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ABSTRACT

The discussion surrounding Islam’s place in Germany is far from new; Islam is the third largest religious tradition in Europe, trailing Protestantism and Catholicism. Germany and France have the highest population percentage of Muslims in Europe and the highest population percentage of Turkish immigrants in Western Europe. This conversation, naturally, is not a one-sided, xenophobic, anti-Islam one. It is multi-faceted and includes the Muslims targeted in the aforementioned hate-crimes. However, this paper is concerned with the nationalistic, xenophobic, anti-Islam sentiments and the ways in which those sentiments manifest in German society. The focus on a specific subset of German nationalists enables one to begin to unpack the roots of the issues nationalists have with Islam. The German nationalists in this paper view themselves as the spokespeople for all Germans, individuals who fit into a white, Christo-centric understanding of German-ness. German nationalists conceive of the visibility of Islam in Germany (minarets, mosques, headscarves, etc.) as a direct challenge to German and Western European culture, values, and ideals. German nationalists, therefore, racialize Muslims as a dangerous demographic who refuse to, or are incapable of, assimilation or integration into German culture and threaten to upend and eventually destroy an idealized German identity.
Introduction:

In 2017 alone, Germany suffered almost 1000 anti-Islam or anti-Muslim hate-crimes.¹ On March 16, 2018, German Interior Minister Horst Seehofer said, “Islam does not belong to Germany... Germany is shaped through Christianity... but of course the Muslims who live with us belong to Germany.”² The discussion surrounding Islam’s place in Germany is far from new; Islam is the third largest religious tradition in Europe, trailing Protestantism and Catholicism.³ Germany and France have the highest population percentage of Muslims in Europe and the highest population percentage of Turkish immigrants in Western Europe.⁴ This conversation, naturally, is not a one-sided, xenophobic, anti-Islam one. It is multi-faceted and includes the Muslims targeted in the aforementioned hate-crimes. However, in this paper I am concerned with the nationalist, xenophobic, anti-Islam sentiments and the ways in which those sentiments manifest in German society. The focus on a specific subset of German nationalists enables one to begin to unpack the roots of the issues nationalists have with Islam. The German nationalists in this paper view themselves as the spokespeople for all Germans,

¹ Deutsche Welle. "Germany Sees Almost 1,000 Anti-Muslim Crimes in 2017."
² Germany, SPIEGEL ONLINE Hamburg. "Geschichte Eines Satzes: "Der Islam Gehört (nicht) Zu Deutschland" - SPIEGEL ONLINE - Politik." SPIEGEL ONLINE. A note on translation: unless otherwise stated, the translations in this paper are my own. I translated from German to English for the accessibility of non-German readers.
individuals who fit into a white, Christo-centric understanding of German-ness. German nationalists conceive of the visibility of Islam in Germany (minarets, mosques, headscarves, etc.) as a direct challenge to German and Western culture, values, and ideals. German nationalists, therefore, racialize Muslims as a dangerous demographic who refuse to, or are incapable of, assimilation or integration into German culture and threaten to upend, and eventually destroy, an idealized German identity. As Neil Gotunda argues, the racialization of Muslims encompasses three dimensions: the raced body, racial category, and ascribed subordination. That is, the brown bodies of descendants or immigrants from the Middle East, North Africa, or South Asia are signified as Muslim; the category of Muslim then becomes a racial category like the categories of White, Black, or Hispanic; and finally, the raced bodies and racial category of Muslim symbolically occupy a space of subordination and inferiority forced upon them by their white, Christian, German counterparts.\(^5\) Regardless of the fact that many Muslims in Germany are German citizens or identify as German, for German nationalists, they do not and will not meet the conceptual qualifications of German-ness. The questions driving this paper are: how do German nationalists conceive of German-ness and the German nation? In what ways do these identifications drive political party platforms and inform party members on Islam? When did the signification of immigrant transform into the signification of Muslim? How do German nationalists conceive of Islam and Muslims and how do they

view Muslims in Germany? What role does the racialization of Islam play in controversies surrounding mosque construction, multiculturalism, and citizenship?

In order to explore these questions thoroughly, I will first begin the history of Islam. I will then outline explore the concept of nationalism. What is nationalism and how do groups negotiate their own identification with their country in the presence of the Muslim Other? For these questions I employ Benedict Anderson and his work *Imagined Communities*. By utilizing the work Mary Douglas, Charles Long, Edward Said, Talal Asad, I construct a framework for understanding how German nationalists view the foreign Other, in this case Muslims, and the historic bases for such dealings with the Other. I then trace the history of Muslims in Germany, focusing on Turkish immigration beginning with a post-war labor recruitment deal. This labor recruitment deal launched the rapid population growth of Muslims in Germany.

In the following sections, I will use my theoretical framing to examine the ways German nationalists influence and construct issues concerning Muslims and citizenship, multiculturalism, and mosque construction and religious education. In these case-studies, I examine how German nationalists preclude, or attempt to preclude, the inclusion of Muslims into larger German society, yet continually frame this preclusion as an inability and refusal for Muslims and Islam to assimilate. I will trace how the Turkish labor recruitment deal penned after World War II brought many Turkish men to Germany for a short period of time. During their brief stay in Germany, these Turkish workers were unconcerned with the permanence of Islam, and therefore did not construct dedicated mosques. I will then explain how German nationalists framed economic turmoil as the
result of high rates of immigration due to familial reunion policies instituted in the 1970s. I will then show how these familial reunion policies led directly to the increased visibility of Islam. Once Islam became visible and Muslim residents began openly practicing their Islam, far-right nationalist conflations of immigrants, Muslims, and Islam, and the construction of Islam as the antithesis of German-ness began as well.

**History of Islam and Turks in Germany**

At the end of World War II, Germany famously formally bifurcated Bundesrepublik Deutschland (BDR) and Deutsches Demokratik Republik (DDR). In the 1950s, the post-war BDR experienced an economic miracle (*Die Wirtschaftswunder*) that caused the unemployment rate to fall from 8% to less than 1%, while the DDR operated as an extension of the Soviet Union firmly planted behind the Iron Curtain. For the BDR, the *Wirtschaftswunder* demanded mass amounts of unskilled labor to keep up with demand, labor that was not readily available in the German state. The BDR originally decided to sign labor recruitment deals with other European countries like Italy and Portugal, but the number of workers who applied for the available jobs was still low. In response, the BDR extended its search to Turkey, Morocco, and Tunisia. Turkey signed the most expansive of these recruitment deals on October 30, 1960 and the recruitment of Turkish men to live and work in Germany began. More than 90% of these men who moved to the BDR for work were Muslim. The Turkish workers, known as *Gastarbeiter*, originally went to work in Germany with an understanding that they were unable to bring their families with them.

