From "Non-Immigration Country" to "Country of Integration"

Transformation of integration discourse in Germany

Shigeki Sato

(Hosei University/ University of Constance)

ssbasis@hosei.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper aims to illuminate the transformation of integration discourse in Germany by comparing the different forms of discourse of the 1980s and the 2000s. In order to do so, the paper attempts to detect underlying cognitive schemes of boundary between immigrants and natives in the discourse of immigrant integration. In the 1980s, the integration discourse, whether it seeks to return immigrants to their homeland and to preserve homogeneous "national character" or it proposes a peaceful and democratic "multicultural" co-existence to enrich "our society", commonly assumed the cultural difference between "Germans" and "foreigners" as essential and fixed. In the 2000s, the Integration discourse is mainly concerned with the common norms and values immigrants must share, whether these norms and values are called "*Leitkultur*" or "constitutional patriotism". It is now generally agreed that immigrants, including Muslims, have to learn German and accept "our liberal-democratic values" of the constitution to be "a part of Germany". Thus the boundary between immigrants and "us" is perceived to be more blurred and fluid. But Immigrants are strongly urged to have the "will" to integrate. More offensive calls for integration tend to marginalize or stigmatize immigrants "refusing" to integrate.

*Do not cite without author's permission

Deutschland schafft sich nicht ab,
Deutschland verändert sich durch Immigration,
und das ist gut so.
— *Hamed Abdel-Samad*

The German policy on immigrant integration has significantly changed in the recent years. After the *Anwerbestopp* of 1973, the Federal Republic of Germany had officially claimed that "Germany is not a country of immigration". Based upon the citizenship law of 1913, which defined the citizenship status on the blood-based principle of *ius sanguisnis*, the Federal Republic took a very restrictive policy for naturalization. Immigrants were usually called as "foreign employees" or, at best, "foreign co-citizens", who were not considered to be a part of the German society. In the 1980s, the conservative-liberal federal government even sought to return them back to their homelands and to restrict further immigration of family reunion. In the 1990s, however, the naturalization regulation was gradually relaxed and the reform of the citizenship law became a central theme of political debate. The citizenship law was eventually reformed in 1999: it now incorporated some important elements of territory-based principle (*ius soli*). Germany is thus no longer the "community of descent" purely based upon ethno-cultural belongingness. Furthermore, after a long and complex process of political struggles, the immigration law (*Zuwanderungsgesetz*) was enacted in 2004. As a result, it was no longer possible to insist that "the Federal Republic is not a country of immigration". The "*Integration*" of immigrants is now a central issue for the federal and local governments in Germany. Even the conservative CDU, which had refused to abandon this motto for a long time, now stated in the party program of 2007 that "Germany is a county of integration" (*Deutschland ist Integrationsland*)[1].

In this paper, I will examine the transformation of the integration discourse from the 1980s to the 2000s by detecting a shift of the underlying conceptions of boundaries between immigrants and native population. The policies and politics of immigrant integration – formulating citizenship law, regulating naturalization, providing social benefits, teaching languages, facilitating school education, inculcating loyalty to the state and the law, etc. – are deeply related to conception of "us " vs. "them" or "self" vs.

---

[1] *Freiheit und Sicherheit. Grandsätze für Deutschland* (CDU Grundsatzprogram, 2007), S.95. This program was adopted in December 2007.

"the other". The cognitive scheme of boundaries between immigrants and native population shapes the way of thinking of, talking about, and practicing the policies and politics of immigrant integration[2]. In the following analysis, I will show what kinds of boundaries were (or are) assumed and used in the integration discourse and examine how the conceptions of boundaries were (or are) related with the ways of discussing and practicing the integration policies.

The conception of group-boundary is a specific way of seeing the world, or the "principle of vision and division" in the words of Pierre Bourdieu, which is taken for granted and routinely used by individual and collective practices in a variety of social contexts[3]. In the integration discourse, the conception of boundary is concerned with the way in which immigrants and the native population are categorized. In this paper, I will show two different conceptions, which were prominently used in the 1980s and in the 2000s respectively, examining how they worked in the field of discourse.

In the 1980s, immigrants and the native population were categorized as "foreigners" and "Germans" in a culturalist term and the differences between them were largely essentialized. The essentialist conception of differences was not only shared by the mainstream discourse that claimed that "Germany is not a country of immigration", but also by an alternative discourse of "multicultural society", which became politically vocal in the late-1980s. In the 2000s, however, immigrants and their children came to be categorized as "immigrants" ("*Zuwanderer*", "*Einwanderer*", "*Migrantinnen und Migranten*", etc), or "persons with immigration background" in the terms of the official statistics, whether they posses German citizenship or not. On the one hand, the boundary between "immigrants" and "natives" is now blurred and multiple, because immigrants, including Muslim immigrants, could be "a part of Germany" if they speak German and accept the "liberal-democratic basic values" of the German constitution. In the integration policy since 2005, immigrants are strongly urged to "learn German" and to "pledge allegiance" to the constitution. On the other hand, the "will" of integration forms a new boundary between "them" and "us": "objectors of integration (*Integrationsverweigerer*)" are to be excluded from "our society". Yet the "will", which is difficult to identify in an objective sense, is variously interpreted, sensationalistically problematized, and politically used in the discourse of integration.

By comparing these two different forms of integration discourse, I will illuminate the transformation of integration discourse in Germany. In so doing, I would also like to

---

[2] On a "cognitive perspective" on ethnicity, race, and nationalism, see Rogers Brubaker, "Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism" in *Annual Review of Sociology,* 35 (2009), pp.21-42.
[3] Pierre Bourdie, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), p.232.

show a change of the self-understanding of the German society in recent thirty years.

"Foreigners" and "Germans":
The integration discourse of a "non-immigration country"

"The limit is surpassed"

Contrary to the intention of the policy makers, the *Anwerbestopp*, a major turn of the West German immigrant policy in 1973, facilitated the settlement of foreign workers in Germany. The German government then began to pursue some way of integrating immigrant workers and their families. But the integration policy in the 1970's was mostly discussed and practiced as a part of lobar market policy, which was called "foreigners' employment policy" (*Ausländerbeschäftigungspolitik*)[4]. The immigrants, usually referred to as "foreign employees" (*ausländische Arbeitsnehmer*) or "guest workers" (*Gastarbeiter*), were regarded as exchangeable labor forces for German industry. The integration policy thus mainly concerned with securing employment of "foreign workers". It was surely recognized that "foreign workers" would stay on a long-term basis. But it was also implicitly or explicitly assumed that they would return to their homelands sometime in the future. The integration was thus regarded as an "integration for the time being" (*Integration auf Zeit*).

In the late-1970s, such social problems as "ghettoization" of foreigners, education for their children, and crimes by foreigners became known to policy makers. In 1979, the federal government established the federal commissioner for foreigners (*Bundesbeauftragte für Ausländerfragen*), an institutional organ that engaged in the issues of immigration and immigrants but had no substantive political jurisdiction. The first commissioner, Heinz Kühn (SPD), produced a memorandum, which developed an idea of full-fledged integration, using the word "immigrants" (*Einwanderer*) instead of "foreign workers"[5]. But this memo was criticized by the oppositional CDU and CSU as "irresponsible". The left-liberal government also kept distance from the proposals made by the Kühn-memo.

But a shift of the integration discourse came in 1980. In this year, "foreigners

---

[4] Karl-Heinz Meier-Braun, *Integration und Rückkehr? Zu Ausländerpolitik des Bundes und derLänder, insbesondere Baden-Württembergs* (Meinz/München: Grünewallt, 1988), S.11-18.
[5] Heinz Kühn, *Stand und Weiterentwicklung der Integration der Integration der ausländischen Arbeitsnehmer und der Familien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland – Memorandum des Beauftragten der Bundesregierung* (Bonn, September 1979), S.15.

