

Refugees in an *Einwanderungsland*: The Integration Policies of Turkish-German
Representatives in the 18th Bundestag

by

Kevin Dobb

B.A., University of California, Santa Barbara 2015

M.A., University of Colorado, Boulder 2018

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Colorado in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of
Masters of Arts
Department of German and Slavic Languages and Literature
2018

This thesis entitled:
Refugees in an *Einwanderungsland*: The Integration Policies of Turkish-German
Representatives in the 18th Bundestag

written by Kevin Dibb

has been approved for the Department of German and Slavic Languages and
Literatures

Professor Beverly Weber

Professor Lauren Stone

Date_____

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we
find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards
of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

Abstract:

Dibb, Kevin (M.A., German Studies)

Refugees in an *Einwanderungsland*: The Integration Policies of Turkish-German Representatives in the 18th Bundestag

Thesis directed by Professor Beverly Weber

The 2013 federal elections marked the first time the Turkish-German community reached proportional representation in the Bundestag, the German parliament. Less than two years later, the “refugee crisis” was well underway, quickly becoming the most pressing political issue of the era and challenging long-standing federal integration policies and structures. The concurrence of these two events provides an interesting case-study in an emergent body of scholarship concerning the engagement of immigrant-origin parliamentarians with issues of national immigration and integration policies. The disparate levels of involvement of the eleven Turkish-German members of parliament in legislation concerning the refugee migrations of 2014-2016 present a nuanced portrait of their political positions on integration and immigration. The legislative activity of Turkish-German representatives surrounding the refugee “crisis” offers evidence that party affiliation and individual policy interests play a greater role in shaping policy activity than ethnic identity.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Arrangement of the Thesis.....	3
	PART I: Formulating a Federal Plan	15
	PART II: The 2016 Shift in Integration Discourse	30
	PART III: The Integration Law of 2016.....	43
	CONCLUSION.....	60
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	65

A dominant theme of German politics of recent years has been the formulation of immigration and integration policies in the context of refugee migrations to Europe. The absorption of German politics by questions of immigration and integration coincided with the culmination of another longer historical trend, the growing proportion of federal representation of the Turkish-German community. Eleven parliamentary representatives (Abgeordneten) of Turkish-German background were elected into the 18th Bundestag (2013 – 2017), a record number for the minority community within Germany. The increase in refugee migration that began in 2014 would come to define the first parliamentary session in which the Turkish-German population had attained proportional representation. The 2013 elections marked a significant representational success for the Turkish-German community at a time when questions of immigration, integration, and belonging were at the fore of German politics.

As a result of their electoral success and their appointment to important immigration-related positions, Turkish-German representatives were in a position to influence the creation of new national policies concerning refugees and their integration into German society. An examination of their political speeches in parliament regarding the stated federal policies (immigration, refugee asylum, and integration) offers a glimpse into how their own identity shows through in their policy positions. As members of the country's largest immigrant group, with personal experience with integration and inclusion in German society, they were in a unique position to rearticulate the future and composition of a nation that has historically refused to see itself as a country of immigration.¹ As a whole, this politically-diverse group of representatives

¹ Kohl, Helmut. Regierungserklärung zur 12. Wahlperiode des Deutschen Bundestages. 30. Januar 1991 "Deutschland ist kein Einwanderungsland."

occupied important positions as both formulators and critics of the government's apparatus controlling entrance and integration into German society.

The significant participation of the Turkish-German representatives on refugee integration and migration in a politically diverse and varying manner speaks to a new era for the Turkish-German community in Germany. There were Turkish-German representatives in each of the major parties of the 18th Bundestag, and the differences in their rhetoric surrounding immigration and integration reflects this political diversity. The issues of immigration and integration raised between 2014 and 20016 are defined on a deeper level by their implications for inclusion and acceptance into German society and access to German identity. These in turn are some of the very same issues the Turkish-German community has grappled with since the beginning of the *Gastarbeiter* program in 1961.

In evoking their own personal history as Turkish-Germans and the longer history of their community during their efforts to legislate and negotiate the status of the next arriving minority group, I argue that certain members both insert the history of Turkish-Germans into postwar German policy history and advocate for their continued role and place in shaping the future of Germany. On the other hand, several of the eleven played little to no role at all in legislating the refugee migrations, instead focusing solely on other policy issues. The complete lack of engagement with integration and immigration policy from many Turkish-German representatives bespeaks the diversity of their policy portfolios and their incorporation into numerous other wings of the government. This policy diversity underlies the Turkish-German community's success in integrating into a wide array of governmental powers.

For those who did work intensively with issues of immigration and integration, the political aim of their work varies significantly. Members of the Green and Left parties vocally

advocated for more inclusive and supportive integration programs that prioritized equality of opportunity for refugee migrants. Members of the SPD and CDU, as representatives of the governing coalition, often tacitly supported proposed legislation even if it did not align with their own espoused views of beneficial integration policy, and some even vocally defended more restrictive and exclusionary policy that favored state interests over refugee rights. In both cases however, Turkish-German representatives played important roles in critiquing or supporting state policy, belying the importance of the group in shaping and legitimizing the country's integration system.

The analysis in this thesis of Turkish-German political activity is split into three parts, each dealing with a different legislative moment between 2015 and 2016. Each section begins with a brief assessment of larger federal trends regarding immigration and integration policy, and is followed by an analysis of the response and participation of Turkish-German representatives within the larger discourse set by federal elites and societal context. Part one deals with the early stance of the federal government toward refugees in the fall of 2015, a moment of initial federal optimism and measured openness toward refugees. Part two serves two functions within this project: it demonstrates the discursive shift in integration rhetoric that occurred in early 2016 in its historical context and second, provides the necessary autobiographical information and personal history of key Turkish-German representatives to show how their experience informs their politics.

Part three deals with the integration law passed in May of 2016 and the role of certain Turkish-German representatives in abetting the passage of the law and how others strongly resisted it. The exclusionary measures included within the law that represent the state's growing shift towards more restrictive immigration and punitive integration policies. The intent of this

division into three parts is to illustrate the discursive shift I argue takes place over the course of this year-long period, and the role of Turkish-German representatives within this changing federal stance toward immigration.

Methodology

The term discourse used in this project is based on a long history of scholarship and is derived from the relationship between language and power first laid out by Foucault.² It is through a discursive lens that I intend to understand and analyze the political activities of Turkish-German representatives. Discourse surrounding a policy area can have direct outcomes on the individuals affected by said policy. For the purposes of this project, my understanding follows Weedon's succinct definition of discourse as:

...ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the 'nature' of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern.³

Political elites, through their speeches to the Bundestag, play a decisive role in shaping the discourse surrounding refugees to suit shifting state interests and in reaction to larger societal changes (see part two and the aftermath of New Year's Eve in Cologne). In doing so, there are subsequent policy consequences that, in the case of the recent refugee arrivals, severely restricted their access to state benefits and weighed heavily on their daily lives. In the beginning of each

² Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: Pantheon, 1972).

³ Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, (Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell, 1987): 108.

part of this project, the discursive setting will be described through a closer look at the speeches of political elites, namely those of Chancellor Merkel and other cabinet level positions.

This type of discursive study is modeled after numerous other works, in particular that of Ruth Wodak who identifies how racism, discrimination, and exclusion manifest themselves discursively:

...racist opinions and beliefs are produced and reproduced by means of discourse [...]; through discourse, discriminatory exclusionary practices are prepared, promulgated and legitimized.⁴

Following the discourse-historical approach as a methodology entails assigning texts (in this case political speeches) to discursive topics (integration, immigration, refugees) and identifying them within a larger context.⁵

Each part of this project will assess legislative changes made to reflect this discourse and the state interests it implies. These legislative changes to the legal structure of integration and immigration policies make up what Schuster-Craig calls an integration apparatus.⁶ An integration apparatus, is a term derived from the Foucauldian theory of governmentality and Agamben's notion of an apparatus.⁷ It describes the set of institutions and political powers that shape the conception of integration, into one that predominantly suits the state's interests. Schuster-Craig describes an integrative apparatus as a form of governmentality that "translates political ambition

⁴ Martin Reisigl, Ruth Wodak. *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. (London: Routledge, 2001): 41.

⁵ Ruth Wodak, *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*, (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2015): 51.

⁶ Johanna Schuster-Craig, "Integration Politics as an Apparatus", *German Studies Review* 40, no. 3 (October 2017): 607-627.

⁷ Catriona Macleod and Kevin Durrheim, "Foucauldian Feminism: The implications of Governmentality" *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 32, no. 1 (2002): 41-60.

Giorgio Agamben, "What is an apparatus?" in *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays*, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009).

(full assimilation) into practical measures (sufficient integration to participate in society)⁸. In each section I examine how Turkish-German representatives conversely challenge, support, and reify this integration apparatus informed by an integration discourse set by other political elites.

Before beginning with the analysis, a brief overview of the Turkish-German community is necessary in order to understand the larger historical context the refugee migrations unfolded within, particularly as much of part one deals with the CDUs attempt to revise the party's own role in the history of German immigration policy.

Historical Background and Contemporary Political Context

The sustained immigration of young and capable workers under the guest worker program of the 1960s contributed significantly to the *Wirtschaftswunder* in Germany and has played an important role in creating the economic prowess that Germany enjoys today.⁹ That a significant portion of the guest workers ended up largely settling down, bringing over family members, and making a new life in their adoptive country has contributed to the growing ethnic diversity and multiculturalism of Germany over the last half century.¹⁰ The Turkish-German population in Germany, both those born in Turkey and those born in Germany to parents or grandparents of Turkish origin, numbers roughly four million and makes up approximately three to four percent of the overall population.

⁸ Johanna Schuster-Craig, "Integration Politics as an Apparatus", *German Studies Review* 40, no. 3 (October 2017): 607-627.

⁹ Stephen Castles "Immigration and Asylum: Challenges to European Identities and Citizenship" in *The Oxford Handbook of Postwar European History* pg 201

¹⁰ Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes, eds. *Germany in Transit: Nation and Migration, 1955-2005*. Pg 25

Long-term policies and structures to encourage integration and political participation for the Turkish population were not initially available. Strict citizenship requirements for holders of political office, to vote in elections, and to participate in most political parties left Turkish immigrants with few viable options for participation in the politics of their adoptive country. Furthermore, the initial lack of pathways to obtaining German citizenship for foreign-born residents left immigrants without the possibility of naturalizing, even after numerous years spent in Germany.¹¹

While formal political channels were, for the most part, inaccessible to Turkish immigrants, early indirect political engagement in the 1970s did exist mainly through membership in labor unions. These unions were strongly affiliated with the left-centrist Social-Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) and through the fledgling Green Party. The Green Party, born out of the 1960s protest movement and based heavily on a pro-environmental platform, was the only party not to require German citizenship as a prerequisite for membership and participation and thus was home to many of the first prominent Turkish-German politicians and political figures.¹² With only minor political access through labor unions and the Green Party, Turkish-Germans remained largely marginalized in the national politics throughout the 1980s and 1990s.¹³ This political marginalization that defined the first three decades of Turkish immigrant presence in Germany contributed significantly to the feelings of alienation and

¹¹ Faruk Şen. "The Historical Situation of Turkish Migrants in Germany" *Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora* 22 (2003): 208-227.

¹² Blühdorn, Ingolfur. *Reinventing Green Politics: On the Strategic Repositioning of the German Green Party*. German Politics. 18:1 36-54 Pg 41

¹³ Aktürk, Şener. *The Turkish Minority in German Politics: Trends, Diversification of Representation, and Policy Implications*. Insight Turkey. Vol. 12, No.1, 2010, pp. 65-80. Pg 66.

exclusion from mainstream German society, sentiments that have for decades been the source of many works of Turkish-German literature and discourse.

This trend of political marginalization entered a period of reform at the turn of the millennium as a result a 1999 citizenship law revision passed by the SPD-Green party coalition under Chancellor Gerhard Schröder.¹⁴ The new legislation reduced the naturalization period from fifteen years down to eight and granted citizenship to children born in Germany to parents who had already lived in Germany for at least eight years. Dual-citizenship, however, was not approved, meaning that the acquisition of German citizenship came at the cost of abandoning Turkish citizenship. Furthermore, children born in Germany to immigrant parents were forced to choose at age eighteen between one passport or the other.¹⁵

Despite the disappointing compromise of the 1999 citizenship reform, citizenship rates and political participation amongst Turkish-Germans have increased. The rate of political representation on the federal level in the Bundestag has further seen a slow yet steady growth since the early 2000s.¹⁶ Below is a graph detailing how many parliamentary members of Turkish-German descent were elected per Bundestag term and which parties they represented.

¹⁴ Hess, Christin, Simon Green. *Introduction: The Changing Politics and Policies of Migration in Germany*. *German Politics*, 25:3, 315-328. Pg 319

¹⁵ Howard, Marc Morjé. *The Causes and Consequences of Germany's New Citizenship Law*. *German Politics*. 17:1, 41 – 62 pg 53

¹⁶ Wüst, Andreas M. "Incorporation beyond Cleavages? Parties, Candidates and Germany's Immigrant-Origin Electorate." *German Politics*. 25:3, 414-432. Pg 416

Table 1 Representatives of Turkish-German Descent in the German Parliament

Term	Left	Green	SPD	FDP	CDU/CSU	Total
18 th Term (2013-2017)	Sevim Dağdelen; Azize Tank	Ekin Deligöz;; Cem Özdemir; Özcan Mutlu	Metin Hakverdi; Cansel Kiziltepe; Mahmut Özdemir; Aydan Özoğuz; Gülistan Tüksel	<i>FDP not in Bundestag</i>	Cemile Giousouf	11
17 th Term (2009-2013)	Sevim Dağdelen	Ekin Deligöz; Memet Kılıç	Aydan Özoğuz	Serkan Tören	–	5
16 th Term (2005-2009)	Hüseyin Kenan- Aydın; Sevim Dağdelen; Hakkı Keskin	Ekin Deligöz	Lale Akgün	–	–	5
15 th Term (2002-2005)	–	Ekin Deligöz; Cem <u>Özdemir</u>	Lale Akgün	–	–	3
14 th Term (1998-2002)	–	Ekin Deligöz; Cem <u>Özdemir</u>	Leyla Onur	–	–	3
13 th Term (1994-1998)	–	Ekin Deligöz; Cem <u>Özdemir</u>	Leyla Onur	–	–	2

Source: Official Website of the Bundestag¹⁷

In the 18th Bundestag term, 11 of 630 seats were occupied by representatives of Turkish-German background, approximately 1.7% of all seats. Population estimates of the Turkish-German population vary, but most academics agree on something between 3% to 4 % of the population, roughly 3.5 million people. In 2013, only roughly 700,000 of the Turkish-German population held German citizenship and could vote in federal elections.¹⁸ Thus in terms of German citizenry, Turkish-Germans made up roughly one percent (1.2%) of the German electorate in 2013. Since 2013 the number of Turkish-German representatives has more than

¹⁷ “Abgeordnete: Biografien” *Deutscher Bundestag*, accessed September 30th 2017.

