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If “the earth was too small for him, [then] how could Braunschweig be large enough?” Thus begins Josef von Baky’s classic German adventure film The Adventures of the Baron Münchhausen, 1943. Baron Münchhausen (Hans Albers) sets out to travel the world, for he is bored with Germany: first he heads to St. Petersburg where he trysts with Czarina Katherina (Brigitte Horney), then to a camp of the Turkish army which he enters on a flying cannonball, on to Istanbul as an entertainer for the Sultan (Leo Slezak), to Venice with the Princess Isabelle d’Este (Ilse Werner), to the moon, and finally back to his residence in Bodenwerder. Ultimately he returns home because, as he tells the Turkish Sultan, he longs for it: “Every one of us only has one Heimat, just like everyone only has one mother.” Travel however is key, for without it Baron Münchhausen could not have had such adventures nor would he have longed for his home as much had he never left it. The national and the local dimensions (embodied by Bodenwerder in Germany), and the transnational (represented by his travels through Europe and Turkey) are thus inextricably combined. Ultimately, Baron Münchhausen returns home.

In this article I want to examine the shift in post-Cold War German cinema towards a transnational direction in the context of “the new Europe,” by which I refer to the shifting configuration of Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the demise of the Soviet Union. Specifically, how do the issues of home and abroad, of stability and travel, and of nationalism and transnationalism as seen in Münchhausen play out in a contemporary German cinema that deals with Turkish-German encounters of a different kind?

“The new Europe” is especially marked by the general issues of migration and mobility. This mobility—the result of ever more permeable borders, trends of tourism, economic needs and opportunities, as well as political crises and violent wars—did not suddenly emerge after 1989. On the contrary: since the end of WWII, Germany has experienced increasing mobility, especially with the tremendous influx of labor migration that occurred during the 1970s. If the “new Europe” shows signs of becoming more transnational, to what extent is such a transnationalism reflected in the German cinema of the past few decades?

In Migrancy, Culture, Identity, Iain Chambers explores the instability that occurs in the interplay between the local and the transnational. Precisely because of the instability of transnationalism, there is a “...need for a mode of thinking that is neither fixed nor stable, ... open to the prospect of a continual return to events, to their re-elaboration...” This need is satisfied by taking travel as a metaphor through which a globalizing world can be understood. Travel is key to a transnational remapping as it highlights removal and displacement from a “home”—or separation from a nation—and yet carries within itself the seeds of longing. Travel indicates a simultaneously national and transnational movement. By looking at how travel is repre-
It becomes possible to comment on both national and transnational issues.

If travel as metaphor and symptom of our transnational times produces displacement, it equally evokes a longing for a real or imagined home/nation, a Heimat that may or may not be attainable. That longing can give valuable insight into the state of “the New European” cinema through representations specific to West Germany.

I want to discuss three different types of film which deal with the issue of transnational travel: the cinematographic adaptations of the nineteenth-century novels of Karl May that were produced during the 1960s and reflect West German concerns about the Cold War; travel videos from the 1990s for Germans planning to visit Turkey that highlight a post-Cold War German attitude; and contemporary Turkish-German films, directed by Turks who have grown up in Germany, which offer a specific Turkish-German point of view. Does a post-Cold War cinema, produced and viewed in a period characterized as transnational, reach beyond or transcend national boundaries more than a Cold War cinema, a time of closed borders and limited mobility?

Travel encounters between Germans and Turks are investigated as part of the phenomenon of longing for a home/nation. Such meetings are very much part of a discourse which seeks to either reify or deconstruct ideas of nationhood. While many films can be said to be transnationally conceptualized—a journey takes place, the characters cross national boundaries, the films are shot in multiple European and non-European locations—a shift in the very meaning of transnational becomes apparent over time. In other words, far from the transnational travel that creates a longing for a German home/nation as seen in the films shot before the fall of the Berlin Wall, the contemporary, post-Cold War Turkish-German films highlight a pluralistic transnationalism that underscores multiple homes/nations. In light of a “New Europe,” however, such a transnational cinema does not necessarily indicate a more transnational Europe.

**Encountering Karl May: Time and the Other**

Karl Friedrich May (1842-1912) was born in Hohenstein-Ernstthal, Germany, and quite possibly is one of the most beloved German authors of all times. His adventure books about the 19th century Orient, the American Wild West, and South America have been translated into 30 languages, and in Germany alone, more than 80 million copies of his books have been sold. His works are best known for their exact ethnographic details even though May was a classic armchair traveler who rarely left his own home.