(*Ausländer*)" were discovered as "problems". The most alarming symptom was the rapid rise of the xenophobic sentiments of the West German population, which was called "*Ausländerfeindlichkeit*" or "hate for foreigners"[6]. Violent attacks against foreigners and xenophobic paroles like "*Ausländer raus*" or "*Scheiß Ausländer*" spread throughout the country. Right-wing anti-immigrants movements, e.g., "Foreigner-Stop" Initiatives, gained supports in many cities. These incidents and trends of the *Ausländerfeindlichkeit* were sensationally reported and discussed by the mass media. For example, the leading weekly magazine *Der Spiegel*, which featured on the *Ausländerfeindlichkeit* in September 1980, stated as follows:

> In the Federal Republic, hatred against the foreigners grows. Lethal violence and dangerous propaganda accompany a new wave of xenophobia. (...) Looking at the "risk", Chancellor Schmidt is willing to "exert influence against it"[7]

Opinion polls also revealed that the xenophobic sentiments of West Germans grew up. *Der Spiegel* reported that the proportion of West Germans against the permanent residence of "guest workers" increased from 39 per cent in 1978 to 68 in 1982. It was pointed out that "on any other topic have the views of German citizens so fundamentally changed as on the question of foreigners in recent years"[8]

In the public discourse about "foreigner's questions", the rise of the xenophobic sentiments was often explained as a natural outcome of the presence of "too many forefingers". It was argued, for example, that the number of foreigners living in Germany "has reached the threshold (*Schwelle erreicht*)" or "has surpassed the limit (*Grenze überschritten*)". Even the Federal Chancellor Schmidt admitted that "it was a

---

[6] The term "*Ausländerfeindlichkeit*" was a neologism. See Lutz Hoffmann und Herbert Even, *Soziologie der Ausländerfeindlichkeit* (Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag, 1984), S.12.

[7] ""Raus mit dem Volk"", in *Der Spiegel*, 37/1980 (September 15, 1980), S.19.
The original text: "In der Bundesrepublik wächst der Haß gegen die Ausländer. Tödliche Gewalt und gefährliche Stimmungsmache begleiten eine neue Welle von Ausländerfeindlichkeit. (...) Kanzler Schmidt sieht "die Gefahr", will seinen "Einfluß dagegensetzen". More on the rise of the *Ausländerfeindlichkeit*, see Georgios Tsiakalos, *Ausländerfeindlichkeit* (1983)

[8] "Ausländer: "Das Volk hat es statt", in *Der Spiegel* 12/1982 (May 3, 1982), S. 37. The article used the results of the opinion polls conducted by Infas and Emnid.
The original of the cited part of the text: "Zu kaum einem anderen Thema hat sich die Ansicht so vieler Buerger in der vergangenen Jahren so grundlegend geändert wie zu Ausländerfragen. Nicht mehre eine Minderheit von 39 Prozent, wie noch 1978, sondern eine Mehrheit von 66 und 68 Prozent der Westdeutschen sprach sich in Umfragen der Meiniungsinsforschungsinstitute Infas und Emnid dagegen aus, daß ‚Gastarbeiter, die nie hierbleiben wollen, die Möglichkeit erhalten, für immer zu bleiben."

failure to recruit so many foreigners in our country"[9].

The presence of "too many foreigners" was a problem, because the German society had the "limit of the burden-bearing capacity". If the "limit is reached" or "surpassed", the population would begin to feel fear or anxiety and to develop the xenophobic sentiment and the social and political tensions would be intensified – This was a typical way of argument in the public discourse regarding the "foreigners' problem". For example, *Frankfurter Allgemeine* reported the words of a government official as follows:

> With such a development [i.e., the increase of the foreign population], *the threshold might be reached*, beyond which the anxiety felt by the significant part of the German population would turn to be openly defensive. The consequences would be social and political tensions that would jeopardize the social peace in the Federal Republic.[10]

But it was not here clearly explained where the "threshold" or the "limit" could be determined. To be sure, there were already some four millions foreigners living in West Germany in the beginning of the 1980s. But was this number "too many"? If so, why? Actually the statistical fact itself was not necessarily crucial. The "anxiety" or "fear" that many West Germans allegedly felt did not merely derive from the presence of foreigners but from their *cultural difference*. In other words, the real "problem" of "foreigners' questions" was the presence of different cultures on the German soil. Hans Scheuler rightly pointed out in *Die Zeit* that "foreigners in the Federal Republic have become nuisance, *not because they live here, but because they are not Germans, because they think differently from us*"[11].

In the 1960s and 1970s when immigrants had been generally seen as "foreign employees", the encounter of native Germans with them had been specific only in labor contract. In the 1980s, however, they were no longer exchangeable labor force; they were now discovered as "foreigners" living a social life in Germany with their own families, networks, languages, and cultural backgrounds[12]. In other words, Germans

---

[9] "Ausländer: "Schmerzhafte Grenze gezogen"", in *Der Spiegel* 50/1981 (December 7, 1981), S. 24.

[10] *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, October 29, 1981 (Emphasis added).
The original text: "Mit einer derartigen Entwicklung könnte die Schwelle erreicht werden, ab der das Unbehagen beträchtlicher Teile der deutschen Bevölkerung in offene Abwehrhaltung umschlägt. Die Folgen wären soziale und politische Spannungen, die den gesellschaftlichen Frieden in der Bundesrepublik gefährden würden".

[11] Hans Scheuler, "Angst vor dem Fremden", in *Die Zeit*, January 1, 1982 (Emphasis added). The original text: Ausländer in der Bundesrepublik sind zum Ärgernis geworden, nicht, weil sie hier leben, sondern weil sie keine Deutschen sind, weil sie anders denken als wir.

[12] Lieselotte Funcke, "Überlegungen zur Weiterentwicklung der Ausländerpolitik", in *Zeitschrift für*

now encountered with "foreigners" as human beings. They had to find a way of co-existence, or "living-together (*Zusammenleben*)", with them. This was seen as a difficult task, because the cultural differences between "Germans" and "foreigners", especially non-Europeans, were "so large". The general secretary of the German Red Cross Jürgen Schilling wrote that "the great majority of Germans are not ready to make themselves at home with the mass of people whom they feel as clearly different and inadaptable. Germans think that their presence could change the German ways of living in the long run. This view would be intensified in the future possible economic crisis"[13].

Such a culturalist view of "foreigners' problems", which was widely shared in the 1980s, was clearly formulated in the following argument of Roman Herzog, who was the interior minister of the Land of Baden-Württemberg at the time:

> The proportion of foreigners of 10% on average in Baden-Württemberg, of 17% in Stuttgart, and of 20% in some communities or neighborhoods, primary secondary schools with foreigners' proportion of 70% or more, the increase in the crime of the youth, extremist activity by foreigners, competition of foreign workers with Germans in labor market with the rising unemployment, the strong immigration pressure made by asylum seekers and refugees: all constituted a problem that is rising to the center of the foreigners' policy. The question is how many *ethnic and cultural strangers* can be incorporated in the Federal Republic, or where the *limit of the burden capacity* runs. ... The question of the limit of the burden-bearing capacity does not arise only because the problems in some areas, such as the high density areas, have become apparent. It also requires an answer because only emotional treatment of these problems could become a dangerous seedbed for general hostility towards foreigners.[14]

Ausländerrecht und Ausländerpolitik, 2/3/1981, S.83-85.

[13] Jürgen Schilling, "Sind wir fremdenfeindlich, provinziell, vermufft oder gar rassistisch", in *Die Zeit* (November 21, 1980)

[14] Roman Herzog, "Ursachen des Ausländerzustroms und die Möglichkeiten einer ausländerrechtlichen Steuerung aus der Sicht des Landes Baden-Württenberg", *Zeitschrift für Ausländerrecht und Auskänderpolitik*, 1/1981, S.17.
The original German text: "Der Ausländeranteil von durchschnittlich 10% in Baden-Württemberg, von 17% in Stuttgart und von über 20% in einzelnen Gemeinden oder Stadtteilen, Schulklassen an Grund- und Hauptschulen mit einen Ausländeranteil von 70% und mehr, zunehmende Kriminalität ausländischer Jugendlicher, extremistische Betätigung von Ausländern, Konkurrenz ausländischer Arbeitsnehmer mit Deutschen auf dem Arbeitsmarkt bei steigenden Arbeitslosenzahlen, immer noch starker Zuwanderungsdruck von Asylbewerbern und Flüchtlingen bilden Hintergrund für ein Problem, das zunehmend in Mittelpunkt der Ausländerpolitik tritt. Es ist die Frage, wieviel ethnische und kulturelle fremde Menschen in den Bundesrepublik aufgenommen werden können, wo also Grenze der Belastbarkeit verläuft. ... Die Frage nach den Belastbarkeitsgrenzen stellt sich nicht nur, weil die Probleme in Teilbereichen, wie den Verdichtigungsräumen, bereits deutlich geworden sind. Sie erfordert eine Antwort auch deshalb, weil ihre nur emotionale Behandlung ein gefährlicher Nährboden für eine allgemeine Ausländerfeindlichkeit zu werden droht".

