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1 Introduction

When I crossed the German-Polish border on 17 October 1989 as a three-and-a-half-year-old, little did I know that I had just immigrated to Germany based on a citizenship I acquired under the Spätaussiedler category. This category – as described later on in the essay – allows ethnic Germans coming from predominantly Eastern Europe to return to their home country. Taking into account that I was already a Polish national, the new acquisition made me a dual citizen. However, possessing dual citizenship in Germany is an exception, rather than the rule. German citizenship has been traditionally based on the tradition of jus sanguinis (law of blood or descent) and only recently began to shift towards a more liberal jus soli (law of birth place) approach, albeit limited. This may be surprising, considering the fact that Germany invited massive numbers of foreigners under its guest worker model in the second half of the twentieth century, and one would assume that immigration would be a well-known and accepted fact in Germany. However, that is not the case. In October 2010, German Chancellor Angela Merkel most famously proclaimed that attempts at building a multicultural society had “utterly failed.”

honesty in her statements was striking, especially given how reluctant German politicians have been in the past with regard to publicly referring to immigration and multiculturalism. In fact, officials maintained the position that Germany was not a country of immigration until well into the 1990s and it was not until 2004 that the federal government under the leadership of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder openly announced it as such. Political opinion is extremely divided in Germany, which is a contributing factor to the country’s slow response towards integrating its large foreign population in terms of multiculturalism in general, as well as towards changes of immigration and citizenship laws on all levels: public, political and legal.

The concepts of multiculturalism and citizenship go hand in hand. The question then arises whether multiculturalism has indeed failed in Germany as Merkel suggested and whether the country is pursuing a liberal path towards immigrants with regard to naturalization and citizenship. This essay will evaluate whether Germany is ready for a more liberalized naturalization approach from a historical and contemporary perspective and investigate the effect of a potential dual citizenship policy on multiculturalism in the country. The essay will first provide a historical introduction and argue that multiculturalism in Germany has not necessarily failed, but instead is a work in progress. Next, the concept of dual citizenship will be examined, along with current public and academic debates, followed by an establishment of the link between dual nationality and multiculturalism. Finally, the essay will explore current challenges Germany is facing with regard to naturalization and multiculturalism and conclude with final remarks regarding the implementation of a more liberal policy approach regarding dual citizenship.

2 Multiculturalism in Germany – Past and Present

Germany, being in its infant stages when it comes to multiculturalism, is in the process of transition towards an open-minded approach, which is a daunting undertaking, given that it has traditionally not been a country of immigration, that it only recently began rejuvenating its citizenship and immigration policies and finally acknowledging that it has a strongly embedded cultural identity.

2.1 Germany as a country of immigration?

Since 1945, Germany has accepted around 20 million immigrants – more than any other country within Europe – yet the social support for those immigrants, such as...
as help towards integration, has been very minimal. Paradoxically, despite this large number of newcomers, Germany has traditionally not been a country of immigration and has publicly asserted this position until 2004.

Germany’s immigrant influx is based on a guest worker system, which was initially established by the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) with the aim to invite highly skilled workers in order to supply labour power for a quick postwar economic recovery. The first hiring agreement was signed in 1955 with Italy, followed by agreements with Spain and Greece (1960), Turkey (1961), Morocco (1963), Portugal (1964), Tunisia (1965) and Yugoslavia (1968). Millions of young men and women cycled in and out of Germany between 1955 and 1973, until the federal government decided to terminate its guest worker program in light of the impending oil crisis. The number of foreign workers admitted to the country was substantial. It quickly rose from 95,000 in 1956 to 1.3 million in 1966 and 2.6 million in 1973. The rapid growth changed the German demographic landscape immensely in a relative short period of time. German public legislation viewed migrant workers as temporary labour units, which could be recruited, utilized and deported again as employers required, which made residing in Germany an uncertain stay based on arbitrary and discretionary principles. After its peak in 1973, many workers returned to their home countries, but a larger number – mainly from Turkey – remained in Germany. With the help of German and international courts, family reunions and settlement were facilitated, which led to families becoming established and children being born.

