

Trinity University

Digital Commons @ Trinity

Political Science Faculty Research

Political Science Department

9-2011

Immigration to Germany: Past and Present Experiences

Peter O'Brien

Trinity University, pobrien@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/polysci_faculty



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Repository Citation

O'Brien, Peter, "Immigration to Germany: Past and Present Experiences" (2011). *Political Science Faculty Research*. 2.

https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/polysci_faculty/2

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science Department at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

Immigration to Germany: Past and Present Experiences

By

Peter O'Brien

Professor

Political Science

Trinity University

San Antonio, TX 78212-7200

E-mail: pobrien@trinity.edu

Abstract

Germany long stood as the epitome of the ethno-nationalist approach to immigration. However, passage of the new Citizenship Law in 2000, which introduced *jus soli*, seemed to signal a sea change in the direction of a postnational outlook. This paper warns against seeing in the new legislation an emerging normative consensus around the kind of liberal cosmopolitanism advocated by the likes of Jürgen Habermas, Ulrich Beck or Will Kymlicka. I document the persistent allure and influence of nationalism and point to the growing appeal and sway of proposals and policies informed by a postmodern normative outlook. Germany's normative landscape, like that of most European lands, is highly complex and contentious, manifesting *Kulturkampf* rather than consensus as far as immigration is concerned. The result is a complicated, indeed messy, immigration policy that defies easy categorization into neat typologies putative in comparative immigration studies.

Paper presented at the conference "Debating the Immigration-Integration nexus in Germany and Turkey: Where to Go from Here?" Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 23-24 September, 2011

INTRODUCTION

Germany has long stood as the prototype of the ethno-cultural approach in the field of comparative immigration studies. The New Citizenship Law of 2000, which essentially replaced *jus sanguinis* with *jus soli*, cast doubt on the validity of the dominant neo-institutionalist methodology of this field with its emphasis on the nation-state and path dependency. In fact, as I argued in my 1996 book *Beyond the Swastika*, the roots, both institutional and ideological, of this liberal, cosmopolitan turn can be traced not only to the new Aliens Law of 1990, not only to the Kuhn Memorandum of 1978, but to the Allied Occupation and the immediate postwar efforts to establish in West Germany a reliably liberal polity and culture in which the Holocaust could not recur. Put differently, there is not now and there has not been for decades a clear national consensus regarding immigration policy in Germany that would justify comfortably fitting the land into a putative comparative typology of nation-states either neatly juxtaposed against, say, “republican France” or “multicultural Britain,” or since 2000 transferred into the republican or multicultural category. Immigration policy in Germany, like every other land in Europe, is controversial, contended and therefore highly fluid, or to borrow from Gary Freeman (2004, p. 946), downright “messy.”

I want to build off this insight in two ways that I am developing in a new book project entitled *Clashes within Western Civilization: The Politics of Immigration in Europe*. First, Germany must be understood in the context of a much broader and longer normative debate that is Europe-wide, even world-wide. Here I can only refer the audience to the deservedly esteemed work of Isaiah Berlin (1979 & 1980), who illuminatingly chronicled and analyzed the protracted and unresolved philosophical

debate between two ontologically, epistemologically and morally incompatible and incommensurable worldviews that he termed “Enlightenment Liberalism” and “Counter-Enlightenment Nationalism.” In his 2000 book *Integral Europe*, Douglas Holmes brilliantly applied Berlin’s insights to the politics of immigration, though Holmes chose to call nationalism “integralism.” Second, I seek to augment Berlin’s and Holmes’ contributions by adding *postmodernism* as a vying and equally influential normative worldview in the politics of immigration. Expressed with extreme pith, liberalism prescribes universal rights protecting the autonomy of the individual to all persons regardless of nationality as long as they respect the same rights for others as well as rational and democratic values or procedures (rules of the game) to govern the pluralism that inevitably results in free societies (Habermas, 1983, Rawls, 1987, Bauböck, 1994, Kymlicka, 1995, Benhabib, 2004). Against liberalism, nationalism, or what I prefer to call “particularism,” stresses community and cultural homogeneity in addition to a political structure designed to protect both (Berghe, 1979, MacIntyre, 1981, Walzer, 1983, Smith, 1991, Waeber, *et al.*, 1993, Taylor, 1994, Miller, 2000, Thaa, 2001). Rejecting both liberalism and nationalism, postmodernism posits invincible relativism and irreducible cultural heterogeneity accompanied by ultimately irrepressible political antagonism (Hall, 1992, Gray, 1995, Fish, 1999, Nancy, 2000, Mouffe, 2000). I introduce the notion of *Kulturkampf* to characterize the relationship between the three worldviews. *Kulturkampf* means that none finds itself in a position to defeat or dismiss once and for all its two rivals as appealing sources of normative legitimacy in the politics of immigration.

I aim to show how normative discord born of inveterate *Kulturkampf* significantly contributes to the messiness of immigration policy, the fact that it represents “an awesome accumulation of contradictions” (Schierup, Hansen, and Castles, 2006, p. 77). Needless to say, normative factors alone cannot fully explain why a certain policy emerges. Policy analysts have identified a range of non-normative factors that influence immigration policy. These include demographics (Mayer, 1999), health of the economy (Simon, 1989, Anderson, 1996), political opportunity structures (Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005), international crises (Tichenor, 2002), media salience (Givens & Luedtke, 2005), level of government (Money, 1999), courts (Joppke, 2001), institutional and legal heritage (Brubaker, 1992), political access (Freeman 1995, Kriese, *et al.*, 1995), ethnic origin (Rex, 1996), asymmetry of available resources (Castells, 1975, Mann, 1987, Smith, 1999), and administrative rationality or “governmentality” (Cohen, 2009, pp. 116-25, Foucault, 1991). That said, several studies document the considerable influence of normative arguments and expectations on immigration policy making (Sniderman, Hagendoorn, & Prior, 2004, Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, pp. 182-209, Messina, 2007, p. 76). Ideally one would integrate normative and non-normative factors into a balanced analysis that favours no single factor unduly (Tichenor, 2002, Schain, 2008). Given limited scope, however, I analyse in these pages only normative factors.

THE METHODOLOGY OF PUBLIC PHILOSOPHIES

I employ the concept of public philosophy (Lowi, 1969, pp. 3-21 & 42-66, Favell, 1998) to structure my analysis of the controversy surrounding citizenship. Of a kind with what various constructivists label ‘worldviews’ (Weber, 1949), ‘frames’ (Bleich, 2003, p. 14), ‘policy paradigms’ (Hall, 1986), ‘political discourses’ (Connolly, 1993, pp. 22-41), the

notion of public philosophy represents an analytical construct and tool to help empirically identify and conceptually organize the myriad normative ideas and presuppositions that actors willy nilly bring to politics.

I underscore three specific attributes of public philosophies. First, a (significantly influential) public philosophy rests on foundational ideas articulated by ‘great thinkers’ (by which I mean the kind of savants covered in any standard *History of Western Philosophy* text). For liberalism, I have in mind such seminal thinkers as Locke, Rousseau, and Kant; for nationalism, Vico, Herder, Burke, Renan; for postmodernism, Nietzsche, Wittgenstein, Merleau-Ponty, Heidegger. Second, a public philosophy is further shaped by the articulations of prominent contemporary (postwar) intellectuals who compellingly augment and develop the ideas of seminal thinkers in varied and nuanced ways that resonate today. Though I have not the space here to explain just how, these two categories of thinkers are primarily responsible for why the three public philosophies find themselves in a *Kulturkampf* unable definitively to defeat their rivals. Third, a public philosophy turns up in the pronouncements of political actors seeking to legitimize their policy agendas. In politics, however, normative ideas are most often deployed as mere fragments of the parent theory. Call them normative sound bites – “equality for all,” “Germany for the Germans,” “The Turks are the new Jews.” Fragmentation eases inconsistent deployment, because the fragments become disassociated from the logic and coherency of the larger theory. Add to this what Charles Taylor (2007, p. 11) calls “mutual fragilization.” This is an inescapable if at times diffuse awareness of the persuasiveness of rival viewpoints.

We live in a condition where we cannot help but be aware that there are a number of different construals, views which intelligent, reasonably

undeluded people, of good will, can and do disagree on. We cannot help looking over our shoulder from time to time, looking sideways, living our faith also in condition and uncertainty.

The resulting diffidence leads political actors to be more willing to compromise their moral convictions, which in turns enables normative inconsistencies to permeate policies.

The ideas of both “great thinkers” and contemporary intellectuals I access through their own published writings as well as some secondary interpretations. The ideas of opinion leaders I tap through their own (or their organization’s) pronouncements (platforms, position papers, press releases, etc.), media coverage of such individuals and organizations, and social scientific studies. Due to limited space, presentation of the evidence of each of the three dimensions will have to remain suggestive as opposed to exhaustive. As a result, the normative stances I limn below do not pretend to represent comprehensive descriptions of the ideas of either the theorists or political actors whom I cite. The nuance thus sacrificed is compensated, I hope, by the breadth of the perspective gained through an analysis that ranges across the whole of the political landscape. Specialists hungry for details can pursue them in the provided references – one reason they are deliberately plentiful.