---

and their labor was temporary—after two years, the *Gastarbeiter* would return home and a new group would be recruited from Turkey. However, in 1964, the treaty changed its policy and allowed *Gastarbeiter* to stay beyond the original two-year limit. The BDR made the decision to remove length restrictions after the corporations employing the *Gastarbeiter* complained of the financial burden imposed by the constant recruitment and training of new workers, followed soon after by the workers leaving not long after.7

After the BDR lifted the limitations on the length of time *Gastarbeiter* could live and work in the state, the BDR implemented a familial reunification policy. Of particular importance, as it will be discussed below, many German citizens and politicians were unhappy with the familial reunification policy as they imagined many, if not most, of the *Gastarbeiter* would return to Turkey after their jobs were done, but that was not the case. In the years following the familial reunification policy, the population of Muslims in the BDR went from 6,500 to an estimated 1.8 million.8 Recruitment and familial reunification continued until the BDR issued a moratorium on recruitment in response to an oil crisis in 1973.9 Not only was a moratorium issued, but ‘re-migrant incentives’ to encourage *Gastarbeiter* and their families to return to their country of origin- these incentives were particularly aimed at Turkish immigrants.10 The political motives behind the re-migrant incentives came from right-wing outcry claiming that immigrants caused the 1982

---

7 Deutsche Welle, “Turkish Guest Workers Transformed German Society.” 2015.
8 Smith, David. “Cruelty of the Worst Kind”: Religious Slaughter, Xenophobia, and the German Greens.” *Central European History* 40, no. 1 (2007): 93. The number of Muslims in Germany today is estimated at 4.7 million, or 5.8% of the total German population.
economic slump and unemployment rates that would rise throughout the 1980s.\textsuperscript{11} Interestingly, as Gölturk, Anton, and Kaes note, the recession was a natural economic ebb and flow. Rising unemployment rates, and consequently fewer job positions, were due to an economic slump that led to businesses closing. Furthermore, open job positions vacated by Turkish \textit{Gastarbeiter} were not filled by German workers for two reasons. First, many of the positions left open were entry level positions and many unemployed Germans were unwilling to take them. Secondly, many of the open positions required skilled tradesmen and many Germans were not tradesmen and were therefore unqualified to fill said positions. Barring rising unemployment, the German economy slumped yet again in 1982, but turned around and rose from 1983-1990 until another brief recession and skyrocketing unemployment rates after the reunification of the divided Germany.\textsuperscript{12} Placing the blame of rising unemployment rates on Muslim immigrants signified Muslims as dangerous to the German state. By blaming Muslims and Islam for disrupting the German economy, German nationalists effectively removed themselves and the German government from taking responsibility for matter. Douglas’s methodology illuminates the nationalists’ labeling of Islam as dangerous to the economic stability of the German government and economy as a response to social ambiguity. By 2009, the number of Muslims in Germany was estimated to be 4.7 million, with more than two-thirds of those Muslims being of Turkish decent.\textsuperscript{13} The number has continually

\textsuperscript{11} Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
increased in the past decade, particularly with the Syrian refugee crisis that saw more than one million refugees, a majority of whom are Muslim, enter Germany. In the following section, I will explore how German nationalists responded to the rising Muslim population in Germany by focusing on Germany’s status as an Einwanderrungsland (immigration country) and the dangers of multiculturalism.

Nationalism

Nationalism is a term used quite frequently to describe the phenomenon of citizens of a country constructing their identity around their citizenship within a given country. It is also a term frequently used in reference to Germany, German citizens, and German history. Throughout this paper I employ a double understanding of nationalism, utilizing in tandem both objective and subjective definitions. Anthony D. Smith (2010) notes that using only one type of definition, the idea of nationalism is lacking in a critical way. Objective definitions, for Smith, “are stipulative. They nearly always exclude some widely accepted cases of nations, sometimes quite intentionally.” Subjective definitions are too broad, making nationalism, rather the nation, almost indistinguishable from other groups. Nationalism, objectively, focuses on shared language, ethnicity, geographic location, and religion. For German nationalists, this is the German Volk and citizenship based on decent, or jus sanguinis rather than a citizenship based on residency.16

---

15 Ibid.
For a subjective definition, Benedict Anderson’s concept of the ‘imagined community’ works nicely. For Anderson, a nation is, an imagined political community... The nation is, imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion... The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind... It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm... Finally, it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.17

So, for German nationalists, their identity is tied to their geographic location within the confines of the politically marked German state. Even when traveling or living outside of Germany, their identity remains located in Germany. Their identity as an imagined community is also bound by their collective resistance to the infiltration of immigrant Islam. They center their identity on their shared cultural roots of being born and raised in Germany, speaking German as their first language, their parents sharing the same heritage and ties to the German state, and cultural roots of being a Christian nation German citizens. For the German nation, the signified population of Muslims in Germany are strictly outside the confines of the imagined German nation. Because of the subjective and objective construction of the German nationalistic identity, Muslims in Germany are barred, as far as the German nationalists are concerned, from identifying as German or

17 Anderson, 6-7.
from representing the German identity. Anderson continues his argument by stating that racism flourishes within the confines of the imagined community of the nation and not transnationally. That is to say that German xenophobia is *German* xenophobia and it is not the same as British or American xenophobia, despite that each of those nations may have similar issues.

A. Dirk Moses description of German Germans and non-German Germans and their construction of self-identification post-World War II illuminates the methodology of German nationalism. For Moses, after the end of World War II, German citizens mourned the loss of a German identity, as this German identity was inextricably linked to the horrors of the Holocaust. In order to renegotiate their identities as German, German citizens chose one of two methods: they either renovated their identities or they defended it. Those who chose to renovate expanded and altered who could be German and what constitutes German-ness. However, those who chose to defend said identity, the German nationalists I am discussing within this paper, stood firm in their definition of German-ness, and refused and continue to refuse, to expand the category of German to Muslims living and working in Germany. Staub defines blind patriotism, which is almost

---

18 It is beyond the scope of this paper to delve into specifics of post-WWII anti-Semitism, yet anti-Semitism did not disappear after WWII, rather remained internalized and repackaged as xenophobic mentalities towards immigrants. However, as Said notes, the transference of xenophobic, racists sentiments from Jewish victims to Arab or Muslim victims was easy due to years of anti-Semitic propaganda, and representation of Muslims as Semitic populations (Said, 286). Building upon Said, Joseph Massad argues that Semitism, anti-Semitism, Orientalism, and the category of Abrahamic traditions are all sides of the same coin, just different methods of employing the same idea. See “Forget Semitism!” in *Islam in Liberalism*.

identical to the nationalism described above as, “an intense alignment by people with their nation or group and uncritical acceptance and support for its policies and practices, with an absence of moral consideration of their consequences or disregard of their impact on the welfare of human beings who are outside the group or are members of its subgroups.”

In the following section, I will discuss the history of Islam in Germany and the historical background for debates on multiculturalism, mosque construction and religious education, and citizenship.