<https://www.bundestag.de/abgeordnete/>

¹⁸ „Wahlen“ Wahlen Übersicht, *Türkische Gemeinde in Deutschland*, accessed October 25, 2017.
<https://www.tgd.de/projekte/wahlen/#ubersicht>

proportionally mirrored the population of Turkish-German citizens (1% of the electorate holding 1.7% of parliamentary seats).

In addition to the rising number of representatives with Turkish-German background, political alignments have diversified significantly.¹⁹ As stated previously, the Turkish-German community has historically been most closely aligned with the Green and Social Democratic parties. This trend has remained strong throughout the last fifteen years, as most of the current eleven representatives are part of the Green Party and the SPD. Yet in the last decade Turkish German candidates from the Left party, the FDP, and most unexpectedly in 2013, the conservative CDU have been elected into the Bundestag.

Another phenomenon has occurred within the Turkish-German population that is connected to their increase in political representation at the federal level. Since the beginning of the guest worker program and the arrival of Turkish workers in 1961, the Turkish-German community has largely been perceived and portrayed in film and literature as foreign-born immigrants.²⁰ This permanent “otherness” applied to Turkish-Germans has long been the source of feelings of exclusion, and discrimination in Germany. In 2012 however, the proportion of the Turkish-German population that was actually born in Germany reached the majority.²¹ The ratio

¹⁹ Şener Aktürk, “The Turkish Minority in German Politics: Trends, Diversification of Representation, and Policy Implications” *Insight Turkey*, 12, no. 1, (2010): 65- 80.

²⁰ Zafer Senocak’s *Deutschsein: Eine Aufklärungsschrift* (2011) is a semi-autobiographical exploration of Germany identity and the author’s own experience as a German with of migrant background. Cem Özdemir’s autobiography *Ich bin Inländer* (1999) explores his struggles with discrimination and acceptance in his young adult life before becoming a politician, and since then after rising to political prominence in the Green party. Faruk Sen’s “The Historical Situation of Turks in Germany” provides a detailed history of early experiences with discrimination and exclusion that *Gastarbeiter* immigrants faced. For filmic representations that present early and often problematic perceptions of immigrants, see Rainer Werner Fassbinder’s *Angst essen Seele auf* (originally *Alle Türken heißen Ali*, 1974) or Tevfik Başer’s *40 qm Deutschland* (1985).

²¹ Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, *Migrationsbericht 2012*.

of Turkish-Germans born in Turkey continued to decline in relation to those born in Germany, with 52.2% having been born in Germany. The Turkish-German community is thus becoming increasingly native-born and not an immigrant community, an important parallel in understanding the corresponding increase in political representation.²²

The Turkish-German community is thus poised at a very interesting political moment in which a majority of the community is German born and has reached proportional representation at the federal level. The total population of *residents* with a Turkish background is around 3 to 4 percent, but approximately 1.7% of the German *citizenry* (people who hold German citizenship and can vote in federal elections) are of Turkish heritage. Thus, in terms of citizenry, proportional representation was reached in the 2013 election. It is during this pivotal period in the history of political representation for the Turkish-German population, marked by an unprecedented level of federal influence and representation, that Germany as a whole has faced one of its toughest national challenges in Post-War history—the arrival of roughly 1.2 million asylum seekers from the beginning of 2015 to the end of 2016²³ who, largely fleeing violence from the Syrian civil war, made up the so-called refugee “crisis.”²⁴

This increase in refugee migration from countries with very different cultural and religious backgrounds challenged immigration systems, built on the espoused values of tolerance and inclusion, of numerous European democracies. The mounting numbers of refugees arriving

²² Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, *Migrationsbericht 2015*

²³ Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, *Aktuelle Zahlen zu Asyl*, Dezember 2016

²⁴ The use of the word “crisis” to refer to the large migration of refugees to Europe between 2014 and 2016 is disputed, for while certain parts of the migration certainly were crises (the frequent drownings in the Mediterranean, the violent civil war in Syria, etc.) the word ‘crisis’ began to be used in reference more to the growing presence of refugees in Germany and implied a sort of existential threat to German and European identity. I will be using the term “refugee migration” for the purposes of this project.

in Europe throughout the course of 2015 created sharp divisions within the European Union regarding refugee policy. They were exploited by right-wing political parties to stoke anti-immigrant sentiment within the populace and attract voters.²⁵

For Germany, the onset of the refugee arrivals and rising humanitarian crisis it represented could not be approached in a historical vacuum. Rather, the country was forced to take into account while formulating a refugee policy its own history as a perpetrator of genocide during World War II and the national guilt that ensued in the Post-War period. The decision by the German government under Angela Merkel in 2015 to accept huge numbers of refugees into Germany and the ensuing (though not unchallenged) *Willkommenskultur* was hailed internationally as a moment of atonement for national sins committed during the Nazi era and the beginning of a new era of moral leadership in Europe.²⁶

The eleven Turkish-German representatives of the 2013-2017 Bundestag session found themselves thus elected into parliament at a time where arguably the most pressing political matter—the refugee migration—was an issue shaded by questions of race, fear of the ‘other’, and the precarious state of religious tolerance and ethnic multiculturalism in Germany. Despite the Turkish-German community’s electoral success in 2013, the community is often portrayed as a case of “failed integration” by political elites. In a televised debate leading up to the 2017 federal election, Chancellor Angela Merkel refers to the integration of Turkish guest workers as

²⁵ Ruth Wodak, *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*, (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2015).

²⁶ Fareed Zakaria. “Germany’s road to redemption shines amid Europe’s refugee debate” *The Washington Post*. September 10, 2015.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/germanys-road-to-redemption-shines-amid-europes-refugee-debate/2015/09/10/00955630-57f0-11e5-8bb1b488d231bba2_story.html?utm_term=.2c9697896013

“unsuccessful” (*nichtgelingen*) and claims to have used the lessons of failed Turkish integration to inform better policy for new refugees.²⁷

These issues surrounding the refugee migrations thus mirror the longer history of the Turkish immigration to Germany and subsequent questions of integration and belonging. Their voices and legislative efforts in the Bundestag surrounding this issue, as some of the few representatives with any personal experience with immigration and integration, are thus of particular interest and warrant deeper study.

There are general parallels between the two immigration groups that make the inclusion of Turkish-German representatives into the recent legislation process pivotal. Indeed, the *future* of refugees in Germany needs to be informed by the history and experience of the Turkish-German community. However, there are also important differences to note between the Turkish guest workers and the recent refugee migration. While there are compelling parallels between the two groups, the elision of their differences risks collapsing the two distinct immigrant experiences into a monolithic other.

Many early Turkish immigrants were initially explicitly recruited and invited to fulfill a defined economic need.²⁸ They migrated through state-sponsored programs (organized and sanctioned by *both* Germany and Turkey) and were installed into out-of-sight housing complexes in primarily industrial regions such as the Ruhr river valley. Most early Turkish immigrants were

²⁷ ZDF, “Das TV Duell-Merkel-Schulz,” filmed September 3, 2017 at ZDF studios, Berlin, video, 17:50.

<https://www.zdf.de/politik/wahlen/tv-duell-merkel-schulz-100.html>

²⁸ After the end of the guest worker program, many Turkish immigrants continued to come to Germany out of other reasons, naming as asylum seekers, through family reunion programs, etc.

young working-class adults who migrated to Germany alone but maintained strong ties to their home communities.²⁹

The refugee experience is radically different. Linguistically and culturally, the migrants lumped under the umbrella term “refugee migrations” hail from a myriad of different countries across North Africa and the Middle East. The highest number came from Syria, but significant portions of the migrations were made up by individuals from Iraq, Afghanistan, Eritrea, Iran, and several other countries. As refugees, they fled violence, war, poverty, and economic privation in their country of origin. Uninvited, they were received in Europe with, at best, a degree of reluctance and at worst with police violence, internment camps, and inflamed right-wing xenophobia.

Many are virtually stateless. For instance, the Syrian government was on the verge of collapse after years of civil war and internal strife. As a result, Syrians lacked a home government to provide support and information to themselves and to the German government seeking to accommodate the migrants. Refugees are of mixed professional and educational backgrounds, often migrate with family members and children, and many have survived intense trauma in their flight from shattered home communities. Additionally, they have been placed all across Germany—rapidly changing the demographics of small rural towns and villages. In short, the context of the Turkish migration was drastically different than the contemporary Syrian experience as refugee migrants. It is to the policy decisions surrounding the early refugee experience that we now turn.

²⁹ Faruk Şen. “The Historical Situation of Turkish Migrants in Germany” *Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora* 22 (2003): 208-227.

Part 1: Formulating a Federal Plan: “*Wir schaffen das*”

“We are a country of immigration.”³⁰

—Cemile Giousouf

First Turkish-German Representative of the CDU

By the fall of 2015, the so-called “refugee crisis” had been underway for almost a year. The Federal Office of Migration and Refugees (BAMF) anticipated the arrival of 800,000 refugee migrants by the end of the year. As the number of refugees in Germany rose throughout early 2015 along with a concomitant increase in media coverage, the issue became more and more pressing for the federal government. Throughout the summer, debate around refugees and the necessity for action became salient in both the Bundestag and public discourse. Rising death tolls in the Mediterranean, disturbing images of overcrowded and ill-prepared transit camps, and the turmoil and discord within the EU all added to the frenzied feeling of crisis surrounding the refugee migrations.

Yet by the end of summer 2015, a coherent plan or national vision on the issue had yet to be articulated. A myriad of factors converged by the end of the summer that, in the absence of an articulate federal plan, further incited a sense of urgency. First, the right-wing party *Alternative für Deutschland* (AfD) exploited the refugee migrations to achieve alarming success in state-level elections. In the spring of 2015, the AfD shocked the world of German politics by winning seats in parliament in both Hamburg and Bremen, two states (*Bundesländer*) that have

³⁰*Deutscher Bundestag Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 128, 02 October 2015. Pg 12492

traditionally been more left-leaning.³¹ In the party's incipient years, its message had centered on dissatisfaction with the EU, the Euro, and harmful effects of globalization on the labor market.³² In the context of the refugee migrations, more xenophobic and far-right voices gained party leadership and amplified the long-extant voices of racial nationalism and anti-immigration within the AfD.³³ The rise in right-wing populism and the entrance of extreme nationalism into German politics—unprecedented since the end of World War II—put further pressure on the 18th Bundestag to articulate a plan for incoming refugees.

Secondly, it became disconcertingly apparent that the German asylum process had been overwhelmed by the sheer number of refugee arrivals. The massive bureaucratic delays created frustration for all parties involved. Understaffed and underfunded, the agencies in charge of processing and clearing incoming refugees were struggling to keep up. For refugees, the asylum process spanned months and often took up a year of waiting before learning their status, meaning months of inactivity and uncertainty would end abruptly with either residency permission or immediate deportation. The reality of an underperforming asylum system and the scale of the issue necessitated parliamentary action.³⁴

³¹ „Bürgerschaftswahl 2015 Hamburg und Bremen“ Wahlergebnisse, Tagesschau. Accessed October 20, 2017.

<https://wahl.tagesschau.de/wahlen/2015-02-15-LT-DE-HH/index.shtml>

³² Robert Grimm. “The rise of the German Eurosceptic party Alternative für Deutschland, between ordoliberal critique and popular anxiety” *International Political Science Review* Vol. 36(3), (2014): 264–278.

Dieter Plehwe; Matthias Schlögl. “Europäische und zivilgesellschaftliche Hintergründe der euro(pa)skeptischen Partei Alternative für Deutschland (AfD)” *WZB Berlin Social Science Center*, (2014): 501.

³³ Knut Bergmann, Matthias Diermeier, Judith Niehues. “Die AfD: Eine Partei der sich ausgeliefert fühlenden Durchschnitts- verdieners?” *ZParl Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen*, Jahrgang 48, Heft 1, (2017): 57 – 75.

³⁴ „Flüchtlinge: Zahl der Asylbewerber erreicht im Juli Rekordhoch“ *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 31, 2015.

As the fall legislative period commenced (19 August 2015 to 16 October 2015, with 14 plenary sessions in total), it was clear that the refugee migration would be a principal legislative issue. On August 31st, days before the second meeting of the fall parliamentary session, Chancellor Angela announced a policy of open borders and urged the Bundestag to work with her on facilitating the arrival and integration of the refugee migration. Her bold call to action in the face of uncertainty and doubt was summarized in a soon to be ubiquitous phrase, “wir schaffen das.”³⁵ Referring to numerous hurdles that Germany had overcome in the past, Chancellor Angela expressed confidence in the country’s ability to manage the refugee migration through “German flexibility” and “a little bit of courage.”³⁶ Two days later, the body of a three-year-old Syrian boy, Alan Kurdi, washed ashore.³⁷ The heart-wrenching photos of Alan Kurdi circulated around the globe and further concretized the need for immediate action in the Bundestag.