LIBERALISM

Citizenship and integration courses and tests represent the latest fad in the politics of immigration. In 2006 Baden-Württemberg and Hesse developed and mandated them for (would-be) immigrants hailing from predominantly Muslim countries. Most other *Länder* subsequently followed suit. The Netherlands first introduced such civics classes in 1998. The EU has endorsed them while numerous other national and subnational governments have devised and implemented them as required hurdles for naturalization as well as for

acquisition or extension of visas. While the courses mandate proficiency in the dominant language of the receiving country, they also invariably teach and test commitment to the essential liberal democratic principles and values anchored in the constitution of the immigrant's supposedly new homeland (de Groot, Kuipers & Weber, 2009, Joppke, 2007). In fact, the classes comprise merely a part of a more general 'return of assimilation' (Brubaker, 2001) and 'the retreat of multiculturalism' (Joppke, 2004) discernible in the West for the last two decades

Some analysts (Parekh, 2008, O'Brien, 1993) have sought to diagnose this unmistakable political trend as a symptom of profound liberal diffidence in the face of cultural diversity of an unforeseen magnitude. In fact, 'liberal assimilationism' (Bauböck, 2002, p. 176) rests on sound, inveterate liberal principles, sustained by an abiding belief in the demonstrated superiority of the universal values enunciated during the European Enlightenment by luminaries such as Voltaire, Kant, Locke, and Jefferson (Barry, 2000, pp. 132-40). These liberal tenets (in updated formulation) include first and foremost the fundamental equality of all human beings regardless of race, creed, nationality, gender, and sexual orientation as well as the primacy of the moral autonomy of the individual against the claims of any wider community. Furthermore, all humans must be presumed to possess the capacity to reason and thus to govern their own lives in self-interested and self-improving ways. These values are neither culturally, historically nor geographically contingent and therefore apply to all persons in all contexts (Kant, 1959, Rawls, 1971).

So important are these ideals to individual and collective well-being that the state ought to protect and promote them against real and potential foes. And this it does best by actively molding its citizens into informed, open-minded political participants in the

democratic process. Across Europe in dialogue about immigration policy can be heard echoes of this basic message that in academic circles receives articulation under such rubrics as ‘Atlantic republicanism’ (Pocock, 1975), ‘strong democracy’ (Barber, 1984), ‘deliberative democracy’ (Gutmann and Thompson, 2004), ‘liberalism with a spine’ (Macedo, 2000), ‘civic patriotism’ (Laborde, 2002), ‘citizenship education’ (Crick, 1999), ‘patriotism’ (Viroli, 1997), ‘preference competence’ (Buchstein, 1995), to name but a few scholarly iterations. An international chorus of prominent opinion leaders including, in Germany Henryk Broder, Hans-Peter Raddatz, Seyran Ateş, Alice Schwarzer, Necla Kelek, Shabana Rehman, Helmut Schmidt, and elsewhere André Gerin, André Glucksmann, Emmanuell Todd, Chadortt Djavann, Bat Ye’or, Caroline Fourest, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, Paul Scheffer, Herman Philipse, Ralph Giordano, Melanie Phillips, Hugo Young, Farrukh Dhondy, Roy Jenkins, and Niall Ferguson has sounded the warning. Though the verses of the individual authors may vary, their common refrain is unmistakable: Islam is inherently illiberal and anti-democratic, and, therefore, pious Muslims and the organizations that represent them threaten democracy, indeed Western Civilization itself. Accompanying these Cassandra-like voices are the clarion sounds of mostly sensationalized, bestselling books and articles as well as widely consumed documentaries and reportage revealing alarming practices of forced marriage, honor killings, genital mutilation, anti-Western indoctrination, and terrorist plotting on European soil (Dirie, 1999, Kelek, 2004, Çileli, 2006). Politicians respond to the indignation with assurances that their governments will not waver in the defense of democracy. This was what was meant, well before any talk of integration classes, when Chancellor Helmut Kohl declared in his first inaugural address that foreigners “must

decide to integrate” or “return home” (quoted in O’Brien, 1996, p. 98). It is also what Interior Minister Wolfgang Schäuble had in mind when in opening the German Islam Conference in 2006 he stipulated that only Muslims who demonstrate an inner “*bedingungslose Anerkennung der demokratisch-rechtsstaatlichen Ordnung*” would be welcome and tolerated (quoted in Amir-Maozami, 2011). A similar liberal assimilationist tone was to be heard by the German’s counterpart in Austria, Liese Prokop, when she asserted in 2005: “we have to teach the Muslim women, who allow their husband to beat them, that this is different in Austria” (quoted in Gresch, *et al.*, 2008, p. 425). Similarly, Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy asserted in the same year:

We are proud of the values of the Republic, of equality between men and women, of laïcité, and of the French ideal of integration. So let us dare to speak of these to those we welcome here. And let us bring pressure to bear so that the rights of French women apply also to immigrant women (quoted in Scott, 2007, p. 162).

The normative logic of assimilationism implies a guarantee of equal treatment to the assimilated. Indeed, most European governments, in keeping with the EU’s Racial Equality Directive of 2000, have enacted anti-discrimination legislation aimed at shielding immigrants from prejudice (Koopmans, *et al.*, p. 249). Germany passed its *Antidiskriminierungsgesetz* in 2006, which included establishing the *Die Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes*. Angela Merkel condemned Thilo Sarrazin’s (2010) xenophobic *Deutschland schafft sich ab* as “*ausserst verletzend und diffamierend*” and warned against scapegoating Muslims, who deserve equal respect (*Migration und Bevölkerung*, September 2010). Immigrant advocate groups such as the Heinrich Böll Stiftung, the German Institute for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, the Open Society Institute, SOS-Racisme, and Amnesty International work tirelessly to keep the public

aware of on-going discrimination. Tony Blair captured the essence of the Europe-wide movement to eliminate discrimination with his much repeated phrase: ‘racists are the only minority’ (quoted in Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, p. 243).

As the erstwhile British Prime Minister’s remark suggests, anti-discrimination legislation typically applies to all persons, assimilated or not. Here emerges an important variant of liberalism that I term ‘cosmopolitanism.’ In contrast to liberal assimilationism, which insists that newcomers earn, so to speak, the rights of citizenship through demonstrated commitment to liberal values, cosmopolitanism asserts that immigrants, by lone virtue of being human beings, deserve (virtually) immediate access to the full rights and privileges of citizenship from the countries in which they reside (Carens, 1987, Tassin, 1994, Rubio-Marin, 2000, Kostakopoulou, 2001, Habermas, 2003, Benhabib, 2004, Beck & Grande, 2007). Citizenship, in other words, should attach to personhood rather than peoplehood and follow individuals across nation-state borders (Delanty, 2009, p.131).

Germany’s Citizenship Law of 2000 stands out as an example of realized cosmopolitanism. Because it established *jus soli*, it was trumpeted by its Social Democratic and Green legislators as political sea change in a Germany that had for decades insisted that *Deutschland ist kein Einwanderungsland* and had defended *jus sanguinis* as necessary for a nation divided by the Iron Curtain and Berlin Wall. In truth, as I have shown elsewhere (O’Brien 1996), the adoption of liberal cosmopolitan values has deep roots in both the CDU and the SPD that can be traced to the 1970s and were quite firmly entrenched by 1990 when a Christian Democratic government took the first major legal step toward *jus soli* with the Aliens Law of that year. Other states have *jus*

sol as well. France has long practiced it, while Greece introduced it in 2009. As early as 1948, in the British Nationality Act, the United Kingdom guaranteed citizenship to all members of the Commonwealth. The Netherlands followed suit in 1954 for the inhabitants of Surinam and the Dutch Antilles.

The pressure toward cosmopolitanism is not likely to abate. The European Council Tampere Conclusions of 1999 directed member states to confer on third-country nationals citizenship rights ‘comparable’ to EU citizens. These and other EU policies have created a “thin Europeanisation” (Geddes, 2000) of rights and privileges for third-country nationals that they do not enjoy at the national level but do enjoy at the supranational level. Sweden, Ireland, and the Netherlands permit legal aliens to vote in municipal elections. Pro-migrant advocacy groups maintain a steady chant of cosmopolitanism with slogans such as ‘open borders,’ ‘*des papiers pour tous*’ (papers for all), or ‘*Ausländer, lasst uns nicht mit den Deutschen allein*’ (Koopmanns, *et al.*, 2005, p. 207).

Needless to say, by detaching the rights of citizenship from a specific territory or people, cosmopolitanism promotes cultural diversity. While liberal assimilationism treats robust cultural diversity as a vice to be overcome, what I dub ‘liberal multiculturalism’ re-conceptualizes it as a virtue to be fostered. By this light, diversity can enhance a more authentic form of personal autonomy. Vigorous affiliation with a chosen tradition can enrich and strengthen one’s personal beliefs. Moreover, just such a sense of secure belonging and connectedness can fortify an individual to resist the fearsome pressures of conformity in mass consumer society (Raz, 1994, Kymlicka, 1995, Bielefeldt, 2007). If cultural identity and pride are integral to personal autonomy, as is for example private

property, then the liberal state should protect them as well. In a plural society, the state 'should aim at insuring that all national groups have the opportunity to maintain themselves as a distinct culture' (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 113). The state adopts a neutral position, facilitating fair and equal relations among varying, even vying, communities as opposed to siding with one particular worldview (Raz, 1994, p. 174). As early as 1978, the very *first Bundesbeauftragter für Integration*, the erstwhile Minister-President of North Rhine-Westphalia Heinz Kühn, stressed that integration could not have anything to do with "*Zwangsgermanisierung*" because aliens deserve a "guaranteed opportunity to preserve their identity" (quoted in O'Brien, 1996, p. 56). Pronouncing that 'diversity brings employers tangible advantages', Kühn's contemporary counterpart, Maria Böhmer, , threw her support in 2010 behind 'The Charter of Diversity' signed by 800 German firms representing 4.5 million employees. Germany is not alone. The Zapatero government's Strategic Plan of Citizenship and Integration 2007-2010 has as one of its principles 'inter-culturalism, according to which persons of different origins and/or cultures can interact with esteem and in full respect of diversity' (Quoted in Ferrero-Turrión & Pinyol-Jiménez, 2009, 344). The EU's Race Directive of 2000 states its goal as 'promoting diversity'. Indeed, for the last three decades policies of multiculturalism that aid immigrants in maintaining integral elements of their distinct identities while simultaneously firmly establishing them in the receiving country have steadily mushroomed across Europe at various levels of government (Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, p. 72, Joppke & Morawska, 2003, p. 19). Especially since 9/11, state-sponsored efforts have intensified to help Muslims maintain their faith (Fetzer & Soper, 2005, Cesari, 2004). The recently established *Deutsche Islam Konferenz* and the *Conseil Française de Culte*

Musulman are two examples. The thrust of such strivings, various though they are, typically centers on the formation of some type of 'Euro-Islam' that is at once authentically Islamic but conceived and practiced in a way consistent with the liberal democratic values cherished in Europe (Tibi, 2002, Ramadan, 2004, Nielsen, 2007).

