

1-1-2011

The Challenges and Opportunities of Immigrant Integration: A Study of Turkish Immigrants in Germany

Matthew Franklin Clark
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Clark, Matthew Franklin, "The Challenges and Opportunities of Immigrant Integration: A Study of Turkish Immigrants in Germany" (2011). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 322.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.322>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

The Challenges and Opportunities of Immigrant Integration:

A Study of Turkish Immigrants in Germany

by

Matthew Franklin Clark

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Conflict Resolution

Thesis Committee:
Harry Anastasiou, Chair
Barbara Tint
Birol Yesilada

Portland State University
2011

Abstract

In an ever-globalizing world societies comprised of myriad people and cultures are quickly becoming the norm rather than the exception. In societies made up of culturally diverse, religiously pluralistic and disparate people, an added layer of complexity becomes apparent when attempting to integrate multiple cultures into a single society. Germany, in its reconstruction effort following World War II, faced such an integration challenge when a massive influx of Turkish migrants arrived as part of a “foreign worker” agreement. The introduction of a large and culturally diverse immigrant population made cultural understanding of paramount importance.

Culture is an intangible element that can be difficult to quantify in political, social, or economic terms. As such, understanding culture and the peaceful coexistence of multiple cultures requires an examination beyond traditional perspectives. The implementation of conflict resolution theories and viewing situations from a conflict resolution perspective enables the extra layer of complexity that can occur within culturally diverse societies to be unpacked and better understood.

Specifically, the goal of this thesis was to examine the integration challenges for Turkish immigrants in Germany while at the same time looking for opportunities to learn from the challenges facing societies attempting to implement immigration and integration policies in order to promote the coexistence of multiple cultures. The thesis concludes by offering directives or recommendations, formulated from the findings in this study, for multicultural societies facing integration challenges.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Conflict Resolution Perspectives	6
<i>Identity Formation Perspective</i>	9
<i>Cultural Understanding Perspective</i>	10
<i>Nationalist Perspective</i>	10
Chapter 2: Conflict Resolution Theory	12
<i>Intercultural Conflict Resolution</i>	13
<i>Interfaith Dialogue</i>	17
<i>Acculturation and Multiculturalism</i>	20
<i>Identity and “Otherness”</i>	21
<i>Nationalism</i>	26
Chapter 3: Historical Background of Turkish Immigrants in Germany	31
Chapter 4: Identity Formation Perspective	36
<i>Multiculturalism</i>	38
<i>Immigration Country?</i>	41
<i>Divergent Perspectives on Immigration and Integration</i>	43
Chapter 5: Cultural Understanding Perspective	48
<i>Identity Formation and “Otherness”</i>	50
<i>Groups</i>	52
<i>German Christian Churches</i>	53
<i>Essentialism</i>	56
<i>Post-9/11 Treatment of Muslims in Germany</i>	56
<i>Turkish Migrant Organizations</i>	58
Chapter 6: Nationalist Perspective	64
<i>German Nationalism</i>	67
<i>Turkish Nationalism</i>	69
Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations	78
<i>Directives:</i>	82
<i>Future Research</i>	92
References	94
Appendix: Turkish Population in Germany Since 1961	101

Chapter 1: Introduction

The decision to select this topic for a Master's thesis started with an opportunity I had to live for nine months as a Boren Fellow in Turkey. While in Turkey, I paid particularly close attention to Turkey's relationship with the European Union (EU) and the West and became aware of an increasing Turkish frustration with its EU accession process. In some cases the frustration led to expressions of futility. On the topic of Turkey's EU accession, it seemed as though every newspaper article or academic journal asked the question of whether or not the West was "losing" Turkey or called into question Turkey's cultural compatibility with the EU or presented EU leaders promoting a "privileged partnership" with Turkey in lieu of full membership. Consequently, I began exploring the aforementioned "concerns". This academic exploration led me to discover the largest Turkish population living in the EU – Turkish immigrants in Germany. After recognizing the integration challenges of Turkish immigrants in Germany, I considered whether or not there were opportunities to learn from the incorporation of Turkish immigrants in Germany in order to address the aforementioned concerns about Turkey's "compatibility" with the EU. But, in order to find opportunities, the Turkish immigration and integration challenges in Germany had to be better understood – understood from perspectives outside of traditional approaches. These musings led me to create this academic study.

This thesis is a historical study of Turkish immigration in Germany. The research question that will be explored in this project is as follows: "By examining the conditions

of Turkish immigrants in Germany and the challenges of integration, are we able to find constructive paths to integration from a conflict resolution perspective?”

The current research on this topic is spread over a number of subject areas. The synthesis of diverse literature will facilitated this study with the intention of creating a multidisciplinary study of the conditions of Turkish immigrants in Germany and constructing a comprehensive approach that brings into focus multiple perspectives on a singular topic.

In synthesizing diverse research, this thesis attempts to 1) gain a better understanding of challenges surrounding Turkish immigration in Germany, and 2) consolidate multiple perspectives on the topic into one document with the intention of developing a more complete understanding and a more comprehensive approach to addressing immigrant integration challenges. The hope is to develop directives based on an in-depth understanding of the situation that could bring about the peaceful coexistence of multiple cultures in Germany and beyond. The expectation is that this type of exploration will facilitate the development of a framework that could lead to a more complete and effective approach to be utilized by societies facing the incorporation of multiple cultures in a single society.

Immigration is a global phenomenon that affects all nations. Individuals migrate for a number of reasons such as a pursuit of greater security, economic prosperity, and personal liberty. As globalization expands and the global transfer of people and cultures become the norm, the ability to adapt to the presence of multiple cultures is essential. For countries with large immigrant populations, the question inevitably becomes one of

integration. The integration of culturally diverse populations into a host society adds a layer of complexity to the immigration debate and demands a higher level of cultural understanding. Furthermore, in a post-9/11 world, the integration of Muslim populations into non-Muslim countries has become an especially sensitive and complex topic.

With the influx of a large Muslim Turkish population over the past 50 years, Germany has been at the forefront of immigration and integration debates. Since the first “foreign worker” agreement was signed with Turkey in 1961, Germany has witnessed the influx of millions of Turkish immigrants. Since then, Germany has adopted multiculturalism as its primary acculturation strategy. But a recent declaration by German Chancellor Angela Merkel that “the approach [to build] a multicultural [society] and to live side by side and to enjoy each other ... has failed, utterly failed” (Clark, 2010, p. 1), appears to have called into question the viability of Germany’s experiment with multiculturalism.

Integration challenges are not exclusively a German experience; they are challenges facing all nations with immigrant populations. By understanding Germany’s integration challenges with its Muslim Turkish population from multiple perspectives, not only could a fuller understanding of the immediate situation emerge, but a framework could be developed to facilitate the integration of culturally disparate populations into host societies worldwide.

Furthermore, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the first “foreign worker” agreement between Turkey and Germany. While there have been those who have celebrated progress, there are others who are looking at the situation critically with recognition that there is still room for improvement. In an interview with *The Local*,

Nalan Arkat, the general secretary of the Turkish Community in Germany (TGD), indicated this anniversary is more a time for reflection than celebration:

The main aim is to take the anniversary as an occasion to critically – and self-critically – analyze the developments over the last 50 years. Not everything went so well. We want to think about what went wrong, why it went wrong, what could have been done better, and what we can do better in the future. It's more a time for analysis. There's no real mood of celebration. (Knight, 2011, p. 1)

This thesis takes a similar approach to that of Nalan Arkat. It critically examines the past and looks for opportunities for improvement going forward.

The purpose of this thesis is to gain a better understanding of the challenges of integration in Germany, focusing specifically on the conditions of Turkish immigrants in Germany. The hope is to develop a framework that presents opportunities for the peaceful coexistence of multiple cultures at the national and multinational level.

The problem is compelling for a number of reasons. First, in an ever-globalizing world the mixture of myriad people and cultures is inevitable. Therefore, it would behoove us to take advantage of opportunities to learn from the challenges facing societies attempting to implement immigration and integration policies promoting the coexistence of multiple cultures.

Second, understanding Germany's challenges with the integration of Turkish immigrants in Germany could help explain the impetus behind German Chancellor Angela Merkel and her Christian Democratic Union (CDU) party championing a "privileged partnership" with Turkey in lieu of full Turkish membership in the European Union. Are there opportunities to facilitate and fine-tune the larger multiculturalism debate about Turkey's cultural compatibility with and "integration" into the European

Union based on lessons learned in Germany? As one journalist asked, “Given the challenges Turks have encountered with integration into German society, how could Turkey hope to successfully integrate into the EU” (Orendt, 2010, p. 1).

The aim of this thesis is to approach a topic from multiple perspectives in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the situation. It is an opportunity to “to look at something holistically and comprehensively, to study it in its complexity, and to understand it in its context” (Punch, 1998, p. 192). The ‘holistic’ mentality will be applied in this thesis by examining the topic from multiple perspectives which include the field of Conflict Resolution. When looking at a situation comprehensively or holistically an important factor to explore is the context in which it occurs.

Punch points out:

...The ‘truth’ about human social behavior is not independent of context; it is not context-free. Therefore it is important...to be able to convey the full picture. The term often used to capture this is ‘thick description’. There are two parts to this idea. First, the description (of the group, or the case, event or phenomenon) must specify everything a reader needs to know in order to understand the findings. Second, the research report needs to provide sufficient information about the context of the research so that a reader can judge the transferability or generalizability of its findings. (Punch, 1998, p. 192)

This thesis will attempt to provide a “thick description” of Turkish immigration in Germany and the integration challenges that have ensued by: 1) critically exploring the situation from a conflict resolution perspective in order to gain a more complete understanding, and 2) showcasing the transferability of the situation by creating directives that could be used by societies worldwide facing integration challenges. Only after compiling complete information can we fully understand the situation. By

approaching the situation from a conflict resolution perspective a “thicker” and more comprehensive description is likely to emerge.

This study is an opportunity to “think outside the box” and shift away from relying primarily on traditional, quantifiable perspectives and introduce a new approach to view the situation from a new perspective, a conflict resolution perspective. The new perspective does not replace the old; it augments it. In order to gain a complete understanding the topic must be approached from multiple perspectives. Recognition that the world has changed and a new perspective is necessary is an important step in the conflict resolution process.

Furthermore, this project is an opportunity to bring together myriad theories/terms into a single document and apply conflict resolution theories to a timely and relevant real-world situation. As such, the original approach of this thesis is to synthesize literature from a multidisciplinary perspective with the intention of gaining a deeper understanding of the immediate situation and formulating directives for multicultural societies facing integration challenges. The hope is to build a multidisciplinary platform on which new approaches can be explored and future research can be performed from a Conflict Resolution perspective.

Conflict Resolution Perspectives

Considering that migration and the acculturation process that ensues are global realities, the need to understand these phenomena is of paramount importance. Understanding that “migration is a fact of modern life” (Zagefka & Brown, 2002, p. 171) is a critical first step in developing a foundation on which to build. Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936) point out:

Such widespread movement of people inevitably brings different groups into contact with one another, as immigrants and members of a host society. The changes in the original cultural pattern of either or both groups as a result of that contact have been labeled acculturation. (as cited in Zagefka & Brown, 2002, p. 171)

Some emigrate on a short-term basis; others emigrate with the intention of permanence.

In either case, a degree of acculturation is introduced into the host society.

Adjustments are necessary when immigrants are introduced into a host society.

This acculturation process contains tangible and intangible agents of change and adjustment. “In many settings the groups [immigrants and members of the host society] co-exist relatively harmoniously and there is consensus as to what changes are desirable; other contexts are marked by intergroup tension or conflict” (Zagefka & Brown, 2002, p. 171).

“Desirable changes” can indicate obvious, tangible elements such as obeying the laws of the host country. But the less tangible elements such as the need to understand the customs, culture, and behaviors of the host country need to be addressed. And just as important is the host country’s understanding and incorporation of the newly introduced cultures, religions, and customs.

In many cases the introduction of a new and “foreign” culture may be met with resistance and viewed with skepticism. The challenge then becomes how to bridge the cultural unawareness gap between members of the host country and immigrants and establish a framework that facilitates peaceful coexistence. The aforementioned conditions were present in post-World War II Germany with the influx of Turkish migrants that arrived as part of the “foreign worker” agreements between Germany and Turkey.

Much has been written about the historical situation of Turkish migrants in Germany. And, from what has been written it is obvious that there have been many integration challenges in Germany – socially, economically, and politically.

When researching this topic, it became apparent that much of the literature focused on one of three broad categories:

1. Social conditions
2. Economic conditions
3. Political conditions

Much of the traditional literature has tended to focus on each of these categories in isolation, independent of the others. Granted, these three conditions are an important part of the Turkish immigrant experience and the integration debate in Germany. But, they do not address all elements of the complex story that is immigrant integration.

In order to gain a more complete understanding these categories must be examined not only as they relate to one another, but as they relate to other conditions – the more intangible conditions – and fit into the overall situation. Therefore, I hope to address the deficiencies of the singular focus of the existing topical literature by synthesizing findings from multiple sources and expanding perspectives so as to create an approach that incorporates the field of conflict resolution and, consequently, brings about a better, fuller understanding of the situation.

This thesis will approach the topic from a new angle. There are three conflict resolution perspectives from which this topic will be further explored and contextualized:

1. Identity Formation Perspective
2. Cultural Understanding Perspective

3. Nationalist Perspective

By approaching the topic from the aforementioned three viewpoints, we are able to gain a more in-depth knowledge and complete understanding of the situation that will augment the knowledge acquired from a more traditional (social, political, economic, etc.) outlook. A description of the conflict resolution perspectives would prove useful when moving forward.

Identity Formation Perspective

Identity formation in multicultural societies can be a complicated process. In immigration situations, identity formation is likely to contain an added layer of complexity given the fact that multiple, and in many cases disparate, cultures and people are attempting to coexist. For immigrants, there is the challenge of balancing the retention of home culture with the acquisition of a new culture. Members of the host society are faced with the challenge of incorporating new cultures and recognizing the extent to which these cultural interactions affect their identity. A third challenge for identity formation has little to do with individual formation but rather identity formation at the national level. In a multicultural society, how does a nation define itself?

Therefore, it is important to understand this identity formation process at all levels from a conflict resolution perspective in order to appropriately address the situation. By examining the topic from an identity formation perspective, we are able to explore and disentangle the complexities of this process.

Identity formation will be examined within the context of acculturation, focusing specifically on Germany's adoption of multiculturalism and the effects on identity

formation and the development of an “us versus them” mentality. The social and political consequences of “Otherness” will be discussed along with the challenge of balancing home culture and host culture. A question that will be explored is to what extent is sacrificing one or both in the name of acculturation necessary for coexistence? Several acculturation strategies will be discussed that include integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization.

Cultural Understanding Perspective

In societies where myriad cultures and people coexist, cultural understanding becomes paramount in importance. In the case of immigration, when a new culture is introduced to a host society intercultural interactions are inevitable. The intercultural interactions between host and immigrant determine in large part how the relationship will develop. Will there be cultural engagement and thus bring about mutual understanding and shared experience? Or, will there be cultural avoidance, the consequence of which is likely to bring about separation? In religiously pluralistic societies, interfaith dialogue can serve as a useful tool in bridging a cultural awareness chasm.

Therefore, by viewing a situation from a cultural understanding perspective, we are able to recognize the primacy of culture in conflict situations and the need to fully understand the importance of cultural engagement in order to develop mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence.

Nationalist Perspective

An immigration and integration challenge that can develop in societies that are introduced to new and multiple cultures is nationalism. Nationalism can play a dominant role when defining one’s self. In countries with large immigrant populations, immigrants

encounter a balancing act in which love for home country coalesces with respect for the host country. Conversely, for a host country, nationalism can be an ideology to formulate a stronger national identity, one that clearly separates host from immigrant.

Nationalism is a concept that can pose numerous integration challenges for immigrant and host alike. In order to understand immigration and the integration challenges that ensue, the role that nationalism plays for host and immigrant alike is a topic that needs to be explored.

With this study, my goal is to bring about a better understanding of the situation that will facilitate the possibility of finding an all-inclusive and sustainable solution, present opportunities for peaceful coexistence, and open the door for future research in the field of conflict resolution.