Chancellor Merkel’s speech a week later on September 9th outlines the scope of refugee migration—comparing it to migrations seen in the years after WWII. She heavily emphasizes Germany’s strong economic growth as evidence of the country’s ability to take in high numbers of refugees. In praising the impressive growth of the German economy, she highlights the country’s high number of unfilled jobs and record-low unemployment rate. In doing so, she

<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/fluechtlinge-zahl-der-asylbewerber-erreicht-im-juli-rekordhoch-13728780.html>

³⁵ *Sommerpressekonferenz von Kanzlerin Angela Merkel*. 31. August. 2015. Berlin. See link for transcript:

<https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Mitschrift/Pressekonferenzen/2015/08/2015-08-31-pk-merkel.html>

³⁶ *ibid*

³⁷ Robert Mackey, “Brutal Images of Syrian Boy Drowned Off Turkey Must Be Seen, Activists Say,” *The New York Times*, April 2, 2015,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/03/world/middleeast/brutal-images-of-syrian-boy-drowned-off-turkey-must-be-seen-activists-say.html>

frames the refugee migrations as a way to meet an economic need and to acquire the workforce required to meet hitherto unmet labor demands.³⁸ This portrayal of refugees as an economic commodity parallels the perception of Turkish guest workers half a century earlier. Almost every other speech given in response to Merkel's speech in the September 9th session echoes these sentiments of economic opportunity.³⁹

Having articulated a federal position, responsibility fell to the governing CDU/CSU and SPD Grand Coalition in the Bundestag to create corresponding legislation. Chancellor Merkel's emphasis on the economic nature of this vision would become visible in the Bundestag's activity, as defining elements of the government's initial legislative response in 2015 are centered on a neoliberal emphasis on productivity and labor as conditions for refugee acceptance. In this early fall period, we thus see the roots of an integration apparatus that evaluates integrative success, and corresponding asylum benefits, according to one's labor value and capacity to contribute to the German economy. To understand this trend, a deeper look at the parliamentary discourse presented in legislative debates of the period is warranted.

Discourse Analysis

The response and actions of the Turkish-German representatives over the next three months are diverse in both their level of engagement and political viewpoint regarding the refugees. Their words on the Bundestag floor are representative of their conscious efforts to shape federal discourse around the refugee migration. By influencing legislation these

³⁸ "Rede von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel im Deutschen Bundestag" Aktuelles, Die Bundesregierung, September 9, 2015.
<https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Rede/2015/09/2015-09-10-rede-deutscher-bundestag.html>

³⁹ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 120, 9 September 2015.

representatives are participating in a process that affects the lives of hundreds of thousands of potentially future Germans, and make their voices heard in the formation of a new vision for Germany. The presence and active role of certain Turkish-German representatives served as a steady reminder of both the history of immigration in Germany and of the nascent future of the refugee migrant population.

The speaking records of the eleven representatives differ greatly, and not all are participating in the fashion identified above. Of the eleven Turkish-German representatives, three (Metin Hakverdi, Mahmut Özdemir, Azize Tank) were silent not just regarding the refugee crisis, but did not speak at all during the entire legislative period. Two of the representatives, Cemile Giousouf and Aydan Özoğuz, hold positions dedicated to issues of immigration and integration (the CDU Integration Commissioner and State Minister for Migration, Refugees, and Integration respectively). Both Giousouf (CDU) and Özoğuz (SPD) gave one lengthy speech explaining the policy positions of their party and defending the initial legislative proposal of the Grand Coalition they represented. Of the eleven, only two—Özcan Mutlu and Sevim Dagdelen—gave speeches regarding immigration and integration of refugee migrants on a regular or frequent basis.

The same number of representatives (5) were decidedly silent on immigration and integration policy. This lack of engagement serves as a glaring contradiction to the thesis that an immigrant background increases the likelihood of engagement with immigration issues. Rather, it bespeaks the diversity of the policy interests of Turkish-German representatives and prevents generalizations from being made about an inherent interest in involvement with migration issues. Metin Hakverdi, Cansel Kiziltepe, and Mahmut Özdemir (SPD), Azize Tank (Linke) and Renate Künast (Green) did not speak publicly about migration issues and focused rather on other policy

areas, including rent control, environmental policy, and tax reform. For the members of the SPD, which in the 2013-2017 period was in a coalition with the CDU, it is plausible that their silence reflected an unwillingness to critique the policies their coalition partner was putting forward.

The mixed speaking record of the eleven Turkish-German representatives warrants further unpacking. First, it suggests anecdotal evidence contradicting research claiming that parliamentary members with a visible minority background engage more with migration issues than their non-immigrant origin counterparts.⁴⁰ One scholar, Andreas Wüst, has engaged heavily with immigrant-origin politicians in the German context. Wüst (2014) concludes that newly-elected immigrant-origin representatives are more likely to engage with issues of immigration and integration than immigrant-origin representatives who have held office for a longer period of time.⁴¹ The fact that half of the Turkish-German representatives, three of whom were newly elected, did not engage with these issues calls into question the applicability of his thesis to this context.

As explained in the introduction, Germany's citizenship laws have been significantly liberalized over the past twenty years. For many Turkish-German representatives, this liberalization affected them personally, as many were only able to gain citizenship and subsequently become politicians as a result of this reform process. In the context of legislating another immigration movement, both the history and the party-origins of this liberalization process became a source of intense debate. In various episodes during this parliamentary period, this history of reform came to the fore, with CDU Representative Cemile Giousouf clashing with

⁴⁰ Karen Bird, Thomas Saalfeld, Andreas M. Wüst *The Political Representation of Immigrants and Minorities: Voters, Parties and Parliaments in Liberal Democracies* (New York: Routledge, 2011).

⁴¹ Andreas M. Wüst "A Lasting Impact? On the Legislative Activities of Immigrant-origin Parliamentarians in Germany." *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 20 (May 2014): 495-515.

members of the Green party about which political parties could take credit for modernizing Germany's citizenship policy.

At stake in this debate is a revisionist rewriting of who the authors of discriminating citizenship policy were and which parties were obstacles to reform. In reality, the CDU's history of acceptance of immigrants is a short one indeed, and the party's acknowledgement of the reality of Germany's immigrant identity is a recent development.⁴² The CDU's historical stance on citizenship reform and its reputation concerning immigrant has important electoral implications in a rapidly diversifying 21st century Germany.

On September 2nd, Giousouf cites CDU leadership for reforming the integration process, earning a sharp retort from Özcan Mutlu:

GIOUSOUF (CDU): For over decades Germany has accepted immigrants and refugees. We are an immigrant country. But in the beginning, we also made mistakes. The so-called guest worker generation had no language course or counseling offers—a situation that persists in most other countries around the world to this day. But we learned from these mistakes. It was the CDU/CSU led government that essentially developed our current conception of integration policy

MUTLU (Green): What a joke!

GIOUSOUF: Because of this, we must tell people when we talk about the integration of refugees: we are not starting from scratch.⁴³

Representative Giousouf claims that the CDU-led government has been historically responsible for developing functional integration policies. As the first Turkish-German representative of the CDU, her claim that “Germany is a country of immigration⁴⁴” is indeed provocative and marks a

⁴² As explained in the historical background section of the introduction, liberalized citizenship and immigration laws have largely been the work of left-leaning coalitions made up of members of the Green and Social Democratic parties, and have been strongly opposed by the conservative CDU/CSU.

⁴³ All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

Plenarprotokoll, Sitzung 120, 9 September 2015, 12492 – 12493.

⁴⁴ *ibid* pg 12492.

unique moment in the history of the Bundestag and the CDU, a party that has maintained a distinctly restrictive stance on immigration since the end of World War II.⁴⁵

Her use of inclusive rhetoric to present a softer face of her party on the issue of immigration is meaningful but does not escape the critique of other colleagues. Representative Mutlu instantly scoffs, exclaiming “what a joke!” in response to her claims of CDU leadership on integration reform. Indeed, her rhetoric effaces the longer history of CDU opposition to the liberalization of citizenship and the implementation of effective integration policies.⁴⁶ Her rhetoric is at odds with the CDU’s history and with the statements of members of the CDU/CSU faction in this same legislative period.⁴⁷

To attribute immigration and citizenship reform to the CDU ignores the watershed steps of the SPD-Green federal government under Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in 1998.⁴⁸ In fact, two Green members of the 18th Bundestag, Cem Özdemir and Renate Künast (at that point not a Bundestag representative but a member of the state parliament of Berlin) played decisive roles in this 1998 reform.⁴⁹ However, Cemile Giousouf is partially correct in her assessment. The CDU under Chancellor Merkel has liberalized significantly, marking a significant departure from its past stance on immigration.

⁴⁵ Simon Green, “Understanding *Ausländerpolitik* in Germany” in *The Politics of Exclusion: Institutions and Immigration Policy in Contemporary Germany* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004): 1 - 25.

⁴⁶ See Simon Green’s *The Politics of Exclusion: Institutions and Immigration Policy in Contemporary Germany* for a succinct account of CDU/CSU opposition to citizenship and immigration reform.

⁴⁷ Deutsche Presse Agentur, “Seehofer will Flüchtlinge aus Bayern vergraulen” *Die Zeit*, July 18, 2015.

<http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2015-07/horst-seehofer-asylopolitik-csu-bayern>

⁴⁸ Christin Hess and Simon Green, “The Changing Politics and Policies of Migration in Germany”, *German Politics*, 25:3. June 2016, 315-328.

⁴⁹ Simon Green, *The Politics of Exclusion: Institutions and Immigration Policy in Contemporary Germany*, (New York: Manchester University Press, 2004) 96-97.

Under the leadership of Angela Merkel, the party embraced several SPD-Green reform ideas, culminating in the 2007 *Nationale Integrationsplan* that did create significant infrastructure to integrate arriving immigrants.⁵⁰ The internal shift within the CDU and its conscious effort in the mid-2000s to recruit more immigrant-origin representatives has come under criticism, suggesting the liberalization is more in appearance than in actual substance.⁵¹ Indeed, recent scholarship into the National Integration Plan of 2007 demonstrates certain excluding aspects of the law.⁵²

A second theme prevalent in the speeches of Turkish-German representatives is their emphasis on the *future* of refugees in Germany. Their language portrays refugees as future members of German society, the descendants of whom will be neighbors, colleagues, and citizens. In her September address to the Bundestag, Gülistan Yüksel (SPD) stresses the difficultly and tedious process that integration can entail, but also emphasizes its importance in securing a productive future for immigrants.

YÜKSEL (SPD): Integration is a difficult and lengthy process. I know this very well from my own twenty years of experience with integration politics in my election district. But it is worth it. It is worth it for young people because it gives them prospects. It is worth it for us, because what we give them, we will receive back tomorrow. We as a society have the opportunity to give these kids and these young adults a real future.⁵³

She describes integration as an investment in both the future of refugees but also in the future of Germany. In her words, the integration of children and young people is especially important for

⁵⁰ Joyce Marie Mushaben, "Citizenship and Migration Policies under Merkel's Grand Coalition" *German Politics*, 20:3. September 2011, 276-391.

⁵¹ E Musch, "Consultation Structures in German Immigrant Integration Politics: The National Integration Summit and the German Islam Conference"

⁵² Kien Nghi Ha (Hg.): *Der nationale Integrationsplan auf dem Prüfstand*, Heinrich Böll Stiftung 2007.

⁵³ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 125, 25 September 2015. Pg 12143

the inclusion of an immigrant community into larger society. Integration requires effort and adjustment from both sides, and thus provide benefits both to migrants and to larger society taking refugees into its fold.

Cemile Giousouf (CDU) also describes the necessity for extensive support and integration funding for refugees in order to incorporate them into German society. Similar to Yüksel, she emphasizes the economic and social benefits Germany can receive from integrated refugees. Citing their ability to strengthen the German nation and to keep the country economically competitive, Giousouf participates in the neoliberal conception of integration prevalent in this discursive period:

GIOUSOUF (CDU): The fact is: if we don't sufficiently support the integration of new migrants, of refugees—and here I fully agree with you, dear Karamba—then we will have many broken biographies in Germany. This contradicts our own personal political ethics, and thus integration is in our own interest if we want to continue as a nation to be strong and competitive.⁵⁴

Of notable interest is Giousouf's description of the lives of unintegrated refugees as “lost biographies.” Without the proper support and well-funded integration programs for refugees, refugees will remain on the fringes of German society with lives and narratives that are largely invisible or “lost” to the German public. Her phrase “lost biographies” is typically used to describe other serious life struggles such as homelessness, alcoholism, welfare dependency, etc. and is thus a decidedly negative association to use in the context of refugees. Her strong language acknowledges the reality of long-term refugee presence in German society and serves as a warning to opponents of integration programs.

⁵⁴ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 128, 02. September 2015. Pg 12492.

Her phrasing here also carries distinctly negative connotations for the portion of the original guest worker program and subsequent family-reunion migrants who remain largely unintegrated into German society. A significant portion of the Turkish immigrant population stayed in their segregated communities, did not learn proficient German, and still maintains Turkish culture.⁵⁵ Her usage of “verlorene Biografien” for the potential failure of refugee integration evokes the ongoing context of failed Turkish integration, and thus can be read as a warning for the future and as a sharp critique of the past. For Germany to avoid a repeat of the “lost” Turkish generation, comprehensive and informed integration programs are imperative.

Aydan Özoğuz also stresses this future of refugees. As State Minister for Immigration, Refugees, and Integration her speech carried definitive authority and promises action she is capable of following through on.

ÖZOĞUZ (SPD): It is therefore right for to want to create legal entrance opportunities and that we open up possibilities for those who come here to work, to live, and to become a part of us. In loosening the valve, we open up a door. This is, in my opinion, long overdue.⁵⁶

Her speech envisions an especially inclusive future for refugees in which they can “become a part of us.” Turkish-German representatives frequently emphasize the fact that refugees and their descendants will still be in Germany fifty years in the future and thus need public support immediately if long-term integration is to be possible. By adding this vocal reminder of the inevitable permanency of the refugee migrants, the Turkish-German representatives contribute a presence that was lacking in the formation of the early guest worker program. The guest worker program was conceived without a vision for the future of immigrants

⁵⁵ Faruk Şen. “The Historical Situation of Turkish Migrants in Germany” *Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora* 22 (2003): 208-227.

⁵⁶ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 127, 01 October 2015. Pg 12288

in Germany. The Turkish German representatives, both through their presence as immigrant-origin representatives and in their historically-informed rhetoric work to prevent this mistake from being made again in 2015.

