This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

AMBIGUITIES OF ANTI-RACISM: REPRESENTATIONS OF
FOREIGN LABORERS AND THE WEST GERMAN MEDIA,
1955-1990

presented by

JULIA M. WOESTHOFF

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctoral degree in History

Dagmar Herzog
Major Professor's Signature

26 August 2004
Date

AMBIGUITIES OF ANTI-RACISM: REPRESENTATIONS OF FOREIGN LABORERS AND THE WEST GERMAN MEDIA, 1955-1990

By

Julia M. Woesthoff

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

2004

ABSTRACT

AMBIGUITIES OF ANTI-RACISM: REPRESENTATIONS OF FOREIGN LABORERS AND THE WEST GERMAN MEDIA, 1955-1990

Julia M. Woesthoff

This study analyzes the public debates in West Germany on foreign laborers from the mid-1950s, when the government first recruited so-called "guestworkers," to reunification in 1990, while examining what the decades-long debate over the presence of foreigners in Germany tells us about *Germans*. Over the course of most of the second half of the twentieth century and continuing into the present, the guestworker debate (which ultimately turned into the foreigner debate) has been a vital forum for Germans to process a variety of post-war developments and historical legacies that reached beyond those immediately connected to the employment of foreigners (like economic and infrastructural considerations). Debates over guestworkers offered Germans a venue for grappling with conflicting visions of what might constitute postwar normality--especially as Germans battled over their own contradictory relationships to the evolution of postwar capitalism, the organization of family and gender relations, and legacies of the Nazi past. The dissertation pays particular attention to discussions of the work ethic and consumerism, issues of sexuality and reproduction, as well as invocations of the Third Reich and the Holocaust. In addition, it analyzes how media reports on guestworkers were a major site for working through conservatives', liberals', leftists', and feminists' notions about education, assimilation, and cultural values.

Drawing on articles published in the mainstream local, regional, and national media as well as other sources such as studies regarding labor migration published by the Federal Institute of Labor, and statistics, surveys, and analyses produced by market researchers, industry leaders, sociologists, the government, and the churches, this study reveals that the press was a key player in both intra-German and interethnic ideological conflicts. Beyond their role as self-promoters, utilizing sensationalism to boost sales, the media had a decisive role in posing as advocates on behalf of the German populace and as didactic educators of their readership. The state of public opinion about foreigners (and how that opinion was formed) was also a constant topic in the press, revealing a perpetual dialectical relationship that shaped as well as reflected the outlook of the readership. By turns, the press educated and admonished, condemned and coached their readers' behavior and attitudes about all things "guestworker."

This dissertation not only makes a contribution to the history of the media in West Germany, but also to the history of West Germans' arduous and ambivalent attempts to unlearn their own racism in the wake of Nazism. It analyzes the paradoxical phenomenon that discussion of the place of foreigners in West Germany functioned as a major source of ideological contention between the main political parties even as the parties' actual policies on foreign labor were frequently quite similar. In addition, the dissertation traces post-Nazi Germans' extraordinary attachment to notions of endemic cultural differences between Germans and foreigners, even as Germans' constant chatter about foreigners revealed precisely that those differences were continually breaking down.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project grew out of my interest to understand better the--to this day--often-difficult encounters between native Germans and those considered non-German in the Federal Republic. Dagmar Herzog enjoined me to explore the various facets of the puzzle, and her unfailing encouragement, endless energy, and guidance helped me navigate the complexities of writing a dissertation. Leslie Page Moch generously shared her time and expertise and introduced me to one of the finest places a person could wish for to think and work. Lewis Siegelbaum's and Lisa Fine's thoughtful readings and probing questions helped me to clarify my point of view and refine my arguments. I could not have asked for a better committee.

In the early stages of the research, the reader services at *Stern*, *Spiegel* and *Zeit* generously provided me with citations and press material. The staff at the Zeitungsforschungsinstitut in Dortmund provided helpful guidance and patiently filled my many requests. Thanks also to Willi Keinhorst, regional editor of *Welt am Sonntag*, for his help in identifying the political leanings of various newspapers. Special thanks to Ingrid Klimmer at the Bundespressearchiv (then still in Bonn); her kind, efficient assistance contributed to this project in immeasurable ways.

Walter and Genevieve Page kindly gave me access to their own little piece of paradise, which allowed me to gather my thoughts and start writing. I thank Katja Schomaker for her hospitality and friendship, and Martin Schmatz for

helping me gather sources as well as fulfilling last-minute requests for trans-Atlantic document delivery.

An invitation to attend a graduate seminar on "Violence and Normality in the Century of Total War" at the Transatlantic Summer Institute at the University of Minneapolis not only provided a wonderful forum in which to discuss my project but also helped to establish the framework for my dissertation. The College of Arts and Letters and the History department at Michigan State University provided semester-long dissertation research and completion scholarships, freeing up time and funds which allowed me travel abroad and finish the project.

My special gratitude belongs to Mike Czaplicki, whose unflagging support for my academic career never wavered, and to Lisa Paullin Hopkins, Mary Alice Gebhart, Amy Hay, and Joshua Wease for providing balance and perspective and much-appreciated alternative points of view.

Finally, I want to thank my parents Wolfgang and Ingrid Wösthoff who, for as long as I can remember made sure I was equipped with the tools that made it possible for me to believe I could enter and succeed in the adventure that is grad school. Many thanks also to my sister Anna Maria whose untiring concern and support I treasure so very much; and to my sister Eva, who still possesses the ability to put things in perspective for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The "Negroes of Our Nation"

In April of 1973 the weekly news magazine *Der Spiegel* reported that at a meeting regarding the situation of West Germany's foreign labor force--the so-called "guestworkers"--North-Rhine Westphalia's labor minister Werner Figgen urged that "'We have to be careful that the guestworkers do not become the 'Negroes of our nation.'"[1] As *Der Spiegel* further noted, however, this warning went unheeded. Similarly, the Industrial Institute, reacting to increasing labor unrest among Germany's foreign labor force, feared "that the guestworkers who were often employed in lowly jobs--and paid accordingly--would soon become, as the 'Negroes of Europe,' the material of social conflict."[2]

The urgency of these prognoses originated in the rapid rise of West Germany's foreign labor force to an until then unprecedented high of 2.6 million at the time of the oil crisis of 1973. The majority of this force consisted of unskilled or semiskilled workers first from Italy, Spain and Greece and subsequently from Turkey, Morocco, and Tunisia. At the time of the oil crisis, 35 percent were employed in the iron and metal industry, 24 percent in the processing trades and 16.6 percent in construction.[3] By the summer of 1973, a diffuse but powerful sense of danger was becoming front-page news.

---

[1] "Markt der Menschenhändler," *Der Spiegel*, 26 March 1973.
[2] "Wie ein Schrei," *Der Spiegel*, 26 March 1973.
[3] Herbert, Ulrich. *A History of Foreign Labor in Germany, 1880-1980.* (Ann Arbor: University of Ann Arbor Press, 1990), 230.

These remarks, as it turns out, were symptomatic of a long and complex tradition of representing foreign laborers in an ambiguous manner. Discussions of guestworkers recurrently, and however paradoxically, served as a way *both* to process intra-German arguments *and* as a way to absolve the West German public and government of harboring or fostering ugly or inappropriate notions about foreigners that might in fact be contributing to the difficulties of German-foreign relations. This dissertation analyzes the ways in which the West German print media reported on foreign laborers in West Germany from the mid-1950s, when the government first recruited "guest" laborers, to reunification in 1990, while examining what the decades-long debate over the presence of foreigners in Germany tells us about *Germans*.

My research shows that the decades of debates over guestworkers need to be understood not just as a place where Germans reacted to issues of ethnicity, migration, and interethnic integration, but also as a site at which post-Nazi Germans worked out their feelings about themselves. My contention is that public debate over the presence of foreign laborers proved to be a central mechanism by which post-Nazi Germans worked--often reluctantly and certainly unevenly--to unlearn their own racism. I am very interested as well in understanding better the role of the media themselves--as advocates on behalf of the German populace, as didactic educators of their readership, and as self-promoters, utilizing sensationalism to boost sales.

While immediate post-war emphasis on anti-fascism and anti-militarism seemed to favor the West German Left, the Cold War soon buttressed more

conservative political forces as efforts focused on creating and perpetuating West German economic prosperity and political stability as a buffer against communism. In response, West German Social Democrats, in an effort to gain more political ground, eventually jettisoned their classic socialist party platform in 1959. Entering into a governing alliance with the conservative Christian Democrats in the grand coalition of 1966 only reinforced the sense that the German Left had given up key elements of its former political ideology. Thus, although technically social democratic, the party was neither leftist nor socialist, making it possible for New Left extra-parliamentary opposition forces (*Außerparlamentarische Opposition*--APO) to move into the vacated political space.[4] In turn, the New Left decisively helped shape postwar German politics, putting both, SPD and CDU, on the defensive, a dynamic that explains a great deal about the actions and attitudes of the two main parties from the 1960s onward. At the same time, these developments also aided in fueling the rise of the Right, however, most dramatically felt in the regional electoral successes of the National-Democratic Party of Germany (*Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands*, NPD) in the late 1960s. The party's achievements then can be read as a double response to the rising visibility of foreigners in Germany as well as to the alternative New Left scene at the time.

In contrast to the U.S. press, the West German press is more overtly politicized, so that papers and magazines unabashedly represent their allegiance

[4] See Andrei S. Markovits and Philip S. Gorski, *The German Left. Red, Green and Beyond* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), 34-5; Geoff Eley, *Forging Democracy* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 416-7; Jeremy Varon, *Bringing the War Home* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004), 30-1.

to or criticism of either of the two main political parties and of other political tendencies to either the Left or the Right. Some publications have been expressly linked to particular political parties (among the most radical has been the *National-Zeitung* of the NPD). Within mainstream politics, *Bayern-Kurier* has been closely associated with the Bavarian CDU affiliate, the Christian Social Union (CSU), whereas the *Westfälische Rundschau*, *Weser-Kurier*, and *Hannoversche Presse* can be identified as social democratic press voices). In the realm of major national publications the weekly newspaper *Die Zeit* has long been considered an intellectual liberal publication, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* is in many ways its conservative daily counterpart, and the weekly political magazine *Der Spiegel* (somewhat akin to *Newsweek* or *Time* magazine) is famous for its investigative left-leaning coverage, although in the wake of German reunification it has taken a neo-liberal turn (as have many ex-1968ers). Many papers officially claim to be independent and non-partisan (*unabhängig und überparteilich*) but nevertheless can be established as leaning toward a particular political direction, as "conservative-liberal," "liberal-conservative," or "bourgeois" (*bürgerlich*) publications. Identified as the latter are many local and regional newspapers also included in this study, among them *Münchner Merkur*, *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, and *Ruhr-Nachrichten*. While such hyphenated political identifications might seem alien in the U.S. context, in the German political environment they provide an indication of a given paper's standing in relationship to politics.

Aside from the media, I have made use of a series of representative studies regarding labor migration published by the Federal Institute of Labor as well as more general statistics about the Federal Republic. In addition, I have examined surveys and studies produced by market researchers, industry leaders, sociologists, and the churches, as well as muck-raking exposés such as *Ganz Unten*. In their totality, they cover a wide range of issues such as working conditions, foreign laborers' consumer behavior, foreigner integration into German society (both in the national and local context), the responsibility of the church in aiding the foreign recruits, as well as more gender-specific issues such as the role of non-working guestworker wives in Germany. This study, then, goes beyond an analysis of the press coverage about guestworkers by examining the interplay between public opinions as presented in articles and studies and the way they are reflected back to the readership. The state of public opinion (how it was formed, what influenced it) was a constant topic in the West German media, and the media is best understood as being in a perpetual dialectical relationship with the public, shaping as well as reflecting the outlook of the readership. By turns, the press educated and admonished, condemned and coached its audiences' behavior and attitudes about all things "guestworker."

Statistics on foreign laborers--and the labor situation in West Germany more generally--were also frequently published and discussed in the press. From 1970 onwards, however, the number of studies about and inquiries into the situation of foreign laborers rose sharply. Sociological studies on guestworkers, official attempts on the local and national level to foster foreigner integration, and

surveys inquiring into German opinions regarding guestworkers, all proliferated. Moreover, for the first time, government statistics did not merely focus on the recruitment and placement of foreigners in West Germany but also expressly inquired into their family and living situation, thus stepping outside of the previously more narrow understanding of guestworkers as mere members of a (temporary) laborer force.[5]

In the debate itself, matters seemingly unrelated to the guestworker issue were continually processed, so that talking about guestworkers was also a way to talk about a whole range of other issues. Media reports on guestworkers and other public proclamations (from opinion polls to sociological studies) were major sites for working through conservatives', liberals', leftists', and feminists' notions about education, assimilation, cultural values, and the management of difference. Throughout, however, as will become evident, I am especially concerned to investigate the ambiguities within various commentators' self-styled anti-racism. So many declarations of tolerance and even celebration of guestworkers' contributions came in the guise of affirming and elaborating notions of profound cultural difference. Without a doubt, the shift from predominantly Christian to predominantly Muslim foreign laborers changed the dynamics of public discussion considerably. Yet notions of abiding cultural difference existed from the very first and were not just introduced with the arrival of the Turks (even as today Turks are commonly equated with guestworkers more generally).

---

[5] Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Repräsentativuntersuchung '72. Über die Beschäftigung ausländischer Arbeitnehmer im Bundesgebiet und ihre Familien- und Wohnverhältnisse* (Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1973).

While postwar labor migration has been a ubiquitous phenomenon internationally, it is important to note the unique impact of Germany's National Socialist history--and especially the racial ideology espoused during that time--and the international scrutiny believed to be directed upon the country in its dealings with the foreign recruits from the mid-1950s onwards. Trying to avoid appearing racist, discussions about guestworkers nevertheless exhibited a passionate attachment to cultural differences, which were constantly flagged and thus reified in problematic, essentializing ways. Time and again, however, the guestworker debate exposed the constructedness of difference understood in this manner, betraying the ideological labor that went into not only keeping neatly separated the category of "German" from that of "guestworker," but also privileging one ("German") over the other ("guestworker") in the process. What has been ignored--and what has made it impossible to keep the groups neatly separated--is the fact that there exists not only tremendous diversity within each group but that the groups also have a lot in common with each other, so that the boundaries between the two are constantly shifting and breaking down, making them inherently unstable. Conceptualized in this way, multiculturalism (or *Multi-Kulti*, as it is called in common German parlance) as a political desideratum could be more helpfully understood as involving not (as it so often has in German practice) a reification of presumed cultural differences, but rather an acknowledgment and celebration of the hybridity, diversity, and pluralism inherent also *within* all groups.

The main emphasis of this dissertation, then, is on how talking about "the others" in their midst also offered Germans a venue for grappling with conflicting visions of what might constitute postwar, post-fascist "normality" and identity. This was so especially as Germans battled over their own (often highly contradictory) relationships to the evolution of postwar capitalism--including attitudes about consumerism and the work ethic, their feelings about the organization of family and gender relations, the sexual revolution and feminism, as well as their attempts to deal with legacies of the Nazi past and the politics of post-Holocaust memory. While other scholarship has explored the ways policies regarding the foreigner situation developed as well as how foreigners perceived their own situation in Germany, what has remained understudied so far is the intricate interplay between postwar debate about foreign laborers and Germany's (cultural, social, political, and economic) struggle to emerge from the ruins of World War II and from the Third Reich's racial ideology. Paying attention to Germans' near-constant chatter about guestworkers changes how we periodize and understand a wide variety of issues in postwar German history. For example, telling migration and economic and cultural history in tandem reveals just how early on in the postwar era Germans expressed ambivalence about their "economic miracle." Similarly, analyzing the complex interplay between assumptions about ethnicity and gender, and charting how these changed over time, offers new insights both into just how soon sexual liberalization was perceived to have begun--*and* how irritated many German men were at German women's attempts at autonomy and equality long before the feminist movement

even emerged. Telling the stories of post-Holocaust memory and of the guestworker debate together, furthermore, also offers valuable new insights into both.

These issues also intersected in complex ways. For instance, economic developments and post-Nazi democratization were connected. Guestworkers' apparent economic success accrued an especially potent symbolic meaning because of the centrality of economic issues to West German attempts at moral reconstruction in the wake of fascism. Guestworkers' roles in the economy seemed particularly threatening to West Germans who, after 1945, had sought to re-establish an identity based on industriousness and economic growth rather than national pride--or rather, industriousness and economic growth became the only legitimate sources of national pride. As Micha Brumlik and Claus Leggewie have pointed out (with only partially restrained sarcasm), "People managed to master ordinary daily life in the early days of the Federal Republic principally as economic citizens [*Wirtschaftbürger*]. The question of German identity, of a historical consciousness and self-understanding, of taking an acceptable stand on one's own history, seemed answered by [Germany's] limited sovereignty, thoughts about Europe and integration into the West--the 'burden of history' was so well taken care of by official commemorations."[6]

In the 1970s and 1980s, Germans still largely identified themselves as "economic citizens." In the course of the 1970s and early 1980s, however, Germans also became much more cautious regarding their economy and its

---

[6] Micha Brumlik and Claus Leggewie, "Konturen der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: Nationale Idenität, Multikulturalismus und 'Civil Society'," in *Deutsche im Ausland--Fremde in Deutschland.* ed. Klaus Bade (München: C. H. Beck, 1992), 432-3.

limits. German society was trying to come to terms with a growing lack of confidence about capitalism caused not only by the New Left critiques (voiced in the late 1960s and early 1970s) but above all by the repercussions of the oil crisis. After Germany had so quickly recovered from an early recession in 1966-67, by the mid-1970s the post-war economic miracle appeared really to have come to an end, and neither conservatives nor left-liberals seemed to know how to regard this development. Newfound anxieties about capitalism and consumerism manifested themselves in heightened ambivalence about foreign and especially Turkish participation in both.

In other instances, both left-liberals and conservatives used the guestworker problem as the ground on which they struggled to come to terms with women's growing participation in the work force and eventually also with the feminist movement. Women who had participated in the New Left student movement had become increasingly disenchanted with it, realizing that traditional gender divisions still reigned supreme even in a revolutionary leftist framework. Focused on rejecting the relentless chauvinism of their fellow male activists, however, the majority of German feminists developed an ideology built on the idea of gender difference without recognizing the divisions that existed *among* women. Overlooking their own complicity in creating and perpetuating racial and ethnic stereotypes, it took considerable time and a tremendous effort to confront the inherent racial prejudices in German feminism and to acknowledge differences while working toward a proliferation of *feminisms*.[7]

[7] For a detailed overview on the emergence of a West German women's liberation movement, see Andrei S. Markovits and Philip S. Gorski, *The German Left*, 87-94; on the historical

Abortion legislation proved to be the galvanizing issue propelling women's liberation forward, and the role of women (German and foreign) as child-bearers also took an a key role in the guestworker debate. Conservatives demonstrated this implicitly as they expressed their concerns about low German and high guestworker birthrates (and thereby indirectly reinvoked Nazi-era anxieties). Leftists and left-liberals dealt with their confusions about women's independence more explicitly in their assault on--and yet also fascinated obsession with--guestworkers' purported patriarchalism. Yet other commentators explicitly attested to continued German grappling with the National Socialist past--worrying out loud that "legitimate" xenophobia was not permissible to express after Nazism or, conversely, using the apparent pervasiveness of xenophobia to accuse fellow Germans of having inadequately overcome Nazism.

In sum, the guestworker debate was never exclusively informed by labor politics in the strict sense. In worrying about guestworkers' relative success in establishing a livelihood where many Germans failed to do so, and in worrying about the growing number of second- and third-generation guestworkers in Germany, Germans were worrying as well about their own work values, their own comparatively low birth rates, and their own national and party-political

---

complexities inherent in the gender crisis within the West German New Left movement, see Dagmar Herzog, "Antifascist Bodies," in *Sex after Fascism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005): forthcoming, 408-90; on West German feminist anti-Semitism, see Susannah Heschel, "Anti-Semites Against Anti-Semitism," *Tikkun*, 8, no. 6 (November/December 1993): 50-1; on ethnic divisions within the West German women's movement and attempts to create an anti-racist German feminism, see Sara Lennox, "Divided Feminism: Women, Racism, and German National Identity," *German Studies Review* 18 (1991): 481-502. As Lennox has shown, racism and antisemitism in Germany for a long time failed to be addressed among German feminists, because they believed that their "commitment to global sisterhood seemed to make their German identity not very relevant." Instead, as in the case of National Socialism, for example, German feminists have traditionally posited German women as victims of a ruthless patriarchy, thus ignoring German gentile women's complicity in the atrocities of the Third Reich.

reputations. The ways in which guestworkers and policy decisions about them were discussed in the different venues provided a constant forum for assessments of German history and society.

The Postwar History of Foreign Labor

The history of guestworkers begins in the 1950s, when Germany experienced the much-vaunted economic miracle (*Wirtschaftswunder*), causing a significant labor shortage by the early 1960s. This shortage was due to a number of factors: the generation born during the war (when the birth rate was very low) formed the majority of the labor market, unable to provide a sufficient number of workers; the building of the Berlin Wall cut off the stream of refugees from the East; and the period of education and job training lengthened. To alleviate the labor shortage, West Germany signed the first employee recruitment agreement with Italy in December 1955. Between 1960 and 1965, Germany entered recruitment agreements with seven more countries (with Greece and Spain in 1960; Turkey in 1961; Morocco in 1963; Portugal in 1964; Tunisia in 1965 and Yugoslavia in 1968). Ulrich Herbert describes German society at the time as having "developed no vistas for the future, while spellbound with the fascination of its economic dynamism" where "guest workers tended to be viewed rather as a symptom of this newfound affluence--like color TV and pedestrian malls."[8] In 1961, the arrival of the one-millionth guestworker was celebrated at the Cologne train station.

[8] Ibid., 227.

Not until several years later did doubts about German guestworker politics surface due to the economic recession of 1966-67. At this time, the initial enthusiasm about guestworker labor was replaced with a growing concern about foreign employment, and Chancellor Ludwig Erhardt proposed that Germans work one additional hour per week to mitigate any possible labor shortage. The guestworker presence in Germany developed into what was commonly called the "guestworker problem," setting the tone for the subsequent decades. One sign that attested to the increasing uneasiness about guestworker politics was the enactment of the Foreigner Law (*Ausländergesetz*) in October of 1965. Touted by some as a progressive piece of legislation, it nevertheless tried to hinder foreigners from settling in Germany. The law thus underscored that guestworkers' length of employment as well as their stay in the Federal Republic should be temporary.

However, legislation regarding guestworkers developed unevenly, informed by immediate developments rather than long-term objectives. In 1971, for example, a new work permit ordinance granted guestworkers who had been employed in Germany for more than five years a special work permit valid for another five years. This new regulation uncoupled the right to work and live in Germany from any (negative) developments on the German labor market for 40 percent of the guestworker labor force, proving especially advantageous for those foreigners not already protected by European Economic Community laws (first and foremost Turks).[9] While the economy experienced another upswing in

[9] See Ulrich Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge* (München: C. H. Beck, 2000), 226.

the years after the recession, it was not able to repeat its swift recovery after the oil crisis of 1973. Since guestworkers were disproportionately employed in heavy industry, they bore the brunt of Germany's rising unemployment. Earlier notions of a "guestworker problem" thus returned in the form of German guestworker policy.

The continued incoherence of solutions was evident in Germany's two-tiered approach to the problem. When the government called for an immediate guestworker recruitment ban (*Anwerbestop*) on 27 November 1973, for example, this was initially considered sufficient to stem increasing unemployment in a declining economy, to stop the influx of foreign workers, and possibly even entice some to leave. At the same time, however, the federal government also acknowledged that it was necessary to deal with guestworkers as well as their families who were already in the country. The legislative solutions, in Herbert's words, left

> the total impression...of a very hastily conceived and occasionally hectic policy, attempting by means of ever-new decrees and ordinances, guidelines, and laws to regulate and guide social processes over the short term--without always recognizing or giving proper attention to their longer term nature or scope.[10]

Not surprisingly, then, the recruitment ban and other measures to deal with Germany's guestworkers did not have the desired effect. Instead of decreasing the foreign population, the number of foreigners in Germany rose even more. Due to the ban, guestworkers feared leaving the country for short visits home – afraid they would not be able to retain their jobs in Germany. As a

[10] Herbert, *A History*, 247.

result, many sent for their spouses and families, a right protected by the Federal Republic's Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*).[11]

In addition to the recruitment ban, a change in the regulation of German child benefits was responsible for the influx of foreigners into the country. Until early 1974, guestworkers received full (monetary) child benefits (*Kindergeld*) regardless of where their children lived (in Germany or the home country). However, new legislation lowered the amount of child benefits for guestworker children who had remained behind in the country of origin and further convinced guestworkers to bring their families to Germany. The government followed up on its child benefit laws by denying employment opportunities to guestworkers' families. Starting in December 1974, spouses following their partners were prohibited from obtaining a work permit; guestworker youth joining their families in Germany after 31 December 1976 were neither allowed to hold an apprenticeship nor a work permit.[12]

A few years later, however, trends again moved in the opposite direction. In October 1978, the law was modified to allow foreigners who had stayed in Germany for a five-year-period to apply for a permanent residence permit (*Aufenthaltsgenehmigung*). One year later, in April 1979, employment regulations for guestworker children and spouses were reformed as well. According to the new laws, spouses were able to acquire a work permit after four years of

---

[11] Article 6 of the Federal Republic's Basic Law states that, "(1) Marriage and family are under the special protection of the state order." Furthermore, "(2) Care and Education of children are the natural right of parents who first and foremost have to apply themselves to this duty [*die zuvörderst ihnen obliegende Pflicht*]."

[12] Students who do not acquire a high school diploma (and are thus not eligible for a college education) usually enter into an apprenticeship for three years to learn a trade.

continued residence in the Federal Republic; children were able to obtain an apprenticeship after two years – although only if no German claimed the job.

Thus, even as some of the foreigner policies prevented the settling of guestworkers in the FRG, other measures facilitated it. It is precisely this mix of incentives to return as well as measures to facilitate integration that allowed the conservative Christian Democratic Party (and its Bavarian affiliate, the Christian Social Union) to interpret left-liberal Social Democratic politics as integrationist (and to deem that problematic), even as the ruling Social Democrats themselves continued to pretend that guestworkers' stays were on the whole temporary. In September 1979, this incoherent politics of "temporary integration"[13]--meant to mask the fact that West Germany was indeed an immigration country--was openly criticized by Heinz Kühn, the representative for matters relating to guestworkers of the federal government (*Beauftragter für Gastarbeiter-Fragen*). Kühn was a member of the Social Democratic Party. He presented a report which marked a turning point in the political handling of foreign workers in the FRG. Kühn "demanded a consistent line of integration within the policy of foreign nationals of the federal government rather than the codification of the non-immigration character of labor migration." This report recognized "de facto immigration," which had so long been denied, while nonetheless also supporting the ban on further immigration.[14] This statement of 1979 is a formal indication of a shift in the guestworker debate toward a politics of integration and the recognition that many guestworkers by their actions were demonstrating that they

[13] Ursula Mehrländer, "Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *Ausländerpolitik im Konflikt*, ed. E. Gehmacher (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1978), 134. Cited in Herbert, *A History*, 249.
[14] Herbert, *A History*, 249.

intended to stay in West Germany permanently. Previous policies were always based on the assumptions that foreign workers would eventually return (voluntarily or not) to their native country.[15]

Ironically, despite the ways guestworkers served as political battleground between the main parties, the shift from a Social Democratic to a Christian Democratic government in 1982 changed very little in foreigner politics. The dual impulses of Social Democratic practices were simply intensified by the Christian Democrats. Christian Democrats proceeded to pursue even more forcefully the facilitation of re-migration of guestworkers back to their home countries as well as the prevention of any further migration to Germany. Yet at the same time, for those foreigners who were already in West Germany, the Christian Democrats now argued that naturalization should be the logical conclusion to integrationist efforts, and thus they strove to reduce foreigners' options (by dropping the option of permission of indefinite residency in West Germany) to either stay and ultimately apply for West German citizenship or leave. Simultaneously, as a result of this intensified double strategy--and even as most aspects of foreigner policy appeared as continuities with the pre-1982 trends--integration would remain a point of acute contention between the SPD and the CDU.[16]

Already, from the early 1970s on, the presence of guestworkers had become ever more noticeable in German society; this was so not only because they stayed but also because they increasingly started to explore alternative avenues regarding work, such as establishing their own businesses.

---

[15] Ibid., 250.
[16] Detlef Bischoff and Werner Teubner, *Zwischen Einbürgerung und Rückkehr* (Berlin: Hitit Verlag, 1992), 52ff.

Furthermore, as their families joined them and their children entered German schools, they transgressed spatial boundaries and gradually moved into German neighborhoods. These developments elicited ambiguous responses from Germans; on the one hand, guestworkers were admired for their work ethic and family values. On the other hand--precisely because they possessed these admirable traits and were increasingly settling in German society--they were also perceived as a serious threat to German identity.

