

Advocating on Immigrants' Rights
"Generation 2.0 RED" Campaign on Citizenship Acquisition

Student Name: Vangi Theodora
Student Number: 417665

Supervisor: Dr. Isabel Awad

Master Media Studies - Media, Culture & Society
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master's Thesis
June 2015

Advocating on Immigrants' Rights
"Generation 2.0 RED" Campaign on Citizenship Acquisition

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this research was the exploration of the campaigning strategies applied by Generation 2.0 RED, the official organization representing the youngsters of migrant background in Greece. The focus of this project was the campaign "Equal Citizens: There are More Greeks Like Me" that claims the right of children born and/or raised in Greece, counting at the moment up to 200.000, to be accepted as full and equal citizens, being granted the Greek citizenship. Taking into consideration the alleged anti-immigrant sentiments and the increase of racism and xenophobia in Europe and Greece, due to the current social and economic crisis, this research aimed to uncover the media strategies and the novel "marketing" rhetoric of Generation 2.0 RED. Ethnographic fieldwork and critical discourse analysis, employed to nineteen documents, were used to discover the implicit ideological meanings of the organization's discourse, their approach on the main challenged notion of citizenship, and the media strategies they employ for the promotion of the campaign. Findings suggest that, with regard to the discursive choices, Generation 2.0 RED adopts a universalistic and democratic approach on citizenship, addressing the issue in terms of belonging and perceiving the notion as status and practice, that are mutually depended. The campaign's discourse is based on the notions of rights, equality and diversity, avoiding negative language that would victimize children of migrant background and accuse others of being racist. They re-introduce the second generation and offer an alternative terminology that illustrates children of migrant background in a positive way and emphasizes their ties with the Greek society. In respect to the media strategies employed for the promotion of the campaign, the organization rejects grievance as a useful way of attracting media attention and opts for strategic networking with immigrants' communities and journalists, rational argumentation and positivity, drawing a novel case of activism and campaigning.

KEYWORDS: Immigrant, Second Generation, Generation 2.0 RED, Rights, Citizenship, Campaign, Anti-racism, Diversity, Media, Activism, Greece

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Generation 2.0 RED: Campaigning on Immigration Issues	1
1.2	Spotting the Problem: The ‘Second Generation’ and the Specificity of Their Case.....	2
1.3	The Act 3838/2010: the Background Story.....	6
1.4	Racism and Anti-immigrant Sentiments in Greece and Europe	8
1.5	Research Question: Social and Scientific Relevance	11
1.6	Research Method Overview.....	12
2	Theory Review & Previous Research	14
2.1	Racism and Anti-Racism	14
2.2	Anti-racism and the Notion of Citizenship.....	16
2.3	Contextualizing the Analysis: Lack of Visibility and Social Representations of Immigrants .	18
2.4	Media Strategies and Activist Organizations	20
3	Research Design	25
3.1	Methods.....	25
3.2	Sampling, Data Collection and Time Period.....	26
3.3	Data Analysis.....	30
3.3.1	Critical Discourse Analysis.....	30
3.3.2	Ethnography.....	33
4	Results.....	34
4.1	Critical Discourse Analysis.....	34
4.1.1	Macro Level Analysis: Uncovering Intentions.....	34
4.1.2	Micro Level Analysis: Under the Magnifying Glass	37
4.1.3	Semantic Strategies of Anti-Racist Discourse: Micro- and Macro-Analyses.....	42
4.1.4	Overview of Discourse Analysis	43
4.2	Setting an Ethnographic Eye on the Discourse and Struggles of Generation 2.0 RED.....	44
4.3	“Non-Media” People in the Pursuit of Media Attention	51
4.3.1	Media Practices: Online and Offline Communication.....	52
4.3.2	Relations with Immigrants’ Communities.....	54
4.3.3	Relations with Journalists	57
5	Conclusion.....	63
5.1	Limitations, Practical Implications, and Future Research	66
6	Literature and References.....	69
7	Appendices.....	75

Appendix A..... 75
Appendix B..... 77

1 Introduction

The main aim of this research is the exploration of the campaigning strategies applied by *Generation 2.0 RED*, the official organization representing the youngsters of migrant background in Greece. The focus of this project is the campaign *Equal Citizens: There are More Greeks Like Me* that claims the right of children born and/or raised in Greece, counting at the moment up to 200.000, to be accepted as full and equal citizens, being granted the Greek citizenship. Taking into consideration the alleged anti-immigrant sentiments and the increase of racism and xenophobia in Europe and Greece, due to the current social and economic crisis, this research aims to uncover the media strategies and the novel “marketing” rhetoric of Generation 2.0 RED. The campaign’s discourse is based on the notions of *rights, equality and diversity*, avoiding negative language that would victimize children of migrant background and accuse others of being racist.

In this chapter I will, firstly, introduce Generation 2.0 RED and discuss the peculiarity of the legal status of children of migrant background in Greece, placing it in a wider perspective, within the general European and Greek context. Secondly, more details about the social and scientific relevance of this research as well as the exact research question will follow.

1.1 Generation 2.0 RED: Campaigning on Immigration Issues

Imagine if you were born and / or raised in a country that refused to recognize you as a citizen. Imagine if you could not issue an ID card in the country you were born and / or raised. Imagine if you needed a residence permit in order to reside legally in the country you were born and / or raised. Imagine if you didn’t have the right to vote in the country you were born and / or raised. Imagine if you didn’t have full access to the labor market of the country you were born and / or raised. We stand up for our right to be all Equal Citizens of Greece (G10)

This is part of the opening statement of the campaign, “Equal Citizens: There are More Greeks Like Me” run by Generation 2.0 RED. It is a youth activist organization based in Athens, with members of both Greek and migrant origin. It combines research and social action aiming to promote rights, equality and diversity and to combat racism, xenophobia, and discrimination. The project “Equal Citizens: There are More Greeks Like Me” was the

starting point of the organization in 2006, known at the time as “Generation 2.0”. In 2013 it became a legal entity after merging with the Institute for Rights, Equality and Diversity (i-RED) which was founded in 2008 and changed its name.

Their goal is to identify social issues, develop culturally specific actions and promote social change in Greece and throughout Europe. They have a division that specializes in the issues facing youth in Greece and Europe, particularly those of migrant background. The maintenance of offices specialized in immigrants’ legal support, their collaboration with civil society organizations, NGO’s, institutes and universities in Greece and throughout Europe, and their membership in various networks, such as the European Network against Racism, ensures the organization’s social perspective and practical contribution on anti-racism and anti-discrimination issues of any kind.

Generation 2.0 RED, having as a starting point the issue of citizenship acquisition, aims mainly to make the youngsters of migrant background and their problems visible, and secondly, to address the issue in political terms in order to attract political attention and put pressure for a resolution. However, the organization engages actively to all kinds of activities related to immigration policy and the promotion of democracy and diversity, as shown in the forthcoming chapters.

1.2 Spotting the Problem: The ‘Second Generation’ and the Specificity of Their Case

At the international level, no universally accepted definition for “migrant” exists. The term migrant was usually understood to cover all cases where the decision to migrate was taken freely by the individual concerned for reasons of ‘personal convenience’ and without intervention of an external compelling factor; it therefore applied to persons, and family members, moving to another country or region to better their material or social conditions and improve the prospect for themselves or their family. The United Nations defines migrant as an individual who has resided in a foreign country for more than one year irrespective of the causes, voluntary or involuntary, and the means, regular or irregular, used to migrate. (<http://www.iom.int>)

This is the official definition of the term *migrant* from the International Organization for Migration. It is a crucial definition for this research because it underlines a special aspect

of migration that is central to understand the peculiarity of case at hand, the children born to immigrant parents in Greece.

Since the late 80's, southern European countries, such as Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal, have turned into popular immigrant destinations, mostly because of their geographical position. The extensive coastlines make them an easy gateway to Europe. Depending on their position, they attract migrants from Eastern Europe, the Balkans, Asia and Africa. The fall of the Soviet Union and the communist regime, the deterioration of the global economic situation and religious fundamentalism are main reasons of the increase of migration flows that has been observed the past decades (Petronoti & Triandafyllidou 2004).

Migration in Greece is a rather recent phenomenon since it only became a popular immigration destination in the early 90's, mainly after the fall of the Soviet Union. Even though it was not among the most developed European Union states, its geographical position, the extensive coastlines and the easily crossed borders have made the country a convenient destination for massive amounts of people. Moreover, the country's economic conditions favored the occupation of migrants in low-income jobs in labor, such as agriculture and construction, mainly jobs that were dismissed by Greek people. In the early 90's, migrants were welcomed as an alternative and profitable source of labor, due to their illegal status (Kasimis & Kassimi, 2004).

The first mass migratory flow arrived in Greece in the early 90's mostly from Albania. The second flow arrived in the second half of the 1990's mostly from Eastern European Countries, such as Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Moldavia, and Russia as well as from Asian countries such as India and Pakistan, and from Africa (Papaioannou, 2013).

According to the 2011 census, almost 7% of the total population currently residing in Greece is foreign. Out of 10.8 (10.815.197) million people, approximately 800.000 are foreigners. More interestingly, the foreign born people residing in Greece constitute 11% of the total population, out of which 3% were born in an EU country and 8% in a non EU country. There are approximately 200.000 children of migrant origin, born or raised in the country, comprising 10% of the total school population (Papaioannou, 2013)¹

Greece, being a rather new destination country, has to deal for the first time in its history not only with migrants themselves, but also with their offspring, the so-called 'second generation'. Children of migrant background, despite being born or raised in Greece, have no

¹ The information presented here are the official statistical data concerning the population of Greece according to the Hellenic Statistical Authority.

access to citizenship, a result of the lack of legal provision for the specificity of their case. From the moment they reach adulthood and are no longer considered protected family members and they are legally treated as migrants, meaning that they have to obtain a personal residence permit in order to continue to reside legally in the country. The only way they can access citizenship is through the rather time-consuming and expensive process of naturalization.

The term “second generation immigrant” is not correct because these children have never been migrants. They have lived their whole life here; it is the only homeland they have met. The problems though they face are more than those of their parents. Today, a migrant’s child who lives in Greece after the age of 18 and does not start to work legally to have an insurance, is considered to be illegal and might be arrested and imprisoned at any time. Ahmed Moawia, president of the Greek Migrant Forum, quoted in Papaioannou, 2013, p. 56

According to the Greek legislation, being an undocumented migrant does not deprive one’s children from public and free education. Therefore, children of migrants, whose parents may be documented or not, have the right to attend a public school. According to the annual research of I.P.O.D.E (Instituto Paideias Omogenon kai Diapolitismikis Ekpaideusis – Institute of Education for Expatriates and Intercultural Education) for the year 2008-2009, in the public schools of the country 118.823 students of migrant status were registered from a total of 1.287.804 students and in the intercultural schools², 1.228 students of migrant status from a total of 4.314 students (Papaioannou, 2013).

The term *second generation* is used to refer to all children of migrants born in Greece or brought in, at a very early age, mostly before the age of 6. They are bearers of characteristics from the culture of their homeland, being influenced from their parents or the few years they have spent there, but at the same time, being born and/or raised in the host country makes them active participants and bearers of the Greek culture as well. They have

² According to the Presidential Decree (#435) in 1984, Schools for Expatriate Greeks were established for the first time in Greece. In 1996 the Ministry for National Education and Religious Matters, renamed this type of schools again as Intercultural Schools. They adopt “intercultural education” as part of a policy regarding education of young people with a specific educational, social or cultural identity. The standard curriculum is adapted to meet the specific educational, social or cultural needs of the foreign students attending them, who may have attended reception classes, but still face problems in the Greek language or may don’t speak the Greek language at all (www.interculturalschool.gr).

attended or attend Greek schools and Universities; they are fluent in Greek and participate in the progress of the country just like the Greek children. Yet, legally speaking, for the Greek state, these children remain invisible. Moreover, those born in the country are not given a Registrar Act of birth from the State. Instead their parents receive just a certificate from the maternity clinic. This means that they are not registered anywhere, that they do not have any kind of formal identity. Nikos Odubitan³, an active critique interviewed for this project, pointed out that they are “Stateless, non-citizens”. On the other hand, a child born in Greece or abroad to Greek parents takes automatically Greek citizenship. The same happens with children born in Greece or abroad even if only one of their parents is Greek.

According to an active researcher, Andromache (Anta) Papaioannou⁴, the lack of a birth certificate causes a series of problems both to the children and their parents. Some of these problems involve difficulties for parents to include their children in their insurance documents and residence permits and get a passport, especially when there is no embassy in the host country, a situation that puts them in danger of prison or deportation.

The main problem that all second generation children and young adults face in Greece has mainly to do with their place in the society linked to their precarious legal status. They are not seen as youth of migrant background but as *migrants*, and are treated as such, by both society and the State. They are not recognized as citizens despite being born in the country; they cannot vote or work in certain positions where one needs the Greek citizenship, even though they have completed their bachelor in Greece. Their legal presence in the country is completely dependent on a residence permit. Not full citizens of their country, those children are subject to discrimination, stigmatization and social exclusion, with the sole excuse being their migrant background (Papaioannou, 2013).

Although in most EU countries there is a legal provision for citizenship acquisition for the second generation, yet in Greece, this matter is a controversial subject that remains unsolved. As studies have shown (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002; Balibar, 1990; Kofman, 2002; Yuval-Davis, 1999) the lack of a legal framework for the recognition of immigrants as

³ Nikos Deji Odubitan: Head of Generation 2.0 RED and one of the founders, born in Athens, Greece from Nigerian parents. Graduate of the Technical University of Athens in Medical Engineering. Currently, student of the Hellenic Open University in Studies in European Civilization, Humanitarian Studies. In 2006 him and his cousin, formed the initiative “Generation 2.0” that later on was transformed into “Generation 2.0 for Rights, Equality and Diversity”. He is the head of the organization and one of my key interviewees.

⁴ Andromache Papaioannou: Co-founder and member of Generation 2.0 RED, Greek. She holds a PhD in International Cooperation and Sustainable Development Policies, University of Bologna. Thesis title: “Who can (not) be Greek? Citizenship, identity and belonging among youth of Sub-Saharan African background in Athens”. She joined the organization in 2010, doing fieldwork for her research. She is currently one of the most important members of the organization and my second key interviewee in this project.

equals, stigmatizes them as foreigners by default and deprives them of basic rights and freedoms. The case of the children of immigrants constitutes a more severe case of this phenomenon, as these youngsters are substantially full members of the Greek society, yet formally, remain invisible, due the recent cancelation of the clauses of Act 3838/2010 regarding the citizenship acquisition, presented in the following section.

1.3 The Act 3838/2010: the Background Story

Until 2010, the only way for a non-national to acquire the Greek citizenship was through naturalization. Yet, naturalization is an expensive and time-consuming procedure. It had ambiguous results and is applicable only to adults. There was a legal void regarding the citizenship acquisition for the case of foreign background minors born and/or raised in Greece. The problem was visible the moment the children of the first migrants started reaching adulthood, as they had to come across a legal system that was not prepared and could not be applied to their case.

In 2010 the Act 3838 was promoted by PASOK, the government of Mr. Georgios Papandreou to solve the problem of the citizenship acquisition. According to the Act, the children of migrants that had been legal residents of Greece for five years were eligible for citizenship, after their birth, after the submission of a statement by the parents. The completion of six years of schooling in Greece was a prerequisite. Those who had already reached adulthood were eligible to apply for citizenship retrospectively, as long as they were holders of a residence permit. The naturalization process for adult migrants was promoted by decreasing the necessary period of continuous legal residence from ten to seven years and the reduction of the fees, from 1500 to 700 euros.

Another important clause of the same Act provisioned a certain time limit for this procedure (12+6 months), and the obligation of the State to justify a rejected application, as so far the procedure was further problematic due to the lack of a specified a time limit or the non-recognition of the necessity to provide a justification in case of rejection. Finally, the Act 3838 gave the right to all legal migrants who were holders of a long-term residence permit to participate in the municipal elections.

The Act 3838 was favorably voted in March 2010, but almost six months later it was frozen, as a lawyer claimed that the clause concerning migrants' participation in the municipal elections was anti-constitutional. The case was taken to the State Council⁵ and two

⁵ The Hellenic Council of State (Symvoulío tis Epikrateias) is the Supreme Administrative Court of Greece. The Council of State, the Supreme Civil and Criminal Court (Areios Pagos) and the Court of Audit (Elegktiko

years later, in 2012, the clauses concerning municipal elections as well as those regarding the citizenship acquisition for the second generation were cancelled. The only clauses that remained intact were those regulating naturalization. At the moment the only way for a non-national to acquire the Greek citizenship is through naturalization. There is no legislation regulating citizenship acquisition for children born and/or raised in the country from migrant parents (Papaioannou, 2013)

From 2013 to 2014, the new Minister Mr. Antonis Samaras and his government were working on a new regulation. However, which was never put to vote because of the upcoming legislative elections on 25 January 2015. After the elections, the government of Alexis Tsipras and the new minister of Interior, have expressed their support to Generation 2.0 RED and in general to migrants and the youth of migrant background publically, announcing the formation of a new regulation which would include provisions about all the different statuses, ages and situations of children of different migrant background, in order to solve the problem for good (Maragidou, 2015).

On the 15th of May 2015 a draft bill on citizenship was uploaded on the Greek OpenGov domain⁶ for public consultation before its submission to the Parliament. The bill, which was welcomed by Generation 2.0 RED, fills in the legislative vacuum that was pending, as promised by the new government. Access to the citizenship will be granted to all children who have successfully completed the compulsory education (primary & high school – 9 years) or the secondary education (junior and senior secondary school – 6 years) or have graduated from secondary school and have a degree from a Greek University or a Technical institution. Moreover, it gives the possibility to minors born in Greece, having at least one of the parents residing legally in the country for at least 5 years before their birth, to apply when commencing primary school.

Synedrio), which has jurisdiction on the audit of the expenditures of the State, local government agencies and other legal entities, are the highest courts in the nation. Petitions for judicial review (annulment) of enforceable acts of the administrative authorities for excess of power are heard in principle by the Council of State which decides in first and last instance.

⁶ Greece being part of the International Initiative of Open Government Partnership, Opengov.gr has been designed to serve the principles of transparency, deliberation, collaboration and accountability. According to “Electronic deliberation”, almost every piece of draft legislation or even policy initiative by the government, is uploaded in a blog-like platform prior to their submission to parliament, and citizens and organizations can post their comments, suggestions and criticisms article-by-article.

1.4 Racism and Anti-immigrant Sentiments in Greece and Europe

It is important to place the case within the specific political context of Greece and generally Europe in order to identify the specific obstacles and challenges that Generation 2.0 RED had to overcome and within which the campaign “More Greeks Like Me” was formed.

Greece has failed countless victims of racist and xenophobic attacks by neither investigating nor prosecuting the attackers. If the minister of Justice and the parliament are really serious about improving the country’s response to racism and xenophobia, they should remove the obstacles to justice for these attacks. Eva Cossé, Greece specialist at Human Rights Watch cited in Human Rights Watch, 2014, para. 3

This statement is part of the memorandum submitted in March 2014 from the Human Rights Watch to the United Nations Committee against Torture, ahead of the upcoming review of Greece. The memorandum aimed at highlighting the severe concerns about the treatment of immigrants in Greece. A close monitoring of the conditions of detention of asylum seekers and immigrants revealed that several violations of human rights were taking place in Greece. Inadequate state response to xenophobic violence and police negligence about hate crimes against immigrants were significant indicators of the country’s racist and hostile environment (Human Rights Watch, 2014).