In the first half of the citation, Herzog mentioned date and facts about foreigners such as the proportion of the foreign population, the increase of young criminals, extremist movements, and the competition in the labor market. And he also referred to the increase of asylum seekers. But in the second half, Herzog suddenly turns into another theme: "ethnic and cultural" differences. He posed a question: how many ethnic and cultural strangers could be received in the West German society, assuming that the "burden-bearing capacity" of the West German society had a "limit". Careless treatment of this problem, Herzog argued, would engender emotional reactions of Germans against foreigners.

This way of thinking formed a typical pattern of argument in the integration discourse in the 1980s. In this argument, the "problems" came from the presence of many "ethnic and cultural strangers". The central question of integration policy was how (or if) their co-existence of Germans and "ethnic and cultural strangers" might be possible.

Integration or return

On the level of part politics, there were two approaches to foreigners' policy in the early 1980s: the left- liberal one of the SPD and the FDP, on the one hand, and conservative one of the CDU/CSU. They both agreed on basic issues. First, further immigration must be restricted, because the "limit of the burden-bearing capacity was reached". Second, return of foreigners to their homeland must be supported. Third, integration of foreigners must be carried out on the social level. They also shared the notion that "German is not a country of immigration". But both approaches had different views on the integration.

For the left-liberal approach, the integration was surely difficult, but there are "no alternative". Then the left-liberal approach proposed "social integration", which sought the improvement of social and legal conditions of foreigners. According to the explanation of Hugo Brandt of the SPD in the Bundestag, integration meant that "foreigners were accommodated with us under the roof of our state and were integrated as equal members in the legal and social system of this state"[15]. But such "social integration" did not affect the boundary between "foreigners" and "Germans" and the cultural identity of "foreigners" was rather respected. By improving the social and legal

---

[15] *Verhandlung der deutschen Bundestages, Plenarprotokoll*, (hereafter, BT), 9. Wahlperiode, 83.Sitzung (February 4, 1982), S.4910.

status of foreigners, the proponents of the left-liberal approach argued, a better "co-existence" would be realized.

For the conservatives, the presence of foreigners from "other cultural areas", especially Turks, was a more serious burden for the German society. The CDU deputy Alfred Dregger argued: "Since Turks are different and they want to remain different from us in their culture and mentality, it is natural that they seek to live in their own neighborhood in Germany. As a result, Turkish districts, also called Ghetto, grew out in our big cities". He surely admitted that social integration of "foreigners" should be supported but he thought that cultural integration was not just impossible but also undesirable: "Turks are not only unable to be assimilated; they are also difficult to be integrated".[16] Therefore, Dregger and the CDU/CSU insisted, the federal government should promote the "return" of foreigners back to their homelands. The cultural homogeneity could be thereby preserved not only for Germans but also for foreigners.

Regardless of such differences, the left-liberals and the conservative both rejected the "assimilation" of immigrants, because this was regarded as "forced Germanization (*Zuwangsgemanisierung*). They insisted that the original cultures of foreigners should be preserved. They both also supported the education of foreigners' children in their mother tongue. For the conservatives, education in mother tongue was encouraged as a preparation for foreigners' future return to their homelands. For the liberals, the preservation of foreigners' original cultures was a way of more peaceful co-existence.

For example, the FDP deputy Sibylle Engel argued in the Bundestag:

> We [SPD and FDP] (...) also agreed that integration is not equal to Germanization, but that the social and professional integration in our society go along very well with the preservation of the cultural uniqueness of foreigners, and that this in turn contributes to the expansion and deepening of our own identity.[17]

For the CDU and CSU, co-existence of different cultures in the German society was undesirable because Germany was not "a historical multi-ethnic state". The CSU deputy Carl-Dieter Spranger invoked this view in the Bundestag:

---

[16] *Op. cit.*, S.4893.

[17] *Op. cit.*. S.4952. The original German text: Wir [SPD und FDP] stimmen (...) auch darin überein, daß Integration nicht mit Germanisierung gleichsetzen ist, sondern daß sich die soziale und berufliche Eingliederung in unserer Gesellschaft sehr wohl mit der Bewahrung der kulturellen Eigenart der Ausländer verträgt und das diese wiederum zur Erweiterung und Vertiefung unserer eigenen Identität beitragt.

Everyone undoubtedly wants the integration as a forum of peaceful and tension-free coexistence. It is yet completely unrealistic to assume that more then 5 million foreigners can be integrated and assimilated here. (…) According to the history and the self-understanding, Germany may not be or become multi-ethnic state. (...) We must commit ourselves actively to maintain and enforce the ability and the willingness of foreigners to return.[18]

Soon after the CDU/CSU returned to power in 1982, the new government soon realized a "return-help" policy. In 1983 the law for "the promotion of the willingness of foreigners to return" was enacted. However, the number of foreigners living in Germany did not decrease as the policy makers had expected. The SPD, now as an opposition party, criticized this "return-help" policy and claimed in turn for more "social integration" of foreigners.

"Multicultural society"

Against the mainstream discourse of the major political parties and the federal government, the idea of "multicultural society" posed an alternative approach to "foreigners" problems". Unlike the mainstream views shared by the left-liberals and the conservatives in the early-1980s, this "multicultural" approach, or "multiculturalism", did not see the existence of foreigners as "burden" or "threat". For multiculturalists, the co-existence with foreigners was a "chance" to *enrich* our society" and "our democracy"[19]. "Culture" was an essence of human dignity and every culture, especially cultures of immigrants and minority peoples, should be not only equally respected but also promoted for further development. Through efforts of cooperation between different cultures, multiculturalists argued, a peaceful and creative co-existence might be possible. Jürgen Miksch, a key proponent of "multicultural society", wrote that "with the goal of a multicultural co-existence, various social groups are urged to approach

---

[18] *Op. cit.*., S.4913. The original German text: "Die Integration als Forum friedlich und spannungsfrei Zusammenlebens will doch zweifelsohne jeder. Nur ist es schlichtweg irreal, davon ausgehen, daß über 5 Millionen Ausländer hier integriert oder assimiliert werden könnten. (...) Deutschland kann nach seiner Geschichte und seinem Selbstverständnis kein Vielvölkerstaat sein oder werden. (...) Wir (...) müssen uns aktiv dafür einsetzen, die Rückkehrfähigkeit der Ausländer zu halten und ihre Rückkehrbereitschaft zu stärken".

[19] For the discourse on "multicultural society", see Axel Schulte, "Multikulturelle Gesellschaft: Chance, Ideologie oder Bedrohung? in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B23-24, 1990, S.3-15, Susanne Frank, *Staatsräson, Moral und Interesse. Die Diskussion um die "Multikulturelle Gesellschaft" 1980-1993* (Freiburg: Lambertus, 1995), and Sabine von Dirke, "Multikulti: The German debate on multiculturalism", in *German Study Review* 17 (3), 1994, pp.513-136..

each other and to learn from each other"[20].

An editor of *Die Zeit* remaked that "the concept of the multicultural society consists of two components: a politics of open boundaries towards the outside and a new kind of a republican integration of foreigners towards the inside"[21]. In short, the "multicultural society" was seen as a new model of the German society as a "country of immigration". The Green politician Daniel Cohn-Bendit said of this concept in an interview given in 1989 that "Whether we wish or not, we have become a country of immigration. And we are now developing a strategy of co-existence of these various cultures"[22].

The concept of "multicultural society" initially emerged in the beginning of the 1980s. It was introduced and publicized by churches and welfare organizations, which were engaged in social work for foreigners. As early as 1980, the ecumenical preparation committee for the "day of foreign co-citizens" (*Tag der ausländischen Mitbürgern*) issued a thesis paper, entitled "we live in the Federal Republic in a multicultural society". The paper insisted: "it is a responsibility for Germans to adjust themselves to new relationships and conditions of multicultural co-existence"[23]. The idea of "multicultural society" was then used in the practices of the social and pedagogic works for foreigners[24]. Yet it was little known in the general public and politically insignificant until the late-1980s.

Multiculturalism became more publicly prominent, after the Green Party and the SPD adopted this concept in the politics against the conservative integration policy of the federal Interior Ministry. In 1988, the federal interior minister Friedrich Zimmermann (CSU) publicized a plan of the new foreigners' law[25]. This plan was, however, to conservative not only of the Green and the SPD, but also for the FDP and some CDU-politicians. Zimmermann's plan warned against the loss of "homogeneity of society" and regarded the "preservation of national character" as the aim of the law. The idea of "multicultural society" could be a powerful alternative available to the conservative idea of ethno-cultural homogeneity.