The focus on the future also keeps the conversation surrounding refugee migrants grounded in the long-term reality of their presence. Media coverage and other representations of refugee migration often focus on the immediate short-term effects, a perspective that can ignore the necessity for long-term plans and funding for integration. An early insistence on creating laws that allocate integration funds and provide for tools and programs over a long period of time—decades in scope—is key for ensuring “sufficient support” once priorities begin to shift and other issues take precedence.

A third similarity in the rhetoric used by many of the Turkish-Germans is an emphasis on the importance of language proficiency for successful integration. Ekin Deligöz calls for more funding in order to train and hire more German language teachers.⁵⁷ Aydan Özoğuz suggests language courses starting even before a residency permit has been granted in order to avoid “months of sitting around doing nothing” while awaiting an asylum decision.⁵⁸ Cemile Giousouf cites the lack of language courses for Turkish immigrants of the guest worker generation as a primary reason for their lack of long-term integration.⁵⁹ According to many of the representatives in their own auto-biographical essays, language is extremely important for feelings of belonging

⁵⁷ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 121. 10 September 2015. Pg 11736

⁵⁸ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 127, 01 October 2015. Pg 12288

⁵⁹ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 128, 02 September. Pg 12492

to a country, a crucial part of national identity, and a requirement for significant social interaction and employment.⁶⁰

Finally, many of the Turkish-German representatives openly acknowledge the poor planning of the guest worker program and the ensuing lack of governmental support for integration. The guest worker program has been deemed a “failure of integration” by members of the federal government, thus this critique is not necessarily new. Critique of exclusionary policies from earlier eras coming from Turkish-German representatives, many of whom’s personal lives have been directly affected by the short-sightedness of the guest worker program, carries exceptional potency. Aydan Özoğuz claims that “Germany has learned from its past mistakes” regarding immigration policy and should thus be cognizant of the necessity of integration paths for refugees.⁶¹ Cemile Giousouf explicitly cites the lack of availability of language courses and job counseling for the stagnant integration of the “*Gastarbeitergeneration*.”⁶²

Conclusion of Part I

From their diverse levels of Turkish-German representative involvement with the legislative response to the refugee crisis, several conclusions can be drawn. The crisis atmosphere surrounding the fall legislative period did not draw all eleven Turkish-German representatives into the immigration policy area, nor did their immigrant background in some way entail an increased interest to work on the issue. Rather, only four of the eleven involved

⁶⁰Özcan Mutlu (ed.) *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016). See the accounts from Representatives Özoğuz, Deligöz, Mutlu, Özdemir, and Kiziltepe.

⁶¹ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 127, 01 October 2015. Pg 12288

⁶² *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 128, 02. October 2015. Pg 12492.

themselves in a meaningful way with the issue, contrary to existing research suggesting a connection between immigrant identity and an interest in immigration policy.⁶³ Aydan Özoğuz and Cemile Giousouf were both nominally involved with the issue but an intrinsic or personal level of interest in the issue cannot be definitively identified, as they were both appointed by their party leadership into federal positions specifically responsible for articulating an immigration policy.

Aydan Özoğuz, as a second-generation immigrant who only gained citizenship in 1989 after being born and living in Germany for 23 years, played an important role in legitimizing the Grand Coalition's response to the refugee crisis as the face of immigration policy in Germany.⁶⁴ Her work from a cabinet level position, and Cemile Giousouf in a similarly charged position, both serve to represent, at least in appearance, the inclusion of informed personal experience and immigrant voices into the federal response. The continued influence they played going into 2016 will be further examined in the next chapter.

Seen through the context of an integration apparatus however, this discourse of this period strongly prioritized the economic contributions and output that refugee migrants could potentially contribute. Integration policies implemented by the state apparatus thus operate chiefly with the potential labor productivity of refugees in mind. Language courses, integration courses, acknowledgement of prior education, work programs, and affordable housing are thus created with the goal in mind of feeding the economy's need for migrant labor.

⁶³ (Ed) Karen Bird, Thomas Saalfeld, Andreas M. Wüst *The Political Representation of Immigrants and Minorities: Voters, Parties and Parliaments in Liberal Democracies* (Routledge, 2011). Andreas Wüst, "A Lasting Impact? On the Legislative Activities of Immigrant-origin Parliamentarians in Germany." *The Journal of Legislative Studies*. 2014: 495-515.

Anne Philips, *The Politics of Presence*, 1998

⁶⁴ Aydan Özoğuz, „Aydan Özoğuz: Mitglied des deutschen Bundestages” accessed October 15, 2017. <http://oezoguz.de/>

Overall, the rhetoric of the active Turkish-German representatives is informing important questions being debated in the Bundestag around the future of Germany. As demonstrated, immigrant-origin members of the political left and right heatedly argue over party history towards immigration, including their historical openness to foreigners and responsibility over liberal immigration reform. In a diversifying German electorate, growing more diverse with the influx of refugees, perceptions of pro-immigration will have long term implications on political success. The rhetorical emphasis on the future of refugees in Germany infuses voices concerned with facilitating long-term integration into the discourse. That this persistent reminder comes from Turkish-German representatives, themselves the culmination of mid 20th century migrations, endows this discursive infusion with more power and authority.

Finally, their insistence on programs for German language acquisition ensures the inclusion of practical tools for integration—language—for refugee populations. A lack of German language skills had typically been the most cited sign of failed Turkish integration.⁶⁵ That many Turkish-German representatives emphasize language *as a means to find employment* demonstrates their participation in the emergent neoliberal trend we see in this time period.

Concurrently others emphasize their informed and lived understanding of integration over a focus on the utility of refugee migrants. They emphasized and advocated for many of the same

⁶⁵ Faruk Şen, Andreas Goldberg. Chapter 4 “Das Leben in der Fremde: Türksiche Familien in Deutschland” in *Türken in Deutschland : Leben zwischen zwei Kulturen* (Munich: Beck Verlag, 1994).

Andreas Goldberg, Dirk Halm, Faruk Şen. *Die deutschen Türken*. (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004).
Friedhelm Steffens. *Integrations- und Segregationsmuster von türkischen Migranten.: Menschen im Spannungsfeld zwischen Tradition und Moderne*. (Hamburg: Kovaç Verlag, 2008).

practical integrative tools and programs for refugees (German language courses, etc.) as their non-immigrant origin colleagues. A key difference, however, lies in their intention or goal behind the implementation of these integrative tools. Where many in the Bundestag saw integration programs as a way of assimilating refugees as productive components of the German labor market, many Turkish-German representatives stressed the inclusion of practical integration tools as a means for refugees to create individual futures for themselves and their families in Germany. Thus, as the speeches and rhetorical patterns of the Turkish-German representatives on the Bundestag floor reveal, integration should be conceived with the individuals interests of the refugees in mind. This is a subtle, yet important challenge to an otherwise neoliberal and economic-orientated goal for federal integration policy.

Part 2: The 2016 Shift in Integration Discourse

“The future of Germany as a country of immigration is certain.”⁶⁶

-Cemile Giousouf, CDU

The Bundestag came to the end of 2015 on a determined, if cautious, note. In the fall legislative period the federal government had allocated six billion dollars for federal, state-level, and local institutions to facilitate the incorporation of arriving refugees into German society. This money went primarily toward funding language courses, work programs, and toward hiring new employees in overwhelmed federal agencies in order to more quickly process asylum

⁶⁶ *Plenarprotokoll* Sitzung 153, 29 January 2016. pg 15094

applications and communicate residency status to refugees. In other words, the 2015 legislative decisions served to strengthen and extend a pre-existing integration apparatus in Germany.⁶⁷

The dominant theme of the fall legislative period was portraying refugee migration as an economic opportunity for Germany. This characterization of refugee migration, led by Angela Merkel in her summer press conference, persisted throughout the fall and was echoed by representatives of all major parties.⁶⁸ Refugee migration was an extremely divisive political event in Germany and, as discussed in the first chapter, was used as an effective fuel the stoke widespread frustration with the government and bolster eager far-right extremism. Thus, understandably, Merkel's government sought to sell the refugee crisis as a viable economic opportunity to the German people to garner political support and patience within the populace.

A myriad of connected events at the outset of 2016 would significantly alter the societal context in which the legislative process responsible for creating further integration laws in the Bundestag would unfurl. The events over New Year's Eve in Cologne and the resulting backlash against refugees would have significant effects on the discourse surrounding refugees and the ensuing integration law of 2016, discussed in part three. Taken in conjunction, the discourse surrounding refugee immigrations and the integration thereof would shift drastically from one focused on the potential economic benefit to an integration apparatus of exclusion characterized by a racially hierarchical system of asylum selection. It is important to understand the nature of

⁶⁷ Johanna Schuster-Craig, "Integration Politics as an Apparatus," *German Studies Review* 40, no. 3, (October 2017): 607-627.

⁶⁸ „Sommerpressekonferenz von Bundeskanzlerin Merkel“ Aktuelles, Die Bundesregierung, accessed October 23, 2017.

<https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Mitschrift/Pressekonferenzen/2015/08/2015-08-31-pk-merkel.html>

this turning point to best understand the climate within which Turkish-German representatives interested in immigration policy were operating.

On New Year's Eve on 2015, a series of sexual assaults and robberies occurred in the large square in front of the Cologne train station, a popular gathering place for New Year's Eve festivities. Early media reports stated that the police had identified approximately 30 suspects, all of whom were of Arab or North African descent, specifically Moroccan, Tunisian, and Iraqi.⁶⁹ Details and exact numbers surrounding the evening were vague and convoluted, and conflicting and inaccurate information spread rapidly. Before the truth surrounding the nature of the attacks and the perpetrators could be investigated, and despite the existence of sexual violence in native-born German society, the event in Cologne triggered a panic surrounding a perceived threat posed by male refugees. This panic was fueled by sensationalist media reports that employed racist imagery, including covers that depicted black hands assaulting white female bodies.⁷⁰

Prominent German feminist, Alice Schwarzer, described the events on New Year's Eve as evidence of the alleged threat that Islam posed to European women. In a series of increasingly outrageous yet widely-received articles in the magazine *Emma* (a publication she formerly owned) Schwarzer links the refugee migrations of the previous year with the events of Cologne

⁶⁹ Ana Maria Michel, Valerie Schönian, Frida Thurm und Tilman Steffen. "Was geschah in Köln?," *Die Zeit*, January 5, 2016. <http://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2016-01/koeln-silvester-sexuelle-uebergreif-griffe-raub-faq>

⁷⁰ See the covers of Focus and Die Süddeutsche Zeitung from January 2016 <http://www.migazin.de/2016/01/12/nach-koeln-kritik-titelseiten-focus/>
Beverly Weber, "The German Refugee "Crisis" after Cologne: The Race of Refugee Rights." English Language Notes, vol. 54, no. 2, Fall/Winter 2016, pp. 77-92.
Beverly Weber, "'We Must Talk about Cologne': Race, Gender, and Reconfigurations of 'Europe.'" German Politics and Society. 34.4 (Winter 2016): 68–86.

and with the terrorist attack in Brussels later in March of 2016.⁷¹ In her book, she goes so far as to claim that Islam is on the verge of invading Europe and is using sexual violence, one of the religions “traditional weapons”, to gain ground.⁷² The work of Alice Schwarzer and others served to reinforce a longstanding image of immigrants of African and Arabic origins as foreign “others” whose backgrounds and home cultures are somehow incompatible with an imagined set of European norms and values.⁷³ Alice Schwarzer of course does not represent the majority of feminists in Germany, but her status as a recognized public figure lent fueled the media frenzy surrounding Cologne and lent authority to rising anti-immigrant sentiments.

The nascent far right party, Alternative for Germany (AfD) seized the events in Cologne as evidence of the dangers of immigration and of the threat refugees posed to German society. Through the winter of 2016, the AfD doubled down on their anti-immigrant message and continued their historically unprecedented electoral success that had begun in prior years.⁷⁴ In the state-level elections on 13 March 2016, the AfD won parliamentary seats in three more states. In each of the three, the AfD not only surpassed the 5% minimum but reached stunning double-digit results.⁷⁵ The March electoral success for the AfD meant the party had secured parliamentary

⁷¹ Alice Schwarzer, “Was geschah wirklich an Silvester?” In *Emma*, 25 February 2016

⁷² Alice Schwarzer, *Der Shock: Was in der Silvesternacht wirklich geschah* (KiWi Verlag, 2016).

⁷³ Fatima El-Tayeb, *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe* (University of Minnesota Press, 2011) xxiv.

⁷⁴ Severin Weiland, “Wie die AfD die Übergriffe von Köln instrumentalisiert,” *Der Spiegel*, January 8, 2016.

<http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/koeln-afd-instrumentalisiert-uebergriffe-politisch-a-1070895.html>

⁷⁵ Deutsche Presse Agentur, “Die Ergebnisse der Landtagswahlen im Überblick,” *Der Spiegel*, March 14, 2016.

<http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/wahlen-2016-die-ergebnisse-der-landtagswahlen-im-ueberblick-a-1082093.html>

representation in half of Germany's sixteen states, a rapid reach of influence for a party only several years old.

The Bundestag responded quickly to the increasing fear and insurgent right-wing extremism by drastically changing their rhetoric surrounding the refugee migrations from one of economic opportunity to one of exclusion and national security. The success of the AfD demonstrated to the CDU/SPD coalition that a policy of openness to refugees was becoming drastically less politically expedient. With an eye towards the 2017 elections, the Grand Coalition began to change course in regards to immigration and refugee policy.