In its support for cultural diversity liberal multiculturalism can sometimes appear one with communitarianism. However, the two should not be confounded, for they rest on divergent philosophical principles. In the former, cultural diversity has no value in and of itself; it should be permitted and encouraged only in so far as it enhances individual autonomy (Delanty, 2009, p. 131, Benhabib, 2005, p. 676, Raz, 1994, pp. 186-89, Bader, 1995). For this reason, liberal multiculturalists invariably insist on voluntarism in and the right of exit from cultural associations and practices (Spinner-Halev, 1999, 73, Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, pp. 178-79). As Habermas (1998, p. 222) puts the case:

The constitutional state can make this hermeneutic achievement of the cultural reproduction of worlds possible, but it cannot guarantee it. For to *guarantee* survival would necessarily rob the members of the freedom to say yes or no... When a culture has become reflexive, the only traditions and forms of life that can sustain themselves are those that *bind* their members, while at the same time allowing members to subject the traditions to critical examination and leaving later generations the *option* of learning from other traditions or converting and setting out for other shores.

Schäuble (2009), in his popular little book *Braucht unsere Gesellschaft Religion? – Vom Wert des Glaubens*, echoes the esteemed liberal philosopher:

Anyone who does not want that, for example does not want their children – and particularly their daughters – to grow up in an open western society because they disapprove of various aspects, is making the wrong decision to settle permanently in Central Europe. One has to accept the conditions of one's new home (...) as we are not prepared to put the rules of tolerance, diversity and pluralism up for discussion."

In 1995, the Austrian government rejected a proposal by the Islamic Congregation – the officially recognized representative of Muslims in Austria – to make veiling mandatory in Islamic education classes in public schools (Bauböck, 2002, p. 174). Similarly, Berlin introduced Islamic education in its public schools in 2005. However, upon determining that the provider of the instruction, The Islamic Federation of Berlin, was imparting illiberal, anti-democratic values to pupils, the Senate abolished denominational religious instruction in its public schools in 2008, opting for a *Religionskunde* approach. The British government has for similar reasons dragged its feet in establishing publicly funded Islamic schools of which there are only seven compared to 7000 Christian schools (Monsma and Soper 2009, p. 151).

PARTICULARISM

Though much research indicates that European Muslims overwhelmingly support individual rights (Phalet, van Lotringen, & Entzinger, 2000, Goldberg & Sauer, 2003, Parekh, 2006, pp. 181-85, Hargreaves, 2007, p. 116, Klausen, 2009, 3), there doubtless exist Muslim groups and individuals (especially among Fundamentalists and Islamists) who willfully violate liberal values (Klausen, 2009, 3). Illiberal positions can be cogently defended under the principles of communitarianism. Though often denounced as dangerously relativistic (Bader, 1995, p. 216), communitarianism rests on the firm philosophical footing of the venerable strain of nationalist thought in the Western tradition. Nationalism's pantheon of sages includes the likes of Vico, Montesquieu, Burke, Herder, Hegel, Fichte, Renan, and Mazzini. In divergent ways, these thinkers rejected the Enlightenment notion of a universal human nature and with it the idea of universally valid and applicable principles and laws. Humans are products of their

particular contexts, be they historical (Vico, 1948), environmental (Montesquieu, 1989), or cultural (Herder, 1877-1913). It follows that because the contexts are neither identical nor chosen, humans cannot share a universal essence or nature. They are insurmountably particular. Each nation, Herder averred, has a unique '*Seele*'. Montesquieu called it a 'spirit'. Whatever the label, this essence defines not only the nation but its individual members as well. They experience life collectively as a 'we' as opposed to an isolated 'I' (Hegel, 1953). Most profoundly, as Burke (1969, p. 194-95) pointed out, nationalism is experienced as an on-going and quasi-sacred pact or 'partnership between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born' to honour the nation's achievements of the past, enrich those of the present, and make possible those of the future (also Renan, 1996).

Communitarians of our times invoke similar ideas but apply them to all meaningful communities, not solely to the nation. Hans-Georg Gadamer (2004, p. 435) speaks of a common 'horizon of experience', Alain de Benoist (1994, 263) a 'sense of belonging', Michael Sandel (2005, p. 258) a 'common vocabulary of discourse and a background of implicit practices and understandings'. Taylor (1994) calls for a 'politics of difference' that enables all significant communities to maintain their idiosyncrasies under 'the presumption of equal worth' and the 'ideal of authenticity' (Taylor, 1995, p. 233 & 234). Walzer (1983: 314) denounces the imposition of extraneous values on communities: 'Since there is no way to rank and order these worlds with respect to their understanding of social goods, we do justice to men and women by respecting their particular creations... To override those understandings is (always) to act unjustly'.

Diasporas of various sorts typically invoke communitarianism when pressing to preserve their distinct ways, especially when they appear to transgress or affront the dominant norms and values of the majority culture. In Europe, Muslims, more than any other minority community, seek exemptions from statute and convention by insisting on the right to be different (Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, p. 155, Rohe, 2005, Gresch, *et al.*, 2009). Take *halal* butchering, for example. The Islamic rite prohibits stunning the animal before slaughtering it. In 2002, the Federal Constitutional Court ruled that to guarantee freedom of religious expression, *halal* preparation of meats had to be permitted (though the *Bundestag* immediately responded with a kind of liberalism for animals by anchoring their protection from harm in the *Grundgesetz*, thereby tying the court's hands). In France and Britain the practice is permitted (Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, p. 55). When called on to justify such exemptions from statute, Muslims commonly enunciate two of the tenets of communitarianism: 1) the practice in question should be permitted because it is integral to the minority community (regardless of its reception in the wider society); and 2) only the diaspora should determine what is integral. Qatar-based cleric Youssef Al-Qaradaoui, who reaches millions of European Muslims via his programs carried by *al-Jazeera*, argues that only the organization which he heads, the Conseil Européen de la Recherche et de la Fatwa (www.islamophile.org/spip/-Conseil-Europeen-de-la-Recherche-.html), should determine what is and is not properly Islamic for Muslims living in the European diaspora. The *Koordinationsrat der Muslime in Deutschland* would appear to be heeding his advice. In its negotiations with the Ministry of Education to establish centers of Islamic Studies at the Universities of Tübingen, Münster and Osnabrück, which will train imams and religious education teachers, the council has insisted that Muslims and Muslims

alone should determine the professors and the content of what they teach (*Migration und Bevölkerung* February-March 2010). The Turkish government's Ministry of Religious Affairs (DITIB) has steadfastly demanded that it should have the sole prerogative to provide the curricula, materials, and teachers for Islamic instruction of Turkish pupils in European schools (Klausen, 2005, Fetzer & Soper, 2005).

Indeed, in efforts to shape the actions of their emigrants abroad, governments of sending countries have used diplomacy to become influential voices in Europe defending numerous aspects of transnationalism beyond retention of religious identity (Freeman and Ögelman, 1998). Turkish premiere Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, for instance, stirred up much discussion in visits to Germany in 2008 and again in 2011 by urging Turks to found Turkish *Gymnasien* in Germany like the German ones in Turkey. Receiving countries too have often embraced communitarian principles. This is true, moreover, not only of countries, like Sweden (Soininen, 1999) and the Netherlands (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007, Entzinger, 2003), which in the Seventies adopted official programs of multiculturalism. Often keen to assuage the mounting xenophobia of native populations, other governments instituted or tolerated forms of 'de facto multiculturalism' (Joppke & Morawsak, 2003, p. 8) with the argument that they were preparing immigrants to return to their homelands (Palidda, 2009, Gresch, *et al.*, 2009, Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, pp. 11-12 & 31-73, Entzinger, 2000). As was the case with the Kohl government's *Rückkehrpolitik* anchored in the *Gesetz zur Förderung der Rückkehrbereitschaft von Ausländern* of 1983, guestworkers had to be given the opportunity to maintain their native culture, language and ways (among their children as well, for instance, through specific classes in their own language at school) if they were to be induced to repatriate

(O'Brien, 1996, pp. 74-104). Despite having motivated relatively few immigrants to depart permanently, many elements of these programs of 'reintegration' in Germany and elsewhere have persisted to the present and play a significant role in sustaining transnational communities (Faist, 2000, Kastoryano, 2002, Caglar, 2001). Acceptance or toleration of dual nationality, which facilitates transnationalism, is on the rise across Europe (Hansen and Weil, 2002; Faist, 2007). In Germany it is officially *verboten* but the ban is rarely enforced (Hansen, 2003, p. 95)

The durable, conspicuous cultural diversity spawned from transnationalism has helped to generate a xenophobic backlash bent on protecting the majority culture. Over the past three decades, radical rightwing parties and personalities have regularly garnered between 10 and 25 percent of the popular vote across Europe. Their electoral success, moreover, has moved moderate parties of both the center right and left to propose or legislate measures aimed at reducing the number of immigrants and/or the rights and privileges which they enjoy (Givens, 2005, Gingrich and Banks, 2006, Messina, 2007). This was manifestly part of the political calculations that led in 1992 to the agreement between CDU and SPD to amend Article 16 of the constitution to make it more difficult for refugees to reach or reside in Germany (O'Brien, 1996, p. 107). The same holds for anti-immigrant legislation such as the British Nationality Act of 1981, Italy's Bossi-Fini Law of 2002, or the so-called Sarkozy Law of 2003, all of which sought to make it harder for would-be immigrants to enter the land and easier for resident aliens to be deported.