From the late-1980s to the early-1990s, multiculturalism spread beyond party lines. In the CDU, for example, Heiner Geißler was a prominent advocate of multiculturalism.

---

[20] Jürgen Miksch, *Kulturelle Vielfalt statt nationaler Einheit. Eine Strategie gegen Nationalismus und Rassismus* (Frankfurt a.M.: Lembeck, 1989), S.34.

[21] Norbert Kosteda, "Was heißt hier Multi-Kulti?" in *Die Zeit* (November 8, 1991), S.9.

[22] ""Die Grünen verklären die Asylbewerber"", in *Der Spiegel*, Nr.22 (1989), S.101.

[23] Der Ökumenische Vorbereitungsausschuß, ""Wir leben in der Bundesrepublik in einer multikulturellen Gesellschaft" – Thesen vom 24. September 1980", reprinted in Jürgen Miksch (Hg.), *Deutschland – Einheit in kultureller Vielfalt*, (Frankfurt: Otto Lemberg, 1991), S.182-186

[24] Frank-Olaf, Radtke, "Multikulturell -- Das Gesellschaftsdesign der 90er Jahre? In *Informationsdienst zur Ausländerarbeit*, S.27-34.

[25] Frank, *Staatsräson*, S.66

He argued that "the question is no longer if we live together with foreigners, but how we do," then the answer was nothing but multicultural society, in which Germans and foreigners could live together "without losing their own identity"[26].

However, the most offensive advocates in the field of politics came from the Green. In the federal party meeting in May 1989, the Green Party issued a statement "For a multicultural society, against the radical right". In the city of Frankfurt, Cohn Bendit led the "office for the multicultural affairs". In the Bundestag on June 24, 1988, criticizing Zimmermann, Erika Trenz of the Green party argued that a "multicultural society" should be the "essence" of democracy, which she claimed was fatally underdeveloped in Germany. In her view, coexistence and confrontation with foreigners could enrich German democracy:

The essence of democracy is concerned with a question (...) whether we Germans would dismiss and neglect the values of other cultures or confront with them and inspire ourselves for the development of common concept of life. (...) The Federal Republic is a country of immigration. Those who, like Zimmermann, ignored this point block the development of multicultural society. We need the confrontation in the spheres of moral, education, and religion, so that this society can actively develop.[27]

The SPD deputy Thomas Schroer also argued in the Bundestag on December 1, 1988 that:

[Foreigners] enrich the diversity of our social and cultural life today. (...) We want a multicultural society. Cultural diversity does not threaten us, but it enriches us. (...) We see that (…) our task is to do everything possible to enable mutual understanding, mutual respect, and cooperation between peoples of different cultural backgrounds in our country.[28]

---

[26] Heiner Geißler, "Wir sind ein Einwanderungsland," in *Die Zeit* (November 15,1991)

[27] BT, 11/88 (June 24, 1988), S.6042. The original German text: Eine Frage der demokratischen Substanz [ist] ... ob wir Deutschen andere Kulturen abwerten und abwehren oder ob wir uns mit ihren auseinandersetzen und uns anregen lassen bei der Entwickelung gemeinsamer Lebenskonzept. ... Die Bundesrepublik ist ein Einwanderungsland. Wer, wie [der Bundesinnenminister] Zimmermann, diese Tatsache ignoriert, blockiert damit die Entwicklung zur multikulturellen Gesellschaft. Wir brauchen die Auseinandersetzung im Sitten, Erziehung und Religion, damit sich diese Gesellschaft lebendig entfalten kann.

[28] BT, 11/113 (December 1, 1988), S.8197. The original German text: [Ausländer] bereichen auch heute die Vielfalt unseres sozialen und kulturellen Lebens. … Wir wollen eine muli-kulturelle Gesellschaft. Kulturelle Vielfalt bedroht uns nicht, sondern sie bereichert uns. ... Wir sehen ... unsere Aufgabe darin, alles zu tun, um Verständnis, Achtung und Zusammenarbeit zwischen Menschen unterschiedlicher kultureller Herkunft in unserem Lande zu ermöglichen.

This is a typical statement of the "multicultural society", which insisted that the "cultural diversity" would not "threaten us" but "enrich us". "Our task" was to promote mutual understanding between "different cultures."

The essentialist concept of culture

I have so far discussed the left-liberal and the conservative approaches to integration in the early-1980s and the "multiculturalist" and the right-conservative "monoculturalist" approaches in the late-1980s. Although they held different views on relationships between "foreigners" and "Germans", they all shared the notion of the difference between them: "foreigners" and "Germans" were considered to be *essentially different in culture*, whether their co-existence would be a "threat" or a "chance". As early as 1983, the sociologist Hartmut Esser touched upon this culturalist consensus in the integration discourse:

> The newly increasing number of proposals, including the intensification of the return and the romanticizing dreams of a "multicultural" society living in harmony, *all commonly overestimated the importance cultural factor* and underestimate the situational, material, and political factors in regards of the confrontation between social groupings[29].

In the integration discourse in the 1980s, the concept of "culture" was a key factor in the construction of boundaries between immigrants and natives. In the words of Michael Bommes and Albert Scherr, the "hypothesis of cultural difference" shaped the discourse of immigrant integration[30]. In this conception, the difference between "Germans" and "foreigners" was reified and even sacrilized. Petrus Han more critically discusses such tendency of the reification of the culture concept as follows:

> A striking common characteristic in all the arguments and the positions [about immigrant integration] known up to now is that they *do not thematize* the concept of culture, or that they tacitly start out from a *static concept of culture*. By the concept of culture they imply a *homogeneous and self-contained system of unspecified content*, which is to be preserved

[29] Hartmut Esser, "Ist das Ausländerproblem in der BRD ein 'Türkenproblem'?", in Rolf Italiaander (Hg.), *"Fremde raus?" Fremdenangst und Ausländerfeindlichkeit* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1983), S.178-179 (emphasis added).
[30] Michael Bommes and Albert Scherr, "Die soziale Konstrukion des Fremden", in *Vorgänge*, 103, (1991), S.40-50.

without any change for all time and to be handed down from one generation to the next.[31]

It seems at first glance that this consensus on the essentialist conception of culture in the integration discourse might be a return of the German tradition of "ethno-cultural nationhood". But is this just another case of the German *Sonderweg*? To be sure, as Rogers Brubaker argues, the ethno-cultural concept of nationhood has been one on the main "cultural idioms" to be used in the discourse of national self-understanding in Germany[32]. But "cultural idioms" also vary in global and historical contexts, because they are deeply related with social and political relationships in which the users of the idioms are embedded. Overemphasis of the historical continuity is therefore misleading[33]. For example, the rise and the fall of National Socialism caused a big rupture in "cultural idioms" of national self-understanding. While the ethno-cultural conception was racialized in the age of National Socialism, the term of "*Rasse*" was largely tabooed in postwar Germany. Moreover, "*Kultur*" (or "culture") was no longer a particularly German (or Western) concept in the postwar era; it became a global concept.

In this sense, it might be fruitful here to locate the German integration discourse of the 1980s within the spread of "neo-racism", since the essentialist conception of the cultural difference has much in common with the "neo-racism" or "differentialist racism", which French thinkers such as Etienne Balibar and Pierre-André Taguieff discuss[34]. Balibar and Taguieff argue that the anthropological and relativist concept of

---

[31] Petrus Han, *Soziologie der Migration* (Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius, 2000), S.331 (emphasis added).

[32] Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

[33] According to Klaus Bade and Michael Bommes, the official notion of the Federal Republic that "Germany is not a country of immigration" was not actually related to the tradition of ethno-cultural self-understanding, when it was formed in the 1970s. It was rather produced by the general logic of the welfare state which would grant privileges to its own nationals. See Klaus J. Bade und Michael Bommes, "Migration und politische Kultur im 'Nicht-Einwanderungsland'", in thers (Hg.), *Migrationsreport 2000. Fakten-Analysen-Perspektiven* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2000), S.169-173.

