Final Exam of Migration and Transnationalism

Marie Konari

424253

Masaryk University

"immigrant integration with cultural armature and city scale"

The discourse of immigrant integration has been one of the main subjects in terms of migration policy since it has been considered that immigrants have a greater impact on social integration. However, likewise the immigrant impact on host society, it is presumed that the characteristics of host cities influence immigrant integration in terms of cultural armature and city scale. In this part, I examine immigrant integration using the concepts of cultural armature and city scale.

The notion of cultural armature and city scale is an important factor to regard immigrant integration. According to Jaworski et al. (2012), cultural armature is the combined concept of "history and cultural geography", " urban self-presentation", "cultural responses to demography", and "prevailing ethos toward immigrants". The characteristics of cities including history, demographics, scale, policy, religion, and regimes etc. consist the concept of cultural armature. In contrast, Glick Schiller and Caglar (2009) address that city scale is " the differential positioning of cities determined by the articulation of institutions of political, cultural and economic power within regions, states and the globe" (p.188), and they divided cities into four categories, which are top-scale, up-scale, low-scale, and down-scale.

These characteristics of cities have a significant impact on immigrant integration, and simultaneously immigrant integration has an impacts on the characteristics of host societies. On the subject of cultural armature, a long history as global city is a big advantage to welcome more immigrants, and it is also important how to deal with immigrants, that is, immigrants as the factors of the developments or as the problem. These differences by cities make a large gap in positioning cities regarding economic, industrial, cultural, and social progress. For example, Portland, Maine and Danbury, Connecticut are cities where both leaders speak about diversity, but the cultural

armature in these places is quite different. Whereas Portland open and welcome new immigrants over decades and use the diversity for the development of economic position, Danbury perceives immigrants, undocumented workers in particular, as threats (Jaworski et al., 2012). Thus, each city perceives immigrants in various ways, and it has resulted in the different policies on immigrants, and the cultural armature is a factor to position cities by city scale.

In terms of city scale, top-scale city has the greatest integration and is economically well developed, whereas the down-scale city has least integration and is economically undeveloped. There are several factors that contribute to the result. In top-scale cities there are more job opportunities for both skilled immigrants and low-wage workers. There are moreover association and organizations for immigrant networks, and it has capacity to form immigrant integration. The diversity and multiculturalism attract more people, i.e. tourists as well as both skilled and low-wage immigrants, and it brings the development of cities. For instance, the global cities such as New York, London, and Paris are considered as top-scale cities where immigrants largely support the industry (Glick Schiller and Caglar, 2009), and the migrant networks form integration within them.

In conclusion, immigrant integration is related to the characteristics of cities, that is, cultural armature and city scale. Each city uses diversity in different ways and the approach influence the economic position of cities. There are more opportunities for immigrant integration within top-scale cities in terms of association, and the diversity and multiculturalism develop the position of cities. Thus, immigrant integration and the development of cities are mutually dependent.

References

- Glick Schiller, N. and Caglar, A. (2009). Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (2), pp. 177-202.
- Jaworski, N. B. et al. (2012). New Perspectives on Immigrant Contexts of Reception: The Cultural Armature of Cities. *Nordic Journal of Migration Studies* 2 (1), pp. 78-88.

"The responsibility for social protection of the migrants"

The discourse of the responsibility for social protection of the migrants has prominent under the influence of transnationalism where people can move easily due to the progress of transport infrastructure. The rights of migrants have improved in the past few decades with the increase number of migrants; however, there are still arguments of social protection especially of the illegal migrants since social protection is considered as a means of regulating illegal migrants (Sabates-Wheeler and Feldman, 2011). Yet, illegal migrants still exist and they tend to be victims of the exploitations due to the low social status. It is therefore the foremost subject to protect their rights. This part examine what state is responsible for social protection of the migrants.

The current situation of social protection of the migrants is different from nation to nation. Whereas some nations already have some programs for social protection of migrants, several countries are on the process of the discussion. For instance, the European Union has "second country nationals" arrangements for citizens of other EU member states and the African Union suggested secondary citizenship arrangement (Bloom and Feldman, 2011; p 47)

Moreover, the status of citizens is quite important in terms of social protection since migrants are not protected equally due to country of origins, country of presence, class, employment status. (Bloom and Feldman, 2011; p57) There are numerous types of migrant status, such as permanent migrants and temporary migrants who will return their countries of origin or move to other countries. Migrants are also classified into legal or illegal. These migrants have different status, and the social security should protect each of them equally by various forms of social security system.