Well before but more intensely since 9/11, Muslims have become the favorite target of xenophobic antipathy. As early as 1968, Enoch Powell delivered his 'river of blood' speech presaging civil unrest if the tide of Muslims entering the United Kingdom

was not stemmed. A decade later, Margaret Thatcher brought this xenophobic perspective into the mainstream of British politics by complaining of a ‘swamping’ of things British by foreign elements. In 1982, maneuvering to become chancellor, Helmut Kohl asserted that ‘the number of foreigners must be reduced’. In the wake of Beur rioting in Lyons in October 1990, Valéry Giscard d’Estaing spoke of ‘the invasion of France’ and Jacques Chirac of an ‘overdose of immigration’. Even more alarmist are those who warn that Islamists are positioning themselves to form and dominate a future ‘Eurabia’ (Ye’or, 2002, Schwarzer, 2002, Ferguson, 2004, Ajami, 2004, Kepel, 2004, Bawer, 2006, Caldwell, 2009). Udo Ulfkotte (2003) limns the *Krieg in unseren Städten: Wie Islamisten Deutschland unterwandern*.

Leftists have denounced these xenophobic tendencies as ‘the new racism’, which substitutes cultural for biological differences and hierarchies (Baker, 1981, Stolke, 1995, Taguieff, 2001). I prefer the epithet ‘nativist nationalism’, for these movements and sentiments, though various in shape and content (Messina, 2007, p. 64), repose on the same founding notions of European nationalism that inform communitarianism. However, nativist nationalism places highest (even lone) moral priority on the nation and nation-state. On this view, history has demonstrated that, despite the efforts of democratic and totalitarian ideologies and regimes committed to cosmopolitanism, people insist (often with their lives) upon living in self-governing nation-states (Schnapper, 1998, 98-110; Huntington, 2004). Following Hegel (1953, pp. 50-52), a people organically bound together as a self-governing nation represents the highest political achievement of humankind, ‘the divine Idea as it exists on earth’. Hermann Lübke (1994, p. 38) concurs:

The ‘people’... which is the subject of constitutional authority in democracies, does not first acquire its identity from the constitution that it

gives itself. This identity is rather a preconstitutional, historical fact: thoroughly contingent, but not for that reason arbitrary...it is unavoidable for those who find that they belong to a particular people.

National solidarity and unity enable the smooth functioning of the political system. Börkenförde, for instance, has maintained that

a relative homogenization in a shared culture is needed...if the society which tends to become atomized is to be reunited into a unity capable of concerted action, in spite of being differentiated into a multiplicity of parts. This task is performed by the nation and its attendant national consciousness along with, and in succession to, religion...Thus the ultimate goal cannot be to overtake national identity and replace it with something else, not even with a universalism of human rights.
(*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 30 September 1995)

Similarly, British political philosopher David Miller avers that ‘without a common national identity, there is nothing to hold citizens together (Miller 1992, p. 94). ‘Nations are ethical communities...The duties we owe to our fellow-nationals are different from, and more extensive than, the duties we owe to humans as such’ (Miller, 2000, p. 27). Jörg Haider iterated a (perhaps distorted) version of Miller’s argument when he exclaimed: ‘the right of natives to *Heimat* is more important than the right of immigrants to family life’ (quoted in Fillitz, 2006, p. 143). With similar concerns in mind, the Danish political scientist Ole Wæver (1993, pp. 23-26) contends that ‘societal security’ should be granted equal priority alongside national and social security by nation-states. Societal security constitutes ‘the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats’. It entails ‘the sustainability...of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom’. It exists when a people does not have to fear that ‘we will no longer be able to live as “us”’. Essentially the same argument did the 15 German professors who published the *Heidelberg Manifesto* in 1982 advance:

Peoples are...living systems of a high order, each with its own systematic characteristics which are transmitted genetically and through tradition. For this reason the integration of large masses of non-German foreigners is impossible for the simultaneous preservation of our people, and leads to the well-known ethnic catastrophes of multicultural societies. (quoted in Chin, 2007, p 148)

The influential French professor, Dominique Schnapper (1998, 116) avers that

homogeneity of population is not enough to create a nation, but it is true that it favors the interaction of social life and a political society. This is why the formation of the nation was always accompanied by policies aimed at reducing particularisms, not only political, but cultural.

Something of the same logic informs the comments by Angela Merkel and David

Cameron to the effect that multiculturalism has failed ('and failed utterly,' according to the chancellor).

On this view, immigrants are to be tolerated only on condition that they assimilate to the majority culture. This outlook turns up in naturalization requirements that demand a manifestation of, say, 'Britishness' (quoted in Ryan, 2009, pp. 290-91), 'feeling Dutch' (quoted in Van Oers, 2009, p. 128) or a 'voluntary and lasting orientation toward Germany' (quoted in Hansen, 2003, 91). The French, of course, purport that their requirement of *assimilation à la communauté française* is based on the universal republican principles of the French Revolution. And yet, the web page of the Ministry of Justice instructs prospective applicants that they need to be 'well assimilated to the French customs and manners'. In practice, for instance, French officials are known to automatically deny naturalization to Muslims who observe the pious duty to pray five times daily at prescribed moments (Klausen, 2005, p. 21; on Denmark, see Mouritsen, 2006 and, on Italy, Triandafyllidou, 2006). In Germany, particularly before 2000, officials considered membership in an ethnic or Islamic association as grounds for denial

of naturalization (Hansen, 2003, p. 91). Is this trend likely to change, when the current Interior Minister, Hans-Peter Friedrich, asserts, as he did when assuming office in 2011, that '*Islam gehört nicht zu Deutschland*' (*Deutsche Welle* 30 March 2011)?

Nativist nationalism tends to exhibit an unmistakable propensity to view immigrants with suspicion as a potential threat to the well-being of the nation. The philosophy here retains some of the 'friend-foe' distinction in the thought of the German nationalist Carl Schmitt (1996). The Nazi enthusiast maintained that in order to overcome internal frictions – to treat one another as friends -- a folk needed to have a designated foe against whom to unite. Today around Europe that enemy designate is doubtless Muslims. Listen, for example, to Frits Bolkestein, erstwhile parliamentary leader of the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy: 'One must never underestimate the degree of hatred that Dutch people feel for Moroccan and Turkish immigrants. My political success is based on the fact that I was prepared to listen to such people' (quoted in Buruma, 2006, p. 64). Clifford Longley, in an editorial to the *Times* (8 July, 1989) entitled 'A very British lesson Muslims must learn', cautioned Islamic immigrants not to underestimate British resolve to protect their way of life: 'the white tribes of Britain can be every bit as stubborn and intransigent, and no less forceful in defense of their beliefs, as the brown tribes'. In 2010, *Bundesbank* board member Thilo Sarrazin (2010) made the bestseller list in Germany with his opprobrious claim that 'Germany is destroying itself' by allowing untold numbers of inassimilable Muslims to reside in the fatherland.

POSTMODERNISM

Postmodernism interprets xenophobia as confirmation of the inescapable and insurmountable cultural and political antagonisms endemic to the 'postmodern

condition' (Lyotard, 1984). Nationalism winsomely posits a hopelessly utopian and nostalgic dream world of cultural homogeneity. The only real community, claims Jean-Luc Nancy (1991), is 'the inoperative community'. Similarly, liberalism quixotically chases after universal principles despite the demonstrated futility of the ill-conceived endeavor (Gray, 1995, pp. 85-95). Etienne Balibar (2004, p. 201) insists

there can be no new 'Leviathan' that would regulate belief and officialize knowledge ('institute the truth,' as the modern state has done through its schools and universities), and there is even less possibility for a new 'civic religion' that would relativize 'traditional' or 'revealed' religions and relegate them to private choice.

Nietzsche sired postmodernism. It was his seminal insight that all truth claims are historically and contextually contingent. They cannot be universal because they are always views from a particular perspective – why Nietzsche (1968) labeled the idea 'perspectivism'. Heidegger, Wittgenstein and Merleau-Ponty in differing ways went on to explain tellingly how our particular perspective evolves from and is embedded in the day-to-day practice of our lives (Solomon, 1987, pp. 178-82). What the Frenchman termed 'prereflective consciousness' colors our understanding of the world, closing our eyes to some dimensions while opening them to others. No person or idea is above bias (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Charlotte Nordmann and Jérôme Vidal (2004), for example, contend that the very republicanism that French liberals lionize for its universalism is itself as much a product of a particular outlook and experience as the Islamic fundamentalism that republicans vilify. Schirin Amir-Moazami (2005, p. 271) has taken like aim at the purported 'neutrality' of Germany's brand of secularism. Across the channel, Bhikhu Parekh (2000, p. 13) underscores the contextual contingency that liberalism cannot overcome.

Liberalism is a substantive doctrine advocating a specific view of man, society and the world and embedded in and giving rise to a distinct way of life. As such it represents a particular cultural perspective and cannot provide a broad and impartial enough framework to conceptualise other cultures or their relations with it.

Though the two concepts share some similarities, postmodernism's perspectivism differs from nationalism's "rootedness." To begin with, nationalist tenets posit a single, hermetically sealed cultural homogeneity that gives holistic meaning and identity to those who live under its influence. Postmodernism, by contrast, maintains that persons are increasingly confronted with and simultaneously influenced by multiple, intersecting perspectives that undermine coherent experience. Whether they characterize it as 'schizophrenia' (Deleuze and Guatarri, 1987), *différance* (Derrida, 1991), 'being singular plural' (Nancy, 2000) 'together-in-difference' (Ang, 2001, p. 200) or 'many in one' (Balibar, 2004, p. 26), postmodern diagnosticians of unending and unexampled alterity and hybridity have something similar in mind to what Stuart Hall (1992, p. 277 & 287) describes:

The fully unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is a fantasy. Instead, as the systems of meaning and cultural representation multiply, we are confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities, any one of which we could identify with - at least temporarily...Modern nations are all cultural hybrids.

Immigration, in particular, creates an atmosphere of 'super-diversity' (Vertovec, 2007) that intensifies the 'instability and mutability of identities which are always unfinished, always being remade' (Gilroy, 1993, p. xi).