Construction of the Other

In her influential book *Purity and Danger*, anthropologist Mary Douglas proposes five ways in which a community, or for the purposes of this paper a nation, deal with secular ambiguities and anomalies. Here, I am concerned with the first four. Douglas’s first proposed manner of dealing with ambiguity is to reduce said ambiguity. For German nationalism, this method is often implemented in political debates, calling for stricter immigration policies and border control. The second manner is to physically control the ambiguity or anomaly. Physical control in relation to nationalism ranges anywhere from proposing Burqa bans to control women’s bodies who make up part of the ambiguous demographic to the most famous example of German nationalism,

---

22 See AfD.de, Pegida.de.
concentration camps. Third, a nation can avoid the anomaly.\textsuperscript{23} For Douglas, the presence of the anomaly reaffirms its abnormality—for German nationalists, the presence of Muslims perform the same function. Muslim Germans reinforce the identity of German nationalists and the signification of Muslims as completely un-German. Fourthly, a nation can label abnormalities, anomalies, and ambiguities as dangerous. This is another common strategy among German nationalists for negotiating the presence of Muslims in Germany. Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States and recent attacks in western Europe, media outlets, politicians, and nationalists have condemned Islam and Muslims as dangerous, as liabilities, and as untrustworthy.

In the context of this paper, to borrow a term from Charles Long, German nationalists signify Muslims as foreign and wholly un-German. For Long in \textit{Significations}, German nationalists racializing Islam denotes a power relationship, wherein German nationalists have the power to construct the racial category of Muslim and those who occupy that category cannot shed the label.

In this movement both religion and cultures and peoples throughout the world were created anew through academic disciplinary orientations—\textit{they were signified}. By signification I am pointing to one of the ways in which names are given to realities and peoples during this period of conquest; this naming is the at the same time an objectification through categories and concepts of those realities which appear as novel and ‘other’ to the cultures of conquest. There is of course the element of power in this process of naming and objectification. This power is both latent and manifest. It is manifest in the intellectual operations that exhibit the ability of the human mind to come to terms with that which is novel, and it is manifest in the manner of passivity that is expressed in the process wherein the active existential and self-identifying notae through which a people know themselves is almost completely bypassed for the sake of conceptual and categorical forms of classification. The latency of the

\textsuperscript{23} Douglas, 49.
power is obscured and the political, economic, and military situation that forms the context of the confrontation is masked by the intellectual desire for knowledge of the other. The nature of this signification is at once a structure of experience and an intellectual problem for both the signified and the signifier. It constitutes the texture and network of various relationships between and among the relationships of cultures and peoples in the modern world."24

German nationalists signify Muslims as the root of social, political, and economic strife—Muslims, for the wholly German, will never occupy the same space as them, regardless of their citizenship or self-identification as German. In these significations, an individual is marked as “Muslim” even if they do not identify as Muslim—for German nationalists, any ties to a country or ethnicity with an Islamic history denotes a Muslim. As German scholar Riem Spielhaus argues,

The fact that being Muslim is not decisive for such markings and exclusions shows that Christians, Jews, and other religious youths with a visible background Muslim majority countries also become addressed as Muslim, or at least as non-German. 25

For Spielhaus, then, immigrants are continually signified as Muslim if they come from Muslim majority countries, regardless of their religious tradition. The signifiers, German nationalists, hold the power in this institution of meaning.26 This is not to say that

24 Long, 4-5.
26 Here I utilize Max Weber’s definition of power as, “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance.” German nationalists clearly hold the social, political, and economic position to exact their will over Muslims in Germany. While they themselves do not occupy even
the signified Muslim populations do not have agency, that is certainly not the case, but signifiers do not conceive of the signified as able to construct a German identity for themselves. The signified German Muslim population is symbolically stripped of their agency in the eyes of the signifier who hopes to solidify the signified group’s place outside of the German identity. Holding the power of signification, the German nationalists can signify Muslims with the meaning of their choice. The signifiers are free to employ one of Douglas’s methods discussed above in order to preserve their place as the power-holding party in a social setting.

As Talal Asad argues, the scholarly study of religion is historically the product of a Christian discourse. The ways in which Western scholars, and I would posit politicians and the general German public, study and view other religious traditions and its practitioners through a lens of Christian morality. German nationalists view Muslims in Germany from a Christian perspective, comparing them to the morals, values, and actions of Christians, which problematically places Muslim communities and individuals at a lesser status. This issue will be developed below examining the Alternative für Deutschland position on the viability of granting Muslims in Germany equality under the Grundgesetz.

a majority of the social real estate, they occupy a great deal more than Muslims, by being signified as German.

Multiculturalism

During the 1970s and 1980s, German society at large began debating the place of foreign workers and Islam in Germany due to an economic recession and rising unemployment. Did foreigners truly belong in Germany for longer than the two years? What about Islam? What was the purpose of *Gastarbeiter* extending their stay in the BDR, and eventually in Germany? These questions were not asked internally by German citizens, rather German politicians debated and answered them publically in speeches and in magazine and newspaper interviews. The Germans who were questioning Islam’s place in Germany, and Western Europe as a whole, had already decided that Islam did not belong in Germany and certainly did not belong to Germany. As Joseph A. Massad argues, a theory of Europe and European-ness is, “one that differentiates Europe from the Orient, and from Islam, and sets it up as their opposite.”²⁸ Therefore, when questioning what is German or what is European, Islam is the categorical opposite of German. For anti-multikulti Germans, Islam itself is reason enough to stand against a multicultural society. For the German nationalist, Germany should be a homogenous, German nation, rather than a nation of immigrants with ideologically opposed cultures.²⁹ For Massad, the Eastern (or Turkish) Question, or the multiculturalism question in this context, is also the Question of Islam, “and therefore the Question of (Protestant) Christianity would be germane to the European liberal project, which emerged from the Enlightenment, of presenting the West as a place with important characteristics that are always lacking in

²⁹ This idea will be developed further below, but a common talking point in the 1970s and 1980s was the debate surrounding Germany’s status as a nation of immigrants.
its Eastern and Islamic antithesis."30 Islam, and therefore Muslims, are the antithesis of the German Volk. In this section, I will analyze the racialization of Islam and Muslim immigrants through an analysis of political speeches, newspaper headlines, and academic works that question the place of multiculturalism and Islam in the former BDR and Germany.

In 1972, BDR Chancellor Willy Brandt, member of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland (SPD), publicly questioned if the BDR had reached its, “societal absorptive capacity,” referencing the number of Turkish immigrants living in the BDR.31 Less than one year after his musings, the BDR issued a moratorium on the recruitment of the Turkish labor; the moratorium was partly due to an oil crisis. After the end of recruitment, many Turkish Gastarbeiter returned to Turkey, but many others chose to remain in Germany and began to bring their families to live with them. From this point on, the number of immigrants sky rocketed, and consequently so did the number of Muslims in Germany. This swift demographic shift led to discussions of the BDR’s status as a country of immigration. By questioning the absorptive capacity of the BDR, this implies that Turkish Muslims are incompatible with German society at large, and that maximizing, or even exceeding, the so-called cultural capacity of German society is hazardous. As David Smith notes, the sentiment of the incompatibility of Islam into German society was made perfectly clear in the 1970s when German politicians kept reiterating that, “die

---

30 Massad, Joseph, 17.
Bundesrepublik ist kein Einwanderungsland.” If Germany is not a country of immigration, then immigrants have no place in Germany. For German nationalists, Germany is a German nation, wherein the German Volk reside, infiltrated and occupied by unwelcome Muslim immigrants.