Chapter 2: Conflict Resolution Theory

When looking at the Turkish immigration in Germany and the integration challenges that have ensued, one field of study that has been inadequately explored is Conflict Resolution. By viewing the situation from a conflict resolution perspective, we open the door to the possibility of developing new perspectives that can augment other perspectives. Conflict resolution provides a flexible framework in which to approach conflict situations. As globalization expands and the mixture of myriad people and disparate cultures becomes the norm, the capacity to approach situations from new perspectives is critical. Conflict resolution provides the framework for developing new perspectives.

Conflict resolution, per se, is an overarching and broad field. It encompasses perspective, approaches, and strategies that are applicable in low-level interpersonal disputes or high-level international negotiations. No matter how it is utilized or defined, conflict resolution provides a platform on which not only to pursue a resolution to a conflict, but to understand the intricacies of conflict. By understanding the source of the conflict the formation of a comprehensive and sustainable solution becomes more likely.

Anastasiou (2009) provides a definition of the emerging fields of Conflict Analysis and Resolution (CAR), Conflict Resolution (CR) and Peace Studies (PS):

1. CAR – as a prerequisite for resolution, inquiry focuses on understanding the structural dynamics of conflict.
2. CR – the emphasis is on perspective, processes, and structures that empower and facilitate the resolution of conflict.

3. PS – the focus is on understanding and fostering the structural dynamics of peace in the form of peacebuilding, peace sustenance, and institutionalizing peace in light of elaborations of constitutes a society and culture of peace. (p. 33)

These three emerging fields provide a structure not only for conflict analysis but to facilitate the exploration of a sustainable and peaceful solution.

Anastasiou goes on to say:

The strengths of CAR, CR, and PS lie in their capacity to deconstruct the disputants' visions of the world, policies, and actions, disclosing conflict patterns that bind the rivals to their adversarial relationship, and envision the possibility of peace in light of which to forge proactive perspectives, strategies, and instruments of action. (2009, p. 33)

The conflict resolution theories and concepts discussed in this section will provide a foundation on which other perspectives, outside of the traditional perspectives, can be formed and analyzed as they relate to the topic. This approach facilitates a multidisciplinary study by combining the more tangible, quantifiable perspectives – economic, social, and political – with less tangible perspectives such as identity formation, cultural understanding, and nationalism.

Intercultural Conflict Resolution

As people and ideas circle the globe with frequency and individuals from around the world are able to communicate in a matter of seconds, cultural knowledge and understanding become necessary. Whether it is an immigrant integrating into a host society or an American professional sending an email to a Chinese business associate, the

nuances of culture need to be understood. But, what is culture? And, what role does culture play in identity formation especially in a multicultural society?

When looking at a culture in the context of multicultural societies, one of two cultural possibilities is likely to emerge:

1. Culture based on tradition with multiple, disparate cultures living side by side with no overlap and a very distinct definition of who “we” are and who “they” are.
2. Culture based on shared experience with individuals of different ethnicities, faiths, and traditions living together, forming identity together, and moving forward together based on interpersonal interactions.

It may not be as simple as defining a multicultural society as one or the other, and it might not be an “either-or” situation. But, at least this provides a launching point for discussing the challenges and opportunities of immigrant integration.

Avruch (1998) addresses the inconsistent use of the word *culture* and proposes an alternative conception in which culture is seen as dynamic and derivative of individual experience. He begins by challenging six mutually related ideas about culture. Culture is homogenous; culture is a thing; culture is uniformly distributed among members of a group; an individual possesses but a single culture; culture is custom; and culture is timeless (1998, pp. 14-16). He claims that using these six ideas “greatly diminishes the utility of the culture concept as an analytical tool for understanding social action...conflict, and conflict resolution (1998, p. 16).

Culture is a complex idea that is more than simply a tradition passed down through the ages or communally shared beliefs. Avruch suggests the need to “complexify culture” (p. 17).

Schwartz explains:

Culture consists of the derivatives of experience, more or less organized, learned or created by the individuals of a population, including those images or encodements and their interpretations (meanings) transmitted from past generations, from contemporaries, or formed by individuals themselves. (as cited in Avruch, 1998, p. 17)

Avruch describes this definition as virtuous and states that it “conceptually connects culture to experience—to interpreted social action, to practice” (1998, p. 17). This definition asserts that culture is not based solely on beliefs or traditions carried over to future generations. Culture is a living, breathing, and constantly changing entity. Of course tradition and customs play a part in formation, but only a part. Culture respects the past, requires an adjustment in the present, and presents an opportunity for growth in the future. The world becomes smaller with each new day. As the intermingling of culture and ideas become the rule not the exception, cultural agility and understanding are essential.

In an era of globalization, the interaction of myriad cultures and people is inevitable. Consequently, there are an increasing number of single societies that are comprised of multiple cultures with different beliefs, faiths, and traditions. For cultural encounters between those with shared experiences or connections (religion, language, ethnicity, etc.) the interaction, in theory, should be less confrontational. There is an immediate sense of compatibility and connectedness. However, for cultural encounters lacking these immediate connections, compatibility might not arrive immediately and

without appropriately addressing the situation might not arrive at all. Intercultural conflict resolution and relationship building techniques must move to the foreground in the latter scenario.

Lederach proposes a more holistic approach to conflict resolution that focuses on relationship building in a reconciliation process. “Reconciliation is not pursued by seeking innovative ways to disengage or minimize the conflicting groups’ affiliations, but instead is built on mechanisms that engage the sides of a conflict with each other as humans-in-relationship” (1997, p. 26). In many cases, disengaging or minimizing affiliation can be harmful as direct conflict. A phenomenon that Newcomb (1947) called “autistic hostility” is when, “Mutual avoidance precludes opportunities for acquiring information that might disconfirm perceptions of the other’s motives and character....Misperceptions and distrust between groups are also fed by lack of contact between members of different social categories” (Brewer & Miller, 1996, p. 107). This emphasizes the importance of engagement and relationship building.

Relationship-centered approaches are of paramount importance for resolving conflict, promoting peaceful coexistence and finding sustainable solutions. Referencing the “system” or the physical world which surrounds us, Lederach explains:

...We must look at the system as a whole and to the relationships of its parts if we are to understand its dynamic and structure. Relationships...are the centerpiece, the beginning and the ending point of understanding the system...It envisions protracted conflict as a system and focuses its attention on relationships within that system. (1997, p. 26)

This target-centered or relationship-centered approach facilitates the involved actors’ understanding of each other and the lens through which they view not only the immediate situation, but also the world in general.

Long standing conflicts are defined by “deep rooted, intense animosity; fear; and severe stereotyping. These dynamics and patterns [are] driven by real-life experiences, subjective perceptions, and emotions....Peacebuilding must be rooted in and responsive to the experiential and subjective realities shaping people’s perspectives and needs” (Lederach, 1997, p. 24). In conflicts, especially conflicts of culture and religion, cultural sensitivity and understanding are essential. Dialogue can serve as a useful conflict resolution tool when addressing animosity, fear, and stereotyping. In conflicts where religion plays an integral role, interfaith dialogue provides a more specific and narrowly focused means of resolution.

Interfaith Dialogue

Appleby describes interfaith dialogue (IFD) and three patterns of effective religious interaction explored by the authors, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Amal Khoury, and Emily Welty:

1. “‘Dialogue’ is a set of practices, not limited to elites or to formal means of communication, which aims to foster long-term relationships based in mutual respect and caring. Dialogue is thus virtually a form of religious discipline” (2007, p. xii).
2. “Precisely because of religion’s access to the full depth of human relations, faith-based diplomacy is an effective means of democratizing and popularizing otherwise state- and elite-centered peace negotiations, settlements, and processes” (2007, p. xii).

3. “The ‘best practices’ of IFD both counteract the negative dimensions of religion and dialogue and evoke the considerable peacebuilding capacity present at the more spiritual core of religious traditions” (2007, p. xiii).

Dialogue and more specifically interfaith dialogue can facilitate peaceful coexistence in a religiously pluralistic world, especially when a sudden spike in tension arises.

In a post-9/11 world where Islam has moved to the foreground of numerous debates, interfaith dialogue takes on a new, more profound meaning. It is an opportunity to come together as people of different faiths and beliefs in order to advance mutual understanding. But given the level of emotion and anger resulting from the horrific attacks and ensuing wars, there are also intensified dialogical challenges in the post-9/11 world.

As was described in the *Economist*, “Making artful use of history, theology and current geopolitics, [Osama bin Laden] has, in effect, urged all the world’s billion-odd Muslims to bury their internal differences and consider themselves at war with all the world’s Christians and Jews” (as cited in Smock, 2002, p. 3). Consequently, for those who viewed this as a religious confrontation, a tension developed between Christians and Muslims. For others, this was an opportunity for conflict resolution through dialogue.

Smock explains:

Christians and Jews with a more balanced perspective on Islam and the Muslim world recognized an immediate need to engage the Muslim world more successfully than they had done in the past. Interfaith dialogue became fashionable in many U.S. churches, synagogues, and mosques. (2002, p. 4)

Fashionable or not, interfaith dialogue was an opportunity not only to deflate tension and animosity but to develop a mutual understanding of culture and religion.

“At its most basic level, interfaith dialogue involves people of different religious faiths coming together to have a conversation” (United States Institute of Peace, 2004). It is an opportunity to converse openly and without judgment in order to advance the coexistence of different religions, beliefs, and cultures. However, according to Smock:

The notion of interfaith dialogue encompasses many different types of conversations, settings, goals, and formats. But it is not an all-encompassing concept: interfaith dialogue is not intended to be a debate. It is aimed at mutual understanding, not competing; at mutual problem solving, not proselytizing. (as cited in United States Institute of Peace, 2004)

Interfaith dialogue is an opportunity to learn about the faith and beliefs of others in order to promote peaceful coexistence. In societies comprised of individuals who have disparate beliefs and faiths, interfaith dialogue has the capacity to be a powerful peacebuilding tool. One issue that has seen more attention is intra-faith dialogue. Interfaith processes tend to often involve the more liberal thinkers of any religion. It is the discourse between those within religions, including the more fundamental and extreme views that is being seen as more crucial.

In countries with large immigrant and culturally diverse populations, dialogue is essential. Where there is a dialogical void, the environment can become a breeding ground for enmification – a process of defining those who are different as the enemy. One attempt to respond to religious and cultural diversity is through the implementation of multiculturalism.

Acculturation and Multiculturalism

Acculturation is defined as “the changes in the original cultural pattern of either or both groups as a result of that contact” (as cited in Zagefka & Brown, 2002, p. 171).

Zagefka and Brown (2002) describe four acculturation strategies:

If immigrants wish to maintain their original cultural identity and are interested in interacting with host community members at the same time, the resulting acculturation strategy is integration. If immigrants want to maintain their original identity but do not want to participate in or engage with members of the host society, a strategy of separation results. Immigrants aim at assimilation if they abolish their original cultural identity and, at the same time, seek contact with members of the host community. Finally, if immigrants reject both their original culture and show no interest in having relations with members of the host community, marginalization results. (p. 172)

It appears as though in Germany the concept of *multiculturalism* has been used euphemistically in place of *separation*.

Multiculturalism has been defined as “a body of thought in political philosophy about the proper way to respond to cultural and religious diversity” (Song, 2010, p. 1).

The fundamental root of its conception rests on the idea of *difference*.

Multiculturalism...is understood as the study and support for peaceful coexistence of diverse cultures in a society (Zeytinoglu, 2010, p. 1).

Multiculturalism can present challenges for nations with large immigrant populations. As immigrants arrive in a host country, both immigrant and host are faced with differences. The question becomes how well prepared is the host society to integrate *different* cultures? And, what does it mean for a society to be multicultural?

Hoopes claims:

Multiculturalism is that state in which one has mastered the knowledge and developed the skills necessary to feel comfortable and communicate effectively (1) with people of any culture encountered and (2) in any situation involving a

group of people of diverse cultural backgrounds... The multicultural person is the person who has learned how to learn culture – rapidly and effectively. Clearly it is an ideal. (1979, p. 21)

He qualifies his definition by describing this as “ideal.” Nonetheless, it is somewhat presumptive. Simply because multiculturalism exists does not guarantee a cultural knowledge has been mastered or skills developed. Multiculturalism, as viewed by some, is living side by side with very little, if any, cultural exchange. You have your culture, I have mine. In this scenario, Hoopes’ definition could be refuted. The argument could be made that one does not learn multiculturalism by mastering knowledge; one learns how to live within a multicultural society and coexist with multiple cultures through interpersonal interaction.

Continuing in the “ideal” domain, Zeytinoglu (2010) points out that multiculturalism “...can be ideally described as the will and desire of diverse and multiple ethnic cultures to live together without exploitation and subordination of others” (p. 2). Unfortunately, “ideals” do not always fit seamlessly into reality. When multiple cultures live side-by-side (no cultural interaction) instead of together (cultural interaction and shared experiences), the likelihood of the formation of an “us versus them” mentality increases considerably.

Identity and “Otherness”

Identity formation starts from an early age. As we grow, our identities are formed according to internal and external factors. “People are able to express identity based on two primary sources of information: information from within and information from beyond” (Rivera & Hohman, 2010, p. 1). Identity is a complex topic. For purposes of

this thesis, I will be focusing on the external (i.e. social) factors that contribute to identity formation.

Rivera and Hohman (2010) explain that:

Gaining identity from beyond is based heavily on the interpersonal aspect of self where information from others is used to gain information about the self...Identity can come from interactions with others, or perception of others, on a one-on-one basis as well as from larger conglomerations of people, such as groups and organization. (p. 1)

Not only is identity viewed in interactional terms, it is also classified by many as a fundamental human need.

Identity formation becomes more complex and important when recognized in the context of human needs fulfillment. Burton points out, "...Needs such as personal recognition and identity...are the basis of individual development and security in a society" (1998, p. 1). These human needs "are part of the very nature of human beings" and as Burton argues, "human individuals *must* pursue their needs, either independently or in association with others, regardless of consequences" (as cited in Burrows, 1996, p. 57).

The fulfillment of human needs has been viewed by some as a "controlling element in social organization":

Many social scientists have highlighted the importance of identifying the role of human needs in any attempt to understand human behavior...Questions about the meaning of human development and self-realization are now being answered in terms of human needs...Attention is now directed to these needs as a controlling element in social organization. (Burrows, 1996, p. 53)

When looking at identity as a human need, recognition of the necessity of fulfillment is critical. And, in a multicultural society where individuals of disparate cultures are attempting to peacefully coexist and establish identity, the ensuing quest to fulfill these

needs can follow a positive or negative direction depending on how the situation is approached.

First, it would be helpful for both host and immigrant to recognize that regardless of culture, identity is a universal human need shared by all and must be fulfilled by all. This creates a common denominator from which collaboration is able to exist. “The most fundamental evolutionary force experienced by individuals is the drive to attempt to control their environment in order to satisfy their needs” (Burrows, 1996, p. 58). Therefore, if host and immigrant from a very early stage in the relationship attempt to “control their environment in order to satisfy their needs” in a collaborative manner, the likelihood of conflict could be minimized. “Once it is discovered that goals are held in common, the stage is set for a search for means that satisfy all parties to a dispute” (Burton, 1990, p. 42).

On the other hand, because of the primacy of human needs fulfillment, if collaboration is nonexistent and the search for identity becomes unconnected, conflict and negative consequences for the society at large are likely to emerge. Burton argues:

In the beginning... individuals seek to satisfy their needs by acting within the limits imposed by the norms and laws of their society... But if these social norms and laws frustrate them, then, subject to the value they attach to their social relationships, they will employ methods that violate these norms and laws. They act this way because there are no other options for satisfying their needs. (as cited in Burrows, 1996, p. 57)

Therefore, collaboration and engagement are important elements in preventing transgressions. If not, “Denial by society of recognition and identity would lead, at all societal levels, to alternative behaviors designed to satisfy such needs” (Burton, 1998, p.

1). To avoid conflict, individuals must work together and adjust their interactions to address the fulfillment of human needs.

In multicultural societies, the question becomes how the formation of identity can be a collaborative effort that meets basic human need for host and immigrant alike. By recognizing this situation, not only is it possible to prevent conflict, but it also opens the door for a collaborative and integrative solution to integration challenges. Within the context of immigration, if integration and identity formation challenges are pervasive in a multicultural society, individuals are likely to turn to groups or organizations that hold personal meaning and connection, a place where they can “fit in.”

Deaux suggests that “Identity refers to social categories in which an individual claims membership as well as the personal meaning associated with those categories” (1993, p. 4). Deaux goes on to cite Tajfel’s (1978) theory of social identity, “...Identity emerges from the context of intergroup relations. Thus, one defines oneself as a member of a particular in-group vis-à-vis an out-group” (Deaux, 1993, p. 4).