In an interview in March of 2016, the Minister of the Interior Thomas de Maizière (CDU) acknowledged the political ramifications of the Cologne events, calling it a “turning point” in the government's stance towards refugees.⁷⁶ This turning point signified the end of the early 2015 era of labor-oriented openness towards a decidedly more exclusionary stage, in which race, ethnicity, and religion became criteria for asylum evaluation, heavily geared toward expulsion. Indeed, every law created in 2016—including the two “Asylum Packages”, the EU-Turkey Agreement, and the Integration Law—served to increase the difficulty of coming to Germany and claiming asylum.⁷⁷

Two weeks after the events in Cologne, the Bundestag resumed its plenary meetings. The media storm that developed in those two preceding weeks dominated national discourse surrounding refugee migrants. The scale of coverage and its implications for the refugee crisis

⁷⁶ Deutsche Presse Agentur, “De Maizière nennt Kölner Silvesternacht ‘Wendepunkt’,” *Der Spiegel*. October 25, 2016.
<http://www.spiegel.de/panorama/gesellschaft/thomas-de-maiziere-nennt-koelner-silvesternacht-wendepunkt-a-1118162.html>

⁷⁷ “‘Nach’ Köln ist wie ‘vor’ Köln. Die Silvesternacht und ihre Folgen,” *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*. Accessed November 3, 2017.
<http://www.bpb.de/apuz/239696/die-silvesternacht-und-ihre-folgen?p=all>

led the issue to consume the agenda of the Bundestag. More conservative voices within the government very quickly gained ground, many of whom had long advocated for more restrictive immigration policies and tighter caps on refugee admission quotas. Over the course of the early months of 2016, the CDU/CSU's rhetorical framing of the refugee crisis transitioned from an emphasis on economic utility to a perception of refugees as unwilling to integrate with a high potential for violence.

In both parties of the Grand Coalition (SPD and CDU/CSU), representatives began to stress the need for requiring and enforcing integration programs rather than simply making integration tools available. In months prior to January 2016, refugee migrants were depicted as a potential opportunity for economic growth and as a solution to demographic trends that threatened long-term economic problems.⁷⁸ The notion that refugees could be the solution to an aging demographic trends was pushed back against by both members of the media and the government.⁷⁹ The events in Cologne quickly shifted the discourse to one in which conservative representatives heavily stressed Germany's limited integration power (*begrenzte Integrationskraft*) and limited absorption ability (*begrenzte Aufnahmefähigkeit*).⁸⁰

A speech from Minister of the Interior Thomas de Maizière, announcing the first asylum package in mid-February, is representative of this discursive shift:

⁷⁸ Lukas Zdrzalek, "Deutschlands neue Facharbeiter" *Die Zeit*, June 15, 2015.

<http://www.zeit.de/wirtschaft/2015-06/ausbildung-fluechtling-fachkraeftemangel>

⁷⁹Sven Astheimer, "Flüchtlinge lösen nicht unser Rentenproblem," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, January 20, 2016.

<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/wirtschaftspolitik/alterung-in-deutschland-fluechtlinge-loesen-nicht-unser-rentenproblem-14024832.html>

"Zuwanderung allein ist keine Lösung" Artikel, Demographischer Wandel, *Die Bundesregierung*. Accessed November 10, 2017.

<https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/2016/09/2016-09-01-demografiekongress.html>

⁸⁰ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 148, 13 January 2016. Pg 14582

DE MAIZIÈRE (CDU): We are working very hard in order to limit and reduce the tide of refugees coming into our country, led by the Chancellor. The awareness of an international responsibility and support for a European solution are both in our national interest.

We know that your willingness to take in refugees depends partly on how quickly the cases of criminals, economic refugees, and other non-vulnerable groups are processed and are then deported back to their home country. Yes, we are going to be stricter with people who claim to need protection, but who in reality, actually come to Germany for other reasons. Especially with those who use tricks and fake stories to try to extend their stay in Germany.⁸¹

After the events in Cologne, refugees became increasingly viewed as criminals or opportunists seeking to exploit the German welfare system.⁸²

Leading politicians, including then Vice Chancellor Sigmar Gabriel (SPD), suggested enough time and money had been spent on accommodating refugees, and that now it was time to force refugees into integration structures. The type of integration emphasized in early 2016 is no longer one of incorporation through employment, the neoliberal utility formulation seen in the fall of 2015. Rather, politicians of the CDU and SPD begin to decry a perceived unwillingness and even refusal to participate in integration programs. In tandem with the assumption that refugees do not share supposed “German values”, the integration apparatus must thus become more forceful. To teach this imagined body of values and thus prevent crimes like those seen in Cologne, stricter integration is necessary to prevent further crimes like those seen in Cologne.⁸³

Vice Chancellor Gabriel hints at this shift in a Bundestag speech in late January, suggesting “enough time has been spent talking about accommodating refugees” and that it was time to establish and enforce integration structures.⁸⁴

⁸¹ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 156, 19 February 2017. Pg 15344

⁸² This is evidenced most clearly through the subsequent speeches from Minister of the Interior Thomas de Maizière and racist media coverage of Silvester in Cologne.

⁸³ This rhetoric completing ignores the reality of sexual assault already present in Germany, perpetrated by Germans.

⁸⁴ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 152, 28 January 2016. Pg 14887

In the Integration Law of 2005, the guiding principle was to create a government system to foster and demand (*fördern und fordern*) integration.⁸⁵ This motto of “fostering and demanding” integration emerged again in the 2015 integration debates, and its initial economic-neoliberal orientation sought to foster the inclusion of refugees into the labor market. In this early 2016 period however, we see the shift from the economic “fostering” attitude of Fall 2015 to one of “demanding” integration.⁸⁶ The events in Cologne renewed long-existing fears of a non-European “other” unwilling to integrate and abide by German laws.

While the SPD participates in this restrictive shift, as evidenced by the rhetoric of Vice Chancellor Gabriel’s speech, the growing yet masked anti-immigrant stance of their coalition partner the CDU/CSU caused a great deal of strain between the two parties. The Grand Coalition begins to face real difficulty maintaining coalition unity, as in-fighting and drastically different opinions collide. In an essay written months later reflecting on the early 2016 legislative period, Cansel Kiliztepe of the SPD recalls feeling little hope for satisfactory immigration legislation being passed, as “a movement towards more equality could hardly be expected from a coalition with the CDU.”⁸⁷

Within this environment of an increasingly restrictive integration rhetoric, many of the eleven Turkish-German representatives emerged as powerful advocates for creating integration policies focused on fostering equality of opportunity and access for refugee migrants. This

⁸⁵ Jan Schneider, “Rückblick: Zuwanderungsgesetz 2005,” *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*, May 15, 2007.
<http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/migration/dossier-migration/56351/zuwanderungsgesetz-2005?p=all>

⁸⁶ Johanna Schuster-Craig, “Integration Politics as an Apparatus,” *German Studies Review* 40, no. 3, (October 2017): 614.

⁸⁷ See Sigmar Gabriel’s speech : *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 152, 28 January 2016. Pg 14887 and Cansel Kiziltepe, “Sie riefen Arbeitskräfte...” In *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016) 95.

understanding of integration, as an apparatus for fostering the conditions for equality of opportunity (*Chancengleichheit*) for refugees, represents a drastically more positive and open orientation towards refugees. Furthermore, it is informed by the Turkish-German representatives own experience with integration growing up and studying in Germany.

Indeed, many Turkish-German representatives describe the heavy influence their own upbringing in Germany has had on their conception of worthwhile integration policy. Specifically, their personal experience with integration in Germany lends them an informed perspective on what kind of future a successful and inclusive integration policy should make possible for refugee migrants. The connection between their own biographies and their policy positions helps understand their ensuing work on the Integration Law of 2016, described in part three.

Ekin Deligöz (Die Grünen) was born in a small Anatolian town, Tokat, and moved to Germany at the age of eight to Neu-Ulm in Bavaria with her parents, who had found work through the Guestworker program. Though originally on a five-year contract, her parents, like many other Turkish families in the Guestworker program, created lives for themselves and decided to stay in Germany. Her first school years in Germany were formative for her later advocacy of inclusive integration policy. She, and other immigrant children with little to no German speaking ability, were kept in segregated classes away from native-German children.⁸⁸

Her mother, who was working as a Turkish-language teacher for the children of guest worker immigrants, forced her into befriending German children in the neighborhood. She describes these early friendships, which helped her learn German, as “opening a door to the

⁸⁸ Ekin Deligöz, “Auf der Suche nach einer Heimat.” In *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016) 49-59.

German language” and eventually helped her switch into a German-speaking classroom.⁸⁹ This shift in educational tracks through language acquisition had long-term consequences for her own professional development, allowing her to study at university. The connection between language ability and social mobility is visible in her definition of integration policy:

A worthwhile integration policy expedites language acquisition, opens up access to education, establishes a common canon of values and, last but not least, facilitates employment and thus one’s capacity for self-sufficiency.⁹⁰

She describes a central goal of her political career as tearing down walls and removing obstacles for current refugees that prevented so many immigrants of her generation from pursuing alternative futures.

Cansel Kiziltepe (SPD) was born and raised in Berlin-Kreuzberg to Turkish parents who migrated in 1960 to Germany as part of the guest worker program. She describes the frustration her family and community felt with the lack of support they received from the government in establishing lives in Germany. School segregation, systematic discrimination, and the language barrier made it extremely difficult for many of her first-generation Turkish-German peers in Kreuzberg to enter broader fields of society. For many in Kreuzberg, community organized self-help groups were the only way to affect lasting change.⁹¹ For her, language acquisition empowered her to move up into German-speaking classes and study economics at the Technical University of Berlin.

This is reflected in her own conception of what integration programs should provide for recipients:

My understanding of integration policy is centered on the needs of the people. In order for people of migrant background to actually attain access to education, and

⁸⁹ *ibid.* pg 53

⁹⁰ *ibid.* pg 56

⁹¹ Cansel Kiziltepe, “Sie riefen Arbeitskräfte...” In *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016) 92.

actually can find a job, support programs must be openly available to them. The state is responsible for providing this. My understanding of integration policy is informed by inclusion as its focal point.⁹²

This conception of integration—language learning that facilitates access to education institutions, and thus better job possibilities—is a common thread amongst the Turkish-German representatives. It equates successful integration with gainful employment in professional sectors, a reflection of the biographies of the eleven Turkish-German representatives. That Turkish-German representatives also see this as the best route towards integration, based on their own personal experience, suggests that this neoliberal conception of integration as a work-oriented apparatus is perhaps to some degree in the interest of refugees as well as of the state.

Cem Özdemir describes himself as “a product of the guest worker employment agreement with Turkey,” as a child born in Germany to Turkish immigrant parents.⁹³ For him language-learning was key to his own success and deeply influences his integration policy:

I am convinced by my own personal life experiences: decisively and urgently necessary [for Integration] is the rapid acquisition of the German language. This is an unconditional requirement for participation and success in society.⁹⁴

Because of their own personal experience learning German, most of the Turkish-German representatives stress the importance of offering accessible language courses to all refugees, especially children. They cite the lack of language-learning resources, and their own fortune in finding themselves in situations that allowed them to learn German, as decisive factors for long-term integration that the government did not provide for most in the guest worker generation. In

⁹² *ibid.* 95

⁹³ Cem Özdemir, “Es kommt darauf an, wo ein Mensch hin will—nicht wo er herkommt.” In *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016) 125.

⁹⁴ *ibid.* pg 139

fact, language acquisition was actively discouraged in the schooling system, indicative of the perception of Turkish migrants as only temporary inhabitants.

Özcan Mutlu echoes this idea of language as crucial to further integration. He migrated at the age of 4 to Germany, in 1973, months before the end of the guest worker program (*Anwerbestoppabkommen*) went into effect. He spent the rest of his childhood in Berlin and, partly due to his young age, learned German very quickly. He describes having to translate for his family members when visiting government agencies or going to the doctor. For him, this language ability helped him overcome discriminatory language barriers in the German school system, and is thus a key part of his conception of successful integration.⁹⁵

The importance of language-learning stressed by many Turkish-German representatives does differ in an important way from the conceptions of the state's integration apparatus. This difference is located in the long-term intention behind German language acquisition. Where the state, as seen in the laws of late 2015, stresses language learning to facilitate entrance into the (often low-level and unskilled) labor market, many Turkish-German stress its importance towards fostering long-term equality of opportunity (*Chancengerechtigkeit*) for refugees and their future children. A future-oriented integration model based around fostering equality of opportunity demonstrates the understanding of many Turkish-German representatives that, as in their own personal biographies, integration is a long-term process that is most seen in the second and third generation of immigrant families.

With this understanding of their personal backgrounds in mind, a better understanding of their speeches in the 2016 legislative period is possible. As the CDU/CSU put forward

⁹⁵ Özcan Mutlu, "Wir sind Deutschland—auch!" In *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016) 109.

increasingly stricter and more exclusionary asylum and immigration policies in early 2016, certain Turkish-German representatives play an important role in resisting this discursive shift. This resistance is characterized primarily by their insistence on maintaining elements of the integration apparatus that foster open mechanisms for incorporation and equality of opportunity for new refugees.

On the other hand, Cemile Giousouf, the sole Turkish-German representative in the CDU, plays an interesting role in the integration and immigration debates of 2016. In her speeches, she stresses the numerous steps that have been taken to accommodate refugees thus far. Additionally, she claims the measures taken in 2015 have been informed by immigration policy of the past:

GIOUSOUF (CDU): German is a country of immigration. 2015 is not the first time we have had refugee children in our schools, and the integration of Germans of a migration background is better than its reputation. This is visible in the subsequent generations of immigrants, whether in the children of *Aussiedler*, of *Gastarbeiter*, or of refugees fleeing war. They have surpassed their parent's generation. The girls especially have demonstrated their success in entering higher schooling paths and jobs. Also, the number of students with a migration background at universities is growing. It is true that migrants and their children are not always equally positioned in our school system and on the labor market. But the trend is going up, which distinguishes our education and job training systems in Germany. The *Integrationspolitik* in this country is a success.⁹⁶

Her account bespeaks an illusorily successful state of integration programs in Germany, both in the present and the past. While her experience with integration might have been more positive, the difficult experiences of most other Turkish-Germans complicates the image she paints of a historically successful integration system.⁹⁷ To the contrary, most Turkish-German

⁹⁶ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 153, 29 January 2016. Pg 15093

⁹⁷ Cemile Giousouf's parents were part of the Turkish minority within Greece and migrated to Germany in the 1970s. She was born in Leverkusen in 1978, making her the youngest Turkish-German representative—by a decade or more in most cases. In considering her different take on

representatives speak of a complete lack of viable and supportive integration programs for immigrants in the past, and identify their own personal success as exceptional within their communities.

By painting the German integration system as being so historically successful, she opens up the possibility of justly curtailing a seemingly generous system. If a system has historically and continues to perform well, there is more legitimacy behind efforts to restrict access and scale back benefits. This thus makes restrictive measures that speed up deportations and prevent migration seem more acceptable. In addition to revising immigration history as a whole, Cemile Giousouf specifically revises her own party's history and stance towards immigration. By depicting a functioning system and alluding to the role the CDU played in forming that system, she justifies a change in integration policy. This change occurred months later, in the May of 2016 with the new Integration Law.