In 1979, the commissioner for foreigners, Heinz Kühn released a special report recommending that the BDR spend time planning for the long-term, including education in Turkish, speeding up and streamlining naturalization processes and citizenship requirements. The German government ignored, and continues to ignore, these recommendations. In the early 1980s, two major events happened in the multikulti debate in Germany: first, the BDR placed major restrictions on familial immigration to Germany in 1982 and secondly, a group of academics released a xenophobic and racially motivated manifesto on the incompatibility of Muslim Turks with German society in 1981. Andreas Goldberg argues that the halt in recruitment spurred Muslim residents to reunite with their families in Germany, fearing they might not be able to immigrate in the future. According to Goldberg, the increase in familial reunification increased the visibility of Islam. Keeping in mind that majority of Gastarbeiter were men, when families immigrated, the number of Muslim women increased dramatically. For German citizens, the vast increase in veiled Muslim women signaled an infiltration of Islam that threatened

---

32 Smith, David, 93.
33 Deutsche Welle. "How Germany Became a Country of Immigrants | DW | 30.10.2011."
For these German nationalists, the problems that surround Muslim immigration are caused by Islam’s incompatibility with Christo-German culture. At the beginning of the Turkish labor recruitment, Turkish *Gastarbeiter* were not concerned with Islam. Rather, the Turkish labor force focused on cultural preservation and community building by forming sport clubs and “ethnic hubs.” This apparent lack of concern for Islam was largely in part to the time *Gastarbeiter* lived in Germany. A short two-year residence did not require dedicated places of worship, so many Muslims prayed at home or in rented rooms.

The academic manifesto mentioned above was the first public academic work of xenophobic and eugenicist rhetoric published in Germany since World War II. The Heidelberger Manifest is an extensive rationalization for anti-multiculturalism attitudes that claims the German Volk is in danger of infiltration by ‘Asiatic’ immigrants. Written and signed by 15 German academics from nine different universities, then published in three alt-right magazines, the Heidelberger Manifest claims that Turkish immigrants are biologically incapable of assimilating with the higher German society due to the biologically and culturally (or traditionally) transmitted ideas:

People are living (biologic and cybernetic) living systems of higher orders with mutually different attributes that are transmitted genetically and through tradition. The integration of large masses of non-German foreigners is therefore impossible while keeping the preservation of our

---

36 Ibid.
37 Peucker and Akbarzadeh. *Muslim Active Citizenship in the West*.
people. And leads to the known ethnic calamities of multicultural societies.\textsuperscript{38}

Originally intended to have two versions, one for public release and one for distribution among academic circles, the so-called signatories’ version was leaked to the media. The differences in content were not great, rather the differences come in the language that is used to get the point across. For the public version, the language is subtler, less outwardly xenophobic. The signatories’ version, excerpts listed throughout this section, is blatant in its racial theory, xenophobia, and anti-Islam sentiments.\textsuperscript{39} The authors continue to defend the right of German and European citizens to preserve their culture and nation. For these xenophobic academics, the presence of Turkish Muslims infringes on this right. The presence of immigrants from other European countries is not an issue because of their shared history. Western Europe is an organism in danger of losing its place as a facet in a divine plan:

Every people, including the German people, has the natural right of the preservation of their identity and the nature of their identity in their residential communities. The respect for other groups of peoples demands their preservation, but not their melding (Germanization). We understand Europe as an organism of peoples and nations worthy of preservation on the grounds of their common history. Every nation is a unique facet of a divine plan.\textsuperscript{40}


\textsuperscript{39} Von Dirke, Sabine.

\textsuperscript{40} Heidelberger Manifest. Jedes Volk, auch das deutsche Volk, hat ein Naturrecht auf Erhaltung seiner Identität und Eigenart in seinem Wohngebiet. Die Achtung vor anderen Völkern gebietet ihre Erhaltung, nicht aber ihre Einschmelzung („Germanisierung”).
Of utmost importance is the next paragraph. It details their objection to the interpretation of *das Grundgesetz des Deutschland* that extends freedom of religion to all citizens in Germany. Their interpretation is that the *Grundgesetz* is not meant for all inhabitants of Germany, rather the *Grundgesetz* is exclusively or the *deutscher Volk*.

The Basic Law of the BDR is not based on the term “nation” as the sum of all of the people inside of a state. Rather, it is based on the term “Volk” and that, indeed, is the German Volk. The federal president and the members of the federal government take the oath, “I swear to devote my strength to the welfare of the German people, to enhance its benefit and to turn shame from it. Hence, the Basic Law is obliged to preserve the German people.”

The *Grundgesetz* is therefore, for the nationalistic academics, a law that exists to protect and preserve the German-ness of Germany. This view is not exclusive to the authors of the *Heidelberger Manifest*. In fact, this is a common view held by many German nationalists. While the Basic Law proclaims freedom of religious expression, the stipulations that groups must meet in order to be protected under the Basic Law are exceedingly Christo-centric. In order to receive the full benefits of the *Grundgesetz*, religious organizations must register as “public law corporations.”

---

Europa verstehen wir als einen Organismus aus erhaltenswerten Völkern und Nationen auf der Grundlage der ihnen gemeinsamen Geschichte. Jede Nation ist die einmalige Facette eines göttlichen Plans’ (Solschenizyn)

41 *Heidelberger Manifest*. Das Grundgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland geht nicht aus vom Begriff ‚Nation‘ als der Summe aller Völker innerhalb eines Staates. Es geht vielmehr aus vom Begriff ‚Volk‘, und zwar vom deutschen Volk. Der Bundespräsident und die Mitglieder der Bundesregierung leisten den Amtseid: ‚Ich schwöre, daß ich meine Kraft dem Wohle des deutschen Volkes widmen, seinen Nutzen mehren, Schaden von ihm wenden werde.‘ Somit verpflichtet das Grundgesetz zur Erhaltung des deutschen Volkes

42 Werner and Wenner. Also Fetzer and Soper.
registration as a public law corporation, religious organizations must be, “an established church, have a hierarchical organization, and have its clergy appointed independently.”\textsuperscript{43} Not only is the language itself Christo-centric in nature, but the requirements themselves are framed in a Christian context. German-ness is Christianity, not Islam. For German nationalists, including the 15 academics who penned the \textit{Heidelberger Manifest}, the preclusion of Muslim groups organizing is positive, as it prevents them from gaining the full-protection of their rights under the \textit{Grundgesetz}.