The country’s bad economic situation and the consequent rise of the extreme right party, the *Golden Dawn*⁷, have further intensified the anti-immigrant sentiments (To Vima, 2013). As Kofman (2002) and Detant (2005) point out, the inability of the state to confront the contradictions and tensions arising from economic difficulties, and the success of far right parties lead to more repressive conditions for undocumented migrants and contribute to further spreading anti-immigrant sentiments in society. The report of the Commissioner Nils Muižnieks and his delegation, who visited Greece from 28 January to 1 February 2013, is insightful in this aspect. It underscores the increase in racist and other hate crimes in Greece which primarily target migrants and the consequent threats to the country’s social cohesion

⁷ The actual origins of “Golden Dawn” date back to December 1980 and the publication of a magazine entitled “Golden Dawn”, managed by Nikolaos Michaloliakos (the current head of the party) who maintained ties with the leadership of the 1967-1974 military regimes and was convicted for involvement in terrorist bomb explosions in Athens in 1978. Some copies of that magazine bore the subtitle “National-socialist periodical” and contained abounding references to and articles on Adolf Hitler and his associates (Psarras, 2012, pp. 35-36). Ideological documents on the party’s current website make clear the overtly racist underpinnings of “Golden Dawn”, similar to those of Nazism and fascism.

and democracy. A number of the reported attacks have been officially linked to members or supporters, including MPs, of the neo-Nazi political party Golden Dawn that won 6,92% of the vote in the national elections of June 2012 and has 18 seats in the Greek Parliament.

As confirmed by the report, during the electoral campaign of 2012 and after its participation in the parliamentary sessions, deputies of this party made extensive use of anti-migrant messages, with its leaders using racist, anti-Semitic and homophobic rhetoric. In September 2012 the Commissioner received a petition signed by more than 18 000 individuals from Greece, alarmed by the rise of racist violence, requesting intervention and effective investigation of all racist attacks, especially those linked to Golden Dawn.

Following the Golden Dawn inclusion in the parliament, the report addresses extreme concerns regarding the rhetoric, identifying it as “hate speech”, used within governmental institutions and structures, such as the parliament, that stigmatizes migrants, underlining with disappointment that it has been widely used in Greek politics. Thus, the Commissioner called all political parties, and particularly the parliament, to adopt “self-regulatory measures” in order to effectively counter and sanction intolerance and hate speech on the part of politicians. In addition, he highlighted the need for anti-racism and human rights campaigns in the country, aiming to awareness-raising of public opinion regarding the Golden Dawn phenomenon and immigrants’ integration in the Greek society, targeting particularly young people and schools. The authorities were invited to design and implement such measures, drawing upon successful existing structures such as the Athens City Council for Migrants’ Integration⁸.

Special attention was given to the issue of citizenship acquisition for children of migrant background, expressing the need to change the legal framework regarding “the naturalization of long-term resident migrant children and the political participation of long-term resident migrants at local level”, calling the Greek authorities to “accede to the 1997 European Convention on Nationality and the 1992 European Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level and draw on its human rights standards” (Report by Nils Muižnieks Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe following his visit to Greece from 28 January to 1 February 2013, 16 April 2013)

⁸ According to the law 3852/2010, the Athens City Council for Migrants’ Integration operates since 2010 as an advisory body of the municipality. It aims at strengthening the integration of migrants in the local community. With respect to this goal, it documents and examines the problems of migrant communities and their contact with municipal services and authorities; it organizes events, campaigns and actions to promote social cohesion and is able to submit proposals to Athens City Council.

This situation, in combination with the fact that Greece has been accepting large inflows of migrants, including asylum seekers, contributes to the increase of racism and xenophobia in the country. Previous research (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002; Detant, 2005; Kofman, 2002) has shown under such conditions and given the state's inability to provide an efficient system for the admission of the migratory flows, the contradictions and social tensions arising from economic difficulties increase and contribute to a further fragmentation of the social cohesion.

In fact, according to FRONTEX ⁹(2012), in the second quarter of 2012, 56% of all detected irregular border crossings in the EU were found to take place at the land border between Greece and Turkey. The following collapse of the Greek asylum system has led to the suspension by a number of European states of returns of asylum seekers to Greece under the "Dublin Regulation", a regulation that contributed to the consideration of the European Union as a "fortress" (Amnesty International, 2014), an attribution that is seen as a consequence of the uniqueness of the European Union.

Specifically, the unique legal paradigm of the European Union is based on the internal market of the four fundamental freedoms for European citizens, which are the following: free movement of goods, free movement of capital, freedom of EU citizens to move and stay in another member state and freedom of establishment and rendering cross-border services. The function of the internal market highlighted the natural following need for a strengthened management of the Union's external borders and for stricter regulations concerning the entry and residence of non-EU nationals. In 2008 the act for a common immigration policy was adopted by the EU countries. It is based on the three principles of prosperity, solidarity and security (European Commission, 2014).

The principle of prosperity implies that legal immigration must contribute to the socio-economic development of the EU. Solidarity underlines the need for coordination between EU countries and cooperation with non-EU countries. Security will be ensured by common policies and effective fight against illegal immigration and common visa and citizenship policies that serve the interests of Europe and its partners (European Commission, 2014).

Houtum & Pijpers (2007) argue that the common immigration policy is protectionist and selective as it has diversified the categories of entry and residence of non-EU nationals,

⁹ Frontex, established in 2004, is the agency of the EU that helps the cooperation between national border guards for the protection of EU borders with regard to illegal immigration, human trafficking and terrorist infiltration.

making the processes more complex and strict. Kuptsch (2012) talks about the “Fortress Europe” that especially after the economic recession of 2008, tries to protect the internal labor markets by encouraging the return of migrant workers and accommodating the stay of immigrants that are of economic value to the EU in the name of the prosperity principle. Fakiolas (2003, 1999) focuses on the cases of southern European states, such as Italy and Greece, where the need for labor has been recognized and immigration policies have an additional significance. Guiraudon (2000, 2003) and Houtum and Pijpers (2007) underline the inadequacy and complexity of the European migration policy and discuss the social effects. According to them, the immigrant is by default portrayed as a threat in the eyes of the European citizen in terms of coexisting in the same labor market in times of economic recession, and in terms of public security. The consequent construction of such a hostile environment prevents social integration of immigrants and demonizes them, in a natural process of citizen’s to find someone “Other” to blame for their country’s problems (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002).

The Greek and the European immigration policy are of great importance for the case of Generation 2.0 RED, as they indicate the anti-immigrant climate within which and against which, the project “Equal Citizens: There Are More Greeks Like Me” took place. In a period of extreme social tensions within the country, but also between the EU and Greece, in a period of economic and social recession within a “Fortress Europe”, how does Generation 2.0 RED function and how do they advocate the sensitive issue of citizenship acquisition from children of migrant background?

1.5 Research Question: Social and Scientific Relevance

The campaign seems to be successful in terms of media attention and in reaching a wider public. It seems that Generation 2.0 RED proposes a novel way to approach issues connected to racism and address controversial issues despite the national and European negative context.

From a scientific perspective, the research aims firstly to illuminate how the notion of anti-racism is connected to the issue of citizenship in the discourse of the campaign. Secondly, to contribute to the debate on how new language can influence the dominant ideologies and terminologies according to which the relevant public problems are addressed, and to show that alternative language may have a significant effect on the formulation of national policies (Detant, 2005; Favell, 1997). The campaign and the anti-racist practices of the organization draw upon novel marketing strategies, as they approach the very heart of the

problem of racism, without representing the children of migrant background as victims of racism, or accusing the Greek society of being racist, something that would create or cultivate the existing dichotomies and antagonisms within the society. In addition, it seems to have been pretty effective in reaching out to a wide range of media with different political views and gained significant media attention, despite the alleged anti-immigration sentiment in Greece and Europe, something scientifically worthy of exploring.

The organization has a vision regarding a new kind of Greek society and aims at inspiring the social change they want to see. The social relevance of this research is directly linked to the social change that they try to inspire and illuminate through their campaign and generally through their actions, mainly by offering alternative representations of immigrants. According to the head of the organization one of their main goals is to show

The already existing bonds between the Greeks and the “Others”...you know change is already here, it is just that nobody is paying attention to it, because of all the negative things that distract people from the positive, and that nobody has welcomed that change. Well, we do and we want people to see it and understand that Greece is ready to accept this richness (Nikos)

Drawing on the outlined context, the research question and sub-questions providing directions for the future thesis enquire about:

RQ: How does the organization Generation 2.0 RED function and advocate the issue of citizenship within the specific social and political context of Greece and Europe?

The research aims to analyze the content of the campaign “Equal Citizens: There are More Greeks Like Me” and the role of its producers by situating it within the current Greek and European sociopolitical context. How does the campaign address the citizenship issue? How did the producers manage to reach a wider public? What are the strategies used to spread the message? What are the obstacles the organization had to confront? These are some key questions this study aims to answer, having as final aim to explore the novelty of Generation 2.0 RED.

1.6 Research Method Overview

The above question is answerable by qualitative methods and specifically by means of ethnography. Spending twenty days in the field, conducting interviews with the key people of the organization and analyzing texts and articles produced by them or by other media actors

by means of critical discourse analysis (thereof CDA), were all insightful ways to deeply understand and uncover the organization, the challenges emerging from the social, political and economic environment within which they have to function, the formation of the campaign “Equal Citizens: More Greeks like Me” and the media strategies they followed to promote it.

Critical discourse analysis, following Fairclough’s (1989) model, was used to analyze in depth the content of the campaign, while interviews and fieldwork with the designers and participants of the campaign provided a wider insight into the political and social context of the campaign’s production from a practical perspective in order to examine what are the ways in which Generation 2.0 RED takes actions, organizes activities promoting social cohesion and runs the campaign, within the alleged anti-immigrant climate.

2 Theory Review & Previous Research

Since this research aims to explore how Generation 2.0 RED advocates the issue of citizenship, a theoretical framework regarding the main challenged notion and its relation to racism and anti-racism is necessary. Previous research on how activist organizations engage with mass media, and what media strategies they implement to gain media attention, follow in the last part of this chapter.

2.1 Racism and Anti-Racism

As many have argued (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002; Detant, 2005; Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 1993, 2002, 2004), issues of identification, representation and language are key aspects of racism. Particularly, according to Fairclough (1989) and Favell (1997), language has the potential to influence the social and political debate and leads to changes towards social problems, as any transformation of the social discourse, reflects also a transformation of the dominant ideology regarding this issue. In simple words, the way society talks at an issue, influences the way this society will practically confront the issue. Bringing *racism* into the light of this perspective, it is believed that its main generative framework is discursive (Van Dijk, 2000).

However, according to Van Dijk (1993, 2000, 2002) and Anthias and Lloyd (2002), it is rather hard to identify and define racism, as there is a large range of repertoires from which it can draw, since in general it is “opportunistic, it is relational to other social processes and it is therefore a fluid and shifting phenomenon which evades clear and absolute definition in a once-and-for-all-type of way” (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002, p. 8). This conceptualization implies that nowadays racism is entailed not only in discourse and ideologies, but also in social practices and legitimized behaviors.

Specifically, as Selingerova (2014) points out, inequalities and discriminatory behaviors, once based in ideologies regarding the biological superiority of the white people, have now transformed into legitimized forms of racist behavior that denies “racism”, but continues to exclude, drawing on elements such as cultural differences and poverty, constructing a “new” contemporary racism, that escapes effortlessly from those who try to fight it.

Wieviorka (1997) and Macpherson (1999) also argue, that as the time goes by, it is even more difficult to recognize racism because of the rise of “new” racism, which is not restricted to groups defined in racial terms, but draws on the boundaries of color, culture and ethnicity; and can be traced in institutions and structures of the society. However, this is just

another reason to try to identify racism and fight against it, as it is commonly acknowledged that to overcome the problems associated with racism, it is important to identify the range of social processes which could be defined as such. In addition, as any contemporary analysis of racism and anti-racism should be placed within the social context that is taking place (Anthias and Lloyd, 2002), - with social context here standing for the economic, political and ideological conditions within which racism operates – a definition of racism is necessary for this research.

Taking into consideration that the justification of the State Council regarding the cancelation of the citizenship clauses was based on the rhetoric “one is born Greek, and cannot become one”, claiming that granting citizenship to children of migrant background – despite their fulfilling the specified requirements – would “distort” the Greek nation (Papaioannou, 2013); and that the dominant discourses and ideologies about race, ethnicity and culture are constructed within language and reflect the dominant ideas about immigration and national identities (Detant, 2005; Favell, 1997), I perceive *racism* in Van Dijk’s (1991) broad approach, as a system, in this case a policy, that enables the domination of one group of people over another, on the grounds that the social and cultural characteristics of the second are negative, excluding them as forever Others.

Drawing from there, anti-racism can be conceptualized as the struggle against racism.

Anti-racism consists of polycentric, overlapping discourses and practices which combine a response to racism, with the construction of a positive project about the kind of society in which people can live together in harmony and mutual respect. Anthias & Lloyd, 2002, p.16

However, Yuval-Davis (2001) and Anthias and Lloyd (2002) make an important observation, adding that anti-racism does not always comes in pairs with racism, as it does not emerge only in contradiction to it, but it can also be constructed independently as an alternative and progressive worldview that rejects any type of discrimination without necessarily focusing against one specific type of racism. The interesting and central question that arises here, is then if Generation 2.0 RED builds its anti-racist discourse against a specific type of racism, or rather, if its discourse constitutes a wider anti-racist perspective and worldview.

Moreover, Detant (2005) argues that the shift of the terms around which national identity and the sense of belonging are constructed, are key elements of the fight against

racism, suggesting that new ways of thinking about anti-racism can provide more efficient tools for the promotion of anti-racist political practices, rejecting as well the conceptualization of anti-racism as only the opposite of a specific racism. Particularly, she builds the understanding of both racism and anti-racism as distinct discourses or interpretative frames according to which the individual makes sense of and evaluates the society, the self and the other. As interpretative frames she defines “a set of commonsense concepts and notions that are used to define reality and orient one’s perspective, and trace the limits in which social positions and relationships develop and are judged” (Detant, 2005, p. 189).

In simple words, she suggests that discourses can be racist or anti-racist independently from each other, and can produce representations of the reality, generating specific constructions of identities according to the terms that are used. In addition to that, Anthias and Lloyd (2002) argue that there was a shift in thinking about anti-racism caused by the implementation of the notion of citizenship in relevant political and theoretical debates. The anti-racist discourse started being constructed, not on the basis of “race”, but on the basis of the inclusive notion of citizenship, which is the central challenged notion of this research.

2.2 Anti-racism and the Notion of Citizenship

More specifically, Anthias and Lloyd (2002) and Yuval-Davis (1999) draw upon the conceptualization of citizenship within anti-racism using the earlier formulation of Isaiah Berlin, the dyad *freedom from* and *freedom to*. They offer a universalistic and democratic approach of citizenship, which recognizes the right of the individual to have freedom from economic, political and cultural forms of discrimination and freedom to exercise rights of active political participation to the community in which he/she is a member, as well as, the freedom to be autonomous and self-realized. The main valuable acknowledgement is the underscoring of the need to understand that one should be free to practice his/her way of life, in terms of culture and identity, discarding all the stereotypes and the attributed from the society identities, and to be able to redefine and build his/her own understanding of the self, something that would deliberate also how one perceives the “other” (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002; Yuval-Davis, 2001; 1999; 1997a; 1991).

Anthias and Lloyd (2002) and Yuval-Davis (1999) point out that people's membership in a state is connected to their legal status. The individual is bonded to the state by obligations and rights that are provisioned by the national constitution and compose the basis of the way he/she participates substantially to its well-being. Here citizenship is perceived as

a status, focusing on the fact that when a person is deprived of its right to be part of the legal system, he/she is by default deprived of the right and the opportunity to become an active equal member. Bringing our case to the light of this conceptualization, since the children of migrant origin in Greece are legally excluded from the rights and the procedures that would enable them to contribute and create strong bonds with the state, such as the right to vote and work, citizenship seems to be a matter of legal recognition and status. However, the notion entails deep ideological perceptions about belonging and participation in society, not only in political terms but also in civil participation.

Specifically, Hall and Held (1989) discuss the notion of citizenship underscoring the struggle over the meaning and the scope of membership in the community of which one is a part. Who belongs and what does belonging mean in practice are central questions that need to be answered in order to capture the different layers of citizenship. In Adrian Favell's words (1997) the politics of belonging are "the dirty work of boundary maintenance". The strict association of citizenship with the nation-state generates the idea that every nation corresponds to a state. The reality though is very far from this fiction. There have always been waves of immigration of populations as a result of wars, natural disasters and persecutions of particular religions and minorities, pushing people to move away from "their territory" and look for a better place to live, demanding the right to be members of another community (Papaioannou, 2013).

According to Hall and Held (1989), membership is not conditional, but a matter of rights and entitlement, and should be recognized as a fundamental human right. It is reciprocal, as it defines the responsibilities of the individual-member towards the community, but rights and responsibilities have to be defined and specified in order to be realizable, through actual participation in the society. In short, they perceive citizenship through three leading elements: membership, rights and duties in reciprocity, and actual participation in the society, constructing the notion in terms of legal status but also in terms of social participation.

Another more contemporary placing of the notion of citizenship was introduced by Yuval-Davis (1997; 1999a), taking on board some ideological developments that emerged from globalization, international law and the legal paradigm of the European Union. He has developed the notion of the *multi-layered citizen*, focusing on the fact that people nowadays are simultaneously citizens of more than one political community. He argues that people's lives are shaped by their rights and obligations in multiple distinct and interconnected layers, from the local, ethnic, religious, national, regional, transnational and international political

communities. The lives of refugees and immigrants, he continues, are affected by this multiplicity of contemporary positioning in a greater scale, both in the formal and the substantive sense of citizenship, as they found themselves between different legal statuses that affect decisively their belonging.

To sum up, citizenship is approached and perceived mainly in two ways: as a social practice, in terms of belonging and participating in the society, and as a legal status, that comes with rights and duties in reciprocity. Following this debate, the issue that Generation 2.0 RED seems to struggle with is how the individual will be enabled to use his/her status in order to achieve actual participation in the social and political community; and vice versa, how he/she participates in the society without a legal recognition as an equal member. Bearing in mind that within this globalized reality, children of migrant background in Greece are not just trapped between legal statuses and the emerging belonging implications, but even worse, are “stateless” and “non-citizens”; and following the academic debate regarding the notion of citizenship, which concentrates on the different conceptualizations of the notion, two important questions arise: How the organization perceives the notion of citizenship? And how do they use their conceptualization of citizenship in the construction of their anti-racist discourse?

2.3 Contextualizing the Analysis: Lack of Visibility and Social Representations of Immigrants

The relation between mainstream media and activist organizations is crucial as it is the main space of terminology and framing negotiation (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002; Papaioannou, 2013; Van Dijk, 1993, 2002, 2004). Taking into account this acknowledgement, it is also crucial to identify the dominant communication issues and in general the media (ted) representations with which Generation 2.0 RED is struggling.

To start with, Papaioannou (2013), studying the integration issues of people of African origin in Greece, argues that the greatest communication problem they have to deal with, is visibility, or rather the lack of it. Second generation does not just “miss” from the media agenda, but is equalized with the first generation. According to her study, the legal equation with immigrants produces a problematic social positioning that is also transferred to the screens, bringing along all the stigmas and false representations that are attributed to these “others”.

One of the most severe problems of communication issues that are traced into media discourses is the word “lathrometanastis” (*λαθρομετανάστης*), which means smuggled

migrant, clandestine and illegal migrant, and is commonly circulated by journalists and politicians in mass media, something highly criticized in the report of the Commissioner Nils Muižnieks. In addition, Papaioannou (2013) pointed out that immigrants in Greece are mainly depicted as “illegal, violent, carriers of diseases, uneducated, inassimilable and alienated as ‘others’” (Papaioannou, 2013, p.117), all being long established stigmas of the first generation that are inherited to the second.

Another generative framework of distorted media representations of immigrants is the current economic crisis of the country. Studies (Anthias and Lloyd, 2002; Detant, 2005; Rathzel, 1995) have shown that in times of economic crisis and unemployment, the state and the media tend demonize immigrants and foreigners as the source of the evil. Particularly, in such circumstances it is commonly acknowledged that the government needs to divert attention from itself as the main responsible for the bad economic system and the socio-political tensions that usually follow, and searches for a scapegoat. Papaioannou (2013) confirms that in Greece of crisis, people who do not “belong” to the nation, but co-exist within it constitute the perfect scapegoat, while Rathzel (1995) and Anthias and Lloyd (2002) add that in times of social crisis the nation-state provides to its members what it is asked to provide: the feeling of being the master of its fate, confirming that the current economic crisis of the country is also a humanitarian one.