Significantly, by the early 1970s the public debate increasingly shifted its focus onto Turks, even though it did occasionally still discuss Italians, Greeks, or even Chinese. By January 1972 Turks had become the largest foreign contingent among the guestworkers. Not only that, but while the number of guestworkers had a little more than doubled in the 5-year-period from 1968-1973, the number of Turkish guestworkers more than quadrupled during the same time frame, so that by 1973 Turks made up around 23 percent of the foreign workforce. By comparison, the other groups who made up more than 10 percent of the foreign labor force were Yugoslavs (18 percent) and Italians (12.8 percent).[17] After 1973, the number of guestworkers (regardless of their nationality) declined. By and large, this also meant a general drop in the number of residents from the recruitment countries. The number of Turkish nationals in Germany, however, kept growing. Moreover, unlike most other guestworkers, Turks in Germany were seen to be especially different and unassimilable and were the center of attention because of their "Asian" origins (most of them came from Anatolia, located in the Asian part of Turkey), and because of their religious

[17] Herbert, *A History*, 230.

beliefs and "Oriental" culture. Moreover, as the sources reveal, these factors set them apart from other foreign workers and often served to make Turks into the archetype of guestworker difference.

At the same time, while both party-political sides in the public debate--left-liberals and conservatives--ostensibly discouraged open discrimination against guestworkers, it was not just the German rhetoric of admiring guestworkers' purportedly inherent traditional values and their relative success "against all odds" (i.e. previous attempts to reduce their numbers) that revealed a systematic, stereotypical racism in the guise of antiracism. In addition, and overall, the language used in describing the guestworker problem by the left-liberals and the conservatives repeatedly supported the opinion that foreigners in general and Turkish guestworkers in particular were inherently different from German people regardless of their actions. Precisely as journalists called for greater popular understanding of Germany's "guests" and styled themselves as creating the grounds for that greater understanding, they also continually reiterated an array of problematic stereotypes. They did this by elaborating on and simultaneously reifying guestworker difference. Indeed, as it turns out, it was the left-liberals who most forcefully styled themselves as antiracists but who nonetheless, ironically, most determinedly (re)produced guestworker difference.

Historiographical Trends

On the one hand, the presence of guestworkers in post-war Germany has traditionally been discussed as part of migration history or, more specifically, as

one element of the long pattern of foreign labor employment in Germany. The focus here has usually been on the legal and political issues that informed the debate regarding labor and immigration regulations.[18] On the other hand, post-war (West) German history has often ignored guestworkers, despite their crucial contribution to the success of Germany's reconstruction after the war, not just economically but politically, socially, and culturally as well. For example, historical overviews of the postwar period that have been published since the early 1990s make no mention of the presence of guestworkers or their impact on and contribution to the West German economic miracle, despite a common consensus that this "miracle" was the driving force behind West Germany's arrival into and acceptance of democracy.[19]

More recently, however, scholarship on post-WWII West German history has finally started to incorporate the history of foreign laborers, acknowledging not only their contributions to the German economy but also recovering their experiences in their German host society more generally.[20] In yet other works

---

[18] See for example, Ray C. Rist, *Guestworkers in Germany. The Prospects for Pluralism* (New York, London: Praeger, 1978); Ulrich Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerbeschäftigung in Deutschland, 1880-1990* (Berlin: J. H. W. Dietz, 1986). (Translated in 1990 under the title *A History of Foreign Labor in Germany, 1880-1980*); idem, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge* (München: C. H. Beck, 2000).

[19] See, for example, Axel Schild, *Ankunft im Westen. Ein Essay zur Erfolgsgeschichte der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1999); Ulrich Herbert, ed., *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2002). An exception is the anthology *Miracle Years*, edited by Hanna Schissler, which includes an essay by Ulrich Herbert and Karin Hunn on guestworkers. Its focus, however, is mostly limited to guestworkers as participants in Germany's postwar labor history. See Ulrich Herbert and Karin Hunn, "Guest Workers and Policy on Guest Workers in the Federal Republic: From the Beginning of Recruitment in 1955 until its Halt in 1973," in *The Miracle Years. A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949-1968*, ed. Hanna Schissler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 187-218.

[20] See, for example, Franziska Dunkel and Gabriella Stramaglia-Faggion, *"Für 50 Mark einen Italiener": Zur Geschichte der Gastarbeiter in München* (München: Buchendorfer Verlag, 2000); Yvonne Rieker, *"Ein Stück Heimat findet man ja immer. "Die italienische Einwanderung in die Bundesrepublik* (Essen: Klartext, 2003); Anne von Oswald and Barbara Schmidt, "'Nach

have focused on placing the history of guestworker politics into the broader political decision-making process that developed in Germany in the postwar years, taking into consideration the public debates that influenced the political decision-making process.[21] Other works have explicitly made it their goal to weave together German and guestworker histories, in effect writing German history as migration history.[22] Much of the focus of these contributions, however, is still on issues related to working and living conditions as well as legal aspects of the guestworker presence without drawing out more explicitly the ways foreigners helped shape life in Germany and German identity more generally.

Recent scholarship has also started to explore the impact of gender and ethnicity on historical developments in Germany. Heide Fehrenbach's work, for example, discusses the period from 1945 to the 1960s when Afro-German youth (born to German women and African American GIs) started entering the labor market and when attention to guestworkers and migration--as she notes--started to displace concern with "racial" difference *within* Germany.[23] Maria Höhn, in her study of encounters between American troops stationed in 1950s Germany and the German public, also explores how Germans deployed the concept of "race"

Schichtende sind sie immer in ihr Lager zurückgekehrt...' Leben in 'Gastarbeiter'-Unterkünften in den sechziger und siebziger Jahren," in *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, ed. Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald, (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999),184-214; Anne von Oswald, "'Venite a lavorare con la Volkswagen!' 'Gastarbeiter' in Wolfsburg 1962-1974," in *Aufbau West Aufbau Ost. Die Planstädte Wolfsburg und Eisenhüttenstadt in der Nachkriegszeit*, ed. Rosmarie Beier (Ostfildern-Ruit: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1997), 199-209; Mathilde Yamin and A. Eryilmaz, *Fremde Heimat. Eine Geschichte der Einwanderung aus der Türkei* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 1998).

[21] Karen Schönwälder, *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität. Politische Entscheidungen und öffentliche Debatten in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik von den 1950er bis zu den 1970er Jahren* (Essen: Klartext, 2001).

[22] Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, Anne von Oswald, eds., *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

[23] Heide Fehrenbach, *After the Racial State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005): forthcoming.

to condemn relationships between African American GIs and German women (who, in the process were stigmatized and labeled as prostitutes).[24] Both studies underscore how important it is to pay attention to issues of race *and* gender in order to understand more fully the larger social, cultural and political developments in post-1945 West Germany. They both reframe assumptions about what constitutes "Americanization" of postwar West Germany as well, among other things noting the racism pervasive in postwar U.S. society--including the "Jim Crow" laws, and thus the inevitable ironies inherent in Americans' attempts to reeducate Germans away from Nazi racism.

Other works have already delved into exploring the ideological underpinnings of German interaction with guestworkers. Since the early 1990s, scholars have increasingly examined the various ways in which guestworkers, and particularly the growing minority of Turks, have been represented within German society. In addition, they have tried to explain guestworker marginalization by analyzing images of foreigners/guestworkers in German film and literary texts, thus exposing (in Azade Seyhan's words) "the complicity of representation in stubbornly reproducing constructions of otherness dictated by dominant ideologies."[25] The various studies have shown that there exists, for instance, an unreflective continuation of Nazi sentiment in the treatment of foreigners (expressed in jokes, for example, that compare Turks to Jews). They

---

[24] Maria Höhn, *GIs and Fräuleins. The German-American Encounter in 1950s West Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

[25] Azade Seyhan, "Introduction" to *New German Critique's* special issue on *Minorities in German Culture* 46 (winter 1989): 3; also see Gail Wise, "Ali in Wunderland: German Representations of Foreign Workers" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1995); Marie Lorbeer and Beate Wild, eds., *Menschenfresser-Negerküsse. Das Bild vom Fremden im Alltag* (Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1991).

have also explored how foreigners not only actively participated in the shaping of their own representation (in the form of what has come to be known as "guestworker literature") but--in "talking back" to their hosts--also affected public discussions about the guestworkers. Moreover, they expose an often "misleading binary opposition between Germanness and Foreignness" in the way guestworkers have been portrayed, an observation that my work also illustrates.[26] Most recently, literary critic Leslie Adelson has also emphasized the inadequacy of paradigms which assume that assimilation into German society by Turks is a one-way street marked by nostalgia and loss.[27]

Also in the 1990s, works like (the sarcastically titled) *Die freundliche Zivilgesellschaft* (*The Friendly Civil Society*) and the more recent *Unsere Türken* (*Our Turks*), approached German-Turkish relations through a critical analysis of German society instead of focusing solely on foreign (particularly Turkish) workers. Both studies reveal that racism has been consistently central to German (political, social, and cultural) dealings with foreigners.[28] Other scholars have worked to represent foreigners' perspectives on Germanness. Eberhard Seidel-Pielen as well as David Horrocks and Eva Kolinsky in *Turkish Culture in German Society Today*, for example, presented personal narratives about the Turkish experience in Germany. In addition, Horrocks and Kolinsky draw attention to the

---

[26] Wise, "Ali in Wunderland," 5-6; Anna Kuhn, "Bourgeois Ideology and the (Mis)Reading of Günter Walraff's *Ganz Unten*" New *German Critique* 46 (Winter 1989): 191-202; Rita Chin, "Re-writing the 'Guest Worker'. Turkish-German Artists and the Emergence of Multi-Culturalism in the FRG, 1961-1989" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1999).

[27] See Leslie Adelson, "The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature: Towards a New Critical Grammar of Migration," paper presented at the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, 25 March 2004.

[28] See Redaktion diskus (ed.), *Die freundliche Zivilgesellschaft. Rassismus und Nationalismus in Deutschland* (Berlin: Edition ID-Archiv, 1992); Eberhard Seidel-Pielen, *Unsere Türken* (Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1995).

increasing literature written by foreigners in Germany. A growing scholarly engagement with this genre began in the 1980s when foreign workers began to write extensively about migration and its significance in their life experience.[29] These studies too have worked to expose the problematic and often racist German attitudes vis-à-vis guestworkers and other foreigners in German society.

Sara Lennox's work, on the other hand, takes a critical look at German anti-racism. In her article "Divided Feminism: Women, Racism and German National Identity," she addresses the issue of anti-racism in a German feminist context. Lennox shows that far from aiding in deconstructing categories of difference, many kinds of anti-racism have a stabilizing influence on the category of whiteness when they do not question how "racial and national identities are constituted".[30]

Apart from Lennox's article, however, ambiguities embedded in Germany's anti-racist discourse remain under-theorized. While many scholars have referred to newspapers to substantiate their findings, their analysis lacks specific engagement with how the mainstream press and other venues for public discussion have elaborated on and shaped the guestworker issue. Such an approach reveals that the print media debate itself has not only served as a site

---

[29] David Horrocks and Eva Kolinsky, *Turkish Culture in German Society Today* (Providence, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996); Barbara A. Fennell, *Language, Literature and the Negotiation of Identity* (Chapel Hill, London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Russell King, John Connell, and Paul White, *Writing Across Worlds–Literature and Migration.* (London, New York: Routledge, 1995); Gisela Brinker-Gabler and Sidonie Smith (eds), *Writing New Identities: Gender, Nation, and immigration in Contemporary Europe* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Sabine Fischer and Moray McGowan, eds., *Denn Du Tanzt auf einem Seil. Positionen deutschsprachiger MigrantInnenliteratur.* (Tübingen: Stauffenberg, 1997); Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox and Susanne Zantop, *The Imperialist Imagination. German Colonialism and Its Legacy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998).

[30] Sara Lennox, "Divided Feminism," 493.

for working out relationships between German leftists, left-liberals, and conservatives, but also served to construct as well as reflect popular German sentiment. As Eric Naiman has argued in a very different context (an analysis of Soviet ideology during the years of the New Economic Policy),

> ideology and the literature that can shape it are not purely reflective of material realities but affect the perception of those realities in ways that then have an impact on the development of material realities themselves.[31]

Naiman's sources are obviously more overtly propagandistic than the German ones. But the conceptual point he makes holds true for the guestworker debate in West Germany as well.

Moreover, studies that have at least in part considered the media nonetheless have often riveted onto quantitative issues (asking how frequently themes are raised and by which ideological camps) rather than considering *how* the themes are handled as well as the commonalities *across* ideological divides.[32] Thereby they have missed the highly consequential impact of the ways media reportage and related forms of public pronouncement structure understanding of issues by identifying and framing themes and by defining the parameters of debate. [33] One of the most remarkable aspects of the public

---

[31] Eric Naiman, *Sex in Public. The Incarnation of Early Soviet Ideology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

[32] For further criticisms of unhelpful strategy media analyses, see Ulrich Sarcinelli, "Massenmedien und Politikvermittlung--Eine Problem- und Forschungsskizze," in *Medien und Politik*, ed. Gerhard W. Wittkämper (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft,1992), 50; Schönwälder, *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität*, 34-5.

[33] See the important interventions of Stuart Hall, "Encoding, Decoding," in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During (New York: Routledge, 1993); idem, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms," in *Culture/Power/History*, ed. Nicolas Dirks et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); Barbie Zelizer, *Covering the Body. The Kennedy Assassination, the Media and the Shaping of Collective Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Michael Schudson, *The Power of* News (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); idem, *Sociology of News* (New York: Norton, 2003).

debate about guestworkers in West Germany was the persistence of an ideology of endemic cultural differences--expressed in endlessly contradictory fashion. Precisely the proliferation of contradictory claims, far from undermining the consensus of a wide gulf in values and manners between Germans and foreigners, instead appeared to strengthen that consensus.[34]

This dissertation, then, is neither an analysis of popular German attitudes about guestworkers nor a study of guestworkers' own lives. It is, rather, an analysis of the way in which the mainstream media and other sites of public debate repeatedly used the guestworker issue as an opportunity for addressing ideological conflicts Germans were having with each other. It shows that while debating issues of foreign employment as well as foreign settlement in West Germany from the 1950s to the 1990s, German commentators also used the occasions to discuss and thereby create "knowledge" not only about guestworkers but also about German economic, sexual, and national identities.

The postwar debates can be loosely divided into five overlapping phases. There was an initial period (lasting until the early 1960s), when the majority of guestworkers came from "Christian" countries like Italy and Spain; this era is discussed in chapters 1 and 2. A transitional period (running from the mid-sixties to early 1970s), discussed in chapter 3, saw a shift of attention to the growing community of Turkish guestworkers. From the early 1970s to the early 1980s,

---

[34] On the insight that ideology works through contradiction, see Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner, "Sex in Public," *Critical Inquiry* 24 no. 2 (winter 1998): 548-53; Dagmar Herzog, "Desperately Seeking Normality: Sexuality and Marriage in the Wake of the War," in *Life after Death. Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europea During the 1940s and 1950s*, eds. Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 189-90; idem, *Sex after Fascism*.

discussed in chapter 4, Turks' increasing tendency to stay in Germany rather than rotate home forced a profound reconceptualization of the guestworker question. Chapter 5, in turn, covering the early 1980s through to reunification in 1990, analyzes the heyday of the New Left's impact on liberal approaches to the subject of foreign labor, as well as conservative responses to it. The conclusion takes the story up to the present.

Throughout, discussions about postwar migration and German attitudes toward foreigners were infused with a number of issues that went beyond the immediate concerns of Germany's transformation into an immigration country and the concomitant fears of "overcrowding" that accompanied the debate. Rather, Germans' concerns about (Christian) Southern Europeans moving to Germany in the context of guestworker recruitment and their apprehensions about the growing number of Muslims from Turkey were intricately linked to ever-shifting memory regimes regarding the country's fascist past, its economic recovery and prosperity as well as changing political orientations and gender dynamics in the context of the rise of the New Left and the emergence of feminism. What my work shows is that ostensibly domestic issues are inseparable from international and intercultural dynamics. By telling the stories of German national and migration history together in this way it becomes possible to understand each more fully.

CHAPTER 1

DENIGRATING GUESTWORKERS: THEORIZING VIOLENCE AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCE, 1955-1965

The Italians Return

Early reports of potential labor recruitment from Italy struck a nerve with parts of the German press. The response was in part informed by a longstanding history of Italian laborers in Germany, most recently in the context of World War II. During the Third Reich, Italians had initially been employed as civilian workers, and while considered alien (*fremdvölkisch*) in Nazi ideology, Italy's role as political ally granted them special privileges among the heterogeneous group of foreigners working in Germany at the time. "They considered themselves free workers, voiced demands and complaints, felt no need to be modest, unassuming, compliant, devoted or deferential in their behavior toward Germans."[1] Such attitude was met with disapproval by the authorities and resentment among parts of the German public. With the overthrow of Mussolini in July 1943, hostility towards Italians became even more intense. Ultimately, and although their situation would never resemble the horrors meted out to Jewish slave laborers or Soviet POWs, or even many non-Jewish Poles, the deprivation of individual liberty was blithely forgotten in such remarks as those made by the *Badische Zeitung* in early January 1958. The paper was able to come out wholeheartedly in support of foreign laborer recruitment, observing good-naturedly and without any hint of self-consciousness that twelve years after the

[1] Ulrich Herbert, *Hitler's Foreign Workers. Enforced Foreign Migration in Germany Under the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 101.

war, many miners, factory workers and farmers were still "used" to working with foreigners.[2]

But what remained most vivid in the German public consciousness, and what many public reports at the time underscored as well, was not the coerced deployment of foreign labor in a wartime economy, but rather images of plundering foreign hordes roaming the streets *after* liberation. In fact, statistically, many more Germans were guilty of such raids than Displaced Persons (an extremely broad category under which the Allies subsumed a wide variety of different ethnicities and nationalities that had suffered under the Nazis).[3] But in postwar tellings, it was the foreign laborers who plundered. Such recollections belie any sense of harmonious relations between Germans and foreigners, and could be said to reveal an anxiety that perhaps foreign laborers' purportedly vengeful impulses might be morally justified. Understanding Germans' highly selective and skewed perception of foreign laborers during and at the end of World War II, thus helps to put in perspective reports about guestworkers in the West German press. In the first years of the debate one could find articles that entirely ignored the experience of wartime foreign labor in German companies and instead incited fear by focusing exclusively on memories of marauding foreigners at the end of the war. These accounts reveal much about the way Germans remembered the war and their role in it. *Kölnische Rundschau*, for example, cautioned most forcefully against hiring an army of foreign laborers,

---

[2] "100 000 Fremdarbeiter in Deutschland," *Badische Zeitung*, 11 January 1958.
[3] Ulrich Herbert, "Apartheid nebenan," in *"Die Jahre weiß man nicht, wo man die heute hinsetzen soll." Faschismus-Erfahrungen im Ruhrgebiet,* ed. Lutz Niethammer (Bonn: J. H. W. Dietz, 1986), 259.

particularly from Italy, because "We had a million [foreign laborers] in our country before...And as we were plunged into the chaos of the zero hour [i.e. the end of the war], a lot of them took revenge for their abduction and forced labor--especially on the German population in the countryside, so that some farmers' wives are still scared stiff."[4] Still in late 1962, *Stuttgarter Nachrichten* reported: "The older population has not forgotten that at the end of the war, thousands of suddenly freed forced laborers took revenge on the people of Wolfsburg for the injustice they had suffered."[5] By focusing exclusively on the last days of the war--and thus at once acknowledging in passing the hardships and mistreatment forced laborers had endured but acting as though revenge was an incommensurate response, articles like these represented the foreign workers as perpetrators; while casting Germans in the role of victims, thereby in the process completely reversing their original roles.

Apart from Ulrich Herbert's analysis of German mentality and behavior towards foreign forced and civilian workers,[6] works by Atina Grossmann and

---

[4] "'Wenn sie nur ordentlich arbeiten...' 300 000 ausländische Arbeiter in der Bundesrepublik--Auch die Folgen bedenken," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 25 October 1960; also see "Fremde Wanderarbeiter," *Die Welt*, 24 June 1955; also speaking to Germany's "bitter experiences" with forced laborers, while at the same time calling for more understanding, see Kurt Widmaier, "Mit Peppo arbeiten--mit Peppo leben," *Christ und Welt*, 1 September 1961.

[5] Josef Schmidt, "Wolfsburgs Italiener bereiten Sorgen," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 24 November 1962; see also, "Reise auf dem Weg der Hoffnung," *Frankfurter Neue Presse*, 31 March 1956.

[6] Ulrich Herbert's analysis of interviews with Germans and their memories of foreign laborers during the Third Reich offers extremely valuable insights into the ways Germans perceived their interactions with foreign workers during the war and aids in understanding the role of the West German press in the guestworker debate of the 1950s and beyond. While most Germans understandably dwelled on their compassion for and acts of kindness towards the foreigners, Herbert also uncovers in the interviewees' responses a particular understanding not only of the "other" but also of the circumstances under which they met. Germans did not question the racial hierarchy at work during the war (which often translated into professional advancement for Germans), nor did they criticize any punitive behavior outside of direct, physical violence against the foreigners. As Herbert argues, "Whatever lies below the threshold of abuse--the foreigners' forced labor, their living conditions--is not remembered [by the interview partners] as something that could be beyond the scope of the tolerable. If they were not beaten, they were doing well."

Robert Moeller have helped us understand and unravel the multiplicity of war narratives that emerged in the postwar years. Their accounts suggest that Germans were able to engage in a politics of memory (rather than a politics of silence) that nonetheless avoided any acknowledgment of their own complicity.[7] Discussions of guestworkers that referenced memories of German (women's) victimization by foreign forced laborers at the end of the war and also denounced the (continued) violation of German women at the hand of *guestworkers* thus have to be read in a larger context of the production of particular postwar memories.

Once recruitment was under way, many newspapers did condemn the harsh treatment foreign migrants frequently received and did acknowledge a connection between their situation now and their fate during the Third Reich. Some articles also betrayed a sense of ambivalence, however, about the complicity of the German population in the war atrocities--on the one hand, there was a desire to exculpate the majority of the population, evident in a politics of memory that avoided engagement with Germans' own complicity. On the other hand, the fragility of that same narrative was often betrayed within the very same article. Dr. Joseph Scheu, who reported for a number of papers on the guestworker issue, for example, admitted that "the 'superiority vis-à-vis foreign laborers [*Fremdarbeiterkomplex*]' might also sometimes taint the good

---

Herbert notes that in the interviews Germans made no distinction between military internees and civilian workers despite the sometimes-enormous differences in treatment according to racial and political policies; see Ulrich Herbert, "Apartheid nebenan," 248.

[7] Atina Grossmann, "A Question of Silence: The Rape of German Women and Occupation Soldiers," *October* 72 (Spring 1995):46-63 ; Robert G. Moeller, "Remembering the War in a Nation of Victims. West German Pasts in the 1950s," in *The Miracle Years: A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949-1968*, ed. Hanna Schissler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 83-109.

relationship with the Italian workers," even as he invoked those memories of "legions of forced laborers, who were forcefully brought to Germany, people who were treated as less than human and with whom one was not allowed to interact in a brotherly fashion."[8] Conceding that forced laborers were treated inhumanely, Scheu nevertheless managed to exculpate Germans by reminding readers that Germans had not been *allowed* to fraternize with the foreign laborers. However, what Scheu omitted here was the fact that during the last months of the war, Italians were on the bottom rung of the racial hierarchy among the forced laborers (proximate in status with POWs from the Soviet Union) and particularly targeted by Germans due to their "betrayal" in the war.[9]

Speaking to the crucial role Germans played in the processes connected to the employment of foreigners, Ulrich Herbert has underscored that "The German population here was not a passive audience--it was incorporated as an active factor in National Socialist politics, and it depended on the behavior of each individual German at work, in the camps, or in public, how the foreign forced laborers were actually treated."[10] Sentiments like "Can't trust them [the Italians]. Twice they started out on Germany's side, twice they ended up on the other," as expressed by a German farmer, according to the *Westfälische Rundschau*, mirrored general German sentiment, indicating a deep-seated resentment for what many Germans still perceived as Italians' betrayal.[11] Also

---

[8] Joseph Scheu, "80 000 italienische Arbeiter werden erwartet," *Caritas* 51 (1960): 126.
[9] Ulrich Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland* (München: C. H. Beck, 2001), 146.
[10] Ibid., 156.
[11] K. H. Behrendt, "Mario hat hier das Singen verlernt," *Westfälische Rundschau*, 24 November 1960.

acknowledging problems with regard to the German population's disposition toward the foreign laborers, one paper warned, "Every insult inflicted on the guestworkers today, will come back to haunt us one day, just as the good treatment many French POWs received on German farms and in German factories has paid off to this day." Eager to exonerate the majority of Germans, the article also acknowledged the level of involvement of the German public with the conscripted workers. The article further asserted that these POWs

> came home and were able to report that in those years, there were not only Germans who worked the gas chambers but also others who saw the prisoners as human beings and who treated them the way they wanted their own sons treated. In 1945, those POWs were a counter weight to the returning concentration camp inmates, who had only come in contact with German sadists.

Germans on the home front are here represented as good and compassionate. While emphasizing Germans' concern for the forced laborers during the war, however, the article also expressed ambivalence about those very same Germans, when it cautioned that "in the Third Reich everybody who was not directly involved in inhumane acts, was still able to claim that they were not involved at all. Today, there is no higher authority that sanctions such uncivil behavior, instead, it is the man on the street, who does it out of his own volition."[12]

Parallels between the potentially violent behavior of postwar Italian guestworkers and the past violations which papers claimed Italian forced laborers had committed in the Third Reich were drawn from the very beginning of the

---

[12] Fritz Richert, "Unsere Gäste," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 8 August 1964; see also H. G. v. Studnitz, "Türken sind die Stiefkinder unter den Gastarbeitern in Deutschland," *Welt am Sonntag*, 12 September 1965.

debate; at the same time it was emphasized that, legally, guestworkers and Germans were on equal footing. And any comparisons between the working conditions guestworkers had to contend with and those forced laborers had had to face during the war were rejected.[13] Even while many papers admitted that there was generally no reason for complaint regarding the vast majority of guestworkers and that violent acts perpetrated by foreigners could be disregarded as the deeds of a few bad apples, some articles nevertheless at the same time also expressed an urgent need to nip the problem in the bud immediately by taking (sometimes drastic) legal actions (ideally resulting in deportation) against the perpetrators. It seems that a lot of papers read the situation as only the first indications of what Germans would have to endure in the near future as the number of recruits continued to rise; some even called into question the very idea of guestworkers' recruitment.

At the same time that papers called for punitive measures, however, they also acknowledged the weight of Germany's fascist past and expressed resentment about how it colored Germany's dealings with foreigners. Thus *Kölnische Rundschau* preemptively (and defiantly) argued, for example, that "The German avowal of a friendship among nations does not exclude [the fact] that we are concerned about customs and order [*Sitte und Ordnung*] within the borders of our country,"[14] or argued that Germany's hands were tied because it quite

[13] "Ausländische Arbeiter in der Bundesrepublik," *Echo der Zeit*, 27 March 1960; "Jeder Fünfte hat Heimweh," *Nürnberger Zeitung*, 22 October 1960.
[14] "Messerhelden," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 7 August 1962.

possibly had to fear diplomatic repercussions if it were to punish the violent offenders.[15]

Ambivalence about the role of the German public in World War II as well as the constant incoming flow of laborers in the postwar period lingered and characterized much of the early discussion regarding guestworkers. Few articles were initially as critical and outspoken as the one appearing in *Freie Presse* already in late 1960: "Because large sections of the population between Isar and Elbe have not even dealt as yet with the deportation of Jews and the reasons for that, it can hardly be expected from the general population [*Allgemeinheit*] that it is concerned with the fate of the foreign laborers [*Fremdarbeiter*] then and now."[16] In general, however, by the early 1960s, papers became much more critical of German anxieties regarding the foreign recruits, and articles began to condemn what they deemed to be Germans' "malicious disdain and typically German arrogance,"[17] as well as the thoughtless use of the term "foreign laborer" or "alien laborer" (*Fremdarbeiter*) for the new recruits. For some papers such terminology was a clear indication that Germans lacked any sense of shame and guilt for what had happened during the war.[18] If Germans had indeed failed to see the connection between the *Fremdarbeiter* of the Third Reich and the

---

[15] "Bürger bilden Schutzgemeinschaft," *Rheinische Post*, 15 November 1962; see also "Leserbrief von Dietrich König: Extrawurst für die Gastarbeiter?" *Rheinische Post*, 26 August 1963; "'Zwei kleine Italiener'--und die Dolche? *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 10 January 1964. The same article also appeared under the title "Den Italienern sitzt das Messer zu locker," *Augsburger Illustrierte*, 15 January 1964.

[16] Horst-Werner Hartelt, "Gestern und Heute: Fremde in Deutschland," *Freie Presse Bielefeld*, 24 December 1960.

[17] "Ausländer sagen: Die Deutschen schneiden uns," *Westdeutsche Rundschau*, 10 June 1961.