Tajfel states, “Social identity...is that part of an individual’s self concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63). By defining ourselves with terms such as “our group” or “our organization,” subconsciously though it may be, we are clearly defining what it means to be “us” and, consequently, what it means to be “them.” Forming identity based on what we are *not* has the capacity to portend “Otherness.”

“Othering, or the process of identifying an individual or group of people as the Other, marks them as strange, foreign, exotic, or heathen...Othering is rooted in the

concepts of in-group favoritism and out-group bias” (Critchfield, 2010, p. 2). Genoni explains that the idea of “the Other” and the associated ideas of “Otherness” and “Othering”...are connected to explorations of identity and identification, needing to find one’s own identity (2010, p. 1). Therefore, for another to be classified as the Other, one must know her own identity.

Genoni argues that one’s self often becomes defined *against* another...called ‘definition through difference’ (2010, p. 1). She goes on to examine the works of Ferdinand de Saussure and describes his “the Other” logic. “Something is *x*, in part because it is not *y*, and only through the knowledge of the identity of *y* can we understand the identity of *x* (as ‘not-*y*’). In this schema, *y* is ‘the Other’” (as cited in Genoni, 2010, p. 1). This logic indicates that we define ourselves not only by who we are, but by who we are not. An example of ‘definition through difference’ is what Cohen (1972) refers to as “moral panic”.

Schiffauer discusses the “sense of moral panic [that] underlies the current debate about Islam in Germany...concerning citizenship, religious minority rights, and access to public funds (2006, p. 94). “Moral Panic” refers to:

...States of collective hysteria which periodically appear in civil societies characterized by a strong concern ‘over the behavior of a certain group or category and the consequences that that behavior presumably causes for the rest of society’; ...an increased level of hostility towards that particular group implying a division between ‘us’ and ‘them’; ...an exaggerated representation of the threats and a disproportionate reaction to them; ...and a certain volatility. (Schiffauer, 2006, p. 94)

The presence of moral panic creates a divisive environment in which identities are based not on shared interest or experience, but on how we define ourselves in relation to “the

Other”. But, in a multicultural society, does identity formation need to be an either-or, “us or them” process? Or, is it possible to develop multi-dimensional identities?

Bell (2010) discusses the presence of unified identity versus multi-dimensional identities. He asks whether a person has one, global, unified identity or if a person is a collection of many identities “expressed fluidly in different social groups and identity content domains” (p. 2). Bell goes on to say:

Over the past decade, an increasing number of scholars have come to see identity as a collection of different identities...Reflecting more of a postmodern complexity of identity development, they propose that a person is composed of many identity *domains*, such as ethnic, sexual, or religious—each with their own potentially differing level of identity development. (2010, p. 2)

Consequently, when thinking about identity, it might be helpful to expand the discussion beyond traditional research methodologies and definitions. In an era of globalization that inevitably results in a growing number of multicultural societies, a new approach and paradigm shift should be considered. However, there is a strong bond that still plays a part in identity formation and connects individuals to each other – nationalism.

Nationalism

For many, the nation instills a sense of pride and paramount allegiance. The nation provides an opportunity to build identity and relationships based on shared experience. It can provide a group of individuals with shared goals and purpose. In the case of immigrant populations in host countries, a love of and loyalty to the *home* nation can serve as a beacon of hope, especially if those populations feel marginalized or maltreated.

“Nationalism, after the birth of the French and American republics in the eighteenth century, became a dominant political movement in the nineteenth century when the emergence of unified nation-states rearranged the map of western and central Europe” (Volkan, 1997, p. 23). Smith defines a *nation* as:

...A group of people sharing an historic territory; common myths and historical memories; a mass, public culture; a common economy; and common legal rights and duties for all members. A nation signifies a cultural bond, a community of people united by ideology, language, mythology, symbolism, and consciousness. (as cited in Anastasiou & Broome, 2010, p. 1)

Nationalism in a traditional sense is loyalty to the nation which takes precedence over other allegiances – regional, local, or kinship links (Anastasiou & Broome, 2010, p. 2).

Anastasiou and Broome explain:

The concept of *nationalism* is embedded in the everyday lives of citizens of modern nation-states. The pride that people feel for national accomplishments, the appeals of politicians to the national interests in justifying policies, and the symbols that nations use for self-identification (e.g., flags, national anthems, and monuments) are omnipresent and help create a national consciousness and national identity among diverse individuals. (2010, p. 1)

This sense of nationalism can serve as a bond that helps unite multiple and disparate groups and champion a common cause – the nation. “Individuals’ membership in the nation is usually involuntary, though there are instances where individuals choose to be part of a particular nation (e.g., immigration)” (Anastasiou & Broome, 2010, p. 2). In a nation where certain groups are marginalized and recognition in the host society is non-existent, immigrant loyalty to the host nation might not be automatic. The traditional nationalistic model may not be the best fit in multicultural societies, where individuals of disparate cultures and faiths coexist.

“Moderate forms of nationalism are more likely to promote individual rights, creativity, and diversity of communities within the nation. Liberal nationalism, for example, strives to protect cultural communities while promoting liberal universal principles” (Anastasiou & Broome, 2010, p. 2). By promoting individual rights and respecting diversity, individuals in multicultural societies are more likely to develop a shared identity and, as such, a deeper allegiance to the state is possible. This allegiance to the state and nationalistic sentiment is not always depicted in terms of nation versus nation conflicts on a national level. Nationalism also presents itself in domestic situations at the community level.

Anastasiou discusses nationalism and the implications for the conceptualization and practice of community:

...The nationalist perception of community gravitates toward the polarization of ethnic groups within and between societies by its exclusivist notion of identity and the hard psycho-political and territorial boundaries it strives to establish between the ethno-national “in-group” and the “out-group.”...Nationalism’s narcissistically constricted concept of national right, democracy and justice is accompanied by an equally constricted view of community and identity. (2009, p. 42)

Therefore, it can be argued that a nationalistic mentality at the community level conflicts with the aforementioned concept of multi-dimensional identities.

When rigidity rules and flexibility is marginalized, the proverbial “you’re either in or you’re out” mentality presents itself. “Nationalists vehemently resist or reject any sense of belonging beyond or complementary to their own ethno-national, in-group community” (Anastasiou, 2009, p. 42). But, according to Anastasiou, there are opportunities for a paradigm shift.

By using the theoretical and practical approaches outlined in Conflict Analysis and Resolution (CAR), Conflict Resolution (CR), and Peace Studies (PS), it is possible to develop a “culture of peace [that] implies a richer and more sophisticated sense of belonging that sees one’s immediate community and identity conjoined to, tolerant of, overlapping with, complementary to, and relationally implicated in other ethno-national communities” (Anastasiou, 2009, p. 42). This approach facilitates the establishment of multi-dimensional identities and promotes cultural overlap. In an era of globalization with the continual exchange and interaction of myriad cultures, it is likely that traditional nationalists will be faced with an identity challenge.

Regarding the challenge of identity formation in a globalizing world Anastasiou (2009) argues:

Globalization processes pose the unavoidable challenge that, among other types of identity groups, ethno-national groups will be increasingly compelled to come to terms with whether their sense of community, identity, and belonging will extend, reach out, and contribute to the stability and wellbeing of an emergent global community, or remain nationalistically self-engaged with narcissistically defined national interests. (p. 42)

It can be argued that this reality has relevance for countries that are facing integration challenges with large immigrant populations. What type of identity will emerge? Will it be a shared identity (between host and immigrant)? Or, will groups become even more entrenched in their national identities, thus creating a further separation between host and immigrant?

If separation occurs in multicultural societies and immigrant and minority populations feel increasingly marginalized, there is the potential for the development of a sense of despair and desperation. If ignored or maltreated by the host country, it is likely

that immigrants will begin to turn to their home nations for support. In these situations, the home nation may be viewed as a hero of sorts, a savior. Consequently, immigrant nationalism (loyalty to the *home* nation) is likely to emerge and drive a further wedge between host and immigrant.

A separation between host and immigrant and a potential rise in immigrant nationalism promotes what could be described as a double-edged nationalism – separate yet intense nationalistic sentiments on the part of both host and immigrant for their respective home countries.

However, an important step in controlling overly nationalistic sentiment is “the crucial realization that the security and identity of one’s immediate community is best sought and pursued by enriching, complementing, and extending the concept of community to encompass ‘the other’” (Anastasiou, 2009, p. 42). Recognition that the world has changed and a new perspective is necessary is an important step in the conflict resolution process. Equally important to this recognition of change in the present is a comprehensive understanding of the past. For purposes of this thesis, this historical understanding should focus on the history of Turkish migration to Germany.

Chapter 3: Historical Background of Turkish Immigrants in Germany

Like many countries, Germany suffered enormous losses as a result of World War II. “Germany faced a severe labor shortage for two reasons: a labor pool depleted by the devastating war – and by Soviet prisoner-of-war camps – and the economic miracle that began on the back of revived industry in the 1950s” (Friedman, 2010, p. 2). Germany filled the need for unskilled laborers for manufacturing, construction and other industries by beginning a series of labor recruitment deals (Friedman, 2010, p. 2).

The post-World War II reconstruction period began as a temporary collaboration with the signing of “foreign worker” agreements between Germany and Turkey in 1961, similar to the agreements previously signed with Italy, Spain, and Greece. These agreements were not intended to be permanent. With the influx of Turkish migrants that started en masse 50 years ago and the integration challenges that have ensued, Germany has been at the forefront of immigration and integration debates. As a result, a more intimate relationship between Turkey and Germany developed.

During the post-World War II era, Germany relied on these agreements to counter a severe labor shortage and facilitate reconstruction. This led to a massive influx of *Gastarbeiter* (Guest Workers). They [Germany] regarded the migrants as temporary labor, not immigrants in any sense...and did not expect this to be a long-term issue (Friedman, 2010, p. 2). Thanks to their own economic miracles, Italians, Spanish, and Portuguese returned home leaving Muslim Turks as the overwhelming majority of migrants in Germany (Friedman, 2010, p. 2). Economic and political instability in

Turkey made it difficult for Turkish migrants to return home and forced them to stay in Germany.

According to Nicole and Hugh Pope (2004), “Turkey in the 1970s never had much of a chance” (p. 127):

The decade had had a turbulent start with the machinations and state persecution of leftist intellectuals after the March 1971 military ‘coup by memorandum’. By the end of the decade, thirteen weak coalition governments had swapped power amid a growing political instability that led inexorably to the more sweeping military coup of 1980. (p. 127)

Political instability was not the only thing hampering Turkey during this period.

Economic conditions left much to be desired. “By the end of the 1970s, shop shelves had become depleted of goods” (Pope, 2004, p. 129).

In a 1980 meeting between the government and military, Prime Minister Demirel described the troublesome economic situation in Turkey:

There’s no oil, no foreign currency, no goods, no medicine, no raw materials, no fertilizer and no production... we can’t even close the 351 billion lira deficit by printing money. Even if we had paper, ink and a printer it would not be possible. It would be another way of saying that the state has sunk. (as quoted in Pope, 2004, p. 129)

Understandably, many Turks began looking abroad for more prosperous economic opportunities and social conditions. For those Turks already in Germany the decision to stay was, to a certain extent, a foregone conclusion.

With the poor economic and social conditions in Turkey, Turkish migrants understandably desired not only to stay in Germany but to reunite with their families. For Germany, without a long-term immigration and integration policy, the issue quickly turned from a temporary solution for a labor shortage to a long-term integration challenge.

Germany was left with a massive migrant population, the vast majority of which were Muslim Turks. Because Germany did not believe the guest workers to stay long-term, they did not approach the issue from a policy perspective. That is, Germany did not address the integration issue because it was not supposed to last. “As the migrants transformed from a temporary exigency to a multigenerational community, the Germans had to confront the problem” (Friedman, 2010, p. 2).

Because Germany did not want the migrants to become part of Germany but wanted migrant loyalty, they came to the solution of multiculturalism which was basically the retention of home culture with a pledge of loyalty to Germany (Friedman, 2010, p. 2). With time, the combination of adopting multiculturalism and the lack of immigration and integration policies would create challenges for all parties involved.

Friedman describes the situation that was created as, “Turkish immigrants... would not be expected to assimilate into German culture. Rather they would retain their own culture, including language and religion, and that culture would coexist with German culture” (Friedman, 2010, p. 3). Based on the aforementioned acculturation definitions and Friedman’s analysis, multiculturalism adopted in Germany appears to have most closely resembled the strategy of separation.

Jonker (2005) points out that numerous returning Germans, in the aftermath of war, had to be reintegrated and as a result politicians did their best to prevent migrants from planting permanent roots (p. 113). This economic competition between returning Germans and Turkish immigrants for labor market participation created a tension ripe with Otherness and a breeding ground for German nationalism. Also, the political

response (or lack there of) to immigration and integration brought a nebulous situation lacking long-term strategy.

After the signing of the “foreign worker” agreements in 1961 the issue of immigration was likely not addressed because German policymakers did not view it as a long-term issue. However, the 1973 recession following the oil shock changed labor conditions in Germany and led to the *Anwerbestopp* (labor recruitment stop) in 1973 (Friedman, 2010, p. 2).

Faruk Şen suggests that the year 1973 was “a milestone with regard to the historical development and changes which have occurred in the social structure of Turkish migrants” due to the implementation of non-recruitment policy and family reunification (2003, p. 214). Gamze Avcı describes the German political response:

In the late 1970s, both the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and Christian Socialist Union (CSU) had framed the issue of foreigners as a ‘problem’ (Ausländerproblem)....Until the early 1990s the German government rejected the *de facto* development of immigration into permanence on the basis that Germany is not an immigration country. Consequently, integration remained rather a controversial and limited option. (2006, p. 69)

Without a clearly defined integration policy and the denial of Germany as an immigration country, multiculturalism filled the vacuum.

Ramm describes German immigration and the political debate between *Multi-Kulti* (multiculturalism) and *Leitkultur* (leading culture or guiding cultural values). The Green Party publicized ‘multicultural realities’ being recognized in Germany which brought about an intense debate in the German public on the concept of multiculturalism (Ramm, 2010, p. 186). Meanwhile, the conservative elements did not like the idea of ‘*Multi-Kulti*’. The recognition of multiculturalism had social consequences.

First, with the German government's lack of long-term immigration policy and the reluctance to acknowledge that Germany had effectively become a country of immigration (Jonker, 2005, p. 114), parallel societies began to appear. Instead of integrating into German society, many Turkish immigrants created separate communities, societies and associations.

Second, for an immigrant essentially caught between two cultures – living in one (host) but abiding by another (home) – there are challenges with establishing identity. Conversely, if there is no effort made with regard to cultural understanding, it is possible the introduction of “foreign cultures” could cause the host country to form a stronger identity – one that is defined through difference and excludes those of a foreign culture when defining one's self.

It is hoped that by exploring the immigration and integration situation in Germany from a conflict resolution perspective this thesis will facilitate a more thorough understanding of two relevant concepts – identity formation and cultural understanding.

Chapter 4: Identity Formation Perspective

The massive migration of people inevitably leads to the mixing of cultures. In order to understand the immigration situation and determine, as much as possible, what kind of society that is envisioned with myriad people of multiple cultures living together, the burden and initial responsibility falls heavily on the host society. One of the first and more important questions that should be asked surrounds the longevity of the situation. Is the migration situation temporary or long-term? By answering this question a host society is better able to create, with greater accuracy, immigration and integration policy and is better able to define itself. Germany faced this scenario in the post-World War II reconstruction era with the “foreign worker” agreements that were signed with many countries including Turkey.

Integration is a challenge for any nation with a large immigration population. It presents the pervasive challenge of finding a balance between two cultures – host and home. And the presence of religious and cultural differences establishes a new layer of complexity. This was the case in Germany 50 years ago as Turks began to arrive *en masse*.

However, from the outset, Germany did not expect the migrant workers to stay long-term and declared with regularity that the Federal Republic of Germany was not a country of immigration. Consequently, and possibly intentionally, Germany did not establish a long-term immigration policy or integration plan.

In this policy vacuum multiculturalism emerged as the mechanism to address the introduction and coexistence of multiple cultures into a single society. Unfortunately, the

desire for positive benefits of migrant labor without the additional burdens of making place for more migrants (Jonker, 2005, p. 113) appears to have led to an “if it is not broken, there is no need to fix it” mentality. Consequently, Germany, now a country comprised of multiple cultures, pushed immigration policy and integration considerations to the background. As such, the formation of identity, for both sides, was complicated by a lack of direction on the part of German politicians and decision-makers.