The common idea here, that is useful for this research regarding the understanding of the dominant social representations that Generation 2.0 RED struggles against, is that in times of economic and social crisis, the blame is traditionally thrown to the non-nationals and the solution is addressed in terms of stricter social control. In Anthias and Lloyd words, “the power of the powerless (nationals) derives from their identification with the state to which this power is handed over” (2002, p. 87). This is also connected to the power of national belongings and the attribution of certain meanings to these belongings, as well as to the importance of social and mediated representations of the Other and the self (Rathzel, 2002; Anthias & Lloyd, 2002).

In this way, a vicious circle of false representations of immigrants, and consequently also of children of migrant background, is put into motion and is legitimized, because of the public rhetoric of the political elites, and the simultaneous need of the nationals to find a scapegoat. The nation is depicted as a culturally homogenous group that is in crisis because of an external intrusion by immigrants, who take the jobs of the nationals and raise the criminality levels, and their children who – by claiming Greek citizenship – are menacing the “cultural purity” the Greek ethnos (Papaioannou, 2013).

2.4 Media Strategies and Activist Organizations

Taking into account the challenging environment within which Generation 2.0 RED is operating, it is also crucial to examine the ways activist organizations promote their values and demands and mobilize supporters via mass media. It is commonly argued that there is an asymmetrical relation between activist organizations and media with the first being more depended on the second in order to function (Carroll and Ratner, 1999; McCurdy 2012, 2011; 2008; Gamson and Wolfsfeld, 1993; Wolfsfeld, 2004).

According to Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993), activists have to pass four levels, in their attempt to influence the political elites and that's where their engagement with media is crucial. Firstly, they need to mobilize their supporters and raise awareness of wide audiences with respect to their cause. Secondly, media validate the existence of and add value to the organization and its cause. Thirdly, media are needed for *scope enlargement* of the issue in question, meaning that by reporting the conflict, they open it up for debate and criticism (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993, p. 116), changing the balance of the existing components. Lastly, having passed these levels, activists are able to put pressure on the political elites. Given the fact that dominant discourses and political elites have access to and gain more media attention, because of their influential power and role (Wolfsfeld, 2004), how do activist organizations manage to get their story on the news?

According Wolfsfeld (2004), there are two ways to get into the news, namely the "front door" and the "back door". The "front door" is reserved for those who already have political power, such as political figures and institutions, while the "back door" is mainly used by weaker political actors or by those who want to gain political influence, such as groups that address specific social inequalities and injustice. Activist organizations that advocate on human rights belong traditionally to the weak side, playing the role of the "challenger" of a certain reality and a certain injustice, just like Generation 2.0 RED is doing with the issue of citizenship.

Wolfsfeld (2004) argues that if one is not powerful, then he/she better be interesting, drawing on the old adage: "if it bleeds, it leads" regarding the media logic and how they decide to cover an issue. "Back door" strategies that draw on this logic, involve protests, grievance demonstrations and "weirdness", using his word, drawing mainly on the fact that media react and are more likely to cover stories with drama, conflict and violence. A traditional "back door" strategy is the naked politics.

According to Detant (2005), protests constitute expressions of the normative choices of the society, meaning that they function as an expression and confirmation of the societal

values and the basic principles of democracy. This is actually the main reason why activists engage in this type of activities and protests, as they are more likely to get important media attention. Especially in protests that address issues of human rights and racism, people are more likely to re-act and participate, as grievance demonstrations of this theme entail an opportunity for the public opinion to express their values and confirm the dominant democratic character of the society within which they live (Detant, 2005).

However, as Wolfsfeld (2004) points out, this strategy does not guarantee for how long the challenger will have this attention and how legitimate this kind of attention makes him in a more general scope. Drawing on the example of naked politics, he argues that once you have the attention you want, you cannot get rid of the “weird costume”, which maybe also draw attention away from the main addressed issue. The main acknowledged problem here is that the challengers will not necessarily gain the legitimacy that would enable them to act and participate substantively in the resolution of the problem.

Proceeding from that, Wolfsfeld (2004) suggests that in some cases there is an alternative “side door”, namely *civic disobedience* that tries to avoid this trap. This strategy involves acts of disorder, meaning that it entails acts that criticize and destabilize “law and order”, and draws upon kinds of conflict and drama, but it refuses the use of violence and extreme negative or “weird” events in order to avoid sacrificing the potential legitimacy of the challenger.

Drawing on this conceptualization of a “side door” strategy, I argue that activists can attract media attention by creating “media events” and by taking advantage of “political opportunities” (McCurdy, 2008). As media events, McCurdy (2008, 2012) defines media friendly acts formed with specific attention to the media logic, including dramaturgical tactics of shock or spectacle, while political opportunities arise when the challengers take advantage of a political event that does not “belong to” them. A good example is protests of groups during meetings of political leaders.

Another useful distinction of possible activist strategies is the one between online and offline practices (Cammaerts, 2007; McCurdy, 2012). A conventional repertoire of media practices includes press releases, press conferences, protests and demonstrations, while it is also commonly acknowledged that online practices and the prevalent use of information and communication technologies are also valuable resources for coordination of activist networks and acts of political contention (Cammaerts 2005; Juris 2008). However, the power and the reliance upon mainstream types of media cannot be doubted (Cammaerts, 2007; Wolfsfeld, 2004).

As Cammaerts (2007) points out, new media and internet technologies are effective tools of mobilization and awareness raising of already interested or semi-informed people. However, activist communication strategies need mainstream media attention in order to have a significant impact and be able to put pressure in the political elites. In this respect, he argues that activists should adopt “dual communication strategies”, which combine “an independent voice through the Internet, directed at core supporters, and a mediated voice through local and national press, directed at the general population” (Cammaerts, 2007, p. 14), emphasizing that positive representations in the mainstream media of the cause and the activist initiative, play the most important role in terms of mobilizing beyond the existing sympathizers. In addition he underlines the importance of interpersonal communication with the sympathizers, underpinning that face to face interaction and calling for actual engagement will transform the weak ties, which are created through online presence to strong ties, where the power of actual pressure lies.

Generation 2.0 RED is a challenger of the existing immigration policy and specifically of the citizenship acquisition law. Bearing in mind the social political context, the profile and the goal of the organization, it is crucial for them be “validated” and recognized as equal and valuable participants on the debate around citizenship. Thus, the question that arises here is which “door” are they using and what are the specific strategies they implement in order to cope with the antagonistic media environment?

McCurdy (2012) makes an important acknowledgement with respect to the relation between activist organizations and media, suggesting that the first, despite the lack of specialists in the communication field, become increasingly “media savvy” and are able to respond to the media’s challenges. He suggests that activists usually work with *amateurs*, focusing on the “original French sense to describe committed individuals who follow a pursuit, often without remuneration and/or formal training” (2012, p. 620). However, they are fully aware of the media logic and can play the attention game successfully.

Lay theories of news media are defined as theories or understandings expressed and/or enacted by social movement actors concerning the functions and motivations of news media; how news media operate, what drives them, and theories concerning how the logic of news influences the representation of reality. The use of “lay” should not be taken as a judgment on, or belittling of theories expressed by activists. Following Furnham and Cheng (2000), the category of “lay” is used to distinguish, compare and place the articulations of social movement actors alongside the published

“professional” or “academic” understandings of media in order to consider the range and orientation of beliefs that inform the practice of activists... Lay theories of news media are not necessarily academic theories, but may be informed by them.

McCurdy, 2012, p. 622

In simple words, people with no relevant background to communication and media fields, based on their individual and collective knowledge and experience, inform and form their actions against injustice. Lay theories of media refer to “lay” people who by applying their knowledge and experience on the field of media and activism, they become key media practitioners. The main acknowledgement here is that social movement actors and activists have become aware of their role as “unofficial” media practitioners and the boundaries of, and opportunities afforded by, this status. They are able to play the role of a critical audience of reality and media representations, but also the role of the producer of alternative representations, which is the main advantage of their positioning between media and audience and/or media and political elites.

The above discussion is further illuminated by McCurdy’s (2008) distinction between two scholarships of approaching the relation between social movements and media: the *representational* and the *relational*. Even though he refers to social movements, this distinction is useful for this research as it applies to cases of activism as well, and serves as a conceptualization of the project’s analytical approach.

According to the representational scholarship (McCurdy 2012), social movements are portrayed or framed in the media, and what matters is how the media production processes facilitate this framing as well as the consequences of this process thereof. The key process and concept in this scholarship is the one of *framing*. Gitlin’s conceptualized as *frames* as “powerful, hegemonic mechanisms which structure the practice and routines of journalism and ultimately influence what the news reports and how the news reports it” (quoted in McCurdy, 2012, p. 246). McCurdy (2012) describes the media frame in comparison to a picture frame, which presents a certain version of the reality.

Relational scholarship (McCurdy, 2012) puts in perspective the asymmetrical relation between social movements and mass media as a whole, and examines the dynamics of this relation and interdependence viewing media strategies implemented by activists not as ends, but as aspects of the wider social political project of the initiative. Media are treated by activists as means of influence of the society and are used strategically in order to transform the activist organizations in important social actors and media practitioners.

This project draws on both approaches and aims to show that representation is only a key theme of the relation between activists and media. Their interaction has now become much more complex due to the development of a variety of media strategies from the part of activist organizations that challenge this asymmetrical relation. Activists ‘do not simply enter into a calculated transaction or “contest” with media at the time of social and political conflict, but consume, share, negotiate, resist, and relax to and with them’ (McCurdy, 2012, p. 251).

3 Research Design

3.1 Methods

The focus on advocating immigrants' rights called for a specialized type of qualitative content analysis – specifically a critical discourse analysis (CDA), as this method allows discovering the implicit ideological meanings that are reflected to discourse (Fairclough, 1989). However, taking into account, firstly, that language and rhetoric are created in relation to and within the specific context in which their producers live and socialize and in contrast to the specific racism(s) that they want to tackle (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002; Fairclough, 1989); and secondly, the suggestions of Philo (2007) and Carvalho (2008) regarding the need to set an ethnographic eye on the process of discourse production in order to fully grasp the context within which it is generated, ethnography, with CDA being part of this procedure, were the best suited methods to answer the research question.

Specifically, according to Phillips and Jorgensen (2002), who build on the CDA approach of Fairclough (1989), discourse itself has the power to express inequalities, as it has a dialectic relationship with society and social processes. By dialectic here, I mean that society and discourse influence and construct one another, as they are in a constant “dialogue”, where ideologies and identities are negotiated. Texts constitute valuable examples of the everyday discourse, the underlying structure and content of which are taken for granted and left unnoticed by the majority of readers. The mission of CDA is to “demystify” (Wodak, 2002) the ideologies buried within the discourse and uncover the powerful role of the discourse in everyday life. The tension of societal transformations is reflected and fought on the symbolical level of ideologies which are placed within the public discourse, something that reflects the suitability of CDA for the analysis of the campaign “More Greeks like me”, as it helps illuminate the produced discourses taking into account the social context and its influence on them (Phillips and Jorgensen, 2002).

Since discursive practices are considered decisive forms of social practices and thus contribute to the construction of the society, its changes and its reproductions, in order to analyze them it is important to take into account the context in which they were created and formed (Fairclough, 1989). Philo (2007) and Richardson (2008), underlining that CDA remains a text-based analysis with problems in its ability to show the origins of the discourses and how it relates to different social interests, call for the combination of CDA with ethnographic analysis in order to cover this gap. Carvalho (2008) underlines also the importance to set an ethnographic eye on the real actors, their interests, their allegiances, their

practices, and where they come from, in relation to the discourses they produce, in order to really grasp the context in which a discourse is produced – and by “context”, I mean not only the social political context in Greece and Europe, but in a more general sense also the practical obstacles that the producers had to overcome and the ideology behind the dominant narratives of the campaign. The main responsibility of the researcher engaged in ethnography is therefore to learn “what life is like for an insider while remaining, inevitably, an outsider” (Mack et al., 2005, p. 13).

3.2 Sampling, Data Collection and Time Period

In the following tables, the documents that were analyzed by means of CDA are presented. *All textual documents* that were found in the official site of the organization were analyzed by means of CDA. This material constitutes the whole data basis of the official site. Every document has a code that will be used in order to trace it throughout the analysis. P corresponds to *press releases*, O to articles written by *other* media and G to documents written by Generation 2.0 RED members.

The articles written from other media were found under the “They said about us” label in the website of the organization and were considered a good sample of other media that covered the campaign, as their place in the official site indicates the organization’s approval and as all of them constitute high readership portals and web magazines¹⁰. In total 19 documents were analyzed by means of CDA, as shown in the following tables.

¹⁰ According to Alexa, a worldwide company that provides commercial web traffic data, the above mentioned portals and web magazines are listed in Greece’s top 30 more visited web pages. Specifically, LIFO was ranked 2nd and Protagon 4th in the most popular Greek portals. In the list with the most popular e-press and magazines, Kathimerini is ranked 10th, Athens Voice 21st and Tvsv 28th. MAD TV is the most popular music channel of the country, while Ert is the state-owned public radio and television broadcaster. UNHCR Greece corresponds to the official web page of UN National Office of the country.

Table 3.1: Table of articles written by others

<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Publisher</i>	<i>Code</i>
200.000 children in vague	9 July 2014	Protagon	O1
Invisible People: 200.000 children, born or raised in Greece do not have the Greek citizenship	22 October 2014	Athens Voice	O2
Young Greeks of Different Origin	24 October 2014	Grekamag	O3
Those who fight for equal rights	18 December 2014	Lifo	O4

Table 3.2: Table of Press Releases

<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Code</i>
Press Release Regarding the Amendment of the Greek Citizenship Code	15 May 2015	P1
Press Release Regarding A. Samara's Statements on the Immigration Issue	14 January 2015	P2
Regarding the Migration and Social Integration Code	1 January 2014	P3
Petition for the Right of Second Generation to Citizenship	21 July 2013	P4
Regarding the Publication of the Judgment of the State Council for the Anticonstitutionality of the Clause of the Act 3838	February 2013	P5

Table 3.3: Table of articles written by G2RED

<i>Title</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Publication</i>	<i>Code</i>
"Our education" and the hypocrisy of the State	Papaioannou Andromache	24 July 2014	Protagon	G1
"Illegal immigrants"...born in Greece (!),	Papaioannou Andromache	May 2013	G2RED official site and blog	G2
Personal thoughts	Eleftheriou Olga	March 2013	G2RED official site and blog	G3
For the rumors	Eleftheriou Olga and Fani K.	March 2013	G2RED official site and blog	G4
How the Government perceives the sense of "integration" according to the 2013 National Strategy regarding the Integration of third country nationals	Papaioannou Andromache	18 February 2013	G2RED official site and blog	G5
I want to be what I choose to be	Nikos Odubitan	18 February 2013	UNHCR Greece	G6
Greek or Citizen? The State Council, the "greekness" and the 2 nd generation	Papaioannou Andromache	9 February 2013	Protagon	G7
The Invisible Children – The problematic of the Second Generation in Greece	Papaioannou Andromache	25 January 2013	UNHCR Greece	G8
Me, the "illegal immigrant" (!)	Nikos Odubitan	26 December 2012	Protagon	G9
Video of the Campaign ^a	Nikos Odubitan	From November 2014	Kathimerini, Protagon, MAD TV, Ert, Tvsx, and others	G10

^a The scenario of the video of the campaign was transcribed and analyzed by means of CDA. It is placed for analytical purposes in the list with the documents written by the organization's members. It is considered a valuable unit of analysis as it was broadcasted in a variety of media and according to Generation 2.0 RED "it targeted specific groups and reflects to the point the ideology of the organization" (Anta).

In addition, the fieldwork diary constitutes one unit of analysis itself, as a detailed recording of my observations and thoughts during the fieldwork period. Ethnography took place between the 1st and the 21st of April 2015. More specifically, the diary contains notes from my daily interaction with them in their office, which was in total fourteen days, as well as notes regarding socializing outside the office, mostly in social events of the organization.

Ethnography calls for interaction and socializing within a specific social context for a lengthy period of time (Mack et al., 2005). However, the two full weeks of interaction and close cooperation with members of the organization are considered sufficient for the purposes of this research, given the limited time of this thesis, my constant interaction with the organization before and after my visit in Greece and that during these two weeks I had the chance to participate actively and observe closely the procedures of text production and interaction with media.

Moreover, it is important to point out that insightful conversations took place from January 2015, when I first contacted some members of the organization, and continued after the end of my visit in Greece. Following them on social media and their interviews in other media since January was necessary in order to be able to follow the campaign and their activities in relation to the social and political developments regarding the citizenship issue, since the elections of January and the emerging new government changed the landscape. The early connection to some of them contributed to creating a casual and friendly relation with members of the organization, facilitating a fruitful cooperation during my stay in Greece.

The time spent with the organization's members allowed engaging to the issue of citizenship and observe, among others, in real time interviewing of members from other media actors, articles' and press releases' production, editing of texts written by members and discussions over articles published regarding the citizenship issue from media of a diverse political scope. Interviews and informal discussions and interaction with the two main executives of the organization, Nikos Odubitan and Andromache Papaioannou (in the interviews quoted as Anta) were of great value.

Therefore the time period of the research has as a starting point my first discussions with the organization in January 2015 and continued months after my visit in Greece, mainly because of the submission of the new draft bill regarding the citizenship issue, in 15th of May 2015.

Furthermore, in order to clarify the period of the research with respect to the date of the publication of the documents that were analyzed and the period of the campaign, it is crucial to provide some more details. The organization was created in 2006, having a starting

point the legal gap concerning the citizenship acquisition from children of migrant background. The first phase of the campaign “Equal Citizens: More Greeks like Me”, as explained by the members of the organization, is considered to be the same year. This research focuses on the second phase of the campaign, which started in 2013, after the organization became a legal entity and after the official announcement by the State Council regarding the cancelation of the clauses of the Act 3838/2010 that referred to the citizenship acquisition. This phase of the campaign, which also signifies the different phases of the organization’s evolution in terms of campaigning and activities, will continue until the put on vote of the draft bill, expected to happen within 2015.

The textual material that was analyzed consists of content released since 2013, while fieldwork took place in April 2015, in a very critical moment for the organization and the campaign, right before the submission of the draft bill. This timing constituted a great opportunity for this research as valuable insights were even more enriched by the observation of the cooperation and the negotiation between the organization and the Ministry of Interior, regarding the draft bill.

Therefore, even though there is a particular stretch of research time, especially with respect to the textual material, taking into account the specificities of ethnography, of the matter in question and its nature, as well as the fact that interesting and important developments are ongoing; this stretch is in conformity with the aim of the research and is therefore considered necessary.

3.3 Data Analysis

3.3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

The main driving force of the discourse analysis lies within Fairclough’s (1989) three-dimensional model of CDA. Fairclough’s model suggests that when seeing language as discourse and as social practice one is committing oneself not just to analyzing texts, nor just to analyzing processes of production, “but the relationship between texts, processes and their social contributions, both the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures” (1989, p. 26). In simple words he draws upon the relationship of three main dimensions of discourse: texts, interaction and context. *Texts* constitute the smaller product of the process of discourse production and are only one part of the whole process of social interaction. *Social interaction* consists of the process of production, of which the text is a product, and the process of interpretation, of which a text is a resource. However, in order to understand these processes, one needs to take

into account the way production and interpretation are socially influenced, which brings us to the third implication of seeing language as social practice that is happening within a specific *context* (Fairclough, 1989).

In this research, the CDA of 19 documents took place partially before my visit in Greece so that there was already a consistent analysis which I could use as a starting point for the first meetings with the organization. This gave me the opportunity to reflect and add valuable comments on my findings until that moment. Respondent validation (Mack et al., 2005) was ensured in this way, as during the fieldwork period, via our daily interaction and discussions, the members of Generation 2.0 RED had the time and space to understand my perspective and contribute to the discourse analysis.