Another category of foreigners in Germany consists of asylum seekers. The country’s asylum policy was far more generous than that of any other state in Europe or the world and it is no surprise that a large number of newcomers entered Germany under its provisions. With the arrival of so many asylum seekers, challenges began to appear; not only in terms of incorporating the newcomers into German society by introducing integration programs and offering financial assistance, but also with regard to creating sufficient space in German society to accept them and allocating adequate resources to meet their needs. As Marc Morjé Howard notes, “in late 1992, the number of asylum applications to Germany was spiraling out of control – reaching a record of 438,000 that year, a figure never seen before or since by any European Nation.” Creating sufficient space in German
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society continues to be a challenge to this day with over 80% of German citizens believing that multicultural society had reached its limits. Back in 1992 and 1993, violent attacks on asylum seekers and foreigners began to occur, which prompted the government to issue a reform in 1993 that made it significantly more difficult to enter Germany as an asylum seeker. While the reform put a halt to the asylum crisis, the demographic diversity of German society was by that time already undeniable. While the country was home to approximately 700,000 foreigners in 1960, about 7.3 million immigrants reside in Germany today, making up about 9% of the general population. As a result, although Germany did not see itself as inviting immigration, it was thus inevitably faced with the concept.

2.2 Rejuvenation of Immigration and Citizenship Policies

Another reason why the German approach towards multiculturalism cannot necessarily be considered a failure is based on the fact that the country has only begun to adopt significant changes to its citizenship and immigration policies in the last decade.

Until recently, Germany was being viewed as having an outdated and restrictive citizenship policy. Although the First Ausländerbeauftragter (Commissioner for Foreigner Affairs) Heinz Kühn attempted as early as 1979 to propose liberalized naturalization regulations under the Kühn Memorandum, changes to legislation were only implemented in the last decade. Furthermore, as late as 1992, the American sociologist Rogers Brubaker suggested that “the automatic transformation of immigrants into citizens remains unthinkable in Germany.” When speaking of immigration, it is also important to bear in mind that immigrants have a relationship with at least two countries. They may be citizens of both, or they may hold citizenship of one state while living in another. Or perhaps they are stateless. This situation can lead to what Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller refer to as the concepts of “transnational consciousness” or “divided loyalties.” Both have the potential to undermine cultural homogeneity, which can be problematic in countries that have a strong cultural identity, such as Germany.

Although Germany has long been characterized as operating under the *jus sanguinis* tradition (law of blood or descent), many of the independent German states initially followed *jus domicili* (law of residence) during the first half of the 19th century. *Jus sanguinis* was not formally introduced until 1818 in Bavaria, then
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adapted more widely by Prussia in 1842, the German Reich in 1871 and finally consolidated by the German Nationality Law of 1913. The law was solidified by the 1919 Constitution and based on the principle that German citizenship referred to a “community of descent”; a notion that remained embedded in German law until the 1990s and was later described as being anachronistic and offensive. After the fall of the Weimar Republic, the *jus sanguinis* definition of citizenship was manipulated by the Nazi regime that cancelled naturalizations and it was not until the 1953 Federal Expellee Law that the FRG allowed for the right of return for all ethnic Germans and their descendants. Thus, both groups, *Aussiedler/Spätaussiedler*, ethnic Germans scattered around Eastern Europe, as well as *Übersiedler*, East Germans who left communist Germany either voluntarily or by expulsion, were granted Western German citizenship. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, East Germans automatically became citizens of the FRG and after an initial influx of *Aussiedler*, their numbers declined in the 1990s, when Germany restricted criteria requiring them to “demonstrate German heritage and culture.” Nevertheless, in response to the arrival of the large number of guest workers, asylum seekers and *Aussiedler*, pressure began to build. The contrast between ethnic Germans and immigrants became increasingly difficult to justify, which led to internal public tensions and raised anti-immigrant sentiments. On one hand, the first group spoke little to no German and automatically received citizenship, while the latter spoke fluent German, studied and worked in the country with hindered access to citizenship. On the other hand, Germany was facing external pressure by being accused of having antiquated laws in need of modernization. Criticism could be heard from as far as North America, with North American analysts questioning the wisdom of the FRG’s restrictive naturalization policies.