Two films based on the novels by Karl May,
written in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Der Schut (The Shoot, 1964, directed by Robert Siodmak), and Durchs Wilde Kurdistan (The Wild Men of Kurdistan, 1965, directed by Franz Josef Gottlieb) highlight the 19th century travels of the German Kara ben Nemsi (Lex Barker), his servant and sidekick Hadschi Halef Omar Ben Hadschi Abdul Abbas Ibn Hadschi Dawud al Gossarah (Ralf Wolter), his horse Rih, and his German Shepherd dog. The films speak from a perspective grounded in Cold War concerns.

Although the films were shot in Spain, Italy and France, they are meant to portray a generic Near East, a semiarid landscape that could inspire the imaginary of the primarily German audiences for whom the films were intended. Even the actors hail from all over Europe. On the surface, these films seem to invoke a transnational discourse. But do they?

Based on two different novels that follow the adventures of Kara as he travels through Kurdistan (envisioned as part of the Ottoman Empire), these two films represent strikingly similar encounters between Germans and Turks, or between other Near Easterners assumed to be Turkish by virtue of wearing a traditional Turkish head-garb, the fez. Both films foreground an admiration for the West, as well as parallel issues of violence and honor/reputation.

Kara, a German traveler who roams a generic Orient and shows up wherever trouble is to be found, is much admired by Turks in their encounters. When he strides onto the screen in both films, taller than anyone, he is immediately surrounded by dozens of men who strive to touch him. The blond German is fawned at by dark men; and while Kara himself takes no note of these encounters, it is his sidekick Hadschi who must shoo the men away. Embodying the suave West, Kara is admired, his superiority thus implicitly underscored. The German audience arguably identifies with Kara, who may remind them of their own home and by extension, their perceived superiority, in stark contrast to everything else on the screen.

Edward Said’s notion of Orientalism as “a style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction made between ‘the Orient’ and (most of the time) ‘the Occident’” is especially relevant in the case of the Karl May films. At the court of the Padishah...
(Fernando Sancho) in *Durchs Wilde Kurdistan*, we deliberately witness the use of femininity as an allegory of the Orient: Kara, entranced, watches the belly dancers seductively sway their hips, the most beautiful woman is given to him as a present. Yet he refuses her because of his plans to return home, and he cannot take a woman of another world back to his German *Heimat*. Although longing here is arguably for a seductive woman, she does not outweigh the longing for his home.

On the other hand Turks are also represented as violent in their encounters with Kara, who himself uses violence only when defending the innocent. The Shoot (*Rik Battaglia*), Kara’s Middle Eastern arch-nemesis who has kidnapped his French friend Dr. Galin-gré (*Henri Fromont*), exacts brutal violence against his own wife: the audience can only watch, helplessly. Violence is naturalized, shown as part of the (national) character of the Turks. Again, such tropes of an imagined Turkish behavior stand in direct opposition to the traits ascribed to Germans, and recognizable by a German audience, as embodied by Kara: a hero who only fights when necessary.

The Karl May films of the 1960s offer stylized, selective representations of a generic Near Eastern landscape. These individuals are subservient, violent, and possess an “oriental mystique.” Such representations reflect the specific political and cultural context of foreign emigration to Germany during this period.

In the mid 1960s, Germany, in full economic boom, became home to millions of immigrants who crossed German borders in the hopes of securing better jobs and livelihoods. After the Berlin Wall was built in 1961, Germany could no longer rely on labor from East Germany: the Federal Republic of Germany now had to actively invite guest laborers, the so-called *Gastarbeiter*, from the circum-Mediterranean region.10

*Der Schut* and *Durchs wilde Kurdistan*, filmed only a few years after the labor-contract with Turkey was signed, should be viewed in the context of these transnational migrant workers moving into the Federal Republic of Germany. Although they take place in an unspecified Ottoman Empire of the past, the Karl May films might be read as commentary on the contemporary situation of Germany in the 1960s. Still relying on past fantasies, the films also reflect the threat of an imagined unknown, represented by violent Turks who beat women, and unclad belly dancing women engaging in illicit activities. This imagined unknown, however, was now actively within the borders of home.