Specifically, the CDA of the textual material was applied drawing upon Fairclough's (1989) model following Van Dijk's and Wodak's approach (Van Dijk, 1992, 1993, 2000; Wodak, 2002) to ideological reproduction in the discourse. The discourse analysis was carried out in three levels: the Macro-level, the Micro-level and the Semantic level.

The *macro-structure analysis* focused firstly on the headlines of the texts. At first, it was crucial to examine headlines, which encapsulate the subject's ideological values and attitudes (Teo, 2000). Headlines serve as an orientation point for the reader and guide his/her understanding by giving the sense to the microstructure revealed further in the text (Teo, 2000; Erjavec, 2001). Secondly, it was essential to focus on the quotation patterns and the quoted speakers. Quotation patterns might reproduce, legitimize or deny racist ideology in quite an explicit way, yet stay concealed as "private opinions", distant from the perspective of the author, and providing the article with authenticity (Erjavec, 2001; Selingerova, 2014), remaining intentionally chosen and arranged in a specific ideologically way. Thirdly, special attention was devoted to lexical cohesion, over-lexicalization and generalization of the minority in the context of the article as a whole. Lexical cohesion refers to the strategic repetition of words in a text, aiming at encoding a specific ideology in the discourse. Over-lexicalization refers to the strategy of creating groups deviance from the norm by employing surplus of lexical epithets, otherwise not employed (Selingerova, 2014). Generalization refers to the strategic extension of the characteristics or activities of a specific group of people or an individual to a much more general and open-ended set leading to homogenization (see Appendix A, table A1).

Moving to the *micro level*, in order to illuminate the relationship between the linguistic structure and the ideological consequences, the texts were analyzed in terms of transitivity, nominalization and rhetorical figures. Transitivity and verb nominalization play

an important role in representing events and ascribing agency to actors, having the power to represent one situation in different, ideologically significant angles (e.g. ascribing/obscuring responsibility, topicalizing/omitting actors). Transitivity examines the syntactic patterns of sentences, as events and actions can be described with syntactic variations that are a function of the underlying involvement of actors (e.g. their agency, responsibility and perspective). For example, passive construction of sentences (passive voice) and nominalization leave the agency and responsibility implicit (Van Dijk, 1993). Lexical structure and modality focus also on the choice of the syntactical structure as well as of words and the cohesion between them. Furthermore, other discourse strategies described by Van Dijk informed the microanalysis procedure, such as usage of rhetorical figures (e.g. metaphors) and local meanings of certain words, which might both imply racist discourse without explicitly using racist terms, as well as strategies of denial (see Appendix A, table A2).

The analysis of discursive strategies of nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivation and intensification/mitigation created by Wodak (2001) constitutes the *semantic level of analysis*. This type of analysis involves examining the usage of ideologically toned verbs, adjectives and nouns for different groups, their foregrounding or overshadowing, the arguments being used for justification of inclusion or exclusion and the expressions of the writer's point of view. The analysis is concerned with linguistic and semantic choices made by the producers of the campaign or the journalists and their ideological effects. Specifically, the aim was to examine if and how the discourse is justified and legitimized. The discursive strategies (nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivation, framing and intensification or mitigation) stress the specific context-dependent linguistic realizations (Wodak, 2002). By *strategy*, Van Dijk (1993, 2004) means a more or less intentional plan of practice adopted to achieve certain social, political, psychological or linguistic aim. The strategies identified as *nomination strategies*, construct and represent social actors, for example in-groups and out-groups, via membership categorization. Secondly, *predicational strategies* are used to stereotype and evaluate attributions of negative or positive traits. *Argumentation and perspectivation strategies* are used to express the position of the speaker in the report, while *intensification and mitigation strategies* are used to qualify and modify the epistemic status of a proposition by intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of racist, anti-Semitic, nationalist or ethnicist utterances (Van Dijk, 1993).

3.3.2 Ethnography

Keeping a fieldwork diary was of great value in order to really grasp the perspective of Generation 2.0 RED on the citizenship issue and understand the relation of discursive choices and anti-racism, as well as to explore the ways they engage with other media actors, as I could keep track of their conversations and comments on the issue, engage to their discourse and observe real time interactions with media, without losing myself on the way.

Van Maanen (1982) argues that ethnography ‘calls for the language spoken in that setting, first-hand participation in relevant activities and, most critically, a deep reliance on intensive work with a few informants drawn from the setting’ (1982, p.104). During the period of my fieldwork, I had the chance to observe the language used in the setting, in formal and informal interactions of members of the organization with target groups of people and media actors; and to observe closely and participate in procedures of writing and editing texts.

I came to across a variety of incidents that offered me new ways to think about the issue itself and the campaign, as well as what the organization challenges and what it overly aims at. While the formal interviews were useful, the most valuable conversations and incidents took place ‘off the record’. Talking with volunteers of the organization offered me a wider perspective on the issue of citizenship, and helped me realize the reality of the second generation, something that provided another perspective on the analysis of the campaign. In addition, the extensive discussions over the cancellation of the clauses of Act 3838/2010 and its justification, as well as on matters of media discourse and the dominant discourses concerning the second generation provided valuable information about the hegemonic rhetoric against which the rhetoric of the campaign was built on and helped me realize the practical problems which the organization had to tackle when cooperating with media actors.

In sum, during my stay in Greece, I attended two public speeches concerning second generation and citizenship issues, and I had the chance to observe the writing and editing of press releases and interviews of their volunteers to other media actors, as well as to meet my key interviewees, Nikos Odubitan and Andromache Papaioannou. The knowledge I gathered through the study of academic literature on issues of citizenship and anti-racism, activist organizations as well as social movements’ media strategies, in combination with discussions with diverse people related to Generation 2.0 RED helped me bring everything together.

4 Results

4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

In order to examine the discourse of Generation 2.0 RED I analyzed 19 documents. The texts were analyzed in macro, micro and semantic level, applying Fairclough's (1989) model. The results of the CDA are systematically reported, accompanied by referenced evidence from the collected material. The results of the macro level analysis shed light on the ideological effects of language use within headlines and leads, of speakers' quoting and of the overall referential patterns used in relation to the State Council and political actors. In addition, the strategies of generalization, over-lexicalization and lexical cohesion are taken into consideration. The microanalysis ensues with a closer look on ideological effects resulting from transitivity, employment of rhetorical devices and the lexical choices the producers make when advocating on the citizenship issue and the identity of children of migrant background. Finally, an insight into semantic strategies is encapsulated in the assessment of the group's identity formation and the organization's argumentation within the texts.

4.1.1 Macro Level Analysis: Uncovering Intentions

4.1.1.1 *Headlines and Leads: Who Are We and Who Is the 'Enemy'?*

The headlines and leads analysis proves to be characteristic in several ways, as they set the tone of the texts. In general I observed two "types" of headlines and leads; those that refer and construct an image for the children of migrant background and those that refer and set the tone for attributing responsibilities to the state and the government.

Specifically, the construction of the image of children of migrant background in the headlines is achieved by the deployment of subjects such as "invisible" and "hovering", and by focusing on the number of people of migrant origin without Greek citizenship. They are constructed as a homogenous group, nominated in plural nouns, such as: "The Invisible Generation" (G8), "200.000 Children in Vague" (O1), "Invisible People" (O2) and "The Invisible Second Generation" (G10).

On the other hand, many headlines and leads consist of references to the state or governmental institutions (P1, P2, P3, P4, G1, G5, and G7). Quotation and punctuation marks are also deployed, revealing the intention of the author to ascribe responsibility, distance him/herself from the ideological significance of the word and/or be ironic and caustic with respect to the oppositional terminology and framing. Some examples are: Me "the illegal

immigrant” (G9), “Illegal immigrants” born in Greece (G2), “Our education” and the hypocrisy of the state (G1), Greek or citizen: the “Greekness” and the second generation (G7).

From a wider perspective, it is important to underline that headlines and leads of articles written by other journalists do not include references to the state or other governmental and public institutions, something that happens with texts signed by Generation 2.0 RED members. In addition, headlines and leads of articles written by the organization or other journalists are dramatized, by the employment of first singular, quotation and punctuation marks, as well as the use of numerosity of children of migrant origin (O1, O2, O4, G7, G6, G3, G2, G1), while the headlines of the press releases are just declarative of the content of the document (P1, P2, P3, P4, P5).

4.1.1.2 Quotation Patterns: Attributing Responsibility

Moving to the quotation patterns’ analysis in the rest of the texts’ bodies, the ratio of speakers quoted is a telling sign of how the authors of the texts ascribe responsibility to the quote’s speaker.

In the press releases (P1, P2, P4) and a significant number of texts signed by the organization (G1, G2, G5, G6, G7, G8, G9) , quotation marks are used to refer to statements of politicians or institutions, regarding mainly the justification of the State Council for the cancelation of the citizenship clauses. This conscious choice, to include politicians’ and institutional voices directly in the debate of the citizenship issue, indicates the will and the perceived power of Generation 2.0 members to participate in the debate. It indicates their approach on the oppositional framing and terminology, proving that they are confronting it straightforwardly, ascribing responsibility to the speakers of this terminology and “attacking” them directly.

All articles written by other journalists include quotation marks when using the terminology “second generation immigrants”, revealing the intention of the authors to show their ideological distance from this wording, and the intention to adopt the organization’s discursive choices. In addition, all articles quote directly members of Generation 2.0 RED, even though only two of them constitute interviews, indicating the success of the organization to gain media attention and space. A valuable example is the article of *LIFO* (O4), the second most popular news portal of the country, which includes an interview with members of the organization. This particular example is of great value as it reveals the domination and the potential of Generation 2.0 RED discourse, firstly, because of the high

readership of the portal and secondly because of the impressive length of the article, which is 6 pages.

From a wider perspective, quoting members of the organization and children of migrant background (O2, O3, O4), as well as the publication of their texts in high readership e-newspapers and magazines (G1, G7, G8, G9) is telling for their success to get media attention, space to report their story and validation of their cause and approach.

4.1.1.3 Lexical Cohesion and Generalization: Constructing New Identities

Moving to the examination of *lexical cohesion*, an on-going effort to create a new identity for children of migrant background is traceable. This new identity is mostly constructed intensely via the repetition and attribution of certain characteristics. Specifically, they are regularly characterized as “productive citizens”, via their status as *teachers, students, graduates, athletes, fathers*; “achievers”, “dreamers” and most importantly, “as Greek as you”. These are the most frequently used and repeated epithets to refer to them.

Table 4.1: Frequently used Lexical Epithets

Lexical Epithets	Documents
Productive citizens	P1, P2, P3, O1, O2, O3,O4, G1, G2, G4, G6, G7, G8,G9, G10
A vital part of the Greek society	P1, P4, G1, G6, O1, O4
Passionate	P1, G2, G4, G6, G8, G10, O2, O4
Willing to participate	P1, P2, P3, O1, O2, O3,O4, G1, G2, G4, G6, G7, G8,G9, G10
Dreamers	G2, G3, G4, G6, G8, G10, O2, O4
Fighters	G2, G4, G6, G8, G10, O2, O4, P1, P5
Achievers	G2, G4, G6, G8, G10, O2, O4, P1
Resilient	G1, G2, G3, G4, G6, G7, G8, G9, O3, O4
Talented	G1, G7, G8, O2, O3, O4
As Greek as you	P1, P2, P3, O1, O2, O3,O4, G1, G2, G4, G6, G7, G8,G9, G10

Over-lexicalization is traceable in the phrases: “born and/or raised”, “children of migrant background/origin”, “born to immigrant parents”, “New Generation of Greek Citizens”, that are constantly repeated *in all texts*, revealing the intention of the authors to

redefine the “belonging” of these people and mostly, distinguish them from their parents and protect them from the term “immigrants”.

Generalization of the characteristics of individuals of migrant origin to the whole group of children of migrant origin is achieved firstly through the focus on their numerosity. Repeating their number, transforms them into something countable, homogenous and more real (P1, P4, O1, O2, O4, G1, G2, G3, G8, G10). Secondly, there is a series of repeated personal stories that create a sense of a “doomed and trapped generation”, because of their legal status, that is attributed to all of them. Specifically, some examples are, “Adeola, a talented athlete that was excluded from the national team because of her precarious legal status” (O4, G8); “Sam, a gifted actor that wants to work abroad but is trapped in Greece because of his legal status” (O3, O2, G3); “Juela, a motivated student that wants to do a master abroad but is restricted due to the lack of the Greek citizenship” (G7); “Manolis, a currently successful and loved musician, who was raised in Greece but has not the right to vote” (G7, O2); ‘Giannis, the talented “greekfreak” that was granted the Greek citizenship in order to play in the national team, but what about the rest?’ (O3, G5, P1).

4.1.2 Micro Level Analysis: Under the Magnifying Glass

4.1.2.1 Transitivity and Activization: The Responsible Agents and the Active Parties of the Debate

Examining the *micro-structure* of the texts, a deeper understanding of the rhetoric and the intentions of Generation 2.0 RED is revealed. Analyzing the texts in terms of *transitivity* indicates intentional responsibility ascription and activization of the actors involved in the debate on citizenship. The use of active voice in verbs activates the subjects and intensifies their responsibility and position in the debate. Both, children of migrant background and the state or representatives of the state, such as political actors and the State Council, appear frequently in the subject position of the sentence.

Specifically, the state actors are predominantly activized via transitive verbs, in order to be ascribed responsibility for negative action, the receivers of which are the immigrants and the second generation, as shown in the table below.

Table 4.2: Transitive verbs ascribing responsibility for negative action

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Object/Receiver of action</i>
Antonis Samaras (P2)	targets	the immigrants
The State Council (P5)	doomed	the fate of children of migrant origin
The state (G8, P1, P5)	failed	the second generation
The judges of the State Council (G1)	failed	to do protect the rights of active citizens
The rhetoric of the government (O4)	cultivates negative feelings	against immigrants

On the other hand, people of migrant background are constructed as “normal” and human, via actions that draw their active participation in society, human sentiments and generally scenes of everyday life. Their actions are presented via intransitive verbs, mostly revealing sentiments, and stating actions that do not have receivers, as presented in the table below.

Table 4.3: Non-transitive verbs revealing ‘normality’, ‘humanity’ and the ‘existing bonds’ with Greeks

Subject	Action	Themes
Children of migrant background	study _(G10,G1,G3,G5P5)	Scenes of everyday life creating “normality”
	work _(G10, P4, O1,O3,O4,G1, G6G8)	
	graduate from Greek universities _(P4, P1, O1,O3,G3, G7, G8)	
	finish the Greek school _(P1, P4, P5, O3,O4, O1, G10, G1, G5, G8)	
	live _(G10, G8, G7)	Feelings and sentiments creating “humanity”
	create _(G10, G8, G7, O2, O4,G1,G4, G6)	
	feel _(G10, G8, G7, G6)	
	dream _(G10, G8, G7, G3, O1,O4,P1)	
	embrace _(G10, G8, G7,.)	
	suffer _(G10, G8, G7)	
	love _(G10, G8, G7)	
	fight _(G10, G8, G7)	
	argue _(G10, G8, G7)	
	laugh _(G10, G8, G7)	
	hope _(G10, G8, G7)	
	cry _(G10, G8, G7)	
	are friends with... _(G10, G8, G7, O1, O2, O3, O4, P2, P4)	Relations with Greeks emphasizing the <i>existing bonds</i>
	are coworkers with... _(G10, G8, G7, O3, O2, P1, P4)	
	are your neighbors _(O,1, O3, O4, G2, G10, G8, G7, P4)	
are Greek as you _(G10, G8, G7, G4, G2, O1, O2, O3, P2, P3, P5)		

Furthermore, the modality and tense in the core of the texts as well as in headlines and leads are further insightful about the intentions of the authors. There is an effort to induce the sense of urgency of the situation. Specifically, it is grammatically induced by the continuous tense, as well as by modality, where the children of migrant background “are fighting for their rights” (G7, G8, P4), “are still waiting” (G5, O4), “want to be what they choose” (G6, G9), “demand their recognition” (G10, O2), emphasizing the pending character of the problem.

Comparing the frequency of the above mentioned clause transformation choices, it is crucial to underline that responsibility ascription to the state and its representatives, takes place predominantly in press releases and some of the texts written by the organization’s members (G1, G2, G4, G5, G7), while the depiction of children of migrant background via positive and “normal” actions is a common element in all documents. Of great value and specific importance is the following lead from an article (O2) written by another journalist, that draws exactly on the above mentioned depiction, revealing the success of the organization to promote its rhetoric and terminology on the issue.

One afternoon five cool people came to our offices. They are graduates and many of them are actually recognized in their field and have to offer a lot to the country in which they live since they were babies. Some of them live here for twenty years and some were born here, but the country continues to deny them as equal citizens, depriving them a Greek identity, a passport, the right to vote and other fundamental human rights (O2)

4.1.2.2 Rhetorical Devices and Lexical Choice: The Villain of the Story

The employment of rhetorical figures is a common phenomenon to *all texts* that were analyzed, revealing a significant unifying thread for the whole dataset. Specifically the personification of “the state” and “the government”, as indicated in the tables above is a common element found mostly, but not only, in press releases. On the other hand, children of migrant background are constantly presented via metaphorical figures, as the “hovering generation” and “the invisible children”, who ‘show us how is living in a country where the “tomorrow” is always in vague’ (O4). Rhetorical figures construct specific ideological perspectives in the mind of the reader, as they draw on the unconscious creation of powerful images, dramatizing further the subjects of the text.

Specifically, in press releases and articles written by Generation 2.0 RED, the personification of the state and the government in combination with the lexical choices of the authors, reveal the evaluative tone and intention of the text. In all their documents, the willingness to directly blame and attribute responsibility to the governmental policies, as well as the emphasis on the state's failure to protect the previous law framework is clear and obvious. The lexical choices to describe the policy of state and its agents are highly evaluative, implementing a variety of negative epithets. Some insightful examples are the following.

The unacceptable and heinous choice of the Prime Minister, Antonis Samaras (P2)

The unbelievable and surely alarming decision of the judges of the State Council (P5)

The racist policies of the government (G2)

The ignorant and egocentric people who constitute the legislative power of the state (G1)

However, generally comparing the texts produced by Generation 2.0 RED (G) and the ones published in other media (O), as well as the main video of the campaign (G10), the tone in the two later is not that denunciatory, as there, the main priority and goal is to construct the identity of people of migrant background, something achieved via the previously described linguistic and rhetorical choices.

Furthermore, it is crucial to add another linguistic choice that was traced in the discourse of the organization (G, P), regarding the selection of the leading subject. Specifically, the inclusive *we* is used to express the active participation of the “*New Generation of Greek Citizens, in which people of Greek and migrant background are united*” (G1, G2, G6, G7, G10, O2, O3, P4, P2), as illustrated in the examples below. In contrast, the second singular or plural, *you*, is strategically used to accuse and blame directly those considered responsible by the producers of the text, mostly identified in subject positions as *the government, the system, the state, the politicians, the legislators, the State Council* and in some cases, the explicit *name of the offender*.

We are really disappointed that, in the name of democracy, you condemn the right to be different (G3)

We are disappointed that you fail to handle the responsibility of your position (G4)

We stand for our rights (G10. P1, P4)

We expect you to you to protect your citizens (G2)

We are what we choose (G6)

And this is our main difference. We talk about individuals that should be equal citizens and you talk about immigrants and illegal migrants (G2)

4.1.3 Semantic Strategies of Anti-Racist Discourse: Micro- and Macro-Analyses

Moving to the *semantic level* of the analysis, what was revealed until now can be linked to a specific strategy, creating certain patterns that, as we will see, are followed with respect to the type and the purpose of each text.