Part 3: The Integration Law of 2016

“Being able to help means being able to say no.”
Minister of the Interior, Thomas de Maiziere.⁹⁸

As 2016 went on the integration apparatus continued to prioritize exclusionary measures through laws, enforcement criteria, and hardline rhetoric, continuing the trend established in early January after the events in Cologne. In addition to the asylum packages 1 and 2, the Bundestag took further measures to reduce the number of refugee migrants allowed to stay in

integration in Germany, her Greek background and relative youth are worth considering. The 1980s, marked by emergence of the Green party and early Turkish-German political movements, was a very different political climate to grow up in than the 1960s.

⁹⁸ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 171, 13 May 2016, pg 16864

Germany and to nominally increase the efficiency of the asylum process by facilitating quicker legal deportations.

One measure of note was the amendment of the list of safe countries of origin (*sichere Herkunftsländer*) to include more countries in North Africa. According to German asylum law, refugee migrants can be denied asylum if they originate from countries on the list in which “there is no risk of persecution” within the general political situation of the country.⁹⁹ On 13 May 2016, the Bundestag passed amendments to the asylum law adding Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria to the list of safe countries of origin.¹⁰⁰ This decision, which would facilitate the deportation of any refugee hailing from these three countries, was heavily critiqued by immigration-focused non-profit organizations such as ProAsyl. This change in asylum law, according to ProAsyl, reinforced a racialized hierarchy to asylum applications and denied the right of asylum seekers to have their asylum applications evaluated on an individual basis.¹⁰¹

In his speech the same day announcing the additions to the list of safe countries of origin, Minister of the Interior Thomas de Maizière stressed additional exclusionary measures intended

⁹⁹“Sichere Herkunftsstaaten,” Asyl und Flüchtlingsschutz, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge. Accessed November 12, 2017.

<http://www.bamf.de/DE/Fluechtlingsschutz/Sonderverfahren/SichereHerkunftsstaaten/sichere-herkunftsstaaten-node.html>

¹⁰⁰ “Sichere Herkunftsländer,” Gesellschaft, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Accessed November 8, 2017.

<http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/migration/kurzdossiers/227456/sichere-herkunftslander?p=all>

¹⁰¹ See “Stellungnahme zum Referentenentwurf des Bundesministeriums für Arbeit und Soziales und des Bundesministeriums des Innern” from ProAsyl, 19 May 2016.

For more research on the role of race after Cologne see:

Beverly Weber, “The German Refugee “Crisis” after Cologne: The Race of Refugee Rights” *English Language Notes*, Vol. 54 Fall/Winter 2016. 77-92.

This decision to add Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria to the list of safe countries of origin would later be struck down by the Bundesrat on 10 Mars 2017. In months following this decision, numerous reports began to emerge documenting the growth of slave trafficking networks in certain North African countries that targeted stalled and deported refugee migrants.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/30/world/africa/slave-market-libya-european-migrants.html>

by the addition to the list of safe countries of origin. On top of facilitating the deportation of “99% of asylum applicants from these countries”, the amendment intended to speed up asylum processing and make the integration apparatus ostensibly more efficient (via a blanket deportation policy).¹⁰² The additions to the list of safe countries of origin also intended to prevent migrants from heading for Germany in the first place. Playing into tropes of refugees as exploitative of state resources, he explains the preventative function of these measures:

DE MAZIÈRE (CDU): Through this law we are going to reduce the expenditure of time that the processing of asylum claims entails, streamlining the process by focusing on the actual prospects for asylum. We are also doing in order to reduce the appeal for someone to come and file an unsuccessful asylum claim simply because one would be accommodated for free or because the benefits here are better than the living conditions in their country of origin.¹⁰³

His rhetoric here ignores the reality of severe economic hardship and often life-threatening political instability that motivates refugee migrations. Instead, he describes refugee migrants as an unwanted burden on state resources who seek to take advantage of the German social system, thus justifying a further tightening of the integration apparatus.

There was significant opposition to this addition of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia to the category of safe countries of origin, namely from the Green and Left parties in the opposition and from non-profit organizations like ProAsyl. Most Turkish-German representatives however were noticeably silent on the issue. Even the few who were more active in this period on immigration issues—Ekin Deligöz (Green), Özcan Mutlu (Green), Cem Özdemir (Green), Aydan Özoğuz (SPD), and Sevim Dağdelen (Left)—did not voice opposition to this amendment in the Bundestag.

¹⁰² *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 171, 13 May 2016, pg 16864

¹⁰³ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 171, 13 May 2016, pg 16864

After creating measures to restrict and dissuade migrant entry into Germany (through the two Asylum Packages of March and April, the asylum reforms in May, and the EU-Turkey Agreement to hold refugees in Turkey) the CDU/SPD Grand Coalition moved towards further tightening the integration apparatus by reforming the German integration law (*Integrationsgesetz*).¹⁰⁴ With fewer refugee migrants arriving and fewer able to successfully claim asylum, restrictive federal policy shifted towards the integration of refugees residing in Germany. This culminated in the passing of the Integration law of 2016 on 31 July 2016 and went into effect in early August. A closer look at the initial drafts of the law and the debate surrounding it in May and June of 2016 reveal that many integral parts of the law are more concerned with creating legal venues to penalize and expel refugees rather than fostering incorporation into society.

The initial version of the law, proposed on 31 May 2016, leans heavily on the “foster and demand” integration motif of previous iterations of integration law in Germany. The numerous added stipulations that force refugees to meet certain standards in order to retain their federal support and residency status indicates a sharper emphasis on the “demand” element of this integration motto. Chief amongst these new demands is an increase in required orientation courses that sought to teach refugees about German values (*Wertevermittlung*), including

¹⁰⁴ This law, the first iteration of which was created in 2007, has a longer history in Germany. As a set of regulations governing the access to integration resources (language courses, job-placement assistance, housing allocation, etc.) it is typically viewed as a barometer of the federal government’s understanding of what integration should look like and, perhaps more importantly, who the government is interested in integrating. For more information on the federal understanding of integration and migration leading up to the law see: Kien Nghi Ha, *Ethnizität und Migration Reloaded: Kulturelle Indentität, Differenz und Hybridität im postkolonialen Diskurs* (Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, Berlin 2004) and Simon Green’s *The Politics of Exclusion: Institutions and immigration policy in contemporary Germany* (Manchester University Press, New York 2004).

specifically gender equality between men and women.¹⁰⁵ Months after the events in Cologne and the heated anti-immigrant rhetoric from the German far-right, federal officials increasingly viewed refugees as largely unwilling to integrate and thus necessitating compulsory integration efforts from refugees.¹⁰⁶

Non-profit groups and NGOs that focus on immigration, asylum, and integration were vocal in their criticism of the law for exactly this reason. ProAsyl, in response to the first draft of the Integration Law of 2016 harshly condemned the underlying assumption of the law that many refugees did not want to integrate or participate in integration courses and programs.¹⁰⁷

In his speech to the Bundestag announcing the first proposed version of the new Integration Law, Minister of the Interior de Maizière describes this unwillingness to integrate as a widespread problem within immigrant communities in Germany:

DE MAZIÈRE (CDU): In certain places in Germany live people with foreign roots who have hardly integrated, if at all, into our country. They live amongst themselves, almost without any contact to Germans and without any connections to our society. They either speak very little German or don't like doing so, and don't have proper jobs. Some young men amongst them noticeably often commit crimes. Many have walled themselves off, some on religious grounds, and others based on wayward conceptions of honor or both. The teachers in the schools found in these kinds of places are often unable to shore up their lacking German ability, let alone impart German values or enable better education opportunities.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ *Gesetzentwurf eines Integrationsgesetzes*, Drucksache 18/8615. Deutscher Bundestag 18. Wahlperiode, 31.05.2016. Pg 11

¹⁰⁶ "Integrationsgesetz setzt auf Fördern und Fordern," Artikel, Die Bundesregierung. Accessed November 3 2017.
<https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/2016/08/2016-08-05-integrationsgesetz.html>

¹⁰⁷ Pro Asyl, "Stellungnahme zum Referentenentwurf des Bundesministeriums für Arbeit und Soziales und des Bundesministeriums des Innern" pg 2

¹⁰⁸ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 174, 2 June 2016. Pg 17186

In his strongly negative depiction, many immigrant communities (inextricably including the Turkish community) are completely unintegrated and do not wish to engage with the rest of society in Germany. This is a radically different stance towards immigrants than the government professed less than a year earlier in the Fall of 2015. By employing this narrative of unintegrated immigrant communities, he seeks to justify the implementation of stricter measures on recently arrived refugee migrants.

The language of the law itself makes this assumption of unwillingness very clear through its attempt to create “integration incentives”:

In order to create integration incentives for recognized refugees, resettlement refugees, and for those granted asylum, permanent residency permits will only be granted to individuals of the aforementioned vulnerable groups who have demonstrated integration efforts.¹⁰⁹

Here we see how the state is setting up the extremely high stakes of future integration policy for refugees. Long-term asylum and residency will only be granted to those who demonstrate “integration efforts,” making the future of refugees in Germany contingent on the state’s evaluation of their integrative success. As the bill further makes clear, this evaluative process will be lengthy and challenging, thus opening up numerous venues for legal deportation of asylum seeker who fail to meet these integration standards.

In addition to residency status, the allocation of other social benefits given to refugees is also made contingent on their “integration efforts.”¹¹⁰ The law stipulates that those who fail to

¹⁰⁹ *Gesetzentwurf eines Integrationsgesetzes*, Drucksache 18/8615. Deutscher Bundestag 18. Wahlperiode, 31.05.2016. Pg 3

¹¹⁰ These integration efforts (*Integrationsleistungen*) include demonstrating German language proficiency, securement of employment and housing, completion of Integration courses that teach “German values,” and regular attendance to appointments and check-ups with immigration officials. All of these are demanded of refugees in this law without necessarily increasing funding or support to facilitate their access to these services.

demonstrate their integration efforts will see reductions in their benefits, thus further marginalizing them and making them more likely for deportation down the road. Benefits are tied to vague and undefined integration requirements, the language of the law is dubiously unspecific in this regard, stating that sufficient integration for benefits “shows itself through mastery of the German language and through a self-sufficient livelihood.”¹¹¹ Particularly dubious is the law’s provisions for denying benefits as a way to help the administrations responsible for managing refugees (*Leistungsträger*) to cut down on costs.¹¹²

The bill contains little additional funding to facilitate refugee access to the resources that are now criterion for their permission to remain in Germany, despite the vocal criticism from immigrant voices that this is desperately needed. In fact, in certain cases the law makes access to these requirements more difficult.¹¹³ By increasing the requirement of orientation courses to forty hours, more teachers need to be trained and more courses offered. Instead of increasing funding for these services, the cost of enrollment was raised, requiring refugees to spend more in courses fees to offset the increase in costs.¹¹⁴

An additional punitive measure the law sought to enact was to control where refugees who had been granted asylum could live. After lengthy months and often even years of waiting in refugee homes, this law sought to control where refugees would spend their next steps in

¹¹¹ *Gesetzentwurf eines Integrationsgesetzes*, Drucksache 18/8615. Deutscher Bundestag 18. Wahlperiode, 31.05.2016. Pg 3

¹¹² *Gesetzentwurf eines Integrationsgesetzes*, Drucksache 18/8615. Deutscher Bundestag 18. Wahlperiode, 31.05.2016. Pg 3

¹¹³ Jafar Abdul Karim, “Ich will mich integrieren, aber wie?” *Die Zeit*, 18 April 2016. <http://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/2016-04/fluechtlinge-integration-deutschland-unterstuetzung-foerderung>

¹¹⁴ *Gesetzentwurf eines Integrationsgesetzes*, Drucksache 18/8615. Deutscher Bundestag 18. Wahlperiode, 31.05.2016. Pg 10

Germany through the implementation of domicile constraints (*Wohnsitzauflage*). In announcing this policy, Thomas de Maiziere argued it would prevent the establishment of refugee “ghettos” that do not seek to integrate in Germany, mimicking the idea of parallel communities (*parallele Gesellschaften*) often used in rhetoric surrounding immigrants in Germany.¹¹⁵ His speech, and the corresponding rhetoric in the bill itself, suggest the federal discomfort with immigrant neighborhoods. In his perception, these “ghettos” prevent integration:

DE MAZIÈRE (CDU): Everyone must pursue a chance to move up and to integrate where a chance is offers, and where one knows the most people with this law the states can—can, but are not required to—allocate a living space to recognized refugee. Or states can deny residency in a certain place if the refugee does not have a permanent job there. If they have a permanent job there, they are obviously allowed to move to the location of their job. However, we do not want any Ghettos full of people who are dependent on social benefits because this does not make integration an easy possibility.¹¹⁶

This stance on housing control for refugees ignores other major causes of segregation—guest worker housing policy, zoning regulations, and housing discrimination—and betrays an ignorance of how immigrants often use these communities to connect, organize, and establish themselves within a new country, eventually serving to actually foster integration. Established immigrant neighborhoods, and the self-organizing and networking they provide, are an important source of resources and information for immigrants and their children to integrate and move up in society.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ For a critical analysis of the history and origin of the concept of parallel societies within the German context see: Wolf-Dietrich Bukow, Claudia Nikodem, Erika Schulze and Erol Yildiz, *Was heißt hier Parallelgesellschaft?: Zum Umgang mit Differenzen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2007.

¹¹⁶ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 174, 3 June 2016 pg 17186

¹¹⁷ Nikolai Roskamm, “Studie: Das Leitbild von der ‘Urbanen Mischung’,” (Berlin: Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt, 2013).

In the light of this new and severely restrictive Integration Law, several Turkish-German representatives were highly critical and used their platforms as members of parliament to resist its implementation. Their critique centered on a couple key assumptions underlying the bill that are explained above: that many refugees do not wish to integrate, and that allowing asylum recipients to choose where they live inhibits integration. Much of their resistance to these assumptions is informed by their own personal experience growing up in Germany.