[34] For the arguments on "neo racism" or "differentialist racism" by Balibar and Taguieff, see Etienne Balibar, "Is there a neo-racism?,in E. Balibar and Emmanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class, Nation: Ambiguous Identities* (London: Verso, 1992) , pp.17-28 and Pierre-André Taguieff, "Die Metamorphosen des Rassismus und die Kriese des Antirassismus", in Uli Beilefeld (Hg.). *Das Eigene und das Fremde. Neuer Rassismus in der Alten Welt?* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1991), S.221-269.

For a brilliant attempt to use the framework of "differentialist racism" for the analysis of the German discourse of integration, see Christine Morgenstern, *Rassismus – Konturen einer Ideologie: Einwanderung im politischen Diskurs der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 2002).

"culture" replaced the biological and hierarchical "race" as a main category of classifying human beings after the Second World War. As a result of the collapse of the NS racist regime and the fall of the European colonial empires, the concept of "race" was fundamentally delegitimized and tabooed. Human beings on the globe were more "correctly" categorized by their "cultures". Since the end of the 19th century, the concept of culture had been developed by European and American cultural anthropologists, but it could date further back to the idea of the German philosopher of the late-18th century Johann Gottfried Herder. In contrast to the notion of "race", which presupposed the hierarchy of "superior" and "inferior" races, the anthropological view of culture presupposed that every culture be equal in principle. The rise of this view went tandem with the global trend of decolonization: anti-colonial movements in the third world could invoke such relativistic concept of culture in order to claim equal status for their own. Then, the concept of culture was imported back to Europe. In the "post-industrial" age allegedly beginning in the late-1970, such "differentialist" concept of culture was used in the discourse of immigration and immigrants[35].

As Balibar and Taguiff argued, this concept of culture was used both by anti-racists and the "new right". Both invoked the idea of the "right to difference" for different purposes. In their discourse, the "cultures" of immigrants and the native population tended to be reified as the "second nature" and to be glorified as "unsurpassable". Both for "anti-racists" and the "new right", therefore, the difference of cultures must be defended.

Balibar discusses the "function" of the concept of culture in the discourse of "neo-racism" as follows:

> Culture can thus function like a nature, and it can in particular function as a way of looking individuals and groups a priori into a genealogy, into a determination that is immutable and intangible in origin[36]

In Germany, the "differentialist" concept of culture was also represented by two opposing camps: progressive multiculturalists and right-conservative "monoculturalists". For example, the theses-paper of the ecumenical preparation committee, a pioneering document of German multiculturalism I mentioned above, represented a typical cultural relativist view in the motto that "different cultures – equal rights". The paper also stated

---

[35] In a recent article, Rogers Brubaker calls this trend a "differentialist turn". See his "Return of Assimilation?" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (4), 2001, pp.531-548.
[36] Balibar, "Is There Neo-racism?", p. 22.

that "kindergartens and schools are the place where the experiences of various cultural traditions clash with each other openly and directly. This is a chance for recognizing other cultures and thereby enriching our own" [37].

The discourse of the right-conservatives was formed as a reaction against the emergence of the idea of a "multicultural society". One of the most famous documents is the *Heidelberger Manifest*, which was written by several professors in 1981 and publicized through major newspapers in 1982. The argument in this *Manifest* was quite similar to the French "new right" in the sense that it invoked cultural relativism to defend the cultural homogeneity of the native society and fight against immigration. The authors of the document argued that cultures of all peoples (*Völkern*), including the culture of Germans, should be *equally* respected:

> It is impossible to integrate the great masses of non-German foreigners without endangering each people (*Volk*) and its own language, culture, and religion. Every people, including the German one, has a *natural right to preserve its own identity and uniqueness* in its own residential area. Respect of other peoples demands their preservation, but not their dissolution or "Germanization".[38]

It was argued that the ethno-cultural homogeneity of the German people should be preserved *because* each people has its own "natural right to preserve its own identity". The return of foreigners to their homelands would be the best solution to "foreigners' problems" in Germany.

While multiculturalism and "monoculturalism" represented contrasting views of the German society, they both thus shared the essentialist concept of culture. According to their conception, "foreigners" and "Germans" are categorized in culturalist terms and the boundary between them is unsurpassable. "Foreigners" are, therefore, "foreigners" for ever, whether they are integrated into a "multicultural society" or excluded from a "culturally homogeneous society". For an actual integration policy, however, both views were too romantic and utopian. The lack of realism in both views largely came

---

[37] Der Ökumenische Vorbereitungsausschuß, ""Wir leben in der Bundesrepublik in einer multikulturellen Gesellschaft"", S.182, 184.

[38] *Heidelberger Manifest* (Öffentlichkeits-Fassung) (January 31, 1982), reprinted in Klaus Staeck und Inge Karst (Hg.), *Macht Ali deutsches Volk Kaputt?* (Göttingen: Steidl Verlag, 1982), S.62-64, emphasis added. The original German text: "Die Integration großer Massen nicht-deutscher Ausländer ist ohne Gefärdung des eigenen Volkes, siner Sprache, Kultur und Religion nicht möglich. Jedes Volk, auch das deutsche Volk, hat ein natürliches Recht auf Erhaltung seiner Identität und Eigenart in seinem Wohngebiet. Die Achtung vor anderen Völkern gebietet ihre Erhaltung, nicht aber ihre Einschmelzung ("Germanisierung")"

from the essentialist conception of cultural difference.

Immigrants and "us":
The Integration discourse of a "country of integration"

The Leitkultur-*debate and search for a common ground of integration*

The inclusion of some significant territory-based (*ius soli*) elements to the new citizenship law of 1999 brought a fundamental shift to the notion of nationhood. Under this new citizenship law, the "German nation" is no longer able to be understood as a "community of descent", because children of ethnically non-German immigrants could be a German citizen by birth, if they are born on the German. This theoretically means that Germany is not an "ethnic nation" any more. The difference between "foreigners" and "Germans" is no longer conceived in ethno-cultural terms. But if the "German nation" is not "ethnic", has it tuned into a "civic" one? If so, what does the "civic" mean in the German context, where, unlike in France or the US, no common historical memories of "democratic revolution" are available? If Germany lacks the tradition of "civic nation" à la France or the US, what kind of collective self-understanding native and non-native Germans can believe to share?

Moreover, as many of second and third generation immigrants have actually obtained German citizenship, it has become clear that the binary scheme of "foreigners" vs. "Germans" of the 1980s is unable to grasp the reality sufficiently. Thus in the public discourse, the term of "immigrants" ("*Zuwanderer*", "*Einwanderer*", "*Migranten*", or "*Migrantinnen und Migranten*") came to widely used. The Micro Census of 2005 introduced the category of "persons with immigration background"[39]. The Micro Census revealed that the more than half of "persons with immigration backgrounds" possessed German citizenship. The integration of "our society" must therefore encompass (legally) non-German immigrants living in Germany. In this phase of immigrant integration, some new form of collective self-understanding was needed even for conservatives.

A turning point of the integration discourse was the year of 2000. In October of this year, a path breaking debate was initiated by the CDU-general secretary Friedrich Merz.

---

[39] An article of *Süddeutsche Zeitung* called this a "small revolution of the official statistics".
Süddeutsche Zeitung, (June 6, 2006).

His remarks of "*Leitkultur*", or leading culture, provoked harsh criticism.[40]   The critics argued that this concept was unacceptable because, as the prefix of "*Leit*" implied, it was ethno-centric, racist, and National Socialist. But the debate on the *Leitkultur* was concerned with an important theme for immigrant integration in the 2000s: the debate was a search for a common standard of integration that both immigrants and natives could share, a theme which had been largely neglected in the 1980s. Merz himself recognized the importance of the integration policy, arguing in an article in the newspaper *Die Welt* that: "the standards and the principles, by which ideas of immigration and integration can be headed, must be important for a successful immigration and integration policy" [41]. The *Leitkultur* must be such standards and principles. But it was not clear what *Leitkultur* exactly meant. After internal debates, the CDU eventually reached a conclusion: the party issued a "key-points paper" in November 2000. For the concept of *Leitkultur*, the paper stated as follows:

> Integration therefore requires, in addition to learning the German language, pledging allegiance to our state and constitutional order and adapting themselves to our social and cultural life conditions. This means that the value system of our Christian-Occidental culture, which was shaped by Christianity, Judaism, ancient philosophy, humanism, the Roman law, and the Enlightenment, should be accepted in Germany. That does not mean to give up their own cultural and religious character, but means to affirm and adjust themselves into the frameworks of values and orders, which were crucial for co-existence. ... Our aim must be a culture of tolerance and co-existence on the basis of our constitutional values and in the consciousness of our own identity. If one talks about the observance of these values as *Leitkultur* in Germany, it is to be understood in this sense.[42]

---

[40]   For the *Leitkultur*-debate, see Hartwig Pautz, *Die deutsche Leitkultur: Eine Identitätsdebatte: Neue Rechte, Neorassismus und Normalisierungsbemühungen* (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2005).