The harm of the Heidelberger Manifest is that it supplies an academic support to a racist and nationalistic rhetoric.\textsuperscript{44} It supports a right-wing racialization of Islam. It stigmatizes and signifies Muslims as foreign, other, and dangerous to Germany. As discussed above, by employing Douglas’s methods of dealing with social ambiguities, the motivation behind the Heidelberger Manifest is intelligible as an attempt to signify the social abnormality (Islam, Muslims) as inherently dangerous.\textsuperscript{45} It also utilizes the presence of Islam in Germany to reaffirm the German nationalists perception of themselves as members of a higher order of humans. The signification of Islam as dangerous by academics adds authority to those who use agree with the rhetoric. For these academics, the presence of Islam in Germany reaffirms their identification as

\textsuperscript{43} Werner and Wenner.
\textsuperscript{44} This is not to say that composition by a group of academics gives the Manifest credit and authority that all Germans blindly follow, rather for those who employ this rhetoric view the Heidelberger Manifest see the Manifest as authoritative and supportive of their overall argument.
\textsuperscript{45} Douglas. Purity and Danger
German. Per Douglas, for them, their arguments are a mode of identification and negotiating their status as German among different cultures.46

If analyzed through a Saidian lens, the emphasis on the immigrant problem and the problem of Islam’s incompatibility with German-ness is not a problem with Islam, rather it is a self-reflective lens of the reluctant incompatibility of rigid German nationalism to expand its definition to include Islam. The question of multiculturalism is not the fault of Muslims in Germany. The question of multiculturalism is a question raised by German nationalists who seek not only to firmly establish a definition of German-ness but who also attempt to strip Muslims in Germany of their agency, competency, and own identifications as German. The establishment of the Volk as the epitome of humanity and the denial of Muslim acceptance in the Volk effectively denies Muslims in Germany humanity.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany in 1989, unemployment skyrocketed once again, particularly in the former DDR.47 Tensions were high as the German government instituted a set of policies, including raising taxes, that decimated the economic stability of the former DDR. With high unemployment, taxes, and the shock of a growing immigrant Muslim population, Sam Mustafa argues that it is unsurprising in retrospect that radical right-wing, anti-immigrant groups emerged in the former DDR, particularly in Leipzig and Dresden.48 In the 1990s, organized anti-
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immigrant and radically nationalistic groups began to sprout. These xenophobic groups claimed that Turkish Muslims were at fault for the current economic state of Germany. They willfully ignored the fact that many of the Turkish Muslims moving into their neighborhoods were second or third-generation bilingual individuals who integrated themselves into larger German society and did not isolate themselves into Parallelgesellschaften (parallel societies). Membership to radical nationalistic ‘skin head’ groups was not limited to residents of eastern Germany. These groups began to violently attack Turkish immigrant communities. In the east and west, skinheads firebombed (Brandanschlägen) immigrant housing in Mölln, Solingen, and Lübeck. Attacks also happened in east Germany against Vietnamese immigrants and North African refugees and these were the attacks that were most often covered by the German media. As Mustafa notes, these Brandanschlägen were framed by the media as issues with reunification, not with immigration. I argue that these attacks were not only motivated by changing economic conditions, rather these attacks were motivated by a series of changing conditions in Germany. Rising unemployment rates, the reunification of Germany, and the sudden influx of immigrants moving to East Germany for jobs, were collectively the events that led to the attacks. Through attacking Turkish
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Muslims, skinhead organizations were attacking shifting perceptions of German and reaffirming German-ness. Through these attacks, German nationalists violently negotiated their own identity while symbolically stripping first, second, and third generation Muslims who identified as German of their identification.

Multiple anti-Islam political parties and organizations have appeared within the past decade. *Alternativ für Deutschland* (AfD), founded in 2013, is a right wing, populist, nationalist political party espouses an ideology that insists on reclaiming the right to use “Volk” and to protect the German Volks from infiltration of and destruction by Muslim immigrants, and currently holds 92 of 709 seats in the German *Bundestag*. According to their website, they stand as an alternative voting platform for German citizens who want to preserve the lived culture of the German people:

> As free citizens we stand for direct democracy, separation of powers and the rule of law, social market economy, subsidiarity, federalism, family and the lived tradition of German culture. Because democracy and freedom stand on shared cultural values and historical memories.  

In 2014, one of the more blatantly anti-Islam organizations was established. Founded by Luz Bachmann, *Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes* (PEGIDA) stands firmly against the “Islamization of the Evening Lands (also known as the Occident or Western Europe). The name alone is enough to understand the
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Orientalist signification of Islam. By claiming to protect the “Evening lands” or “Occident”, PEGIDA places itself in direct opposition to the “Morning lands” or “Orient.” PEGIDA has a 10-point party platform that outlines their stances including:

- Protection, preservation and respectful treatment of our culture and language. Stop political or religious fanaticism, radicalism, Islamization of Germany, genderization and early sexualization. Preservation of sexual self-determination.⁵³

PEGIDA members want to preserve the language and culture of Germany and prevent radical religious fanaticism of Islam. They also want stricter immigration policies. If analyzed with Douglas’s methods of handling cultural anomaly, PEGIDA members label Muslims and Islam as dangerous and attempt to physically control Muslims in Germany by calling for strict immigration laws based on cultural and demographic criteria:

- Creation and strict implementation of immigration law according to demographic, economic and cultural aspects. Qualitative immigration (instead of current quantitative mass immigration) following to the Swiss or Canadian model.⁵⁴

PEGIDA members routinely demonstrate in Dresden and Leipzig, drawing thousands to their rallies. Frequently, however, counter-protesters outnumber PEGIDA members.⁵⁵ As Massad argues, when Chancellor Angela Merkel and previous German Chancellors or
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politicians discuss the failures of the German multiculturalism project, they are not speaking of the failure of the, “hegemonic white Christian culture, which markets itself as democratic, tolerant, and multi-cultural, to tolerate people who are nonwhite and non-Christian and who resist assimilationist policies democratically, but the “utter” failure of nonwhite non-Christian despotic Muslims to assimilate into a secularized Christian and democratic whiteness. According to Joceylne Cesari, more than 67 percent of Germans believe the failure to integrate in Germany is the fault of Muslims who refuse to do so, rather than the fault of Germans who refuse to accept Muslims in Germany.

Cesari concludes by noting that European, including German, citizens see Islam in fundamental opposition to Western European values, despite the lack of empirical evidence that Muslims in these countries do anything to provoke this stereotype. The main difference, Cesari notes, is that European Muslims identify with their religious affiliation as equally as they do with the national affiliation, whereas most Europeans identify with their nation more frequently than religious affiliation. Clearly, the debate surrounding multiculturalism in Germany is a debate surrounding the presence of Islam in Germany. Muslims and Turkish immigrants are racialized by German nationalists and routinely signified as dangerous, incompetent, isolated, nonwhite, and inherently un-German. In the following section, Mosque Construction and Religious Education, I will argue that
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German nationalists negatively responded to the increased architectural and political visibility of Islam and oppose the adaptation of Islam into German society.

Mosque Construction and Religious Education

The first mosque in Germany was constructed in 1915 in Zossen for prisoners of war during World War I.\(^{59}\) However, despite the rapid growth of the Muslim population in Germany beginning in the 1970s, until the 1990s, other than Zossen, none of the mosques and prayer rooms in Germany were originally built as mosques.\(^{60}\) Muslims in Germany, though they wished to construct purposeful mosques, found the bureaucratic processes tiresome and reluctant of Muslim applications. In this section, I will argue that German nationalists reproach the idea of a visible Islam in Germany. German nationalists, therefore, were and are hostile to the construction of mosques as they represent the permanent visible presence of Islam in Germany. I will then examine German nationalists extend the attack on visible Islam to prevention of Islamic religious instruction in German public schools.