Nomination strategies are traced in the specific and coherent lexical choices for the construction of every subject-actor of the debate on the citizenship issue. There are straight references to the two participants of the debate, namely all those that can be summarized under “the state” label, and “us”, including the society as a whole. Specifically, the inclusive *we* and the repetition of the “*New Generation of Greek Citizens*” construct the image of a Greek society that consists of individuals of Greek and migrant background, who, regardless their origin, live together and claim the right to diversity. Therefore, the in-group and out-group formation that indicate employment of nomination strategies is identified in the construction of the state and its representatives as the enemy and the oppositional terminology’s speaker, via the deployment of “you”, as illustrated in the examples above; and the construction of the in-group, via the inclusive “we” and by emphasizing on the existing similarities and bonds between Greeks and people of migrant origin, as well as, de-demonizing difference and diversity, as illustrated in the following part.

It is time for everyone to realize that people born to immigrant parents study, work and live with us. They are our friends, coworkers, neighbors, co-citizens. They are black, Muslim and Asian. They speak (also) different languages, they dress (also) differently and they cook (also) different. But they are (also) Greeks (G8)

Predication strategies are revealed in the use of quotation marks and highly evaluative epithets while describing or referring to the state, as described in the previous sections. The use of active voice and the positioning of the “government” and “the state” in subject positions further intensify the direct approach of Generation 2.0 RED to those considered responsible and clarifies their perspective and desirable role in the debate.

The *perspectivation* of organization, meaning the construction of their role in the citizenship issue, is achieved again via the use of active voice and the first plural to address and express its perspective. The positive representation and framing of people of migrant background as already substantially and fully integrated members of the society is developed not only by their own characteristics, but also by their relation to Greeks, as shown in the above mentioned examples (P4, G10, O1-4, G2, G4, G6, G7, and G9). In addition, description of individual cases and narration of personal stories that constitute devices of perspectivation, as well as quotation of events and utterances was a common element of the texts written by Generation 2.0 RED (G) as well as to all articles written by others (O).

Lastly, the justification of the evaluative choices and the responsibility ascription to the state and the government, draws the absence of a legal framework regarding the citizenship acquisition as a discriminatory, nationalistic and unjust governmental choice that contributes to the further expanding of the existing dichotomies and reflects the failure of the state to protect its citizens (P1-P5, G1, G2, G5, G6, G7, G8). In addition, the argumentation that arises from the constant repetition of “children of migrant origin”, “born and/or raised in Greece”, “born to immigrant parents” entails the justification for rejecting the dominant terminology, namely “second generation immigrants” that presents them as immigrants, with the sole excuse being the migrant status of their parents.

4.1.4 Overview of Discourse Analysis

The construction of the identity of children of migrant background is achieved mainly via their depiction as a homogenous group. The focus on their numerosity, the metaphorical figures that describe them mostly as hovering, invisible and dreamers, and the use of continuous tenses, create the sense of a pending and urgent situation that remains unsolved and needs immediate action. The dramatization of the tone of texts intensifies this, as the reader or the considered responsible is approached directly and is invited to act. Especially the use of utterances to refer directly to those considered responsible for the problem reveals the willingness of Generation 2.0 RED to participate actively to the debate. Moreover, their position as subjects and the use of intransitive verbs, that reveal human sentiments and acts build a human profile and de-demonize difference. “Greek citizens” and “Greeks” are presented in roles that indicate positive and “normal” existing bonds and relations with them, further underscoring their integration to the Greek society. Society is not an active actor, but the subject in question. What kind of society we have and what kind of society we want to

have is the debate around which “the state” and “the citizens” address the issue of citizenship, according to the Generation 2.0 RED discourse.

Interestingly, this representation is common in all texts that were analyzed, indicating the main goal of the discursive choices of the organization, to build a certain identity for this group of people as well as a certain perspective on the issue of citizenship. In addition, tracing the abovementioned elements in the articles written by other journalists, especially when taking into consideration their ranking in readership, indicates the success of the organization in promoting their perspective and terminology when discussing the issue, implying their “validation” (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993) by media.

On the other hand, the discursive practices that aim in responsibility ascription and the direct labeling of the considered as responsible actors, are mostly found in press releases. The villains of the story are the state and the government which are approached and criticized directly, via highly negative evaluative lexical choices and via their positioning as subjects of verbs revealing negative transitive actions against immigrants, children of migrant background and citizens of the country.

In sum, the theme of belonging, via sameness creating discursive devices, as well as a blame game process, were common in all texts, with the second being more intense in press releases and some texts of Generation 2.0 RED (G1, G2, G5, G7). Excitingly, the theme of racism as well as references to the Golden Dawn phenomenon were not traced, with minor exceptions (O2, O4, G7, and P1). Particularly, the word “racism” is found only 13 times in all texts analyzed and only one reference was made to the Golden Dawn (G8), indicating interesting implications that were subject to the magnifying glass of ethnographic research and will be discussed and developed in the following sections

4.2 Setting an Ethnographic Eye on the Discourse and Struggles of Generation 2.0 RED

Spending time with the producers of the texts gave me the chance to dive deeper into the discursive challenges and struggles of the organization. In this section valuable information regarding the hegemonic discourse, the discursive choices and the rhetoric of Generation 2.0 RED, as well as how these choices reflect the ideology and the perspective of the organization on citizenship and difference, will be illuminated via the description of specific facts that took place during the fieldwork period.

The hegemonic rhetoric and framing regarding immigrants in Greece, as well as the equation of children of migrant origin with them, are always in the minds of the

representatives of Generation 2.0 RED. Notes from my fieldwork diary contain valuable information in this respect with specific examples of distortion of the portrayal of children of migrant origin and immigrants. Nikos indicated the following discursive choices that are used in mass media discourses, claiming that despite their non-racist character, do have specific ideological meaning and enforce social dichotomies.

Specifically, “Greek taxpayers” and “Greek citizens” constitute discursive choices that have transformed into collocations and are commonly used in news reporting. Even though racist reference or intention to be racist cannot be identified or attributed to the speaker of this wording, it constitutes a “local meaning” (Wodak, 2002) that entails “othering”, as it is implied that “taxpayers” and “citizens” are only Greeks. The term “colored” was also indicated as problematic. Although its implementation aims at avoiding the term “black”, that is commonly perceived as racist; according to Nikos it actually incriminates the “black” and cultivates negative sentiments towards black people. Their reaction to the sound of the term in a public discussion they held with members of Vyrone’s Syriza Youth¹¹ group, was very interesting. The speaker of the term was interrupted in a friendly way and two members of Generation 2.0 RED, both of African origin, explained that ‘the term “black” is ok. “Colored” is the TV screen. We are black’.

From a wider discussion I had with members of the organization regarding the dominant public discourse and how it cultivates racism, they argue that the media discursive choices, ‘if not always, often enough, construct intentionally or unintentionally “citizens” and “foreigners”’ (quotes from my fieldwork diary attributed to Anta). The above mentioned examples reveal struggling with local meanings and collocations that entail and cultivate ideological perceptions, and indicate their recognition as such and the construction of alternatives by the organization. In addition, valuable comments of the heads of the organization concerned the impact of discourse on the self-perception of people born to immigrant parents in Greece. Anta pointed out, that people of migrant origin may reproduce terms, such as “immigrant” and even “illegal immigrant” to introduce themselves, ignoring the power of the specific lexical choices.

Furthermore, with respect to the equation of children of migrant background and their depiction as immigrants, Anta gave me valuable examples of articles published in popular newspapers, in which, despite the general friendly approach to the issue of citizenship, the

¹¹ The Syriza Youth group is the official local group of young supporters of the political party of Syriza, whose leader is the current Prime Minister, Alexis Tsipras. The discussion was held in the city of Vyrone and is one of the events I attended during the fieldwork period.

use of “wrong lexical choices or pictures” delivered a distorted depiction of the individuals and more generally of the issue of citizenship. Specifically, the terms “second generation immigrants” and “immigrants that were raised in Greece” constitute the most common examples of wording to refer to people raised or born to immigrants parents, employed not only by journalists but also by politicians who are pro the citizenship bill. Valuable examples of negative representation are also traced in the use of the “wrong” picture in articles regardless their positive or negative approach to the citizenship issue. The common element of all pictures is the depiction of ragamuffins or old dirty and poor men behind fences or waiting in lines outside the Decentralized Administration of Attica¹² that provoke negative sentiments and the sense of fear implying that the citizenship acquisition draft bill refers to people like those of the picture.

The perspective of Generation 2.0 RED on these matters is interestingly illuminated in the following event that took place during the fieldwork period. One “defective”, in terms of language and picture, article, which was published in EfSyn¹³, was sent to the organization’s e-mail by the author, a girl born to immigrant parents, asking for comments. The first problem identified by Anta was the picture accompanying the article, which depicted a sad young poor boy behind a fence.

I don’t know if the picture that accompanies your text was selected by you or the editor, but in my opinion, it is problematic. The picture of a hand hanging through a fence provokes the feeling of fear and is negative in general. Most readers observe the pictures of articles and do not always read them, so it is necessary to use representative pictures, carefully chosen. (Part of the reply e-mail)

The use of wrong terms, such as “second generation immigrants” and some false information regarding the citizenship acquisition were also found and indicated to the author in a friendly and simple tone. Anta’s justification for rejecting the terms was mainly that immigrants are people who decide consciously for specific reasons to leave their homeland and that children born to immigrants parents cannot and should not be referred to as such.

¹² Decentralized Administration of Attica and Immigration Office, also known as “One Stop Shop”, is the competent authority for issuing and renewing residence permits of third country nationals residing in the municipalities of Attica.

¹³ EfSyn is a popular daily newspaper, known for its independence and objective reporting, in terms of political scope.

Special attention was given to some false information regarding the draft bill, another “problem” that they try to tackle.

Specifically, members of Generation 2.0 RED, having as a starting point this incident, had a conversation regarding other institutions or journalists that support the right of people of migrant origin to citizenship, but “fail to report and discuss it appropriately, due to lack of information or basic background knowledge, something that transforms them into enemies of what they are trying to support” (quote from the fieldwork diary attributed to Nikos). This alone, constitutes another specific challenge, stressing out that they struggle, not only with oppositional framings and arguments, but also with ignorance and irrational argumentation from supporters, who unintentionally put the debate in danger. How they cope with such incidents is illustrated in the case of the girl’s article as well, as mostly they try to explain privately the issue.

In addition, highly interesting was also Anta’s comment on the identification of the author in the end of the article.

At the end of the article, in the author’s identification part it is written that: “XX (the name of author) is an upcoming journalist, graduate student of University of Athens, second generation immigrant”. I consider that this wrong. Immigration is not inherited. I believe that it would be more appropriate to put it like this: “XX is an upcoming journalist, graduate student of University of Athens, youngster of migrant background”. And that, only if you believe that it is necessary to state your origin and include it in your identification. Your origin can be whatever it is, but it is not the basic element of your identity. It does not have to define you. The state may label you as an immigrant. If you don’t feel like that, why do you accept it and reproduce it? You have the right to choose for yourself.

In Anta’s comment it is clear that “the state” is explicitly referred to as the main actor that “labels you as an immigrant”, confirming the findings of the CDA regarding the direct attribution of responsibility to “the state”. The problems identified were explained and alternatives were given, as indicated in the part above, pointing out the right terminology as well as the general perspective of Generation 2.0 RED on the issue.

Particularly, the phrases “Immigration is not inherited”, “Your origin can be whatever it is, but it is not the basic element of your identity. It does not have to define you”, “You have the right to choose for yourself”, captivate the perspective of the organization on the

citizenship issue. The individual, in this case the author, should not be defined by her origin and has the right to choose for herself. “Origin” is de-connected from “identity” and self-actualization is connected to the “right”.

The above mentioned instances indicate that the members of Generation 2.0 RED construct their rhetoric being fully aware of the importance of discourse and its relation to the cultivation of hegemonic ideologies. The counter-rhetoric is based on notions such as “rights” and “equality”, “immigration” is attributed to the parents, the state is appointed as the actor that “puts labels on citizens” and the children of migrant background are re-defined. “Colorblindness” is also rejected in an effort to “de-criminalize” the different.

Their willingness and reactions in personal interactions, with members and non-members of the organization, regarding discursive choices and the right way to respond and react to “wrong” terms reveals a deep knowledge of the way society and racism interact with and reflect ideological meanings and perceptions. The creation of a “tank” of interviewees that are trained to tackle issues of terminology “on air” highlights this deep knowledge of the power of public discourses.

Particularly, the heads of Generation 2.0 RED have created a group of 9 individuals of migrant origin, who are promoted as the main faces of the second generation, and train them on matters such as the “right” terminology to refer to themselves and the issue in general, how to avoid trap questions, such as “how Greek do you feel” or “what is the difference between nationality and citizenship”, as well as how to answer to questions regarding specific clauses of the draft bill. Practicing is an ongoing process and interviewees are trained via personal discussions before and after the interviews. During the fieldwork period I had the chance to observe closely how they prepare the interviewees before the actual interview. The main advices that were repeated to the interviewees can be summarized in the following quotes: “You do not have to answer to questions that you don’t like”, “Use your personal story and drama but do not victimize yourself”, “Stay updated on the details regarding the draft bill”. The constant discussions with the interviewees before the interview and the “anxiety” of the heads to see how did it go afterwards, are telling signs of “media savvy” (McCurdy, 2012) people that try to be in control.

Furthermore, Nikos indicated that using personal stories and drama is crucial for the campaign but can also backfire if not deployed carefully. He recognized that media are traditionally attracted by negative incidents and personal drama stories, underlining their strategic use in articles and texts, something that was confirmed in the CDA results. However, he underlined that “too much drama will not be good”, as it constructs the image of

a victim. Specifically, they explained that even though negativity, conflict and drama offers what the media logic asks for, they avoid it because it can harm their cause. In Anta's words,

I don't want the image of these people to be constructed as miserable and poor fellows who claim the Greek citizenship as if it is a charity thing. I do not care about what "sells" to media

Since their goal is to be recognized as equal and important participants in the citizenship debate, too much drama would draw attention away from their arguments and potential role, and would exclude them from the "real" battlefield, meaning the political scene. In the same discussion, I pointed out the absence of "racism" and the Golden Dawn. As they confirm, during interviews they are commonly asked about racist incidents and if they have ever been victims of racist violence and hate speech. However, they strategically avoid these questions and any reference to the Golden Dawn.

We have made a conscious choice to... because if you have noticed, the past years, everything needs to be connected to the Golden Dawn. Not everything has to do with them. Racism existed way longer before the Golden Dawn (...) It is not the Golden Dawn that brought racism. Racism brought the Golden Dawn (...) Moreover; we do not want to attract their attention. We have no reason put ourselves in a position where we would have to talk with people who do not consider us human beings.
(Anta)

Moreover, when I pointed out the absence of the word "racism" and its derivatives in their documents, Nikos confirmed that they consciously avoid the term because it is linked with negative sentiments and it implies that there are racists and victims of racism. However, Anta made a different remarkable observation:

Generally we try to avoid the labels. Because if we use some words over and over again, after a while they lose their power, their significance (...) I believe that in 90s if you accused someone of being fascist, it was something big. There was a special weight to the word (...) every behavior that we do not like, we describe it as fascism. It is not like that though. It can be sexism, racism, homophobia; it can be anything but it is not necessarily fascism.

It is revealed that “racism” for her, is “another label” that can have any meaning and that should be carefully employed in order to maintain its deeper ideological meaning. Using the example of “fascism”, she argues that such terms are fluid and their meaning is subject to change over the time and in correspondence to the sociopolitical context. This approach implies that we should not describe any incident that we do not like as racism, because this would distort the deeper ideological meaning of the term and would make us unable “to see the distinctions and the different levels” of the phenomenon.

Drawing on these remarkable observations and the CDA results, going back to the main questions that arose from the theoretical framework of this project, with respect to racism, anti-racism and their interrelation, it is implied that for Generation 2.0 RED there is not a specific type of racism against which the anti-racist discourse is built. Rather, they adopt a wider anti-racist political and social perspective on issues of discrimination that has as a cornerstone the right of the individual to be self-realized, free to exercise his/her rights and free from any kind of discrimination. *Anti-racism* is a worldview (Anthias and Lloyd, 2002) and *citizenship* is a tool to achieve their goal.

Specifically, citizenship is perceived as the incarnation of this right to be self-realized and autonomous. It is addressed in terms of “belonging” and it is claimed as a fundamental human right. As shown in the CDA results as well as in the above incidents, children of migrant origin are defined by their relation to Greek co-citizens and by their active participation in the society, emphasizing on the existing integration and social cohesion of a culturally diverse community. Citizenship is both a practice and a legal status (Hall and Held, 1989), and these are mutually dependent. The notion is challenged not only in relation to the people of migrant origin, but also, from a general perspective, in relation to the “New Generation of Greek Citizens”, that sets free both Greeks and the second generation from consolidated ideas regarding who “belongs” to the society and what does belonging mean.

This universalistic approach of citizenship is constructed via the constant repetition the notions of equality, diversity and right, and via discursive choices that reject a politically correct discourse, in an effort to re-define and re-frame the “different”. They are not building the social character and the discourse of the organization against racism, xenophobic attitudes and the rise of the Golden Dawn, as this would force them to concentrate on the negativities and the dichotomies created and promoted by others, and to engage to a discourse that entails racism. However, this does not mean that they are not preoccupied with racist attitudes and phenomena, or the rise of the Golden Dawn and its violent practices against immigrants, as

they condemn and engage to this battlefield via multiple practices, such as their participation to European Network against Racism and the Golden Dawn Watch¹⁴.

The fact that they recognize the power of discourse to influence the self-perception of children of migrant background, the dominant ideologies on the citizenship issue and the political debate, as well as the fact that they strategically use drama and personal stories to attract media attention, but avoid constructing their image in a negative way, rejecting “too much drama” - that would stigmatize their discourse as dramatic and undermine their active role in the debate, as political elites and media would see them just as a grievance group, without valuable argumentation – implies that they are not just “media savvy” (McCurdy, 2012). In fact, I argue all these indicate that they manage to manipulate in their own way media attention and play by the rules, elements that will be further illuminated in the following section.

4.3 “Non-Media” People in the Pursuit of Media Attention

An important finding of my fieldwork experience was that Generation 2.0 RED maintains strong and strategic relationships with important and well known journalists. The publication of texts of the organization to *Protagon* (G1, G7, G9, G10, O1, and P1), the fourth most visited portal in Greece, founded by well-known and respected in the field journalists, constitutes a valuable example of strategic media “alliances”.

Nikos explained to me that the strategic advantage they have, since the very first steps of the organization, is mainly the fact that when they founded “Generation 2.0” in 2006, there was no other official representative of people of migrant origin in Greece. Other anti-racist organizations and institutions that were interested in the issue of citizenship were not focused only to this and sometimes appeared inappropriate sources for the media because of lack of actual contacts with second generation representatives. The opportunity for media attention was exactly this lack of spokesmen for interviews with children of migrant background, when the issue was high in the media agenda. The creation of the first blog and Niko’s participation in the editorial team of *Protagon* were the very first steps for the creation of Generation 2.0

¹⁴ “Golden Dawn Watch” (GDW) is an initiative aiming to monitor the trial against Golden Dawn, organized by the Hellenic League for Human Rights, the Greek Observatory against Fascism and Racist Speech in the Media, which works as part of the Educational Foundation of ESIEA (Journalists’ Union of Athens Daily Newspapers), the Antifascist League of Athens and Piraeus, and the City of Athens Migrants’ Integration Council. The main aspect of this initiative is the website goldendawnwatch.org, through which they publish information concerning Golden Dawn’s actions and illuminate all aspects of the trial, offering continuous and reliable information and analysis from specialists, lawyers and the monitoring team of GDW. Generation 2.0 RED is responsible of information dissemination in immigrants’ communities and international groups and organizations on the GD trial.

RED. The blog became a reference point for journalists that wanted to cover the issue of second generation and cooperation with well-known journalists created a small network that in the future proved to be very useful.

This information is of special importance because an important clarification is indicated. In the case of Generation 2.0 RED, according to the members of the organization, they wanted media attention but also, media were asking for them. The issue was high in the political agenda, and therefore in the media agenda, but nobody knew for whom this whole debate is happening. Drawing on this, it is implied that the organization gained easily and quickly media attention, because it flourished in times that the political elites and the society “were asking for them” (quote from my fieldwork diary, attributed to Nikos).