[41]   Friedrich Merz, "Einwanderung und Identität", in *Die Welt* (October 25, 2000).

[42]   From an excerpt published in *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (Nobember 11, 2000). The entire text of the "Eckpuntke Papier" is reprinted in the final report of the CDU-commission "Immigration and Integration, which was publicized in May 2001.

The original German text of the above quotation: "Integration erfordert deshalb, neben dem Erlernen der deutschen Sprache sich für unsere Staats- und Verfassungsordnung klar zu entscheiden und sich in unsere sozialen und kulturellen Lebensverhältnisse einzuordnen. Dies bedeutet, dass die Werteordnung unserer christlich-abendländischen Kultur, die vom Christentum, Judentum, antiker Philosophie, Humanismus, römischen Recht und der Aufklärung geprägt wurde, in Deutschland akzeptiert wird. Das heißt nicht Aufgabe der eigenen kulturellen und religiösen Prägung, aber Bejahung und Einordnung in den bei uns für das Zusammenleben geltenden Werte- und Ordnungsrahmen. (…) Unser Ziel muss eine Kultur der Toleranz und des Miteinander sein – auf dem Boden unserer Verfassungswerte und im Bewußtsein der eigenen Identität. In diesem Sinne ist es zu verstehen, wenn die Beachtung dieser Werte als Leitkultur in Deutschland bezeichnet wird".

According to this statement, the *Leitkultur* consists of three factors: (1) the German language, (2) the value system of the "Christian-Occidental (*christlich-abendländisch*) culture", and (3) the values and orders of the constitution. It is to be mentioned that the *Leitkultur* is anything but the German "ethno-culture". It is surely "Christian-Occidental", but not particularly "German" in the traditionally ethno-cultural sense. It contained the Enlightenment, humanism, and even Judaism. In this sense, this is simply synonymous with a Judeo-European culture. Moreover, the *Leitkultur* at least formally recognized the plurality of cultures of immigrants: it does not demand giving up of their cultures of origins. "Tolerance and co-existence" are allegedly part of the *Leitkultur*. But the *Leitkultur* required from immigrants to learn German and pledge loyalty to "our basic, constitutional values".

The CDU propagated this concept against "the illusion of *Multikulti*", a pejorative term for multiculturalism, triumphantly arguing that "*Multikulti* failed". But the CDU and the CSU also recognized that the old ethno-cultural self-understanding of the "German people" was no longer useful. The Green Party and the SPD, main proponents of multiculturalism in the late-1980s, criticized the "*Leitkultur*" as ethnocentric, but they did not invoke the idea of "multicultural society" so offensively any more. Even the Green tried to keep some distance from this concept[43]. The SPD and the Green had already acknowledged the importance of the German language and the German constitution (the Basic Law) as the basis of integration in the course of debates on the citizenship law reform. In 1999, they agreed to stipulate the acquisition of the German language skill as well as the declared belief in the "liberal-democratic basic order" (*freiheitlich-demokratische Grundordnung*) of the constitution as part of requirements for naturalization in the new foreigners' law (*Ausländergesetz*).

If the *Leitkultur*" was understood as the "liberal-democratic" values embodied in the Basic Law, the SPD and the Green Party were no enemies to this concept. The parliamentary leader of the SPD Franz Münterfering expressed some sympathy with this concept in the Bundestag. He remarked in December 2004: "If you [i.e., the CDU and the CSU] say that the *Leitkultur* complies with our Basic Law, then it is all right. … I am not against it"[44]. The federal commissioner of Immigration Marieluise Beck of the Green Party mentioned the acceptance of the Basic Law and the German language skill

---

[43] Even a Green leader Renate Künast provoked internal criticism by insisting that the Green Party should not use the concept of "multicultural society" any more, because this concept was "not sharp enough (*unscharf*)". Referring to the idea of "constitutional patriotism", she stressed the importance of democracy and the equality of law as the "basic values" for immigrant integration. See *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (Novermber 2, 2000), S.7.
[44] BT, 15/145 (December 2, 2004), S.13444.

as "*Leitlinien*"[45]. She also said that in the Bundestag: "I proposed that we should invite immigrants to patriotism. This invitation means that our constitution is also their constitution"[46]. Here she thought that loyalty to the constitution, or constitutional patriotism, was thus the basis of integration[47].

The *Leitkultur*-debate thus shows a *broad consensus* about the "liberal and democratic" norms and values of the German constitution as the common basis for immigrant integration[48]. This is surely a "leading" framework that immigrants of any cultural background, whether they posses a German citizenship or not, must respect and accept, if they want to live in Germany. There are still disputes about the meaning of this common ground. Especially the question on the extent to which the German constitution is rooted in the "Christian and Occidental" history is a matter of debate. The conservative "Christian" parties stress the "Christian and Occidental" characters of the German constitutional history, while the leftists understand the constitution in more secular and universal terms. The Green deputy Fritz Kuhn, for example, stated in the Bundestag: "As an evolutionary historical process of the Enlightenment shows, the clear separation of church and state, which is part of *our culture*, has brought us peace and freedom"[49]. This is a secularist interpretation of the constitutional history. But, along with the German language, the basic norms and values of the constitution are now generally recognized as a common framework of immigrant integration and are often invoked in the policy and discourse of "integration". At the same time, cultural relativism of the 1980s at least partly recedes in this new consensus. To be sure, "assimilation" is still rejected. But "cultural pluralism" is to be respected in the framework of the constitutional norms and values. Acceptance or non-acceptance of these common norms and values now constitutes the boundary of "our society".

---

[45] Veronika Vitt und Friedrich Heckmann, "Migration in Deutschland: Chronologie der Ereignisse und Debatten" in Klaus J. Bade und Reiner Münz (Hg.), *Migrationsreport 2002. Fakten – Analysen – Perspektiven* (Frankfurt: Campus: 2002), S .239.

[46] *Op. cit.*, S.13448.

[47] For an interesting account on institutional and institutional backgrounds of *Leitkultur*, constitutional patriotism, and multiculturalism in the integration discourse, see Tine Stein, "Gibt es seine multikulturelle Leitkultur als Verfassungspatriotismus? Zur Integrationsdebatte in Deutschland," in *Leviathn*, 36 (1), 2008, S.33-53.

[48] For a broad consensus on the "norms and values", see Klaus Roneberger und Vassilis Tsianos, "Abschied von der postmodernen Kulturegesellschaft. Nachlese zur 'Leitkultur-Debatte", *Texte zur Kunst*, 11/41. 2001 and Werner Schiffauer und Manuel Bojadzijev, "Es geht nicht um einen Dialog. Integratinsgipfel, Islamkonferenz und Anti-Islamismus", in Sabine Hess u.a. (Hg.), *No Integration?! Kulturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Integrationsdebatte in Europe* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2009).

[49] BT 16/17 (February 10, 2006), S.2251, emphasis added. Problems of the "separation of church and state" are one of the most controversial issues in regards of the integration of the "Islam". For an interesting analysis of this problems, see Christian Joppke, *Veil: Mirror of Identity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2009).

Integration policy in progress

A new move to integration policy began with the Immigration Law, which came to effect in 2005. Under this law, nation-wide, compulsory "integration courses (*Integrationskurse*)" were established. In the integration courses, the German language and the German history and legal order were taught. All new-comers without sufficient command of German must take the courses and the language certificate was necessary for naturalization. Integration courses thus became the institutional basis of integration policy.

The "Prescription on the Implementation of Integration Courses" defines the "aims" of integration courses as the "transmission of everyday knowledge as well as the knowledge of the legal order, the culture, and the history of Germany, especially of the values of democratic state of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the principles of rule of law, equality, tolerance, and religious freedom"[50]. As this prescription clearly stipulates the basic framework of integration: the knowledge of the German legal order, culture, and history, as well as the German language are to be "transmitted" to immigrants. Although the prescription refers to the "the culture and the history of Germany", they do not differentiate "Germans" from "foreigners" any more. They constitute a common basis of the German society that immigrants and natives should share.