In these transnational encounters of the traveling kind, the blond triumphs over the brunette, the violent danger is defeated, and Kara returns home in both films. In the words of the traveler Baron Münchhausen in 1943: "Every one of us only has one Heimat to which he belongs." I argue that the Karl May films can be seen as a reaffirmation of the notion of a pure *Heimat*, invoked precisely at the point in time when the national borders were transgressed by a massive flow of Turkish migrant workers. By offering the unknown in a way that makes its strangeness apparent and even uncomfortable, and placing it in contrast to a clearly defined and admired German hero (Kara), notions of longing for home are exacerbated and reinforced. Despite a superficial transnationalism—they are transnational in terms of location, nationality of the actors, and the narrativized encounters with an other culture—both films are more concerned with the longing for a German home than encounters with the Other, especially when seen in the context of West Germany in the 1960s.

**Touristic Encounters**

One of the more interesting genres of post-Cold War German cinema that deals with Germans and Turks are travel videos intended for German audiences planning to visit Turkey. Travel videos such as *In einem Zug durch die Türkei (In a Train Through Turkey, 1995)* and *Türkei (Turkey, 1995)* are interesting case studies. As introduction to the culture and customs of Turkey, they serve to further an examination of transnational encounters: German audiences are guided through a travel experience which creates a link between two
countries, Germany and Turkey. These videos explain what should be expected of Turkey by prospective German visitors: among other things, they should expect encounters with traditional Turkish occupations, the "folk," and religion. In these representations—which help constitute the field of new tourism studies—the audience is again confronted with difference. These encounters end up by underscoring the familiar vis à vis the strange: one's identity can be recognized only if juxtaposed with another, as Frank Trommler points out. These travelogues ultimately emphasize precisely that message evident in the earlier Karl May films: in the case of Germany, travelling to Turkey can lead to a longing for and a reassertion of home.

In einem Zug durch die Türkei, broadcast in 1995 on the Bavarian television station Bayerischer Rundfunk, sells a touristic Turkey to its German audience, as does its contemporary, the travel-promoting video Türkei. Turkey is marketed through its primary geographical sites, and leads the audience along a highly scripted itinerary of place after exotic place. But Turks are nonetheless depersonalized and kept at a distance: neither travel video depicts actual face-to-face encounters. Although the audience is presented with highly stylized individuals that conform to particular conventions of representation, these individuals only pass in front of the camera, snapshots reminiscent of National Geographic stills.

In einem Zug durch die Türkei follows the Turkish train conductor Yasar on his trips through Turkey. Although the audience is never introduced to him, and never hears his voice in translation, Yasar is nevertheless the closest to an actual encounter that the audience has with a Turk. While the video Türkei also never directly shows interactions with individuals who speak to the audience, it does showcase encounters with people who are engaged in their traditional occupations. However Western businessmen or jet-setting bosses do not occupy the spotlight: instead fishermen, carpet dealers drinking tea, men and women tilling the fields, boys herding sheep, and women making bread—or the more traditional occupations—are the focus of the film. Coupled with particularly suggestive texts, spoken by a disembodied voice over: "As it has been since time immemorial [...] people still live in the old rhythms ..." these representations, though certainly a part of everyday life in Turkey, serve to relegate the Turks that German travelers might encounter to a pre-industrial past, which translates into an eternal present. Whether the use of such images and disembodied voice trigger a longing for such a past or a longing for the familiar German home is not clear, yet both are inscribed in the text: ultimately Turkey functions as a German projection.

The audience is also shown “traditional” Turkish “folk,” and usually pursuing some aspect of a rural lifestyle: they are always peasants, the very old or the very young, colorfully dressed. We return to scenes of peasant occupation—farmers tilling their land and women harvesting tea leaves—or disturbingly voyeuristic close-ups of smiling groups and individuals: a veiled woman with golden teeth, three giggling women, a man who licks his finger, and a veiled woman shyly hiding behind her laundry. These images, while not entirely fictitious, are part and parcel of a German imaginary of what an audience would desire and expect to see.

The notion of the peasantry/folk is a central feature in a German, Herderian framework of Romantic nationalism, when the folk were seen as vessels of a national spirit: peasants "had kept on their lips those songs created by folk poets in the days when German culture had rested on its own foundation" and their words "mirror[ed] the ancient German soul." The encounters between audience and the people in the video echo Dutch scholar Johannes Fabian’s Time and the Other, which argues that anthropology (here, a type of ethnographic film) relegates the objects of study to a less "civilized" past.