[18] See Marianne Asbrock, "Der Bahnhof wird zur Piazza," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 25 July 1961; Kurt Widmaier, "Mit Peppo arbeiten--mit Peppo leben," *Christ und Welt*, 1 September 1961.

guestworkers of the postwar period and were operating under the "fiction of a lack of precedent [*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*]," as Ulrich Herbert argues, a number of German newspapers made it their point to remind them.[19]

It is not immediately obvious what initially caused this shift towards a more critical viewpoint regarding German behavior. However, it appears to have been motivated in part by complaints guestworkers themselves started to articulate, maintaining that while not all Germans seemed hostile toward the foreign migrants, among parts of the German public there still existed "National Socialist racism"[20] or a certain "race pride and Hitler spirit."[21] Such sentiment was diametrically opposed to the official message of international understanding and European integration German politicians were touting at the time,[22] and some articles pointed to the potential threat to international political relations in what they saw as a less than even lukewarm public reception of the guestworkers.[23] In turn, an increasing number of articles endeavored to set Germans on a more appropriate political and ideological path by stepping up education about the guestworkers. Yet while didactically encouraging greater understanding towards guestworkers, the media nonetheless disseminated a broad array of stereotypes.

---

[19] Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 200-1.
[20] Anton Dieterich, "El Guierrillero verteidigt sich. Spanische Arbeiter in Deutschland," *Rheinische Post*, 7 July 1962.
[21] Gustav René Hocke, "Wie die Brüder Rossi aus Tarent Deutschland sehen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 7 September 1962.
[22] Ulrich Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 210.
[23] See, for example, Horst-Werner Hartelt, "Gestern und Heute: Fremde in Deutschland," *Freie Presse*, 24 December 1960; Fritz Richert, "Unsere Gäste," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 8 August 1964; Wolfgang Bartsch, "Gäste im Zerrspiegel," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 30 December 1966; Helmut Hertsch, "Gäste oder Freunde? Zur Situation der ausländischen Arbeitskräfte in der Bundesrepublik," *Europa Union*, February 1967; "Ein Experiment wurde zum Anspom. Wertvolle 'Tage der Begegnung' mit Gastarbeitern," *Echo der Zeit*, 17 December 1967.

Primitive Southerners

As the number of guestworkers rose quite significantly from 1960 onwards, the public debate frequently turned to the (increasingly asserted) "problems" of foreign labor recruitment, what had caused them and how they could be prevented. Many articles cited a lack of contact between Germans and foreigners as one of the biggest obstacles to alleviating tension (because isolation had marginalized foreigners, put them on the defensive, thereby fostering stereotypes rather than eliminating them) and admonished their readers for what many papers understood to be Germans' unreflected resentment (by the mid-1960s increasingly referred to directly as racism) left over from the war years and caused in large part by Germans' skewed memories about the foreign forced laborers. They also found fault in Germany's pleasure-oriented life-style and argued that guestworkers were necessary to keep the German economy--which made the German way of life possible in the first place--running smoothly (even if they had different views on how many guestworkers were needed to accomplish this feat) and for Germans to realize what an asset guestworkers were economically. In turn, one of the major tasks papers elected for themselves was to educate Germans about guestworkers. While often critical about the tabloids and their sensationalist coverage of guestworker brutality and customs considered utterly alien and backward to enlightened westerners, more serious coverage of the issue was also based on the belief that difficulties arose because of deep-rooted--possibly insurmountable--differences between Germans and guestworkers. By the mid-1960s the debate intensified around the issue of

guestworker violence, often centered around sexual matters. Not surprisingly, in the process papers themselves at times betrayed their own ambiguities about the ongoing recruitment of foreigners even as they tried to dismiss them.

Papers were highly critical of what they saw as Germans' obstinate refusal to treat the foreign workers decently and with respect. Repeatedly, articles admonished readers that many problems occurred because Germans had never critically considered the issue of forced laborers during World War II.[24] Worse, Germans still had what some papers continued obliquely to refer to as the "superiority complex vis-à-vis guestworkers," presumably the lingering belief that Germans were superior to both the foreigners who had been forced to work in Nazi Germany's war economy as well as those who had come to fuel the postwar economic miracle and the conviction that Germans had unjustly suffered under the problems forced laborers might have caused. [25]

In an article in late 1964, for instance the conservative paper *Christ und Welt* conjured up a variation on this theme when it described a "guestworker complex," and defined it as something created out of German men's fears for the safety of their wives, and Germany's general potential for succumbing to hot-blooded knifers, who were also draining money from the German social system via child allowances, and who in general worked on undermining the Federal

---

[24] Horst-Werner Hartelt, "Gestern und heute," *Freie Presse*, 24 December 1960; Marianne Asbrock, "Der Bahnhof ersetzt die Piazza," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschafts Zeitung*, 25 July 1961.

[25] "Ausländer sagen: Die Deutschen schneiden uns," *Westdeutsche Rundschau*, 10 June 1961; Joseph Scheu, "80 000 italienische Arbeiter werden erwartet," *Caritas* 61 (1960); Kurt Widmaier, "Mit Peppo arbeiten--mit Peppo leben," *Christ und Welt*, 1 September 1961; Rolf Buchwald, "'Gastarbeiter schlechte Leute...?'" *Abendpost*, 19 November 1963; Fritz Richert, "Unsere Gäste," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 8 August 1964; "Unsere Mitbürger aus dem Süden. Aussprache in der Arbeitsgemeinschaft katholischer Verbände," *Frankfurter Neue Presse*, 11 February 1965; see "Gastarbeiter. Die Millionenarmee aus dem Süden," *Christ und Welt*, 6 November 1964.

Republic. Other papers not explicitly referring to the Third Reich nevertheless mocked what they saw as the schoolmasterish, petit-bourgeois behavior of Germany's growing middle-class,[26] or condemned Germans for giving arrogant speeches, bossing around foreigners, and ignoring different national sensitivities.[27] This particular assessment, published in various papers all over Germany, held additional weight as it came from an official source--the head of one of the state employment offices, Dr. Valentin Siebrecht. Aside from admonishing Germans for their less than sensitive demeanor towards foreigners, in that same article Siebrecht also stressed that "For the Southerner, the human [element] is key [*das Menschliche ist entscheidend*]." Sounding innocuous enough, it was nevertheless indicative of the mentality of difference that pervaded newspaper coverage. Even when Germans were accused of unacceptable behavior, papers did not question the notion of difference (often equated with inferiority) between Germans and foreigners on which German reactions were based. Instead they tried to explain what they understood to be guestworkers' cultural differences in an effort to minimize misunderstandings even if it seemed impossible to many to bridge the mental and cultural distance they perceived.

Trying to refute what some papers apparently considered to be the public's misconception that guestworkers had chosen to come to Germany out of

---

[26] "Die ausländischen Arbeitskräfte und wir," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 3 June 1961; "Ausländer nicht nur Arbeitskräfte," *Main-Post*, 30 September 1961.

[27] Dr. Valentin Siebrecht, "Die Gastarbeiter," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 9 June 1962; the same article (sometimes with slight variations) also appeared in a number of other papers all over West Germany under the following headings: "Die ausländischen Arbeiter," *Augsburger Allgemeine*, 12 July 1962; "Ausländer als Gastarbeiter," *Westfälische Rundschau*, 28 July 1962; "Ausländische Arbeiter werfen neue Probleme auf," *Lübecker Nachrichten*, 5 August 1962; "Die ausländischen Arbeiter," Deutsche *Tagespost*, 12 September 1962.

a sense of adventure, the media emphasized that guestworkers were forced (rather than chose) to leave their respective countries because they could barely make ends meet at home. Guestworkers were neither "gold diggers," with a "thirst for adventure," nor did they expect Germany to be "the land of milk and honey."[28] Papers expressed similar sentiments in discussions about guestworker ethic. Nevertheless, papers' perceptions about guestworker life were riddled with problematic stereotypes, often conjuring up images of a simpler, possibly more carefree mentality and way of life at home (reflected in their appearance, housing, and sexual behavior, to name a few central issues). In turn, such supposed vast differences seemed to make it more difficult for them to fit into German society. While reminding Germans of the poverty in which many of the recruits lived at home, for example, *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung* asserted that it was nevertheless an exotic, seemingly less severe kind of poverty, describing it as "the kind of poverty that seems to be coupled with cheerful carefreeness, with what appears as a childlike calmness: the street there is home [*Heimat*]." Despite criticism about the inadequate housing guestworkers were offered in Germany, the paper nevertheless claimed that it was an open secret that "a cozy living atmosphere can quickly brought to the brink of ruin [*herunterwirtschaften*] by southerners, especially in a foreign country [*in der Fremde*]."[29] *Rheinischer Merkur* was similarly ambivalent, maintaining that

---

[28] Joseph Scheu, "Fremdarbeiter," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 19 February 1960; idem, "80 000 italienische Arbeiter werden erwartet," *Caritas* 61 (1960); Horst-Werner Hartelt, "Gestern und heute: Fremde in Deutschland," *Freie Presse*, 24 December 1960; Hans K. Herdt, "Armando aus Portugal," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 12 September 1964.
[29] Marianne Asbrock, "Der Bahnhof ersetzt die Piazza," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschafts Zeitung*, 25 July 1961.

Germans had encountered guestworkers before on vacation in their respective home countries and should thus be somewhat familiar with them, but that it was also understandable that Germans displayed a rather reserved attitude because

> the southerners are foreign to us. Their dark skin, their dark hair and sparkling eyes or the often-matching little mustache, all this seems to us a bit frightening. Moreover, these people come from countries with a low standard of living, which already shows in their outer appearance. One also often meets them in groups; fond of community [*gemeinschaftsliebend*] as Southern peoples [*Völker*] after all are.[30]

Christ und Welt talked about "an army of foreigners, who can neither speak nor read German, [who are] not familiar with German customs, mores, and laws, [which] come from a different environment, a different milieu and climate" and concluded that "[they] cannot be easily 'integrated'...They form, especially in conurbations, 'foreign bodies [*Fremdkörper*].'"[31] *Handelsblatt* conceded that from the German perspective guestworkers might look like "primitive fellows,"[32] and *Industriekurier* even argued that unlike Belgium and France, for example, Germany had no colonial history with the countries from which it recruited its workers. Therefore, it lacked the "economic, political and cultural ties" other former colonizers supposedly had with people from the former colonies.[33] Outside of the right-wing *Deutsche Nationalzeitung* one could rarely find blatantly racist remarks about guestworkers, although *Hannoversche Presse* reported in May 1964 that Kardinal Frings, one of the most prominent leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, issued a warning in his parish magazine that

---

[30] Ursula Petri, "Spanische Gastarbeiter in Deutschland--Mißverständnisse und Enttäuschungen verärgern die Südländer," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 19 April 1962.
[31] Richard Kaufmann, "Fremdenhaß? Der Gastarbeiter--ein gesellschaftliches Problem," *Christ und Welt*, 13 November 1964.
[32] "Gastfreundschaft," *Handelsblatt*, 4 March 1965.
[33] Dr. H.-G. Hoffmann, "Kesseltreiben gegen Gastarbeiter?" *Industriekurier*, 7 April 1966.

> A nation [*Volk*] needs to get clear in its mind [*darüber klarwerden*] . . . if it wants to secure its continued existence [*Bestand*] through its own growth or through immigration of other *Völker*. A *Volk* should know if it wants to remain a *Volk* that has been molded over centuries or if it wants to mix with other *Völker* on a grand scale. If one were to decide in favor of "guestworkers",...then one would have to limit their residency permit to a few [short] years. If one decides in favor of "immigrants", then one would have to think harder...from which *Völker* one should replenish our *Volk*.[34]

While the quote itself is extremely disturbing with its implications about a homogenous German nation that had supposedly been evolving for centuries, it is even more disconcerting that the liberal paper refrained from any comment about it.

Ironically, the issue of difference was underscored most forcefully and consistently in articles citing so-called guestworker experts--educated Germans or foreigners (often educated in Germany) who were in charge of a group of guestworkers at a particular company or employed by one of the charitable organizations that looked after the foreign recruits. One of the oft-cited experts was Dr. Giacomo Maturi. He had been in charge of the guestworkers at Ford Motor Company in Cologne and had further made a name for himself as a social expert on Italian workers in the Federal Republic (working with the German radio and TV station *Westdeutscher Rundfunk*, for example). Over the years, Maturi's evaluation of the guestworker situation in Germany appeared in a variety of papers. In 1964, he wrote an article for *Die Welt*, significantly titled "From a Different World." In it Maturi attempted at length to explain to the German readership the Mediterranean guestworker psyche (presumably in an effort to bring down some of the barriers that had been built up between Germans and

[34] "Gastarbeiter oder Einwanderer. Kardinal-Frings-Blatt fordert Entscheidung in Bonn," *Hannoversche Presse*, 14 May 1964.

foreign workers), juxtaposing it with what he considered to be particularly German traits:

> The German is correct without exception but does not hide his disdain for the workers from the underdeveloped parts of Southern Europe, and this disdain often leads to a reserved attitude, to an impersonal way in dealing...and a consistent and firm attitude that does not show any consideration for the idiosyncrasies and typical weaknesses of the southerner. Even the industrious foreigner willing to adapt has the feeling that he will never succeed in being accepted as an equal employee. The last German is always more talented and reliable enough to control and lead even more talented and willing foreigners.

Maturi managed both to praise and criticize the guestworkers, while using the authority of his own erstwhile "ethnic" identity in a very odd way that permitted native Germans to feel comfortable with their own prejudices. In an act of extraordinary infantilization he further "explained":

> The Southerner feels misunderstood. He is exceedingly individualistic and has a pathetic sense for solidarity in the community, for organization and discipline. In the state in particular he sees an enemy rather than a protecting power, he considers laws and norms that come from any authority as harassment rather than help, and [he] easily tends to an unconventional and rebellious attitude. He loves to work and is obedient if he has concrete goals and [if he is] treated personably, but he can be lazy and stubborn if he is not considered the number one.

But that was not all:

> He is distrustful and cunning. Cunning is simultaneously a necessity of life for him and the art of life for him, but he can also be exceedingly open and childishly optimistic if he finds the right contact. He is passionate, temperamental, easily filled with enthusiasm but equally easily discouraged and depressed.[35]

Replete with generalizations, Maturi's evaluation of the guestworker situation, which he voiced in modified and shorter but similar form in other papers as well,[36]

---

[35] Giacomo Maturi, "Aus einer anderen Welt," *Die Welt*, 8 August 1964.

[36] See for example, Josef Schmidt, "Firmen brauchen weniger Gastarbeiter als vor einem Jahr," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 6 April 1965; the same article also appeared under the heading "Der Ruf

echoed many of the problems other papers also saw in German behavior--arrogance, a feeling of superiority, and a decided lack of effort to understand and empathize with the guestworkers. In contrast to the authority loving correct German, Maturi's "Mediterranean worker" with his "typical weaknesses"--his tendency to mistrust higher authorities, his individual and potentially rebellious nature, and his childish character--was everything "the" German was not. In the end, the article--ostensibly meant to help open channels of communication and understanding--was more likely to have confirmed for readers their suspicions, leaving them with a feeling that their reserved attitude and mistrust toward the foreign laborers were justified. By firmly placing Germans and guestworkers in opposition to each other, Maturi's article underscored the general tendency among papers to emphasize difference, thus unwittingly contributing to the growing suspicions the public harbored about guestworkers. Maturi also strategically flattered Germans, when he emphasized that also the "least qualified [*der letzte*] German managed matters better than the overly emotional foreigner.

Thus, even if they did not report as sensationally and copiously about guestworker violence as the tabloids, more serious newspapers did feed into the general excitement about the issue. They not only pointed out that there was an increasing number of reports on guestworker violence but also proceeded to give

---

nach den Gastarbeitern ist nicht mehr so laut," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 6 April 1965. In the article, Schmidt reported about a conference by the German Institute for Business Management where Maturi talked about German-guestworker relations. Once again, he juxtaposed guestworkers' "southern individualism" with Germans' difficulty to make friends (*Kontaktarmut*), their life structured by tight norms, and the "organized objectivity (*Sachlichkeit*) in all aspects of life" that foreigners often took to be arbitrary." *Süddeutsche* made this last point even more forcefully, stating that the "organized objectivity in all aspects of life" was perceived by the foreigners as an act of *cruelty*.

the news added credence by explaining to their readers the reasons why guestworkers were particularly predisposed to sexually motivated crimes. Again, such news attained yet more authority when its source was one of the guestworker experts, as was the case with Egon Tenze. "Himself of Italian descent," which--as in the case of Maturi--appeared to lend his opinion even more authenticity, he voiced his fears about an increase in knifings (according to popular opinion the weapon of choice for Mediterranean men) around Mardi Gras. Accompanied by increased alcohol consumption and its sexually charged atmosphere, Tenze saw danger emanating from "'the hot-blooded, and in accordance with their mentality, quick-tempered Italians." For him the Sicilians posed a particular problem, because "'They have a particularly violent temper, and additionally are mostly of small stature, so that they are likely to take out their inferiority complex on the taller Germans.'"[37] Similar opinions appeared in other papers which among other things argued that guestworkers, and particularly Italians cooled off their "hot little rage with cool steel." An article in *Weser-Kurier* explained such behavior by pointing out that, "in the southern regions of Italy, particularly on Sicily...the stabbing weapon has always been the only effective means to defend oneself or to fight for one's rights."[38]

Almost identical statements also started to circulate about Turks. When papers reported an increase in Turkish violence in Cologne in early 1965, the

---

[37] "'Zwei kleine Italiener'--und die Dolche?" *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 10 January 1964; the aricle also appeared under the heading "Den Italienern sitzt das Messer zu locker," *Augsburger Illustrierte*, 15 January 1964.

[38] K. J. Schröder, "Bei Luigi sitzt das Messer locker," *Weser-Kurier*, 1 August 1964; see also Gerhard Schmidt, "Südländer haben es im kühlen Norden schwer," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 13 February 1965.

conservative *Kölnische Rundschau* published an article titled "The Hot-Headed Turks." Claiming that the author was an authority on Turkey, the article further asserted, however, that the information about Turks was just as applicable to Sicilians, Spaniards or the Portuguese. The rambling exposé that followed this outrageously hyperbolic and arrogant introduction immediately turned the focus to the issue of (sexual) violence, claiming that, "No matter what Turkish paper one is reading, one repeatedly encounters reports about murder and manslaughter, abduction or rape. The hot temperament of Turks is hard to check, although they are all fundamentally good-natured." It went on to explain that the "supply of humans" from Turkey who were familiar with cosmopolitan urban life had been depleted and that Turkish laborers now came from Anatolia. According to the expert, these were simple people who only knew the Anatolian steppe, on their way to a totally different world,

> That is completely unfamiliar to them....They do not know that elsewhere one does not put one's feet on stuffed chairs or take off one's shoes, not scratch one's feet in public, that it is custom to take off one's hat in bars and restaurants, and that one does not touch everything in department stores. No wonder they [guestworkers] are reminded in quite a few bars and stores that in Europe one is supposed to behave like a European.

The verbal rampage might seem absurd, especially because the expert's discussion of deficiencies in Turkish etiquette seemed rather trivial and the transgressions he listed were certainly not just the prerogative of non-Europeans. However, for the author, it was evidence that proved guestworkers' utter difference. Worse, any attempts to Europeanize the foreigners would inevitably bring out their violent nature:

> A word spoken a little more forcefully might suffice to infuriate these people, who are highly sensitive, think a lot of themselves [*von sich selbst eingenommen*] and are easily offended in their national pride. A stern look--after Mehmet or Hassan have consumed alcohol, something they are not used to--maybe even the request to pick up a piece of discarded paper, not to just throw away their cigarette butts in a bar or to spit in public, might be enough to evoke a feeling in these people that they are no better than the little servant in their village, who is only good to clean up the dirt. [In these situations] reaching for the knife is an automatic reaction.[39]

Here, even well meant German guidance was considered doomed in the face of foreign ignorance and pride and sure to evoke violent reactions.

Violence and Desire

In short, the media's belief in ethnic and racial differences became most evident (and potentially most problematic) in the context of a larger debate regarding issues of guestworker violence. As the preceding narratives already indicate, the topic carried additional weight not least because papers often saw the reason for violent outbreaks in the foreigners' sexual escapades. Some concerns had been voiced in the press at least since the beginning of the decade, but by 1964 these topics carried a sense of urgency that until then had been absent and that was fueled not only by the papers' general speculations but underwritten by interviews with as well as articles by the experts. The media expressed ambiguity and contradiction about how to talk about the sexual desire-spawned violence and veered between unreflected racism and didactic antiracism. They were also rather indecisive, however, about how to evaluate *German* women's behavior. While seemingly championing Germany's

[39] "Die hitzigen Türken," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 19 March 1965.

comparatively liberal morality, papers also took a critical stance on the sexual license it seemed to provide German women, faulting them for inciting the problem in the first place.

Many articles seeking explanations for guestworker violence found them in the precarious social situation the foreigners faced in their host country. They pointed out that one of major problems was the way guestworkers spent their leisure time. Guestworker interaction with the German public was severely limited for a number of reasons. As papers admitted, many German colleagues--no doubt influenced by the host of stereotypes circulating about the guestworkers--were not interested in establishing relationships with the foreign recruits outside of work. Moreover, particularly in the early years of postwar labor migration, many guestworkers lacked German language skills, which only reinforced their social isolation. Their segregation in company barracks, however, was deemed one of the gravest problems of the guestworker issue. In 1962, around two-thirds of the guestworker population lived in often extremely spartan dorm-style housing. "Not only a lack of space and freedom of movement, but inevitably also a lack of quiet, [as well as] opportunities for retreat and intimacy led to a complete loss of a private sphere in the mass accommodations [*Massenunterkünfte*]."[40] Papers repeatedly pointed out that the foreigners' physical isolation in barracks only reinforced their social isolation and helped to

[40] Anne von Oswald and Barbara Schmidt, "'Nach Schichtende sind sie immer in ihr Lager zurückgekehrt...' Leben in 'Gastarbeiter'-Unterkünften in den sechziger und siebziger Jahren," in *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, ed. Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, Anne von Oswald (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999), 200. The article provides a detailed discussion of the evolution of guestworker housing policies comparing them to dormitories provided for German laborers. It also argues for continuities in official ideology between labor camps in Word War II and guestworker housing in the post-war period.

explain guestworker violence, including sexually motivated offenses.[41] The press criticized the overall quality of the guestworker accommodations, calling them "old-fashioned barracks" that quickly and understandably turned into "hotbeds of fermenting unrest and revolt against the new environment,"[42] claiming that the root of all (sexual) evil could be found in the way the guestworkers were housed,[43] also because it caused guestworkers to drift back "into the psychology of the single man....one does not feel like the head of the household anymore, [and therefore] one succumbs to temptation."[44]

Indeed foreign men's separation from their families at home (most notably their wives) was brought up repeatedly as one of the rationales for guestworkers' sexual transgressions. Papers did not unanimously condone family reunification, however. Some voices pointed to fears of "foreign infiltration [*Überfremdung*]"[45] or argued that guestworkers whose families resided with them in the Federal Republic would have no incentive left to return home.[46] While those opinions were few and far between in the early 1960s, they nevertheless were indicative of a trend that gathered force in the late 1960s and particularly in the early

---

[41] Arndt Brüggemann, "Deutsche bewahren gegen Ausländer angeblich zuviel Zurückhaltung," *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 August 1962; "Um die Kinder der Gastarbeiter. Besondere Betreuungsmaßnahmen auch für jugendliche Einzelgänger nötig," *Saarbrücker Landeszeitung*, 4 March 1964; Ruth Baren, "Wie steht es um die Kinder der Gastarbeiter?" *Mannheimer Morgen*, 15 April 1964; Dagmar Zeisset, "Der Weg der Sehnsucht ist kürzer geworden," *Der Tagesspiegel*, 11 Juli 1964; "Mit Bildern lernen Türken schnell Deutsch verstehen," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 12 September 1964. Guestworkers themselves were quoted criticizing their living conditions in an article by Hanns-Günter Grosser, "Einsam in der fremden Stadt. Zehntausend Türken fühlen sich isoliert," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 19 February 1965.

[42] Gerhard Schmidt, "Südländer haben es im kühlen Norden schwer," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 13 Februray 1965.

[43] Werner Höfer, "Mit dem Dolch im Gewande. Gastarbeiter//des deutschen Wunders unverstandene Kinder," *Die Zeit*, 23 April 1965.

[44] "Der hohe Preis der Auswanderung," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 11 December 1965.

[45] "Ausländer tragen unser Wirtschaftswunder mit," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 3 June 1960.

[46] Arndt Brüggemann, "Verantwortung dafür kaum zu übernehmen: Gastarbeiter holen gern die Verwandten," *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 8 August 1962.

1970s, when the number of guestworkers seemed to be endlessly growing despite indications that the economy might not expand forever.

Most papers expressed their support for family reunification, pointing out that it would help save guestworker marriages[47] and aid the process of assimilation.[48] Other articles also emphasized, however, the advantage it would have for the *German* population. Apart from minimizing guestworker desire for overtime (which angered German colleagues and worried unions) and creating "solid romantic relationships,"[49] it would aid in reducing the (sometimes violent) competition for German women[50] as well as the number of illegitimate children fathered by foreigners.[51]

Despite a certain level of awareness for the difficult circumstances under which guestworkers lived, however, articles also disseminated blatantly essentialist assumptions regarding cultural (or even biological) differences that seemed to make foreigners' sexual troubles a foregone conclusion. At times, papers betrayed their confusion about what caused the problem when they acknowledged the social difficulties guestworkers faced but nevertheless proceeded to focus on their inherent differences in the very same article.[52]

---

[47] Josef Schmidt, "Wolfsburgs Italiener bewältigen die Freizeit," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 22 October 1964; "Der hohe Preis der Auswanderung," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 11 December 1965.
[48] "Angelo und Anna arbeiten in Deutschland," *Badische Zeitung*, 6 April 1960.
[49] "Ausländische Arbeiter haben sich bewährt," *Allgemeine Zeitung-Neue Mainzer Zeitung*, 19 August 1960.
[50] Erich B Kusch, "In Deutschland zufrieden--auch ohne Spaghetti," *General-Anzeiger*, 1 April 1960; Gerhard Schmidt, "Südländer haben es im kühlen Norden schwer," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 13 February 1965.
[51] H. P. Körfgen, "Italienische Gastarbeiter und Deutsche Mädchen," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 9 January 1960.
[52] See Gerhard Schmidt, "Südländer haben es im kühlen Norden schwer," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 13 February 1965; Hanns-Günter Grosser, "Einsam in der fremden Stadt. Zehntausend Türken fühlen sich isoliert," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 19 February 1965; Werner Höfer, "Mit dem Dolch im Gewande. Gastarbeiter--des deutschen Wunders unverstandene

Repeatedly, reports commented on the traits that seemed to epitomize the Mediterranean male. Articles that focused on Italians in the early 1960s, but at times also depicted Greeks and Spaniards (and later Turks), often ascribed to the foreigners behavior informed by "Southern temperament." Generally, it referred to what was understood to be their more outgoing character, as they were "more fond of singing, louder and more temperamental" than Germans[53] and had a "tremendous need to talk to other people." Indeed, *Die Rheinpfalz* maintained, "Not to be able to talk, not to be able to talk things through, is for them like a harsh punishment. So they gaggle together and talk."[54]

According to another paper, the way guestworkers moved about more freely on the streets also attracted romantically inclined German girls.[55] The expert on foreigners Dr. Giacomo Maturi most succinctly summarized the dichotomy between Germans and foreigners for *Bild am Sonntag* when he stated that "'The differences between Germans and foreigners are much greater and deeper than we can even imagine. Friction is initially unavoidable. My fellow countrymen not only tend to show their feelings and impressions outwardly but also to let them explode at times."[56] Such a comparison not only underscored guestworkers' extroverted character but also warned about its inherent dangers. Maturi flagrantly deployed his own dual identity statues--referring to "my fellow countrymen" (Italians) and yet also styled himself as the fully assimilated German

---

Kinder," *Die Zeit*, 23 April 1965; Joachm W. Reifenrath, "Das Messer und die Ehre," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 29 December 1965.

[53] Arndt Brüggemann, "Deutsche bewahren gegen Ausländer angeblich zuviel Zurückhaltung," *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 August 1962.

[54] "Die Gastarbeiter suchen eine Brücke," *Die Rheinpfalz*, 6 July 1963.

[55] "Anstandsfibel für die italienischen Gastarbeiter," *Weser-Kurier*, 8 December 1960.

[56] Gert Lahmann and Jochen Kummer, "Menschen zweiter Klasse?" *Bild am Sonntag*, 28 March 1965.

bourgeois expert--in order to encourage Germans to feel comfortable in their assumptions about cultural differences.