One of the most difficult aspects of multiculturalism and the incorporation of multiple cultures into a single society is identity establishment. The formation of identity is applicable not only when discussing immigrants but also members of the host country. In order to establish identity a complete understanding of all factors contributing to this development must be explored – social, economic, political, and cultural.

How multiculturalism is defined or viewed is essential in determining how identity formation will take place. For some, multiculturalism is individuals from multiple cultures living side-by-side with little or no interaction. For others, multiculturalism is an opportunity to promote the interaction of multiple cultures in order to share experiences and form a shared identity. If there is confusion defining multiculturalism, it is highly likely there will be confusion defining self.

There are several factors which have likely contributed to an ambiguous perception of multiculturalism in Germany and, thus, the creation of identity formation challenges:

1. An incomplete understanding of multiculturalism and a lack of clarity in adopting and implementing an acculturation strategy.

2. Germany's lack of self-recognition as an "immigration state" and, thus, the absence of long-term immigration and integration policy.
3. Conflicting opinions about how to integrate multiple cultures into German society.

Ambiguity surrounding and insufficient attention paid to the aforementioned three matters led to conflicting perceptions of how to incorporate multiple cultures in Germany. Confusion surrounding how Germany defined itself (as a state) complicated the identity formation process at an individual level – for Germans and Turks alike. By not accepting itself as an "immigration country" and not providing a platform on which to facilitate the development of identity, the state created an environment that promoted separation instead of integration through shared experience and collaboration.

The fantasy of Germany's leaders that it was not a country of immigration did not match the reality of the state with a large immigrant population. As such, the state did not see the need to address the long-term consequences. Consequently, it did not possess the pluralistic mentality to create an identity that appropriately addressed the multicultural society that had developed. To begin with, what is multiculturalism and how has it been perceived in Germany?

Multiculturalism

It is difficult to provide a singular, universal definition of *multiculturalism*. Earlier, multiculturalism was defined from a political perspective and a conflict resolution perspective. From an academic perspective, "Multiculturalism is that state in which one has mastered the knowledge and developed the skills necessary to feel

comfortable and communicate effectively...with people of any culture encountered and...in any situation involving a group of people of diverse cultural backgrounds” (Hoopes, 1979, p. 21).

Klopp points out that there is no simple, widely shared definition of multiculturalism (2002, p. 25). He goes on to describe the uncertainty and ambiguity surrounding multiculturalism in Germany:

...Even the former director and staff of Frankfurt’s Office of Multicultural Affairs have had trouble clearly defining their understanding of the concept...., “I have no theory of multiculturalism....The art of muddling through is called for, not whether or not a theoretical concept is successful....Multicultural society is for me the recognition of differences. It is not even the acceptance of the legitimacy of these differences, I do not know if they are or not, but I accept them.” (as cited in Klopp, 2002, p. 25)

As can be seen, it is difficult to define multiculturalism and depending on the perspective from which multiculturalism is viewed, several definitions could emerge. Nonetheless, the basic concepts consistently present in the aforementioned definitions include: culture, diversity (difference), and response (reaction).

Within this context, how did Germany respond to multiculturalism and the cultural diversity introduced by the reconstruction era foreign worker agreements and the large pool of migrants that were invited to Germany as workers? The short answer appears to indicate short-sightedness.

The reoccurring theme, thus far, is that Germany initially viewed the presence of migrant workers as temporary:

During this period German politicians wanted simply to acquire the benefits of cheap foreign labor without the additional burdens of making place for yet more migrants in society. At the same time, millions of returning Germans had themselves to be integrated. Therefore political decision-makers did their utmost to prevent other migrant groups from establishing permanent roots. (Jonker, 2005,

p. 113)

In this case, the decision-makers' action was harmful not so much because it prevented migrant groups from establishing permanence but because it did not offer a viable alternative. This created an ambiguous situation ripe with uncertainty about the proper way to move forward with immigration. Further, there was no regard for the acculturation already taking place in Germany – with or without the guidance of decision-makers. This avoidance created a void and a separation which complicated the identity formation process.

Because this was intended to be a temporary situation, it is possible that German decision-makers preferred separation as the acculturation strategy; as such, there was no need to try to “integrate” migrant workers into German society. Thus, the opportunity for shared experience or shared identity is drastically minimized.

For several decades there appeared to be an implicit understanding or hidden (sometimes maybe not so hidden) desire for the foreign workers to leave. For example, “In November 1983, the Bundestag passed a law providing financial incentives to encourage foreign workers to leave Germany” (Avcı, 2006, p. 69).

An added layer of complexity to the ambiguity surrounding multiculturalism and the incorporation of immigrants into German society is the German insistence that it is not an immigration country. If it does not believe it is an immigration country, it is less likely to see the need to address immigration related matters.

Immigration Country?

The second factor that complicates identity formation in Germany is the refusal to see itself as an immigration country. Basically, if immigrants are non-existent, there is no need to have a multiculturalism debate. By refusing to define itself as an immigration country, Germany created an environment where multiple cultures coexisted but did not overlap thus leaving an “us” (Germans) versus “them” (immigrants) divide.

Klopp (2002) points out:

Germany, as with the majority of the continental European states, has considered itself not to be a country of immigration since its formation. The territory of the Germany state has never been coterminous with the ‘German nation.’ ...Groups...have long argued that citizenship should be reserved solely for those of German descent (*ius sanguinis*) and that population growth through immigration was not necessary. (pp. 34-35)

Because Germany viewed foreign workers as temporary, a mentality of impermanence emerged; they will be leaving soon, so there is no need to address long-term issues.

However, this mentality did not adequately reflect reality.

A report prepared by the Federal Minister for Labor and Social Order 1977 indicates:

The Federal Republic of Germany is not a country of immigration. West Germany is a country in which foreigners reside for varying lengths of time before they decide on their own accord to return to their home country. Over the long-term this basic orientation serves the economic and social interests of the Federal Republic of Germany as well as those of the home countries. (as cited in Klopp, 2002, p. 7)

This denial mentality complicated the immigration debate and did not accurately reflect the reality of a large Turkish population living in Germany. This denial was not only relevant for how Germany, as a state, defined itself, but also for how those in Germany defined themselves.

At the time of this report in 1977, the Turkish population in Germany was more than one million (See Appendix). Several years earlier, “When Germany was hit by the oil crisis in 1973 and faced a downturn in its economy, it was forced to stop the intake of foreign workers; by that time the number of Turkish migrant workers had reached 910,500” (Şen, 2003, p. 209). Whether or not they wanted to admit it, Germany possessed a large immigration population. And, 1973 was a critical year for that population.

On 23 November 1973, “the federal government imposed the *Anwerbestopp* (‘cessation of application for work,’ or end of labor migration). The official reason given for this action was the difficult domestic and international economic conditions created by the OPEC oil embargo and the resulting need to protect domestic jobs” (Klopp, 2002, p. 39).

The *Anwerbestopp* may have stopped the recruitment of foreign labor, but it did not stop the foreigners already living on German soil from continuing their lives in Germany. Turkish immigrants who came to Germany for work did not want to leave but needed to balance their work lives with their personal lives. This “balance” was realized through family reunification.

“Since 1972, migrant workers from Turkey and their families have constituted the largest group of immigrants in Germany” (Ramm, 2010, p. 184). Even as families began to reunite, there still appeared to be a lack of anticipation and recognition by German decision-makers:

Those who had worked in Germany for more than five years were now allowed to apply for unlimited residency and the right to settle wherever they wished....Remarkably, it was not anticipated that this new opportunity for

unlimited residency would encourage foreign workers to reunite with their families in Germany. (Jonker, 2005, p. 113)

Even though, in theory, the *Anwerbestopp* stopped the flow of migrant workers, it did not meet all of the government's goals.

Klopp describes the unanticipated consequences that resulted from the *Anwerbestopp*:

...It did serve to decrease the number of foreign laborers in Germany for a period of time...[but] the total foreign population did not decrease through voluntary repatriation, as the government had hoped....The total foreign population continued to increase as a result of family-unification policies that allowed children to join parents already in Germany. (2002, p. 39)

This is an example of the short-sightedness and the lack of long-term policy making.

However, by late 1970s there appeared to be some recognition on the part of the decision-makers that something needed to be done.

But, even as decision-makers recognized that something needed to be done, there was still a refusal to admit that Germany was an immigration country. With this recognition came conflicting perspectives on how to reach a solution.

Divergent Perspectives on Immigration and Integration

The third matter that has complicated Germany's perception of multiculturalism and affected its own definition of self has been the decision-makers' differing perspectives on immigration and integration. Obviously, it is natural for political parties to have conflicting policy goals. But things get complicated when there is confusion surrounding the topic about which the debate is being made. In this case, that topic is multiculturalism. The self-defining quest for Germany came down to two dichotomous

perspectives: 1) Are we an immigrant country with multiple cultures, or 2) Are we a homogenous country that should promote a dominant culture?

“In post-unification Germany the words ‘multicultural society’ are polemical and highly charged for some, matter-of-fact for others. Opinions, often vehement, abound on the subject” (Klopp, 2002, p. 25). For example, Ramm describes German immigration and the political debate between *Multi-Kulti* (multiculturalism) and *Leitkultur* (leading culture or guiding cultural values). A move which ignited fierce debate among the German public was the Green Party’s circulation of ‘multicultural realities’ recognition in Germany while the Christian Democrats and the conservative press responded by denouncing ‘*Multi-Kulti*’ (multiculturalism) as extremely dangerous for ‘German culture’ (Ramm, 2010, p. 186).

The conservative elements did not like the idea of ‘*Multi-Kulti*’. “Conservative criticism of multiculturalism was based primarily on two principal ideas: the notion of a German *Leitkultur* and the conception of ‘parallel societies’ (Ramm, 2010, p. 187).

To a certain extent, the debate on multiculturalism appears to be split down the liberal-conservative divide with the more liberal elements of society viewing multiculturalism in positive terms and the conservative elements with more negativity. However, both the left and the right have shown positive and negative reactions, further confusing the multiculturalism debate.

For example, Klopp describes the positive views of the left by pointing out, “Left proponents...regard multiculturalism variously as descriptive of reality (‘it’s just the way things are’), as a progressive non-nationalist...possibility for German society and

identity” (2002, p. 25). But, the more liberal left is not the only proponent of multiculturalism.

Klopp then goes on to explain how the far right views multiculturalism in a positive manner (at least from their perspective):

Even far right proponents (referred to as ethno pluralists) exist. They espouse a multicultural notion of separate and not equal, and therefore champion a discourse of difference with the goal of keeping ‘different cultural groups’ physically apart, either in their ‘own countries’ or in the ghettos if they happen to live in Germany. (2002, p. 25)

In this scenario, the far right and the liberal left might actually agree on how to define multiculturalism but differ on its implementation. The left perceives multiculturalism as a positive alternative to nationalism while the far right views it as positive in that it offers a necessary segregation.

Klopp then points out the negative views of multiculturalism by the conservative elements in Germany:

Detractors often refer to “*multikulti*” as merely superficial pandering to the folklore and traditions of other cultural groups. They deride this “philo-otherism” as a bourgeois liberal fascination with, and attraction to, things non-German...Multiculturalism is depicted as a “lifestyle” or an image, but not a committed political belief or practice, let alone a...policy for political reform. (2002, p. 25)

But the left is not immune from detractors. Even though the left promotes cultural awareness and a recognition that multiculturalism is just how it is, they also criticize it “for what they view as a misguided focus on cultural practices and categories to the exclusion of economic factors in addressing societal problems” (Klopp, 2002, p. 25).

This dichotomy underlines the ambiguity surrounding multiculturalism and accentuates the difficulty Germany has had implementing this acculturation strategy and, thus, forming an identity.

Therefore, when German Chancellor Angela Merkel declares, “the approach [to build] a multicultural [society] and to live side by side and to enjoy each other ... has failed, utterly failed” (Clark, 2010), what exactly does she mean by multicultural society? The confusion surrounding the perception of multiculturalism and the subsequent effect on identity formation in Germany have complicated the immigration situation and created integration challenges.

As can be seen, multiculturalism is not an easily definable or a clearly defined topic. To a certain extent inadequate perception in Germany is understandable. But, it is not that lack of understanding that is troubling as much as the lack of effort put forth in finding a long-term solution. By not focusing on a long-term solution and the ambiguity surrounding multiculturalism, complications developed with identity formation at the state and individual levels. If Germany struggled to define itself, how could citizens of disparate backgrounds and cultures expect to succeed in identity formation at the individual or group levels? Without direction or solution, uncertainty reigns. When uncertainty reigns, a structure is needed to bring order.

In this case, it appears as though Germany initially thought the migrant workers would not stay long-term; it was a temporary solution. By not focusing on or fully understanding the incorporation of immigrants, the German decision-makers’ approach was to avoid the issue. This avoidance led to immigrants being stuck in a state of limbo –

not recognized as part of society, even though they are living and working as neighbors. At the same time, Germany was having a difficult time defining itself. In a society with myriad cultures and people, Turkish migrants were not the only ones struggling with identity formation; the German state was also facing an identity formation challenge.

Germany's adoption of multiculturalism and the lack of immigration and integration policy intensified the search for identity on two levels. First, in light of the massive influx of Turkish migrants, there has been an effort on the part of some Germans to separate themselves from "the other" and display "moral panic". The presence of moral panic created a divisive environment in which identities are based not on shared interest or experience, but on how we define ourselves in relation to "the Other".

Second, Turkish migrants have been forced to balance the culture of their home with the culture of the host country. Because multiculturalism is essentially a form of separation, the opportunity for developing a shared identity was reduced drastically. "Each collective identification is, therefore, an exercise in boundary drawing, separating the insiders from the outsiders, 'us' from 'them' and 'we' from 'others'" (Yilmaz, 2007, p. 293).

For a society to successfully adopt multiculturalism, there must be the will and desire of diverse and multiple cultures to not only live together, but to learn from each other and develop identities based on shared experience. The trickle-down effect of this ambiguity surrounding identity formation at the national (state) level will be explored in the next section.

Chapter 5: Cultural Understanding Perspective

‘man hat Arbeitscarafte gerufen und es kommen Menschen’
(We called for manpower, but people came instead)
Max Frisch, Swiss play writer¹

With immigration, multiple cultures are introduced into a single society and the interactions between groups (host and immigrant) can have a profound effect on relationship building, identity formation, cultural awareness, and peaceful coexistence. There are two ways to approach the situation. First, both immigrant and host can live separate lives, avoid cultural encounters, and build relationships based solely on advancing individual agendas. Or, both groups can accept that fact that they live *together* and attempt to understand one another through cultural exchange and dialogue and build relationships that promote shared experience and identity formation. After the ‘foreign worker’ agreement was signed with Turkey in 1961 and due to its perceived temporary status, it appears as though with respect to the newly arrived Turkish migrant population, Germany favored the former.

Heretofore, the fact that Germany initially viewed migrant workers as temporary has been repeated *ad nauseam*. This section will provide no relief. The consequences of this perception have been examined from an identity formation perspective. Now, they will be examined from a cultural understanding perspective. To be more precise, as will

¹ As cited in Küçükcan, 2002, p. 97

be analyzed in this section, it is my belief that cultural misunderstandings and disengagement have complicated the immigration and integration processes in Germany.

But cultural misunderstanding does not always materialize in a misrepresentation of knowledge. Cultural misunderstanding can take place through avoidance. Mutual avoidance prevents engagement and can be an obstacle that inhibits cultural understanding.

Because the Turkish immigrant population was viewed as “the Other” and there was a belief that the migrant workers were temporary, the desire to gain cultural knowledge for peaceful coexistence was dramatically reduced. A lack of understanding and cultural avoidance created an inadequate cultural knowledge of the Turkish migrant population and the perception of Turkish immigrants as “the Other” was fostered. Inadequate knowledge led to erroneous assumptions and the consequences of Otherness had a significant impact on the identity formation process. Inadequate cultural understanding will be explored on two levels:

1. The perception of “Otherness” and the consequences for identity formation.
2. Cultural misunderstandings and avoidance on the part of groups in Germany – German Christian Churches and Turkish Migrant Organizations (TMOs).

It appears that a lack of cultural understanding (especially in the period immediately following the arrival of the first Turkish migrant workers in 1961) and cultural avoidance in Germany have made integration into German society more difficult for Turkish immigrants. This will be explored through an examination of the two aforementioned topics.