As a result, intense political discussions ensued in the 1980s and 1990s, although they remained mostly on an elite level until 1999. While there were minor amendments to Germany’s citizenship policy in 1990 and 1993 that made naturalization an entitlement, rather than a discretionary decision, a change of pace eventually took place in 1998, when the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and the Green Party won national elections and formed a coalition government under Chancellor Gerhard Schröder. Moving the political debate about immigration into the open,
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Schröder announced ambitious changes to citizenship policies, advocating dual citizenship and naturalization based on *jus soli.* What ensued in reaction to this statement was nothing short of a counter-attack of substantial proportions. Public and political backlash was so great, that the SPD/Greens coalition was unable to pass the proposal and had to reach a compromise, which led to the 2000 Nationality Act. While the law stopped short of recognizing dual citizenship, it introduced important changes, such as the *Optionsmodell,* allowing children born in Germany by foreign parents to hold dual citizenship until the age of 18, after which they have to decide which country they would like to belong to by the age of 23. Five years later, in 2005, the government passed its first Immigration Law, which was designed to entice highly skilled workers to settle down in Germany and essentially replaced the Green Card initiative in addition to paving the way for more intense integration courses. Overall, Germany has come a long way since its first citizenship law in 1913, shifting its *jus sanguinis* approach towards a more lenient policy of *jus soli.*

2.3 Germany’s Strong Cultural Identity – “Leitkultur”

Germany is a country in transition towards more liberal citizenship laws, yet the progress of this approach is significantly hindered by its strong national identity. The country’s predominantly cultural emphasis on citizenship grants it a unique status in Europe and the world in general, while at the same time creating compatibility issues with other cultures attempting to integrate and naturalize within its borders.

As Castles and Miller state, “immigration of culturally diverse people presents nation-states with a dilemma: incorporation of the newcomers as citizens may undermine myths of cultural homogeneity; but failure to [do so] may lead to divided societies, marked by severed inequality and conflict.” Furthermore, according to Douglas Klusmeyer and Demetrios Papademetriou, the Basic Law of 1949 includes a section that focuses on “an understanding of FRG membership based on shared cultural and historical ties as privileged over ones based on actual residence and direct contributions to civic and economic life in the Federal Republic.” Integration is especially challenging in Germany, given its strong *Leitkultur,* or leading culture that was forged early on.

During the 18th century, a German-speaking cultural elite, consisting of poets, philosophers and writers, developed interests in pan-Germanism in reaction to
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the political fragmentation resulting from the downfall of the Roman Empire. This elite constructed German nationhood based on ethnocultural rather than political membership and defined the German *Volk* (German people) as a language rather than a political community; further emphasizing the cultural foundation. The notion of German identity was solidified as time progressed and can be considered a major catalyst for German unification in 1871. It presents an important driving force behind political change throughout German history and continues to this day. The political and public debates about *Leitkultur* have been closely related to proposals for German citizenship examinations for immigrants and aspiring citizens nowadays. Having a strong national identity provides solid foundations for cohesion and belonging in society, but if a country does not grant sufficient leniency, integration and naturalization processes can become challenging – much more so when it comes to multiple identities or citizenships, as is the case in Germany.