Toward the mid-1960s, discussions of male Mediterranean characteristics took on an increasingly cautious note, conveying more about what was understood to be the dangerous side of "Southern temperament." Even before that, however, tension about foreigners' violence existed, and papers were less than sure about how to evaluate the situation. One paper argued, for example, that guestworker attacks were no exception anymore while still reassuring its readers that there was generally no reason for complaints against the foreigners.[57] Yet another paper maintained that violence was indeed the exception rather than the norm but also contended that the few violent guestworkers managed to terrorize whole neighborhoods and that "for a Turk the knife in a certain sense belong 'to his outfit,'" implying that a possible threat emanated from the entire male Turkish community in Germany.[58] However, as one paper put it "'Of course, the guestworkers as a whole are generally unskilled support workers whose behavior by no means permits extrapolated assumptions about the entire population of the homeland." In their effort to educate their readers, urging them not to give in to guestworker stereotypes, papers themselves disseminated them liberally.

The liberal *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* made similar claims about Turks, also basing its statements on "an expert on Turkish peoples," and drawing out the connection between sexuality and violence. "Merely the smile on a German girl's

---

[57] "Messerhelden." *Kölnische Rundschau*, 7 August 1962.
[58] "Bürger bilden Schutzgemeinschaft," *Rheinische Post*, 15 November 1962.

face, never mind a relationship, in Anatolia is understood to be something serious [*Endgültiges*]. The woman who turns away from him [the male Turk] easily becomes the victim of his jealousy and passion."[59] *Welt am Sonntag* further underscored Turks' increasingly marginal role among the guestworkers in an article titled "Turks are the Step-Children among the Guestworkers in Germany." According to the paper, Turks were rather clumsy when dealing with the other sex--unlike Italians or Spaniards. If they did manage to get the attention of a German girl, they fell for her that much harder. It was not unusual, therefore, for such relationships to result in dramas of jealousy.[60] In the end, apparently neither expertise in the art of seduction (as was granted to the Italians and Spaniards) nor a lack thereof (as was presumed about the Turks) boded well for the guestworkers.

What made the problem particularly troubling, according to the papers, were guestworker relations with female minors. It was reported that parents feared that their daughters did not know how to handle the Mediterranean temperament,[61] a view also implicitly underscored by other reports about illegitimate children fathered by guestworkers and born to German mothers, many of them still teenagers.[62] Another article on the issue pointed out that the

---

[59] Hanns-Günther Grosser, "Einsam in der fremden Stadt. Zehntausend Türken fühlen sich isoliert," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 19 February 1965.
[60] H. G. v. Studnitz, "Türken sind die Stiefkinder unter den Gastarbeitern in Deutschland," *Welt am Sonntag*, 12 September 1965.
[61] Marianne Asbrock, "Der Bahnhof ersetzt die Piazza," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschafts Zeitung*, 25 July 1961.
[62] Heinz Stuckmann, "Noch nie ging es Antonio so gut...Geht es ihnen aber ausgezeichnet?" *Die Zeit*, 14 October 1960; H. P. Körfgen, "Italienische Gastarbeiter und deutsche Mädchen," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 9 January 1961; Max-Karl Feiden, "Gastarbeiter isolieren sich in Baracken-Zentren," *Ruhr-Nachrichten*, 10 January 1964; "Gastarbeiter weniger krank. Hauptproblem:

marriageable age for women in Mediterranean countries was fourteen, so that guestworkers were not even aware of any wrongdoing. To prevent problems, the article suggested to educate girls in school about the different guestworker habits and the different status women had in their home countries. It further advocated--referring to advice given by the head of the Office for Italians at the Labor Office of the Capital of Rhineland-Palatinate (*Betreuungsstelle für Italiener des Arbeitsamtsbezirks der rheinland-pfälzischen Landeshauptstadt*)--not to encourage meetings between guestworkers and German girls by inviting guestworkers into families with daughters, nor to encourage meetings between them at dances.[63]

The issue of sexual offenses committed by guestworkers was a sensitive issue for papers given the already apprehensive attitude about the foreigners' sexual conduct. Papers did point out that there were no separate statistics available for crimes specifically committed by guestworkers (rather than all foreigners residing in Germany) and that information on crimes committed by guestworkers was often times filtered through the personal experiences of local police stations, courts, and foreigner offices (*Ausländerämter*). Nevertheless, papers (even when they showed understanding for the impossible--sexual--

---

Unterbringung von Familien," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 17 March 1965; "Bambini schlüpfen durch Gesetzeslücken," *Oberbayerisches Volksblatt*, 4 September 1965.

[63] "Um die Kinder der Gastarbeiter. Besondere Betreuungsmaßnahmen auch für jugendliche Einzelgänger nötig," *Saarbrücker Landeszeitung*, 4 March 1964; a very similar article also appeared by Ruth Baren, "Wie steht es um die Kinder der Gastarbeiter?" *Mannheimer Morgen*, 15 April 1964.

situation in which the guestworkers found themselves) generated anxiety by pointing to the rise in sexual offenses among the foreign labor recruits.[64]

Bothered by what it perceived to be the state authorities' tendencies to downplay guestworker crime, the liberal *Tagesspiegel*--well aware and critical of the anxious pitch with which the media reported about guestworker violence--cautioned not to go from one extreme to the other and ignore the problem entirely. After all, the article queried, what purpose did it serve to know that the proportion of delinquents among guestworkers was relatively lower than among Germans when empirical evidence showed that among solved crimes the percentage of Spaniards, Greeks and Italians involved in sexual offenses and crimes resulting in grievous bodily harm was higher than that of the German population. The report gained additional credibility when it cited criminologist Professor Hans von Hentig, who believed that the high number of young guestworkers who were single or had come to Germany without their wives explained

> the frequent occurrence of crimes motivated by jealousy, of rough-housing and stabbings. Similarly [the presence of guestworkers] is the reason for the increase in prostitution in West German cities, as well as cases of homosexuality and sexual offenses. Between 1960 and 1963 alone the total number of obscene acts between foreigners and children has doubled.

For von Hentig all these occurrences could only be explained with the guestworker presence.[65]

---

[64] "Unbehagen über Gastarbeiter," *Welt am Sonntag*, 10 January 1965; Gerhard Schmidt, "Südländer habe es im kühlen Norden schwer," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 13 February 1965; Werner Höfer, "Mit dem Dolch im Gewande," *Die Zeit*, 23 April 1965.

[65] "Sie straucheln nicht mehr als unsereins," *Der Tagesspiegel*, 9 April 1965. Hentig, it should be noted, made a name for himself above all by claiming to "prove" that lesbianism was intrinsically

The Trouble with German Girls

Throughout the debate, the assessment of guestworker behavior happened against a backdrop of commentary about German society and morality. While equally disturbed by the sexual violence that seemed to emanate from the guestworker population, however, a number of papers also questioned Germany's lax morality. In an article that appeared in *Die Zeit* in late April 1965, Werner Höfer, in an interview with the head of the Kölner Kriminalpolizei Karl Kiehne about what many perceived as an alarming rise in guestworker violence, posed a question as to whether the "sexualization" of (German) civilization also made itself felt in the criminal behavior of guestworkers.[66] Answering in the affirmative, Kiehne confirmed and stated explicitly what other papers had also reported for a while: that sexual desire or jealousy were the primary reasons for most guestworker violence, that they were more prone to act on sexual impulses than Germans, but that, above all, it was the sexualization of *German* society that was at the root of this issue. In short, while the problem expressed itself most forcefully in guestworker violence, Kiehne deemed native Germans ultimately responsible for the violent upheaval the population read about in the papers so frequently and condemned Germans in general for indulging in an increasingly hedonistic lifestyle. On the most general level, papers alluded to German

---

linked to criminality among women. See Hans von Hentig, *Die Kriminalität der lesbischen Frau* (Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1959).

[66] Werner Höfer, "Mit dem Dolch im Gewande. Gastarbeiter--des deutschen Wunders unverstandene Kinder," *Die Zeit*, 23 April 1965; see also H. G. v. Studnitz, "Sind wir unfair zu den Gastarbeitern?" *Welt am Sonntag*, 20 March 1966.

society's "freer mores" and "more liberated way of life,"[67] for example, or, more harshly, condemned the "decadence of affluence"[68] evident in the western industrialized countries, denouncing their "'popular morality'" expressed in a "carelessness of relationships between the sexes" that encouraged "a loosening of ties to the [guestworkers'] home countries."[69] More specifically, however, in the context of the guestworker debate--and as other articles made clear--it was specifically the freedoms of German *women* to which many articles referred[70] and which were questioned.

Conceding that women were not pure victims of the unbridled Mediterranean lust they frequently warned about, papers grappled with how to represent German women's behavior vis-à-vis the male guestworkers. Not wanting to abandon their resentment regarding guestworker masculinity in its entirety, but also feeling compelled to acknowledge German women's agency in the interethnic sexual encounters, papers settled on an uneasy middle ground. Appearing outwardly critical towards German laborers refusing to take guestworkers along on a company outing because they supposedly hit on German women and girls, *Westdeutsche Rundschau*, for instance, did not dismiss the problem entirely but managed to displace it onto German women:

---

[67] See Marianne Asbrock, "Der Bahnhof ersetzt die Piazza," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschafts Zeitung*, 25 July 1961; Arndt Brüggemann, "Deutsche bewahren gegen Ausländer angeblich zuviel Zurückhaltung," *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 August 1962; Evi Melas, "Bei Rotwein feiert Pavlos seinen Wagen," *Münchner Merkur*, 28 September 1962.
[68] Joseph Scheu, "Fremdarbeiter," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 19 February 1960; idem, "80 000 italienische Arbeiter werden erwartet," *Caritas* 61 (1960).
[69] "Der hohe Preis der Auswanderung," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 11 December 1965.
[70] "Immer Kartoffeln--*Impossible*," *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt*, 10 September 1961; Josef Schmidt, "Italiener flanieren auf der Porsche-Straße," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 Mai 1962; idem, "4300 Italiener bevölkern Wolfsburg," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 2 June 1962; Karl Heinz, "Die Gastarbeiter suchen eine Brücke," *Die Rheinpfalz*, 6 July 1963.

> But the problem with relationships between foreigners and German girls lies somewhere else entirely. Are we really supposed to talk about a particular willingness on the part of German women and girls to thoughtlessly get involved with men? Of course not. But it probably has been and is still true that it apparently depends on the woman or girl. And a man, who as an Italian at home cannot have every girl he desires, perhaps finds out with a certain astonishment that [the situation] is sometimes different here.[71]

Additionally, *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* reported that German female provocative behavior could already be detected in thirteen- to sixteen-year-old girls, recommending that it would be wise to advise them to "exercise restraint without being cheeky" when dealing with guestworkers. Instead, the paper maintained, "the dumb little girls giggle. They consider themselves so grown-up and they openly return the fiery looks they receive." As an afterthought, the paper did attempt to exonerate the girls by claiming that it was hard for them to know that their behavior caused the foreigners to lose all respect for them and consider them as easy-going.[72]

German women were not only considered the agents provocateurs when it came to initiating relationships with foreigners. Their "less than exemplary behavior"[73] was also deemed to be the direct cause of many instances of guestworker violence. According to *Welt am Sonntag* the situation often escalated because German women goaded on their German husbands and boyfriends, which resulted in bloody skirmishes with the guestworkers.[74] Ultimately--and in sharp contrast to relationships between German men and

---

[71] "Ausländer sagen: Deutsche schneiden uns," *Westdeutsche Rundschau*, 10 June 1961.
[72] Senta Ulitz-Wever, "Sie bangen um ihren Ruf. 250 000 Gastarbeiterinnen in unserem Land," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 16 February 1965.
[73] Joachim W. Reifenrath, "Das Messer und die Ehre," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 29 December 1965.
[74] Joachim Neander, "Unbehagen über Gastarbeiter. Bringen sie wirklich Mord und Totschlag in friedliche deutsche Städte?" *Welt am Sonntag*, 10 January 1965.

female guestworkers (to be discussed in the next chapter)--papers considered male guestworkers' relationships to the German female sex as problematic and destined to fail. The foreign men not only encouraged young teens to engage in sexual activity but also often left in their wake young unwed mothers and violence.

In an effort to educate their readership about the guestworker situation, the press both condemned what they understood to be popular anti-guestworker sentiment and fed that very same resentment. Papers were very much aware of the difficulties life in Germany posed for the foreign labor recruits but in the end always found arguments based on essential difference to be the most convincing to explain the various problems. In the context of guestworker violence and sexuality especially, articles found their most satisfying (and to the contemporary reader most troubling) answers in cultural particularities. Papers did acknowledge that the problem was not exclusively a guestworker one, but that it also involved *German* society, indeed emanated from it. Having grown accustomed to a life increasingly shaped by leisure, afforded in no small part through guestworker labor, papers detected disturbing signs of a depraved sense of morality in the German public. For the press, such tendencies were most pronounced in the behavior of some German women--even girls--, whose assertive sexual advances were deemed responsible for fanning the flame of guestworker volatility.

Even if at first glance the issues seem unrelated, then, much of the apprehension suffusing articles lobbying for stricter control of the guestworker

population in Germany and more conservative immigration policies also derived from an uneasiness about sexual developments within the Federal Republic. These debates about sex and violence in the early 1960s also provide an important background to later conflicts over Germany's fertility decline and an even greater focus among Germans in the later 1960s and early 1970s, on the pursuit of pleasure in the realms of both sexuality and consumerism.

Intra-German Ideological Conflict

By the mid-sixties the debate took on a more divisive character--one side condemning ever more forcefully Germans' attitude toward guestworkers and the other feeling resentful that the country's past seemed to hamper any action against what appeared to become a "guestworker problem." Most certainly, those who thought that too little was done for the guestworkers registered with concern the increasing support the right-wing German National-Democratic Party (*Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands--NPD*) gained soon after its founding in 1964. Consequently, progressive-minded papers again accused Germans of arrogance left over from the days of the *Fremdarbeiter*,[75] continued to detect a longstanding inbred fear of *Überfremdung* and of the "other",[76] or sarcastically surmised that now Germans once again could take out their inferiority complex on "lesser humans," because that was obviously how

[75] "Unsere Mitbürger aus dem Süden. Aussprache in der Arbeitsgemeinschaft katholischer Verbände," Frankfurter Neue Presse, 11 February 1965.
[76] Hans-Jürgen Müller, "Deutschlands bezahlte Gäste. Die zwei Seelen des einheimischen Arbeiters," *Hamburger Abendblatt*, 11 December 1965.

guestworkers were regarded in Germany.[77] Indeed, *Welt am Sonntag* acidly and very perceptively charged, "Germans, who work through their past by being outraged about apartheid in South Africa or the race riots in the USA, obviously do not have anything against the apartheid of foreign laborers [*Fremdarbeiter*] in the Federal Republic, against their social boycott and their displacement into ghettos."[78] The results of a representative survey by the Institute for Applied Social Science (*Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft*) published in the summer of 1966 and titled *Germans and Guestworkers* caused further strife when it revealed that 51 percent of all Germans would be willing to work one hour a week longer to eliminate the need for guestworkers, and 73 percent agreed to shutting down the country's border to keep out guestworkers.[79] It is important to note that the survey also coincided with the first recession in Germany after the war when emotions regarding job security ran high. For some papers, the survey further confirmed that something akin to an Aryan mentality was alive and well in the Federal Republic, leading *Frankfurter Rundschau* to conclude disgustedly: "One is very open on these occasions [surveys]; after all, Italians and Turks and Greeks and Spaniards are no Jews."[80]

According to some papers, Germany's fascist past also seemed to affect directly the way Germans assessed the guestworker situation, making it difficult if not impossible to act objectively, because the legacy of the war made Germans

---

[77] Fritz Richert, "Unsere Gäste," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 8 August 1964.
[78] H. G. v. Studnitz, "Sind wir unfair zu den Gastarbeitern?" *Welt am Sonntag*, 20 March 1966.
[79] The survey also showed that 35 percent of Germans were in favor of firing all immigrants at the same time that it revealed that more than half of all employed Germans (57 percent) had no contact whatsoever with guestworkers.
[80] Wolfgang Bartsch, "Gäste im Zerrspiegel," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 30 December 1966; on a comparison of guestworkers as the "new Jews", see also " Prügelknaben," *Welt am Sonntag*, 6 January 1967.

self-consciously question their *own* sentiments and actions. For example, in the context of inadequate schooling policies for guestworker children, the *Deutsche Tagespost* remarked allusively that, "because self-criticism in postwar Germany is so very common, the shocked citizen first of all accuses the fellow countrymen [of wrongdoing]."[81] Even worse, this paper seemed to claim, it pitted Germans against *each other*, unnecessarily and unjustly causing upheaval in the German social order--yet another reason to resent foreign recruits in the first place. Such sentiments could also be found in letters to the editor, where readers expressed their conviction that Germany had to show more "national pride...of course without falling back into extremes again"[82] or making it clear that "the social experiment with a million alien [*fremdvölkische*] people" was "rather risky," because, according to this particular reader, Germany was not "a united world state [*Welteinheitsstaaf*] but rather a "German nation [*Volk*]."[83]

These allusions to--and agitated irritation at--Germans' moral handicap as former Nazis would become ever more explicit a theme in the later 1960s and early 1970s. For the time being, however, the media sought to balance uneasily its habit of exacerbating worries about guestworker backwardness and violent proclivities with reportage that emphasized guestworkers' value as laborers--and even as neighbors and (in the case of guestworker women) as romantic partners.

---

[81] Else Schlüter, "Bleiben sie Analphabeten? Schulsorgen der Gastarbeiter," *Deutsche Tagespost*, 20 April 1965.
[82] Dietrich König, "Extrawurst für die Gastarbeiter?" *Rheinische Post*, 26 August 1963.
[83] Hellmuth Kingkeldey, "Leserbrief: Wer sorgt sich um die Gastarbeiter?" *Bayern-Kurier*, 19 September 1964.

CHAPTER 2

PRAISING GUESTWORKERS: IDEAL WORKERS, IDEAL WIVES, 1960-1966

Industrious and Loyal

Press coverage of foreign labor recruitment in the 1950s had been rather sparse--compared to the attention papers paid to the topic from 1960 onwards--and most of it had focused on the relative economic advantages and disadvantages inherent in the employment of foreign workers. Papers had expressed skepticism about the undertaking for a variety of reasons: the number of unemployed Germans was still deemed too high; an influx of what was feared to be cheap foreign labor would increase job competition and would lower wages; Germany needed skilled laborers but could only expect to get unskilled workers; and finally, a larger pool of laborers would ultimately stunt the development of more efficient production methods. Additionally, for industrialists and observers of the situation it was not at all clear that the foreigners would make good workers. Therefore one of the earliest and--during the first years especially--one of the most persistent topics was the contribution guestworkers could make to German industry. More than merely a discussion of manpower and skill, guestworker work ethic was also evaluated in the context of national character and the idiosyncrasies it evidently engendered. Some members of the press went even further, not only contemplating the quality of work but also the different *meaning* it supposedly held for Northern and Southern Europeans respectively.

The number of Italians migrating to Germany in the second half of the 1950s was exceedingly small compared to the waves of foreigners entering (and leaving) Germany from 1960 onwards.[1] It is not surprising, therefore, that in the first few years after the recruitment agreement with Italy was signed on 22 December 1955, there was comparatively little media interest in this new development. Early information was often economically oriented, and particularly papers like *Industriekurier* and *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*--catering to those with a professional interest in foreign labor recruitment--explored the relative benefits of hiring Italians. Many of these recruits came from the southern, economically depressed regions of Italy, and their popular reputation for being less than enthusiastic about physical labor preceded them to Germany. Their supposedly unassuming and undemanding demeanor, however, apparently also had its benefits. In regard to housing, for example, *Industriekurier* argued not to underestimate the advantages that "by reverting to Italians, we will avoid the concentration of living space [*Wohnungsballung*], because the furnishing of barracks should generally be sufficient."[2] Furthermore, as the same paper reported a few months later, quoting the German ambassador in Naples, Dr. Partsch: "[Because] his energy is not at all spent [*völligen Unverbrauchtheit*] und [because of his] remarkable loyalty, with correct treatment, he [the Southern Italian] can very easily be trained to become a useful employee."[3] Entirely ignoring the dire economic straits and the hardships it had created for many

---

[1] In 1959, less than 50,000 Italians worked in Germany. By 1960 that number had soared to almost 150,000. That same year Germany also signed labor agreements with Spain and Greece, further increasing the number of foreign laborers migrating to Germany.
[2] "Es geht nicht ohne Italiener," *Industriekurier*, 4 October 1955.
[3] "BMW setzt sich für Süditaliener ein," *Industriekurier*, 14 January 1956.

people in the region, Partsch managed to portray Southern Italians not only in derogatory terms while at the same time praising their potential as fresh, loyal, and malleable laborers; in his description Italians had been effectively reduced to a precious unspent resource that--if harnessed properly--could do wonders for the German economy.[4] Significantly, moreover, and despite the blatant stereotypes, papers rarely had anything but praise for the foreigners' industriousness. From the very first they argued that Italians (and later other foreign recruits) had indeed proven to be good laborers, lauding their diligence, discipline at work, and thriftiness.[5] Behind their praise, however, were a whole host of problematic assumptions that pitted guestworkers against Germans.

As the number of guestworkers dramatically increased in the early 1960s, so did the press commentary on their working habits. In March 1960 the West German government signed additional recruitment treaties with Greece and Spain, and within just one year the number of foreign workers almost doubled to nearly 330,000.[6] In October 1961 a labor agreement with Turkey followed. Despite the prominent role Turks occupied later in the guestworker debate, before the mid-1960s (by then they made up about ten percent of the foreign labor force) they drew relatively little attention. Indeed the small number of

---

[4] Some papers noted, however--and thus proved wrong some of their own stereotypes about the submissive, undemanding Italian laborer--how well Italian agricultural laborers were informed about their rights, refusing to work hours beyond those stipulated by their contract, much to their employers' surprise and sometimes dismay. See "Italiener sollen wiederkommen," *Schwarzwälder Bote,* 17 September 1955; "Gute Landarbeiter kosten Geld," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 17 September 1955; "Auf die kleinen Höfe wollte keiner," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 29 October 1955; "Italiener wollen nur acht Stunden aufs Feld," *Hannoversche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 17 March 1956.

[5] See "Werden Italiener seßhaft im Pütt?" *Industriekurier*, 19 September 1957; "Walsum geht neue Wege," *Handelsblatt*, 20 September 1957; "Mehr Ausländer gegen Arbeitskräftemangel," *Rheinische Post*, 11 December 1959; "Enrico weiß die D-Mark zu schätzen," *Christ und Welt*, 14 April 1960; "O sole mio--in der Baubaracke," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 19 August 1960.

[6] Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 198, table 19.

Turkish men and women migrating to Germany just before and right after the labor treaty was in place garnered some initial praise; they were depicted as urban and educated and willing to work hard, eager to learn as much as they could to improve their job situation at home.[7] Critical voices, however, could already be heard as well, warning, for example, about the "Anatolization" of Turkish cities, which were supposedly being flooded by illiterates from the Turkish hinterlands trying their luck at the German recruitment offices in Istanbul. The implication here was that while seemingly from the urban center of Istanbul, most Turks interested in coming to Germany in reality were simple, uneducated farmers, unsuitable for work in Germany's modern industry. Not surprisingly then, the papers determined that Turks would not be a desirable addition to the German labor market.[8] *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, while ostensibly defending the employment of Turkish workers, nevertheless managed to cast doubt not only on their work ethic but also on how well they would fit in the German work place: "The Turkish farmer is not lazy, as one sometimes hears, he has just--due to the circumstances in his country--become lazy. No Turk is by nature lazy, and when one passes the few construction sites in Istanbul and Ankara, where there still is work to be done, even on holidays one can witness a level of diligence that, in the mechanized world, would already be out of place."[9] Here *FAZ* managed to portray Turks as lazy and overly zealous simultaneously,

---

[7] "Ohne Siskebab, jedoch mit Ayran und Kuru Fasulya," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 17 December 1960; Joseph Schmidt, "Mittags verneigt sich Onga gen Mekka," *Der Tag*, 12 November 1961.
[8] "Türkische Arbeitskräfte?" *Der Mittag*, 22 June 1961.
[9] Karl Kerber, "Die Türken kommen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 26 March 1962; for a more critical evaluation of Turkish work ethic, see also, "Türkische Kollegen nehmen die Grippe gern gemeinsam," *Neue Rhein und Ruhr Zeitung*, 5 November 1963.

conveying to their readers that neither extreme was beneficial for the German economy.

Given the relative dearth of outright criticism papers voiced in regard to guestworkers' performance on the job, their contemplations about Turkish laborers appeared that much more conspicuous. Such concerns seem particularly curious in light of the fact that a 1962 report by the Federal Institute of Labor (*Bundesanstalt für Arbeit*) revealed that Turks made up the highest percentage of skilled laborers among the foreign work force (36 percent)--very much coveted by the economy. In comparison only 21 percent of Italians and a mere 5.7 percent of all Spanish guestworkers could boast similar qualifications (a number that had dropped dramatically from 39.8 percent).[10] This incongruity--criticism of Turkish laborers despite the comparatively high number of skilled workers among them--serves as yet another indication that professional abilities might have been appreciated but that preconceived notions about national particularities weighed in more heavily in the overall evaluation.

While criticism and references to supposed national traits were never totally absent, in comparison to their evaluation of Turkish workers, papers often hailed Spanish guestworkers' efforts on the job. Considered some of the most popular among the guestworkers, articles praised the Spaniards for their intelligence, modesty, adaptability, industriousness, politeness, decency, and natural empathy. Their individualism--less appreciated--was also presented as a

[10] See "Die deutschen Löhne locken," *Saarbrücker Zeitung*, 31 Mai 1962.

hallmark of their character.[11] Often enough, and despite all the excellent traits Spanish guestworkers seemed to bring to the job, characterizations were usually accompanied by a cautious note drawing the readers' attention to the essential differences that existed between guestworkers and Germans. In an open letter to employers, for example, the *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung* maintained that--apart from having too high hopes of what he could accomplish in Germany--it was true, "the Spaniard" was "more capable of development than his reputation [would suggest]" and his German colleague's equal in speed and intelligence. He was also able to react quickly but tended toward improvisation. In contrast to the proverbial German, however, he was still missing the German's "famous thoroughness."[12] *Rheinische Post* was even more ambiguous, first likening the Spanish guestworkers to warriors growing stronger in the presence of danger, then proceeding (almost enviously) to laud them for their "modesty, thriftiness, stamina, industriousness, and not least their radical earnestness with a focus on the essential things in life." Only a few sentences later, however, the paper warned that "the basic Spanish trait of modesty proves to be a double-edged sword, [because] it leads to a lack of intellectual curiosity and ends in intellectual mindlessness [*Stumpfsinn*]."[13]

Indeed papers were not merely interested in how well guestworkers functioned as stopgaps in the German economy. They were also

---

[11] See "Schwarzhandel mit Spaniern," *Augsburger Allgemeine*, 9 July 1960; "Die Anwerbung spanischer Arbeiter," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 3 August 1960; "Sie wollen nach Deutschland. Spanische Fremdarbeiter kommen," *Rhein-Zeitung*, 31 August 1960; "Spanier machen sich sehr beliebt," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 1 December 1960.

[12] "Offener Brief an einen Unternehmer. Einige Ratschläge für die Behandlung der spanischen Fremdarbeiter," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 25 May 1960.

[13] Anton Dieterich, "El Guierrillero verteidigt sich. Spanische Arbeiter in Deutschland," *Rheinische Post*, 7 July 1962.

preoccupied with what motivated the recruits and what labor meant to them, in the process probing issues of materialism, ideological fulfillment, and--again--supposed essential national differences. Moreover, behind the fascination with the guestworker psyche was an at least equally great concern about what defined German national character, particularly apparent in articles juxtaposing "the Mediterranean" with "the Northerner." These articles revealed a deeper apprehension about the source of motivation for the foreigners and the meaning work held for them. *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung* stated this dichotomy most succinctly when arguing that:

> The Southern European has a different take on life and the worthwhile goals of human existence than the person north of the Alps. For him, work is a means to gain access to life's comforts; his model is not social prestige or property but ancient tranquility [*Beschaulichkeit*]. Unlike the Northerner, he is therefore unable to perceive organizational forms of economic and social life as an objective embodiment of human existence [*Dasein*].[14]

Portraying southern Europe almost menacingly as "mobile, hungry, [and] fermenting" in contrast to the "static, saturated, [and] regulated" northern half of the continent, *FAZ* warned that "The Mediterranean . . who is coming here for work neither intends to adapt [to life in Germany] long-term nor use his strength economically. Quite the contrary: after his departure to the North, he begins to live in a kind of psychological state of emergency [*Ausnahmezustand*], [in a state] of work mania, so to speak,

---

[14] "Ihr Leitbild ist die antike Beschaulichkeit," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 29 November 1960.

which usually passes within twelve months at the most."[15] Still in 1964 *Die Welt* informed their readers that "In their [guestworker home countries'] history, there does not exist the period of work discipline that stood under the influence of Protestantism....Therefore their job does not play the same role for them as it does for Germans in regards to prestige and social order [*Sozialordnung*]." The paper further lamented that guestworkers were more interested in the money they earned than in the welfare of the company that employed them. Revealing some ambiguity about this evaluation, the article also questioned its own assessment when it queried "Doesn't earning money compete with the work ethic here [among Germans] as well?"[16] On the one hand, then, guestworkers supposedly saw work merely as a means to an end whereas for Germans it had a much deeper value; labor itself and the hierarchy within which it was performed was meaningful and an integral part of German life. As *Die Welt*'s suspicion about German professional ethics also makes clear, however, doubts about the nation's own labor ideology started to emerge as well.