Identity Formation and “Otherness”

Based on field research and interviews in Berlin, Jens Schneider articulated a sentiment that helped establish an understanding of how the Turkish migrant population was viewed in Germany. “The role as *central* Other that primarily the Jews had played for various fields of dominant German self-definitions prior to 1945 has shifted to the so-called *Ausländer* [foreigner or foreign resident]” (2002, p. 15). Schneider goes on to describe the discourse of the interviewees:

The German image of the Turks in Germany is anything but positive. Two elements play a major role in the construction of cultural distance to the Turks...: the Islamic belief and the supposed peasant or low class origin of the first immigrant generation. (Schneider, 2002, pp. 15-16)

Without proper cultural understanding and engagement, it is likely the aforementioned sentiments invoked inaccurate and possibly negative perceptions of the newly arrived Turkish migrant population.

Brewer and Miller (1996) provide a quote from Gordon Allport’s 1954 book that portrays how a lack of familiarity with others can breed hostility and contempt:

See that man over there?
Yes.
Well, I hate him.
But you don’t even know him.
That’s why I hate him. (as cited in Brewer & Miller, 1996, p. 107)

This example of “autistic hostility”, while extreme, showcases the negative consequences of cultural disengagement.

In Germany, the language used to describe Turkish migrants has tended to be in terms of “the Other.” White provides examples of the vocabulary of categorization used by Germans when referring to the Turkish population (1997). Over the years, the terms

have included: *Fremdarbeiter* (foreign workers), *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers), *Ausländer* (foreigners), *ausländische Arbeitnehmer* (foreign employees), *Migranten* (migrants), and *ausländische Mitbürger* (foreign co-citizens) (1997, p. 761).

The Turkish population has never been referred to as “*Immigranten*, as that would imply the right to remain. Turks, as the Other, have always been considered *ausländer*, and some argue that Germans consider Turks among the most inferior groups of foreigners...due in no small part to religious differences” (White, 1997, p. 761). As can be seen from the language used to describe the Turkish population, there was an implied transient status that lacked any real sense of belonging. This exclusion mentality had the potential to create Otherness and impact identity formation.

“*Ausländer* is the most general category of Otherness.... *Ausländer* must be *distinguishable*, preferably on ‘first sight’ (using ‘external’ attributes, like skin and hair color, religious symbols, names), and the function of the category is to draw a line between ‘Germans’ and ‘non-Germans’” (Schneider, 2002, pp. 15-16). For the Turkish migrant population in Germany, religious differences portend an awkward dichotomy due to the negative association with “Otherness” and a threat to German culture and the positive association with and primacy of Islam in Turkish identity formation.

For most Turkish migrants in Germany, Islam was a part of their identity. “The majority of Muslims in Germany are Sunnis of Turkish origin” (Schiffauer, 2006, p. 96). For many Germans religious difference was a reason for disengagement because it was too culturally different. For some, this “definition through difference” created a schism between the “Muslim Other” and German society. Schiffauer provides a few examples of Otherness in Germany as it relates to the “Muslim Others.”

“It is the naturalization of the Muslim Others which confronts German society with the problem of the true stranger, with ‘the man who comes today and stays tomorrow’The majority of Muslims in Germany are Sunnis of Turkish origin” (as cited in Schiffauer, 2006, p. 96). Referring to the confrontation between the Muslim Other and German society, Zygmunt Bauman (1991) describes the ambivalence:

They are neither friend – as practicing Muslims they represent a culture which has been and still is considered to be the quintessential Other to the ‘Christian Occident’ – nor enemy – because they live and work in Germany and intend to stay....They represent disorder.... ‘The main symptom of disorder is the acute discomfort we feel when we are unable to read the situation properly and to choose between alternative actions.’ (as cited in Schiffauer, 2006, p. 96)

Lack of understanding can lead to an “acute discomfort.” One way to bridge this cultural and religious knowledge gap between the “Muslim Other” and German society is through engagement.

Identity formation was complicated by cultural misunderstandings and disengagement that led to Turkish Migrants being viewed as the Other. In situations where identity formation is challenging on an individual level, some will turn to another mechanism that can facilitate identity formation – Group Identity. Group interaction is one way to engage in conflict resolution and build mutual understanding.

Groups

In multicultural societies, groups or organizations provide an opportunity to promote coexistence and facilitate mutual understanding and respect. They are important vehicles for relationship building. In countries with large immigrant populations they also serve as a support system for immigrants.

Groups or associations can bring together individuals of shared background and experience. But confusion surrounding the goals of immigrant associations can result in conflict. What is the goal of an immigrant group or association? Is it to serve merely as a support system for immigrants? Or, is it an opportunity to promote cultural understanding and serve as a bridge between immigrants and the broader society in order to promote integration? If there is no clearly defined interactional objective, it is likely that immigrant groups will drift into separate societies and remove themselves from interactions with society at large.

This disengagement can lead to the development of parallel societies; disengagement will likely result in cultural misunderstanding. With the presence of multiple cultures in Germany, groups should serve at least as the catalyst for mutual cultural understanding. In the case of Germany and the arrival of the Muslim Turkish population, one group made an effort to understand the culture of the new arrivals – German Christian Churches.

German Christian Churches

Even though by the 1970s Germany was a largely secularized society and discussions on religious matters were considered “out of place” the German churches, whose constitutionally granted semi-official responsibilities were viewed as a bridge between state and society “responded to the influx of Turkish workers and their ‘unknown religion’ by establishing a number of ‘inter-faith’ dialogue forums” (Jonker, 2005, p. 115).

In this religious capacity, the Churches “were amongst the first to perceive Turks as ‘Muslims’” and promoted equality by addressing them as “fellow religious beings” (Jonker, 2005, p. 15). However, the absence of adequate cultural understanding brought about an unfortunate situation; the Christian Churches forged relationships with a minority group within the larger Turkish population that did not represent the Turkish Muslim population as a whole.

“In their endeavor to establish inter-faith dialogue with Muslims, the Churches did not forge partnerships with laicist Muslims. Rather they established links with lay Sufi movements that did not represent the majority of the Turkish population” (Jonker, 2005, p. 115). By forging these “relationships” with the minority without fully understanding the views of the majority (and the role of religion in Turkey), a platform was developed upon which opinions could be formed and, as we will see later, universally applied to all Turkish Muslim immigrants.

By focusing on a single, narrowly-tailored group in an attempt to gain mutual understanding, dialogue can be counterproductive. Another oversight in the pursuit of mutual understanding was the Christian Churches’ inability (or possibly unwillingness) to open a dialogue with those parties that did not mirror their religious structure.

The constitution in Germany “recognizes ‘religion’ only in terms of ‘churches’ which has in turn defined as transparent membership organizations with certain bureaucratic features. With this understanding of religion in mind, not surprisingly the Churches identified as partners those Muslim organizations which mirrored their own structures” (Jonker, 2005, pp. 115-116). By forging partnerships with this minority group the Christian Churches overlooked and underestimated the respect for laicist ideology

(which, simply put, is the subordination of religion to the state; a separation of church and state) to which the majority of first generation Turkish migrants adhered and brought with them to Germany.

The irony of the situation is that Christian Churches formed relationships with the religious structures that most mirror their own and ignored the laicist ideology and respect for secularism and a respect for separation of church and state held by the majority of Turkish migrants. In a secularized German society, it is possible that the majority of Turkish Muslims' views on religion and the state were more in line with the majority of German society. The Sufi movements with which the Churches established links were those "which in Turkey had protested against Kemalist policies of forced modernization and developed an intensive form of piety which became fused with missionary zeal" (Jonker, 2005, p. 115).

The Churches' effort to engage in interfaith dialogue with Turkish Muslims was commendable. But the damage caused by an inadequate cultural and religious understanding became apparent as Churches and the minority lay Sufi movements began to utilize these "groups" as "instruments with which members would communicate both to their own communities and to wider society" (Jonker, 2005, p. 116). As a result, the minority lay Sufi communities began representing the Turkish Muslim population as a whole. "It was in this context that the lay Sufi communities...moved centre stage while the majority of Muslims were left without representation" (Jonker, 2005, p. 116).

This misrepresentation was critical because "the Churches did not understand the emphasis on individual responsibility as opposed to the hierarchical authority in forms of Sunni Islam" (Jonker, 2005, p. 116). By forming relationships with the more

conservative Turkish Muslims instead of the laicist Turkish Muslims, German Christian Churches missed an ideal opportunity to develop a deep cultural understanding.

Essentialism

By viewing all Turkish Muslim immigrants within the context of the minority lay Sufi communities, opinions were formed about the group as a whole. With blanket assumptions, the German Christian Churches were showcasing essentialism.

“Essentialism is a result of the hyper-visible Othering. Essentialism suggests that all who look or act similarly have similar experiences. Instead of recognizing individual attitudes and actions within groups, all are perceived similarly, or Othered” (Critchfield, 2010, p. 2). This mentality would prove to have negative consequences for Turkish Muslims in Germany in the aftermath of the attacks on 11 September, 2001. Perhaps stereotyping all Muslims through the religious minority of lay Sufis prepared the ground for stereotyping secular Turkish migrants as religious fundamentalist thereby viewing them as religious terrorists.

Post-9/11 Treatment of Muslims in Germany

For some, the attacks of September 11, 2001, increased sensitivities to all things Islam. One response was to link Islamic fundamentalism with terrorism. Immediately following the attacks, Germany made the terrible realization that it had been harboring terrorists (Jonker, 2005, p. 118). Jonker goes on to describe the situation in Germany:

It was estimated that approximately one hundred ‘sleepers’ lived on German soil. These new semantics expressed a new awareness. Borrowed from Bacteriology, the idea of ‘sleepers’ invoked the image of an infectious disease that had to be

isolated and removed for the sake of public health. (as cited in Jonker, 2006, p. 119)

This isolation and removal was directed at terrorists, but unfortunately the broader Muslim population was caught in the crossfire.

It is no secret that the 9/11 attacks brought about a heightened sensitivity to all things Islam. In Germany, a growing obsession with Islam shifted the focus from *Ausländer* towards the Muslim (Ramm, 2010, p. 188). “The identification of immigrants as foreigners has been gradually replaced by their demarcation as the religious ‘Other’...The image of Turkish immigrants is increasingly ‘Islamized’, thereby taking up and reshaping older discourses which focused on their ethnic and cultural ‘otherness’” (Ramm, 2010, p. 188).

In Germany, little distinction was made between Islam and Islamism and Muslims quickly represented a hidden danger (Jonker, 2006, p. 119). It can be argued that this blanket allegation of a “hidden danger” could have at least been partially disproven if the German Christian Churches, through their interfaith dialogue efforts, had developed a more comprehensive understanding of the Turkish Muslim population to include secular Turkish migrants which were the most representative of Turkish immigrants in Germany.

“Turkish secular organizations, which had been suspicious of their pious compatriots for some time, declared that the latter were nurturing ‘extremist thinking’, thereby enflaming the debate” (Jonker, 2006, p. 119). The interfaith dialogue efforts had not focused on intra-group distinctions; as such, “it was not long before the credibility of all Muslim organizations in Germany was in doubt” (Jonker, 2006, p. 119). A lack of empirical research about Muslim organizational structures and a virtually non-existent

state support structure led to a situation ripe with suspicion and Otherness. But, one state organization that understood the different groups could have deflated the tension.

Jonker (2006) argues the inaction by *Verfassungsschutz* (the constitution), a German state organization, complicated the situation:

As one of the few institutions that had observed the different groups and knew about their different orientations, the state organization safeguarding the constitution (*Verfassungsschutz*) could have set matters straight. However, for its own reasons, it chose not to. The secular character of the German government, its general lack of knowledge on religious matters and suspicion of using religious language, may have played a role in the decision. (p. 119)

This inaction showcases a combination of lacking cultural and religious knowledge and cultural avoidance.

Turkish Migrant Organizations

By forging relationships with a minority sect instead of the majority of the Turkish immigrant population, the previous scenario showcased an example of an inadequate cultural understanding on the part of the Christian churches. They formed erroneous beliefs about the group as a whole based on interactions with and an understanding of a small segment of the Turkish migrant population in Germany.

This section does not examine cultural misunderstanding per se, but rather the consequences of cultural disengagement and avoidance. However dissimilar they might appear at first glance, both are means to the same end – separation.

Zeynep Sezgin argues that “TMUOs’ [Turkish Migrant Umbrella Organizations] efforts to support the integration of TMs [Turkish Migrants] into the German society have generally been ignored” (2008, p. 78). Sezgin goes on to argue that “these

organizations are excluded in many cases from negotiations with the government and thus have limited impact on the growth of Turkish minority rights in Germany” (2008, pp. 78-79).

This section will not focus on the intricacies of the myriad Turkish migrant organizations. Instead, because of its religious charter and focus on homeland (Turkish) politics, one TMO in Germany, the Turkish-Islamic Union for Religious Affairs (DITIB), will be examined. The distraction of homeland politics shifted focus from integration thus creating challenges for Turkish migrant organizations in fulfilling their role as cultural facilitator and relationship builder. Unlike minority associations, immigrant associations must facilitate incorporation.

Yurdakul and Bodemann describe the distinction between the goals of minority associations and immigrant associations:

Minority associations make demands for distinctive social, political and cultural rights that recognize their differences....Through such ‘recognition of difference,’ they are able to maintain a certain level of institutional completeness....Immigrant associations, however, are assumed to be social services to facilitate the incorporation of immigrants into the broader society....In contrast to the situation of minorities, immigrant associations must facilitate incorporation rather than maintaining institutional separateness. (2006, pp. 46-47)

This distinction points out what should be a primary objective (if not *the* primary objective) of immigrant associations: facilitation of integration. However, when immigrant associations are distracted with unrelated activities, integration is likely to become a secondary obligation. For Turkish migrant organizations, this distraction has materialized through in-group focus on Turkish politics and the interference of Turkish organizations in Turkish migrant affairs in Germany.

Nedim Ögelman argues that Germany's Turkish organizations have focused on homeland differences instead of common interests (2003, p. 163). Ögelman goes on to say, "When a sending country generates contentious political migrants in an ethnically dissimilar, homogeneous democracy and the host fails to incorporate the foreigners, infighting on the homeland is likely to preoccupy the immigrant community" (2003, p. 163). This infighting distracts immigrant associations from integration and the promotion of peaceful coexistence. With one foot in Turkey and another in Germany, DITIB is an organization that more or less has promoted and protected Turkish Islam outside of Turkey.

The International Crisis Group provides a description of the role of DITIB in Germany:

The Turkish government offers its own version of Islam for its émigrés: a religious practice within the secular Turkish framework, complete with clergy who stick to sermons centrally approved and posted on an Ankara website each Friday...DITIB-affiliated prayer spaces are asked to promise to 'uphold valid Turkish laws and regulations' on the premises. (2007, p. 7)

The DITIB has served as the vehicle for transporting Turkish Islam from Turkey to Germany. To a certain extent, Germany may have appreciated the assistance from Turkey in conducting religious affairs for the Turkish Muslim population in Germany. For example, in a 2006 Crisis Group interview, DITIB general secretary, Mehmet Yildirim pointed out that imams are sent "to spread healthy religious information and encourage peaceful coexistence. This is a benefit to the country, since we cannot wait for Germany to get around to training imams" (as quoted in International Crisis Group, 2007, p. 7).

But, with the interference of a homeland organization, the likelihood of the continuation of homeland identity instead of one built on shared experience increases dramatically. If DITIB addresses Turkish Muslims and Islam related functions as if they are in Turkey, the opportunity to integrate into German society diminishes along with the exposure to a new culture.

DITIB's 1971 mission statement outlines the primacy of maintaining love for the fatherland. The mission statement "compels it to 'instill love of fatherland, flag and religion' abroad and to 'prevent opposition forces from exploiting the religious needs of Turkish migrants and mobilizing them against the interests of the Turkish republic'" (International Crisis Group, 2007, p. 7). This message explicitly points out a need to control Turkish migrants and prevent them from "mobilizing against the interests" of Turkey. From a German integration perspective, the underlying message of the mission statement could pose numerous challenges. Under DITIB control, perhaps Turkish migrants are more likely to be restricted in their ability to engage with and understand German culture.

DITIB leaders adopted a policy of "preference for Turkish religion lessons conducted in Turkish over lessons conducted in any other language" (International Crisis Group, 2007, p. 7). With orders coming from Ankara and the direction of Muslim affairs in Germany being directed by a Turkish organization, the potential for separation and the creation of separate agendas are likely to increase.