Firstly, it was important to write about the issue and us. We started writing a lot and we sent our texts to the media. We were in control of what was published as we have written it. After that, the organization started gradually functioning as a reference point for journalists when they wanted to cover the citizenship issue, Internet appointed us as the right source, via the blog (Anta)

However, this does not mean that they had no trouble to maintain this attention and especially to promote their preferred framing and terminology to the society and the political arena, something that is pursued by the implementation of online and offline practices.

4.3.1 Media Practices: Online and Offline Communication

The practices that the organization employs in order to promote the campaign “Equal Citizens: More Greeks like Me” can be distinguished mainly in online and offline practices, as shown in the table below. To start with, it is obvious that Internet and new media play a decisive role in the organization’s function, as they are the main channels of information dissemination and mobilization of supporters and media. But let’s take a closer look on how they engage with journalists and how they use the below mentioned social media in practice.

Table: 4.4: Online and Offline Practices

<i>Online Practices</i>	<i>Offline Practices</i>
Blog/Webpage (petition)	Social and Cultural Events → Media Events And Lobby Efforts
Press Releases	
Mailing Lists	
Facebook	
Twitter	
Instagram	
YouTube	
Online radio station	

Press releases are written mostly when a specific relevant event or political development takes place, as indicated also in the titles of the analyzed texts (P1-P5). While I was there, only one press release was written and that concerned the preparation of the new draft bill. Press releases are promoted in media and specific journalists, as well as to their subscribed members via e-mailing lists. According the authors, the language of the press releases is more technical, as it is important to show that they have specific knowledge on the issue, and the tone is usually stricter and more denunciatory – something that was confirmed in the CDA – as this is more likely to get covered. Specifically, the press release that was written when I was there, was changed and adapted to a more friendly and simple tone to be published on their facebook page. Particularly, technical references and legal language that was used in the press release to comment specific clauses of the draft bill were eliminated.

Drama and the use of individual cases are also employed but, according to Nikos, do not ensure the promotion of the text by other media when the issue is not high in the political agenda, something that, because of the theme of the economic crisis, happens quite often. That is the main reason why they do not wait for media to cover their story, but they make it visible themselves using new media and their strategic contacts with journalists.

Their blog, that is now replaced by the official webpage of the organization, e-mailing lists and Facebook, are the main tools of information dissemination and contact with journalists, other organizations and supporters. Specifically, there is one person that is constantly engaged in managing all the social media accounts. Facebook is used to promote relevant articles and comment on political developments, inform and mobilize with respect to future events, but also for personal interactions.

Remarkably worth telling is their engagement with Facebook in terms of interpersonal communication, as they were all working with their own Facebook pages open and were in constant communication with members of the organization as well as people who were asking for legal advice and other information regarding individual cases. I engaged in observing the rate of responses in comments of Facebook posts, and I found out that everyone who asked questions in comments of posts in the official page of the organization received a response, revealing that engagement in the interpersonal level of communication with people, who follow them, appears to be very important for the heads of the organization.

This brings us to the important part of their media strategies, the offline practices they employ in order to promote their cause, as there I confirmed that interpersonal communication and networking are of vital importance for the members of the organization. Their offline activity will be distinguished for analytical reasons in relation with immigrants and relations with journalists, as their offline interaction with both factors is the place where their media strategic advantage was traced.

4.3.2 Relations with Immigrants' Communities

With regard to their relation with immigrants' communities, Generation 2.0 RED provides counseling on paper issues to migrants, youth of migrant background and refugees in Athens and throughout Greece since 2006. In addition, since January 2014, they provide services of cultural mediation, interpretation and translation at the Decentralized Administration and Immigration Office of the Municipality of Athens, servicing in a daily basis up to at least 150-180 third country nationals who come to issue or renew their residence permits. The creation of the organization's department within the Decentralized Administration of Attica and Immigration Office is a result of the initiative of the members of the organization, as explained by Nikos. Having bad personal experiences in the Immigration Office because of lack of staff or knowledge and untrained to immigration codes staff, gave the organization the incentive to make the proposal for this cooperation.

Visiting their department in the Immigration Office with Nikos was of great insight. The building is generally old and "sad" in terms of maintenance. However, the offices of Generation 2.0 RED in the building differ radically, creating a friendly towards immigrants' environment. Specifically, having the walls covered with the organization's posters and addressing to immigrants' in a friendly and simple way, two elements that are not observed in the rest of the Immigration Office, is what makes the department of Generation 2.0 RED so distinct. The employees of their department are young and trained in intercultural mediation

by the heads of Generation 2.0 RED. The atmosphere in their offices is noticeably different in relation to the rest of the Immigration Offices, mainly because of the employees' attitude towards immigrants, which is more friendly and polite than in the rest of the service. When Niko's entered the offices, people that were waiting to be serviced welcomed him, indicating not only that they recognize him but also a kind of "inside trust".

Similar incidents took place at the offices of the organization as well. Specifically, during the fieldwork period, immigrants and people of migrant origin were visiting the office of Generation 2.0 RED mainly for legal advice or to subscribe for a project called "LeFamSol"¹⁵, in which the organization was responsible for the recruitment of African women. The door of the offices was always open in order for visitors "to feel immediately welcomed", as indicated by Nikos, and coffee was offered to them while they were waiting, elements of hospital behavior, that immigrants' never see in authorities like the Decentralized Administration in Greece. Everyone was extremely careful, polite and patient with every case, even when the person was not in a position to explain clearly what she/he wanted or what the issue was.

These observations are of great value with respect to the role of Generation 2.0 RED in "building bridges" between the immigrants' communities and other institutions, something that eventually functions also as a great advantage in the organization's relation with media, as shown in the following section. Specifically, Nikos pointed out that other organizations that operate in the field of immigrants' rights in Greece are not trusted by the communities, something that creates a problem to both of them.

It is really difficult to win the trust of immigrant communities. There are projects run by institutions of the state, like Universities, or governmental structures, that aim and are able to help them, but they do not trust them. And it is normal. I think that we have managed to win their trust because we do not advocate "for them", but "with them". I mean... there are a lot of other organizations like us... I know them... I am working with them...but their approach or their style, I don't know...is not appealing to those people (...) we have created a bridge. I can say that. I can see it. Because both sides call us to ask for the other (Nikos)

¹⁵ "LeFamSol" is held by the University of Peloponnese, Koc University and Institute for Qualification and Requalification. The project is taking place simultaneously in three partner countries, Greece, Italy and Turkey, and its final goal is the creation of three "solidarity reference points" for African women and retrospective migrant communities, NGO's and the public sector.

The organization has managed to play a decisive role, the one of the mediator between the immigrants' communities and governmental structures and institutions. This is a result of their professional approach to the issue of citizenship. Firstly, they do not demand "citizenship granting for everyone right now" – as others, according to them, are doing – but they apply the knowledge and the experience they have, drawing on specific individual cases. In this way, their voice gains a specific value, as they are not only advocating but they draw on knowledge and experience in immigration policy and the relevant national codes, that governmental representatives and institutions usually do not have, as explained by Nikos.

In addition to the abovementioned ways of personal interaction with immigrants, they have a plan for strengthening cooperation and communication with the communities that is based on "Generation representatives" within every community. They have key contacts of different background and age in specific key neighborhoods. In this way they have managed to create a trustful and efficient relation with the communities, being the mediator and the guarantor for the other side. While I was there, two events took place. One of them was a competition, organized by Impact Hub Athens¹⁶ that would give a prize fund for the best social initiative of the year and the second one was the public discussion with members of Vyrone's Syriza Youth group. Both events were systematically promoted in social media, by a series of posts and invitations to the followers of the organization, specifically, four days before the event, one post was uploaded in a daily basis. However, interestingly, members of the organization in both cases called the "Generation representatives" to inform and ask them personally to mobilize the community to participate in the events. In addition, with respect to Facebook use, the page of the organization is not yet advertised, but there were discussion to use this tool of Facebook for the extension promotion of their page.

These incidents are in line with Cammaerts (2007) valuable insight with regard to the need of activists to maintain an active presence in social media, but keep a balance with interpersonal communication, as face to face interaction with key communities and sympathizers will transform the weak ties, which are created through online presence with supporters, to strong ties.

Another useful example to capture the decisive role of Generation 2.0 RED in actuality and its strategic relation with the communities, is how the organization got the role

¹⁶ Impact Hub Athens is a community that aims to inspire and connect people who, through responsible and sustainable initiatives, can bring social change. The competition Athens Impact is organized in a yearly basis.

of the recruiter in the “LeFamSol” project. When the university contacted directly the communities asking for possible participations, the answer was immediately no. This situation resulted a project for immigrants, without immigrants, and on the other hand, immigrants that wanted lessons of Greek language, one of the project’s offers, but rejected them because of their suspicion towards the institutions. What happened eventually is that both sides called Generation 2.0 RED to ask for information on the other side and the project, a situation that led to the official subcontract between the organization and the university, appointing the organization as the competent for the recruitment of African women.

This case illustrates that the organization has right now a strategic advantage being the coordinator and the mediator of the two sides, bringing them together and showing them the way to trust each other for their mutual benefit. This recognition and acceptance from both sides, as well as the practical engagement of the organization in the field via the creation of their department within the Decentralized Administration, are the key advantage in their relation with journalists.

4.3.3 Relations with Journalists

The relation of Generation 2.0 RED with journalists is based on what was described in the above sections: active online presence, engagement and creation of strong ties with the immigrants’ communities and practical participation of the organization in governmental and other institutions. Via strong and strategic cooperation with the communities and the competent structures there is a diffusion of legitimacy to the organization, something that was detected from journalists. Journalists had Generation 2.0 RED as a reference point for immigration issues and as a source for interviewees especially for the second generation issue.

Interestingly, I observed that in daily basis there were interpersonal contacts with a significant number of journalists. The heads of the organization were talking constantly on the phone and on social media with journalists that “are friends from the past”. From discussions I had with them, I realized that especially the heads of the organization have strong relations with journalists that are in the field for years, something that ensures partly their access to media actors. Partly, because as they indicated, when the issue was not high in the political agenda, it was not covered, even from the “friends”.

My first contacts with journalists and generally media people were personal (...) I became a member of Stavros¹⁷ team and the part concerning the issue of people of migrant origin was exclusively mine. It was really important because we had the opportunity to increase our visibility really fast using their high readership. Via this cooperation, others contacts emerged, and now we have a really good network with trustful people (Nikos)

Having such strategic contacts is therefore recognized by Nikos as an important way of increasing “visibility really fast by using their high readership” and creating a “good network with trustful people”. However this does not mean that the organization had never trouble in terms of media visibility and a positive framing. In this respect, Anta gave me a valuable example that indicates both the struggles regarding their representation and the reaction of the organization to such cases.

It was last November, right before the voting of the new law framework. There was a journalist that you could see she did not know much about the subject. She was with some people who knew a bit more but it was a live shooting for the news so she was in control. And we were outside the building because they wanted to shoot images from the building. You have noticed I guess that sometimes Pakistan immigrants gather right in the corner. So she was taking the interview and right in the background of our girl, one could see almost 30 Pakistan men. And it gets worse, she asked our girl, the interviewee, the following: “What is your opinion about illegal immigration?” You understand how wrong this is. The words illegal immigration and this combined with such a background. And thank god, I was downstairs as well and when I saw what happened I went in front of the camera and interrupted the shooting. We scolded her, me and Nikos. Telling her that if this is aired we will sue them. She tried to deny that she intentionally did that, but anyway then we continued bossing her around. I just explained to her that this, to me and to Nikos, it is our whole live. We cannot play with this. We cannot allow something that wrong. It is better to not go public at all, than to go public like this. And of course we realized that if you do not like something, you have every right to cut it (Anta)

¹⁷ Stavros Thodorakis is a popular journalist, founder of the “Protagon” team, having a portal and a weekly TV show. Recently, he followed a career in politics, and is currently president of the political party, Potami, which won 6, 05% of the vote and has 17 seats in the Parliament.

In the above incident, like in cases with pictures that accompany the articles in newspapers, there is an effort to depict the children of migrant origin as immigrants and promote pictures of poor foreign people, following the rules of what “sells” in the media, as claimers of the citizenship. However, the strict reaction of the members of Generation 2.0 RED indicates their perspective on issues of media representation. The “It is better to not go public at all, than to go public like this” strategy confirms once more that they are aware of the importance of media representations and that they are not willing to draw attention using elements that “sell” such as drama and violence, a statement that is in line with their discourse as well, bearing in mind the absence of “racism” and the Golden Dawn in their texts.

In addition, in discussions we had concerning the participation of the organization in protests and anti-racist demonstrations, it appears that they do not participate but they do use such strategies as main means for media attention. This relates to the scope of their cause, as the citizenship issue constitutes only one aspect of a series of immigration policy problems in Greece. However, observing the amount of festivals and social-cultural events they organized during March and April, indicates that they use “the logic of protests”, converting such events to media events, in an effort to show that diversity is a reason to celebrate and integration is already here.

Specifically, they organized a series of events, parties, seminars and open discussions. During March and April, they held three parties “celebrating diversity” and four public discussions, one of which was the open discussion with the Syriza Youth group that I attended. As they explain, media coverage is not the only goal in all the events. Particularly parties and events of social character aim mainly to attract attention of specific group targets, such as youth or political parties. However, I observed that some events despite their social character are “sold” to media actors and are planned so as to gain media attention. The project “Multiculturalism in Action”¹⁸ is a valuable example of how the organization designs “media events” (McCurdy, 2008).

¹⁸ “Multiculturalism in Action” is sport event that focused on the integration process of young Athenians of different backgrounds, who reside in targeted districts of the city of Athens. This project took place in June 2015. The project sought to bring the inhabitants of specific neighborhoods of Athens together, through a basketball tournament, which was organized in targeted areas. Their aim is to make it an annual basketball event. The strategy of this anti-xenophobia project involves sports events and a main outreach activity, which will involve the creation of a short documentary featuring the tournament, as well as the testimonies of both the local residents and the participants, in order to promote the integration of immigrants and children of migrant background.

For this project I have already contacted the media sponsors and there will also be a camera. We will make a small documentary, with shootings from the event, about multiculturalism and the new generation of these youngsters. Basketball brings them together. In addition, something that adds “media value” to the event is that players who are famous in the basketball field will be there. This alone gives the event another dimension and will promote its “message” in other arenas as well. Lastly, I have already talked with Tsimas¹⁹ to cover it (...)The event is taking place right after the voting of the new draft on citizenship, they will ask for “news” and I am going to give them something to talk about.

As explained in a relevant discussion about the promotion of the event in media and journalists, Nikos pointed out the importance of timing the event with the voting of the new draft bill, expressing their intention to make it newsworthy by taking advantage of the political developments. In this respect, I argue that their strategy in engaging with media is drawing on positivity, rejecting “grievance” as a valuable way to attract media attention and combining the social and cultural aim with the developments in the political scene, as an opportunity for media attention.

The production of the main video of the campaign “Equal Citizens” (G10) happened in a similar, well-coordinated, in terms of timing with political developments, way. Particularly, in November 2014, the issue of citizenship was high in the political and media agenda, as the government of Antonis Samaras was preparing and negotiating the draft bill. The right timing was one of the most important things, according to Nikos and Anta, as this video aimed at introducing the children of migrant background to the society right before the submission of the draft bill. The cooperation with Lakis Lazopoulos²⁰, a highly recognized personality, was also a strategic choice of the organization.

¹⁹ Pavlos Tsimas is a popular Greek journalist.

²⁰ Apostolos "Lakis" Lazopoulos (Greek: Λάκης Λαζόπουλος) is a famous Greek playwright and actor and songwriter. In 2009, he was ranked 83rd by the public in Skai TV's Great Greeks, a TV program for the most influential persons in Greece. In addition, in 2010, Forbes ranked Lazopoulos as the most powerful and influential celebrity in Greece.

We were invited to his show²¹, one year ago. It was our first appearance on TV and we had 15 minutes to talk. It was really positive because his show has a lot of viewers and their age is really wide as well... from 15 to 90. I do not know if people understood it was his voice in the video, though I think that it is easily recognizable. Of course he has as well his own fans and critics but we thought that such a voice over would make the video more visible. Everybody knows him (Anta)

According to Anta and Nikos, the video is of special importance as it depicts the profile of Generation 2.0 RED and explains in a very simple way the issue of citizenship. In addition, right before the submission of the draft bill, the video presented masterfully the main principles and values of the organization, via the repetition of equality, diversity and rights, and introduced the children of migrant background drawing on their relation and ties with Greek co-citizens.

I think that the video was positive. It was not like we were weak people that beg for the citizenship. We told people that we are strong, we are here, we laugh, we participate, and... we are all together. Because if you noticed, some phrases are told by persons who do not have immigrant origin. For example, the “I want my friends to be treated equally”, that indicates the willingness of the Greek society ...of our generation to be all equal. And this was something important that we wanted to show through this video. It is not the campaign of the second generation; it is the campaign of the New Generation of Greek Citizens, who demands equality for their friends, their classmates, with them (Anta)

To close, through these incidents, observing the media practices and strategies implemented by the organization, it appears that they reject grievance, violence and conflict to gain media attention, and instead, they draw on positive marketing approaches. Specifically, they create “media events” and take advantage of the political tension of the time in order to maximize the media value of their “product”. There is also important power diffusion, from their cooperation with immigrants’ communities and the governmental institutions, which transforms into legitimacy, and makes them valuable participants of the

²¹ “Al Tsantiri News” (“Live from the Shack”), aired first in November 2004, is a satirical news bulletin that draws exceptionally high ratings and made Lazopoulos the first actor in Greek television history to host his own weekly show.

debate, because their practical activity in the field. “Friendly”, to use their lexical choice, relations with key journalists contributes decisively to the formation of their media strategies, helping the promotion of the campaign and the creation of a network of trustful journalists that will cover their story positively. Moreover, the members of the organization have important experience in the field of media, which is traceable in the formation of their discourse, in their interactions with media, in the coordination of their events in media logic and other “media savvy” elements such as the exploitation of the right timing and the cooperation with well recognized personalities that will add media value to their “product”.

5 Conclusion

The leading question of this research aimed to reveal *how Generation 2.0 RED functions and advocates the issue regarding the citizenship acquisition within the specific social, political and economic reality of Greece and Europe*. Answering this question was rather a challenge because of the diversity of factors that needed to be taken into consideration and the difficulty to grasp the reality in which the organization operates. Being able to identify the challenges and relate them with the discursive and media practices of the organization was a process that encompassed a lot of thought.

Having spent five months following the developments regarding the issue of citizenship and the reaction of the organization to them and vice versa – as the activities and the discursive practices of the organization influenced the relevant developments as well – I had the chance to understand the interrelation of the factors of time and space and their impact on the organization's effort. The economic crisis, the rise of the extreme-right rhetoric, xenophobia and the racist attacks that have become a daily phenomenon, the evolution of the campaign “Equal Citizens: More Greeks like Me”, media representations of children of migrant background and the political tension that followed the elections of January 2015 constitute some of the most important aspects of the environment of Generation 2.0 RED.

With regard to the roots of the problem, until 1990, Greece was a rather homogeneous country, managing to successfully assimilate the diverse minorities residing on its soil throughout the 19th and 20th century. Greekness was perceived as the core element of the Greek identity, inherited from parents and the nation was perceived as a big family whose members were related through unbreakable blood ties. After the collapse of the Soviet Union many migrants chose Greece as a country of settlement and this was the starting point of the issue of citizenship in Greece. As their children started reaching adulthood the problematic inadequacy of the existing immigration legal frameworks became apparent. Not being able to access the Greek citizenship, those youngsters inherited the migrant status and social representation of their parents. Being perceived as migrants they had to apply for a personal residence permit upon reaching adulthood since they were no longer considered protected family members (Papaioannou, 2013).