As much as southern European work ethic and eagerness were deemed suspect--at times even inappropriate--journalists nevertheless instrumentalized guestworkers' efforts to criticize Germans' growing lack of enthusiasm and willingness to work hard. At least since 1960, the year guestworker recruitment

---

[15] L. Kroeber-Keneth, "Die unbewältigte Freiheit," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 26 August 1961.
[16] See Albert Müller, "Sind Südländer faul?" *Die Welt*, 13 March 1964. For a similar historical assessment of northern European work discipline see also, Hanns Schmidt, "Noch mehr ausländische Arbeitskräfte?" *Industriekurier*, 16 November 1963.

took off, articles repeatedly pointed to Germans' deteriorating work ethic, asserting that the moniker "Made in Germany" had lost some of its reputation on the German job market.[17] Derisively (and very matter-of-factly) titled "The halo has faded. How Spanish guestworkers evaluate the Germans," *Weser-Kurier* presented some of the insights gathered in an interview with Spanish guestworkers. Speaking frankly (but not unkindly) about their experiences with German colleagues, the Spaniards noted with some relief and quite a bit of self-confidence that not every German was a "little god of the economic miracle who worked so much more, knew so much more, and was so much more perfect than [the Spanish guestworkers]." Repeatedly, papers held up the image of the industrious guestworker against the increasingly less productive but more demanding German worker. Lauding Italians and Spaniards for their exemplary work ethic, one paper noted that, "Employers complain time and again that it is impossible these days to reprimand a worker without granting him special requests. It has become the custom just to quit and go to the next company that offers [a better salary]."[18] Even *Bild*--despite a potentially misleading headline that screamed "'We don't want any more Italians!'"--argued that the slogan of the lazy Italian was wrong and that some of them were "as good as their German colleagues--some even better."[19]

---

[17] Helmut Koeber, "Gute Arbeitsmoral im Gepäck der Gastarbeiter," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 24 December 1962.
[18] "Ausländische Arbeiter haben sich bewährt," *Allgemeine Zeitung--Neue Mainzer Zeitung*, 19 August 1960; see also "Ausländer tragen unser Wirtschaftswunder mit," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 3 June 1960.
[19] "'Wir wollen keine Italiener!'" *Bild Zeitung*, 10 March 1965.

By the mid-1960s the debate took on additional gravity as Germany's dependence on foreign labor became ever more obvious. In September 1964 the one millionth guestworker was celebrated at Cologne train station, and *Mannheimer Morgen* took the opportunity not only to denounce Germans' work ethic but also to credit guestworkers with elevating Germans' standard of living virtually single-handedly: "Let us not delude ourselves. Basically, it has been the guestworkers who have ensured the 'leisure time successes' of the German laborer."[20] *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* in turn considered it prophetic when a businessman from Cologne declared that the German worker was no longer irreplaceable.[21] At the same time that Germans increasingly enjoyed the comforts afforded them through guestworker labor (rather than their own) as some papers suggested, a survey by the Wicker Institute in Tübingen revealed that 70 percent of all Germans were willing to work an additional hour a week if it made guestworkers unnecessary. From the perspective of the press, it appeared that the German economy had reached a point of no return, particularly because Germans had gotten so used to the additional benefits guestworker labor made possible. At the same time, however, that Germans realized the extent of their dependence on guestworkers, they were also most eager to get rid of them. *Hamburger Abendblatt* put it most eloquently when it underscored Germans' unwillingness to clean up other people's messes (as waiters, maids, or even garbage collectors) and the ambivalence that resulted from it: "Thus, in the German laborer's heart, a certain uneasiness about the future--little precursors of

---

[20] Hans K. Herdt, "Armando aus Portugal," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 12 September 1964.
[21] Joachim Reifenrath, "Für den Anfang ist ein Kinderbett groß genug," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 28 December 1965.

existential fear--wrestle with his fondness for idleness born out of prosperity [*Wohlstands-Bequemlichkeit*]."[22] This tension between wanting to enjoy the good life but being reluctant to accept the consequences it wrought informed much of the guestworker question in the following decade.

"The Fräuleins from Sevilla and Toledo"

While German papers paid most attention to male guestworkers, they increasingly took notice of foreign female recruits as well as their numbers began to grow more rapidly from the early 1960s onwards.[23] What stands out (particularly in comparison to the news coverage on male guestworkers) is the consistently positive opinion papers expressed about these female workers, commenting on their supposed character traits and physical attributes, and exploring their relationships with German men (and--implicitly--comparing them to those with male guestworkers), and juxtaposing their lives with those of German women. In the early years, the majority of female guestworkers were young and single and came from Spain or Greece. Like their male compatriots female foreign workers consistently garnered much praise for their positive work ethic as papers documented how satisfied companies were with their new recruits, praising them for being conscientious, easily trainable laborers who

---

[22] Hans-Jürgen Müller, " Deutschlands bezahlte Gäste. Die zwei Seelen des einheimischen Arbeiters," *Hamburger Abendblatt*, 11 December 1965.

[23] In 1961, there were almost 75,000 female guestworkers in the Federal Republic (in comparison to around 550,000 guestworkers overall). By the end of the recruitment period in 1973, they made up about one third of the entire foreign workforce; see Monika Mattes, "Zum Verhältnis von Migration und Geschlecht. Anwerbung und Beschäftigung von 'Gastarbeiterinnen' in der Bundesrepublik 1960-1973," in *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung. Nachkriegsgeschichte als Migrationsgeschichte*, ed. Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, Anne von Oswald (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999), 307.

loved the work they were doing, and performed it with, as one employer reportedly gushed, "a playful elegance, as if--undectable to our ears--a band played Southern melodies."[24] Also similar to the portrayal of male foreign laborers was the way in which the German press depicted the foreign women in erotically exotic terms, commenting on their supposed hot-bloodedness, their dark hair and dark, almond-shaped eyes. What is different in these descriptions, however, is the way in which papers saw these attributes not as potentially disrupting factors as they often did with male guestworkers. Rather, articles pointed to the benefits such appearance had for overall production in the German companies--as one foreman remarked, "a score of Mediterranean women in a company that employs both men and women [*gemischten Betrieb*] gives it an extra something [*ist wie das Salz in der Suppe*]."[25] In addition, the presence of foreign females was not only beneficial for male German workers' performance on the job, but also motivated German *women* to work harder and prove that they could more than keep up (presumably in more than just labor-related terms) with their foreign female colleagues.[26]

---

[24] Peter-Michael Hauser, "Carmen spinnt in Remscheid," *Kölner Stadtanzeiger*, 5 April 1960. On guestworker women's good work ethic also see, "Die Mädchen mit den Mandelaugen," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 5 April 1963; "200 000 Gastarbeiterinnen," *Südwest-Merkur*, 3 July 1964; Marianne Asbrock, "Hauptärgernis Klima und Kartoffeln--aber für viele ausländische Arbeiter ist die Bundesrepublik schon 'halbe Heimat,'" *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 14 May 1960; Josef Schmidt, "Zufriedenheit auf beiden Seiten, " *Saarbrücker Zeitung*, 24 November 1960; Schmidt's article also appeared with only slight variation in at least two other papers: "Die 377 Spanierinnen von Barsinghausen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 November 1960, and "Carmen in der Keksfabrik," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 28 November 1960; Rosemarie Werner, "Das fremde Fräulein im fremden Land," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 20 April 1963. Later that year, the article also appeared (almost verbatim) in another paper (despite the different author): Renate Winkler, "Señoritas arbeiten im Akkord," *Die Rheinpfalz*, 7 September 1963.

[25] "Die Mädchen mit den Mandelaugen," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftzeitung*, 5 April 1963.

[26] Rosemarie Werner, "Das fremde Fräulein im fremden Land," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 20 April 1963.

This apparent discrepancy in the ways the press viewed what it perceived to be "hot-blooded" male and female guestworkers might be explained with what were understood to be their "natural" gender traits. As historian Monika Mattes has argued, "labor administration and industrialists--supported by 'foreigner experts'--assumed that foreign women had even more strongly developed natural gender characteristics than German women." These assumptions included a particularly pronounced sense of morality and therefore a special need for protection (from the supposed dangers lurking in German society).[27] The press reflected this view as well. Pitied for what were understood to be the severe restrictions placed on their lives in their patriarchal home countries, initially the focus was on the myriad ways in which these Southern European women were now able to enjoy what freedom they had gained by moving to Germany.

As in discussions about male foreign workers, papers were most interested in how these new female laborers spent their time outside of work and how they interacted with the German public. Unlike the reports about male foreigners, however, articles about what these women did in their leisure time had an overwhelmingly positive tone, entirely lacking the anxiety so prominent in anything that was said about their male colleagues. It seems that these women knew to appreciate their (professional and personal) opportunities as they gained the "longed-for equality with the opposite sex."[28] As a result, they were considered to be less conservative, more modest and unpretentious, less demanding, better at adjusting to life in Germany, and overall less trouble than

---

[27] Mattes, "Migration und Geschlecht," 290.
[28] Werner Schulz, "Carmen träumt von einem soliden, deutschen Karlchen," *Der Kurier*, 25 February 1963.

their fellow countrymen.[29] Moreover, as one paper ascertained, "The *Fräuleins* from Sevilla or Toledo are also more popular than their male colleagues because one does not have to fear that they bring their whole family one day."[30] Here the article played on common assumptions that because of their deep-rooted cultural bonds, female guestworkers would eventually most certainly return to their respective home countries.

In contrast to the prospect of family reunion and the dangerous potential for self-segregation male guestworkers embodied for the press, the media was happy to point out the apparent ease with which the female recruits seemed to find their place in German society. According to various reports, this adjustment became evident on a number of levels: in dress, a growing love for German food and drink, and not least in social behavior. For example, if the prospective female guestworkers had not already entered the country dressed in nylons and expertly made-up (as was reported about a group of Greek women), then they acquired an appreciation for such style soon after their arrival in Germany as woolen tights and apparently unfashionable hairdos were exchanged for the latest German (hair) fashions and undergarments.[31] The transformation complete, female

---

[29] See for example, idem, "Carmen träumt von einem soliden, deutschen Karlchen," *Der Kurier*, 25 February 1963; "Das Mädchen mit den Mandelaugen," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 5 April 1963; Karl-Heinz Kallenbach, "An der Grenze singen sie heimische Schlager," *Ruhr-Nachrichten*, 10 August 1964; idem, "Ein Besuch im Café ist schon eine Sensation," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 11 August 1964.

[30] "Das Mädchen mit den Mandelaugen," *Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, 5 April 1963.

[31] Horst Wünsche, "Schlagermusik gegen Heimweh," *Münchner Merkur*, 14 November 1960; Josef Schmidt, "Zufriedenheit auf beiden Seiten, " *Saarbrücker Zeitung*, 24 November 1960; "Die 377 Spanierinnen von Barsinghausen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 November 1960; "Carmen in der Keksfabrik," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 28 November 1960; Anton Dieterich, "El Guierrillero verteidigt sich. Spanische Arbeiter in Deutschland," *Rheinische Post*, 7 July 1962; Karl-Heinz Kallenbach, "An der Grenze singen sie heimische Schlage. Gastarbeiterinnen isolieren sich freiwillig," *Ruhr-Nachrichten*, 10 August 1964; Key L. Ulrich, "Das Schwein im Koffer. Die Gastarbeiter und ihr Hauptbahnhof," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 19 December 1964.

foreig

an eve

collea

familie

langua

marrie

Austri

the ar

the G

proce

integr

reflec

Germ

forei

evalu

(Germ

Germa

with G

develop

not to b

[2] See for
5 Apr. 196
1960 Anton
Rheinische
Ruhr-Nachr

foreign laborers were reported to enjoy an afternoon shopping, a visit to a café, an evening out on the town, or an invitation into the home of a German colleague. As an article about Spanish women in Remscheid remarked, "[in the families of factory employees] the do not only get to know German customs and language but also their [future] husband with whom they go to city hall [to get married]."[32] As the article further noted, this was what had happened earlier with Austrian and Italian female migrants and what was happening once again with the arrival of female guestworkers. Apparently marriage, like the acquisition of the German language and German customs was just one more element in the process of acculturation. The sense of ease papers portrayed about the integration of female guestworkers into German society socially was also reflected in legal terms. At the time, female guestworkers automatically acquired German citizenship when they married a German man, which was not true for foreign males who wed German women.

Herein lies one of the most striking differences in the way the press evaluated foreign men in contrast to foreign women's interaction with the other (German) gender. For the papers, part and parcel of integration into life in Germany seems to have been foreign women's interactions--and even marriage--with German men as many articles commented on relationships that had developed between them, and a few even described German women's attempts not to be outdone in their competition for German men, as they even resorted to

[32] See, for example, Peter-Michael Hauser, "Carmen spinnt in Remscheid," *Kölner Stadtanzeiger*, 5 April 1960; Günter W. Kaller, "Bier und Torte kennen alle," *Hannoversche Presse*, 12 November 1960; Anton Dieterich, "El Guierrillero verteidigt sich. Spanische Arbeiter in Deutschland," *Rheinische Post*, 7 July 1962; Karl-Heinz Kallenbach, "Gastarbeiterinnen isolieren sich freiwillig," *Ruhr-Nachrichten*, 10 August 1964.

dying th

end up

men, ho

also inc

Germa

interett

charac

were

goal.[3

withou

stater

their

mam

show

datin

unde

pape

[2] Josef
Die 377
in der Ke
[3] See fo
5 April 19
1961. 'Sc
22 Januar
[4] Verden
Zeitung 26

dying their hair to resemble that of their Mediterranean "competitors," so as not to end up as "wallflowers" at social gatherings.[33]

Reports on romantic relationships between foreign women and German men, however, not only contained reflections on foreign women's sexuality, they also included and thereby revealed much about popular ideas regarding both German and guestworker masculinity and femininity. Press coverage of interethnic romance between guestworker women and German men was characterized by a number of elements. Almost without fail, the relationships were depicted as very serious and committed, with marriage as the ultimate goal.[34] Apparently, papers did not believe that these women could enjoy romance without taking it seriously and wanting to make it permanent, as the following statement makes clear: "Even though most Mediterranean women claim that their lives mostly consist of working, eating, and sleeping, the thick folder of marriage licenses kept by a Spanish priest who cares for his fellow countrymen shows that some [of them] also think about something else."[35] When it came to dating, then, guestworker women's romantic pursuits were always also understood as the pursuit of marriage, befitting the moral and pious character papers attested to these women.

---

[33] Josef Schmidt, "Zufriedenheit auf beiden Seiten, " *Saarbrücker Zeitung*, 24 November 1960; "Die 377 Spanierinnen von Barsinghausen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 November 1960; "Carmen in der Keksfabrik," *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 28 November 1960.

[34] See, for example, Peter-Michael Hauser, "Carmen spinnt in Remscheid," *Kölner Stadtanzeiger*, 5 April 1960; "Auch am Rhein soll Pepe Perez Spanien nicht vergessen," *Die Rheinpfalz*, 6 July 1961; "Schöne Mädchen, flotte Stürmer. Gastarbeiter bringen nicht nur Probleme mit," *Vorwärts*, 22 January 1964.

[35] "Verdientes Geld–Verlorene Zeit? Wünsche und Sorgen der Gastarbeiterinnen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 26 November 1964.

In this context, papers provided commentary on German men's personal qualities as well--as in the following case gleaned directly from the female guestworkers themselves:

> Almost without fail, the señoritas...revealed to the inquiring journalists that it is their dream to be married to a German. "The German men treat us with a respect that is beneficial to us [*der uns wohltut*]. For them, we are real señoritas. They are proper [*formell*] and reliable. When they promise something, they keep [the promise]. And they never speak lightly of love. They are really serious about it then." And a dark-haired woman from Castillo whispered to a Spanish reporter: "My German [*Aleman*] is really a sweet chico. We will get married soon!"...It's true the Spanish fellows are funnier and more agile, but for marriage a [German] Karlchen was more reliable than a [Spanish] Carlitos, even if Karlchen was quieter and more restrained.

As the young Spanish women saw it, reflecting on the quintessential German man:

> He shows more compassion toward a woman, he adapts better. And, what is most important, he himself thinks of marriage when he talks of love. That is what matters most to the hot-blooded Spanish women. "Love me--but only after the wedding" is their motto. And that, after all, is a rather healthy attitude that reflects favorably on the Spanish chicas.[36]

Here, loose--but apparently less-sensual--German women were no match for guestworker women, who were supposedly sexier than German women *and* insistent on premarital chastity.

German men's attractiveness was apparently neither anchored in their looks (which were never mentioned but constantly discussed when it came to male guestworkers) nor their relative agility, liveliness, or general flirtatiousness--characteristics, which Mediterranean men flaunted, according to their female compatriots, and which the women did enjoy. What ultimately mattered, however,

---

[36] Werner Schulz, "Carmen träumt von einem soliden, deutschen Karlchen," *Der Kurier*, 25 Februar 1963.

was the way men treated their partners, so that German men's earnestness, decency, and reliability made them highly attractive--more so, apparently, than sexy behavior or appearance could.[37] There did exist some challenges to this claim, as one article stated about yet another group of guestworker women preferring German over Mediterranean men: "These young women apparently do not belong to the female...guestworkers, who, in a survey, described German men as so 'terribly rational [*nüchtern*]...that we could never marry them.'"[38] Yet overall, articles were silent about complaints about German men and instead focused on the extremely high marks they received from women whose physical beauty and exemplary character were repeatedly discussed, cementing German men's masculinity in the process.

In turn, papers confirmed that German men were more than happy to make a "dark-eyed señorita" into a "Frau Lehmann or Frau Schneider."[39] Thus, the press generally reviewed unions between guestworker women and German men positively, as they fulfilled each other's expectations with regard to particular traditional gender roles. On the other hand, German women fit those expectations less well, making harmonious relationships potentially difficult, as a German man engaged to an Italian woman knew from experience. "Günter knows three young German men who married Italian girls. 'Well, don't you believe they were happy? Maybe more happy than others who married Germans.

---

[37] See R. Görtz, "'Statt Kaffee: Kastanienwasser.' Was spanische Arbeiter aus Deutschland berichten," *Die Welt*, 28 Februar 1963; Richard Aschenborn, "Wenn ich gut verdiene, bleibe ich hier...Nur ein Teil der nach Spanien zurückkehrenden Gastarbeiter will sein Glück wieder in Deutschland suchen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 5 April 1967.
[38] Max-Karl Feiden, "Gastarbeiter isolieren sich in Baracken-Zentren," *Ruhr-Nachrichten*, 10 January 1964.
[39] "Auch am Rhein soll Pepe Perez Spanien nicht vergessen," *Die Rheinpfalz*, 6 July 1961.

Italian women are usually domestic and sweet. One can get along well with them."[40] While refraining from explicitly naming and thus criticizing possible German female character flaws, the observation that Italian women were domestic and sweet not only revealed what were deemed important wifely traits but also left room for the readership to imagine why German women might be lesser partners to their husbands.

The effects of German female emancipation were part of the guestworker debate and surfaced at least since the early 1960s in a number of different contexts, and opinions about it varied and were often ambiguous. While articles in the early 1960s commented on the "much longed-for equality with the other gender,"[41] and women's greater freedom of greater movement, already in 1960 Joseph Scheu in *Rheinischer Merkur* warned that "The displacement of female workers who are not yet used to the--not even in the German context completely successful--emancipation would be greater than among the [foreign] men," not only playing into the popular stereotype of the sheltered and submissive Mediterranean woman, morally jeopardized by her relocation, but in the same breath also managing to criticize German women's emancipatory efforts.[42]

By 1963 at the latest, quite a few articles reporting on the lives of guestworker women cautioned against the dangers this (questionable) freedom brought with it because these women were supposedly unaccustomed to the rights German women had claimed. Earlier articles had also mentioned the need

---

[40] "Sauerländische Braut aus Turin," *Westfälische Rundschau*, 29 October 1965.
[41] Werner Schulz, "Carmen träumt von einem soliden, deutschen Karlchen," *Der Kurier*, 25 Februar 1963.
[42] Joseph Scheu, "Fremdarbeiter," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 19 February 1960.

to preserve female guestworkers' cultural values (first and foremost religious in nature) lest these--often quite young--women became totally uprooted from their home countries and completely lose "their way" during their stay in Germany. But only towards the mid-1960s did a shift occur emphasizing the inevitability of moral corruption these women would without a doubt experience if they were left to their own devices.

This perception seems to be at odds with earlier depictions in the press of freedom-loving, self-confident, acculturating young women, but the shift in emphasis might be explained not only by the growing numbers of female guestworkers entering the country (possibly making their supposed problems more noticeable) but also by the sources for those new stories, which usually originated in interviews with the supervisors of female guestworker dormitories. While some of the female supervisors came from the guestworkers' home countries, many were German welfare workers from church-affiliated organizations like the Catholic charity Caritas.

In some instances, papers reported that recruits apparently actively sought to sequester themselves to "preserve their honor,"[43] and while some commented on the problems of isolation that dorm life fostered, most articles still regarded supervised group housing as the only possible strategy to guarantee protection from (sexual) temptation. Overall, articles conveyed the superiors' genuine concern for their charges, and by all accounts the superiors took their responsibilities very seriously. What also becomes evident, however, are

[43] See Karl Pflugmacher, "Italiener und Griechen machen mit Freude Überstunden," *Augsburger Allgemeine*, 20 May 1964; "Im Heim isoliert. Spanierinnen haben privat kaum Verbindungen zu Deutschen," *Hannoversche Presse*, 11 February 1966.

particular assumptions the welfare workers harbored both about the foreign recruits and about German culture and which were inscribed in the particular power dynamics between (mostly) German superiors on the one hand and foreign women on the other.

Those in charge of the foreign women in the dormitories were not only condescending toward the foreign female workers but also toward Germans coming to terms with their own new sexual freedoms, even if they were also not so much anxious as proud of Germany's increasingly liberal sexual mores. As one paper reported, in the first weeks after the recruits' arrival, supervisors "ruled" in the dormitories to push through strict house rules, so that the young women could gradually get accustomed to "the conditions of German life,"[44] and be sheltered from "the unobserved, permissive life in the city."[45] One paper even described Germany as "a world of freedom, even free of commitments [*Bindungslosigkeit*]," which the women entered after just having been separated "from the family, from native mores and customs and an ancient tradition with a strong system of values and ties," thus describing the meeting of two diametrically opposed worlds (Germany vs the recruitment countries), an image that colored most reflections on guestworker culture.[46] Such remarks also betrayed some uneasiness about German cultural and moral values, which might have evoked an even stronger resolve to protect the recruits from any possible harm but also managed to bring into even starker relief the assumed differences

---

[44] Karl-Heinz Kallenbach, "Gastarbeiterinnen isolieren sich freiwillig," *Ruhr-Nachrichten*, 10 August 1964.
[45] "Gefährliche Freiheit für Dolores," Deutsche Zeitung, 10 December 1963.
[46] "Unsere Mitbürger aus dem Süden. Aussprache in der Arbeitsgemeinschaft katholischer Verbände," Frankfurter Neue Presse, 11 February 1965.

between capable educated German women and their less fortunate southern sisters.

This contrast is exceedingly obvious in one particularly poignant example that appeared in the paper *Mittag* and depicted the role of welfare worker "Edda Korte, born in 1940, daughter of a Prussian squire from Reppen in Ostbrandenburg. Girl with Cambridge education and experience with Parisian boarding schools. Psychologist and welfare worker." Establishing her background and credentials in this way left no question about Korte's professional abilities and confirmed her as a more than capable modern German woman. As Edda Korte herself described her duties,

> "I am mother and girl friend; guardian of public morals and confidante. I teach German and sexual education. I protect the girls from foolish men. I explain to my charges the difference between a Spanish and a German kiss. I try hard to show them that a mini dress and even a bikini can be worn with elegance and restraint."

This enumeration of Korte's responsibilities firmly established not just her role as an accomplished knowledgeable German female, and what was deemed proper behavior for a respectable young woman, but also conveyed her assumptions about the Spanish women as helpless, naïve, and unrefined. Even more explicitly, Korte sighed at one point in the article that the foreign women "are like children in a dangerous fairyland."[47]

In a few instances, papers looked at dorm life more critically, as when they questioned the strict rule that prohibited even husbands from visiting the dorm

[47] Werner Kirchner, "Deutsche küssen anders," *Mittag*, 2 May 1967.

rooms[48] or when they alluded to the problematic attitude some German supervisors exhibited, judging "the" female guestworker in general to be, as one Spanish woman put it, "a poor illiterate, no, worse."[49] Generally, however, praise for the efficient way in which the foreign women were taken care of prevailed over a more critical engagement with the inherent problems in the ways the system was set up.

The dualities in representations of guestworkers that characterized the discussion in the first half of the 1960s--primitive but hardworking, potentially very dangerous but also quite delightful--would become *both* ever more exacerbated and subtly refined as attentions shifted in the mid-1960s to the challenge of integrating guestworkers into German life on a more permanent basis. The constitutive incoherence within a single point of view (was Germans' unwillingness to do dirty work the problem or were foreigners simply just more dirty themselves? Was Germans' own sexual liberality the problem, or was it foreigners' incapacity to read the relevant signals in the new host environment?) would increasingly be joined by a tendency for media venues to use the dilemmas of how to manage foreign labor recruitment and other aspects of guestworker policy to attack opposing political perspectives. Ambivalences and confusions inherent within argumentative positions became harnessed--and identified by--ideological conflicts in an ever more openly divisive political climate.

---

[48] "Verdientes Geld, verlorene Zeit? Wünsche und Sorgen der Gastarbeiterinnen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 26 November 1964.

[49] This article, however, is not without its problems either, as it questioned the changed character of a female guestworker who returned home to Spain and deemed her to be "A big work horse [*Arbeitsstute*] ..., ugly by Spanish standards, but she looks quite strong." Carmen Rosselini "Ramona und Jana kehren heim," Mannheimer Morgen, 10 March 1956; the article also appeared under the title "Sie haben die Sonne verloren. Wie sieht die Heimkehr der spanischen Gastarbeiterinnen aus?" *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 24 April 1965.

At the same time, however, a new paradox began to emerge. Even as commentators on the subject of foreign laborers took ever more vehement and hostile snipes at each other, the overall effect was to consolidate an interpretive framework defining the parameters of the "guestworker problem" on which almost all sides seemed to agree.

CHAPTER 3

THE CHALLENGE OF INTEGRATION, 1966-1973

The Changing Nature of Migration

Having begun not quite twenty years earlier, foreign labor recruitment to West Germany had brought with it an unprecedented level of financial stability, upward mobility for German workers, and a growing enjoyment of the good life among the general German population. All these developments happened at the same time that Germany continued to experience a significant and constant migration of foreign laborers (and their families). As the preceding chapters have shown, the presence of large numbers of foreigners among Germans and their (however limited) participation in German society, however, also stimulated a variety of debates not just narrowly confined to how to deal with what to some observers in the 1960s already started to look like permanent migration and settlement. Rather, the social ramifications of a sustained growth economy and the larger social and ideological shifts at the time (having to do with a wide range of issues including Germans' work ethic, the country's past, as well German attitudes toward sexuality and the family) also strongly influenced the ways the guestworker issue was viewed. Furthermore, the way the press perceived its own position in relation to the populace shifted considerably during this time as well.

While papers had always covered issues of guestworker migration, by 1966 the context in which this debate took place had significantly changed and with it not only the way the press commented on the situation but also the role it

saw itself playing in it. Part of this was certainly due to the political developments at the time. As West Germany in 1966 experienced the first economic downturn since the end of World War II, many viewed with trepidation the precarious situation on the job market. Papers attempted to keep an even keel at this time of economic uncertainty and political polarization (the rise of both the New Left student movement as well as, on the other side of the political spectrum, growing popular support for the right-wing *Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschland*, NPD), without either left-liberals or conservatives ever completely surrendering their mutually critical edge. Both, however, began to make an increasingly concerted effort to condemn what they saw as a tendency for Germans' residual Nazi sentiments to flare up in economically unstable times. As the number of employed guestworkers dropped below the one million mark (thus seemingly confirming that their main function was to provide an economic buffer), the debate temporarily leveled off as well.

From 1969 on, however, after the German economy had recovered and as the industry's interest in foreign laborers grew once again (their numbers practically doubling as they reached close to two million by 1970), so did the media's interest in the topic.[1] Moreover, now the press consciously positioned itself as the educator of the public, publishing a virtual avalanche of articles and pointing the finger ever more sharply at the perceived injustices in guestworker

[1] At the time the print media's interest in the political decision-making process grew as well. See Karen Schönwälder, *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität. Politische Entscheidungen und öffentliche Debatten in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik von den 1950er bis zu den 1970er Jahren* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2001), 497ff.

housing, schooling, and labor conditions. On the face of it, the press had taken up the guestworker cause with a vengeance.