Ögelman describes the development in Germany's Turkish organizational landscape:

DITIB along with other Turkish organizations in Germany “remain fragmented primarily due to the persistent role of homeland political identities. Internal divisions over goals, strategies and tactics weaken the Turkish community’s potential to launch a successful incorporation movement. (2003, p. 167)

Another integration challenge comes from Turks who are escaping political persecution and coming to Germany with one goal in mind – to rally support for their cause.

Ögelman describes this transnational political activism phenomenon:

A transnational contextual framework affording some politically active Turks better opportunities to rally support for Turkish causes in Germany than in Turkey plays a significant role in the dominance of homeland interests and contributes to divisions in Germany’s Turkish community. (2003, p. 164)

In this scenario, Germany is viewed not so much as an opportunity for economic advancement or a place to start a new life; it is viewed as a platform far away from the Turkish state on which to air political or social grievances.

Granted, the right to voice one’s opinion should be respected. But, the more time spent airing political grievances against the homeland, the less time spent exploring cultural understanding and integration opportunities within the host society.

For a multicultural society to succeed, cultural understanding and cultural engagement must be primary concerns. In Germany, inadequate cultural knowledge and in some cases cultural avoidance by the host and immigrants alike created an environment that promoted separation and, in some cases, misunderstanding.

German Christian churches and Turkish migrant organizations (TMOs) were utilized to promote Turkish migrant integration in Germany. However, both groups tended to focus on narrowly-focused aspects and less on the bigger picture of integration and peaceful coexistence in Germany.

In many cases, groups are formed in response to the need for identification. Within a group we are able to feel connected with those who share similar interests and goals. Within a group our vulnerability to attack from the “others” is significantly reduced, if not completely eradicated. The mentality is the further we can disengage from the other the better off we will be. This disengagement promotes *negative identification*. Negative identification “takes place between different groups, emphasizing distinctions and creating handles by which enemies can be grasped” (Barash, 1991, p. 89).

For Turkish migrants in Germany, it may be nice to be part of a group that possesses shared experiences with which you can identify and relate. But while these Turkish migrant organizations may be able to serve as a support mechanism and in many cases help form identity, they are not always the best equipped to facilitate identity formation in and integration into a multicultural society.

For migrants, the problem with forming groups is that while they may provide intra-group support, they do not always provide the level of support necessary for representation in society. The challenge with immigrant rights is the narrow concern with “the organization and articulation of incorporation policy and membership rights, not their implementation and practice” (as cited in Sezgin, 2008, p. 80).

In Germany, for example, if groups (both the migrants and the host) form individual, separate identities that are not based on shared experience, separation is likely to occur. This separation inhibits the formation of shared identity. As the coexistence of multiple cultures expands with each new day, shared experience is not only inevitable but should be pursued with a collaborative and integrative spirit.

Chapter 6: Nationalist Perspective

Over the course of the twentieth century the composition of population of industrialized states has undergone a radical transformation. States that were once largely ethnically homogenous are now home to a wide range of ethnic groups. However, in many cases the understanding of the nation has not kept pace with demographic changes. This has created a serious mismatch between ethnic, cultural, linguistic, etc., diversity, and a reductionistic and narrow conception of the nation.
Bal and Herscovitch, 2010, p. 1

Nationalism can serve as a powerful force in forming identity and dictating how individuals or groups relate to one another. Nationalism can present itself in myriad shapes and sizes. In countries with large immigrant populations the host can utilize nationalism as a tool to separate “us” (the host country) from “them” (the immigrants) and thus create a stronger national and more homogenous identity. For immigrants, nationalism can materialize as a transnational phenomenon in which immigrants disengage from the host society and maintain stronger ties with and nationalistic sentiments for the homeland. This “double-edged” nationalism can serve as a vehicle for societal separation. Consequently, if separation occurs, integration challenges are likely to expand exponentially.

Double-edged nationalism can be defined as the presence of conflicting and separate nationalistic sentiments where co-existing groups in a single country turn to their respective homelands for a sense of pride, a feeling of inclusion, and the formation of identity. The stronger the nationalistic sentiments on both sides, the more difficult it becomes to develop multi-dimensional or pluralistic identities. Nationalistic

entrenchment diminishes the capacity for shared experience and complicates immigrant integration.

A consequence of inadequately addressing integration challenges is the formation of parallel societies. As separation from society occurs, these parallel societies have the capacity for home culture retention, diminished interaction with the host society, and can be a breeding ground for nationalism. If Germany does not facilitate the inclusion of Turkish immigrants into German society, it is highly likely the bond between immigrant and home country will grow in lieu of host country integration. How else would they identify?

A result of this separation is that identity is formed not on shared or overlapping experience, but through a growing bond with and loyalty to the home country. This home country loyalty stems, in part, from the inability to share experiences with the members of the host country and thus creates a stage for separation instead of a platform on which to develop shared identity. This identity vacuum with its lack of shared experience is likely to be filled not only with the formation of separate identities, but identities that define themselves as they relate to the “other”. Therefore, it can be argued that a traditional nationalistic mentality at the community level conflicts with the aforementioned concept of multi-dimensional identities.

Based on traditional views, the concepts of nationalism and multiculturalism are diametrically opposed. Traditional nationalism is a homogenous belief whereas multiculturalism is predicated on pluralism. “There are also criticisms [of multiculturalism] from traditionalist, nationalist, and conservative figures who believe that certain cultures should not be allowed because they are against the standards of

morality, tradition, and truth” (Zeytinoglu, 2010, p. 6). However, the existence of nationalism and multiculturalism in a single society does not need to be a zero-sum game. But without the appropriate integration mechanisms, immigrants may never feel a sense of loyalty to or national pride in the host nation.

In a nation where certain groups are marginalized and recognition in the host society is non-existent, immigrant loyalty to the host nation might not be automatic. The traditional nationalistic model may not be the best fit in multicultural societies, where individuals of disparate cultures and faiths coexist. Consequently, if immigrants do not view integration into the host country as an important objective, it is possible that they will turn to their homeland as the primary means of connection. As a result, nationalistic sentiments could be ignited for host and immigrant alike.

In the case of Germany and its Turkish immigrant population, double-edged nationalism has materialized in different ways for both host and immigrant:

1. For the host German society, nationalism appears to have come in the form of *Leitkultur* (guiding values or leading culture) and the creation of a strong German identity, one that separates itself from the immigrants.
2. For Turkish immigrants, nationalism appears to be a response to marginalization in the host society that has materialized itself as an attachment to the home country and a disengagement from the host society.

In Germany, the failure to implement a long-lasting and all-inclusive immigration and integration policy has likely contributed to the creation of this double-edged nationalism.

Double-edged nationalism is likely to increase when disparate groups in a single society disengage from one another. In many cases, disengaging or minimizing

affiliation can be harmful as direct conflict. Consequently, the importance of engagement and relationship building should not be underestimated.

German and Turkish nationalism are reciprocal and feed off of one another. They each, in part, have risen because of the existence of the other. For some Germans, the desire for a more defined “German-ness” was likely in response to the influx of migrants that were trying to become part of German society; for Turks, it was a consequence of the lack of inclusion in and separation from the larger German society. This type of cultural disengagement results in the formation of separate identities and in some cases can lead to separate national identities with immigrants and host looking to their respective homelands as the primary means of connection.

German Nationalism

The German struggle with incorporation of immigrants began very early in the “foreign worker” agreement era. This struggle was complicated by the timing of the agreement which coincided with the return of German soldiers from war and their need to be re-integrated into German society. Immediately, there was labor market competition between returning German soldiers and the newly arrived migrant workers from Turkey.

As economic conditions worsened and unemployment increased not only among Germans but also foreigners, “German workers first!” became the catchphrase and foreigners were increasingly labeled “parasites” (Jonker, 2005, p. 114). Part of this frustration likely stemmed from the manner in which Germans identify not only themselves, but also the German nation.

For many Germans, the notion of nation and German identity follow the European notion of nation. It is predicated on individuals who learned their respective language or adopted their values and you were German because your parents were, as were their parents. It meant a shared history of suffering and triumph. It was not something that could be acquired (Friedman, 2010, p. 3). As such, those who did not share the language, history, and familial and generational connection were not viewed as “German” and increasingly viewed as “the Other”. In this view, the migrants were not part of German society. Consequently, migrants were not viewed as citizens and thus not treated as equal.

As time passed and the immigrant population grew, a political debate between *Multi-Kulti* (multiculturalism) and *Leitkultur* (leading culture or guiding cultural values) began in Germany. It is impossible for Germany to reconsider its position on multiculturalism without at the same time validating the principle of the German nation....An attack on multiculturalism is simultaneously an affirmation of German national identity (Friedman, 2010, p. 4)

By attacking multiculturalism and affirming a German national identity, integral nationalism is being expressed. Integral nationalism is “encountered in state-centered approaches to governance, where the state, utilizing unreservedly all its instruments of power, pursues the unconditional assimilation and homogenization of society into an ethnocentric nation-state, regarded as absolute and sacred” (Anastasiou, 2008, p. 22).

In a 2004 interview, Chancellor Merkel indicated, “The notion of multiculturalism has fallen apart. Anyone coming [to Germany] must respect our constitution and tolerate our Western and Christian roots” (as quoted in Stratfor, 2004, p. 2). In December 2004 at

a Christian Democratic Union (CDU) party conference, Merkel criticized German multiculturalism policy. She described it as a “resounding failure” and championed patriotic and conservative values (Stratfor, 2004, p. 1). Stratfor describes the CDU’s formation after World War II:

The CDU, formed after World War II, espouses a conservative, center-right platform. It draws support from all economic classes and trumpets a return to patriotism and “traditional” German values...Its platform also calls for controls to limit immigration and promotes the idea of a “*leitkultur*,” or German “guiding culture. (2004, p. 1)

Leitkultur simply put is a set of German values that must be adopted for one to become German.

Anastasiou (2008) describes the consequences of the absoluteness of cultural values:

The nationalist drive to cultivate diachronic, irreplaceable, cultural values has also produced nonnegotiable rivalries against the absoluteness of similar values of other adjacent nationalisms. The rediscovery of ethnohistory by one group induces the rediscovery of another, often competing ethnohistory by a neighboring group. (p. 41)

While the conservative elements in the German political arena were championing *Leitkultur* and traditional German values, some Turkish immigrants were discovering their own sense of national pride; but it was not necessarily a pride in Germany.

Turkish Nationalism

Migration can serve as an opportunity to escape persecution. Therefore, groups that may have been marginalized or maltreated in their home societies have an opportunity to start afresh in a new society. But, future generations with little or no exposure to the home country tend to be ignorant of home country realities. They have

not been exposed to the negative elements or hardships of the home country and, thus, a Shangri-La like fantasy emerges. Consequently, if immigrant marginalization and separation occurs in the host society, an immigrant's blissful and heroic image of the home country serves as a vehicle for hope; they look to the home country as a savior. This nationalistic vision of the home country is transported across borders. For some Turks in Germany, the lack of inclusion in the larger German society led to the rise of nationalistic sentiments for the homeland.

As previously mentioned, because Germany did not want the migrants to become part of Germany but wanted migrant loyalty, they came to the solution of multiculturalism. By not integrating migrants into German society, Turkish immigrants were able to maintain their culture, language and connections to their country of origin, seemingly at the expense of integrating into the host society. Faist (2004) argues:

In Germany 'multicultural' policies have contributed to the transboundary expansion of immigrant politics and culture. If immigration states are liberal democracies and do not seek to assimilate immigrants by force, the respective immigrant minorities have greater chances of maintaining their cultural difference and ties to their country of origin. (p. 12)

The question of whether Germany was a "liberal democracy" when dealing with immigrants or whether it viewed the migrant worker situation as a temporary exigency and, thus, did not create long-term policy is not being argued here. But, the consequences of both arguments are the same – more room for immigrants maintaining ties with the country of origin, arguably at the sacrifice of integrating into the host society. These connections are transported across borders through what is known as transnational social formations.

Transnational social formations, fields, and spaces are “continuous transborder linkages between migrants, groups, communities and non-state organizations... [that are] relatively stable, lasting and dense sets of ties reaching beyond and across the borders of sovereign states” (Faist, 2004, pp. 1-3). These linkages serve as transborder connections for organizations, political parties, and ideas and a bridge between the home country and host country populations. These transnational ties become institutionalized by implying “that there is a permanent locus of regularized and established principles or a code of conduct that governs a crucial area of social (political, economic, cultural) life” (Faist, 2004, p. 1). Regarding Turkish immigrants in Germany, one group that utilized these transnational ties were the Turkish nationalists.

One might expect that after more than 40 years of living in Germany Turkish immigrants’ nationalist feelings towards their homeland would lessen with time; but the extensity and the intensity of the relationship between the Nationalist Action Party (MHP) in Turkey and Turkish immigrants in Germany has not abated throughout the generations (Arslan, 2004, p. 111). Arslan (2004) describes the nationalist movement:

For an ultra-nationalist ideology and movement, the situation of *ülküçülük*² in Germany seems quite paradoxical. As in all other forms of ultra-nationalism (or: all other ultra-nationalist organizations), *ülküçüs* exalt their own state and nation. In accordance with this ideology, their politics mainly depends on a reverence for the Turkish nation. Although most *ülküçüs* have resolved to live in Germany, the German nation-state or territory is not the main objective or space for their politics. They live in a territory that can be ignored, or at least bears secondary importance from their political point of view. (p. 111)

To a certain extent, ultra-nationalists can be expected to showcase unflinching loyalty to their home nation in any situation. However, in an environment where immigrants feel

² While *ülküçü* literally means ‘idealist’, *ülküçülük* implies idealism. Both of these terms are adopted by Turkish Ultra-nationalists (Arslan, 2004, p. 111)

marginalized and unappreciated, nationalistic sentiments can take on a new meaning. In this situation, nationalism can be seen as an opportunity to mentally and emotionally escape marginalization and in some cases, mistreatment.

For Turks in Germany who feel they are lacking legal and economic rights in Germany, "...ideologies that rely on the concept of ethnicity become more attractive than others for immigrants in the host country" (Arslan, 2004, p. 128). Consequently, ideologies such as nationalism can have a powerful effect. Arslan (2004) points out, "Ultra-nationalism offers a simple answer for young people who feel discriminated or repressed in everyday life because of their ethnicity" (p. 129).

Arslan describes the shock and trauma of one *ülküciü* youth in response to the Solingen fire attacks (attacks carried out by members of the German extreme right against Turks in Solingen and Mölln in the early 1990s) and how influential they were in shaping identity:

I began to hate Germans. After this event, I really hated Germans. I did all kinds of things to show that I am different from them. I hung out a Turkish flag, I spoke only Turkish. I am a Turk, and I speak Turkish. (as quoted in Arslan, 2004, p. 129)

For many young Turkish people their views on *ülküçülük* changed after the attacks with many turning to the Turkish extreme right as a natural and proper response to the German extreme right (Arslan, 2004, p. 129).

In an environment where mutual understanding and trust between immigrant and host are already compromised, when disaster strikes, the margin for error is small. Consequently, in an overly sensitive situation the likelihood of both sides turning to extremist (i.e. nationalist) elements and disengage from one another increase

considerably. Unfortunately, this nationalist sentiment tends to have a more pronounced effect on the younger generations.

“Young people support ultra-nationalist ideologies to a greater degree than older people. This also seems to hold true for *ülküçüs* in Germany. Both the MHP and *Türk Federasyon* attach special importance to attracting and organizing Turkish youths in Germany” (Arslan, 2004, p. 130). This attempt to attract youth to ultra-nationalist ideologies can bring negative consequences for integration. “One of the most salient features of *ülküçü* youth is their refusal to mix with German youth to a greater extent than any other youth section of Turkish organizations in Germany” (Arslan, 2004, p. 130).

In a 1997 survey conducted by Wilhelm Heitmeyer et al., it was found that 39.2 percent of Grey Wolves (an ultra-nationalist Turkish organization) spend their free time with just Turkish people, 24.1 percent of Islamists spend their free time with just Turks (as cited in Arslan, 2004, pp. 130-131). A strong ultra-nationalist ideology with Turkish youth in Germany does not bode well for the future of Turkish integration in Germany.