3 **Dual Citizenship – Why It Matters**

With the concept of multiculturalism in Germany comes also the issue of multiple citizenship. Germany practices a policy of avoidance when it comes to dual nationality. That means the original nationality of an applicant has to be renounced before he or she can acquire German citizenship. However, exceptions do exist and include cases, in which renunciation of the original citizenship is refused (due to conscription for instance), or applicants are expected to pay unreasonably high fees to relinquish their nationality. Other instances in which dual nationality is permitted is in the case of elderly persons or when refugee status is granted. What is surprising however, is the fact that more than half of all German naturalizations are now accompanied by dual citizenship, despite that principle of avoidance. Current trends indicate that this percentage will only increase in the future.
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Dual citizenship matters because in 2010, nearly 800,000 foreigners entered Germany.\textsuperscript{45} Considering the country’s population that year (nearly 82 million),\textsuperscript{46} that number may not seem significant, but it increased the total number of foreigners to 6.75 million\textsuperscript{47} and that constitutes a large portion of the population. Immigration into Germany has more or less remained constant in the past decade, with over 841,000 foreigners entering the country in 2000 and 798,000 in 2010,\textsuperscript{48} despite the introduction of more lenient naturalization policies stated in the 2000 Nationality Act. According to recent naturalization statistics, in 2009 over 96,000 foreign-born residents living in Germany were granted citizenship.\textsuperscript{49} Evidently, dual citizenship has become a relevant topic in Germany, however little has been mentioned about it in the public sphere in Germany. Nevertheless, it is a concept that has been debated more thoroughly in academia and on a political level.

3.1 Dual Nationality – Discourse and Effects

Thomas Faist, Professor of Transstate Relations and Sociology of Development at Bielefeld University in Germany, acknowledges that while academic research about dual citizenship has been a focal point of many scholars, overall it has been neglected in favour of studies of national citizenship in a single country.\textsuperscript{50} Nevertheless, in today’s globalizing world that fosters interconnectivity, there is a clear direction favouring dual nationality, “even in those liberal democratic states that do not as a rule recognize dual citizenship.”\textsuperscript{51}

Citizenship and national identity have taken gigantic leaps in the last 50 years. On a world scale, Canada, the United States and Australia are no longer the only countries faced with large numbers of immigrants adding to their multicultural societies. The Council of Europe adapted its perspective to the new world order in 1997 when it declared a new European Convention on Nationality, designed to welcome the concept of dual nationality.\textsuperscript{52} Countries began to respond and even those governments that insisted on new citizens renouncing their original nationalities, began to apply their laws with less stringency and instead focused on
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the more lenient and verbal approach of having the applicant renounce his or her allegiance to the home country.\textsuperscript{53} Many countries in the world nowadays have adapted their citizenship policies to current trends.

In fact, history indicates that the implementation of dual citizenship will only proliferate in our globalizing world, in which cultural and spatial interconnectedness is becoming increasingly prominent, while the concept of one nationality is becoming more and more outdated.\textsuperscript{54} This line of reasoning is supported by the postnational school of thought, which posits that rights of individuals gain importance vis-à-vis considerations of sovereignty and national identity.\textsuperscript{55} Postnationalism stresses the devaluation of national citizenship in favour of national identity as a human right.\textsuperscript{56} Thus, national identity loses importance, relative to supranational or global entities. The fact that citizens of European Union member states possess at least two citizenships, one on a national and the other on a supranational level, underlines that idea.

It is also important to keep in mind the debate between “good” and “legal” citizenship, which was a big point of contention in the 1990s in Germany when ethnic Germans returned to their home country and were automatically granted citizenship, while the foreign-born population in Germany could not officially become part of the society. A “good” citizen in that view, then, can be described by the concept of denizenship. According to Tomas Hammar,

Denizens are foreign citizens who have a secure permanent residence status, and who are connected to the state by an extensive array of rights and duties. They have their legal domicile or effective residence in the host country; this distinguishes them from other foreign citizens, who lack denizens’ well-developed ties to persons and institutions in the host country. Although they are foreign citizens, denizens are not necessarily foreign-born immigrants. Some may have been born in the country and never lived anywhere else; they may speak the language of the country with perfect fluency, and may perhaps speak no other language. Yet they may remain denizens rather than citizens.\textsuperscript{57}

A “good” citizen is a model resident in every way – speaking the language fluently, working, contributing to society, but not possessing any official recognition as
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being such. On the other hand, a “legal” citizen possesses German citizenship, but may not particularly feel affiliated with the country or speak the language. As a result, tensions between ethnic Germans and “native foreigners” form naturally. The debate of the 1990s between Turkish migrants and returning ethnic Germans was such a case.