Culturally, the most puzzling of all encounters between the German audience and the Turks portrayed in the videos are the ones concerning religion. In einem Zug
durch die Türkei teaches the audience more about early Christianity, like the purported death of Mary in Ephesus, than about Islam, except for unexplained calls to prayer, ablutions, and prayerbeads that are flashed before the audience. We see a man with Muslim prayerbeads, an act which is brushed aside as ludic: "Everywhere in Turkey one sees men playing with such chains, they are called ‘killers of boredom.’" And a man praying on the train remains the uncomfortable focus of the camera’s gaze, with no explanation of his activity or sign of respect for the privacy of his actions. A video about a Muslim country which showcases Christian ideas and ideals is more of a projection of its German maker than an actual attempt to present Turkey as it is really lived.

Once again, the historical context of Germany in the 1990s has to be accessed to make sense of these representations. As the videos are part of an endeavor to promote travel, the historical trajectory of tourism must be examined. Tourism studies arose concurrently with the rise of immigration to Western European countries in the 1960s. Encounters with "Others" were thus simultaneously occurring at home and abroad. But beginning in the mid 1980s, traveling exploded to unprecedented heights, and people began to expect a destination whose trademark was cultural authenticity. These expectations included something traditional, authentic, and different from home: in short, as MacCannell pointedly remarks, an artifice which constantly needed to be produced. These tropes, re-enacted across the sampled travel films, are precisely the type of encounters that tourists not only desire, and are made to desire, but are actively produced for tourists to consume.

But why are such representations produced? The travel videos for Germans interested in armchair travel or real tourism frame Turks in ways very different from everyday life in Germany; in fact, they represent the fantasy world that travel creates. Among other things, they generate a frame of juxtaposition for the audience to reassert their own particular nationality and identity. In the specific case of Germans encountering Turks through travel videos, a longing for the audience’s own lifestyle is created by showing them something very different from their own reality. And longing for one’s home is of some importance for sustaining a nation. Transnationalism, superficially encoded in the very nature of these videos that seemingly transcend national borders, produces quite the opposite effect, a reassertion of nationality. Thus, Post-Cold War German travel videos, produced in a very transnational time, do not necessarily indicate a more transnational Germany.

Encounters within Germany

While both the Karl May films and travel videos, transnational in their content, locations and outlook, ultimately highlight the German home and nation, the post-Cold War films of Turkish German encounters shot by Turks living in Germany indicate a change in perspective.

Hussi Kutlucan’s Ich Chef, Du Turnschuh (Me Boss, You Sneaker, 1998) follows the haphazard adventures of the Armenian asylum-seeker Dudie (Hussi Kutlucan), who works at the Potsdamer Platz construction site, locus of the new German government since 1999. He tries to marry a German woman for residency papers, and ends up by being deported to Turkey with his German “son” who has been given a Turkish name. Fatih Akin’s Im Juli (In July, 2000), on the contrary, follows the equally haphazard adventures of the German schoolteacher Daniel Bannier (Moritz Bleibtreu) and his German travel companion Juli (Christiane Paul) on their way to Istanbul, where Daniel hopes to encounter Melek (Idil Üner), a Turkish woman with whom he believes he is deeply in love. He is arrested, realizes he loves Juli instead, and they finally drive off into the sunset, together with Melek and her boyfriend Isa (Mehmet Kurtulus). Whether or not Daniel and Juli will remain in Turkey is left unclear. But they head east, away from the setting sun, away from Germany.

Both films revolve around travel: Kutlucan’s film grounds itself in the notion of transience, as it highlights the displacement of asylum
seekers, and Akin’s *Im Juli* models itself as a German road-movie that again takes travel as its premise. And while Kutlucan’s protagonist Dudie is Armenian, not Turkish,16 arguably the represented encounters are of the kind that most certainly occurred between Germans and Turks over their 30 years of cohabitation since the beginning of labor migration into Germany. Moreover, by playing an Armenian, Kutlucan “escape[s] overidentification within the [Turkish] community and [can] protect himself against possible reproaches of mis-representation coming from other Turks.”17

The encounters that take place in both films revolve around issues of hierarchies, finance, and a strict German bureaucracy. Unlike the previously examined cinematic representations (both the Karl May films and the travel videos), however, no single German locus of longing and home is created; quite on the contrary. Certainly because of the status of the directors—both Kutuclan and Akin are Turks who have grown up in Germany and can be rightly considered transnational citizens—and the historical moment in which they were produced, the films instead question the notion of one pure home that only one group of people may inhabit. Germany and Europe in Kutlucan and Akin’s films become truly transnational places.