Social protection covers many part of fundamental human life. Sabates-Wheeler and Feldman (2011) divides social protection for migrants into four elements;

(i) access to formal social protection

- (ii) portability of vested social security rights between host and origin countries
- (iii) labor market conditions for migrants in host countries and the employment recruitment process for migrants in the origin country
- (iv) access to informal networks to support migrants and their family members. (p21)

 Thus, the receiving countries have responsibility of migrants in many parts, it is impossible to form every types of social protection without the cooperation of other sectors, and origin countries are also important factors in order to conduct each social protection. Vonk and Van Walsum (2012) state that the respect for basic human rights is obligatory, and not only the government of the host countries but also the one of origin countries are responsible to this since they get remittances from emigrants, and also international organizations play an important role in international co-operation especially when migrants return to their origin countries. Hence, the social protection of migrants is the discourse of the host nations as well as the countries of origin and international organizations.

 Moreover, transnational bodies have capacity to support social protection of the migrants such as United Nations, World Trade Organization of the European Union, the African Union, etc. (Bloom and Feldman, 2011) These organizations are possible to form programs in a broader way than nation states with trans-border approach.

In conclusion, several bodies are responsible for social protection of migrants such as the governments of the host nations and the origin countries, international and transnational organization, and NGOs, and the cooperation of these organizations is essential in order to form social protection since social protection of the migrants is not only the discourse within a country but within a transnational world.

References

- Bloom, T., Feldman, R. (2011). "Migration and Citizenship: Rights and Exclusions." In *Migration and Social Protection. Claiming Social Rights Beyond Borders*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 36-60.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., Feldman, R. (2011). "Introduction: Mapping Migrant Welfare onto Social Provisioning." In *Migration and Social Protection. Claiming Social Rights Beyond Borders*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3-35.
- Vonk, G., Van Walsum, S. (2012). "Access denied: Towards a new social protection approach for excluded migrants." Gijsbert Vonk (ed.). *Cross-Border Welfare State: Immigration, social security & integration.* Intersentia, pp. 3-59.

"The relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism"

The notion of nationalism and cosmopolitanism tend to be considered as inconsistent; however, the way of being citizens has been changing through transnational network and it has resulted in the changes of nations. People use their own language and recognize themselves as citizens of nation in parts of their lives where people can see national symbols such as flags and sports matches. At the same time, they can go beyond the border easier than ever and perceive themselves as global citizens in terms of economics and global culture. Thus, the relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism has been changed over the past few decades and the concept of nation has become more diverse. Also, arts and museums have a capability to form national citizens as well as global citizens by shaping the concept of nation. This part examine the relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism using the example of arts and museums.

Nationalism is considered as a fundamental of national history rather than a definite subject (Gellner, 1983), whereas cosmopolitanism is defined as a principal which the global and the local are mutually interconnected (Levy and Sznaider, 2010; Beck, 2006). Thus, the definition of nationalism and cosmopolitanism seems incomparable because of the differences among categories of historical, political, economical and cultural context; however, the national history that consists nationalism includes transnational concepts, such as migration and human rights which are important subject of cosmopolitanism. Levy and Sznaider (2010) addressed in terms of human rights the formation of cosmopolitan memories creates nationhood and it does not eradicate nationalism. Therefore, the notion of nationalism and cosmopolitanism is quite connected and it is possible to mutually exist.

Also, arts and museum play an important role in shaping the notion and creating both national and global citizens. Each museum has a different role because of the different characteristics

of the locations. For example, in Sweden museums aim to create global citizens and it showcases human trafficking in order to show the rights and responsibilities(Levitt, 2012; n.d.). On the other hand, museums in the United States are different from ones in Sweden. They show immigrants experiences and internal diversity by telling how they are influenced and shaped by outside (Levitt, n.d.). Thus, Sweden creates global citizen by showing ethical problems which is shared globally, whereas the United States show internal diversity and the effects from other nations.

In conclusion, nationalism is related to cosmopolitanism since national history includes several subjects to which the notion of cosmopolitanism relates as an example of migration, and nations are formed under the influence of other countries. Hence, nations are connected to other nations to some extent. In order to show the connections, arts and museums have a great impact on citizens. Each museum have different role, such as Sweden as the ethical leader and the United States as economical and political one. Thus, nations are shaped by both concepts of nationalism and cosmopolitanism, and arts and museums have capabilities to show how each nations are connected to each other.

References

Beck, Ulrich (2006). Cosmopolitan Vision. Cambridge: Polity Press

Gellner, E. (1983). Nations and nationalism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Levitt, P. (n.d). The Lawyer and the Priest (unpublished manuscript) (24)

Levitt, P. (2012). The Bog and the Beast. Ethnologia Scandinavica, 42.

Levy, D., Sznaider, N. (2010). Chapter 1 "The Ubiquity of Human Rights in A Cosmopolitan Age", pp. 1-23, and Chapter 10 "Human Rights and Sovereignty After 9/11", pp. 142-151. In Levy, D., Sznaider, N. *Human Rights and Memory*. The Pennsylvania State University Press.