3.2 Dual Citizenship – The Good and the Bad

As with any policy, there are many aspects to be considered in the case of dual citizenship. This section will present a brief summary of the main arguments for and against its implementation.

David Martin and Kay Hailbronner compose a comprehensive list of the most important concerns against dual nationality, which includes the issues of loyalty, voting, diplomatic protection, changes in a nation’s culture and military service. The authors then take those arguments and offer alternative means of addressing them. Thus, the issue of loyalty is rebutted with the postnationalist theory, suggesting that individuals can feel attached to more than one country and still feel loyal to them all. When it comes to voting, the argument is brought forth that citizens have an incentive to become voters because they will be directly affected by the results of their voting and it is reasonable to suggest that if one is applying for citizenship, there is an underlying dedication and commitment to remain in that country for a longer period of time. Diplomatic protection is becoming less of a state responsibility, as there are now supranational institutions that guarantee universal rights and safety. With regard to the issue of the transformation of a nation’s culture, dual citizenship cannot be the cause, as the mere presence of cultures already suffices to have an impact on society and change it fundamentally, in addition to external influences, such as media imperialism. Finally, military service is becoming less of a concern in today’s world as countries have signed treaties protecting dual nationals against multiple military service terms. Of course, in that case there is never a guarantee and wars can break out unexpectedly, even among now friendly states.

On the other hand, research indicates that an official dual citizenship policy “increases the propensity among newcomers viz. immigrants to naturalize in the country of settlement” and some surveys suggest that immigrants prefer maintaining their old citizenship when naturalizing in another country. Considering the
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current decline in naturalizations in Germany\textsuperscript{66} and the large number of foreigners currently living in the country (6.75 million), a dual citizenship policy would facilitate the naturalization process and provide a stepping-stone towards integration. Moreover, on an international level, dual citizenship fosters global peace, international trade, the spread of democratic values, and observance of human rights.\textsuperscript{67}

A third argument for dual citizenship centers on the importance of social integration. As mentioned previously, research indicates that an official policy in favour of dual citizenship would increase naturalizations. Thus, a larger proportion of the 6.75 million residents currently without citizenship would officially become part of society and feel a greater incentive to participate politically and socially. In that aspect, political participation is also important because legislation should represent the voice of the entire society, without leaving out those who are minorities or are marginalized.

3.3 The Connection Between Dual Citizenship and Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism has a variety of definitions: it can refer to the diverse ethnic composition of a population or to a set of inclusive policies implemented on the federal level to facilitate equality in a society. Multiculturalism can be used as a tool for integration, it can be an ideology and it can take both, a top-down and bottom-up approach. How does one measure multiculturalism? How does one know whether policies of multiculturalism have been successful? This paper does not use one specific definition of multiculturalism. Instead, the multiculturalism referred to in this paper simply means that Germany, as a society, is no longer solely composed of ethnic Germans that make up a perfectly homogeneous and coherent society. As a result, such a diverse society creates opportunities and challenges. Multiculturalism does not mean that the more diverse a society is the better, rather it means that leadership needs to implement inclusive policies allowing for a stable environment and equal opportunities for all ethnic and immigrant groups as well as the protection of their rights. The point of this paper is not to establish a definition of multiculturalism; instead it argues that dual citizenship would facilitate the aforementioned inclusiveness.

To date, the link between dual citizenship and multiculturalism has merited little attention in academic debate. However, there are scholars stating its explicit presence and I would like to elaborate on their theories in this section. In their working paper from 2004, Faist, Jürgen Gerdes and Beate Rieple argue that dual citizenship is a path-dependent process.\textsuperscript{68} Path-dependency, they suggest, “occurs when a previous decision, norm or rule reinforces itself, when it deter-
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mines in part the subsequent development of events.” With that approach in mind, dual citizenship can be seen as a stepping-stone towards more liberal naturalization and multicultural policies that will then be inevitable consequences of a policy treating dual nationality as the norm.