“...Mythical elements [such as the Grey Wolf, Ötuken, and Ergenekon] from Turkish history give the *ülküçü* youth a basis for their ultra-nationalist identity that emphasizes their distinction from German people” (Arslan, 2004, p. 131). Another reason the MHP focuses on the Turkish youth of Germany has less to do with ideology and more to do with politics.

Arslan points out that many *ülküçü* organizations consider themselves as a natural lobby for Turkey (2004, p. 131). Arslan Tekin, an *ülküçü* journalist, reinforces this point by saying:

The MHP has an extremely dynamic and conscious power that follows the permanence of the state. The biggest lobby in Europe is *ülküciis*. They are very well organized and they (have) succeeded in gathering thousands or ten thousands of members. The *Türk Federasyon* does what the Turkish state cannot do. Turkish associations function as a natural lobby. (as quoted in Arslan, 2004, p. 131)

A prominent member of the *Türk Federasyon* describes the behavior of the Turkish state as it related to Turks in Germany as “remote control mentality” (Arslan, 2004, p. 132).

However, mobilizing Turks in Germany as a lobby group is not limited to Turkey’s nationalist party (MHP). It has become a tool used by multiple political parties, including the current Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and his AK Party.

Spiegel Online reporters describe Turkish immigrants’ response to a 27 February 2011 visit to Dusseldorf by Prime Minister Erdoğan as a “rock star welcome...in a show of national pride that remains fervent, even after decades spent in Germany” (Gezer & Reimann, 2011, p. 1). Referencing Turkey, Erdoğan claimed, “this land belongs to us all” and a shout of “Turkey is great!” came from the crowd (Gezer & Reimann, 2011, p. 1). And then he repeated a statement that caused a stir three years prior in Germany, “Yes, integrate yourselves into German society but don’t assimilate yourselves. No one has the right to deprive us of our culture and our identity” (Gezer & Reimann, 2011, p. 2). “Erdoğan steadfastly appealed to the Turkish national pride of people who have been at home in Germany for four generations” (Gezer & Reimann, 2011, p. 2).

During Erdoğan’s 27 February 2011 visit to Germany, it can be argued that he ignited Turkish nationalistic flames. In this situation Erdoğan was able to play the hero for Turkish immigrants in Germany (some of whom have probably never been to Turkey). At the end of the day, he will return to Turkey and Turkish immigrants in

Germany will not be his primary concern. In this show, he can play the savior; in reality it is not his problem to solve. Leaders must be careful not to fan nationalistic flames, especially in another country. But, unfortunately, some welcome the opportunity and view it as a platform to rally political support.

“One of the most important political aspects of the *ülküciis* in terms of manpower for the MHP is their right to vote in Turkey. Like other political parties, the party tries to mobilize its rank and file in times of elections in Turkey, as most of the *ülküciis* are citizens of Turkey in Germany” (Arslan, 2004, p. 133). Prime Minister Erdoğan is not a member of Turkey’s nationalist party, MHP. However, Turks in Germany including *ülküciis* are viewed as a large voting population no matter what the party affiliation. Political interference and fanning of nationalistic flames has not gone over well with some in Germany.

“Erdoğan preaches Turkish nationalism on German soil...that is anti-European,” declared Erwin Huber, the head of Bavaria’s conservative Christian Social Union (Crossland, 2008, p. 1). Following up on Huber’s comment, Wolfgang Bosbach, deputy parliamentary group chairman of Chancellor Merkel’s conservatives, called on Erdoğan not to interfere in German affairs. “A Turkish government shouldn’t try to conduct domestic policy in Germany” (Crossland, 2008, p. 1). Erdoğan and other Turkish political parties might view Turks in Germany as a “natural” Turkish lobby. But, preaching Turkish nationalism in Germany is likely to compound the already numerous integration challenges for Turks in Germany.

By ignoring the immigration and integration issue for so long, Germany may have contributed to the return of a sensitive subject that it has desperately been attempting to put in its past – nationalism. Only this time, the sentiment cuts both ways with the rise of two separate nationalist ideologies – host and immigrant. I believe the rise of double-edged nationalism has been a by-product of failed integration policy.

By not laying the groundwork for the integration of immigrants, policy makers have inadvertently created a nationalistic entrenchment that diminishes the capacity for shared experience and complicates immigrant integration. The stronger the nationalistic sentiments on both sides, the more difficult it becomes to develop multi-dimensional or pluralistic identities.

In Germany, an immigration country, the concept and implementation of *Leitkultur* is intrinsically divisive. It creates an environment where individuals of disparate homelands, cultures and traditions are expected to adopt a philosophy as a precondition to inclusion. This promotes an “us versus them” mentality and, consequently, separation from the host society is likely to occur.

For Turkish immigrants, the inability to sever the umbilical cord with the homeland is an obstacle to integration into and peaceful coexistence with the host society. Transnational political and social ties are understandable – to a certain extent. But, when host country integration is sacrificed in the name of homeland primacy, attempts at immigrant integration, by Germans and Turks, are rendered useless. The continuation of transnational ties is acceptable, as long as it does not interfere or take precedence over integration.

The existence of nationalism and multiculturalism in a single society does not need to be a zero-sum game. But without the appropriate integration mechanisms, immigrants may never feel a sense of loyalty to the host nation and the members of the host nation may want to separate themselves from the immigrant population. A collaborative effort is necessary to replace double-edged nationalism with shared identity.

Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the first foreign worker agreement between Turkey and Germany. And, there is no doubt that over the past 50 years many integration challenges have existed and continue to exist for the Turkish immigrant population in Germany. These challenges have affected identity formation, mutual cultural understanding, and national allegiance and pride. But the resolution of these challenges should not be the absolute responsibility of either one group (host) or the other (immigrant). Integration should be a collective effort by both sides based on mutual understanding, relationship building and shared experience. Integration is a two-way street.

The goal of this thesis has been to gain a better understanding of the integration challenges in Germany with the intention of finding opportunities for conflict resolution and developing a framework within which similar situations could be constructively addressed. Immigration and integration challenges are not easily resolvable conflicts. They are deep-rooted and personal. As such, an examination beyond political, social, or economic conditions has proved necessary.

By examining the situation from a conflict resolution perspective and, as such, viewing the conflict from a lens that facilitates the augmentation of traditional perspectives, we are able to gain a better, fuller understanding. The development of a “thick description” presents a platform on which to build a sustainable, integrative, solution.

When formulating a conclusion it is helpful to revisit the research question: “By examining the conditions of Turkish immigrants in Germany and the challenges of integration, are we able to find constructive paths to integration from a conflict resolution perspective?” This thesis has critically explored obstacles to peaceful coexistence in a multicultural society by viewing integration challenges from a conflict resolution perspective.

By examining the situation from three perspectives – identity formation, cultural understanding, and nationalist – we have not only gained a better understanding of the historical conditions surrounding this topic but we have been able to use that information to develop a framework to explore constructive paths to integration for countries facing similar situations. What was learned from the past can enhanced the present and set a positive tone for the future.

Now, within the context of what was presented in this thesis, there are three conclusions that can be made:

- Ambiguity surrounding the concept of multiculturalism has complicated the identity formation process in Germany.
- Inadequate cultural knowledge and understanding have exacerbated the integration challenges and debate in Germany.
- Nationalism has filled a void created by a lack of long-term immigration and integration policy in Germany.

It is my conclusion that inadequate attention given to cultural understanding of a diverse society has led to deep-rooted integration challenges for host and immigrant alike

including identity formation challenges, religious animosity and misunderstanding, and the development of strong nationalistic sentiments.

These challenges could have been minimized or possibly avoided if the added layer of cultural complexity and religious plurality had been viewed from a conflict resolution perspective and with the application of conflict resolution theories and practices.

Also, had Germany acted with immediacy and clarity with regard to immigrant integration and multiculturalism 50 years ago, the ambiguity and uncertainty that has complicated the integration situation in Germany – difficulty in forming identity, lack of cultural understanding, and the rise of nationalistic sentiments – could have been drastically minimized and the path to integration could have been more collaborative.

At the end of the day, such imperatives as social equality, political representation, opportunities for economic prosperity and access to education should be primary goals of any host society's immigrant integration policy. But these goals cannot be reached solely by looking at statistics or formulating policy based on historical precedence. In societies made up of culturally diverse, religiously pluralistic, and disparate people, an added layer of complexity is introduced to any integration debate.

Therefore, cultural understanding is paramount in importance. By examining the situation from a conflict resolution perspective, we are able to gain a better understanding of such topics as identity formation in culturally diverse societies or the importance of cultural understanding in interfaith dialogue or the role of nationalism in countries with large immigrant populations. The implementation of conflict resolution theories enables

us to unpack and understand the extra layer of complexity that tends to be present within culturally diverse societies.

In post-World War II Germany, these situations were present with little or no precedence on which to formulate a response. The seemingly ubiquitous response that “Germany is not a country of immigration” created an immediate obstacle to migrant inclusion. This denial set the tone for subsequent debates on immigrant integration into German society.

When describing the Turkish immigrant situation in Germany, the International Crisis Group (ICG) points out “the long refusal to acknowledge a diverse society has not been without costs” (2007, p. 31). The ICG report (2007) goes on to say:

Educational and employment statistics make clear the makings of a parallel society or underclass. The disadvantaging of immigrant-origin children in secondary schools should be redressed, and programs that respond to real integration needs – from further political outreach to effective anti-discrimination measures – are required. (p. 31)

Over the past few years, Germany has taken steps to address the situation starting with the recognition that it is a country of immigration. “Germany has accepted its status as a country of immigration and now is struggling to define what kind” (International Crisis Group, 2007, p. 31).

Over the past few years an Integration Plan has been developed and in 2000, citizenship laws were changed. According to the International Crisis Group (2007):

The 2000 [citizenship] law grants citizenship to children born in Germany to non-German parents if at least one parent has been a legal resident for more than five years. Dual nationality for such children is allowed until 23, when a choice must be made. (p. 5)

This law enabled *ius soli* (“right of the soil”, citizenship for those born in Germany) for the first time in Germany history.

These recognitions and adjustments are critical steps in addressing the integration challenges faced by a country with a large immigrant population. A similar action that can be taken to augment these tangible adjustments is the recognition and utilization of conflict resolution strategies to address the less tangible challenges – identity formation and cultural understanding. To adequately and completely address the integration challenges faced by societies with large immigrant populations, conflict resolution strategies must be utilized to augment the adjustments and recognitions that have been made.

Throughout this study I have attempted to develop a strong and in-depth understanding of the integration challenges of Turkish immigrants in Germany. As such, it would be helpful to establish directives, from a conflict resolution perspective, that could be applied not only to the topic of discussion but also to other multicultural societies facing integration challenges of immigrant populations. These directives can be defined as recommendations for improvement based on historical precedence and findings. These directives are an opportunity to address existing challenges (in this case, integration challenges for countries with large immigrant populations) with the intention of formulating a framework to better address the topic.

Directives:

When creating a historical study, hindsight is a privilege; a privilege that should be utilized when carefully examining the past in order to better understand the future.

The ability to view a situation from new perspectives provides an opportunity to determine what has worked and what has not worked and address the challenges so as to create opportunities going forward. As cliché as it might sound, it is important to know where we are going before we get started.

In an era of globalization, when disparate cultures and people are able to travel the world with relative ease, the mixing of myriad people, culture, and ways of life is inevitable. As societies are introduced to more diversity, they become less a homogeneous mass of similar looking and thinking individuals and more societies of plurality built on disparate cultures, religions, and languages. The introduction of “foreign” cultures does not change “who” a society is but it does change “what” a society is. This shift brings about the formation of multicultural societies.

Zeytinoglu (2010) argues that there are certain conditions that must emerge and exist in order for a multicultural society to succeed:

1. “A more inclusive kind of liberal democracy needs to be adopted to accommodate such a multicultural society.”
2. “...the ideas of reception, recognition, and acknowledgment of diverse cultures within a society.”
3. “...Multicultural society needs to address the needs of its current members and should have a determination to ensure that future generations will enjoy similar rights as well as they could accommodate new needs as the extent of the interpretations of culture may expand.” (pp. 2-3)

Once the framework has been established for the realization of these three conditions, the opportunities for peaceful coexistence expand extensively. However, there are two underlying preconditions that should be established.

First, “a more extensive definition of multiculturalism should contain all the connotations of *culture*” and, second, there must be “the will and desire of diverse and multiple cultures to live together” (Zeytinoglu, 2010, p. 2). Societies lacking appropriate understanding of its extensive cultural complexities and lacking the desire to want to find a solution, are unlikely to find peaceful and equitable coexistence. In addition to an expanded definition of culture and the existence of will and desire, there should be another precondition for multicultural societies: recognition of identity as a basic human need.

As we discussed earlier, identity is a basic human need. When formulating a directive in the context of human needs, the pursuit of motivational factors in fulfilling human needs and the importance of collaboration in multicultural societies should be explored. From a human needs perspective, what motivates host and immigrant to want to pursue constructive paths to integration and peaceful coexistence?

First, to satisfy needs within the context of group relations, Bay argues that individuals must strive for an “authentic community” which is “a group of people who share a sense of solidarity and who have an equal right to influence community decisions” (as cited in Burrows, 1996, p. 61). Bay goes on to say, “...Only this form of community can ensure the satisfaction of human needs” (as cited in Burrows, 1996, p. 61). To reach this state, both host and immigrant need to recognize that in order to fulfill human needs, collaboration and engagement are necessary. Through engagement the

fulfillment of other basic human need – security, effectiveness and control, and positive connection – is possible. The pursuit and subsequent fulfillment of these needs should be enough to motivate both groups to engage.

From a policy perspective, if appropriate structures and systems are in place for individuals to realize human needs, peaceful coexistence is possible. “In order to tackle human needs, conflict resolution processes must be concerned with finding political structures which promote the full development of the individual” (Vayrynen, 2001, p.

43). Burton points out that:

Human needs as such do not lead to conflict. Rather, conflict emerges from the frustration caused by unfulfilled needs. ...They include a potential for harmonious society. ...Conflicts are potential manifestations of system failures, the failures of a domestic system to provide the needs of people. (as cited in Vayrynen, 2001, p. 37)

Decision-makers (in this case, decision-makers in a multicultural host society) should be motivated to ensure to the proper institutions are in place to facilitate the fulfillment of human needs for both host and immigrant. Fulfillment of human needs can lead to a sense of satisfaction which in turn can lead to successful integration, peaceful coexistence, and societal harmony.

The use of conflict resolution is critical in facilitating the satisfaction of human needs. Burton argues that, “If conflict resolution is to be taken seriously, if it is more than just introducing altered perceptions and good will into some specific situations, it has to be assumed that societies must adjust to the needs of people, and not the other way around” (1998, p. 1). Simply put, “Human needs satisfaction is the ultimate prerequisite for the stability of society” (Vayrynen, 2001, p. 34). Conflict resolution perspectives should be explored in the context of facilitating the fulfillment of human needs.

Consequently, to understand the complexities of the topic of study, directives created from the aforementioned conflict resolution perspectives would prove helpful in promoting a sustainable and integrative solution.

From an identity formation perspective, the importance of a state recognizing and appropriately defining itself is critical for: 1) formulating immigration and integration policy and, 2) building a platform on which identity formation can take place at the individual and group levels. When a country does not know exactly who or what it is, how are individuals or groups able to identify themselves? For multicultural states, a logical place to start is with the definition of “multiculturalism” and what it means for societal integration.

As previously discussed there are many definitions of and perspectives on multiculturalism. Is multiculturalism the existence of multiple cultures living side-by-side with little if any overlap? Or, is multiculturalism the existence of multiple cultures coexisting together and building an identity based on shared experience? The answer to this question not only facilitates identity formation (at the state and individual level) but also brings about a well-informed debate about the integration of multiple cultures into a single society.

As has been shown in Germany, integration policy has not been implemented without challenges. When discussing how immigrants, for example, could be incorporated into a host society, several acculturation strategies are possible (see *Acculturation and Multiculturalism* section for complete definitions). The strategies range from total assimilation which is when an immigrant completely immerses herself

into the culture of the host society and leaves behind the home culture, to separation which is the creation of parallel societies where separate cultures exist in different worlds with little, if any, overlap or interaction. But, does it need to be an either-or situation? Is it possible for an immigrant to become part of a host society while at the same time not completely abandoning his home culture? One acculturation compromise is what Brent Klopp refers to as “Reciprocal Integration”.

