' of Research on Migration and Integration". In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39/13, pp. 1-19.
- D'Amato, Gianni (2008): "Historische und soziologische Übersicht über die Migration in der Schweiz". In: *Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für Entwicklungspolitik* 27/2, pp. 177-95.
- EKA/Eidg. Konsultativkommission für das Ausländerproblem (1976): *Die Stellung der Ausländer im politischen Leben der Schweiz*, Bern: EKA.
- Eigenmann, Philip (2017): *Migration macht Schule. Bildung und Berufsbildung italienischer Migrantinnen und Migranten in Zürich 1960-1980*, Zürich: Chronos.
- El-Tayeb, Fatima (2016): *Undeutsch. Die Konstruktion des Anderen in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Espahangizi, Kijan (2016): "Das #Postmigrantische ist kein Kind der Akademie". In: *Geschichte der Gegenwart*, June 12 (<http://geschichtedergegenwart.ch/das-postmigrantische-kein-kind-der-akademie>).
- Espahangizi, Kijan (2017a): "The Granddaughter's Dissertation. Some Thoughts on Knowledge about Migration in 1960s Switzerland". In: *History of Knowledge*, August 10 (<https://historyofknowledge.net/2017/08/10/the-grand-daughters-dissertation>).
- Espahangizi, Kijan (2017b): "Migration research and epistemic participation: A Case Study on the 'Sociology of Foreign Workers' in Zurich in the 1970s". In: Katharina Morawek/Martin Krenn (eds.), *Urban Citizenship. Demokratisierung der Demokratie*, Vienna: VfmK, pp. 112-131.
- Espahangizi, Kijan (2019a): "The 'Sociologic' of Postmigration: A Study in the Early History of Social Research on Migration and Integration in Switzerland, 1960-73". In: Barbara Lüthi/Damir Skenderovic (eds.), *Switzerland and Migration: Historical and Current Perspectives on a Changing Landscape* (Palgrave Studies in Migration History), Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 33-49.
- Espahangizi, Kijan (2019b): "'The Way to School between Two Worlds': Documenting the Knowledge of Second-Generation Immigrant Children in Switzerland, 1977-1983". In: *KNOW – A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge* 3/2, pp. 305-330.

- Espahangizi, Kijan (2019c): "Der Schweizer Migration-Integration-Komplex. Postmigrantische Perspektiven". In: Ruth Daellenbach/Beat Ringger/Pascal Zwicky (eds.): *Reclaim Democracy. Die Demokratie stärken und weiterentwickeln*, Zürich: edition 8, pp. 149-155.
- Espahangizi, Kijan (2021): "The 'Cultural Turn' of Postmigrant Conviviality: A Historical Case Study on the Practices and Discourses of Cultural Diversity and Multiculturalism in Switzerland, 1970s-1990s". In: Lise Gaupp/Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer (eds.), *Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 96-126.
- Espahangizi, Kijan/Hess, Sabine/Karakayalı, Julianne/Kasperek, Bernd/Pagano, Simona/Rodatz, Mathias/Tsianos, Vassilis (eds., 2016): *Rassismus in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Falk, Francesca/Lüthi, Barbara/Purtschert, Patricia (2012): *Postkoloniale Schweiz. Formen und Folgen eines Kolonialismus ohne Kolonien*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Flusser, Vilém (2007): *Von der Freiheit des Migranten. Einsprüche gegen den Nationalismus*, Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Foroutan, Naika (2016): "Postmigrantische Gesellschaften". In: Heinz Ulrich Brinkmann/Martina Sauer (eds.), *Einwanderungsgesellschaft Deutschland. Entwicklung und Stand der Integration*, Wiesbaden: Springer, pp. 227-255.
- Gabaccia, Donna R. (2015): "Time and Temporality in Migration Studies". In: Caroline Brettell/James Frank Hollifield (eds.), *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, New York: Routledge, pp. 37-66.
- Goldberg, David Theo (2006): "Racial Europeanization". In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (2), pp. 331-364.
- Greve, Jens/Heintz, Bettina (2005): "Die 'Entdeckung der Weltgesellschaft'. Entstehung und Grenzen der Weltgesellschaftstheorie". In: *Weltgesellschaft. Theoretische Zugänge und empirische Problemlagen. Sonderband der Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, pp. 89-119.
- Hahn, Sylvia (2012): *Historische Migrationsforschung*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Handlin, Oscar (1951): *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations That Made the American People*, Boston: Little Brown.
- Harzig, Christiane/Hoerder, Dirk/Gabaccia, Donna R. (2009): *What is Migration History?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Haug, Werner (1988): "Ausblick auf die Zukunft der schweizerischen Bevölkerung. Bevölkerungsperspektiven 1986-2025". In: *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik* 124/2, pp. 93-210.
- Haug, Werner/Kreis, Georg (2017): *Zukunft der Migration. Reflexion über Wissenschaft und Politik*, Zürich: NZZ libro.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (1970): *Migration. Ein Beitrag zu einer soziologischen Erklärung*, Stuttgart: Enke.

- Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (1973): *Soziologie des Fremdarbeiterproblem: Eine theoretische und empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Schweiz*, Stuttgart: Enke.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (1988): "Paradigmen und Paradigmenwechsel in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Wanderungsforschung. Versuch einer Skizze einer neuen Migrationstheorie". In: Gerhard Jaritz/ Albert Müller (eds.), *Migration in der Feudalgesellschaft*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, pp. 21-42.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (1995): "Switzerland: A Non-Immigration Immigration Country". In: Robin Cohen (ed.), *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 302-307.
- Holenstein, André/Kury, Patrick/Schulz, Kristina (2018): *Schweizer Migrationsgeschichte. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Baden: hier und jetzt.
- Jasanoff, Sheila (ed., 2004): *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and Social Order*, London: Routledge.
- Karakayali, Juliane/Tsianos, Vassilis (2014): "Rassismus und Repräsentationspolitik in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft". In: *ApuZ* 64/13-14, pp. 33-39.
- Kennedy, John F. (1959): *A Nation of Immigrants*, New York: Anti-defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
- Kubat, Daniel/Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (1981): "Migration. Towards a New Paradigm". In: *International Social Science Journal* 33/2, pp. 307-329.
- Kury, Patrick (2003): *Über Fremde reden. Überfremdungsdiskurs und Ausgrenzung in der Schweiz 1900-1945*, Zürich: Chronos.
- Kury, Patrick/Lüthi, Barbara/Erlanger, Simon (2005): *Grenzen setzen. Vom Umgang mit Fremden in der Schweiz und den USA, 1890-1950*, Köln: Böhlau.
- Lässig, Simone/Steinberg, Swen (2017): *Knowledge and Migration. Themenheft Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43/3 (http://www.v-r.de/de/geschichte_und_gesellschaft_2017_43_3/me-o/1094023).
- Lagos, Gustavo (1963): *International Stratification and Underdeveloped Countries*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lentin, Alana (2014): "Postracial Silence: The Othering of Race in Europe". In: Wulf D. Hund/ Alana Lentin (eds.), *Racism and Sociology*, Wien: Lit, pp. 69-106.
- Lentin, Alana/Titley, Gavan (2011): *The Crises of Multiculturalism, Racism in a Neoliberal Age*, London: Zed books.
- Lucassen, Jan/Lucassen, Leo/Manning, Patrick (2010): *Migration History in World History: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, Leiden: Brill.
- McKeown, Andrew (2008): *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Maiolino, Angelo (2011): *Als die Italiener noch Tschinggen waren. Der Widerstand gegen die Schwarzenbach-Initiative*, Zürich: Rotpunktverlag.
- Mecheril, Paul (2011): "Wirklichkeit schaffen. Integration als Dispositiv". In: *ApuZ* 43/11, pp. 49-54.

- Mecheril, Paul (2014): "Was ist das X im Postmigrantischen?" In: *sub\urban. Zeitschrift für kritische Stadtforschung* 2/3, pp. 107-112.
- Pecoud, Antoine (2014): *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Pivot.
- Piñeiro, Esteban (2015): *Integration und Abwehr. Genealogie der schweizerischen Ausländerintegration*, Zürich: Seismo.
- Rausa-de Luca, Fabienne (2005): *Die Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund. Ergebnisse des Moduls 'Mobilität und Migration' der SAKE 2003 (Demos. Informationen aus der Demografie, 4/2004, published by Bundesamt für Statistik)*, Neuchâtel: BFS.
- Schramm, Moritz/Pultz Moslund, Sten/Ring Petersen, Anne et al. (eds., 2019): *Reframing Migration, Diversity and the Arts: The Postmigrant Condition*, New York/London: Routledge.
- Skenderovic, Damir (2015): "Vom Gegenstand zum Akteur. Perspektivenwechsel in der Migrationsgeschichte der Schweiz". In: *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 65/1, 1-14.
- Skenderovic, Damir/D'Amato Gianni (2008): *Mit dem Fremden politisieren. Rechtspopulistische Parteien und Migrationspolitik in der Schweiz seit den 1960er Jahren*, Zürich: Chronos.
- Spielhaus, Riem (2012): "Studien in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft. Eine kritische Auseinandersetzung". In: *Dokumentation 4. Bundesfachkongress Interkultur*, Hamburg, pp. 96-100.
- Stricker, Yann (2017): "Migration Statistics and the Making of an International Point of View in the Interwar Period". In: *History of Knowledge*, October 5 (<https://historyofknowledge.net/2017/10/05/migration-statistics-and-the-making-of-an-international-point-of-view-in-the-interwar-period>).
- Supik, Linda (2014): *Statistik und Rassismus. Das Dilemma der Erfassung von Ethnizität*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Thränhardt, Dietrich (1975): "Ausländische Arbeiter in der Bundesrepublik, in Österreich und der Schweiz". In: *Neue politische Literatur. Berichte aus Geschichts- und Politikwissenschaft* 20, pp. 66-88.
- Wimmer, Andreas (2013): *Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wimmer, Andreas/Glick-Schiller, Nina (2002): "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond. Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences". In: *Global Networks* 4, 301-334.
- Yildiz, Erol/Hill, Marc (2015): *Nach der Migration. Postmigrantische Perspektiven jenseits der Parallelgesellschaft*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Zimmerman, Andrew (2010): *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.