One of the topics moving into the forefront in this context was the growing number of guestworkers who brought their families to Germany. As ever more guestworker children reached school age and beyond, integration, the foreigners' place in their host society--and more generally interactions between the guestworker and German populations--became key concerns informing the reports. The ensuing debate about guestworker integration, while dealing with guestworker housing and living conditions, revealed that some of the papers' greatest concerns were with romantic relationships, and not just those between guestworkers and Germans. Intra-German relationships became hotly debated as well, particularly in the context of what the media worried was a newly narcissistic German femininity. In contrast, guestworker women working in the German industry were increasingly denied any emancipatory impulses of their own, as their actions became narrowly perceived as the result of patriarchal oppression. This was not least because increasingly, public debates focused on foreign women married to foreign men rather than on single foreign women, and among those, particularly on Turkish women more than Italian or Spanish women.

Indeed, the changing face of migration to Germany also shifted the ways in which the press evaluated its impact as Turks became the largest foreign contingent in Germany in early 1972, changing the ethnic makeup of

guestworkers.[2] Even though public scrutiny of Turks (and the equation of guestworkers with Turks) became most intense after the recruitment ban took effect in late November 1973, almost from the beginning this group of foreigners was considered the most "different," their growing presence generating a variety of responses about their role in German society. While reporting on the social, political, and economic state of what had been dubbed the "guestworker problem," guestworkers' appearance, customs, and gender relations stirred the interest of the press as they were interpreted as indicators for how well the foreigners' "fit" in the Federal Republic.

Mediator and Educator: The Role of the Press Transformed

By the spring of 1966 the "guestworker problem" had become a familiar concept, one that had been fermenting at least since late 1964.[3] Papers had different views on what lay at the heart of the issue, and by the mid-sixties the debate became more divisive--one side condemning ever more forcefully Germans' attitudes toward guestworkers and the other feeling resentful that the country's past seemed to hamper any action to solve the "problem." Nevertheless, both the left-liberal *and* the conservative press--most likely influenced by the political polarization at the time between the ascendance of leftism among youth on the one hand and the growing outspokenness among

---

[2] See Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge* (München: C. H. Beck, 2000), 224, citing Mathilde Jamin, "Die deutsche Anwerbung: Organisation und Größenordnung," in Fremde *Heimat. Eine Geschichte der Einwanderung aus der Türkei*, edited by Mathilde Jamin and A. Eryilmaz (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 1998), 149-70.

[3] See Karen Schönwälder, *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität*, 198, 158.

right-leaning Germans on the other--also made an effort not to let the negative public momentum against guestworkers get out of hand.

For example, following a conference on foreign labor attended by leading industrialists and politicians, on 1 March 1966, the conservative--and often sensationalist--daily tabloid *Bild* ran the provocative headline "Guestworkers more industrious than Germans?" playing off the remark made by one of the attendees that the productivity of foreign laborers was in no way lower than that of German laborers. The paper did not affirm the statement in its article, but the headline was enough to set off a number of strikes by German workers. Despite previous jabs the media had taken at the German work ethic, in this particular case, articles (including those in left-liberal papers) came to the German workers' defense, reasoning that the protests were a reaction to the brazen headline rather than the actual comments made at the conference.[4] One day after the headline ran, *Bild* itself tried to right the picture, flattering German laborers with the assertion that "praise for the guestworkers, after all, is nothing but praise for those German colleagues who have shown them what German craftsmanship [*deutsche Wertarbeit*] is and how it is accomplished."[5]

Most certainly those--often the more liberal publications--that thought that too little was being done for the guestworkers registered with concern the increasing support the right-wing NPD gained soon after its founding in 1964 and wanted to steer against it. But *Bild*, too, at times spoke out on *behalf* of the

---

[4] See "Gutes Zeugnis für Gastarbeiter," *Tagesspiegel*, 1 April 1966; Thorsten Scharnhorst, "Der Ausdruck Gastarbeiter ist falsch--denn: Gästen mutet man keine Arbeit zu," *Neue Rhein-und-Ruhr Zeitung*, 1 April 1966; Wolf-Dieter Zöllner, "Metallarbeiter protestieren gegen 'Bild-Zeitung,'" Frankfurter Rundschau; "Reicht euch jetzt die Hand," *Bild-Zeitung*, 2 April 1966.
[5] "Ohne die Deutschen Arbeiter ware unsere Wirtschaft im Eimer," *Bild-Zeitung*, 1 April 1966.

guestworkers, arguing among other things that "far-reaching racial conflicts do not only exist in the US, Africa, and Latin America but also here in Germany."[6] Earlier the paper had already reported about guestworkers expressing "anger and concern about the 'German subservient spirit and haughtiness" as well as stubbornness, echoing the message of other papers that German attitudes were unacceptable. Some other papers argued that Germans behaved like "demigods" while yet others warned Germans not to repeat parrot-fashion "fascist" NPD slogans or cautioned Germans not to mistake guestworkers for Nazi-era *Fremdarbeiter* and thereby running the risk of jeopardizing Germany's improved international reputation.[7]

Not surprisingly, the right-wing NPD mouthpiece *National-Zeitung* was the most outspoken and defensive in regards to comparisons with Germany's fascist history, railing against the inability to take a critical stance against guestworker recruitment without being immediately branded a Nazi.[8] That the party was able to gain seats in seven state elections during that period and only barely missed the 5-percent hurdle in 1969 to gain entry into the *Bundestag* (German parliament) shows that it spoke for a substantial minority among Germans at the time. This same radical groundswell, however, also seemed to prompt a more restrained tone in conservative publications regarding their dissatisfaction with the way the guestworker issue was discussed.

---

[6] Horst Koch, "'Kümmert euch um die Gastarbeiter!'" *Bild*, 2 November 1966.
[7] Reinhold Stimpert, "So urteilen Ausländer über uns," *Bild*, 17 October 1966; Lothar Meißner, "Mit Gastarbeitern heimwärts," *Hannoversche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 24 December 1966; "Prügelknaben," *Welt der Arbeit*, 6 January 1967; "Fremd- statt Gastarbeiter?" Handelsblatt, 16 February 1967.
[8] Dr. Wilhelm Peyer, "Gastarbeiter--Segen oder Fluch?" *National-Zeitung*, 2 June 1967.

Thus, more moderate voices also frustrated with the seemingly one-sided coverage of the guestworker situation refrained from drawing parallels between the situation at hand and the Third Reich (in contrast to some earlier remarks), quite likely in an attempt to avoid any association with the NPD. Still they took it upon themselves to defend Germany's recruitment of foreign laborers. From their perspective the problem lay with the guestworkers rather than German society, so that calls for downsizing the foreign labor force seemed a common-sense conclusion. While conservative papers acknowledged the need for (some) foreign laborers and also supported their fair treatment, in their view, Germany was not merely using the guestworkers to fulfill its economic needs. Rather, the host country also provided the workers with professional know-how and a way to support their families financially--more so than their home countries could.[9] Furthermore, *Nürnberger Stadtspiegel*, for example, conceded that guestworkers had most certainly not become part of German society but squarely placed the blame on guestworkers, their lack of German language skills, and their unwillingness to spend more money (either at the pub or on the housing market). As the paper saw it, they had a tendency to isolate themselves and favor the company of fellow countrymen, deeming it unnecessary to adapt to German customs.[10] Solving the problem, i.e. sending guestworkers home, however, proved difficult. Frustrated, *Christ und Welt* underscored the earnestness and

---

[9] Thorsten Scharnhorst, "Der Ausdruck Gastarbeiter ist falsch--denn: Seinen Gästen mutet man keine Arbeit zu," *Neue Rhein und Ruhr Zeitung*, 1 April 1966; Antonius John, "Ohne Gastarbeiter geht es nicht," *Handelsblatt*, 15/16 April 1966.

[10] "Sie bleiben fremd," *Nürnberger Stadtspiegel*, 7 May 1966. Another paper also defended German negative attitudes toward guestworkers by reasoning that prejudice was always deeply rooted, so that Germans should not be criticized too harshly even if they should know better; see "Gastarbeiter," *General-Anzeiger*, 28 March 1967.

consideration (for guestworkers) with which Germany had apparently drafted the recruitment treaties and discussed the political fall-out that would undoubtedly ensue from sending any laborers from countries outside the European Economic Community (EEC) back to their respective native countries. Comparing Germany's legal guestworker situation with that of Belgium, the paper remarked enviously that, "It is easier for Belgium to rid itself of its non-EEC guestworkers discretely. The Belgians were not as perfectionist as the German authorities when they hired foreign guestworkers. A recruitment agreement after the German pattern only exists between Belgium and Italy, and no other country."[11]

After the heated debates of the mid-1960s, the discussion temporarily ebbed as the number of guestworkers dropped below the seemingly magic mark of one million during the 1966/67 recession. Many assumed that the guestworker situation had conveniently regulated itself. By 1970, however, when the number of foreign laborers had almost reached two million, the debate continued more vociferously than ever, not just in the papers but also in a number of studies and initiatives that made headlines. All of them dealt with (the lack of) guestworker integration and sought to remedy the situation. For example, the city of Cologne published what was hailed as the first comprehensive study about the integration of guestworkers and its continuing challenges; the Ministry of Labor together with the coordination group "Foreign Employees" published the "12 Principles for the Integration" of foreigners; left-leaning activists called for the creation of the position of an ombudsman to take charge of and consolidate efforts to deal with

[11] "Nach Hause schicken? Ein Diplomat hinter jedem Angeworbenen," *Christ und Welt*, 28 April 1967.

guestworker issues; and the Westdeutscher Rundfunk (one of Germany's public TV and radio networks) sponsored a competition to find a more appropriate replacement for the term "guestworker," because the foreign recruits were not merely guests (and were not treated as such either) as their increasing length of stay and foreign family reunification in Germany showed.[12]

Thus, once Germany had pulled through the recession and the recruitment of guestworkers gathered steam once again, so did the calls for more compassion towards the foreigners. Underscoring the role of the press as educator, by August of that year Germany's leading news agency dpa (*Deutsche Presse Agentur*/German News Agency) lauded the mass media for their important role in changing Germans' mentality about guestworkers, arguing that "a wave of information has begun to roll that most likely has already washed away many a sandcastle built on self-satisfaction."[13] As they had occasionally done before, papers now ever more frequently attested to Germans a general (racial) arrogance that made it difficult if not impossible to interact civilly with the foreign laborers, decried the capitalist exploitation (*frühkapitalistische Zustände*), and argued that the German economic and social treatment of guestworkers bordered on slavery, in effect and--with reference to the ethnic problems in the United States--contended that they had become the "Negroes" of the German nation.[14]

---

[12] The term ultimately chosen (*Ausländische Arbeitnehmer*--foreign employees) did reflect that guestworkers indeed were not guests but also left open those foreigners' role in German society.
[13] dpa-Brief, 24 August 1970.
[14] See for example, Ernst Klee, "Bürgerrecht für Gastarbeiter?" *Publik*, 9 April 1971; Gerhard Malbeck, "663 000 Gastarbeiter in Nordrhein-Westfalen--eine Vielzahl von Problemen," *Rheinische Post*, 17 November 1972; Heinrich Rieker, "Sollen Gastarbeiter deutsche Bürger werden?" *Rheinische Post*, 22 December 1972; "Die Neger von Mitteleuropa?" *Rheinischer*

More conservative factions irritated with the seemingly incessant criticism of German shortcomings in the guestworker question (at that point also emanating from the political Left) tried once again to provide a counterweight. Feeling hampered by Germany's ideological and historical obstacles, the conservative press of the early 1970s resented the seeming inability to resolve the guestworker situation without having to fear for their country's reputation. Those (by and large) conservative papers more critical of the "mea culpa" attitude now suddenly being repeatedly diagnosed in the German public, found support in a survey conducted by the Marplan Research Council (*Marplan Forschungsgesellschaft*) in Offenbach. Among other data, it showed that 70 percent of all foreign laborers in Germany considered their economic situation to be good or very good. Possibly even more important, only 4% of all guestworkers thought of themselves as "anti-German." In light of such findings, it seemed plausible not only to emphasize German integrationist efforts and to qualify criticism regarding the supposedly inadequate guestworker housing--one of the most lamented aspects in the guestworker debate--but also to criticize the guestworkers for their lack of effort and at times seemingly unreasonable demands.[15] Providing a counterweight to the ongoing and persistent protests against the poor quality of guestworker homes, some papers pointed out that such assessments had to be put into context, that guestworker housing was not

---

Merkur, 20 July 1973; Hermann Lammert, "Ist unser Ausländerrecht noch tragbar?" *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 24 July 1973; Gerd Sowein, "Als Gäste betrachtet sie niemand," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 4 August 1973.

[15] See Heinz Günther, "Die doppelte Ausbeutung. Niedrige Löhne und hohe Mieten–Was von Gastarbeitervorwürfen übrigbleibt," *Deutsche Zeitung–Christ und Welt*, 5 October 1973; Alfred Schürer, "Das Lehrstück von Opladen. Eine Modellstadt für die Gastarbeiterintegration?" *Christ und Welt*, 29 June 1973.

as bad as generally portrayed, particularly, as a few noted, when compared to the standards of comfort in the guestworkers' respective home countries.[16] Indeed, according to journalist Rolf Weber, it was all a matter of perspective: " From the German citizen's viewpoint, who likes the comfort and coziness of his dwelling, the accommodations of foreigners are indeed sometimes catastrophic. One is quick to blame the employer or the profiteering landlord." However, as he further maintained, this argumentation missed a crucial point:

> [It] has been overlooked that foreigners from the Mediterranean countries have totally different ideas about their housing. Their standards are not nearly as high as assumed. For a person from the Mediterranean region, the apartment plays a totally different role than in northern Europe. 'My home is my castle' does not apply in the Mediterranean. There, life--including family life--mostly takes place in front of the door or at the piazza. (For the foreigners living here, the train station is the *ersatz*-piazza).[17]

Even articles in the liberal *Weser Kurier* and *Frankfurter Rundschau*, while pointing to the generally poor guestworker housing conditions, published similar assessments without any critical engagement.[18]

Conservative papers--generally tired of what they perceived as unfounded complaints emanating from the political Left--defended the way the guestworker problem was handled on an official level. They argued that the foreigner law was

---

[16] See Hans Joachim Wolf, "Nationalstolz verträgt keine Tatsachen," *Münchner Merkur*, 21 May 1969; Ocke H. H. Peters, "Heute Gastarbeiter--morgen Außenseiter?" *Kieler Nachrichten*, 13 February 1971; Gunther Schach, "Welchen Nutzen bringt Antonio? Gastarbeiter--Faktor der Wirtschaft," *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt*, 7 April 1972; Henk Ohnesorge, "Die Gastarbeiter der Bundesrepublik: Die inzwischen Unentbehrlichen türmen nicht nur Müll und Konten, sondern auch Probleme auf," *Die Welt*, 24 April 1973; Burkhart Salchow, "Der Sturm auf das Wunderland," *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt*, 23 November 1973. The argument of conservative mainstream papers regarding guestworker housing was echoed by the right-wing *Deutsche National-Zeitung*; see Prof. Dr. B. Rubin, "Sollen Gastarbeiter Deutsche werden? Umvolkung der deutschen Nation?" *Deutsche National-Zeitung*, 23 November 1973.

[17] Rolf Weber, "Ausländische Arbeitnehmer in der Bundesrepublik. Die Zwei-Millionen-Grenze rückt in greifbare Nähe," *Handelsblatt*, 20 February 1970.

[18] See Josef H. Weber, "Wenig Gastlichkeit für die Gastarbeiter," *Weser Kurier*, 20 February 1970; idem, "'Wohnung' zwischen Baustoffsäcken," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 21 February 1970.

a liberal piece of legislation[19] (which had come under attack for giving local authorities too much power to punish foreigners with expulsion for minor infractions), and charged that those complaining about the treatment of guestworkers came from the ranks of those "who cover up the attack on the existing social system with their care for the foreigners."[20] Mockingly calling its members "leisure-time revolutionar[ies]"[21] underscored what conservatives deemed the New Left's wanting competence in the political realm.

Christ und Welt was particularly vocal in arguing against only blaming Germans for the guestworker problem, criticizing the repeated calls for more compassion and assistance toward the guestworkers and blaming remnants of postwar guilt for what it considered ineffective (and unnecessary) measures. Conceding to the brutal treatment of forced laborers during the Third Reich while simultaneously exculpating Germans, the paper criticized the misplaced concern it perceived in the treatment of guestworkers.

> The trauma that the treatment of foreign forced laborers during the war has bequeathed upon us now reverberates not only in the creation of the silly invention of the word 'guestworker,' meant to articulate our intention to redress [past wrongs]. Incessantly, employers, landlords, the authorities, and more generally the whole public are urged to integrate [the guestworkers] and their families.

To show its readers how little guestworkers had integrated despite their equal status in terms of social and labor legislation that allowed them more than a mere modicum of financial security, the paper illustrated the article with a

---

[19] Walter Fröhder, "Vom Gastarbeiter zum Mitbürger auf Zeit," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31 August 1972.
[20] Henk Ohnesorge, "Die Gastarbeiter der Bundesrepublik: Die inzwischen Unentbehrlichen türmen nicht nur Müll und Konten, sondern auch Probleme auf," *Die Welt*, 24 April 1973.
[21] Heinz Günther, "Die doppelte Ausbeutung. Niedrige Löhne und hohe Mieten--was von Gastarbeitervorwürfen übrigbleibt," *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt*, 5 October 1973.

picture of a male guestworker in pajama pants sitting on his bed in dormitory-style housing, in the background a picture of the Hagia Sophia (one of the great historical religious and cultural symbols of Istanbul) next to a picture of a roaring stag (ubiquitous in Germany's petty-bourgeois living-rooms). The caption read "forced coziness" and underscored what the paper saw as the clashing rather than meshing of cultures, underscoring the seeming absurdity of integration efforts.[22]

A year later the paper repeated even more forcefully its previous assessment in a commentary on a pilot project for integration in the city of Opladen. Deriding the effort and yet again squarely placing the blame for failure on the guestworkers, the paper saw "Mediterranean lethargy" clashing with "German idealism." Once again hinting at the "ball and chain" that Germany's past posed, the paper referred resentfully to Germany's "guilty conscience that can be blackmailed" and wished that it might be possible to say outright that it was "high time to divorce the guestworker problem from all the sentimental fuss," and that one should be able "at least to dare to question that...'we can escape the grave social political problems long familiar to other industrial nations.'"[23] Whereas previously, papers had merely complained about the way Germany's

---

[22] Gunther Schach, "Welchen Nutzen bringt Antonio? Gastarbeiter--Faktor der Wirtschaft," *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt*, 7 April 1972. The (implicit) equalization of suffering and brutality of Germans and those persecuted during the Third Reich was also evident in an article in *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt* about the history of forced laborers in World War II. While the author condemned the treatment they received, he also voiced resentment about the postwar Displaced Persons (DPs) "ghettos," where things were "the other way around" now. DPs were provided with goods of which "Germans didn't dare to dream," and which were "'requisitioned'" from nearby German towns. Even worse, some of the goods, according to the author were stolen by vicious gangs described as murdering and pillaging mobs that managed to break out of the lax camp discipline. See Wolf J. von Kleist, "Die Leute mit dem Brandmal," *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt*, 3 May 1970.

[23] Alfred Schürer, "Das Lehrstück von Opladen. Eine Modellstadt für die Gastarbeiterintegration?" *Christ und Welt*, 29 June 1973.

past seemed to hamper more decisive action in the guestworker question, *Christ und Welt* went one step further when it determined that the issue could only be handled objectively if the Nazi past that seemed to cause the supposedly unhelpful "sentimental fuss" was finally put aside.

Indecent Integration? Interethnic Sex and Romance Revisited

Underlying much of the debate was the question of what role guestworkers were supposed to play in Germany outside their personae as laborers. According to most papers, the problems between Germans and foreigners had their root in the laborers' inherent differences. While guestworker difference had always been part of the debate, it became an even weightier issue precisely as the press acknowledged guestworkers' manifest integration into their host society.[24] In part, papers were responding to what many deemed to be West German government authorities' response (albeit a slow one) to the ongoing development as "Immigration was underestimated but not ignored."[25] By the mid-1960s at the latest, the press also became focused on the long-term ramifications of labor migration. Many papers agreed that the key guestworker problem was the foreigners' lack of integration into their host society, and the

---

[24] A recent article, drawing on various statistics published by the Federal Institute of Labor (*Bundesanstalt für Arbeit*), has found that, "as a very rough estimate, one third of the 1966 migrants became settled." See Anne von Oswald, Karen Schönwälder, Barbara Sonnenberger, "Labour Migration, Immigation Policy, Integration: A Re-evaluation of the West German Experience," *Studi emigrazione* 38, no. 141 (2001): 126. Moreover, a 1968 survey undertaken by the Federal Institute of Labor shows that more than a quarter of all guestworkers (26 percent) had already been in Germany for seven years or more, and nearly a third of them (31 percent) for between four and six years. In other words, well over half of all guestworkers had been in Germany for four years or more. See Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Ergebnisse der Repräsentativ-Untersuchung vom Herbst 1968* (Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1970), 49.

[25] Oswald, et al., "Labour Migration," 120.

majority of articles dealing with this issue illuminated the difficulties *male* guestworkers faced. Women--both German and foreign--however, played a crucial role in the way the press conceived of the problems and devised potential solutions for them.

From the beginning, and as discussed Chapter 1, the press had viewed interethnic relationships between German women and foreign men as problematic, not merely because of its cultural bias against male guestworkers but also because of what the media worried was German women's increasingly blithe approach to relationships more generally. Thus, papers continued to puzzle over German women's role in the larger guestworker question, alternately commending and condemning them for their (economic and sexual) independence. Apart from accusing guestworkers of failing to take responsibility for their actions, especially when their encounters with German women ended in illegitimate pregnancies,[26] articles did acknowledge at times that German women were not without blame either, because "all too often it turns out that the mothers can barely give information more specific than 'His name was Giovanni' or 'He is Sicilian, from a village near Palermo' or 'He worked in our street at a construction company that doesn't exist anymore...'."[27] In the eyes of the press, however, the very same factors that drove German women into the arms of guestworkers--greater sexual and economic independence--also made it impossible for those relationships to last. As one paper asserted, "West German divorce courts

---

[26] "Wenn Antonio in Deutschland Vaterfreuden entgegensieht," *Passauer Neue Presse*, 8 January 1966; Lieselotte Weber, "Hohe Scheidungsquote bei Gastarbeiterehen. Jedes vierte uneheliche Baby hat ausländischen Vater," *Westdeutsche Rundschau*, 26 April 1966.
[27] Ria Theens, "Wenn Givoanni zahlen soll...Uneheliche Kinder von Ausländern warten meist vergeblich auf den Vater," *Rheinische Post*, 17 March 1966.

[*Scheidungskammern*] agree that marriages with a foreigner make up an unusually high percentage of the growing number of divorces, a fact that seasoned lawyers put down to the high level of independence of the young working women in Germany."[28] It needs to be pointed out that the article here did not distinguish between guestworkers in particular and foreigners at large, an oversight many papers routinely made when commenting on what they considered problematic behavior (a frequent occurrence in the context of guestworker/foreigner violence as well). Indeed a lengthy article published in *Stern* magazine (a liberal weekly publication) refuted the argument that marriages between guestworkers and German women disproportionately had to end in divorce while nevertheless managing to portray interethnic unions as inevitably headed for failure. Even more revealing however, the feature betrayed a double standard regarding the assessment of interethnic relationships.

Reporting on the break-up of a German marriage due to an affair between the wife and an Italian guestworker, *Stern* gave a detailed account of the deterioration of what the husband had deemed an exemplary marriage up to that point. According to the magazine, he knew his marriage was in trouble when his wife began "to neglect the beautiful new home, the husband and the children. The doubts grew as the wife, who had been so industrious and frugal up until then, asked for a cleaning lady, spent ever more money and finally demanded that their 14-year-old daughter go to boarding school." At the time the story was written, the wife and her Italian lover had been together for two years. *Stern*

---

[28] Lieselotte Weber, "Hohe Scheidungsquote bei Gastarbeiterehen. Jedes vierte uneheliche Baby hat ausländischen Vater," *Westdeutsche Rundschau*, 26 April 1966.

nevertheless cast doubt on the potential longevity of the relationship, based on the opinion of social expert (*Sozialreferentin*) Maria Begliatti, working for the Italian general consulate in Munich. Conceding that only one in twelve marriages between a German woman and an Italian man ended in separation, Begliatti nevertheless argued that "Even most of the marriages that have not failed yet are unhappy." *Stern* completely trusted her opinion "because they [the Italian men] particularly like to unburden themselves to her," regardless of the fact that partners in happy marriages had no reason to seek her counsel, therefore resulting in a profoundly one-sided point of view. Furthermore, according to Begliatti the root cause of "German-Italian dissonances" could be found in the fact that "the Italian man, especially the one from Southern Italy, enjoys the role of pasha. He is used to being the boss in the house." This, however, severely clashed with the character of the German woman, as Begliatti put it: "The German woman...is not made for the role of obedient maid." Given *Stern*'s portrayal of the cuckolded German husband and his idea of an "exemplary" marriage, the difference between Begliatti's depiction of the typical Italian male and his German counterpart only seem to be one of degrees.[29]

Even in the sexual realm, the magazine argued, foreign men did not live up to their reputation. To "prove" its point, *Stern* based its claims on the opinion of prostitutes near the Volkswagen plant in Wolfsburg, which employed many

[29] While *Stern* did not comment on the Italian's appearance, it did run a photograph of the man. In response to the article, Günter Walraff published what was meant to be a defense of the Italian paramour, in an article in the leftist journal *Konkret*. Denouncing *Stern* for appealing to Germans' "sexual jealously" for its portrayal of insatiable guestworkers, Wallraff in a stint at investigative journalism visits the Italian and reports, "I hardly recognize him from the *Stern* photo. The gaps in his teeth that disfigure his face are not visible on the *Stern* photo so as not to ruin the cliché of the 'dark-eyed beau.'" While Wallraff convincingly manages to dispel the image of the dashing young Italian, it is equally hard to ignore the overtones of relief contained in his observations.

Italians. While those Italians might still enjoy the "aura of the unusual lover" among German women vacationing on the Adriatic coast, the magazine argued that according to the prostitutes, Italians were "no better in bed than Americans or Germans." Just a few lines later, however, the article conceded that it was still possible for guestworkers to be successful with German women, because "the charm, full of words and gestures, that southern Italian men. . . exhibit, does not miss its target with German girls who are often used to coarser fare." Apparently not entirely comfortable criticizing German men's sexual and romantic prowess with such a blanket statement, *Stern* qualified its argument yet again, maintaining that the foreign men were most successful with girls "who are closer to the level of the Mediterraneans who tend to come from a simple milieu." Throughout the article, then, *Stern* unsuccessfully attempted to characterize the women that were attracted to guestworkers, alternately referring to "shy [young] girls," "women, well advanced in years and in love with life," and those from the guestworkers' own--lower--social sphere. Including the description of the middle-class housewife leaving her husband for her Italian lover, it seems that despite *Stern*'s best efforts those women happy to enter into relationships with guestworkers defied neat categorizations. Adding to its questionable evaluation of interethnic relationships, the magazine presented prostitutes' opinions as the ultimate verdict on guestworkers' sexual performance, implicitly equating romantic interethnic relationships to the sexual and monetary exchange between prostitutes and their customers.[30]

---

[30] See Walter Unger, "'Die deutschen Frauen laufen uns nach'" *Stern*, 1 December 1968.

Other papers, meanwhile, reported on guestworkers' inability (or indifference) to distinguish between "honorable" women and what they considered disreputable ones (not necessarily professional prostitutes) and the potential for violence those relationships bred.[31] Such statements not only criticized the German women involved in these relationships but also in effect belittled guestworkers as they were portrayed as either too naïve or careless in their selection of women.

In 1968--the same year the *Stern* article appeared, an annual study by the Federal Institute of Labor (published in 1969) revealed that about a quarter of all *married* guestworkers *living with their wives in Germany* were married to German women.[32] The study was quite broad, not only reflecting on the situation of the foreign labor market in Germany, but also inquiring more generally about guestworkers' personal and social conditions. By the time the *Stern* article appeared, then, the integrative process via interethnic relationships was already well under way regardless of what the magazine claimed. As in the case of *Stern*, reactions in the press about this finding were mixed. Some papers reporting on the official study, for example, misrepresented the statistics and stated that a quarter of all guestworkers were married to German women, when in reality only about one in ten male guestworkers had a German wife.[33] *Welt am Sonntag*, also

---

[31] Cypress Forst, "'Carlos' greift in die Saiten. 1,2 Millionen GA halfen, den Horizont zu erweitern Deutsches Leben und exotische Einflüsse," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 30 March 1966; Vilma Sturm, "Der Muezzin und Frau Schmitz. Mitteilungen über unsere Türken," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 Mai 1966; Effi Horn, "Hauptproblem: Viel Heimweh und wenig Liebe," *Münchner Merkur*, 14 May 1966.