Postmodern theory furthermore reads into all truth claims an ineluctable political dimension – what Nietzsche (1968) diagnosed as the 'will to power'. Influenced by Edward Said's seminal *Orientalism* (1978), postcolonial scholars and many Muslim

organizations contend that the great hullabaloo over the alleged threat posed by Islam to European societies is less about the defense of freedom and equality and more about the deliberate demonization and continued domination of Muslims by Europeans (El Guindi, 1999, p. 184, Lamont, 2000, pp. 212-13, Schiffauer, 2007, p. 86, Scott, 2007, pp. 42-89, Sayyid, 2009, pp. 198-99). The '*Feindbild Islam*' (Naumann, 2010, p. 19) has deep roots in European history and feeds directly into the '*Islam-bashing für jedermann*' (Gerhold, 2010, p. 345) common in contemporary Europe. Particularly but not exclusively in Germany, one hears the analogous argument that Islamophobia represents a kind of new anti-Semitism (Benz, 2009). Turkish rags with a wide distribution in Germany, such as *Günaydin* or *Milliyet*, frequently refer to Turks as 'Germany's new Jews'.

Once all truth claims are exposed as ultimately contingent and self-serving, there can be no escape from the vicissitudes of politics into the reassuring certainty of metaphysics. 'Truth' or 'right' becomes nothing more than what has been made to pass for truth or right (Baudrillard, 1996, Fish, 1999). A case in point is Islamist organizations in Europe that persistently succeed in convincing their adherents of 'truths' deemed absurd by the European mainstream (Modood, 2002, pp. 121-22, Roy, 2004, p. 140). As far as citizenship is concerned, postmodernism conceptualizes it as neither an inalienable right anchored in universal ethics (or even in a legal constitution) nor a firm identity rooted in a nation. Citizenship is rather a political prize won through the 'perennial' give-and-take of politics (Cohen, 2009, p. 96-97). The politics of immigration, claims Werner Schiffauer (2007, p. 79), 'must almost by necessity lead to an agonising conflict-oriented *fight for recognition*'.

Because the outcomes of political contestations vary, citizenship is inherently protean, “plastic” (Konsta & Lazaridis, 2010) as well as ‘multi-layered’ (Yuval-Davis, 1999, 120). Thus, in addition to conventional (full) citizens, scholars have identified ‘dual citizens’ (Faist, 2007), ‘alien citizens’ (Bosniak, 2006), ‘hybrid citizens’ (Stasiulis, 2004), ‘fragmented’ citizens (Wiener, 1997), ‘semi-citizens’ (Cohen, 2009), ‘denizens’ (Hammar, 1990) and ‘margizens’ (Castles and Davidson, 2000). We are witnessing the ‘irregularization of immigration’ whereby increasing numbers of migrants do not have a formal or secure status (Engbergesen, 2001, 222). The ‘flexible’ nature of citizenship tends to foster instrumentalism. Increasingly individuals assume whatever available form of citizenship that produces the most advantage for them in a particular time and place (Ong, 1999; also Engbergesen, 2001). Virtually all sending countries honor dual citizenship, in part at least, as a way to keep much coveted remittances (estimated to be in the \$100 billions annually) pouring back into their economies (Vertovec, 2004; Freeman & Ögelman, 1998). Receiving countries have a documented track record of adeptly controlling migration to serve their perceived economic interests (Messina, 2007), including turning a blind eye to illegal immigration that supplies cheap labor to industry (Verstraete, 2003, p. 228; Schierup, Hansen and Castles 2006). In justifying his government’s introduction in 2005 of a “green card” program preferring select groups of migrants, Gerhard Schroeder crassly opined: ‘there are people we need and there are people who need us’. A year later Sarkozy contrasted desired *immigration choisie* and suffered *immigration subie* (a proposal actually first put forth by Socialists in 1998). Britain has had a Highly Skilled Migrant Program since January 2002.

The postmodern point, again, is that one's citizenship status necessarily results from political decisions subject to ceaseless contestation. Furthermore, these inescapable struggles are not confined to formal politics. Some stigmatized immigrants, like Muslims in Europe, even after naturalizing, suffer informal discrimination to an extent that they experience citizenship differently from unstigmatized 'fellow citizens' (Essed, 1991, Ong, 1999, Rumbaut, 2002, Brysk, 2004, Tibi, 2006, Phillips, 2006, Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul, 2008, Cohen, 2009). By the same token, stigmatized groups are far from powerless. Of course, they can and do protest through official channels. But typically in ethnic enclaves they often manage to establish countervailing conditions of *de facto* citizenship more favorable to them. A striking example of such self-customized citizenship comes from numerous areas in Europe with dense concentrations of Islamists where significant elements of *sharia* (for example, mandatory veiling or polygamy) are regularly practiced and enforced (Leitner and Ehrkamp, 2003, Roy, 2004, pp. 281-82, Kastoryano, 2006, pp. 66-67, Saharso, 2007). This type of conflicting claims to sovereignty became particularly poignant and salient during the Salman Rushdie Affair when the Muslim Parliament UK – a legal immigrant organization – issued a *fatwa* calling for the author's execution, and added that it intended to utilize every means at its disposal to carry out its law on British soil (Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005, p. 165). All of Europe witnessed again on September 11, 2001 just how radically different the mood, culture, and identity of such Islamist enclaves could be as some of their inhabitants cheered the destruction of the two towers while the rest of Europe commiserated with America. Indeed, some element of the plot appears to have been planned or prepared in Germany at the al-Quds mosque in Hamburg. Of course, these acts of defiance against

the West led to violent clashes between Muslims and non-Muslims. And there have, of course, been others, for instance, in Bradford, Burnley, Oldham in the summer of 2001 or following the murder of Theo van Gogh in 2004. These are the nastiest examples of what some deplore in the so-called 'parallel society' (Cantle, 2004). Hard-line postmodernists regret such degeneration of political difference into violence but warn that no one can devise a full-proof recipe to prevent it in a Hobbesian world lacking an overwhelming Leviathan to keep the peace (Gray, 1995, p. 90, Fish, 1999, p. 240). Just such Hobbesian postmodern candor did Tariq Modood (1990, p. 144) express when he called Muslims 'the group that British society is currently being forced to adjust to or defeat'. Most of Europe's cities, explain Diken and Lausten (2008, p. 245) contain an "Islamic ghetto" and are therefore "always already antagonistic. The city is an antagonism...that can only be united through fantasy." Youth fora in Berlin's Kreuzberg borough pose the open question '*Zusammenwachsen oder Zusammenprallen der Kulturen?*' (*Spiegel* 14 November 2005).

Not all (including Modood, 2006) believe postmodern politics has to be so starkly Hobbesian or necessarily result in the dreaded parallel society. Hospitable as opposed to Hobbesian postmodernism also offers no guarantee of harmony, neutrality, certainty or stability but refuses to jettison the possibility that rival parties adhering to fundamentally different worldviews can learn to interact with one another via mutually respectful and beneficial practices. Rushdie himself, for instance, encourages readers to celebrate 'hybridity, impurity, intermingling, the transformation that comes from new and unexpected combinations of human beings, cultures, ideas, politics, movies, songs' (quoted in Joppke, 1996, p. 488). Julia Kristeva (1991) argues that deep down we are

each of us strangers to ourselves – an unavoidable state of the human condition which, however, can be tapped to ease and encourage openness vis-à-vis foreigners. In order to reap the benefits of insurmountable difference, opposing parties must resist the tempting urge to denounce and dismiss one another. Richard Rorty (1989), for example, proscribes cruelty toward others. Kristeva (1991, pp. 75-76) adds oppression to the list of discouraged practices, Stuart Hall (2000, p. 232) ‘inferiorisation’. Chantal Mouffe (2000, p. 9) dubs her preferred manner of co-existence ‘agonistic pluralism’ in which differing parties come to see themselves not as Schmitt’s foes, but as ‘adversaries, adversaries being defined in a paradoxical way as “friendly enemies”, that is, persons who are friends because they share a common symbolic space but also enemies because they want to organize this common symbolic space in a different way’. Balibar (2004, p. 76) urges ‘citizenship without community’, while Romand Coles (2005, p. xiii) endorses ‘a democratic ethos that cultivates tension-dwelling’. ‘Such a starting point’, Ash Amin (2004, p. 4) envisages, ‘suggests that empathy/engagement with the stranger could become the essence of what it is to be “European”’.

Hospitable postmodern encounters must be open-ended, totally void of unquestionable presumptions and foregone conclusions. No topic, no perspective may be considered taboo. Indeed, the legitimacy of the very ground rules of the meetings must remain open to debate (Lefort, 1988, p. 39). Hilmar Hoffmann, Cultural Minister for the city of Frankfurt, underscores that deep diversity ‘makes any all-inclusive ideology, religion, or worldview impossible... Whoever merely speaks of the preservation of a cultural identity, be it of Germans or foreigners, misunderstands the *dynamic character* of the cultural [exchange] process’ (quoted in Chin, 2007, p. 213). Parekh (2008, p. 52),

who headed the Runnymede Trust Commission, explains: ‘since every dominant group tends to impose the principles of justice that serve to legitimize its domination, we need to counter it by seeking out those it marginalizes or silences and ensuring their adequate representation in deliberative bodies’. Lacking consensus on principles, such bodies should seek a ‘pragmatic, case-by-case, negotiated approach to dealing with controversy and conflict: not an ideological, “drawing a line in the sand” mentality’ (Modood, 2009, p. 180). Indeed, studies reveal that across Europe Muslims and non-Muslims more often than not do manage to find pragmatic solutions to the conflicts that divide them (Liederman, 2000, Modood and Kastoryano, 2006, pp. 174-75, Mushaben, 2007, Faist, 2009, Korteweg and Yurdakul, 2009, Wise and Velayutham, 2009). Sadly, such commonplace accommodations between parents and teachers, workers and bosses, imams and ministers do not receive the media coverage given to the less frequent conflicts that elude resolution.