At the beginning of the Turkish labor recruitment deal, as noted above, many of the *Gastarbeiter* were unconcerned with creating religious organizations or mosque building. It was not until the 1970s, with the beginning of the familial reunification policy, that Muslims in Germany began creating religious organizations and putting plans together to build mosques and religious community centers. As Werner and Wenner
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note, once Gastarbeiter became permanent residents, the desire to establish religious centers for worship and education for the coming generations blossomed.\textsuperscript{61} For Muslim communities in Germany, building mosques and community centers is proving more difficult than expected. The bureaucratic policies and procedures instilled by the BDR and German government preclude Muslim communities building mosques, an attempt to keep the visibility of Islam minimized. By restricting religious building projects, the German government and society ostracize Muslims and inhibit their attempts to expand the German identity to include Islam. In a 1993 article entitled “The ‘Black-Brown Hazelnut’ in a Bigger Germany: The Rise of a Radical Right as a Structural Feature,” John Ely correctly predicted that, “the development of an internal state of fear for non-ethnic Germans combined with a viable electoral politics of xenophobia will affect both German foreign policy and upcoming debates on the German constitution.”\textsuperscript{62} As we will see, the debate surrounding citizenship and naturalization often includes conversations about the viability of the Grundgesetz protecting the religious freedom of Muslims in Germany.

When the labor recruitment deal with Turkey, Morocco, and Tunisia began, Gastarbeiter were limited to a two-year stay in the BDR, returning to their country of origin. Due to these short-term residencies in Germany, many of the Muslim men did not place lofty importance on mosque construction. In lieu of a dedicated building, Gastarbeiter used common rooms on job sites, church rooms, and railway wagons for
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prayer spaces. As Elisabeth Becker argues, the invisibility of Islam in the earlier years of the recruitment program mirrored the invisibility of the foreign workers rebuilding post-war Germany. The invisibility of the Gastarbeiter and their Islam was well-suited to German citizens who were at this time re-negotiating their identity as German. Becker also argues that when scholars discuss mosques, they ignore the agency of those who lead and attend said mosques. I posit that the same is true of the German nationalists who capitalize on the presence of mosques for their xenophobic and islamaphobic rhetoric. The mosques discussed below are not agency-less, in fact they have leaders and congregants that are active in their projection of their mosque. The issue at hand is that German nationalists, politicians, and media symbolically strip the mosques and change the narrative of the mosques from what their leaders want. German nationalists view mosques as the architectural representation of anti-German, secular, and Christian values.

In 2005, Pro-Köln established itself as a political movement with an anti-mosque-building platform. Following soon after, Pro-NRW followed suit and established itself with a very similar platform. For these political groups, with large followings, mosques are the antithesis of German values. The presence of mosques reaffirms German nationalistic ideologies. Radical alt right German nationalists view the presence of visibly Islamic
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mosques as the presence of danger, terrorism, and foreignness, where for Muslims, mosques represent community and political and social movements within the Muslim community. This active involvement in German social and political spheres stemming from mosque leadership adds another layer of fear for German nationalists. In 2007, there were 150 traditional mosques in Germany, all in the former BDR. This number is vastly low compared to the number of churches and cathedrals in Germany, marking the consistently low visibility of Islam and the disproportionate reaction to mosques by German nationalists reiterates the view of Islam as a foreign abnormality.

The distribution of religious communities among Muslims in Germany reflects the distribution of Gastarbeiter during the years of labor recruitment. The number of these communities is greater surrounding former industrial plants and work sites. According to Piotr Suder, there are 2,350 Muslim communities made up of the estimated 4 million Muslims in Germany, with Turks or individuals with Turkish heritage making up the largest percentage of each of these groups. However only 20 percent of Muslims in Germany report belonging to or frequenting a mosque. The intense focus on mosques and mosque construction by groups like Pro-Köln, Pro-NRW, and PEGIDA stems from a Christian understanding of religious buildings, leadership, and community. For Christians, the church is the physical representation of the religious communities, values, and ideals.

67 Traditional mosques describe mosques with minarets and domes. As discussed above, most twenty first century alt-right groups were established in eastern Germany and the lack of traditional mosques is often attributed to the DDR’s strict oppression of religious institutions. See Ftezer and Soper Muslims and the State in Britain, France, and Germany.
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For anti-mosque-building nationalists, they see the mosque as the breeding ground for dangerous anti-German sentiments, as Islam, and therefore the mosque, is the opposite of Christian Germany. This appropriation of mosques is an amalgamation of fear of the ‘foreign’ Islam, German-Christo values, and xenophobia.

In March of 2016, a draft of a Bavarian AfD policy statement circulated through Germany, calling for a ban on the construction and operation of mosques.\textsuperscript{69} The document argued that mosques serve no religious purpose and the only goal of a mosque community is to tear down the German legal system.\textsuperscript{70} The document generated widespread backlash, often citing the right to religious freedom protected by the \textit{Grundgesetz}; the AfD responded, however, saying that the interpretation of the \textit{Grundgesetz} allowing for religious freedom of Muslims is misinterpreted, claiming that, “the application of religious freedom could give access to religions that call for the committing of crimes ... and have the aim of world domination.”\textsuperscript{71}

While it is not a strictly German nationalist position to not support mosques and mosque construction, as Benedict Anderson notes, German nationalist xenophobic is explicitly German. The reasons and nuances behind the opposition to mosque construction, and religious education which will be discussed below, are German.\textsuperscript{72} According to an IFOP survey done in Germany, more than 50 percent of respondents did not support the construction of mosques.\textsuperscript{73} The common concerns given include...
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radicalization, terrorism, and threats to German culture, which are consistent with other issues discussed throughout this paper. The fear of mosques and a visible Islam leads to the denial of construction permits, and consequently leads to many Muslims praying in rooms rented from pubs, churches, and other multi-purpose rooms. Often, these rooms are rented without contracts that lead to landlords evicting Muslim worshippers. The fear of visible Islam is not limited to anti-Mosque attitudes. Religious instruction in public schools is another issue, with more opposition from German nationalists and less success for Muslims in Germany.

Religious education (Religionsunterricht) in German public schools is a standard practice. However, this practice is only extended, in all cases but one, to Christian instruction. In 2008, almost 35 percent of children under the age of 5 had an immigration background. The lack of religious instruction for Muslim school children is a major cause for concern for Muslim parents, as they would like their children education in their religious tradition, as is dictated as a right in the Grundgesetz. As discussed above, many German nationalists do not abide by the notion that Muslims are guaranteed equality under the Basic Law, as it is meant exclusively for the Volk and, as I have argued, Muslims inherently excluded from that group by nationalists.