Sevim Dağdelen (Die Linke) emerges in these late Spring months of 2016 as one of the most vociferous critics of the new Integration law. Dağdelen pushes back against the perception that refugees don't want to integrate, and in a direct response to Minister of the Interior de Mazière connects this discursive shift with the rise of right-wing politics in Germany:

DAĞDELEN (Green): For some time now you have been you have been campaigning in public concerning alleged integration refusers. In answering the persistent questions of my party however even you stated that there was no data at your disposal showing immigrants who, for some reason, have been refusing to attend integration courses and how many people are supposedly doing so. You cannot say whether these people have perhaps found work, have fallen ill, who has moved, or if a woman has had a child. You do not know, and yet you are still constantly propagating the idea around here that refugees are refusing to attend such courses.¹¹⁸

Attendance of integration courses is one of the requirements the new Integration law seeks to establish punitive measures around, precisely due to this claim that refugees are refusing to participate in them. Integration courses have been part of the integration apparatus since the National Integration Law of 2007, the government has consistently not offered enough courses to meet the demand.¹¹⁹ Representative Dağdelen here calls out the government for propagating this notion of “integration refusers” despite the lack of concrete evidence, suggesting they are

¹¹⁸ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 174, 3 June 2016 pg 17188

¹¹⁹ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 174, 3 June 2016 pg 17188

restricting their policies as a political precaution in light of the rise of the Alternative for Germany party. In her actions, Dağdelen demonstrates a resistance to the growing influence the emergent political right had on the shifting refugee and immigrant policy put forth by the governing political parties (SPD and CDU/CSU).

Representative Dağdelen also takes particular issues with the law's domicile constraints (*Wohnsitzauflage*) stipulation that is supposed to foster integration.¹²⁰ Instead she argues quite critically that it will do the opposite:

DAĞDELEN (Green): This also means, that people cannot use their private networks in places where they have family, relatives, and friends, something that is important during a job search for fostering job possibilities. You are hindering this by creating domicile constraints. You are acting along the lines of the czarist development model for Siberia, ladies and gentlemen. .¹²¹

Her forceful critique serves to pushback against the narrative put forth by the government¹²², and inserts an informed voice into a discourse otherwise dominated by Germans with little to no experience with living in immigrant communities. The usefulness of immigrant communities in establishing a sense of belonging and in propelling professional careers is a frequent theme of the autobiographical narratives of several Turkish-German representatives.¹²³ Cansel Kiziltepe describes the important role of the Turkish Women's Association (*Türkischer Frauenverein*), an

¹²⁰ For scholarship on the importance of immigrant communities in facilitating incorporation into the housing and job markets see: Umut Erel, Karim Murji & Zaki Nahaboo "Understanding the contemporary race-migration nexus", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39:8, (2016): 1339-1360.

¹²¹ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 174, 3 June 2016 pg 17188

Sevim Dağdelen in the same speech cites the work of Professor Dr. Herbert Brücker from the *Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesagentur für Arbeit* that demonstrates how "Wohnsitzauflagen zu niedrigeren Beschäftigungsquoten „im zweistelligen Bereich“ und zu anfänglich geringeren Löhnen führen."

¹²² Again, when I use 'government' I mean *Regierung*, which specifically refers to the governing parliamentary coalition and the executive branch consisting of Grand Coalition party members.

¹²³ *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016).

organization created by Turkish women in the immigrant-rich neighborhood of Kreuzberg in Berlin, to foster professional connections and community support. She attributes a great deal of her own professional success to the community self-organizing her upbringing in Kreuzberg allowed.¹²⁴

One goal of the proposed Integration law of 2016 was to facilitate refugee access to work, in the understanding of gainful employment as “the best way towards orderly integration.”¹²⁵ The claim therefore that this law would create 100,000 jobs for refugees was framed as a major success in the Grand Coalition’s integration law. It also purported to fulfill a widespread desire amongst refugees: access to work. These jobs, largely the product of Minister for Labor and Social Affairs Andrea Nahles (SPD), were an extension of a long-existing “one euro job” program designed to help people enrolled in long-term unemployment support (commonly referred to as *Hartz IV*) reenter the labor force.¹²⁶ Because the program existed already as a form of labor stepping stone to help people find better long-term employment, it seemed like a natural extension to include refugees into it. Two stipulations for refugee participation in the program however led to widespread criticism—that refugee employees would only be paid eighty cents an

¹²⁴ Cansel Kiziltepe, “Sie riefen Arbeitskräfte...” In *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016) 92.

¹²⁵ Minister for Labor and Social Affairs Andrea Nahles quoted in: Thomas Öchsner, “Ein-Euro-Jobs für Flüchtlinge sind nur 80-Cent-Jobs” *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, June 10, 2016. <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/wirtschaft/fluechtlinge-ein-euro-jobs-fuer-fluechtlinge-sind-nur-cent-jobs-1.3027433>

¹²⁶ “Ein-Euro-Job: Arbeitsgelegenheiten mit Mehraufwandentschädigung, Arbeitsgelegenheiten in der Entgeltvariante” Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Accessed November 4, 2017. <http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/lexikon-der-wirtschaft/19209/ein-euro-job>

hour and that most of the jobs would be maintenance and cleaning work within Asylum homes away from other Germans.¹²⁷

As employment in the new Integration law is considered one form of demonstrating “integration effort”, with benefits and residency status tied to a refugee migrant’s demonstration thereof, refugees would have little choice but to participate in this labor program. Representative Dağdelen critiques this use of refugee labor as highly exploitative in a speech in the Bundestag:

DAĞDELEN (Green): Numerous measures in this law proposal provide for the creation of a new cheap labor supply. Minister of Labor Nahles of the SPD wants, under the guise of humanitarianism, to establish a new tool for wage dumping. For 100,000 refugees, jobs paying just an 80-cent hourly wage are to be created. The 1-Euro-Jobs, already a miserly amount, are to be reduced by twenty percent when held by refugees.¹²⁸

Her comments are harsh, but the perception of these “80 cent jobs” was equally poorly received in many German media outlets and in opposition political parties, particularly upon further revisions of the law that reduced the money and number of positions in the program.¹²⁹

The government’s intention of creating these menial, essentially unpaid jobs, obligating refugees to maintain the refugee homes they are forced to live in, painfully embodies the restrictive shift in the integration apparatus in 2016. It also symbolizes the continuation of neoliberal labor motivation so present during the fall of 2015, as it clearly underlies the work assistance part of the 2016 Integration law. While most Turkish-German representatives were in agreement with the idea of work-programs first proposed in the fall of 2015, the objection to “80-cent-jobs” demonstrates their insistence⁸ that work can only lead to integration when it is

¹²⁷ Minister for Labor and Social Affairs Andrea Nahles quoted in: Thomas Öchsner, “Ein-Euro-Jobs für Flüchtlinge sind nur 80-Cent-Jobs” *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, June 10, 2016.

¹²⁸ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 174, 3 June 2016 pg 17187

¹²⁹ “Deutlich weniger Ein-Euro-Jobs für Flüchtlinge” *Die Zeit*, April 20, 2017.

<http://www.zeit.de/wirtschaft/2017-04/asylpolitik-fluechtlinge-jobs-arbeitsamt-andrea-nahles>

created on an equality of opportunity basis. Jobs that truly lead to integration recognize the former training and education of refugees and empower immigrants to work in a diverse range of fields through the German labor market.

Despite the heavy criticism of the Integration law—from certain Turkish German representatives, opposition parties, and many other sources, the law moved forward. Two individuals played an important role in defending the law and lending the bill the legitimacy of their office, State Minister for Migration, Refugees, and Integration Aydan Özoğuz (SPD) and the CDU/CSU Representative for Integration (Integrationsbeauftragte) Cemile Giousouf. Before being passed, the integration law was presented for its third and final round of revisions and defended on the Bundestag floor by these two powerful members of the German integration apparatus.

In her speech defending the law, State Minister Özoğuz painted a more positive picture of the state of immigration in Germany, despite the extremely negative rhetoric from the CDU and in the integration law. She describes a contemporary Germany excited about the country's growing diversity:

ÖZOĞUZ (SPD): A majority of our population welcomes the growing diversity in the population, and the majority of the population—including those with and without an immigration background—wants participation in society to be possible for all. This is exactly what we are doing with this Integration law. We are enabling participation for those whose asylum application is still in processing and for those who, in the past, had to wait until the asylum process was completed. It could often last a long time, up to one or even two years, until they finally could take language course or even doing anything, even though they had been here the whole time.¹³⁰

¹³⁰ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 183, 7 July 2016 pg 18088

The majority of her speech reinforces this characterization of the law as a meaningful step towards fostering inclusivity. Her representation of the law largely ignores the large number of demanding requirements it places on refugees, facilitating the states exclusion of unwanted immigrants.

Prior to this speech however, Aydan Özoğuz had publicly criticized the law in interviews with journalists, calling the law “imprecise” and doubting its ability to foster integration for all refugees.¹³¹ In an interview, she articulated numerous concerns with the law.¹³² Chief amongst her concerns is the lack of a clear definition for a term the law relies heavily upon, a refugee’s “residency prospects” (*Bleibeperspektive*, also often translated as “prospects of remaining”). Through an unclear description of the term, she argues the law could lead to the exclusion of many refugees from integration resources.¹³³ The law stipulates that refugee migrants must be deemed to have “good residency prospects” in order to receive access to language courses and other benefits. The lack of a clear definition makes the term subjective, and subject to constricting state interests surrounding integration and immigration. How one’s residency prospects are determined are not explicitly laid out in the law, leading many organizations like ProAsyl to infer that a system of racial hierarchy is an evaluating factor, with refugees of certain nationality viewed as less desirable for integration than others.

¹³¹ “Integrationsbeauftragte rügt Integrationsgesetz ihrer Regierung,” *Der Spiegel*, July 7, 2016. <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integrationsbeauftragte-oezoguz-kritisiert-integrationsgesetz-a-1101737.html>

¹³² Several articles reference this interview but I am having a really hard time finding the original. <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2016-07/aydan-oezoguz-integrationsgesetz-verabschiedung-kritik>

¹³³ Agence France-Presse “Was heißt ‘gute Bleibeperspektive’?” *Tageszeitung*, July 7, 2016. <http://www.taz.de/!5320197/>

Her level of critique outside the Bundestag demonstrates her more nuanced stance on the law, and gives a much different picture than her decidedly rosier depiction and defense of the law in the Bundestag. While she does mention the blatant lack of a definition for this term in her speech in the Bundestag, it is a brief comment lacking weight, and she quickly turns back to urging her colleagues to vote in support of the law.¹³⁴ Partly through her efforts, the law eventually passed and become national law, coming into effect in August of 2016. State Minister Özoğuz's defense of this law, coming from arguably the most influential Turkish-German representative, the only to hold a cabinet level position, endows the bill with a sense of legitimacy and conveys tacit approval for the bill's conception of integration.

Later in the same parliamentary session, Representative Cemile Giousouf (CDU), charged with representing integration policy for her party, also gave a speech passionately defending the integration merits of the law. Her speech however is immediately preceded by a damning speech by Sevim Dağdelen, who questions the viability of an integration law that is so publicly critiqued by the government's own Minister for Integration. Indeed, the critiques put forth by Aydan Özoğuz bespeak the growing tension between the parties of the governing Grand Coalition over the issue of migration and integration. Giousouf attempts nonetheless to spin the law as a success for integration efforts in Germany:

GIOUSOUF (CDU): Today we are passing the first German integration law. This law really is a milestone, as the chancellor has called it. This law shows that, in this country, we no longer want immigration without integration and that we won't have it anymore. Recognized refugees we will support, but integration also needs rules. We have rules in all areas of society, and need them in the area of integration. It is a law of partnership. If we tell refugees that we also expect something in return from them, we take them seriously as self-responsible people. We see them eye to eye in our society by not wanting to paternalistically look after them.

¹³⁴ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 183, 7 July 2016 pg 18089

Her rhetoric surrounding the law, calling it a “partnership” between the government and refugees that avoids paternalistic condescension, paints an inclusionary scene for the integration of refugee migrants. It ignores the difficult demands the law places on refugees and the historic lack of resources allocated towards “integration measures” such as language courses.

Instead, the law emphasizes the autonomy and “self-responsibility” of refugees. In doing so, it sets up refugees as responsible for their own integration process, thus exculpating the state of responsibility for those who fail to meet their heightened integration standards. Her rhetoric elides the aspects of the law that intentionally make integration more difficult to demonstrate by hindering access to integration resources. If it is indeed a “partnership”, it is a very unequal one with refugees bearing all the risk. The tone of her speech, and the general disregard for the mounting critique leveled against the law’s content, irritates several fellow Turkish-German representatives who begin interjecting her speech:

GIOUSOUF (CDU): My colleagues in the opposition have criticized a couple points. That’s within their right.

KÜNAST (Green): Ah, thank you so much! How about you say something new for once!

GIOUSOUF (CDU): But let’s look at the proportionality of this! You, Ms. Dağdelen—you once made this very clear yourself—doubt that the domicile restraints can foster integration. Experts in the matter say, not just politicians: if there are things that foster integration best, they are language acquisition and work. Therefore, it is right that refugees move to places where they can get work, join integration courses, and can learn the language.

(Applause from the CDU/CSU)

To one point I have to concede to Ms. Dağdelen. It did irritate me a bit to read in the press today that even the State Minister for Integration criticized this law.

KÜNAST (Green): Is your coalition already over?

GIOUSOUF (CDU): In her speech today her stance sounded much differently.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 183, 7 July 2016. pg 18094.

The vocal protest of Renate Künast demonstrates the diversity of political orientations amongst Turkish-German representatives. Their particular disagreement over the 2016 Integration law further suggest their disparate conception of integration and the government's role in the role, and of their discordant perceptions of the state of immigrant-community integration in Germany. In a climatic conclusion, punctuated again by interjections of disbelief, this time from Representative Özcan Mutlu of the Green party, Giousouf urges the passing of the law:

GIOUSOUF (CDU): Altogether the finance plan for this year provides roughly 10 billion euros for the admission of refugees and to fund the fight against the causes of refugee flight. Those who continue mantra-like to bad talk what we have done and plan on doing, are playing into the hands of fear mongers.