The first challenge Generation 2.0 RED had to tackle was the legally migrant status that second generation people inherited from their parents, which functioned as a generative framework of a boundary line between them and their native peers. The second challenge is the representation of this problem. According to Papaioannou (2013) the importance of

communication in consolidating ideas about the nationhood and the Other and the “imagined community” of a nation (Anderson, 1983) were among the most important issues that the organization had overcome in relation to the representation of those youngsters.

In order to answer the research question critically, I first approached the notion of citizenship from a historical perspective, relating it to the notion of the Greek nation; second, I examined the relation of the notion to racism and anti-racism, and understood how these play a decisive role in immigrants’ rights advocacy, and especially in the case of children of migrant background in Greece. Drawing on this theoretical framework enriched the critical discourse analysis of the rhetoric of Generation 2.0 RED and ensured a fruitful cooperation during the fieldwork period.

Following the organization before my visit in Greece and being in contact with them, was of great importance in order to build a significant background and be able to start immediately a fruitful cooperation when I arrived. Ethnography proved to be the most insightful research approach to be able to answer this research question as, after having analyzed the campaign’s discourse, it enabled me to experience the production of this discourse, adding valuable insights to my findings. This experience gave a new dimension to the results of CDA and gave me the time and space to involve practically and observe closely all sorts of activities and choices made by the organization in order to face the above-mentioned challenges.

Specifically, with regard to their discursive choices, Generation 2.0 RED adopts a universalistic and democratic approach on citizenship, addressing the issue in terms of belonging and perceiving the notion as status and practice, that are mutually depended. Belonging and integration in the Greek society are shown emphasizing on the existing bonds and relations between the second generation and the Greek peers. In addition, children of migrant background are “de-connected” from the immigrant status of their parents focusing on the fact that they “were born and/or raised” in Greece. They are re-introduced through, *positive epithets*, such as “dreamers, achievers, talented, young, powerful”; *their humanity and their sameness* with Greeks, as they “live, love, laugh and cry in Greek” (G8), all together being part of the “New Generation of Greek Citizens”; and *their active participation* in the society. The conceptualization of Hall and Held (1989) that perceives citizenship through membership, rights and duties in reciprocity, and actual participation in the society seems to best describe the approach of Generation 2.0 RED, as in their discourse all three elements are traced and challenged.

The absence of “racism” as well as the distance they chose to keep from the Golden Dawn theme, suggest that they do not perceive anti-racism only as a response to racism, but rather as a worldview that rejects all forms of discrimination and exclusion, and is constructed as an alternative mentality (Anthias and Lloyd, 2002), emphasizing ideal values and principles such as equality, diversity and democracy. Furthermore, I argue that the absence of “race” lexical choices and the direct responsibility attribution to the state and its representatives, is a successful strategy of addressing the issue, as in this way, nobody is accused of being racist and nobody is depicted as a victim of racism, while the focus is centered to the competent authorities and the need for action.

With respect to the media strategies they implement in order to gain media visibility and spread their preferred framing and terminology, they engage in online and offline presence and activities that respond to the media demands. Drawing on personal stories and “as much drama as it takes” to attract media attention, as well as “attacking the state” as the main responsible and competent to take action, respond to media demands drawing on their need for drama and conflict. The “side door” of grievance, via protests and demonstrations or other “weird and interesting” ways of getting media attention are rejected (Wolfsfeld, 2004), and instead, legitimacy comes from the strategic networking of the organization with all the players of the field, namely alliances with immigrants’ communities and key personalities.

Generation 2.0 RED members are *allies* with the immigrants’ communities, *co-workers and partners* with the governmental institutions, and *friends, colleagues and valuable sources* for the journalists. Being useful and important to all the important parts of the debate and engaging in a multidisciplinary way to the field of anti-racism constitute the “side door” (Wolfsfeld, 2004) for Generation 2.0 RED, as this networking provides them legitimacy and transforms them not only to important media practitioners, but also important interlocutors.

Specifically, their discourse, their experience as well as the ways they engage with media actors reveal that they have special knowledge and potential in the field, which does not appear to be that “lay” (McCurdy, 2012), but rather, remarkably *multidisciplinary and professional*, meeting successfully the multiple challenges of activism. With respect to this observation, *relational scholarship* (McCurdy, 2012) seems more well-suited to examine relations between activists and mass media, as activists “do not simply enter into a calculated transaction or “contest” with media at the time of social and political conflict, but consume, share, negotiate, resist, and relax to and with them” (McCurdy, 2012, p. 251), especially

activist organizations that have much more narrowed and specific scope, like in the case of this research.

Drawing on the above described findings, I argue that Generation 2.0 RED constitutes an activist organization that engages in a novel way to the issue of citizenship, and has managed to get media attention despite the alleged anti-immigrant sentiments in Greece and Europe, employing multidisciplinary knowledge and experience to meet successfully the challenges that arise in such environments. With respect to the declared scientific relevance of this research, aiming to explore how new language influences dominant ideologies and potentially national policies (Detant, 2005; Favell 1997), it is suggested that the promotion of alternative discursive and linguistic choices do have significant impact on the public discourse and can change the perspective of the society over an issue, and therefore the relevant national policy. Last, I also consider that networking, rational argumentation and drawing on positivity are the key elements that made the organization successful in communicating their campaign, illustrating a novel case of activism and campaigning and suggesting a special way of activism that addresses specific and narrow scope national issues.

5.1 Limitations, Practical Implications, and Future Research

Finally, it is necessary to acknowledge the research's shortcomings. The research period in relation to the organization's and the campaign's lifetime is rather short, a disproportionality that can question if the researcher had enough time to explore in depth the environment of the organization and the campaign on the issue of citizenship. However, the fact that the first discussions with members of the organization regarding the construction of the counter rhetoric and the relevant political developments as well as their representation on media, started already from February 2015, extends the research period further. In addition, the fact that the discourse analysis took place mostly before my visit in Greece offered me the opportunity to discuss the results of the analysis with members of the organization, a process which proved to be of great value, ensuring respondent validation (Mack et al., 2005).

Moreover, bearing in mind that the campaign is still ongoing and the new draft bill is expected to be put on vote within the following months, it is important to mention that Generation 2.0 RED seems to be optimistic with regard to the new draft bill. Despite the fact that the campaign is not to be judged in terms of success or failure depending on the luck of the new draft bill, the comments on OpenGov.gr²² are of great insight. A lot of comments focused mainly on the attributed meaning to the notion of citizenship, revealing that despite

²² See footnote no. 6

the acknowledgement of the need for legal recognition of children of migrant background, a significant part of the Greek society still sees them and wants them to remain “second-class citizens”.

Specifically, the debate – and the confusion I would say – around *citizenship* on the comments in OpenGov is related to the two corresponding Greek words, *ιθαγένεια* (*ithagenia*) and *υπηκοότητα* (*ipikootita*). Both words correspond to the English word *citizenship* and legally do not differ. However the very notion of the two words, being formed in the age of kingdoms, entails a significant difference that provokes a special confusion. *Ιθαγένεια* (*ithagenia*), which is the commonly used word and the official wording of the relevant laws, is perceived as *nationality*, expressing the unbreakable blood bonds on the Greek nation. *Υπηκοότητα* (*ipikootita*), is the word that expresses the political membership of an individual to a specific emperor or king. The confusion between the terms became rather apparent when the Act 3838/2010 was voted. Particularly, some of its opponents appeared flexible in granting citizenship to the children of migrant origin, but were negative in “granting nationality”, focusing on the specific word, its meaning and how it expresses a different “belonging”. They perceived nationality as something one was born with, while citizenship was something that could be acquired, claiming “that all those who perceived the two terms as synonymous were making a terrible mistake; confusing the natural fact of being born as a member of a specific nation with an administrative act, granting citizenship or even more becoming a citizen of a State” (Papaioannou, 2013, p. 71).

A significant number of comments on the draft bill focused on this terminology, illuminating two aspects of the issue. First, the failure of the competent authorities to clarify that the two words are used in all legal documents, Acts and in international law as synonymous (Christopoulos 2012:279). Second, the persistence on the need to use solely the term *υπηκοότητα* (*ipikootita*) reveals the denial of a part of the Greek society to accept children of migrant background as equal citizens, suggesting a status of second-class citizenry, and indicates the powerful sense of *nationhood* (Vertovec and Cohen, 2002) of the Greek society. The issue is worthy of future research and suggests itself, especially after the latest developments regarding the immigration policies implemented in Greece and throughout Europe.

However, taking the advice of members of Generation 2.0 RED to compare the comments on the draft of the Act 3838 in 2010 and those of the new draft bill, the Greek society, despite the debate on the best suited terminology, appears more progressive and

open. While now the majority of the comments refer to the confusion regarding the terminology, in 2010 the comments expressed violently and absolutely the denial of the society to grant citizenship to second generation.

Drawing from there and with respect to the social relevance of this project that aimed to explore the social impact of the whole project named Generation 2.0 RED, I consider this development, the media attention gained by the organization and the wide support of the new framing of second generation by media and politicians, despite the current human crisis of the country, a rather optimistic framework for the future of the organization, the children of migrant origin and the Greek society as whole.

6 Literature and References

- Amnesty International Report (2014). Το ανθρώπινο κόστος του φρουρίου Ευρώπη [Human price of Fortress Europe]. Amnesty International Ltd. Peter Benenson House. United Kingdom. Retrieved from: http://www.amnesty.org.gr/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/fortress_europe_report.pdf
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London, Verso.
- Anthias, F. (1998a). Rethinking social divisions: Some notes towards a theoretical framework, *Sociological Review* 46(3), 506–35. doi: 10.1111/1467-954X.00129
- Anthias, F. (2001). The concept of social division and theorising social stratification: Looking at ethnicity and class. *Sociology*, 35(4), 835-854. doi: 10.1017/S0038038501008355.
- Anthias, F., & Lloyd, C. (2002). *Rethinking anti-racisms: From theory to practice*. Routledge.
- Balibar, E. (1990). Paradoxes of universality. In D. Goldberg (Ed.) *Anatomy of Racism*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, (p. 283–294).
- Cammaerts, B. (2005), ICT-Usage among transnational social movements in the networked society – to organise, to mobilise and to debate. In R. Silverstone (ed.), *Media, Technology and Everyday Life in Europe: From Information to Communication*, Aldershot: Ashgate, (p. 53–72).
- Cammaerts, B. (2007). Media and communication strategies of glocalized activists: beyond media-centric thinking. In B. Cammaerts & N. Carpentier *Reclaiming the media: Communication rights and expanding democratic media roles*, (p. 265-288).
- Carroll, W. K., & Ratner, R. S. (1999). Media strategies and political projects: A comparative study of social movements. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 1(34). doi: 10.2307/3341476
- Carvalho, A., (2008). Media (ted) discourse and society. *Journalism Studies*, 9(2), 161-177, doi: 10.1080/14616700701848162
- Christopoulos, D. (2012). *Ποιός είναι Έλληνας Πολίτης; Το καθεστώς ιθαγένειας από την ίδρυση του ελληνικού κράτους ως τις αρχές του 21ου αιώνα* [Who is a Greek Citizen? Citizenship acquisition from the foundation of the Greek State until the beginning of the 21st century], Athens: Βιβλιόραμα.
- Cottle, S., (2008). Reporting demonstrations: The changing media politics of Dissent. *Media, Culture and Society* 30(6), 853–872. doi: 10.1177/0163443708096097

- Detant, A., (2005). The politics of anti-racism in Belgium: A qualitative analysis of the discourse of the anti-racist movement Hand in Hand in the 1990s. *Ethnicities*, 5(2), 183-215. doi: 10.1177/1468796805052116
- Erjavec, K. (2001). Media representation of the discrimination against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The case of Slovenia. *Discourse & Society*, 12(6), 699–727. doi: 10.1177/0957926501012006001
- European Commission. (2014). The EU explained: Economic and monetary union and the euro [Report]. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/pol/pdf/flipbook/en/economic_and_monetary_union_and_the_euro_en.pdf
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Pearson Education.
- Fakiolas, R. (1999). Socio-economic effects of immigration in Greece. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9(3), 211-229. doi: 10.1177/095892879900900302
- Fakiolas, R. (2003). Regularizing undocumented immigrants in Greece: Procedures and effects, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(3), 535-561, doi: 10.1080/13691830305614
- Favell, A. (1997). Citizenship and immigration: Pathologies of a progressive philosophy, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 23(2), 173-195, doi: 10.1080/1369183X.1997.9976585
- Gamson, W. & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and media as interacting systems. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 528(1): 114–125.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Guiraudon, V. (2000). European integration and migration policy: Vertical policy-making as venue shopping. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38(2), 251-271. doi: 10.1111/1468-5965.00219
- Guiraudon, V. (2003). The constitution of a European immigration policy domain: a political sociology approach. *Journal of European public policy*, 10(2), 263-282. doi: 10.1080/1350176032000059035
- Hall, S. & Held, D. (1989). Citizens and citizenship. *New times: The changing face of politics in the 1990s*, 173-188.
- Herzfeld, M. (1992). *The social production of indifference: exploring the symbolic roots of western bureaucracy*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press. doi: 10.1525/aa.1996.98.3.02a00550

- Houtum, H., & Pijpers, R., (2007). The European Union as a gated community: The two-faced border and immigration regime of the EU. *Antipode*, 39(2), 291-309. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2007.00522.x
- Human Rights Watch, (2014, March 24). Greece: Human Rights Watch submission to the United Nations Committee against Torture. [Press Release]. Retrieved from: <http://www.hrw.org/news/2014/03/24/greece-human-rights-watch-submission-united-nations-committee-against-torture>.
- Jayasuriya, L. (1991). Citizenship, democratic pluralism and ethnic minorities in Australia. *Immigration & the Politics of Ethnicity & Race in Australia & Britain*, London: Bureau of Immigration Research Australia, Sir Robert Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, University of London, 27-43.
- Jørgensen, M. & W., Phillips, L. J., (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.
- Juris, J. S. (2008). *Networking futures: The movements against corporate globalization*. Duke University Press.
- Kasimis, C. & Kassimi, C. (2004). Greece: A history of migration. Migration information source, June 2004. Retrieved from: <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=228>
- Kofman, E., (2002). Contemporary European migrations, civic stratification and citizenship. *Political geography*, 21(8), 1035-1054. doi:10.1016/S0962-6298(02)00085-9
- Kuptsch, C. (2012). The economic crisis and labour migration policy in European countries. *Comparative Population Studies*, 37(1-2). doi: 10.4232/10.CPoS-2011-17en
- Lloyd, C. (1998). *Discourses of antiracism in France*. Ashgate Pub Limited.
- Maanen, J. (1982). Fieldwork on the beat. In J. Van Maanen, J.M. Dabbs, R.R. Faulkner. *Varieties of qualitative research*, (p.103-151).
- Mack, N. W. C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G. & Namey, E. (2005). Qualitative research methods: a data collectors' field guide. Retrieved from: <http://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/Qualitative%20Research%20Methods%20-%20A%20Data%20Collector's%20Field%20Guide.pdf>
- Macpherson, W. (1999). The Stephen Lawrence inquiry, report of an inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny [Report]. London: Stationery Office, *Parliamentary papers*, Cm, 4262, 3-10

- Maragidou, M (30 Jan. 2015). Generation 2.0 is celebrating, *Vice*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.vice.com/gr/read/party-generation-2-0>
- McCurdy, P. (2012). Social movements, protest and mainstream media. *Sociology Compass*, 6(3), 244-255. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00448.x
- McCurdy, P. (2011). Theorizing activists “Lay theories of media”: A case study of the Dissent! Network at the 2005 G8 summit.’ *International Journal of Communication* 5, 619–38.
- McCurdy, P. (2008). Inside the media event: Examining the media practices of Dissent! At the Hori-Zone eco-village at the 2005 G8 Gleneagles summit. *Communications*, 33(3), 295–311. doi: 10.1515/COMM.2008.019
- Muižnieks, N. (2013). Report of Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, following his visit to Greece, 28 January-1 February 2013 [Report]. *CommDH* (2013), 6, 16. Retrieved from: <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=2053611>
- Papaioannou, A. (2013). Who can (not) be Greek? Citizenship, Identity and Belonging among youth of sub-Saharan African background in Athens. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from Alma Mater Digital Library. doi: 10.6092/unibo/amdottorato/6038
- Petronoti, M. & Triandafyllidou, A. (2004). Recent immigration flows to Greece. In R. Caftanzoglou & M. Petronoti (Eds.). *Bibliography of Social Sciences on Modern Greek Society*, Special Issue, National Center for Social Research & National Book Center.
- Phillips, L. & Jørgenson, M. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Philo, G. (2007). Can discourse analysis successfully explain the content of media and journalistic practice? *Journalism Studies*, 8(2), 175-196. doi: 10.1080/14616700601148804
- Räthzel, N. (1995). Aussiedler and ausländer: Transforming German national identity. *Social Identities*, 1(2), 263-282. doi:10.1080/13504630.1995.9959436
- Richardson, J. E. (2008). Language and journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 9(2), 152-160. doi: 10.1080/14616700701848139
- Selingerova, M. (2014). Ideological discourse in the Czech and British Press treatment of Roma minority in comparative perspective. (Master Thesis). Erasmus University Rotterdam, June 2014.
- Vertovec, S. & Cohen, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*. Oxford University Press.

- Taylor, S. J. & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource*. (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley
- Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 11(1), 7-49. doi: 10.1177/0957926500011001002
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1992). Discourse and the denial of racism. *Discourse & Society*, 3(1), 87-118. doi: 10.1177/0957926592003001005
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & society*, 4(2), 249-283. doi: 10.1177/0957926593004002006
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). New(s) racism: A discourse analytical approach. In S. Cottle (Ed.), *Ethnic minorities and the media* (p. 33–49). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Discourse and racism. *The Blackwell companion to racial and ethnic studies*, 145-159. doi: 10.1002/9780470753460.ch20
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). Racist discourse. In E. Cashmore (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies* (p. 351–355). London: Routledge.
- Wieviorka, M. (1997). Is it so difficult to be an anti-racist?. In P. Werbner and T. Modood (Eds). *Debating cultural hybridity: multi-cultural identities and the politics of anti-racism*, (p. 139-53).
- Wodak, R. (2000). The rise of racism - an Austrian or a European phenomenon? *Discourse & Society*, 11(1), 5–6. doi:10.1177/0957926500011001001
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (p. 63–94). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of critical discourse analysis. *ZfAL*, 36, 5-31. Retrieved from http://userpages.uni-koblenz.de/~diekmann/zfal/zfalarchiv/zfal36_1.pdf
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2004). *Making sense of media and politics: Five principles in political communication*. Taylor & Francis.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1991). The citizenship debate: Women, ethnic processes and the state. *Feminist Review*, 39(39), 58-68. doi: 10.2307/1395439
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). Women, citizenship and difference. *Feminist review*, 4(27). Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1395799>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). The 'multi-layered citizen'. *International feminist journal of politics*, 1(1), 119-136. doi: 10.1080/146167499360068

- Yuval-Davis, N. (2001). 3 Some reflections on the questions of citizenship and anti-racism. F. Anthias and C. Lloyd (Eds). *Rethinking anti-racisms: From theory to practice*, (p. 44-53).
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2004). 10 Borders, boundaries, and the politics of belonging. In D. S. May, T. Modood & J. Squires. *Ethnicity, nationalism, and minority rights*, (p. 214-236)
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2007). Intersectionality, Citizenship and Contemporary Politics of Belonging, *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 561-574. doi: 10.1080/13698230701660220

7 Appendices

Appendix A

Tables of overview of the analytical steps applied to the textual material. The approach draws on the by the following CDA researchers: Fairclough (1989), Van Dijk (1992, 1993b, 1995, 2000), Teo (2000), Wodak (2001), Erjavec (2001), Selingerova (2014)

Appendix A1: Macro-level Pattern Analysis

<i>Level of Analysis</i>	Pattern analyzed	Ideological significance
<i>Macro-level</i>	Headlines and Leads	Setting the tone for the rest of the article, influencing the reading of micro-structure, evaluative charge
	Quotation Patterns	Providing space for expression to different speakers, means of argumentation and perspectivation indicating that the journalist is not accounted for, ideologically significant selection of quotes
	Lexical Cohesion	Creating a coherent image of a group within the article's body through the repetitive use of certain epithets and lexical choices
	Over-lexicalization	Marking group's deviance from the norm by employing surplus of lexical epithets, which are otherwise not employed
	<i>Generalization</i>	Simplification, essentializing the members of a group, rendering individuals less complex, creating illusion of a homogenous group

Appendix A2: Micro-level Pattern Analysis

<i>Level of analysis</i>	Pattern Analyzed	Ideological significance
<i>Micro-Level</i>	<i>Transitivity</i>	Clause transformation: ascribing/concealing responsibility, activation/passivization of subjects
	<i>Local meanings</i>	Seemingly neutral words designated for a group, its behaviour, characteristics – in fact pejorative
	<i>Rhetorical Figures</i>	Leading rhetorical devices (metaphors, personification, synecdoche, euphemism), providing evaluation, amplification/mitigation of the propositions
	<i>Lexical Choice</i>	Evaluative choice of the journalist, leading subjective selection

Appendix B

Andromache Papaioannou, 32

Co-founder and member of Generation 2.0 RED, Greek

PhD in International Cooperation and Sustainable Development Policies, University of Bologna,

Thesis title: “Who can (not) be Greek? Citizenship, identity and belonging among youth of Sub-Saharan African background in Athens”

Andromache (for short Anta) engaged with the organization more actively from 2010. The following interview took place in the office of Generation 2.0 RED the first week of my visit in Greece. Many of the issues discussed below were discussed off the record before the interview as well as after the interview.