[32] Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung. Erfahrungsbericht 1969* (Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1970), 53, 56.

[33] "Immer mehr Gastarbeiter," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 30 April 1969; "In Deutschland läßt es sich gut leben," *Main Post*, 1 May 1969.

one of the papers misinterpreting the latest statistics at the time, was one of the most outspoken in voicing its frustration about the (misunderstood) developments, lamenting that a satisfying solution to the guestworker solution, like family reunification, "seems impossible. Of course, one could only recruit single guestworkers. But then even more foreigners would marry German women. One in four brides in guestworker marriages already says 'I do' in accent-free German."[34]

Not all reports were apprehensive about the possibility of growing numbers of interethnic relationships. Another exposé about the Italian autoworkers at Volkswagen in Wolfsburg shows that romantic involvement between the foreign workers and German women was not always viewed negatively. Appearing in several German newspapers, the article pointed out that signs for integration in Wolfsburg were few and far between, "One rarely sees a German girl with an Italian on Wolfsburg's streets." Nevertheless, "in the past eight years, there have been 240 Italian-German marriages" in Wolfsburg. For the author, then, interethnic relationships were the prime indicator for successful integration rather than a reason for concern and social upheaval.[35] In other

[34] Horst Zimmermann, "Gastarbeiter aus der Türkei: Sperrfrist für das Eheglück," *Welt am Sonntag*, 8 June 1969. In a slightly different context, *Kieler Nachrichten* also revealed its apprehension about guestworkers settling in Germany. Calling for more empathy among Germans, the paper warned that in the current social climate guestworkers would continue to bring their families to Germany or marry German women if it would help them attain private housing and avoid having to live in guestworker dormitories. See Ocke H. H. Peters, "Heute Gastarbeiter--morgen Außenseiter?" *Kieler Nachrichten*, 13 February 1971.

[35] See, for example, Seff (Josef) Schmidt, "Jeder 11. Bürger in Wolfsburg ist heute schon ein Italiener," *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 12 February 1971; idem, "Jeder elfte Wolfsburger ist Italiener," *Saarbrücker Zeitung*, 18 February 1971; idem, "Arbeiten ohne Aufstieg--Wohnen mit Aufzug," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 18 February 1971; idem, "Der Vorarbeiter ist immer ein Deutscher," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 20 February 1971.

instances, papers similarly suggested "the bed" as a helpful integration tool.[36] This more accepting attitude, however, did not apply to all guestworkers. Instead, it seems that lines between different ethnicities only became drawn more sharply.

While Italians (and Italian-German relationships) increasingly gained acceptance, for example, Turkish difference became ever more explicitly inscribed in the guestworker discourse. Among the groundswell of initiatives and studies that appeared in 1970, a report on the integration of guestworkers in Cologne drew much attention from the press. Initiated by the German Society for Socio-Analytical Research in Cologne and supported by the social security office of the city of Cologne, the study was a response to a series of violent crimes occurring in the city in early 1966 and closely associated with foreign laborers.[37]

Despite its municipal focus, because of its breadth and depth, the press not only hailed it as an exemplary study, but also underscored that its findings were valid beyond city lines. Among other issues, the study aimed at making transparent certain characteristics of the four major guestworker groups (Italians, Spaniards, Greeks, and Turks) as well as the Germans in Cologne.

As a number of papers reported, one of the researchers' findings singled out Turks as the least integrated into their host society because they were the most different. In fact, guestworkers supposedly had a natural affinity for a city like Cologne, where so-called *Klüngel*--a general tendency of irreverence toward the law, including clever semi-legal dealings of all kinds--was part and parcel of

---

[36] See Peter F. Ruthmann, "Vereint malochen, getrennt schlafen," *Vorwärts*, 13 August 1970; "Gastarbeiter: Noch immer Fremde?" *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 5 January 1972.
[37] See Karl Bingemer, Edeltrud Meistermann-Seeger, Edgar Neubert, *Leben als Gastarbeiter* (Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1970).

the cultural fabric of the city. As *Die* Welt pointed out, referring to the study, guestworkers from the Mediterranean countries felt at home in this kind of environment, because they were well-versed in how to circumvent the law, for example, which facilitated their integration into Cologne society.[38] On the other hand, as the paper summarized, "Turks, who precisely here make up the biggest group of foreign laborers, suffer [in this environment]. They are naturally law-abiding and, because of it, are bitterly disappointed in Cologne."[39] The study, explicitly aimed at *exculpating* guestworkers who in the public's eye had taken on the aura of criminals, received exclusively positive reviews in the papers. Ironically, it also helped single out Turks as the most different and least likely to fit in, *because* they were the most law-abiding and upstanding among the guestworkers.[40] One paper reporting on the Cologne study emphasized the degree of Turkish men's marginalization when it announced that not even German prostitutes were willing to service them[41]--a genuinely romantic relationship with German women seemed out of the question.

---

[38] The term is explicitly and proudly associated with the city of Cologne, also known as the "Kölsche Klüngel."

[39] Eberhard Nitschke, "Spanier leben auf dem Land, Griechen bringen ihre Frauen mit," *Die Welt*, 14 March 1970. Other papers also picked up on the study's assessment that Turks were the most segregated. See Ulla Schickling, "So gut wie kein einziges Klischee stimmt," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 6 June 1970; Peter N. Ruthmann, "Vereint malochen, getrennt schlafen," *Vorwärts*, 13 August 1970.

[40] A 1971 *Zeit Magazin* article echoed the sentiment that Turks had become the least integrated group among the guestworkers. See Ernst Klee, "Warum Gastarbeiter Mascolo den Deutschen so wert ist wie ein Deutscher," *Zeit Magazin*, 16 July 1971.

[41] Peter F. Ruthmann, "Vereint malochen," *Vorwärts*, 13 August 1970.

Reproducing Germans

Apart from relationships between male guestworkers and German women, intra-German relationships also came under scrutiny in the early 1970s. Germans' unwillingness to produce what were considered sufficient numbers of offspring that would result in an excess of births over deaths in effect made the guestworker presence imperative to insure the republic's economic health, but paradoxically, it also fueled the perceived guestworker problem. Barely any paper viewed the rise in the guestworker birth rate and simultaneous drop in the German birth rate as advantageous. Unsurprisingly, already by 1967 the right-wing *Deutsche Nationalzeitung* lamented the declining number of births among Germans.[42] Many papers at the time focused more on the problem of an increasing number of guestworker children, and the difficulties it would create integrating the growing numbers of foreigners, than on the declining number of Germans. Mainstream papers started to report on the trend in the early 1970s with varying degrees of trepidation. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* acknowledged that Germany's age structure would look even less promising were it not for the children born to foreign families in Germany. That, however, was part of the problem. In the eyes of the paper, it was clear that Germany's economic dependency on foreign labor would grow "even further, beyond the already high degree [of guestworkers present in Germany]."[43] Other papers ominously reported about what they characterized as incredibly high percentages

[42] Jochen Arp, "Die Gastarbeiterfrage. Gastarbeiter bleiben--Deutsche arbeitslos," *Deutsche National-Zeitung*, 20 January 1967.
[43] Wilhelm Throm, "Die Ausländer unter uns," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 14 August 1971.

of foreign babies among the total births in Germany[44] and the high costs for day care, Kindergartens, and schools associated with arrival of foreign children.[45] Papers did not consider that similar costs would arise (and that the government would presumably be happy to allocate funds for them) were Germans to have more babies. Papers thus displaced social welfare (*soziale Versorgung*) problems almost exclusively onto guestworkers.[46]

Other papers focused less on the actual cost than on the ideological price they feared the growing numbers of foreigners exacted, attempting to draw clear lines between Germans and others. *Stuttgarter Zeitung* reported--without critically reflecting on the statement--that authors of a local study examining the guestworker problem warned that, "no nation has ever succeeded in taking in this much foreign blood without creating internal tensions."[47] *Handelsblatt*, referring to the declining number of German citizens pointed out that because of this process, "scientifically speaking, the biological equilibrium is disturbed," and that "experience has taught us how dangerous an effect the population pressure of younger and smaller groups with higher birth rates can have on more strongly industrialized peoples [*Völker*] with lower birthrates"--without explicitly mentioning what constituted those dangerous effects.[48] Germans' unwillingness to produce "enough" babies was at the center of the problem.

---

[44] "Das Problem Gastarbeiter," *Die Welt*, 5 April 1973.
[45] Rose-Marie Borngässer, "Landeshauptstadt München. Unbewältigtes Problem Gastarbeiter," *Bayernkurier*, 10 March 1973.
[46] See also Schönwälder, *Einwanderung*, 607.
[47] Manfred Bornemann, "Das Gastarbeiterproblem kritisch beleuchtet," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 1 March 1973.
[48] "Auch Geburten für die Lebensqualität. Gastarbeiter müssen Wachstumslücken schließen," *Handelsblatt*, 23 March 1973; emphasis mine.

While other papers implicitly wondered about Germans' disinterest in reproduction, the Protestant conservative paper *Christ und Welt* put the topic front and center. In an article entitled, "When Fertility is Imported: Baby Boom among the Guestworkers," the paper did not only express its displeasure about the declining birth rate in general but particularly targeted German women, making them the culprits in what the papers considered a major debacle. Rather than demonizing the advent of the birth control Pill, the paper not uninsightfully contended that "The 'Pill'...has certainly not caused the 'slump in the birthrate [*Pillenknick*]'...Rather, the 'Pill' has been in use, *because* behavior has changed, as has the attitude towards children." The paper went on, however, to amplify this perspective by arguing that "The desire or the need to have children has decreased among our young women, just as one can simultaneously ascertain that the authoritarian manly lust ('the woman must give birth!') is not tolerated anymore." While talking more generally about changes in Germans' behavior, the paper ultimately argued that men's behavior had not shifted (their authoritarian desires were still in place) but was rather not tolerated anymore by their female companions, making these females responsible for the new trends.

Apart from German women's emancipation, the paper also found fault with the consumer society that had emerged out of the prosperous postwar years: "In addition, however, the suppression of the desire to have children has been made increasingly easy. The wave of affluence in the sixties has raised a new generation of rational calculators. Tourism, the desire to own a car or one's own perfect nest, a sailboat, a second condo or a second car" had apparently

started to take precedence over raising a family. Once again, however, the paper managed to associate the problem primarily with women, contending that the desire for consumption "was hard competition against the planned child that was only, as a young wife once casually remarked, 'the most expensive pet' a woman could have. It takes up all of your free time!"[49] Conjuring up a future scenario in which eager guestworker children would compete with complacent German ones, *Christ und Welt* predicted further that "healthy rivalry" between Germans and foreigners would ensue, ostensibly viewing this as a positive possibility. In the end, however, the paper warned, "Whoever thinks they know of a proven cure for this development, should not hold back their knowledge yet. Whoever thinks that one could maintain the constantly growing tendency toward pleasure and affluence solely through imploring warnings and without sacrifice, and still avoid the foreign infiltration described here, is lying to themselves and everybody else." Apart from its frustration with German women, then, the paper also made it clear that future descendants of guestworkers would never be able to become part of German society (instead just bringing about growing foreign infiltration [*Überfremdung*]), even if they were successful in escaping the underclass through education and professional integration. *Christ und Welt's* article reflected the larger issues at the time that had little to do with guestworkers in particular but gathered more immediacy because of their growing presence, like society's emphasis on consumption, the declining birthrate, and the battle about Germany's abortion paragraph 218 that was fought in the first half of the 1970s.

---

[49] Richard Kaufmann, "Wenn Fruchtbarkeit importiert wird. Babyboom bei Gastarbeitern," *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt*, 21 September 1973.

Such matters gathered importance after the recruitment ban took effect in late November 1973, when it became clear that the number of foreigners rose rather than declined (much of it due not just to family reunification but also guestworker children born in Germany).

Female Guestworkers and the Limits of Integration

German women's increasing independence as well as their progressively growing reluctance to bear children also influenced the way the press reported on the growing presence of foreign females in the German workforce as well as the German public. With the exception of the brief early 1960s discussions of Italian women as ideal potential wives of German men, female guestworkers had never garnered much press attention. But female guestworkers' role in the integration process (as wives and mothers of foreigners) increasingly came to be viewed as an important factor as their percentage in the foreign labor workforce grew consistently. Despite these developments and despite earlier reports that the female guestworkers integrated nicely into German society, by the mid-1960s, they were once again increasingly portrayed as backward and victims of patriarchy, ultimately not only exploited by their husbands, but in the long run also a danger to integration.

The 1968 federal study on foreign employees that had established the percentage of German women married to guestworkers also showed that about two thirds of all female guestworkers were married (at the time about one third of all guestworkers were female), 90 percent of them living in Germany with their

husbands. The study made no mention, however, of the husbands' nationality, thereby reinforcing the notion that marriage between women from the recruitment countries and German men--despite the early 1960s celebration of marriages of Italian and Spanish women to Germans--was a non-issue.[50] Generally, the role of guestworker women as workers had not been a burning topic with the press and most papers at the time reported with relief the shrinking guestworker population. (The lack of awareness regarding the growing number of female guestworkers, for example, is nicely portrayed in a 1968 article in the *Lübecker Nachrichten*, which compared the job market in West and East Germany. The paper reported, "in the Federal Republic gaps in the economy are being filled with foreigners, in the GDR with women." Such an observation also shows the mutual constitutiveness of race and gender, as the article rendered foreign women invisible as *women*.).[51] The number of female guestworkers in fact kept growing throughout the 1966/67 recession as the percentage of female guestworkers rose from 25.8 percent to 28.9 percent between September 1966 and September 1967.[52] During the same time period, the total number of workers declined by 24.5 percent.[53] After Germany had overcome its economic problems, guestworker recruitment in general picked up once again, and the number of female guestworkers reached about 30 percent in 1973, growing by 23.2 percent in two years compared to 17.9 percent for the male guestworkers.[54]

---

[50] Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Erfahrungsbericht 1969*, 55.
[51] See F. W. Friese, "Gastarbeiter werden teuer," *Lübecker Nachrichten*, 17 October 1968.
[52] See, *Erfahrungsbericht 1969*, 17.
[53] See Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 198-99, table 19.
[54] Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung. Erfahrungsbericht 1972/73* (Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1974), 27

Despite the general upswing in the labor market (foreign and German) beginning in the early 1970s, Turkish men faced obstacles in obtaining a German work permit due to the high volume of applications. By 1971 the average waiting period for unskilled Turkish male laborers was six to seven years.[55] A year later, legal labor migration became even more difficult as the German recruitment offices in Turkey were advised to sort out all existing applications of unskilled laborers over thirty-five years of age and only to accept new applications for unskilled labor from men twenty-five years or younger.[56] The same was not true for foreign women who still found positions in the tertiary sector and consumer goods industry, both less affected by the economic downturn at the time than the industries in which male guestworkers tended to cluster (construction, iron and metal industries, and the processing trades). While the German economy still eagerly sought foreign female labor, the press more often focused on what it considered the cruel circumstances that forced women to leave their families behind to work in Germany. Curiously, even as papers condemned patriarchal Turkish culture, they rarely considered women's escapes from it as a positive turn of events.

As a 1971 article in the *Hannoversche Allgemeine* demonstrated, the depictions of guestworker women were still very much in line with earlier accounts, where the women had often appeared as naïve, fearful, and in need of protection. Denying guestworker women "any trace of independence," "decision-making opportunity [*Entscheidungsmöglichkeit*]," as well as "the ability to make

---

[55] Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung. Erfahrungsbericht 1971* (Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1972), 35
[56] Bundesanstalt, *Erfahrungsbericht 1972/73*, 48.

their own decisions [*Entscheidungsfähigkeit*]," the paper charged, "How helpless must a people [*Volk*] be, how ultimately powerless a government, that can allow mothers to leave their children, wives to leave their husbands, for months or years to free themselves from depressing poverty?"[57] It was rare that foreign women were granted a sexual identity equal to that of (foreign) men as was the case in the *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, which (even though it labeled them "girls") stated that female guestworkers in Germany were just as sexually frustrated as their foreign male colleagues.[58] If anything, the opinions about foreign--particularly Turkish--female labor, became ever more critical because, according to some members of the press, working in the German industry prevented them from fulfilling the only roles they knew: those of mother and wife. Thus, while papers were critical of gender inequalities among Turks and other ethnic minorities, they denied foreign women the capacity for breaking out of those roles and succeeding in relative independence. Instead, German papers depicted their employment in Germany not as a voluntary (let alone a liberating) act undertaken in time of need but as the irresponsible result of patriarchal pressure.

This image of an immutable patriarchal culture was underscored by descriptions of Turkish women covered from head to toe in what the *Deutsche Tagespost* called their "garbs from time immemorial." The paper further predicted that the dissolution of foreigners' marriages with each other were an inevitable outcome not only because it was impossible for the husbands to keep a watch on their wives, but also because these were marriages "that had possibly been

---

[57] Sieglinde Werner, "Gastarbeiterin--warum?" *Hannoversche Allgemeine*, 15 June 1971.
[58] See "Schnell Geld und dann nach Hause," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 30 May 1970.

arranged years ago, when both were still children, and they were " not based on real love or were held together only through sex [*nur über das Sexuelle gehalten*]." The paper concluded that "The Anatolian woman is the husband's servant, rarely ever his companion [*Wegbegleiterin*]."[59] *Frankfurter Rundschau* went so far as to claim that up until about 1970, "no Turkish woman dared go abroad," while "today foreign women make up almost 30 percent of all guestworkers." Rather than viewing migration and employment in West Germany as an act of female emancipation (as the recruitment office in Ankara claimed) the paper argued that the Turkish women's husbands who used their wives as a means to their own ends initiated this development.[60] The paper's argument was problematic on a number of levels. First, it refused to consider Turkish women's migration as anything but a sign of her oppression. Moreover, *Frankfurter Rundschau* presented these women's migration as a new phenomenon, ignoring the fact that already in 1967, almost 20 percent of Turkish guestworkers were women,[61] growing to 24.4 percent in 1973.[62] Finally, the paper cited the 1973 percentage of *all* foreign women among guestworkers (30 percent) rather than just that of Turkish women (18.2. percent) to bolster its claim.[63] Thus, while there was certainly an increase in the employment of Turkish women in particular and foreign women in general, the paper made the change appear more dramatic

---

[59] Franz von Caucig, "Verstärkte Anmeldung von Frauen. Sechshundertausend Türken suchen Arbeit in Europa!" *Deutsche Tagespost*, 23 August 1968. Regarding comment on traditional dress, see also, Dietmar Wittmann, "Mehr als eine Million Türken suchen Arbeit in Deutschland," *Münchner Merkur*, 4 September 1973.
[60] Helge-Ulrike Peter, "Die Legalen und die Illegalen. Türken, die nach Deutschland wollen," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 20 January 1973.
[61] See Bundesanstalt, *Erfahrungsbericht 1969*, 17.
[62] Bundesanstalt, *Erfahrungsbericht 1972/73*, 28.
[63] Ibid.

than it really was. Turkish women, then, had been part of the country's labor migration to Germany for quite some time. Moreover (as historian Mathilde Jamin argues in *Fremde Heimat* and as pictures throughout this book underscore vividly), these women "were the exact opposite of the German stereotype of the Turkish woman."[64] A far cry from the deeply veiled woman garbed in billowing pants and dresses, these young Turkish women could barely be distinguished from their German female colleagues at the time.

The public debate about guestworker recruitment in the postwar period, then, was always more than merely an evaluation of the relative advantages and disadvantages of employing foreigners and their potential contributions to Germany's economic recovery after World War II. Rather, discussions about foreign laborers were also very much about *Germans* and their ambivalences about postwar developments, particularly their conflicting visions of postwar West German society that were reflected, among other issues, in the organization of family and gender relations and postwar capitalism. For Germans, ideas of "normality" were inherently caught up in particular (and often contested) notions of proper sexual behavior, and the phenomenon of guestworker recruitment affected the debate considerably. As the debate in the 1960s shows, part of the papers' concern stemmed from what they perceived to be macho guestworkers' pursuit of German women. These same papers, however, often also faulted those German women (and more generally what they considered a hedonistic lifestyle) for actively seeking those relationships in the first place (and in stark

---

[64] Mathile Jamin, "Einführung," in *Fremde Heimat. Eine Geschichte der Einwanderung aus der Türkei*, ed. Mathilde Jamin (Essen: Klartext, 1998), 24.

contrast to the equally problematic media images of meek, traditionally garbed guestworker women). Looking at the guestworker debate in the West German media at the time therefore helps to uncover the complicated ways in which Germans not only managed difference but also attempted to negotiate the dramatic changes in the sexual landscape they went through in the 1960s. The emerging interest in Turkish women and the papers' belief that they were not only victims of patriarchy but also ill-suited for a life in Germany was just one, albeit particularly clear, indicator for a more general concern about the growing Turkish contingent of guestworkers. As the number of Turks more than doubled between 1968 and 1970, papers devoted increasingly more attention to their situation. By 1972 they were the largest group among the guestworkers. While there was a general sense that the guestworker situation--especially the workers' often-squalid living conditions--needed to be rectified, papers were also uneasy about how to accomplish these goals while the number of guestworkers kept growing.

"The Turks are Coming"

Despite apprehensions about the settling of foreigners in Germany, since the early 1960s, many papers had considered family reunification as a solution to guestworker isolation and resulting problems and by the second half of the decade, many articles saw it as an effective integration tool that would help solve tensions and conflicts, decrease fluctuation in the foreign labor force, and foster

adaptation and assimilation.[65] Starting in the early 1970s, however, papers became more critical of family reunification, not merely because it proved difficult to integrate foreign children effectively in German schools but also because, contrary to previous beliefs, it appeared that foreign--and particularly Turkish--mothers and wives complicated rather than facilitated the integration process. In addition, the terrorist attack at the Munich Olympics on 5 September 1972 as well as a political reorientation of economic policy toward a stabilization and reduction of the foreign labor force at the time also influenced the guestworker debate.[66]

Even before those events, however, signs of mounting interest in (and unease about) a growing Turkish presence had been visible already in 1970 as the terms "Turks" and "guestworkers" started to be used synonymously, particularly well illustrated in a *Handelsblatt* article. Ostensibly dealing with "guestworkers and their sorrows," and aiming to explain to its readers "what it looks like...in many a guestworker, when he walks through [German] shopping streets [and] sees the plethora of goods [*Angebotsfülle*] and the passers-by, the girls in their micro-minis," the paper proceeded to depict what viewers would unequivocally identify as typically Turkish without labeling it as such: "Oftentimes their wives and sisters accompany them to the train or the plane still deeply

---

[65] See, for example, J. W. Reifenrath, "Die Heimat bleibt starker," *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 4 January 1966; "Gastfamilien zusammenführen. Eine Forderung des Arbeitsministers von Baden-Württemberg," *Badische Zeitung*, 26 April 1966; Leopold Bergmann, "Illusionen vom Wunder zerplatzt. Viele Gastarbeiterfamilien wollen für immer in Deutschland bleiben," *Freie Presse*, 9 September 1966; Erich B. Kusch, "Kein Heimweh nach Deutschland. Wenig Bindung italienischer Gastarbeiter and das Gastland," *Badische Zeitung*, 14 September 1966; "Gastarbeiter von heute--Fachkräfte von morgen," *Die Rheinpfalz*, 26 July 1968; Marianne Steible, "Gastarbeiter in Deutschland. Die neue gesellschaftliche Minderheit," *Badische Zeitung*, 27 August 1970; Elisabeth Emmerich, "Unsere Parias von morgen," *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, 3 August 1972.

[66] See Karen Schönwälder, *Einwanderung*, 532, 568.

veiled despite a governmental ban."[67] In other instances, articles claiming to speak about guestworkers in general went on to address specifically Turkish problems.[68] Even in Schleswig-Holstein, the state with the lowest guestworker rate, the *Flensburger Tageblatt* started to focus on the Turkish population arguing that the state of Schleswig Holstein had enough Turks to constitute a small town: "If 6,000 people make up a small town, then Schleswig-Holstein has a Turkish small town, because over 6,000 Turks live here." Conjuring up the surprising and arguably disconcerting image of a Turkish town in the readers' midst, the paper swiftly moved to assuage readers' discomfort by assuring them that one would look for this town "in vain, of course" but that the 6000 Turks were spread across a number of the state's cities. Nevertheless, the image of a group of Turks big enough to make up their own municipality certainly lingered, especially because the paper focused exclusively on Turks and did not offer any comparative perspective, thus failing to mention that the state of Schleswig-Holstein had by far the smallest number of guestworkers in their midst.[69]

As the *Handelsblatt* article demonstrates, most papers attempted to bring what they understood to be the world of Turks closer to their German readers. In doing so, however, they succeeded not so much in fostering acceptance but

---

[67] Katharina Olbertz, "Aus der Hirtenlandschaft in das Ruhrgebiet. Gastarbeiter und ihre Sorgen--Hilfe bei der Rückführung nötig," *Handelsblatt*, 20 April 1970.

[68] See for example, Peter F. Ruthmann, "Vereint malochen, getrennt schlafen. Deutsche und ihre Gastarbeiter: Vorurteile verhindern Integration," *Vorwärts*, 13 August 1970; Peter Sabinski, "Konfliktstoff um 'Gastarbeiter.' Ausländische Arbeitnehmer sind schwierig einzugliedern," *Westdeutsche Allemeine Zeitung*, 17 August 1970; "Kühle Bewunderung für Deutsche. Gastarbeiter auf Besuch in der Heimat," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 January 1972.

[69] "Über 6000 Türken in Schleswig-Holstein," *Flensburger Tageblatt*, 12 March 1970. It is unclear what the source for the paper's statistics were, since a survey by the Federal Institute of Labor showed that almost 16.000 Turks worked in the state (including Hamburg) in June 1970. Outside of Berlin, this was still by far the lowest number of Turks (3.8 percent) in any West German state. See Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung. Erfahrungsbericht 1970* (Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1971), 64.

suspicion, not merely by singling out this group of foreigners but by betraying their own ambivalences about what they understood to be an inherently different culture. In its signature mix of serious reporting and sarcastic social commentary, the political weekly magazine *Spiegel* reported on a new informational flyer about toilet hygiene compiled by the Hamburg health authorities for the Turkish contingent among the guestworkers, giving its readers a flavor of the "seemingly self-evident" instructions: "'The toilet bowl in Germany is meant for sitting on.'...'After emptying one's bowels, one is supposed to wipe the anus carefully--with two folded pieces of paper taken from the roll at the wall--until it is completely clean. For this purpose one uses the left hand and as much paper as necessary.'" Commenting sardonically that Turks from the provinces apparently "interpreted the Koran incorrectly on the [use of the] toilet," the magazine countered by quoting from the Koran, arguing that it explicitly demanded "cleanliness and tidiness" from the faithful. The rest of *Spiegel*'s report was nevertheless serious enough, maintaining that visits of guestworker dormitories by hygiene officials had not only led to the belief of a lack of hygiene among Turks but also to the recommendation not to hire them for work in food-processing plants. As the magazine disapprovingly noted, however-- thereby making the reader wonder about the amount of truth in reports regarding lacking guestworker cleanliness--the trade had failed to react promptly on the advice because Turks were a desirable source of cheap labor. Thus once again straddling the issues, the magazine went on to blame the tabloid *Bild* for the dissemination of racist suspicions because it had pointed the finger at Turkish

soft-serve ice cream vendors as the source of a hepatitis breakout (a claim not backed by the health officials). The article closed on a pessimistic note by quoting a bacteriologist expressing his skepticism about the success of changing Turkish toilet hygiene.[70] Despite its sarcasm, then, the article nevertheless fostered misgivings about Turks as it focused on their apparently debatable hygiene and expressed its consternation that the food-processing industries did not heed the authorities' warnings. Furthermore, *Spiegel's* purposefully graphic description of Turkish hygiene might have been aimed at exposing the outrageousness inherent in official investigations into Turkish workers' most intimate realms. In doing so, however, the magazine also contributed to them. By the early 1970s, growing numbers of Turks waiting to be recruited for employment only enhanced the sense of trepidation papers had previously conveyed. The sense of fascination with purported difference present in the *Spiegel* article, however, prevailed as well.