In 2005, the federal government began to more offensively engage in the integration policy. While the chancellor initiated an "Integration Summit", the interior minister organized the "Islam Conference" in 2006. The integration summit of 2007 publicized the volume of *The National Integration Plan*. In 2006, the interior ministers of state governments agreed to standardize the naturalization test. In a series of these measures, the German language and the constitutional norms and values were always mentioned as the common basis of immigrant integration. For example, Angela Merkel remarked in the preface to *The National Integration Plan* that:

Some 15 million people with immigration background live here. Most of them have found their places in our society for a log time. But unfortunately we also know that there are still a

---

[50] *Verordnung über die Durchführung von Integrationskursen für Ausländer und Spätaussiedler*, §3 (1). The integration courses consist of 600 hours of language course and 45 (originally 30) hours of the „orientation course".

too great number of people who are badly integrated. (…) It is necessary to develop a common understanding of integration. Recognition of the German legal order and the constitutionally defended values is of course included in this common understanding. [Moreover,] whoever will live with us and seize various chances available in our country cannot avoid having good command of the German language.[51]

Merkel also states that "our society will be richer and more human through tolerance and openness in our co-existence" but the cultural differences between immigrants and natives does not play a key role in her discourse of integration as they did in the 1980s. The German language and the constitutional values form an overarching, "transcultural", framework that can encompass non-German immigrants from different cultures. In the words of the *National Integration Plan*, this cultural framework is "an essential basis of our co-existence, combining peoples of different backgrounds"[52]. If they speak German and accept the constitutional values, they could belong to the "common house of Germany". However, this is of course a contentions process. Especially in the 2000s, the existence of Muslim immigrants is perceived to be "problems" for the integration policy.

"The Islam is a part of Germany"?

A series of terrorist attacks in New York, Madrid, London, Amsterdam, and so forth in the first-half of the 2000s deeply affected integration discourse in Germany. In the global campaigns of the "war against terrorism", immigrant integration became an issue of internal security. As Otto Schily suggests, integration policy came to be regarded as a "prevention against terrorism"[53].

In this context, "Islam fundamentalism" became major "problems" for integration.

---

[51] *Der Nationale Integrationsplan. Neue Wege – Neue Chance* (Bundesregierung, 2007), S.7. The german oliginal text: "Hier leben rund 15 Millionen Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund. Die moisten von ihnen habe längst ihren Platz in unserer Gesellschaft gefunden. Dennoch wissen wir aber auch um deutliche Integrationsdefizite bei eine leider zu großn Zahl von Menschen. (…) Es gilt, ein gemeinsames Verständnis von Integration zu entwickeln. Selbstverständlich gehört die Anerkennung der Rechtsordnung Deutschlands und der grundsetzlich geschützten Werte. Wer dauerhaft bei uns leben und vielfältige Chance ergreifen will, die sich in unserem Land bieten, kommt nicht umhin, die deutsche Sprache hinreichend zu beherrschen".

[52] *Der Nationale Integrationsplan*, S.19. See also Serhat Kanakayoli, "Paranoic Integrationism. Die Integrationsformel als unmöglicher (Klassen-)kompromiss," in Sabine Hess u.a. (Hg,), *No Integration?! Kulturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Integrationsdebatte in Europe* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2009), S.95-104

[53] *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, (August 3, 2005).

Moreover, the issues of "Islamic violence" came to be widely reported and discussed in the public sphere. "Honor killing" (*Ehrenmord*)" and "forced marriage (*Zwangsehe*)", which had been relatively neglected or "tolerated" as "their" practices, were now seen as the symbols of violence, repression, and authoritarianism of the Islam in everyday lives in Germany[54]. They were no longer matters of "their culture" but those of "our society". The development of a "parallel society" of Muslim immigrants was thus regarded as a symptom of the "failure" of integration.

Report the rise of violence by Muslim immigrants in Berlin, the weekly magazine *Focus* wrote as follows: "integration of Muslim immigrants failed. Yet immigrants themselves aren't responsible. German politicians are responsible for this failure. They have claimed for total tolerance for many years and glossed over their incompetence"[55]. Struggles against violence and "parallel society" became an urgent task of integration policy. German politicians began to talk about the necessity of a more "realistic" approach to integration to hinder the development of "parallel society." As the interior minister of Baden-Württemberg Heribert Rech remarked, "on of the central messages of the 9.11 is that we must prevent the emergence and the formation of parallel society"[56].

In this struggle against "Islamic violence" and "parallel society", a broad consensus on the common ground of integration, which I discussed in the previous sections, was formed, whether it might be called "*Leitkultur*" or "constitutional patriotism"[57]. The policy and discourse of immigrant integration call upon Muslim immigrants to accept "our liberal-democratic basic values" of the constitution. All political parties in the Bundestag agreed to support and encourage "constitutionally loyal (*verfassungstreue*) Muslims". "Muslims" are here not excluded as a whole from "our society". In the integration discourse, the "great majority" of "legally and constitutionally loyal" and "well-integrated" Muslims are always differentiated from a "small minority" of "Islam fundamentalists" or "extremists". The simplistic scheme of "friend/enemy" confrontation between Muslims and Germans (or Europeans) is thus carefully avoided.

---

[54] After 2004, the themes of "honor killing" and "forced marriage" frequently reported and discussed in newspapers, magazines, and books. For example, in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the word "*Ehrenmord*" appeared only one time in 2004, but 25 times in 2005 and 48 in 2006. Moreover, several autobiographical books written by Muslim women were published. It is remarked in *Der Spiegel* that: "crimes under the cover of honor, pride, and religion are omnipresent for a long time, but merciless violence by young and mostly Muslim immigrants has been so far unknown. They now became a subject of new books". "Verbrechen im Namen der Ehre", in *Der Spiegel* 17/2006 (Apri 24, 2006), S.81.

[55] *Focus*, 15/2006, (April 10, 2006).

[56] BT, 16/11 (January 19, 2006), S.757

[57] Mark Terkessidis, "Die Spaltung der Gesellschaft" in *Tageszeitung* (February 27, 2006).

The CDU/CSU, for example, insisted in its proposal of a parliamentary resolution "Fight against Islamism, support constitutionally loyal Muslims" that "political Islamism" should be distinguished from the "Islam as religion", for "political Islam is not only a seedbed of terrorist activities in the name of the Koran, but also brings about suppression and intolerance towards other religions and women in everyday life". The argument of the proposal suggests that Muslims could be a part of the German society under the roof of *Leitkultur*, if they accept the constitutional values. It is claimed as follows:

> The constitution of the Federal Republic in the entire content of its meaning must be completely accepted by all people living in Germany, including Muslims. Muslims in our country can enjoy religious pluralism, as far as their activities do not deviate from the demands of our liberal-democratic basic order. (…) Integration does not mean assimilation; it means the recognition of the constitutional state and of the liberal-democratic *Leitkultur* in Germany, including a seeable effort to learn the German language and the basic cultural ideas that have been developed in our country.[58]

Of course, the Greens criticized the use of the problematic concept "*Leitkultur*", but their idea of integration was far from different; making of "constitutionally loyal Muslims" is also their aim. The Green Party actually called for the "naturalization (*Einbürgerung*) of the Islam". In their conception, "multiculturalism" is also possible within the framework of the constitution. Claudia Roth said in the Bundestag:

> Integration policy must recognize the Islam as a religion with equal rights and seek to *naturalize the Islam among us* in some way. [The establishment of] the European Islam is the best contribution to the international struggle against Islamist extremism. (…) Tolerance in a *multicultural* democracy always operates in the framework of our constitutional

---

[58] BT Drucksache, 15/4260, "Politischen Islamismus bekämpfen, - Verfassungstreue Muslime unterstützen" (November 24, 2004), S.6. This proposal was discussed in the Bundestag on December 2, 2004. The original German text: "Verfassung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland muss in ihrem umfassenden Bedeutungsgehalt von allein in Deutschland lebenden Menschen, einschließlich der Muslime, vollständig und uneingeschränkt akzeptiert werden. Die Entfaltungsmöglichkeiten, die der religiöse Pluralismus den Muslimen in unserem Land einräumt, enden dort, wo deren Wirken die Anforderungen unserer freiheitlich-demokratischen Grundordnung nicht mehr erfüllt. (…) Integration meint nicht Assimilation, wohl aber die Anerkennung des Verfassungsstaates und der freiheitlichen-demokratischen Leitkultur in Deutschland einschließlich eines erkennbaren Bemühens um das Erlernen der deutschen Sprache und der in diesem Land gewachsenen kulturellen Grundvorstellungen".

order. (…) The common foundation is the Basic Law, this is our constitution."[59]

This line of argument led to the well-known statement of the interior minister Wolfgang Schäuble: "Islam is a part of Germany". In a newspaper interview just before the first Islam Conference in 2006, Schäuble called for the "enlightenment" of Muslim immigrants. He remarked as follows:

> Meanwhile the Islam is a part of Germany and Europe. … It must be clear that whoever lives here must accept and respect the German constitutional and legal order. We want enlightened Muslims in our enlightened country.[60]

"Enlightenment" is a key term in this argument. In the integration discourse, while such "Islamist violence" as "honor killing" and "forced marriage" is usually characterized as "patriarchic and authoritarian" practice, which is regarded as incompatible with "our values", "enlightened Muslims" are welcome in "our country". In this way of thinking, the boundary between "Muslims" and "us" is not fixed but blurred. The "naturalist" culture concept of the 1980s does not play a significant role in this way of thinking any more. The conception of the boundary in the 2000s is rather "civilizationist" in the sense the boundary could be sifted through "enlightenment".