- You are one of the main people who write the texts of the organization. Would you like to tell me what do you have in mind when you write the texts and how you became one of the main writers?
- Yes... When I first came to the organization in 2010, there was no specific plan...I mean there were goals and a background against which the orientation of the organization was constructed, but everything was more fluid, especially regarding the image of the organization to the media. As the time went by and the organization grew bigger, we realized it was important to be more careful about our image in the media and more consistent not only to what we say, but also to the way we say it...we should figure out what vocabulary was the best to use but also how we are going to work with the media in order to get them to cover and promote it. Firstly, it was important to write about the issue and us. We started writing a lot and we sent our texts to the media. We were in control of what is published as we have written it. After that, the organization started gradually functioning as a reference point for journalists when they wanted to cover the citizenship issue. But of course this came naturally, over the time, as the organization gained visibility, the more they would contact us for interviews, as a reference point. Now...One of the main reason I started writing the texts of the organization was that because of my previous work and studies I was more comfortable to do it and I could realize easier what using specific words would mean...I could see what we would lose or win from the terminology we choose to use. So like that we started using a specific vocabulary and generally style of what we claim, how we claim and why we claim it. The words are powerful. We first decided the terms we were going to use to refer to the children of migrant background and secondly, the terminology for the immigrants in general. It was wrong to refer to this group of people as “immigrants” and the problem was what it really means for them to be referred to as “immigrants”. The word “immigrants” has the power to make everything else disappear. I do not think that the word corresponds to these

people, as they were born and raised in Greece. Immigration is a conscious personal choice and it does not apply to the case of these people. Let alone, that the background of someone's parents should not define his/her identity and future.

- And this is also one of the main arguments of the organization...
- Yes. Starting from the terminology used for the citizenship acquisition, the dominant way to refer to those children is "second generation immigrants" ...and this comes along with their stigmatization as immigrants. The emphasis is on the word immigrant. I do not accept this word because in this way one creates a wrong depiction of these people. Firstly as we said before, they were born here so they cannot be immigrants. Secondly, in this way one also makes the society as a whole to treat these people as immigrants while they are not. So "second generation immigrant" also emphasizes the word immigrant. Or also "second generation" is also not appropriate, but sometimes we use it as well to be clear to whom we refer to, but generally "youngsters of migrant origin or background" is the terminology we promote. The association many people make puts this group in a position where they are depicted as poor people who beg for citizenship. And no this is not true at all. And I don't want the image of these people to be constructed as miserable and poor fellows that claim the Greek citizenship as if it is a charity thing. I also don't like to present them in negative terms. One basic thing is the terminology used to refer to these people. As an anthropologist, but also as a human being, I don't want to use this term. I consider it unacceptable to call them immigrants. The term is not right. How can they be immigrants, since they were born and raised here? The word "immigrants" has the power to make everything else disappear. In addition, I do not think that the word corresponds to these people, as they were born and raised in Greece. Immigration is a conscious personal choice and it does not apply to the case of these people. Let alone, that the background of someone's parents should not define his/her identity and future
- And how do you think this new terminology works out after all?
- Well... we also realized that people who are in favor of the citizenship acquisition as well as the people of migrant background themselves they were using the term "immigrant". They are born here and they say "We, the immigrants..." without being aware of what they are saying, they are reproducing one dichotomy. They even use the word "illegal immigrant". And when you tell him/her that this is wrong, he/she asks you "what is the alternative?" This is what we want to offer. Because that is the point when one realizes how important it is to use the right words. For the image you construct for the other but also for oneself. Obviously the use of a specific terminology over another is to serve specific interests and... how should I put it? In this case it aims at creating a specific atmosphere of fear and xenophobia.
- Yes. I understand.

- Actually they demonize the other so that they can use him as the scapegoat for anything bad is happening. To accuse him. Now with regard to our own texts, we realized it was important to write instead of letting others covering us, as I told you before we started writing a lot and promoting our texts to other media, but giving them a ready text for example.
- How did you manage to build relations with journalists? Cause from what we have discussed so far I see that you have a network of people with whom you now work on a regular, let's say, basis.
- We had huge problems with journalists. They insisted using the wrong terms. Personally, before publishing something, I ask them to send it to me for a check. Most of them are cooperative in this part. They send the texts to me. Usually I put that as a requirement actually...like "if I don't see the text before it goes public, we're not doing the interview. It is very simple. We were played in the past so now we are strict. I think that we have to control our public image. And I don't want the image of these people to be constructed as miserable and poor fellows who claim the Greek citizenship as if it is a charity thing. I do not care about what "sells". This is my life. This is Niko's life. If it's not going to be as I want it, then it better stay unpublished
- So how did you react in such cases?
- Look...In the beginning, when we were still inexperienced, when someone, intentionally or unintentionally, distorted an interview, let's say, we had the reaction of "ok...we are no cooperating with you again". If someone was not willing to accept our own corrections, we were not willing to work with him again. That was one thing. It was hard because we wanted attention but we struggled to stay in control of our image... After a while, though, and especially now, we have managed to have a better relation with the journalists. From the point where we had one or two interviews every time there was something going on regarding the citizenship law, now we say no to people. Now, that the organization is more popular, we have the possibility to choose with whom we're going to work with. At first they would call Nikos or me, but now they call the organization and ask for interviews with second generation people. It is different. As the time goes by, journalists and people in general, begin to understand the issue. This is very positive...it is easier now to do an interview because they are better informed and in the same time, yes...the public opinion I think it is now more positive. It gives us a motivation to keep up.
- I see...now you are in control of your image more and of your texts. So another thing on this...I have noticed that in your texts you do not use the term "racism" that much..is that a strategic choice as well? Do you avoid it?
- Well, no...I do not think so... for this specific word maybe it is something that happens but not really on purpose. But generally we try to avoid the "labels". Because if we use some words over and over again, after a while they lose their power, their significance. For

example, not everyone is fascist. It is impossible to use this term to describe everyone that does something wrong. If we do that, then the notion of fascism will be distorted. We will fail to identify it and consequently fight it. It is important to be precise with such distinctions and differences. I believe that in 90s if you accused someone of being fascist, it was something big. There was a special weight to the word. Now we use it all the time. Every behavior that we do not like, we describe it as fascism. It is not like that though. It can be sexism, racism, homophobia; it can be anything but it is not necessarily fascism. If we use it thoughtlessly, we are not able anymore to see the distinctions and the different levels.

- Speaking of fascism, I have noticed that you do not refer to the Golden Dawn phenomenon and even when you are asked to do so in interviews, I think that you manage to not say much about it.
- We have made a conscious choice to... because if you have noticed, the past years, everything needs to be connected to the Golden Dawn. Not everything has to do with them. Racism existed way longer before the Golden Dawn. It is not a result of the rise of the Golden Dawn. But this is highly promoted by mass media. But this is wrong. It was always like that, it is just that maybe now, because of social media, the problem is more visible. It is not the Golden Dawn that brought racism. Racism brought the Golden Dawn. So we are moving from there. Moreover, we do not want to attract their attention. We have never been targeted as an organization. We are not denying their existence. But we have no reason put ourselves in a position where we would have to talk with people who do not consider us human beings. Equals. It is that simple.
- Ok. Do you want to go back for a while, cause I want you to talk to me about how you managed to get to the phase that you are now and have all this control over your image and the dominant terminology?
- The control over our image and the terminology came after we started writing more. We started sending our texts everywhere we were in control of what is published. After that, the organization started functioning as a reference point for journalists when they wanted to cover the citizenship issue. So when this happened, we had the control over to who is going to be interviewed. We choose those who were able to manage the journalist. That was not possible always, but we tried to protect them. We were not passing around the numbers of the children like that. We invited the journalists to our offices and then we gathered the interviewees. We prepared them beforehand and we were present during the interviews. We want to protect our children. But of course this happened over the time naturally, as the organization gained visibility, the more they would contact us for more interviews.
- Yes I see.
- There is the idea that when a journalist asks a question, the interviewee is obliged to answer. A lot of times journalists ask stupid questions. One time we had to interrupt the shooting

because they did a huge mistake. It was last November, right before the voting of the new law framework. There was a journalist that you could see she did not know much about the subject. She was with some people who knew a bit more but it was a live shooting for the news so she was in control. And we were outside the building because they wanted to shoot images from the building. You have noticed I guess that sometimes Pakistanis gather right in the corner. So she was taking the interview and right in the background of our girl, one could see almost 30 Pakistan men. And it gets worse, she asked our girl, the interviewee, the following: “what is your opinion about illegal immigration?” You understand how wrong this is. The words illegal immigration and this combined with such a background. And thank god, I was downstairs as well and when it happened I went in front of the camera and interrupted the whole thing. We scolded her, me and Nikos. Telling her that if this goes on air we will sue them. She tried to deny that she intentionally did that, but anyway then we continued with be bossing her around. Haha. I just explained to her that this, to me and to Nikos, it is our whole live. We cannot play with this. We cannot allow something that wrong. It is better to not go public at all, than to go public like this. And of course we realized that if you do not like something, you have every right to cut it.

- But of course, having the nerve to manage this situation came by time as you before.
- Yes, of course. The more we experienced, the tougher we were.
- That was a nice story... Well about what you said about the interviewee, the girl. So how do you choose who is going to be interviewed? Tell me about the group of people you have for these cases.
- Yes. We have a group of people, volunteers that help us changing “the face” of the organization every time there is an interviews or something. Because we do not want to show the same people every time. We choose those people that will be able to manage a journalist better. That they feel more comfortable talking about the issue. So we organize short seminars on how to answer this and that, how to avoid or change a question and stuff like that.
- How many people are they?
- We have a basis consisting of eight or nine persons, so that we usually call but as the time goes by we want to train more. But always trained.
- Can you elaborate?
- Yes. To know and be familiar with the law framework and the terminology and to be able to manage a journalist, especially in the case on a live show. It is one thing to send them some questions and I will edit them to make sure everything is ok, and it is another thing to be on air. If you do not know the draft bill, and you do not know what it says, then you are screwed. And as an organization, we have to protect our members. So yes... we train them, via discussions and we repeat the same things, like that you don't have to answer a question that you do not like. The journalist is not you teacher at school that if you do not answer one of his

questions, he will give you a bad grade. Communication. We have organized some seminars with a communication specialist and now we want to continue. But it is ok now, because the journalists have started to get to know the subject and they do not ask that stupid questions anymore...and they also appear to be familiar with our terms, so it is a good thing.

- So the new terminology that you have promoted is influencing according to you the public opinion...there is an impact. Right?
- Well, yes...people gets to know these youngsters. There will always be journalists that will ask you “from 1 to 100, how much Greek do you feel?” yes... there are always these journalists. But you learn to manage them.
- What about the video?
- I think that the video was positive. It was not like we were weak people that beg for the citizenship. We told people that we are strong, we are here, we laugh, we participate, and... we are all together. Because if you noticed, some phrases are told by persons who do not have immigrant origin. For example, the “I want my friends to be treated equally”, that indicates the willingness of the Greek society ...of our generation to be all equal. And this was something important that we wanted to show through this video. It is not the campaign of the second generation; it is the campaign of the New Generation of Greek Citizens, who demands equality for their friends, their classmates, with them.
- Yes. That is evident and I find it really positive and to the point.
- Now about the voiceover? Lazopoulo’s voice. We were invited to his show, one year ago. It was our first appearance on TV and we had 15 minutes to talk. It was really positive because his show has a lot of viewers and their age is really wide as well... from 15 to 90. I do not know if people understood it was his voice in the video, thought I think that it is easily recognizable. Of course he has, as others as well, his own fans and critics but we thought that such a voice over would make the video more visible. Everybody knows him.
- What about the scenario?
- The scenario was written mainly from me, Nikos and Tonia ...and Makis. Makis as an actor helped a lot with the script...we had the general ideas about what we want to show and promote. The concept was ours...then we gave it to the team to organize it more professionally. We wanted something positive, the everyday life, to avoid the racism or the negative aspect and show young people, but not kids...this is something that it was played in video made by the Hellenic League for Human Rights, and everybody thinks that second generation, I will put it like this now, consists of kids. No, it consists of people who are 38 years old by now.
- Yes I understand this. It was really shocking for me too because I had the same idea before starting looking into it closely. So that is something you make clear by promoting young people that just reached the age of 18.

- Yes because we really base our rhetoric on the main issue of this group that is that they have grown up here, they went to school here, they are in Greek universities, so what else do you want to consider them citizens of this country?!

Nikos Deji Odubitan,34

Head of Generation 2.0 RED and one of the founders, born in Athens, Greece from Nigerian parents.

Graduate of the Technical University of Athens in Medical Engineering. Currently, student of the Hellenic Open University in Studies in European Civilization, Humanitarian Studies.

The following interview took place in the office of Generation 2.0 RED the first week of my visit in Greece. Many of the issues discussed below were discussed off the record before the interview as well as after the interview.

- So to start with, I would like you to tell me in your words what is the primary goal of the organization.
- Our primary goal is to get the citizenship issue discussed and also of course to get the Generation 2.0 RED mentioned, as the main representative of children of migrant background. You know...the previous law framework concerning the citizenship acquisition was not protected by the government nor the legislative power. A wrong and distorted idea about the characteristics of the people, who are excluded socially because of the lack of citizenship, was promoted by mass media and politicians, causing the negative and extreme reaction of the Greek society. Someone had to take this responsibility and play this role. Crisis makes the political cost of this issue even heavier. In 2010, after the announcement of the State Council, it was clear that we should move and act more intensely and systematically towards this problem.
- By more systematically you mean that you had to engage more with media and organize more activities to promote your perspective?
- Yes. You know...the basis of this campaign is that people are already within the same society. They are already friends, lovers, classmates. It is very crucial this for our campaign...the already existing bonds between the Greeks and the “Others”...you know change is already here, it is just that nobody is paying attention to it, because of all the negative things that distract people from the positive, and that nobody has welcomed that change. Well, we do and we want people to see it and understand that Greece is ready to accept this richness.
- How do you try to make this visible?
- Our events have this as a central aim. Of course the campaign as well. We want to point out the obvious. That, just like racism, acceptance and inclusion of diversity are now also latent in the Greek neighborhoods and in the consciousness of the inhabitants. We want to show the acceptance of the different is already here. “Multiculturalism in action” is a perfect example. We invite people to play with each other regardless their origin, but we also invite people to

see that these bonds already exist. We will make video from this project, and of course we will also promote it through several media.

- So you have already found how you will promote it I imagine? Is that easy?
- I am crazy with the promotion of our events to the media. I work on this so hard mainly because I know what we can achieve. I can promote a small event as if it is something that has never happened before. For this project I have already contacted the media sponsors and there will also be a camera. We will make a small documentary, with shootings from the event, about multiculturalism and the new generation of these youngsters. Basketball brings them together. In addition, another huge advantage that adds “media value” to the event is that players that are famous in the basketball world will be there. This alone gives the event another dimension and will promote its “message” in other arenas as well. Lastly, I will “sell” it to a really popular TV journalist... The event is taking place right after the voting of the new draft on citizenship, they will ask for “news” and I am going to give it firstly to the popular guy.
- So you have cooperated with him in the past as well? That’s why you prefer hi,?
- Yes I know him. He is good journalist and I know him for years now. I met him because of our job...through Generation I have met a lot of people in this field.
- And did this started? I know that you had a blog that was about second generation...
- My first contacts with journalists and generally media people were personal. I was a blogger and I knew some people, so the first who contacted us knew who are we and what we are advocating for. Everything happened fast. I started writing and I promoted the texts via friends and others to popular media, like the “Protagonistes” (popular Greek online newspaper and tv show). After a while I became a member of Stavro’s (Stavros Thodorakis, popular journalist, and currently president of the political party, Potami) team and the part concerning the issue of people of migrant origin was exclusively mine. It was really important because we had the opportunity to increase our visibility really fast using their high readership. Via this cooperation, others contacts emerged, and now we have a really good network with trustful people.
- How do you engage with media practically?
- First of all every text we write, it is automatically sent to a main list with all the important media, mostly press media. Our image in the media is really important and we are really careful with what is out there regarding the organization. There is always proofreading to all texts, videos, articles...we are constantly preoccupied with this as you have seen already. Many remember us an old informal activist organization...something that as you know in Greece is not easy to be.
- What do you mean?

- First of all in Greece, it is not easy to be an activist. People believe that we climb to the parliament to demand something. Being an activist means nothing in Greece. In addition, other organizations with similar orientation claim the same media coverage, and that is really tricky sometimes. There are organizations that demand citizenship for everyone and they are not careful with what they are claiming and how they promote it, constructing a negative image for the people they want to help ...if not negative, at least not positive. This can backfire. It is important to be heard and covered by the media, but only under certain circumstances. It is very important to be present in the media but only if you manage to get them to respect you and not distort the image of the organization or its cause. We do the dirty job that no one else wants to do. But we have to be careful when cooperating with media. We need them but we cannot trust them thoughtlessly'
- How do you deal with this?
- After years on the field we have now a network and it is easier to deal with this I think. We know who is going to take care and protect our "product" and who wants to target us.
- Is there a specific strategy you have to attract media's attention, given the fact that they look for a conflict and in many cases they will cover you only if a negative event takes place?
- I always use personal stories and experiences, especially of children that already had some media attention because of their talent in music, arts and sports. Faces familiar and well known to the public. They can promote the general problem through their field of action. As you understand, this is attractive to even the most witless journalist. The Antentokoumpo brothers were a really good example. But when we were writing about them, when their case was not "hot", nobody paid attention...of course back then there was a different political line and the priority was given to the demonization of the immigrants.
- You said before that other organizations advocate for the citizenship as well but they do not do it successfully because of the rationale. Can you elaborate on this?
- Yes. There are other organizations that claim the right to citizenship, however the way they claim it is irrational, something that have a negative impact on everything. Claiming a right a very delicate issue and it needs the corresponding approach. If we ask citizenship for everyone without arguments and without a rational argument about what we are claiming then the backfire of the whole project is certain. You automatically shoot yourself and you allow far-right ideologists take the floor and talk about massive naturalizations of people that do not belong to the Greek nation etc...the journalist seeks for a bad argument. With this, he will make news.
- Yes. I understand...and argument is based on the irrationality of the procedure of naturalization for this group of people.

- Yes, exactly. It is not ethically right, or rational, to ask people that were born and raised in Greece to prove their greekness... and especially, with the existing problems and inadequacies of the system. This process is not appropriate.