CONCLUSION

Schain (2008), like Freeman (2004) and Schierup, Hansen and Castles (2006) cited in the introduction, underscores the messiness of immigration policies. In his transatlantic comparative study he finds a ‘contradiction of policies in different arenas’ (276) that governments regularly and quite knowingly, if tacitly, tolerate (283). Such glaring inconsistencies, he avers, ‘reflect the complexities of the democratic political process’ (Schain, 2008, p. 275). This paper has tried to show that normative discord represents a critical element of the political process. But more than mere philosophical discord between liberalism, particularism and postmodernism is at work. In politics, as opposed to philosophy seminars, what I call “normative fragmentation” is equally or even more

important. Most political actors, as we have seen, deploy but fragments of the grander theories. When detached from the parent theory, fragments are used by political agents with little or no regard for logical consistency. Indeed, the fragments do not in the detached form come across as contradictions but rather as moral legitimizations apropos for a particular political setting or argument. Normative fragmentation or muddle permeates political rhetoric and from there finds its way into policy itself. It is important to realize, however, that the intense normative fragmentation depicted above would not be possible in the absence of the deeper philosophical discord separating the three public philosophies, that is, the incompatibility and incommensurability underscored by Berlin (and augmented by me with regard to postmodernism). The clashing of the three public philosophies at the level of pure theory yields sharper shards that make the battles on the ground both fiercer and messier than they would be in the absence of the theoretical conflict. If virtually all significant political actors in the politics of immigration were committed liberals, as some analyses of the 1970s contend was largely the case (Schierup, Hansen and Castles 2006, p. 28, Messina, 2007, pp. 188-89), they would still debate how best to integrate Muslim newcomers, some, for instance, siding with a stronger others with a weaker role for the state to play in socializing migrants to liberal values. The nature of the conflict changes altogether when actors enter the field outfitted with nationalist normative artillery campaigning that the newcomers should be deported as opposed to integrated. The intensity of the fighting raises yet another level when newcomers wielding postmodern weapons claim that they plan to stay whether welcome or not and have no intention of adopting the predominant norms and values of what they see as a ravagingly cruel society. Moreover, as we have seen, the politicking takes place

within a fully internationalized normative political landscape in which actors are keenly aware of what is happening and being argued in countries beyond their own. For this reason, it is becoming increasingly problematic to talk of German immigration politics and policy in the sense of being distinct, say, from French or British despite the prominence of this nation-state, path-dependency approach in the field of immigration studies (Brubaker, 1992, Joppke, 1996, Koopmans, *et al.*, 2005). Normatively speaking, the discourse is fully internationalized. It, furthermore, is the continuation of an inveterate *intra-civilizational Kulturkampf* (contra Huntington's *inter-civilizational* 'clash' thesis) the appreciation of which can help us better to comprehend "the bewildering diversity" (Bader 2007, p. 26) of immigration policies and politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ajami, F. (2004) 'The Moor's Last Laugh: Radical Islam Finds a Haven in Europe', *Wall Street Journal* 22 March.
- Aleinikoff, T.A. and Klusmeyer, D. (2002) *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*. Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Alesina A, Glaeser E. (2004) *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, Ash (2004) 'Multiethnicity and the Idea of Europe'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 21(2): 1-24.
- Amir-Moazami, S. (2005) 'Muslim Challenges to the Secular Consensus: A German Case Study', *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 13/3.
- Amir Moazami, S (2011) 'Muslims in Germany: Pitfalls of Consensus Oriented Dialogue Models and Practices'. Paper presented at the conference 'Religion and Society in the Twenty-first Century'. Dahlem Humanities Center – Free University of Berlin. Berlin, 5 May.
- Anderson, C.J. (1996) 'Economics, Politics, and Foreigners: Populist Party Support in Denmark and Norway', *Electoral Studies* 15(4): 497-511.
- Ang, I. *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Asad, T. (2003) *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bader, V. (1995) 'Citizenship and Exclusion: Radical Democracy, Community, and Justice. Or, What is Wrong with Communitarianism?', *Political Theory* 23(20): 211-46.
- Bader, V. (2007) *Democracy or Secularism? Associational Governance of Religious Diversity*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

- Baker, M. (1981) *The New Racism*. London: Junction Books.
- Balibar, E. (2004) *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Barber, B. (1984) *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barry, B. (2000) *Culture and Equality*. Oxford: Polity.
- Bauböck, R. (1994) *Transnational Citizenship: Membership and Rights in International Migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Bauböck, R. (2002) 'Cultural Minority Rights in Public Education: Religious and Language Instruction for Immigrant Communities in Western Europe', in A. Messina, (ed.) *West European Immigration and Immigrant Policy in the New Century*, pp. 161-89. Westport: Praeger.
- Baudrillard, J. (1996) *The Perfect Crime*, trans. C. Turner. London: Verso.
- Bawer, B. (2006) *While Europe Slept: How Radical Islam Is Destroying the West from within*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Beck, U. & Grande, E. (2007) *Cosmopolitan Europe*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Benhabib, S. (2004) *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2005) 'Border, Boundaries, and Citizenship', *Political Science and Politics* 38(4): 673-78.
- Benoist, A. de. (1994) 'Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft: A Sociological View of the Decay of Modern Society', *Mankind Quarterly* 34(4): 263.
- Benz, W. (ed.) (2009) *Islamfeindschaft und ihr Kontext: Dokumentation der Konferenz Feindbild Muslim-Feindbild Jude*. Berlin: Metropol.
- Berghe, P. (1979) *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier.
- Berlin, I. (1979) *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*. London: Hogarth.
- Berlin, I. (1980) *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas*. London: Chatto & Windis.
- Berlin, I. (1998) 'On Pluralism', *New York Review of Books* XLV(8).
- Bielefeldt, H. (2007) *Menschenrechte in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: Plädoyer für einen aufgeklärten Multikulturalismus*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- Bleich, E. (2003) *Race Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloemraad, I, Korteweg, A. & Yurdakul, G. (2008) 'Citizenship and Integration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State', *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 153-79.
- Börkenförde, E-W. (1995) "Die Nation." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. 30 September.
- Bosniak, L. (2006) *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brubaker, W.R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, W.R. (2001) 'The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and Its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24: 531-47.

- Brysk, A. (2004) 'Children across Borders: Patrimony, Property, or Persons?' in A. Brysk & G. Shafir (eds.) *People Out of Place: Globalization, Human Rights and the Citizenship Gap*, pp. 153-76. New York: Routledge.
- Brysk, A. & Shafir, G. (eds.) (2004) *People Out of Place: Globalization, Human Rights and the Citizenship Gap*. New York: Routledge.
- Buchstein, H. (1995) 'Die Zumutungen der Demokratie. Von der normativen Theorie des Buergers zur institutionell vermittelten Praeferenzkompetenz', *Politische Vierteljahresschrift Sonderheft 26, Politische Theorien in der Aera der Transformation*: 295–324.
- Burke, E. (1969) *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Buruma, I. (2006) *Murder in Amsterdam*. New York: Penguin.
- Caglar, A. (2001) 'Constraining Metaphors and the Transnationalisation of Spaces in Berlin', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27(4): 601–13.
- Caldwell, C. (2009) *Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*. New York: Doubleday.
- Cantle, T. (2004) *The End of Parallel Lives? The Report of the Community Cohesion Panel*. London: Home Office.
- Carens, J. (1987) 'Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders', *Review of Politics* 49(2): 251-73.
- Castells, M. (1975) 'Immigrant Workers and Class Struggles in Advanced Capitalism: The West European Experience', *Politics and Society*, 5: 33-66.
- Castles, S. *et al.* (1984) *Here for Good*. London: Pluto Press.
- Castles, S. and A. Davidson. (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. London: Routledge.
- Cesari, J. (2004) *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and the United States*. New York: Palgrave.
- Chin, R. (2007) *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Çileli, S. (2006) *Wir sind eure Töchter, nicht eure Ehre*. Munich: Blanvalet.
- Cohen, E. (2009) *Semi-Citizenship in Democratic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coles, R. (2005) *Beyond Gated Politics: Reflections for the Possibility of Democracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Connolly, W. (1993) *The Terms of Political Discourse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Crick, B. (1999) 'The Presuppositions of Citizenship Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33(3): 337-52.
- Delanty, G. (2009) *Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Social Critical Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*. Trans. G.C. Spivak. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1991) 'Différance', in P. Kamuf, (ed.) *A Derrida Reader*, pp. 59-79. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Diken, B. and Lausten, C. (2008) 'Nomadism and the Ghetto'. In P. Mouritsen and K. Jørgensen (eds.) *Constituting Communities: Political Solutions to Cultural Conflict*, pp. 236-52. New York: Palgrave.
- Dirie, W. (1999) *Desert Flower: The Extraordinary Journey of a Desert Nomad*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- El Guindi, F. (1999) *Veil: Modesty, Privacy and Resistance*. Oxford: Berg.
- Engbersen, G. (2001) 'The Unanticipated Consequences of Panopticon Europe: Residence Strategies for Illegal Immigrants', in V. Guiraudon & C. Joppke (eds.) *Controlling a New Migration World*, pp. 223-46. London: Routledge.
- Entzinger, H. (2003) 'The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism: The Case of the Netherlands', in C. Joppke & E. Morawska (eds.) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, pp. 59-86. New York: Palgrave.
- Entzinger, H. (2000) 'The Dynamics of Integration Policies: A Multidimensional Model', in R. Koopmans and P. Statham (eds.) *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics*, pp. 97-118. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Essed, P. (1991) *Understanding Everyday Racism*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Faist T. (2000) 'Transnationalization in international migration: implications for the study of citizenship and culture', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(2):189-222.
- Faist T. (ed.) (2007) *Dual Citizenship in Europe: From Nationhood to Societal Integration*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Faist, T. (2009) 'Diversity – a New Mode of Incorporation?' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(1): 171-90.
- Fallaci, O. (2006) *The Force of Reason*. New York: Rizzoli International.
- Favell, A. (1998) *Philosophies of Integration*. London: Macmillan.
- Ferguson, N. (2004) 'Eurabia?', *New York Times*, 4 April, 2004.
- Ferrero-Turrión, R. & Pinyol-Jiménez, G. (2009) 'Immigration and the Construction of Public Philosophy(ies) of Integration in Spain', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 337-6. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Ferry, J-M. (1991) *Les puissances de l'expérience*. Paris: Cerf.
- Fetzer, J. & Soper, J. (2005) *Muslims and the State in Britain, France, and Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fillitz, T. (2006) 'Being the Native's Friend Does Not Make You the Foreigner's Enemy! Neo-nationalism, the Freedom Party and Jörg Haider in Austria', in A. Gingrich & M. Banks (eds.) *Neo-Nationalism in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from Social Anthropology*, pp. 138-61. New York: Berghahn.
- Fish, S. (1999) *The Trouble with Principle*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, (eds.) G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fournier, P. & Yurdakul, G. (2006) 'Unveiling Distribution: Muslim Women with Headscarves in France and Germany', in G. Yurdakul & Y.M. Bodemann (eds.) *Migration, Citizenship, Ethnos*, pp. 167-84. New York: Palgrave.
- Freeman, G. (1995) 'Modes of Immigration Politics in Liberal Democratic States', *International Migration Review* 29(4): 881-92.