As Fetzer and Soper argue, German school officials do not act professors of religious doctrine, rather as vehicles that enable students to learn of their religious tradition—either Evangelicalism or Roman Catholicism.\textsuperscript{77} For Turkish Muslims, frustration stems from a perception that the German state grants freedom of religion and is more lenient in citizenship grants to other religious minority groups in Germany.\textsuperscript{78} Currently, there is one school in Berlin that offers Islamic religious instruction. Naturally, there are only a few Muslims students who are able to take advantage of this course. And that course is not truly *Religionsunterricht*. In order to be considered *Religionsunterricht*, the course must teach the religious doctrines and beliefs as being true. The course on Islam in Berlin is a historical overview, instructing the students on the basic history and culture of Islam. According to Fetzer and Soper, many Muslim parents enroll their children in Christian courses, as they would rather their children have religious instruction in a tradition other than their own than to not have religious instruction at all.\textsuperscript{79}

For Muslim parents who campaign for equal right under the *Grundgesetz* to educate their children like Christian parents can has proved difficult due to the historical Christian understanding of religious organizations. That is, in order to request religious instruction, a group must either register as a Public Law Corporation or must meet general requirements set by each *Länder*, that are almost identical to those needed to become a Public Law Corporation. Since nearly all Islamic organizations lack approval as a Public Law Corporation, many school districts and *Länder* governments do not feel pressured to offer
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instruction on Islam nor do they feel the need to meet with Muslim leaders in their Länder. In order to teach a Religionsunterricht course, the instructor must receive permission from the church and the state. While many Muslims teachers have applied to lead a course, they are often denied due to the German state’s understanding of religious organizations. Muslim communities lack a hierarchical structure like Christian churches, therefore allowing the state to deny their requests. Often requests are criticized in the media for ‘fundamentalists’ views of the requesting organization, leading to the denial of instruction. In an attempt to appease Muslim parents in the 1970s, the German Länder of North Rhine Westphalia, which had the largest Muslim population at the time, sought what they regarded as a Religionsunterricht compromise. Originally, “hand-selected” Muslims were partially included in this compromise, but were ultimately disbarred from the formation of the curriculum, NRW officials offered to create an Islamic education course. This course, however, due to the disapproval of Muslim leaders in the Länder became merely an informational course on Islam. The denial of Islamic instruction and the criticism surrounding the decision to allow the only Islamic Religionsunterricht course in Germany is a manifestation of anti-Islamic sentiments of German nationalists. The AfD is notorious in their desire to strip Muslims of freedom of religious expression under the Grundgesetz, arguing that Muslims do not deserve the right to religious freedom and
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expression. By denying religious instruction to Muslim students, a right in theory that is guaranteed to German residents under the Grundgesetz, Muslims are ostracized from the imagined German community. The ostracism of Muslims from German society is also apparent in the debate surrounding German citizenship. In the following section, I will explore the multiple citizenship reforms beginning in 1977, and the attempts of German nationalists to preclude Muslims from becoming Germans.

From Ausländer to Mitbürger

The process for becoming a German citizen was, and continues to be, quite restrictive, preventing many Muslim immigrants from becoming legal German citizens. While many of them identify as German due to being born and raised in Germany. The change in German citizenship from jus sanguis to jus soli and the processes and restrictions themselves preclude the full involvement of Muslims in German society. While the German citizenship debates are not specifically targeted at Turkish Muslims, the restrictions are particularly arduous for Turkish immigrants. Until recently, the official term for German citizens with other-than-German heritages was Ausländer (foreigner). The slow acceptance of the term Mitbürger (co-citizen) highlights German resistance to changing ideas of what it means to be considered German, both legally and symbolically. As Ely notes, after the reunification of Germany, the possibility of Turkey entering the European Union spurred a right-wing nationalist, “demonization of Islam.”
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demonization of the Other continues today, warning against the incorporation of Muslim citizens into the imagined German community.

In 1977, the BDR instituted the Naturalization Regulation, revising the *Reichs- und Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz* (RuStag). The previously upheld RuStag notoriously withheld citizenship from non-Ethnic Germans, including children born to *Gastarbeiter* in the BDR. The Naturalization Regulation technically allowed for citizenship, but it was rarely granted. Requirements for applicants included advanced proficiency in spoken and written German, declaration of intent to fully integrate into German culture in all aspects of life, and the renunciation of all other citizenships.86 Not only were the required qualifications subjective and left to the discretion of the German official who heard the citizenship case, the process was expensive. As Triadafilopoulos explains, the cost of naturalization was three months’ salary—a sum a family or individual could rarely go without.87 Triadafilopoulos also notes that these requirements were only for immigrants. German repatriates gained citizenship upon re-entry and were not expected, or required, to prove written and spoken German proficiency, provide three months’ salary, or dedicate themselves in all aspects to German culture, regardless of how long they had been an ex-patriate. Children who were born in Germany, yet relocated with their parents and had no command over the German language nor German customs were granted citizenship immediately, but children and individuals who had been living in Germany for decades, years, or even since birth were not afforded the same opportunities. German-
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ness, then, was still intrinsically tied to ethnicity and religion and the 1977 citizenship reform continued to preclude the majority of Muslim immigrants from becoming German under the law.

The change in colloquial terminology, from Ausländer to Mitbürger stems largely from terminology used in legal reforms. In 1993, a compromise was reached regarding the citizenship status of asylum seekers, much to the chagrin of German nationalists who attacked immigrant communities in 1992 and 1993. The reforms continued and in 1999, despite resistance by the German public and political opposition, immigrants were able to gain citizenship in two ways through the Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz. The CDU and its Bavarian sister party the CSU were among the most outspoken in resistance to the citizenship reform warning that Germany should be careful about naturalizing so many non-Germans. Once passed, the CDU and CSU did not let up in their pursuit to uphold Germany’s Christian values stating that the German culture (Leitkultur) must be upheld, particularly by the newly naturalized citizens:

Our Christian culture, marked by Christianity, ancient philosophy, humanism, Roman law and the Enlightenment, must be accepted... that does not mean abandonment of particular religious and cultural practices, but acceptance of our values and organization for living together.

88 The new Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz was accepted in 1999 then went into practice in 2000.
89 German nationalism and the resistance to the integration of Muslims into German society was not a monolithic movements encapsulating the entirety of the German population. Beginning in the 1980s and 1990s, many Germans and left-wing political parties campaigned for citizenship reform. The CDU/CSU and far-right nationalistic organizations were in clear opposition to this reform.
Their suggestions continued, adding that immigrants should take assimilation courses, bear part of the financial burden, and learn the German language and German customs.\textsuperscript{91} The financial burden of citizenship is not a new idea—as discussed above, after 1977 citizenship via naturalization required an imposing financial burden, one that precluded many from pursuing citizenship.

First, if a child is born in Germany and at least of their parents is a German citizen or if one parent’s residence in Germany is at least 8 years. With this method of attaining citizenship, all other citizenships must be dropped at the age of 23, as Germany does not recognize dual-nationalities. The second way a foreign-national can attain German citizenship is through a naturalization process. After 8 years of residence in Germany, an individual can apply for naturalized citizenship if they lack a criminal record, do not receive welfare benefits, speaks proficient German, and pledges allegiance to the German Grundgesetz. These requirements are not entirely different from the requirements instated in the 1977 Naturalization reform.