It is yet well recognized that the "enlightenment" of Muslims is not an easy task. It takes time. It is therefore no wonder that the role of "dialogue" is always emphasized in the integration discourse. All political parties in the Bundestag, from the left to the conservative, agree that "dialogue" is a clue to better integration, since integration is a mutual and interactive process. For example, Angela Merkel stated in her first speech as a federal chancellor in the Bundestag that "we need a dialogue with the Islam"[61]. The Integration Summit that she organized was called the "beginning of a continuing dialogue"[62]. The federal interior minister Schäuble also said of the Islam Conference

---

[59] BT 15/145 (December 2, 2004), S.13448, emphasis added. The original German text: "Integrationspolitik muss doch den Islam als gleichberichtige Religion anerkennen und zum Ziel haben, den Islam quasi bei und einzubürgern. Den nein europäischer Islam ist doch der beste Beitrag im internationalen Kampf gegen den islamischen Extremismus. (…). Toleranz in einer multikulturellen Demokratie bewegt sich immer im Rahmen unserer Verfassungsordnung. (…) Das gemeinsame Fundament, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, das ist das Grundgesetz, das ist unsere Verfassung." In the name of the "naturalization", the Green Party proposed the institutionalization of Islamic religious education in Germany.

[60] *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (September 26, 2006).

[61] BT, 16/4 (November 30, 2005), S.83

[62] Bundeskanzleramt, "Gutes Zusammenleben - klare Regeln. Start in die Erarbeitung eines nationalen Integrationsplans" (July 14, 2006).

that "we attempt to start a dialogue"[63]. The SPD-deputy Niels Annen insisted that "mutual understanding and agreement [between Muslims and non-Muslims] is only possible by dialogue"[64]. Fritz Kuhn of the Green remarked on integration that "this is about a real dialogue. It means above all that both sides take a perspective of each other and put a question on itself". The CSU-deputy Karl-Theodor Freiherr zu Guttenberg commented on this remark as follows:

> Yes to the willingness to dialogue (*Dialogbereitschaft*). I agree with you, Mr. Kuhn. We must be also aware that no line of conflict or no apodictic line of separation is drawn between the Western and the Islamic worlds. The real and definite line of conflict is drawn between those who speak of terrorism, hate, and intolerance, on the one hand, and those who, regardless of their religion, support human rights, the rule of law, and the diversity of opinion, on the other.[65]

Through "dialogue", as zu Guttenberg suggested, the boundary between the "Islam" and the "West" or the "Christianity" could be surpassed. But in order to conduct a "dialogue", Muslims need to have the "willingness to dialogue". In zu Guttenberg's statement, this seems to mean a will to accept the "liberal and democratic values", which include the human rights, the rule of law, the diversity of opinion, and religious freedom, as the common ground of dialogue. Moreover, if this "dialogue" is conducted in Germany, it probably requires good command of German. Learning German is therefore an initial step to participate in "dialogue"[66]. Thus "dialogue", as a way of better integration, actually presupposes the common ground of integration: the German language and the constitutional values.

The German society of the 2000s, which is "imagined" in terms of the "liberal-democratic" constitutional values and dialogue, seems to be more "open" to immigrants from "other cultural spheres". Angela Merkel wrote in the preface to *The National Integration Plan* that "Germany is a worldly open country". Is it really so? Theoretically speaking, the essentialist cultural difference between immigrants and

---

[63] *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, (September 26. 2006)
[64] BT, 16.17 (February 10, 2006), S.1254.
[65] *Op. cit.*, S.1250, 1251 (emphasis added). The German original text: "Ja zur Dialogbereitscheft, da stimme ich Ihnen zu, Kollege Kuhn. Wir müssen uns auch bewusst sein, dass keine Konfliktlinie, keine apodiktische Trennlinie zwischen denjenigen, die Terrorismus, Hass und Intoleranz das Wort reden, und denjenigen – egal welcher Religion -, die sich für Menschenrechte, für Rechtsstaatlichkeit und für Meinungsvielfalt einsetzen".
[66] On the "Dialogue" in the integration discourse, see Emanuel Richter, "Die Einbürgerung des Islam", in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 20/2005.

natives is no longer assumed to be a primary boundary of this society. Immigrants, including Muslim immigrants, could be a part of this society, if they speak German and accept the German constitutional values. Thus the boundary between immigrants and natives is not fixed but blurred and fluid. However, the German society requires from immigrants to have the "will" of integration. Immigrants are now urged to learn German and pledge allegiance to the Constitution as their own responsibility. The federal commissar for integration and immigrants Maria Böhmer stated in the Bundestag as follows:

> What is important is the willingness (*Bereitschaft*) on the side of immigrants to get actually involved into a life in Germany. It means saying "yes" to our Basic Law, our legal order, and our German language.[67]

The real "apodictic line" of separation, in the words of zu Guttenberg, is thus drawn between those who have the "will" and those who do not. If an immigrant refuses to learn German and to accept the constitutional values, this person might be regarded as a "hindrance" to integration and stigmatized as an "objector of integration (*Integrationsverweigerer*)".

Concluding remarks: Integration as a "moral responsibility"

"Germany changes through immigration", said the German political scientist of the Egyptian origin Hamed Abdul-Samad[68]. In this paper, I have tried to show how the self-understanding of Germany has changed by discussing the transformation of the integration discourse from the 1980 through the 2000s. In the 1980s, the essentialist concept of culture underlay and shaped the discourse of integration. Left-liberals and conservatives, or "multiculturalist" and "monoculturalist" each proposed different views of integration. But they all basically shared the essentialist cultural difference between "foreigners" and "Germans".

But in the 2000s, the essentialist scheme of the difference between "foreigners" and "Germans" no longer played a primary role in the integration discourse. A broad

---

[67] BT, 16/123 (November 8, 2007), S. 12735. The German original text: "Notwendig ist auf der Seit der Zuwanderer die Bereitschaft, sich auf ein Leben in Deutschland wirklich einzulassen. Das heißt, Ja zu unserem Grundgesetz, zu unserer Rechtsordnung und zu unserer deutschen Sprache zu sagen".

[68] ""Der Islam ist wie eine Droge"", in *Der Spiegel*, 37/2010, S.120

consensus on the common cultural framework of integration emerged. It came to be generally agreed that the German language and the "liberal-democratic basic values" of the constitution is the common ground that immigrants and natives should share. Immigrants could be "naturalized" into the German society, if they accept this common ground. In this sense, the German society is more "open" to immigrants from different cultural backgrounds and the boundary is more blurred and fluid.

But the integration now needs the "will" of immigrants to integrate. The main-stream integration discourse calls for the "will" and criticize the "lack of the will". "Learn German! Go to German schools! Get job training!, Work hard without social benefits! Be rational and independent citizens!" "Fellow immigrants, integrate yourselves!" "Integration is your moral responsibility (*Bringschuld*)!" These are messages repeatedly heard from governments, politicians, commentators, and journalists.

After the heat-up of the integration debate in the last month, these general calls for integration are becoming more omnipresent and offensive. The "lack of the will" is more blatantly criticized. "No taboo" is a motto now. The rise of such nation-wide offensive calls for integration reveals a new dividing line more clearly: The common criteria of integration are articulated and "objectors to integration" is marginalized and excluded. The consequences of this trend, however, remain to be seen.