- Freeman, G. (2004) 'Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies', *International Migration Review* 38(146): 945-69.
- Freeman, G. & Ögelman, N. (1998) 'Homeland Citizenship Policies and the Status of Third Country Nationals in the European Union', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 24(4): 769-88.
- Gadamer, H-G. (2004) *Truth and Method*. London: Continuum Books.
- Geddes, A. (2000) 'Thin Europeanisation: The Social Rights of Migrants in an Integrating Europe', in M. Bommers and A. Geddes (eds.) *Immigration and Welfare: Challenging the Borders of the Welfare State*. Pp. 209-26. London: Routledge.
- Gerhold, M. (2010) 'Islam-bashing für jedermann. Leserbriefe und Onlinekommentare als Orte privater Stimmungsmache'. In T. Schneiders, (ed.). *Islamfeindlichkeit: Wenn die Grenzen der Kritik verschwimmen*, pp. 345-54. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Gilroy, P. (1993) *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gingrich, A. & Banks, M. (2006) *Neo-Nationalism in Europe and Beyond*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Givens, T. (2005) *Voting Radical Right in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givens, T. & Luedtke, A. (2005) 'European Immigration Policies in Comparative Perspective: Issue Salience, Partisanship and Immigrant Rights', *Comparative European Politics* 3: 1-22.
- Goldberg, A. & Sauer, M. (2003) *Konstanz und Wandel der Lebenssituation türkischstämmiger Migranten in Nordrhein-Westfalen*. Essen: Zentrum für Türkeistudien.
- Gray, J. (1995) *Liberalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gresch, N., et al. (2008) 'Tu felix Austria? The Headscarf and the Politics of "non-Issues"', *Social Politics* 15(4): 411-32.
- Groot, G-R.de, Kuipers, J-J., Weber, F. (2009) 'Passing Citizenship Tests as a Requirement for Naturalization: A Comparative Perspective,' in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, & S. Carrera (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 51-78. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Guild, E., Groenendijk, K., & Carrera, S. (2009) 'Understanding the Contest of Community: Illiberal Practices in the EU?', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*. Pp. 1-28. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (2004) *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1983) *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. C. Lenhardt & S. Weber Nicholsen. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (1992) 'Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe', *Praxis International* 12(1): 1-19.
- Habermas, J. (1998) *The Inclusion of the Other*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas J. (2003) *The Future of Human Nature*. London: Polity.
- Hall, P. (1986) *Governing the Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, S. (1992) 'The Question of Cultural Identity', in S. Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (eds.) *Modernity and its Futures*, pp. 274-325. Cambridge: Polity.

- Hall, S. (2000) 'Conclusion: The Multi-cultural Question', in: B. Hesser (ed.) *Un/settled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions*. Pp. 209-41. London: Zed.
- Hammar, T. (1990) *Democracy and the Nation State*. London: Gower.
- Hansen, R. (2003) 'Citizenship and Integration in Europe', in: C. Joppke and E. Morawska (eds.) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, pp. 87-109. New York: Palgrave,
- Hansen, R. and Weil, P. (2002) 'Dual Citizenship in a Changed World: Immigration, Gender and Social Rights', in Randall Hansen and Patrick Weil (eds.) *Dual Nationality: Social Rights and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe*, pp. 1-15. New York: Berghahn.
- Hargreaves, A. (2007) *Multi-Ethnic France: Immigration, Politics, Culture, and Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Hegel, G.F. (1953) *Reason in History: A General Introduction to the Philosophy of History*, trans. R. Hartman. New York: Bobbs-Merill.
- Heidegger, M. (1962) *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper and Row.
- Held, D. (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Herder, J.G. (1877-1913) *Sämtliche Werke*, B. Suphan (ed). Berlin: Hildesheim Olms.
- Hirsi Ali, A. (2006) *The Caged Virgin: An Emancipation Proclamation for Women & Islam*. New York: Free Press.
- Hollifield, J. (1992) *Immigrants, Markets, and States: The Political Economy of Postwar Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holmes, D. (2000) *Integral Europe: Fast-Capitalism, Multiculturalism, Neofascism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1993) 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs* 72(3): 22-49.
- Huntington, S. (2004) *Who Are We?* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jacobson, D. (1996) *Rights across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Joppke, C. (1996) 'Multiculturalism and Immigration: A Comparison of the United States, Germany, and Great Britain', *Theory and Society*, (August): 449-500.
- Joppke, C. (2001) 'The Legal-Domestic Sources of Immigrant Rights: The United States, Germany, and the European Union', *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(4): 339-66.
- Joppke, C. (2004) 'The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy', *British Journal of Sociology* 55(2): 237-57.
- Joppke, C. (2007) 'Transformation of Immigrant Integration: Civic Integration and Antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France and Germany', *World Politics* 59(2): 243-75.
- Joppke, C. (2009) *Veil: Mirror of Identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Joppke, C. and Morawska, E. (2003) 'Integrating Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States: Policies and Practices', in C. Joppke & E. Morawska (eds.) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, pp. 1-36. New York: Palgrave.
- Kant, I. (1959) *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Kastoryano, R. 2002. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Kelek, N. (2005) *Die fremde Braut: Ein Bericht aus dem Innern des türkischen Lebens in Deutschland*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- Kepel, G. (2004) *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kezjar, B. (2009) 'Dual Citizenship as an Element of the Integration Process in Receiving Countries: The Case of Slovenia', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 131-47. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Klausen, J. (2005) *The Islamic Challenge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klausen, J. (2009) *The Cartoons That Shook the World*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Konsta, A. and Lazaridis, G. (2010) 'Civic Stratification, "Plastic" Citizenship and "Plastic Subjectivities" in Greek Immigration Policy', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 11(4): 365-82.
- Koopmans, R., et al. (2005) *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Korteweg, A. and Yurdakul, G. (2009) 'Islam, Gender, and Immigrant Integration: Boundary Drawing in Discourses on Honour Killing in the Netherlands and Germany'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(2): 218-38.
- Kostakopoulou, D. (2001) *Citizenship, Identity and Immigration in the European Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kostakopoulou, D., Carrera, S., and Jesse, M. (2009) 'Doing and Deserving: Competing Frames of Integration in the EU', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 167-88. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Kriese, H. et al. (1995) *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1991) *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. L. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laborde, C. (2002) 'From Constitutional to Civic Patriotism', *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(4): 591-612.
- Lamont, M. (2000) *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lefort, C. (1988) *Democracy and Political Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Leitner H, Ehrkamp P. (2003) 'Beyond National Citizenship: Turkish Immigrants and the (Re)Construction of Citizenship in Germany', *Urban Geography* 24(2): 127-46.
- Liederman, L.M. (2000) 'Pluralism in Education: The Display of Islamic Affiliation in French and British Schools', *Islam and Christian Muslim Relations* 11(1): 105-17.
- Lowi, T. (1969) *The End of Liberalism*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1969.
- Lübbe, Hermann (1994). *Abschied vom Superstaat. Vereinigte Staaten von Europa wird es nicht geben*. Berlin: Siedler.

- Lyotard, J-F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. G. Bennington & B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Macedo, S. (2000) *Diversity and Distrust: Civic Education in a Multicultural Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981) *After Virtue*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mann, M. (1987) 'Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship', *Sociology* 21: 339-354.
- Mayer, N. (1999) *Français qui votent Front National*. Paris: Librairie-Ernest-Flammarion.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962) *The Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. C. Smith. New York: Humanities Press.
- Messina, A. (2007) *The Logics and Politics of Post-WWII Migration to Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, D. (1992) 'Community and Citizenship', in S. Avineri & A. de Shalit (eds.) *Communitarianism and Individualism*, pp. 85-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, D. (2000) *Citizenship and National Identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Modood, T. (1990) 'British Asian Muslims and the Rushdie Affair', *Political Quarterly* 61(2)
- Modood, T. (2002) 'The Place of Muslims in British Secular Multiculturalism', in N. AlSayyad, M. Castells (eds.) *Muslim Europe or Euro-Islam: Politics, Culture, and Citizenship in the Age of Globalization*, pp. 113-30. Lanham: Lexington.
- Modood, T. (2006) 'British Muslims and the Politics of Multiculturalism', in Modood, T., Triandafyllidou, A., Zapata-Barrero, R. (eds.) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, pp. 37-56. London: Routledge.
- Modood, T. (2009) 'Muslims, Religious Equality and Secularism', in G. B. Levey and T. Modood (eds.) *Secularism, Religion and Multicultural Citizenship*, pp. 164-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Modood, T., Kastoryano, R. (2006) 'Secularism and the Accommodation of Muslims in Europe', in Modood, T., Triandafyllidou, A., Zapata-Barrero, R. (eds.) 2006. *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, pp. 162-78. London: Routledge.
- Modood, T., Triandafyllidou, A., Zapata-Barrero, R. eds. (2006) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Money, J. (1999) *Fences and Neighbors: The Political Geography of Immigration Control*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Monsma, S. and Soper, C. (2009) *The Challenge of Pluralism: Church and State in Five Democracies*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Montesquieu, C-L. (1989) *The Spirit of the Laws*, (eds.) A. Cohler, B. Miller, & H. Stone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mouritsen, P. (2006) 'The Particular Universalism of a Nordic Civic Nation: Common Values, State Religion and Islam in Danish Political Culture', in Modood, T., Triandafyllidou, A., Zapata-Barrero, R. (eds.) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, pp. 70-93. London: Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (2000) *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.
- Mushaben, J. (2007) Islam, Sex and the City: Quality of Life Issues in Multi-Cultural Berlin. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the German Studies Association. San Diego, 5 October.