Furthermore, as of August 2007, German citizens are no longer required to apply for a Beibehaltungsgenehmigung, a document allowing the possession of dual nationality, when they apply for citizenship within European Union member states. However, several examples in countries such as Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands suggest that “granting dual nationality to nationals abroad makes it harder to exclude immigrants from the same benefits.” Keeping in mind that most immigrants in Germany come from non-EU countries, those who are granted dual citizenship based on the above-mentioned policy constitute a small proportion of the German population, while the main cohort of immigrants is left behind and denied that privilege. Thus, allowing dual citizenship would give those immigrants coming from non-EU countries a sense of belonging and facilitate inclusion into German society. On the other hand, the refusal to allow dual citizenship to those who live in Germany on a permanent basis can have negative repercussions and heighten notions of not wanting to identify with the country and along the same lines diminish the acceptance of responsibilities and participation in society.

Faist, Gerdes and Rieple mention that in those countries where dual nationality became a matter of political debate and legal regulation, social integration policies favourable to dual citizenship were of a multicultural kind, suggesting that the two concepts go hand in hand. Also, there is evidence that a politically inclusive understanding of nationhood – as is the trend in Germany, given its provision of choice in the Optionsmodell and its legislative shift from jus sanguinis to jus soli – coupled with explicit multicultural policies and political rights for permanent residents, have established a favourable context for increasing tolerance towards dual nationality. Thus, according to the path-dependency theory presented earlier, Germany is most certainly on its way towards dual citizenship, given the fact that the country is considering multiculturalism to be a part of its society and changing its notion of national identity, from a law of descent towards increasingly liberal notions of German identity.
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Referring to the postnational model, Faist, Gerdes and Rieple suggest that the shift from a state-centric view to a person-centered perspective gave rise to multiculturalist policies. The authors argue that “both political rights for denizens and dual nationality have been conceived as part of […] multiculturalist policies in Sweden during the second half of the 1970s and during the 1980s.” Furthermore, they make the observation that the Netherlands and Sweden accepted dual nationality at a time when the multicultural debate was replaced by discourses on individual responsibility, thus suggesting that dual nationality is a substitute for explicit multicultural policies and that collective rights are necessary ingredients for multicultural policies. I would like to question this view, insofar as multiculturalism is very much based on individual rights. According to Will Kymlicka, a state is multicultural if “its members belong to different nations (a multination state), or have emigrated from different nations (a polyethnic state), and if this fact is an important aspect of personal identity and political life.” Kymlicka further acknowledges that some people use the term in an even broader way, namely to encompass “a wide range of non-ethnic social groups which have, for various reasons, been excluded or marginalized from the mainstream of society.” Both definitions then make Germany a multicultural country if we take into consideration the countries of origin of foreigners currently residing in Germany. 2009 data indicates that Turkey is the largest country with over 1.5 million Turkish living in Germany, followed by 500,000 Italians, 400,000 Polish and 300,000 Greek. Overall, more than 70 nationalities are part of German society nowadays and taking into consideration Kymlicka’s definition of multiculturalism, Germany easily meets the criteria. If multiculturalism then acknowledges the fact that a country’s members have different national identities, the issue of individual rights is very much prevalent. Multiculturalism aims at protecting and nurturing individual cultural and religious values, while granting everyone that same privilege and in that aspect, allowing individual rights to exist could be considered a collective right.

Another argument linking multiculturalism and dual citizenship pertains to a person-centered approach. Jürgen Gerdes suggests that personal identification with a certain culture is very much related to dual citizenship and not only when it comes to integration. Gerdes argues that in the context of transculturality, multiple identities are inevitable and should be studied in association with dual nationality. Along the same lines, an official dual citizenship policy would perpetuate dual
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identities and allow individuals to feel connected to the countries they identify themselves with. In that way, since multiculturalism is based on the acknowledgement and protection of individual rights, dual citizenship is a multicultural right.