MUTLU (Green): Excuse me?

GIOUSOUF (CDU): Get behind the people of this country and vote for this law!¹³⁶

She portrays the concerned opposition of other Turkish-German representatives as fearmongering, a highly ironic claim coming from the representative of the party that had spent the last five months subtly (and occasionally very explicitly) connecting refugees to sexual assault and suggesting latent criminal tendencies amongst immigrants. Of particular interest is her last line, largely addressed at the three other Turkish-German Representatives who so vocally opposed her in the day's parliamentary session. She implores them to "stand behind the people of this country," suggesting that they are against the will of the majority.

The active engagement of numerous Turkish-German representatives in creating (and for most, in critiquing) the Integration law of 2016 demonstrates their level of political engagement with the integration apparatus of contemporary Germany. While their opinions range greatly and they often disagree on content, their presence in the formation and discourse-shaping bespeaks

¹³⁶ *Plenarprotokoll*, Sitzung 183, 7 July 2016. pg 18094.

the political integration of the Turkish-Germany community into influential positions at elite levels of governance.

Conclusion

From the fall of 2015 to the integration law of 2016, the rhetoric surrounding integration in the Bundestag shifted drastically. Initially integration was defined by open, if neoliberal-work oriented programs, that hoped to use the refugee migrations for the economic benefit of the country. Due to a multitude of factors, the discourse shift surrounding refugees grew increasingly negative, characterizing refugees as potential threats who were unlikely or unwilling to integrate into Germany society. As a result, the integration apparatus charged with enacting the state's conception of integration became correspondingly restrictive. The factors responsible for this shift include an association created between refugees and the violence of New Year's Eve in Cologne. Inflammatory media sources and a burgeoning far-right political movement drew this connection and fueled its growth, with important consequences for the federal and societal perception of refugee migrants.

In this tightening process, the conception of integration transformed into a mandatory process for a refugee population that was progressively more ostracized and excluded. This transition within the course of a year parallels an earlier pattern within the history of immigration to Germany, a process Chin describes as follows:

Ultimately, the terms of integration set out in more progressive circles converged with the conservative logic of cultural incommensurability. By the mid-1980s, both ends of the political spectrum framed integration according to a set of strict parameters, and defined it as a one-way process.¹³⁷

¹³⁷ Rita Chin, *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 171.

The discourse around the refugee migrations that began in 2014 followed a very similar trajectory as that which Chin identifies as characteristic of the 1980s, in one of Germany's earliest moments of Post-War immigration reform. In the fall of 2015, the initial portrayal of the refugee migrations was defined by a careful optimism in which arriving refugees were depicted by state authorities as a significant economic opportunity for Germany. The choice of this depiction bespeaks the neoliberal labor-oriented integration apparatus present during the early years of the refugee migrations.

In the months following this discursive shift, the Grand Coalition between the SPD and CDU/CSU—two parties from “both sides” with positions that often lie far apart from each other on the political spectrum—embraced this “conservative logic of cultural incommensurability.” Informed by this logic of cultural incompatibility between refugees and native Germans, they created a series of legislation shifting the burden of integration onto refugees. The definition of integration formulated through these series of laws, especially in the integration law of 2016, growingly articulate integration as a one-way process demanded of refugees, with penalizing consequences for those the integration apparatus deems are not meeting required “integration efforts.” This cycle of conservative backlash against periods of pro-immigration and inclusive integration laws is also present in the other prior moments of German legislative history.¹³⁸

The positive wording surrounding the 2016 laws, employing the “foster and demand” motto, is reinforced by two key lawmakers within the integration apparatus—Özoğuz and Giousouf. Their support of the law serves to temper its appearance, and downplays the truly

¹³⁸ Simon Green, *The Politics of Exclusion: Institutions and Immigration Policy in Contemporary Germany* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004). See his conclusion on the citizenship reform of the 1990s, articulated in chapter 4 “The Reform of Citizenship Policy, 1990-1999).

restrictive nature of its content. By masking the elements that would exclude refugees, they achieve in portraying the law as an ideological continuation of the more open fall 2015 policies while still acceding to a powerful conservative backlash. The state conception of integration by mid 2016 is therefore represented as still being open and inclusive, while in reality it restricted opportunities for refugees dramatically. In doing so, the governing CDU/CSU party was able to project an image of political unity and consensus despite the growing political rupture within the Grand Coalition.

This bifurcated approach to immigration and integration serves both to appease conservative elements within the CDU/CSU, and suggests a strategic response to the rise of a far-right political competitor. By establishing a more restrictive integration apparatus, the CDU/CSU sought to stymie the appeal of the Alternative for Germany, the far-right party that threatened to attract scores of CDU/CSU voters. However, by masking these restrictive measures, in part with the help of Aydan Özoğuz and Cemile Giousouf, the government could still claim to be meeting Germany's historical obligation to accept refugees. This ability to play multiple opposing sides through cautionary middle-road policies is a hallmark of the political era under Angela Merkel.

The point of this project has been to identify this shift in the integration apparatus, and the role of the eleven Turkish-German representatives within this watershed moment in state immigration and integration policy. In a larger historical context, the refugee migrations of 2014-2016 occurred in the wake of a longer process of decolonization in Europe. In studies of this postcolonial period, activists and representatives from immigrant communities—often from

former colonies—have largely been responsible for reforming and opening citizenship and immigration policies.¹³⁹ As Robert Young describes this period:

Politically, socially, and intellectually, the fight against inequality, against racism, against cultural hierarchy, has been fought within Europe in the postcolonial era by the subaltern subjects of the developing world who had migrated there.¹⁴⁰

Despite the different decolonization history in Germany, this description is in line with the long history of Turkish immigrant activism behind citizenship and immigration reform. As noted in the introduction, Turkish-German activism and persistent political involvement has been a driving factor of reform in post-war Germany.

Within the larger political dynamic that played out in this time period, the Turkish-German representatives in office occupied a diverse range of positions that defies generalizing statements. Several representatives, namely Cem Özdemir, Ekin Deligöz, Özcan Mutlu, and Sevim Dagdelen of the Green and Left parties, were vocal advocates for refugee rights and invoked their own personal experiences with integration in Germany in an attempt to inform federal policy. Others, mainly Cemile Giousouf and Aydan Özoguz of the governing SPD/CDU/CSU Grand Coalition, were more muted in their critique and even served to support and legitimize a more restrictive integration apparatus. This most likely reflects their party loyalty and the tacit obligation of Coalition members to support proposed government policies. This suggests a next step in postcolonial history, in which Turkish-Germans have diverse political opinions and cannot be easily categorized into reformist or activist boxes.

Several others play no role whatsoever in the shaping of new immigration and integration policies, working instead on other policy issues they cared more about. Indeed, it is important to

¹³⁹ Elizabeth Buettner, *Europe after Empire*:

¹⁴⁰ Robert J.C. Young, “The Postcolonial Condition” *The Oxford Handbook of Postwar European History*. 2012

bring up that several Turkish-German representatives, including Cem Özdemir and Cansel Kiziltepe, describe being pigeon-holed by their party leadership into immigration and integration policy areas because of their Turkish heritage, despite their articulated desire to focus on issues like the environment or financial policy.¹⁴¹ As this case study demonstrates, politicians are not necessarily activists, and identity politics do not trump party loyalty and affiliation.

In many moments, the protests of Turkish-German representatives are shared and equally vocalized by other fellow party members of the opposition. While they are not unique in protesting, their participation in the mobilizing resistance to restrictive immigration and integration policy demonstrates the growing role of Turkish-German politicians in German politics and their establishment as representatives of the Turkish-German community.

¹⁴¹ *Politik ohne Grenzen: Migrationsgeschichten aus dem Deutschen Bundestag*, ed. Özcan Mutlu (Berlin: B&S Siebenhaar Verlag, 2016)

Bibliography and Secondary Literature

Books

Agamben, Giorgio. "What is an apparatus?" in *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press: 2009.

Aktürk, Şener. *Regimes of Ethnicity and Nationhood in Germany, Russian, and Turkey*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1958.

Arendt, Hannah. "The Perplexities of the Rights of Man." In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.

Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Bade, Klaus. *Vom Auswanderungsland um Einwanderungsland? Deutschland 1880- 1980*. Berlin: Colloquium, 1983.

Balibar, Étienne. *Citizenship*. Cambridge: Polity, 2015.

Baskın, Oran. *Turkish Foreign Policy 1919 – 2006: Facts and Analyses with Documents*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2010.

Benhabib, Seyla. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Bird, Karen, Thomas Saafeld, and Andreas Wüst. *The Political Representation of Immigrants and Minorities: Voters, Parties, and Parliaments in Liberal Democracies*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2001.

Buettner, Elizabeth. *Europe after Empire: Decolonization, Society, Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Çinar, Alev. *Modernity, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Chin, Rita C-K, Heide Fehrenbach, Geoff Eley, and Atina Grossmann. *After the Nazi Racial State: Difference and Democracy in Germany and Europe*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2009.

- El-Tayeb, Fatima. *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Erel, Umut. *Migrant Women Transforming Citizenship: Life-stories from Britain and Germany*. Farnham, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon, 1972.
- Green, Simon. *The Politics of Exclusion: Institutions and Immigration Policy in Contemporary Germany*. Manchester; New York : Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes, eds. *Germany in Transit: Nation and Migration, 1955-2005*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Hale, William. *Turkish Foreign Policy 1774 – 2000*. London; Portland, OR : Frank Cass, 200.
- Halm, Dirk and Sauer, Martina. *Bürgerschaftliches Engagement von Türkinnen und Türken in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2007.
- Halm, Dirk und Sauer, Martina. *Erfolge und Defizite der Integration türkeistämmiger Einwanderer: Entwicklung der Lebenssituation 1999 bis 2008*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2009.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hoerder, Dirk. *Geschichte der deutschen Migration: vom Mittelalter bis heute*. Munich: C.H. Beck Wissen, 2010.
- Isin. Engin F., Michael Sawrd. *Enacting European Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Judt, Tony. *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*. New York: Penguin, 2005.
- Luft, Stefan. *Staat und Migration: Zur Steuerbarkeit von Zuwanderung und Integration*. Munich, C.H. Beck, 2009.
- Nathans, Eli. *The Politics of Citizenship in Germany: Ethnicity, Utility and Nationalism*. Oxford; New York: Berg, 2004.
- Özyürek, Esra, *Being German, Becoming Muslim: Race, Religion, and Conversion in the New Europe*. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Özyürek, Esra, *Nostalgia for the Modern: State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey*. Duke University Press, 2006.

Penninx, Rinus, Karen Kraal, Marco Martiniello, and Steven Vertovec. *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics, and Integration Policies*. Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.

Phillips, Anne. *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Reisigl, Martin, Ruth Wodak. *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Rosenow-Williams, Kerstin. *Organizing Muslims and Integrating Islam in Germany: New Developments in the 21st Century*. Leiden, BRILL, 2014.

Wodak, Ruth. *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*, Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2015.

Yavuz, Hakan and Esposito, John. *Turkish Islam and the Secular State: The Global Impact of Fethullah Gülen's Nur Movement*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2003.

Young, Robert J.C. "The Postcolonial Condition" *The Oxford Handbook of Postwar European History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Articles:

Bergmann, Knut, Matthias Diermeier, and Judith Niehues (2017). "Die AfD: Eine Partei der sich ausgeliefert fühlenden Durchschnitts- verdieners?" *ZParl Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen*, Jahrgang 48, Heft 1. 57 – 75.

Donovan, Barbara (2007). "Minority representation in Germany". *German Politics*, 455-480.

Faruk, Şen (2003). "The historical situation of Turkish Migrants in Germany, Immigrants and Minorities" 22:2-3, 208 – 227.

Green, Simon (2013) "Germany: A Changing Country of Immigration" *German Politics*, 22:3, 333-351.

Grimm, Robert (2014). "The rise of the German Eurosceptic party Alternative für Deutschland, between ordoliberal critique and popular anxiety" *International Political Science Review* Vol. 36(3). 264–278.

Hess, Christian, Simon Green (2016) "Introduction: The Changing Politics and Policies of Migration in Germany" *German Politics*, 25:3, 315-328.

Howard, Marc Morjé (2008). "The Causes and Consequences of Germany's New Citizenship Law" *German Politics*, 17:1, 41-62.

Lengfeld, Holger (2017). "Die „Alternative für Deutschland“: eine Partei für Modernisierungsverlierer?" *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. 69: 209.

Macleod, Catriona and Kevin Durrheim, "Foucauldian Feminism: The implications of Governmentality" *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 32, no. 1 (2002) 41-60.

Mushaben, Joyce Marie (2011). "Citizenship and migration policies under Merkel's Grand Coalition" *German Politics*. 20:3, 376-391.

Plehwe, Dieter; Schlögl, Matthias (2014). "Europäische und zivilgesellschaftliche Hintergründe der euro(pa)skeptischen Partei Alternative für Deutschland (AfD)" *WZB Berlin Social Science Center*, No. SP III 2014-501r

Schmidtke, Oliver (2016). "The 'Party for Immigrants'? Social Democrats' Struggle with an Inconvenient Electoral Issue" *German Politics*. 25:3, 398-413.

Schuster-Craig, Johanna (2017). "Integration Politics as an Apparatus", *German Studies Review* 40, no. 3: 607-627.

Turner, Ed, Simon Green & William Paterson (2013) "Introduction: Understanding the Transformation of the CDU" *German Politics*, 22:1-2, 1-15.

Weber, Beverly. "The German Refugee "Crisis" after Cologne: The Race of Refugee Rights." *English Language Notes*, vol. 54, no. 2, Fall/Winter 2016, pp. 77-92.

Weber, Beverly. "'We Must Talk about Cologne': Race, Gender, and Reconfigurations of 'Europe.'" *German Politics and Society*. 34.4 (Winter 2016): 68-86.

Wüst, Andreas M (2004). "Naturalised Citizens as Voters; Behavior and Impact" *German Politics* 13:2 pg 341-359.

Wüst, Andreas M (2016). "Incorporation beyond Cleavages? Parties, Candidates and Germany's Immigrant-Origin Electorate" *German Politics*. 25:3, 414-432.