A main theme in *Ich Chef, Du Turnschuh* concerns encounters of a hierarchical nature. Dudie encounters Germans who are on a socially and financially higher level than he is, and who masquerade their supposed power. We witness Dudie’s encounter with his German boss Hans (Heinz-Werner Kraehkamp), who parades his status around by shouting and speaking an invented “immigrant German” to Dudie (whose German, in fact, is flawless). We also see Dudie interact with Hasan (Orhan Güner), a Turkish foreman, who claims that he “is practically a Boss already,” and who further reinforces his hierarchy by claiming a near-German identity. Yet he stutters, thus pointing to the irony of the situation. The film underscores that anyone can learn German; language ceases to be an indicator of nationality, given that even the German
boss cannot master it. This might suggest that a more transnational Germany and Europe are marked not as much by linguistic or national boundaries as much as by mobile individuals. Some encounters are of a financial nature: having, or not having money seems to be of some importance. While obtaining a resident permit through official routes seems impossible, paying a German woman to marry him is an option that Dudie actively pursues. That monetary currency is one way of establishing, if not hierarchy, then at least some stability and a chance for survival, becomes more visible when Dudie’s Iranian roommate Sadam (Kolya Turgay Mandoz) steals Dudie’s 7,000 Deutsch Marks, and immediately begins to flirt with Dudie’s German girlfriend Nina (Wiebke Inn). To have money means that immigrants can have a chance when other routes fail.

Akin’s Im Juli also stages encounters based upon the possession or lack of the right currency. When Daniel arrives at the Turkish border, hours from meeting the woman of his dreams, he does not have a passport. Relying on the translation skills of his Turkish travel companion Isa, who is traveling from Germany to Turkey to repatriate the body of his dead uncle, Daniel gets arrested for not having the right currency—a passport—needed to cross the border. Arrests affect both Dudie and Daniel, in Germany and Turkey alike, since neither has the official means to remain or enter the respective country.

We need to put these narratives in an historical context to learn what they have to say about a transnational reconfiguration of Germany and Europe. Both films, made by Turkish directors who grew up in Germany, constitute a post-Cold War response to the earlier cinema of the 1970s and 1980s about mobility and economic migrancy. Previous films portrayed immigrants as silent objects of suffering, such as Rainer Werner Fassbinder’s classic Angst Esset Seele Auf (Fear Eats the Soul, 1974), Fassbinder’s Katzelmacher (1964), and Jörg Gförer and Günter Wallraff’s Ganz Unten (Lowest of the Low, 1986). In such a context, Ich Chef, Du Turnschuh and Im Juli both present a different view, one that points to the agency of immigrants as opposed to their oppression.18

In the end, there is no explicit longing for a particular home (for example, Dudie prefers to stay away from his own home and remain in Germany). Instead, both films question the notion of one pure home, and deconstruct the idea that only one group of people may inhabit a particular home and nation. Thus, in Me Boss, You Sneaker, Berlin is posited as a pluralistic location, and is being rebuilt jointly by immigrant labor and Germans alike: the new capital is being rebuilt in spite of the conflicts. In fact, Dudie and the other immigrants are vital to the literal rebuilding of a new Germany—one that is truly transnational. And lastly, Im Juli presents the possibility of multiple homes for transnational people, as the protagonist Daniel and his German girlfriend Juli are happy anywhere, actively so in Turkey, and the German-Turkish couple Isa and Melek also live comfortably in both Turkey and Germany.

At Home and Abroad: Conclusions Concerning the Nation

How do the Karl May films (1964 and 1965), travel videos (1995), and Turkish-German films (1998 and 2000) address the concepts of nationhood and transnationalism through travel? And how, overarching, can different versions of transnationalism be understood from a Cold War and post-Cold War perspective?