- Nancy, J-L. (1991) *The Inoperative Community*, trans. P. Connor, et al. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nancy, J-L. (2000) *Being Singular Plural*, trans. R. Richardson & A. O'Byrne. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Naumann, T. (2010) 'Feinbild Islam – Historische und theologische Gründe einer europäischen Angst'. In T. Schneiders, (ed.). *Islamfeindlichkeit: Wenn die Grenzen der Kritik verschwimmen*, pp. 19-36. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Nielsen, J. (2007) 'The Question of Euro-Islam: Restriction or Opportunity', in A. Al-Azmeh & E. Fokas (eds.) *Islam in Europe: Diversity, Identity and Influence*, pp. 34-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1968) *The Will to Power*, trans. W. Kaufmann & R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books.
- Nordmann, C. & Vidal, J. (2004) 'La République à l'épreuve des discriminations', in C. Nordmann (ed.) *Le foulard islamique en questions*, pp. 1-11. Paris: Editions Amsterdam.
- O'Brien, P. (1993) 'Islam vs. Liberalism in Europe', *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 10(3): 367-81.
- O'Brien, P. (1996) *Beyond the Swastika*. London: Routledge.
- O'Brien, P. (2009) 'Making (Normative) Sense of the Headscarf Debate in Europe', *German Politics and Society* 27(3): 50-76.
- Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Palidda, S. (2009) 'Insertion, Integration and Rejection of Immigration in Italy', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 357-72. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Parekh, B. (2000) *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press.
- Parekh, B. (2006) 'Europe, Liberalism and the "Muslim Question"', In Modood, T., Triandafyllidou, A., Zapata-Barrero, R. (eds.) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, pp. 179-203. London: Routledge.
- Parekh, B. (2008) *A New Politics of Identity: Political Principles for an Interdependent World*. New York: Palgrave.
- Phalet, K. van Lotringen, C. & Entzinger, H. (2000) *Islam in de multiculturele samenleving. Opvatingen van jongeren in Rotterdam*. Utrecht: ERCOMER.
- Phillips, T. (2006) 'Parallel Lives? Challenging Discourses of British Muslim Self-segregation', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24(1): 25-40.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (1975) *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ramadan, T. (2004) *Western Muslims and the Future of Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Rawls, J. (1987) 'The Idea of an Overlapping Consensus', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 7(1): 1-25.
- Raz, J. (1994) *Ethics in the Public Domain*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Renan, E. (1996) 'What Is a Nation?', in G. Eley & R. Grigor Suny (eds.) *Becoming National: A Reader*, pp. 42-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rex, J. and Drury, B. (eds.) (1994) *Ethnic Mobilisation in a Multicultural Europe*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Rex, J. (1996) *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State*. Houndmills/Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Rohe, M. (2005) 'The Legal Treatment of Muslims in Germany.' Paper presented to the joint conference of the German Marshall Fund and the European Forum for Migration Studies at Bamberg University entitled "The Role of Religion for Integration," Berlin, 25 November.
- Rorty, R. (1989) *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, M.H. (2007) *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rousseau, J.J. (1967) *The Social Contract and the Discourse on Inequality*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Roy, O. (2004) *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Roy, O. (2007) *Secularism Confronts Islam*, trans. George Holoch. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rubio-Marin, R. (2000) *Immigration as a Democratic Challenge: Citizenship and Inclusion in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rumbaut R. (2002) 'Severed or Sustained Attachments? Language, Identity, and Imagined Communities in the post-Immigrant Generation', in P. Levitt & M.C. Waters (eds.) *The Changing Face of Home: The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*, pp. 43-95. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ryan, B. (2009) 'The Integration Agenda in British Migration Law', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds.) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 277-98. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Saharso, S. (2007) 'Headscarves: A Comparison of Public Thought and Public Policy in Germany and the Netherlands', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10(4): 513-50.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Sandel, M. (2005) *Public Philosophy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sarrazin, T. (2010). *Deutschland schafft sich ab: Wie wir unser Land aufs Spiel setzen*. Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Sayyid, S. (2009) 'Contemporary Politics of Secularism', in G.B. Levey and T. Modood (eds.) *Secularism, Religion and Multicultural Citizenship*, pp. 186-99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schain, M. (2008) *The Politics of Immigration in France, Britain, and the United States: A Comparative Study*. New York: Palgrave.
- Schäuble, W. (2009) *Braucht unsere Gesellschaft Religion? – Vom Wert des Glaubens*. Berlin: Berlin University Press.
- Scheffer, P. (2008) *Die Eingewanderten. Toleranz in einer grenzenlosen Welt*. Munich: Hanser.
- Schierup, C-U., Hansen, P. and Castles, S. (2006) *Migration, Citizenship, and the European Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Schiffauer, W. (2007) 'From Exile to Diaspora: The Development of Transnational Islam in Europe', in A. Al-Azmeh & E. Fokas (eds.) *Islam in Europe: Diversity, Identity and Influence*, pp. 68-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, C. (1996) *The Concept of the Political*, trans. G. Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schnabel, P. (1999) *De multiculturele illusive – Een pleidooi voor aanpassing en assimilatie* Utrecht: Forum.
- Schnapper, D. (1998) *Community of Citizens: On the Modern Idea of Nationality*, trans. S. Rosée. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Schwarzer, A. (ed.) (2002) *Die Gotteskrieger und die falsche Toleranz*. Cologne: Kieperheuer & Witsch.
- Scott, J. (2007) *The Politics of the Veil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Simon, J. (1989) *The Economic Consequences of Immigration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Smith, A. (1991) *National Identity*. London: Penguin.
- Smith, R. (1999) *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sniderman, P. & Hagendoorn, L. (2007) *When Ways of Life Collide: Multiculturalism and Its Discontents in the Netherlands*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sniderman, P. & Hagendoorn, L. & Prior, M. (2004) 'Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities', *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 35-49.
- Soininen, M. (1999) 'The "Swedish Model" as an Institutional Framework for Immigrant Membership Rights', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 25(4): 685-702.
- Solomon, R.C. (1987) *From Hegel to Existentialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Soysal, Y. (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spinner-Halev, J. (1999) 'Cultural Pluralism and Partial Citizenship', in C. Joppke & S. Lukes (eds.) *Multicultural Questions*, pp. 65-85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stasiulis, D. 2004. 'Hybrid Citizenship and What's Left', *Citizenship Studies* 8(3): 295-303.
- Stolcke, V. (1995) 'Talking Culture: New Boundaries of Exclusion in Europe', *Current Anthropology* 36(4).
- Taguieff, P.A. (2001) *The Force of Prejudice: On Racism and Its Doubles*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tassin, E. (1994) 'Identités nationales et citoyenneté politique', *Esprit* 198: 97-111.
- Taylor, C. (1994) *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1995) *Philosophical Arguments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Thaa, W. (2001) "'Lean Citizenship": The Fading Away of the Political in Transnational Democracy', *European Journal of International Relations* 7(4): 503-23.
- Tibi, B. (2002) 'Muslim Migrants in Europe: Between Euro-Islam and Ghettoization', in N. AlSayyad & M. Castells (eds.) *Muslim Europe or Euro-Islam: Politics, Culture, and Citizenship in the Age of Globalization*, pp. 37-38. New York: Lexington Books.

- Tibi, B. (2006) 'Europeanizing Islam or the Islamization of Europe: Political Democracy vs. Cultural Difference', in T. Brynes and P. Katzenstein (eds.) *Religion in an Expanding Europe*, pp. 204-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tichenor, D. (2002) *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2006) 'Religious Diversity and Multiculturalism in Southern Europe: The Italian Mosque Debate', in T. Modood, A. Triandafyllidou, R. Zapata-Barrero (eds.) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, pp. 116-42. London: Routledge.
- Tribalat, M. (1996) *De l'immigration à l'assimilation*. Paris: La Decouverte.
- Ulfkotte, U. (2003) *Der Krieg in unseren Städten. Wie Islamisten Deutschland unterwandern*. Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn.
- Van Oers, R. (2009) 'Justifying Citizenship Tests in the Netherlands and the UK', in E. Guild, K. Groenendijk, S. Carrera (eds) *Illiberal Liberal States: Immigration, Citizenship and Integration in the EU*, pp. 113-30. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Verstraete, G. (2003) 'Technological Frontiers and the Politics of Mobility in the European Union', in S. Ahmed, et al. (eds) *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*, pp. 225-49. Oxford: Berg.
- Vertovec, S. (2004) 'Migrant Transnationalism and Modes of Transformation', *International Migration Review* 38(3): 970-1001.
- Vertovec, S. (2007) 'Super-diversity and Its Implications', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6): 1024-54.
- Vico, G. (1948) *New Science*, trans. T.G. Bergin & M.H. Fisch. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Viroli, M. (1997) *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Waeber, O. (1993) 'Societal Security: the Concept', in O. Waeber, et al. (eds.) *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*, pp. 23-26. London: Palgrave.
- Waeber, O., et al. (eds.) *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. London: Palgrave.
- Walzer, M. (1983) *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Warner, C. and Wenner, M. (2006) 'Religion and the Political Organization of Muslims in Europe', *Perspectives on Politics* 4(3): 457-79.
- Weber, M. (1949) "'Objectivity" in Social Science and Social Policy', in E. Shils & H. Finch (eds.) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, pp. 72-111. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Weiner, A. (1997) 'Making Sense of the New Geography of Citizenship: Fragmented Citizenship in the European Union', *Theory and Society*, 26: 529-60.
- Wise, A. and Velayutham, S. (eds.) (2009) *Everyday Multiculturalism*. London: Palgrave.
- Ye'or, B. (2002) *Islam and Dhimmitude: Where Civilizations Collide*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958) *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G.E.M. Anscombe. New York: Macmillan.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999) 'Multi-layered Citizenship in the Era of "Globalization"', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1(1): 119-37.