Ahmet Yükleyen notes that proficiency in German and declaration of loyalty are subjective and German authorities use their own discretion in judgement of these two requirements in granting or restricting citizenship.\textsuperscript{92} As with citizenship by birth, the new German citizen must give up citizenship in another country. This is particularly demanding of Turkish citizens seeking German citizenship. Once declared a German citizen, the Turkish consulate officially revokes citizenship; however the individual can regain it at a
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later time. But, as Yükleyn notes, the German government’s refusal to recognize dual-citizenship means they cannot claim Turkish citizenship in cases of inheritance disputes in Turkey. This scenario might sound tediously specific, but it is a deterring factor for many first generation immigrants, who have strong familial ties in Turkey and is a reason that naturalization rates are drastically lower than rates for second and third generation individuals.93

The renunciation of other citizenships was originally not in the Staatangehörigkeitsgesetz. In 1998, a year before the citizenship reform passed, the CDU/CSU waged a campaign against the proposed reform that would allow immigrants granted citizenship to keep dual-citizenship. The CDU/CSU warned that this was inherently dangerous to Germany and circulated a petition that more than 3.5 million Germans signed.94 In the spirit of compromise, dual-citizenship remained forbidden in the German citizenship process and the previously discussed loop-hole that allowed Turks to renounce citizenship, gain German citizenship, then re-acquire a Turkish passport was revoked. However, dual-citizenship is tolerated for individuals who wish to retain their citizenship in EU countries. Technically speaking, dual-citizenship is not recognized by the German government, but that loop-hole was not closed to citizens of other EU countries. The CDU/CSU did not have an issue with EU loopholes and failed to circulate a petition warning of the dangers that other Europeans posed to German society. I argue this is because German nationals were concerned with the perceived infiltration of Islam into
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Germany, and Western Europe as a whole. This issue is multi-faceted. In the early 1990s, the arson attacks against immigrant communities were, at least partially, in response the possibility that Turkey could join the EU. The insistence on the threat that non-European immigrants posed to Germany is clearly xenophobic and targeted non-Christian majority countries, Turkey being the best example.

In 2004, under the Zuwanderungsgesetz, further stipulations were added to the 1999 Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz. At the behest of the CDU/CSU, all immigrants were now required to take integration courses. These courses aimed to cohesively integrate immigrants directly into mainstream German society through 30 hours of civic training and 600 hours of German language instruction. Enrolling in these courses, which are advertised as voluntary, but are truly mandatory, reduces the length of residence necessary for naturalization from eight years to seven years. In a famous German court case and scandal, the German government declared that interview questions asked in Baden-Württemberg violated the Grundgesetz. Citizenship officials had, for almost a year, been asking questions of Muslim naturalization applicants that delved into their personal beliefs that would conflict with German society. Questions included thoughts on domestic violence, parenting styles, and homosexuality. Officials instructed interviewers to ask these questions in a direct attempt to thwart Muslims from becoming German citizens. While these interview questions caused outrage amongst many Germans,
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German nationalists defended these interview questions, claiming that they protected German democracy and morals that would be in danger if too many dishonest applicants (i.e. Muslims as they were the only ones asked these questions) naturalized. This is not the only instance of prejudicial denial of citizenship. In a 2005 report, the German commissioner for Integration, Migration, and Refugees noted that Muslim members of the Turkish Muslim group Islamische Gemeinschaft Mili Görüşch had been denied naturalization due to their apparent disagreement with German values.\textsuperscript{99}

The resistance to equal citizenship opportunities continue today. In 2015, the Syrian refugee crisis precipitated a flood of resentment of German nationalist resentment. Already disgruntled at the mass numbers of refugees that came to Europe to seek asylum, in August Chancellor Angela Merkel repealed the statute that mandated refugees return to the European country from which they entered. This shocked many of her CDU/CSU party members and German nationalists in general. In fact, after her decision, along with Austrian officials, to save refugees trapped in Hungary, AfD candidates beat the CDU/CSU in Bayern. A terror attack in Berlin in a Christkindlemarkt by a rejected asylum seeker did nothing to relieve the criticisms of Islam by German nationalists. In fact, the official stance of the AfD is that German immigration, including asylum seekers, should remain zero. They suggest this should happen in either a moratorium on immigration or by increasing deportations so that the immigration rate is effectively nil. Similarly, they do not support familial reunification in any way and do not support migration from Muslim countries in the Middle East and North Africa. For
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rejected asylum seekers, the AfD supports mass deportations, including to regions that are not viewed as safe, including regions of Afghanistan and Syria. For PEGIDA members, refugees are *Invasoren* (invaders) who need to be dealt with via deportation. They have no physical place in Germany and certainly, for these nationalists, no place in the German imagined community.

**Conclusion**

German nationalists hold a very firm and exclusive definition of what it means to be German. The imagined German community members are white, Christian, Ethnic-Germans. There is no room in this understanding of German-ness for racialized Muslims. Rather, they forcibly bar Muslims from joining their imagined community, regardless of how a Muslim in Germany identifies. For German nationalists, Muslims will never and can never be German. German nationalists signify Muslims as dangerous, as foreign, opposite of German, as wholly Other. Throughout this paper, I have argued that for nationalists, Muslims are a visible threat to Germany. These far-right nationalists construct an imagined community based on a shared geographic region, common language, religious tradition, and shared heritage. Turkish Muslim immigrants, and the Muslim community in Germany in general, are the complete antithesis of German-ness.

I first began traced the history of Islam in Germany, beginning with the labor recruitment deal post-World War II in response to the *Wirtschaftswunder*. From the inception of the labor recruitment deal to the familial reunification policies in the 1970s,
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the number of Muslims in Germany is estimated to have risen from 6,500 to 1.8 million. This vast increase in both the number of Muslims and the visibility of Muslims in the former BDR unsettled many German nationalists who manifest their xenophobia publically and worried about the future of Germany due to the presence of. I then outlined a theoretical framework for understanding that that highlights the by German nationalists construction of the Other, or methods for understanding the construction of Islam as Other.

I then examined debates surrounding multiculturalism, mosque building and religious education, and citizenship. In conversations surrounding multiculturalism, German nationalists largely blame Muslims for failing to integrate into German society, while simultaneously campaigning to preclude their inclusion. Their arguments frame Muslims as dangerous to German society and that Muslims refuse to be a part of Germany, despite many German nationalists campaigning for the expulsion of Islam from Germany. In my discussion of mosque building and religious education, I showed that German nationalists find the architectural visibility of Islam to be a jarring reminder of Islam’s presence in Germany. Not only do mosques visibly reflect Islam, the permanence of the buildings reflects Islam’s permanence in German society. Religionsunterricht finds itself at the center of heated debates regarding the protections guaranteed to German citizens and residents under the Grundgesetz. German nationalists often argue that the Basic Law is meant only for the Volk, which effectively bars Muslims from becoming part of the Volk. The denial of Public Law Corporation status, and there for religious instruction, highlights the Christo-centric understanding of religion and religious freedom
in Germany. Finally, in discussing citizenship, I highlighted the anti-Islam tendencies in citizenship reforms since 1977. Compromises made at the request of the CDU/CSU restricting eligibility for citizenship reveals the difficulty Muslims in Germany face when applying for naturalization.
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