The concept of Reciprocal Integration could function as an acculturation compromise between separation and assimilation. Klopp describes it as:

...Reciprocal integration should be understood as a process located between pure assimilation to a predetermined membership standard and an extreme, relativist multiculturalism in the form of separate ethnic communities or enclaves that exist side by side but do not interact or cohere with one another...It lays the groundwork for a “national identity” defined by common practices and shared civic traditions, but one that does not exclusively privilege monolingualism or a particular race or ethnicity. Reciprocal integration encompasses the idea that a common language (or languages) and common civic tradition evolve, change, and transform over time, and that new members of society contribute directly and indirectly to producing these transformations. (2002, pp. 25-26)

The importance of recognizing that the world has changed is a critical first step in formulating identity based on shared experience. But recognition is only the first step. Beyond recognition there needs to be a desire to understand each other; to understand the intricacies of each other’s culture.

When looking at the arrival of Turkish immigrants to Germany from a cultural understanding perspective, there were efforts made to understand the culture of the new arrivals and vice versa. German Christian Churches made an attempt to understand the newly arrived Turkish Muslim population through interfaith dialogue. Also, Turkish

migrant organizations served as a bridge between Turkish migrants and the German state. However, a lack of cultural knowledge and cultural disengagement complicated the efforts of both entities.

For host society entities attempting to understand the culture or religion of a newly arrived migrant population, it would be helpful to have a basic understanding of the history and way of life of a migrant's home country. For example, in German Christian Churches attempts to understand the faith and culture of the newly arrived Turkish Muslim population, it would have been helpful to understand the strong support for the separation of church and state harbored by the majority of Turkish Muslims in Germany. But, by forming a partnership with a minority group, a more extremist group, the entire Turkish Muslim population was viewed as sharing similar beliefs of the minority group.

The introduction of a new population to a host society, and especially one of a different faith, makes mutual and accurate understanding critical when forming a solid and long-lasting relationship. "The greatest defense against religious extremism and imported fundamentalism is intensive interaction to enhance the mutual acquaintance of Muslim religious associations and the state" (International Crisis Group, 2007, p. 31).

In line with intensive interaction and mutual acquaintance, an underlying theme of this thesis has been to showcase the importance of relationship building in multicultural societies. However, the building of relationships simply for the sake of relationship-building is unproductive. These relationships should be strategic and thorough in nature. Otherwise, negative consequences are more likely to ensue.

For example, when the German Christian Churches forged partnerships with a religiously conservative minority sect within the larger Turkish population in Germany, they were not only leaving the majority of secular Turkish immigrants without representation, but also forming erroneous opinions about the population as a whole. It could be argued that in this case the forging of relationships was more detrimental than not forming a relationship at all.

As such, when forming relationships, a solid understanding of all parties involved should be a prerequisite. In the beginning, mutual understanding should be the number one priority. Any attempts at problem solving without a solid mutual understanding is likely to create a relationship plagued by confusion, frustration, and mistrust. This is especially important if the parties are expected to be a representative to society at large.

Regarding migrant organizations, when serving as a bridge between migrants and the State it is imperative to minimize the influence of homeland politics. The goal of migrant organizations should be the facilitation of mutual understanding and the successful integration into the host society. The existence of homeland politics presents complications on two levels.

First, if migrant organizations are preoccupied with homeland politics, they are less likely to pay adequate attention to the immediate situation in the host country. And, the politics of the homeland and the host country might not always be in sync. Thus, migrant organizations are in the unenviable position of choosing between home and host, thus forcing them to take their eyes off the prize – successful integration into the host society.

Second, to a certain extent, migrants look to migrant organizations for direction and leadership. Consequently, if a migrant organization is focused on homeland politics instead of integration, it is likely that migrants will follow suit. Consequently, migrants are likely to remain caught up in their homeland politics instead of focusing on life in the host society. The consequences of this action can lead to what has been previously defined as “double-edged” nationalism.

From a nationalist perspective, the failure to successfully incorporate immigrants into a host society can lead to the creation of strong nationalistic sentiments within members of the host society as well as within the immigrant community. These nationalistic sentiments are not means to the same end; they are separate nationalistic tones with the host society (in this case, Germany) championing more “German-ness” while the immigrant population (in this case, Turkish immigrants in German) turns to Turkey for support and connection. The convergence of these separate and more than likely conflicting nationalistic sentiments brings about a “double-edged” nationalism.

For Germany, the key to deflating nationalistic sentiment is recognition. This recognition comes on two levels. First, recognition that Germany is a country of immigration and, as such, formulates immigration and integration policy accordingly could go a long way in addressing integration challenges. Second, it would be helpful to recognize that Turkish nationalistic sentiments on the part of the Turkish immigrant population are in part caused by a lack of recognition and separation from German society.

There will always be extremist nationalistic elements in a society. But, by incorporating the immigrant populations into the host society and building relationships based on shared experience, the national pride that results could be a collective pride.

For Turkish immigrants in Germany, one way to deflate Turkish nationalistic sentiments is to maintain focus on integration into the host society (Germany) and not turn to Turkey for support or connection out of desperation or marginalization. This responsibility does not only fall to Turkish immigrants in Germany; it is also the responsibility of those in Turkey to avoid introducing homeland politics into a society that is already struggling with the challenges of integration. The country of origin should also use caution when viewing immigrant populations in host countries as a lobby group and eligible voter pool. It is counterproductive and adds a layer of complexity to an already complex situation.

Turkish migrant organizations should do more to function as a bridge between Turkish immigrants and the German state and leave Turkish politics off of the agenda and out of the decision-making process. In order to abate the interference of homeland politics, the International Crisis Group recommends Turkish organizations in Germany “avoid organizational, personnel, or financial links to political parties in Turkey” (2007, p. iii). Severing this connection could go a long way in allowing Turkish immigrants in Germany to focus on successful integration into German society without the pressure or influence of Turkish politicians.

After 50 years, Germany has taken steps to address the aforementioned lack of recognition and integration challenges. It has changed its citizenship laws, created an

annual integration summit, and recognized itself as a country of immigration. Now, it is deciding what kind.

While the primary goal of this thesis has been to gain a better understanding of the integration challenges faced by Turkish immigrants in Germany, another goal has been to create a template to be used for other multicultural societies facing the challenges that come with integrating large immigrant populations into a host society. Therefore, when looking at these directives while the details are specifically tailored for the topic of study, the concept remains the same and could be transferred and applied to other situations. The details and the parties involved might change but the end goal remains the same – successful integration and peaceful coexistence of disparate people with diverse cultures, religions, languages into the host society.

Future Research

This thesis has been an opportunity to view a situation from a conflict resolution perspective; a perspective that I believe has been underutilized. With little precedence on which to build, this thesis has been an attempt to establish a platform on which future research could be conducted and to create a template that can be utilized in similar situations around the world. Going forward there are two areas that could be further explored and could build on this study.

First, obtaining personal experiences from individuals directly involved with immigration and integration challenges in Germany utilizing questions built from the research question of this thesis could introduce a layer of real world and individual experience to the perspectives and theories discussed in this project. Through personal

experiences and thoughts, opportunity to validate these findings or fine-tune the project to more accurately reflect reality could be found.

Second, I believe this project could be used in other parts of the world in unrelated societies facing integration challenges. It would be interesting to see how the framework that has been created and the conflict resolution perspectives that have been explored could be transferred and applied in other countries that are facing integration challenges of multiple cultures into a single society. Looking at other situations from a conflict resolution perspective and applying the theories discussed in this thesis could help bring to the fore opportunities to address integration challenges in an increasingly diverse and culturally co-mingled world.

References

- Anastasiou, H. (2008). *The Broken Olive Branch: Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and the Quest for Peace in Cyprus*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Anastasiou, H. (2009). Encountering Nationalism: The contributions of peace studies and conflict resolution. In J.D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, & J. Senehi (Eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution* (pp. 32-44). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Anastasiou, H. & Broome, B.J. (2010). Nationalism. *Encyclopedia of Identity*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from http://www.sage-reference.com/identity/Article_n171.html
- Appleby, R.S. (2007). Forward. In M. Abu-Niber, A. Khoury, & E. Welty (Eds.), *Unity in Diversity* (pp. xii-xiii). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Avcı, G. (2006). Comparing Integration Policies and Outcomes: Turks in the Netherlands and Germany. *Turkish Studies*, 7(1), 67-84. doi: 10.1080/14683840500520592
- Arslan, E. (2004). Turkish Ultra-nationalism in Germany: Its Transnational Dimensions. In T. Faist, & E. Özveren (Eds.), *Transnational Social Spaces: Agents, Networks and Institutions* (pp. 1-33). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Avruch, K. (1998). *Culture & Conflict Resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Bağış, E. (2010). Turkey's EU Membership Process: Prospects and Challenges. *Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies*. Retrieved from

http://www.coleurop.be/file/content/studyprogrammes/ird/research/pdf/EDP2010/EDP_5_2010_Bagis.pdf

Bal, D. & Herscovitch, B. (2010). From Liberal Nationalism To Nationalistic Liberalism: Liberal Democratic Values & The Prospects For Progressive Nationalism.

Retrieved from <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/bherschovitchpaper.pdf>

Bell, D.M. (2010). Development of Identity. *Encyclopedia of Identity*. SAGE

Publications. Retrieved from http://www.sage-reference.com/identity/Article_n68.html

Brewer, M. & Miller, N. (1996). Intergroup Contact, Cooperation, and Competition:

Does Togetherness Make Friends? In *Intergroup Relations* (pp. 107-133). Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity and Intergroup Relations. In *Group Processes* (pp. 311-360). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Burrows, R. (1996). *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense*. NY: State University of New York Press.

Burton, J. (1990). Human Needs Theory. In *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Burton, J. (1998). Conflict Resolution: The Human Dimension. *The International of Peace Studies*, 3(1). Retrieved from

http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol3_1/burton.htm

Clark, M. (2010). Germany's Angela Merkel: Multiculturalism has 'utterly failed'.

Christian Science Monitor. Retrieved from

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Global-News/2010/1017/Germany-s-Angela-Merkel-Multiculturalism-has-utterly-failed>

Critchfield, A. J. (2010). The Other. *Encyclopedia of Identity*. SAGE Publications.

Retrieved from http://www.sage-ereference.com/identity/Article_n179.html

Crossland, D. (2008, February 12). The World From Berlin: Erdoğan's Visit Leaves German Conservatives Fuming. *Spiegel Online*. Retrieved from

<http://www.spiegel.de>

Deaux, K. (1993). Reconstructing Social Identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 19, 1. 4-12.

Faist, T. (2004). The Border-Crossing Expansion of Social Space: Concepts, Questions and Topics. In T. Faist, & E. Özveren (Eds.), *Transnational Social Spaces: Agents, Networks and Institutions* (pp. 1-33). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Friedman, G. (2010, October 19). Germany and the Failure of Multiculturalism. *Stratfor*.

Retrieved from <http://www.stratfor.com>

Genoni, M.R. (2010). History of Otherness. *Encyclopedia of Identity*. SAGE

Publications. Retrieved from http://www.sage-ereference.com/identity/Article_n180.html

Gezer, Ö. & Reimann, A. (2011, February 28). Erdoğan Urges Turks Not to Assimilate: 'You Are Part of Germany, But Also Part of Our Great Turkey'. *Spiegel Online*.

Retrieved from <http://www.speigel.de>

Hoopes, D. (1979). Intercultural Communication Concepts and the Psychology of

Intercultural Experience. In M. Pusch (Ed.), *Multicultural Education: A Cross-Cultural Training Approach* (pp. 9-38). Chicago, IL: Intercultural Press, Inc.

- International Crisis Group. (2007, March 14). *Islam and Identity in Germany*. Retrieved from
http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/europe/181_islam_in_germany.ashx
- Jonker, G. (2005). From 'Foreign Workers' to 'Sleepers': The Churches, the State and Germany's 'Discovery' of its Muslim Population. In J. Cesari & S. McLoughlin (Eds.). *European Muslims and the Secular State* (pp. 113-126). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Klopp, B. (2002). *German Multiculturalism: Immigration Integration and the Transformation of Citizenship*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Knight, B. (2011, October 26). 'There's no real mood for celebration'. *The Local*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelocal.de/society/20111026-38425.html>
- Küçükcan, T. (2002). Turks in Germany: Between Inclusion and Exclusion. *Islam Araştırma Dergisi*, 7, 97-118
- Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Orendt, M. (2010). Germany's Role in Turkey's EU-Accession-Process. *BILGESAM*. Retrieved from
http://www.bilgesam.org/en/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=233:germanys-role-in-turkeys-eu-accession-process&catid=70:ab-analizler&Itemid=131
- Ögelman, N. (2003). Documenting and Explaining the Persistence of Homeland Politics among Germany's Turks. *International Migration Review*, 37(1), 163-193.

- Pope, N. & Pope, H. (2004). *Turkey Unveiled: A History of Modern Turkey*. Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press.
- Punch, K.F. (1998). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. London, England: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Ramm, C. (2010). The Muslim Makers. *Interventions: The International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 12(2): 183-197. doi: 10.1080/1369801X.2010.489692
- Rivera, J.E., & Hohman, Z.P. (2010). Psychology of Self and Identity. *Encyclopedia of Identity*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from http://www.sage-reference.com/identity/Article_n207.html
- Schiffauer, W. (2006). Enemies within the gates: The debate about the citizenship of Muslims in Germany. In T. Modood, A. Triandafyllidou & R. Zapata-Barrero (Ed.), *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach* (pp. 94-116). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schneider, J. (2002). Discourses of Exclusion: Dominant Self-Definitions and "The Other" In German Society. *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe*, 2: 13–21. doi: 10.1525/jsae.2002.2.1.13
- Sezgin, Z. (2008). Turkish Migrants' Organizations: Promoting Tolerance Toward the Diversity of Turkish Migrants in Germany. *International Journal of Sociology*, 38(2), 78-95. doi: 10.2753/IJS0020-7659380206
- Smock, D. (2002). Introduction. In D. Smock (Ed.), *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Song, S. (2010). Multiculturalism. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2010/entries/multiculturalism>

- Stratfor. (2004, December 7). Germany: Merkel vs. Multiculturalism. *Stratfor*. Retrieved from <http://www.stratfor.com>
- Şen, F. (2003). The Historical Situation of Turkish Migrants in Germany. *Immigrants & Minorities*, 22(2/3), 208-227. doi: 10.1080/0261928042000244835
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London; New York: Academic Press.
- United States Institute of Peace. (2004). *Special Report: What Works? Evaluating Interfaith Dialogue Programs*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.usip.org/files/resources/sr123.pdf>
- Vayrynen, T. (2001). Burton's Human Needs Theory and the Denial of Culture in Conflict Resolution. In *Culture and Conflict Resolution: A Critical Analysis of the Work of John Burton*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Volkan, V. (1997). Ethnic Tents: Descriptions of Large-Group Identities. In V. Volkan (Ed.), *Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism* (pp. 81-100). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Yılmaz, H. (2007). Turkish Identity on the road to the EU: basic elements of French and German oppositional discourses. *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 9(3), 293-305. doi: 10.1080/14613190701689993
- Yurdakul, G. & Bodemann Y.M. (2006). "We Don't Want to Be the Jews of Tomorrow": Jews and Turks in Germany after 9/11. *German Politics and Society*, 24(2), 44-67
- Zagefka, H. & Brown, R. (2002). The relationship between acculturation strategies, relative fit and intergroup relations: immigrant-majority relations in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 171-188. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.73

Zeytinoglu, C. (2010). Multiculturalism. *Encyclopedia of Identity*. SAGE Publications.

Retrieved from http://www.sage-ereference.com/identity/Article_n165.html

Appendix: Turkish Population in Germany Since 1961

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>
1961	7,116	1981	1,546,300
1962	15,300	1982	1,580,700
1963	27,100	1983	1,552,300
1964	85,200	1984	1,425,800
1965	132,800	1985	1,400,400
1966	161,000	1986	1,425,721
1967	172,400	1987	1,481,369
1968	205,400	1988	1,523,678
1969	322,400	1989	1,612,632
1970	469,200	1990	1,694,649
1971	652,800	1991	1,779,586
1972	712,300	1992	1,854,945
1973	910,500	1993	1,918,395
1974	910,500	1994	1,965,577
1975	1,077,100	1995	2,014,320
1976	1,079,300	1996	2,049,060
1977	1,118,000	1997	2,107,426
1978	1,165,100	1998	2,110,223
1979	1,268,300	1999	2,053,564
1980	1,462,400	2000	1,998,536

Source: Şen, 2003, p. 209