### 4 Challenges

“I don’t have to respect anybody who lives off welfare but rejects the state, doesn’t do enough for his children’s education and constantly produces little girls in headscarves.”

*Thilo Sarrazin, “Deutschland schafft sich ab”*

The above-mentioned quotation perfectly describes the approach Thilo Sarrazin, German politician and former member of the Deutsche Bundesbank, took in writing his book. Its publication caused a controversial debate in German society, as it hailed anti-immigrant sentiments and blamed foreigners for problems the country was experiencing. Thilo Sarrazin echoed perceptions of divided public opinion about multiculturalism in Germany and fueled immigration debates.

However, that is not the only challenge Germany is facing. While dual citizenship has been on the political agenda for quite some time, legislation allowing dual nationalities was never fruitful due to two opposing political camps, with the Social Democrats, Greens, PDS, and Free Democrats on one side and the CDU/CSU-FDP coalition on the other. The former made several proposals regarding a toleration of dual citizenship, but the latter refused to agree.

It is important to keep in mind that access to citizenship does not equal integration. A successful dual citizenship policy needs to be coupled with a good integration policy to facilitate the incorporation of foreigners into society. As Gerdes mentions, “Selbstverständlich kann die politisch-rechtliche Integration kein Ersatz für die gesellschaftliche sein, aber ebensowenig ist eine gesellschaftliche Integration ohne eindeutig gleiche Rechte, insbesondere solche der politischen Beteiligung, vorstellbar.”

Nevertheless, Germany needs immigration. Germany needs to invite multiculturalism and naturalization due to its demographic dilemma – a common situation in European countries. Klusmeyer and Papademetriou point out that “since
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2003, the German population has declined due to the birth deficit no longer being compensated by migration flows.\textsuperscript{86} Another important factor in this argument is the aging population, with the number of retirees across the advanced industrial world set to reach absolute and relative sizes unlike anything witnessed in history.\textsuperscript{87} Immigration is no longer an option, but a must in economic terms. Dual citizenship would facilitate multiculturalism and present a more welcoming policy to those hoping for a better life in Germany, while at the same time contributing to economic output and giving back to society.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

Germany is a diverse country and a country of immigration, as this essay has shown. In our globalizing world, interconnectedness and transculturality are becoming more and more prominent realities that will only increase multiculturalism. As postnationalist thought suggests, the one-nationality concept, such as Leitkultur, is becoming outdated, whereas the emphasis on supranational institutions and global entities is growing. While some countries have adapted to the new world order and facilitated naturalization processes or dual nationality, others have stayed behind, holding on to their sense of national identity.

In Germany, multiculturalism is a work in progress. The country has traditionally not accepted immigration, but was inevitably faced with the concept after its guest worker policy. Furthermore, multiculturalism has not necessarily failed, as Germany is in the process of rejuvenating its immigration and naturalization procedures towards more liberalized policies, keeping in mind the country’s strong ethnocultural identity that has been fundamentally changed by the many cultural identities embedded in its society.

What does this mean for the dual citizenship policy? Considering that more than half of German naturalizations are already accompanied by dual nationality and show an upward trend despite the principle of avoidance, the next logical step would be to make the policy official, along the lines of the path-dependency theory introduced earlier. Moreover, such legislation would have positive effects on German society: on one hand, it would provide a greater sense of belonging as well as legitimize the presence of the many foreigners currently residing in the country and identifying as not only being part of their original culture but also as being German. On the other hand, it would pave the way for German society to treat them as equals.

Dual citizenship is a stepping-stone towards multiculturalism, as it reflects the level of comfort of a society towards diversity. Multiculturalism is about protecting individual rights, such as one’s culture, religion and traditions, and dual citizenship would allow for that connection to exist. In order for that to happen, however, the
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problem of two opposing political camps will have to be addressed. Although dual citizenship has been proposed several times, it was always struck down by the opposing camp, and unless Germany will have a majority government at some point in the near future, the prospects for dual citizenship will continue to remain dim, even though Germany as a country of many cultures is prepared for the next step.
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