Both the Karl May films and the travel videos, seen from within their historical context, seem to reify the German home and home nation, a nationalism triggered by transnational encounters. Although the films nod to the existence of strangers, Turks remain scripted at a distance, and do not figure positively or even realistically in the film: they are either the villains (Karl May films) or shown to be backward and innocent peasants (travel videos). Both adventurous tales and travel videos juxtapose one national identity vis à vis another in order to reassert a German national identity, as if to underscore that in order to know who you are, you must know who you are not. Through geographic distancing in the
GERMANS AND TURKS: CINEMATIC ENCOUNTERS OF THE TRAVELING KIND

travel videos, and by the fantastic glorification of the (German) West and the vilification of the Turks in the Karl May films, the German nation is reaffirmed. To quote Kara ben Nemsi’s borrowed statement: “Every one of us only has one Heimat to which he belongs.” His sidekick Hadschi, a Turk, would, or rather could never go to Germany, for it is made very clear that he does not belong.

While Cold War German cinema is not truly transnational in the case of the Karl May films, produced during a time characterized among other things by low mobility, why would travel videos made after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a time which signaled a renewed mobility and potentially a new disposition, also reaffirm a German national identity? Both the Karl May films and the travel videos are historical responses to the presence of immigrants and the opening of borders; the situations are similar, and the films are made by Germans for Germans.

Encounters at home in Germany, discussed in light of the films made after the fall of the Berlin Wall by Turkish-German directors Kutlucan and Akin, however, do not so easily reify or reassert the German nation. Instead, they deconstruct ideas of nationhood by criticizing tropes of nationhood in terms of language (which is learnable by anyone), by crossing borders, and depicting a transnational comfort. Akin’s Im Juli especially downplays ideas of home, as there is no indication that Daniel and Juli wish to return to Germany. Akin and Kutlucan’s Germany—and Europe—is a lot more transnational than Karl May’s Europe, or the Europe of travel videos. Here, it is the view of the immigrant in Germany (as assimilated and legalised as these directors are) that produces a truly transnational place. This might well be the path to a “new Europe.”
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NOTES

1 The film stages the quintessential German hero loyal to the fatherland; it was produced on the order of Goebbels, Hitler’s Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment to celebrate the 25th anniversary of UFA, the German Production studio.


3 Iain Chambers, Migrancy, Culture, Identity (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).

4 Ibid., 3.


7 Robert Siodmak (1900-1973) is a well known German director who achieved considerable fame in the United States. It is interesting to note that Siodmak himself was a transnational figure, operating out of two very distinct countries. This may, in fact, help explain the longing for home that is visible in the Karl May films.

8 Franz Josef Gottlieb (born in 1930 in Austria) continues to direct TV series in Germany. From the 1970s through the
1980s, he produced primarily slapstick films and erotic comedies

12 Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) is of particular importance to the study of folklore in Germany: Herder helped usher in the literary Sturm und Drang movement, and is often considered to be a leading figure in German National Romanticism.
16 Armenians in Turkey raise similar questions as the status of Turks in Germany does. Both groups represent diasporic communities. I would posit that by having the protagonist Dudie be Armenian, the director Kutuculan is both equating and making a comment on parallel situations.
18 While the recruitment of immigrants helped the economy, there were other, unexpected repercussions: with five million immigrants living in Germany by 1989, violent racist attacks and expressions of intense xenophobia changed the cultural landscape. While initially hopes were held that “acceptance of foreigners and the end of exclusion ... [were] only a matter of time,” (Horrocks and Kolinsky, xvi), the unification in 1989 drove racism to even higher levels, especially in the former East Germany. In part, the reasons lay in the fear that the economy could not support the former East Germany, and that jobs now needed for East Germans would instead be “usurped” by immigrants—individuals who rightfully saw themselves as German but were not given citizenship rights. For further exploration of the issue, see David Horrocks and Eva Kolinsky, eds., Turkish Culture in German Society Today (Providence, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996), Holly Cartner, “Foreigners out”: xenophobia and right-wing violence in Germany (New York: Helsinki Watch, 1992), E.D. Angele, Xenophobia and right-wing extremism in Germany: a selection of new materials (Chicago: Goethe Institute Chicago Library, 1993), and Allan Pred, Even in Sweden: Racism, Racialized Spaces, and the Popular Geographical Imagination (Berkeley; University of California Press, 2000).