At this time, articles repeatedly pointed to what were estimated to be one million Turks waiting in Turkey for employment recruitment. Such anxieties arose in the context of the possibility that regulatory migration barriers between Germany and Turkey could disappear as a result of Turkey's associate membership in the EEC. One of the conditions for Turkey's transition from an associated to a potentially full member of the EEC, was a 10-year transitional period, intended to go into effect in December 1976. Under the agreement, Turks were supposed to be allowed to migrate to other EEC countries freely and enjoy

[70] "Feiner Sand," *Spiegel*, 22 February 1971.

the same benefits and working conditions as other EEC members.[71] Papers were therefore seriously worried and angry about what some envisioned as the possible "Turkish onslaught"[72] and a feeling as if "the entire Turkish population wanted to relocate to Germany."[73] By 1973, those impressions grew even stronger, causing one paper to speak of the "fear of a sudden unhindered flood of Turks."[74] Reports from the recruitment offices in Turkey often accompanied such assessments, at times even illustrated with pictures of groups of male Turkish applicants at the recruitment office, standing in a half-circle in nothing but their underpants during medical examinations. Such pictures had never appeared before nor had there ever been similar pictures published from other recruitment countries. *Vorwärts*, one of the papers that had published such an image, did briefly raise the question if this kind of "group processing" was not insensitive (*unzumutbar*), but was assured that Turkish men underwent the same procedures during medical examinations for military service. The question if publishing the picture of nearly naked Turkish men was humiliating and utterly inappropriate, on the other hand, was never raised.[75]

---

[71] Ray C. Rist, *Guestworkers in Germany. The Prospects for Pluralism* (New York: Praeger, 1978), 99-100.
[72] Götz von Coburg, "Istanbul an der Spree. Jeder achte ist ein Türke," *Welt am Sonntag*, 18 February 1971.
[73] "Bundesrepublik wird zum Schmelztiegel Europas," *Weser Kurier*, 24 July 1973.
[74] "Günstiger Nährboden für Agitation. Türken leben in einem selbstgewählten Getto," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 September 1973. For further evidence of papers' anxiety about the number of Turks, see, "Warum Gastarbeiter zu Bürgern werden sollen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 13 January 1973; Dietmar Wittmann, "Mehr als eine Million Türken suchen Arbeit in Deutschland," *Münchner Merkur*, 4 September 1973; Hans Wüllenweber, "Das Gastarbeiter-Problem spitzt sich immer mehr zu. Gefahren der Radikalisierung in Bonn viel zu spat erkannt," *Münchner Merkur*, 8 September 1973; Burkhart Salchow, "Der Sturm auf das Wunderland," *Deutsche Zeitung–Christ und Welt*, 23 November 1973.
[75] "Enstation Sehnsuch für eine Million Türken: Ein Arbeitsplatz in der Bundesrepublik," *Vorwärts*, 19 April 1973. A similar picture also appeared in at least one other paper. See, Peter Pragal, "1,2 Millionen Türken wollen als Gastarbeiter ins Ausland," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 13 March 1973.

Papers' view of Turkish guestworkers as utterly different might explain the lack of self-consciousness apparent in discussions about Turkish cleanliness or the publication of photos showing barely clad Turkish men. It also seemed to make it difficult for German papers to take Turkish attempts at integration seriously, criticizing--contradictorily--both the apparent preservation of Turkish culture in emerging ghettos as well as Turks' embrace of consumerism, one of the primary indicators, it seemed, of foreigners' integration. Mocking their "clumsy climbing attempts on the lowest rungs of the social ladder" one paper also noticed with reluctant admiration Turks' optimism and determination, admitting, for example, that in Kreuzberg they "at times prove themselves to be...more German than the long-established natives [*Alteingesessenen*]" in the way they worked on their cars and leaned out of windows, surveying the neighborhood and disciplining their children in "ribald German [*deftigem Deutsch*]."[76] This aggregation of Turks in particular neighborhoods caused some papers, however, to point to what they saw as the "exceptionally strong cohesion among the Turkish guestworker contingent," evident in the fact that "Turks live with Turks and [rent from] Turks. They buy their groceries from their fellow countrymen, have their cars serviced by Turks and, when necessary, seek help from Turkish legal advisers."[77] For *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, the problem was not just the close proximity in which Turks chose to live with each other and the seemingly strong

---

[76] Hans Nerth, "Türken in Berlin: Keinen der 80 000 zieht es zurück auf die anatolische Hochebene," *Die Welt*, 28 August 1973.

[77] "Günstiger Nährboden für Agitation. Türken leben in einem selbstgewählten Getto," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 September 1973. It is curious that articles in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt* partially matched word for word in their description of Turkish life given above, even though the former reported on Turks in the state of North Rhine-Westfalia and the latter focused on West Berlin. See, Burkhart Salchow, "Der Sturm auf das Wunderland," *Deutsche Zeitung--Christ und Welt*, 23 November 1973.

ties they had in their community, but the potential for political upheaval inherent in this setting. Other papers echoed not only the fear of a political but also that of a potential violent threat emanating from such communities.[78]

Spiegel once again captured the sign of the times when it ran a cover story on the issue, provocatively titled "The Turks are coming--run for your life" (*Die Türken kommen--rette sich wer kann*). The magazine asserted that the increasing number of Turks arriving in Germany heightened an already smoldering crisis that could not be solved with temporary and inadequate policies, policies which were themselves seen as contributing to worsening the situation. As the article declared--and in the months and years that followed many more in other periodicals would concur--it was becoming apparent that measures such as a proposed infrastructure tax[79] (*Infrastrukturabgabe)*, the rotation of guestworkers[80] and gestures such as officially changing the term "guestworker" into "foreign employee" (*ausländische Arbeitnehmer*) were insufficient to change either public or political attitudes towards the members of the foreign workforce.[81] The wide-ranging essay, however, managed not to settle the question of whether the main problem was the ill-considered government policies towards the guestworkers, or the ubiquity of popular racism, or the

---

[78] See, "Genscher will die Gastarbeiter integrieren," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 17 October 1972; Hanns Wüllenweber, "Das Gastarbeiter-Problem spitzt sich immer mehr zu. Gefahren der Radikalisierung in Bonn viel zu spät erkannt," *Münchner Merkur*, 8 September 1973; Hans-Otto Eglau, "Wohin jetzt mit den Türken?" *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger*, 8 December 1973.

[79] A tax targeting those companies that profited from foreign employment, it was proposed (but never implemented) as one of the solutions to reduce the employment of guestworkers.

[80] The idea behind rotation was to assure a temporary stay of guestworkers in Germany, sending them back to their respective home countries while recruiting new guestworkers to replace those who had returned home. Thus, a constant flow of guestworkers between the Federal Republic and the guestworkers' respective home countries was thought to decrease the "risk" of permanent guestworker settlement in Germany.

[81] "Die Türken kommen--rette sich wer kann," *Spiegel*, 26 March 1973.

proliferation of guestworkers themselves (for they were "reproducing nicely"). In having it all ways at once--disseminating stereotypes while distancing itself from them, documenting harsh conditions while leaving open who was responsible for them--the article was indicative of further trends to come.

CHAPTER 4

CAPITALISM AND FAMILY VALUES, 1973-1983

In the decade between the mid-sixties and mid-seventies, "integration" had served as a key element of the guestworker debate. In the course of the second half of the seventies, a new focus of obsession emerged: consumerism. On the one hand, Turkish participation in the German culture of consumption was seen as one of the few places where integration was a success. On the other hand, foreigners' forays into German consumer culture were also at times received less positively, and foreigners' fascination with consumer goods was criticized by both liberals and conservatives, albeit for different reasons. Conservatives expressed fears that guestworkers' newfound enjoyment in acquiring consumer objects would hinder their primary objectives of saving enough money to facilitate their return home. In other words, spending the money in Germany made both the goal of attaining a sizable nest egg as well as their return home ever more elusive. The result was guestworkers' ever-longer residence (and ultimate settling) in Germany, anathema to those conservatives vehemently arguing against Germany's transformation into an immigration country. Meanwhile, left-leaning liberals read guestworker consumption as surrender to Germany's highly questionable consumerist values.

While steadily rising during the guestworker recruitment years, the number of foreigners overall was declining in the second half of the 1970s, particularly the number of wage-earning guestworkers, dropping by about 660,000 to just

under two million in 1979.[1] Papers commented on the loss in revenue this caused in consumer spending. Many of these remarks came in the wake of the publication of Klaus Kunkel's *"The Germans Think We are Stupid..."* [*"Die Deutschen halten uns für blöd..."*] The study was published by the Informedia Verlag, a publisher, as one paper remarked, closely affiliated with the German Economic Institute in Cologne (*Kölner Institut der Deutschen Wirtschaft*), which itself was an institution of the industry and employers.[2] As the title of the book suggests, the study shrewdly played on (and ostensibly criticized) negative German attitudes toward guestworkers and argued that consumer capitalism was one way to bridge the gap between the ethnic minorities and their host society. The study presented encouragement of guestworker consumerism as a compassionate and thoughtful way to make the guestworkers feel more appreciated in Germany. Asserting that it was the person, and not the economic profit produced by the person [*erbrachter wirtschaftlicher Nutzen*] that was at the center of the study, the author nevertheless argued that the two (the person and his or her contribution to the economy) could never be completely separated. The book celebrated itself for offering "tips" for "marketing even more German wares to foreign employees (and their native countries)." It also announced that this aim was eminently "legitimate" and that, "moreover, as has been proven, catalogs [for marketing these wares] developed in the foreign languages create the welcome

[1] See Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge* (München: C. H. Beck, 2000), 198-9, table 19.
[2] Sef Despineux, "Von Demokratie in der Familie halten Türken und Spanier nichts," *General-Anzeiger*, 31 December 1976.

impression that one cares about the foreign employees."[3] The celebration of consumerism and of capitalism with a friendly face coexisted with unabashed condescension towards the guestworkers.

Guestworkers' enjoyment of consumerism had in general raised eyebrows and invited condescension. Every December, for example, the media reported on the special trains that took guestworkers back to their home countries over the holidays and with astonishment described the ways in which they seemed to overflow with refrigerators, television sets, bicycles and other major consumer goods. While guestworkers had early on gained a reputation as stingy, neglecting to invite colleagues for rounds at the local bar, refusing to pay cafeteria food prices or pay higher rents, their newfound interest in consumption failed to win the press' approval. The clothing they picked apparently only drew into sharper relief their difference, as *Münchner Merkur* remarked: "When they leave [the store] they wear loudly checkered jackets..., pink shirts, colorful ties, wares that have been stocked specifically to their taste, that appeal to them and yet only serve to emphasize the foreignness in their appearance."[4]

Even when papers defended guestworkers as valuable consumers, they also had to point out how their participation in consumption set them apart. For example, the *Neue Württembergische Zeitung* admonished businessmen and sales staff not to treat guestworkers as "second-class customers," but conceded that they talked too much and too loudly, loved to haggle, and touched the goods (!). Moreover, and again, "their fashion taste" was deemed "grotesque, their

---

[3] Klaus Kunkel, *"Die Deutschen halten uns für blöd..."* (Köln: Informedia Verlags-GmbH, 1975), 102-3.
[4] Effi Horn, "Hauptproblem: Viel Heimweh und wenig Liebe," *Münchner Merkur*, 14 May 1966.

naiveté alarming."[5] Similarly--and even as it gave itself permission to condescend to guestworker taste by pretending to be critical of *German* consumerism--as *Zeit* evaluated the goods carried by Yugoslavian guestworkers returning home, it derisively concluded that they "give their loved ones everything that rich, consumption-conscious Germany has taught them to value." In the full-page article, the paper ironically commented on Yugoslavs traveling home with "dresses that are not only warm, but also 'nice and colorful'" and matter-of-factly stated that "a lot of it is useful, some things are totally absurd, some of it is touching." It made fun of the "tawdry sweater off the junk table for the portly fifty-year-old" that one of the returning workers thought was "'just the right thing' for his mother. Also, the do-it-yourself hair dye. 'Our women,' he says proudly, 'should be just as pretty as you are!" Despite its dim view of Germany's consumer culture, its appropriation by guestworkers seemed even worse than the real thing, and *Zeit* could not help but mockingly sum up: "a German *Fräuleinwunder* for the Balkans right out of the [cosmetic] tube." *Kölnische Rundschau* was a little more outspoken about its view on guestworkers souvenirs, admitting, "We turn up our noses at so much stupidity and tastelessness." In a move that was meant to evoke compassion for the guestworkers but only succeeded in drawing the lines between Germans and guestworkers even more clearly, the paper continued, "But who among us can

[5] H. Gebe, "Gastarbeiter. Als Kunde nicht König," *Neue Württembergische Zeitung*, 10 December 1968.

assess how much joy a cheap plastic car will bring to a little boy in the mountains of Sardinia?"[6]

Yet, in 1970 the industrial organ *Der Volkswirt* reported that a representative survey by the Offenbach-based Marplan Research Council [*Marplan Forschungsgesellschaft*] showed that at least with respect to consumption guestworker integration was a success--as their investment in durable household goods in particular demonstrated.[7] While guestworkers might have started to rival Germans in their spending habits, however, some articles read the same news as an indication that guestworkers' "pleasure in consumption" was getting "out of control,"[8] chiding them for not investing more money in proper nutrition (which would presumably enhance their productivity) and instead spending it "on foolish things."[9] Others noted that guestworkers tried to adapt through fashion and shiny consumer goods" to make up for their inferior social status in Germany.[10] Meanwhile, Turkish attempts to participate in Germany's culture, particularly its consumer culture, were also deemed problematic because the "glittering, goods-filled windows of the bursting full department stores" led them to buy "'civilization toys [*Zivilisationsspielzeug*]' like televisions, cars, refrigerators." These, readers were admonished, were "things

---

[6] Norbert Iserlohe, "...weil sich in der Herberge kein Platz für sie fand. Die Gastarbeiter--'Deutschlands neue Juden?" *Kölnische Rundschau*, 24 December 1970.
[7] "Gastarbeiter. Die Lückenbüßer der Wohlstandsgesellschaft," *Der Volkswirt*, 4 September 1970.
[8] "Gastarbeiter: Sparen ist Trumpf," *Bayern Kurier*, 26 February 1972, and Rose-Marie Borngässer, "Gastarbeiter: Lawinenwarnung anderer Art," *Bayern Kurier*, 16 June 1973.
[9] Barbro Schuchardt, "Türkenkinder machen in der Sparkasse Hausaufgaben," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 7 February 1971.
[10] Key L. Ulrich, "Bilder und Zeiten: Die Helfer, die wir riefen. Gastarbeiter in diesen Tagen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 February 1967.

that supposedly make life more pleasant but that fail to make it more secure [*sicher*]."[11]

A full-page article in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, showing what it found to be the lack of improvement in the guestworker situation, made a particularly strong case against consumption and tried to expose its inadequacies as a surrogate for social status or social integration. In the process, the article also managed to marginalize Turks within the larger group of guestworker nationalities. In his 1972 report, the documentary filmmaker Edmund Wolf revisited Augsburg two years after he had made a film about the life of guestworkers there. In his observations, he juxtaposed seemingly content Turks with other guestworker nationalities who were much more vocal about their discontent brought on by the 1965 foreigner law and the insecurity it generated. The Turkish family that Wolf visited in their dilapidated home, however, had nothing but praise for their environment: "Augsburg is good. Germany is good. Everything is good," causing Wolf to comment, "It is almost provocative [*aufreizend*], this uncritical contentment. How can they be satisfied with their meaningless job in these foreign parts?" Incredulous about their lack of resentment, he found the source of their false consciousness in the appliances proudly displayed in their home: "Next to each other at the wall...stand tall and super modern, the best of the best, a television, a record player, a radio, like three luxury yachts, lying there at anchor, just waiting to take away [*entführen*] their owners." To underscore the incongruities, he mockingly pointed out that "There are rats in the kitchen, but that cannot be

[11] Hans-Ulrich Gaerdes, "Das meiste wird eisern gespart. Viele türkische Gastarbeiter legen ihr Geld in eigenen Betrieben an," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 28 August 1972.

helped, that is just the way it is." For Wolf, exactly *because* this Turkish family bought into German consumer culture it was impossible for them to achieve their dream (and arguably that of Germans as well): return home when enough money was saved. [12]

Regardless of the papers' various ideological stances on these issues, in the 1970s, the press acknowledged that guestworker consumption could no longer be treated as an odd curiosity (describing what many articles had previously depicted as clumsy attempts at consumption) since consumption had become elevated to an important element of the German economy.[13]On the surface, in sum, guestworkers' emulation of German consumer culture seemed to bring them closer to a German life style. However, a number of papers at the time did not merely see Germans' rising consumption as a reflection of the unmitigated economic success Germany had experienced since the 1950s. Rather, they found Germans' infatuation with consumption questionable not least because it seemed to be part of the reason for the presence of foreigners. In turn, guestworkers' participation in the quest for consumer goods only aggravated the problem: the accumulation of goods indicated that guestworkers were settling; the rise in guestworker spending in Germany meant a decline in savings, thus making the prospect of guestworkers' return home increasingly less likely.

---

[12] Edmund Wolf, "Nix Ausländer, nix. Gespräche mit Gastarbeitern," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 2 December 1972.

[13] See, for example, "Gastarbeiter: 'Geradezu hemmungslos,'" *Wirtschaftswoche--Der Volkswirt*, 18 July 1975; "Eine halbe Million ausländischer Arbeiter weniger," *Passauer Neue Presse*, 2 August 1975; "Kunden, die fehlen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 9 August 1975; "Arbeitsmarkt. Brauchen wir die Gastarbeiter?" *Wirtschaftwoche, Der Volkswirt*, 9 April 1976.

Building Family Businesses

At the same time that papers reported on the drawbacks of potentially losing valuable guestworker customers, however, the debate about the place of foreigners in German society and economy vs Germans' *own* attitudes about consumer capitalism, the welfare state, and--most immediately--the workplace continued unabated. One of the key elements of the debate at the time, for instance, was the creativity guestworkers exhibited in finding ways to be able to stay in Germany when unemployment seemed to make this prospect virtually impossible. How determined guestworkers were in securing a livelihood in Germany became particularly apparent after the end of recruitment in 1973. Many politicians believed that it would be possible to regulate guestworker migration and alleviate German unemployment sufficiently by simply ending recruitment,[14] since for many guestworkers, losing their jobs also meant the threat of losing their residence permit. However, rather than leave for home (which some admittedly did), guestworkers found alternative avenues of employment. As ever-new regulations geared toward keeping immigration (especially family unification) at a minimum were tested, modified, or cast aside, guestworkers sought (and found) ways to negotiate their often-tenuous situation in Germany, trying to attain more financial and legal stability. Rather than leaving Germany in the face of unemployment, a growing number of guestworkers discovered entrepreneurship as an alternative to employment, starting their own

[14] During the first economic crisis in 1966/67 this had proven to be true as guestworkers left the country in substantial numbers. Six years later, however, guestworkers were less willing to do so, also because more of them had been in Germany longer and started to settle .

restaurants, groceries, and taking over various trades that--because of their relatively low prestige, the long working hours, or level of physical labor--Germans increasingly shunned.

Thus, while the desired reduction of guestworkers was a prominent topic in the post-oil crisis years--because of the fear that the German welfare state would have to support a growing number of unemployed laborers, let alone unemployed foreigners--*German* unemployment was often discussed in equally if not more critical terms. Over and over again, papers accused Germans of a misguided sense of superiority that seemed to have developed in the affluent postwar years and was now feeding the unemployment crisis, making it even worse than it should be. As newspapers lamented, Germans possessed a sense of "grandiose self-importance [*Selbstherrlichkeit*]," [15] and one out of two Germans apparently believed themselves to belong to the middle class.[16] Furthermore, in an article titled "Germans Can Carry Suitcases as Well," another paper maintained that the "false hubris in our nation [*Volk*]" was "surely also a basis for the high unemployment."[17] The creation of an "ideology of prosperity [*Wohlstandsideologie*]" (in which it was apparently unbecoming to perform hard manual--if honest--labor)[18] and its twin, the "throwaway society [*Wegwerfgesellschaft*]"[19] were seen as the results of a rather flawed German work-ethic. These days, the argument went, Germans apparently preferred to live

---

[15] Brigitte Ueffing, "Betriebsgründungen: Mohammed wird Unternehmer," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 13 January 1978.
[16] "Gastarbeiter, nicht Fremdarbeiter," *Die Zeit*, 25 Oktober 1974.
[17] Axel Schnorbus, "Auch Deutsche können Koffer tragen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 19 April 1978.
[18] Ludwig R. Keykauf, "Lieber einen fleißigen Italiener...," *Südwest-Presse*, 12 January 1974.
[19] "Pizzabäcker und Flickschuster. Pionierunternehmer mit fremdem Paß," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 28 December 1978.

off of unemployment benefits rather than to take on jobs that guestworkers had performed for at least two decades and that paid merely tariff wages.[20] Even the suggestion by Hans Filbinger (head of the state of Baden-Württemberg, 1966-1978) in the mid-1970s, to entice Germans to appreciate once again physical labor, and his insistence "that we must once again reorient the true value of productive labor," betrayed the fact that Germans were extremely reluctant to do just that. Given papers' opinions about Germans' work ethic, Filbinger's insistence that guestworkers were *not* irreplaceable unsurprisingly met with mixed reactions in the press.[21]

Such remarks already hinted at the shift in German values and Germans' relationship to labor that had taken place over the course of two decades. In the context of discussions about guestworker success in business niches left by Germans, the line between guestworker and German values was drawn even more sharply. Strikingly, however, nobody questioned the commitment guestworkers exhibited on the job. Instead, indeed, it was the German work ethic being continually criticized. As one paper lamented, for example, even "in times of immense unemployment no law could probably force the German unskilled laborer to ever do the dirty work again...Before [a German worker] will take hold of the broom again, he will prefer to live off unemployment benefits rather than face such 'social decline.'"[22]

---

[20] Stefan Esser, "Gastarbeiter in der Bundesrepublik. Vom Mitbürger zum Überschuß," *Münchner Merkur*, 12 March 1976; Franz Georgis, "In Berliner Unternehmen fehlen schon die Hilfsarbeiter," *Berliner Morgenpost*, 25 July 1976; "Kein Thema? Die vergessene Integration," *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, 5 August 1976; Ruth Herrmann, "Neuregelung für Gastarbeiter. Eine Schranke ist gefallen," *Die Zeit*, 30 March 1979.
[21] See, for example, Kurt Naujeck, "Mehr Konkurrenz," *Rheinische Post*, 9 February 1979.
[22] "Bei weniger Arbeit wird Ibrahim zum Problemfall," *Die Welt*, 1 November 1974.

By the late 1970s, guestworkers had become "heirs to the mom-and-pop shops," at a time when German owners increasingly abandoned such businesses.[23] Many of the foreigners were able to make a profit, excelling in their capitalist host environment, and according to some even at times even surpassing Germans.[24] In discussions about guestworkers' recipe for entrepreneurial success, time and time again, the media could not help but point to the importance of family cooperation, where (German) capitalist notions such as an "executive salary [Unternehmerlohn]," for example, were apparently unheard of.[25] In discussions about guestworkers' growing interest in entrepreneurship, newspapers juxtaposed guestworker and German characteristics that helped explain why the former were more successful in their ventures. Ironically, they argued, much of German reluctance to become small-time entrepreneurs was due to the economic success Germans had experienced over the past two decades. Guestworkers who had mostly filled the least desirable jobs in the German postwar economy, on the other hand, apparently knew how to appreciate economic independence and were not afraid to take risks. They approached the endeavor with "greater uninhibitedness and less of

[23] "Gastarbeiter beerben Tante Emma," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 26 July 1977.
[24] In early 1974 already, *Bild* published a whole series about some of the most successful guestworkers in Germany who had managed to become millionaires. Interestingly enough, the paper was the most diplomatic in its assessment of guestworkers success, maintaining that those who had made it big were guestworkers "who had surpassed [in die Ecke gestellt] their German *role models*," thus trying not to ruffle too many feathers by flattering Germans in the process as well. See "Wie Gastarbeiter in Deutschland reich wurden," *Bild*, 25 February 1974 [emphasis mine].
[25] "Pizzabäcker und Flickschuster. Pionierunternehmer mit fremdem Paß," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 23 December 1978.

an 'employee mindset [*Arbeitnehmerbewußtsein*]'"[26] than their German counterparts and were willing to "tighten their belts when not everything went the way one had expected in the land of the economic miracle"--something that Germans had apparently been able and willing to do themselves only twenty years ago (but now lacked, as the observation seemed to imply), according to officials at the Chamber of Industry and Commerce in Hannover.[27]

Indeed, as papers remarked, guestworkers could be successful participants in the German economy and not only preserve family values (believed to be long lost in German society) but these family values were the key to succeeding economically as small business owners.[28] Not only were guestworkers able to draw strength from cherished family values, they also helped to keep the German institution of the mom-and-pop shop open, thereby "guaranteeing the supply...of rolls and milk--and in clumsy German, even of gossip."[29] Thus, guestworkers appeared as the ones holding German society together; paradoxically, keeping it German.

Furthermore, articles acknowledging guestworkers' relative economic success then also carried with them strong criticism of contemporary German values, not least of which were found to have gotten lost in Germans' (and particularly women's) defiance of family values. Even more significantly, in a little

---

[26] "Pizzabäcker," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 23 December 1978; on the importance of family in the world of entrepreneurship, see also, "Großfamilie," *Hannoversche Allgemeine*, 10 January 1979; Carola Böse-Fischer, "Die Selbständigkeit lockt," *Hannoversche Allgemeine*, 21 February 1981;
[27] "Großfamilie," *Hannoversche Allgemeine*, 10 January 1979.
[28] The same was not true for guestworker parents working in the industry. Rather than seeing flaws in the system, papers criticized guestworker parents working opposite shifts (so that one parent could theoretically be with the children at all times) for purportedly valuing money over family, and thus neglecting their children.
[29] "Gastarbeiter. Fatales P." *Spiegel*, 12 September 1977.

over two decades, Germans' and guestworkers' relationship to work and the place it occupied appeared to have shifted completely:

> Industriousness and a willingness to chip in [*Einsatzbereitschaft*] as well as a particular modesty in their demands are their [the guestworkers'] biggest trump cards in the competition. Nevertheless, they took on the difficulties of starting a business because they still see independence as a value in and of itself. It is something positive for them just by virtue of not being (salaried) employment. A Greek reduced it to the [following] formula: "Independence is fun!" It is the purpose in life, not just a means to an end.[30]

Only a quarter century earlier, papers had described Germans' relationship to labor in those terms.

A certain degree of desperation and fear thus permeated the public discourses regarding the growing dependency on guestworkers to keep the German economy going. While it was clear that guestworkers were needed because Germans seemed to consider themselves "too good" for certain jobs, by the early 1980s, some voices sounded more alarmed. Because they managed not only to deal with but even to succeed in situations where Germans faltered, foreigners' determination, competence, and industriousness, according to *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* journalist Konrad Adams, made them "equal to Germans if not superior to them...the role of pariah...now threatens the Germans."[31] Thus, guestworkers' work ethic came to be perceived as a threat because they seemed to beat Germans at their own game.

Yet another topic emerging in the new thematization of German ambivalence about capitalism and the work ethic was greed--and exhaustion--

---

[30] Gottfried Eggerbauer, "Vom Wohlstand nur naschen. Immer mehr Gastarbeiter gehen den mühsamen Weg einer Existenzgründung," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 29 January 1981.
[31] Konrad Adam, "Die Letzten könnten eines Tages die Ersten sein," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 November 1981.

that working hard apparently brought out in many guestworkers. An article in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on guestworker life opined that at the end of the day "everybody is dead tired and everybody screams at everybody else and they throw around pots and hate each other in this dreadfully small apartment. At least they have earned money, and of course, they won't give any of it to authorities and other enemies."[32] While Germans were enjoined to work hard and save (virtuous traits in German society), this virtue, when pursued by others, seemed to be revealed as selfish (i.e. a vice). What is exposed here is a constitutive incoherence within capitalist morality, one that is, however, not recognized as such. Moreover, the view that working (too) hard ruins people's private life exposes yet another incoherence within capitalism which was otherwise rarely confronted directly. Only in the context of "pitying" foreigners was it, at least partially, acknowledged.

Turkish Maternity, German Selfishness

Discussions of gender roles and relations in the larger guestworker debate had for a long time focused heavily on portrayals of male guestworkers and interethnic liaisons between foreign men and German women. Papers had often questioned guestworkers' character and doubted the quality of their relationships with German women (while at the same time criticizing those women for entering into the relationships). Overall, then, this part of the debate had been informed by fears of particular (romantic and/or sexual) forms of male guestworker

[32] Horst Schötelburg, "Sagen wir doch ruhig einmal danke," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 March 1982.

participation in German society. By the 1970s, the concern shifted toward guestworker *segregation*, especially when the recruitment ban of late 1973 was answered by greater rates of family reunification particularly among Turks. Whereas some voices in the press had earlier proposed family reunification as a solution to the problems single males were seen to be causing (the presence of the family supposedly reining in guestworker "urges"), wives joining their partners were now deemed the largest hurdle in Germany's attempt to curb immigration and foster integration. The fact that integration had been a goal only reluctantly pursued in the first place was now conveniently forgotten. In the process, as foreign women's role as laborers went for the most part unnoticed, their role as mothers became a major focal point from the 1970s onwards, in effect shifting the focus of public obsession away from male guestworkers and onto foreign women and their children. As much as papers fretted over guestworker women's high fertility rate, for instance, what seemed to make the problem worse was the ever-lower fertility rate among Germans. In the eyes of the press at least, the problem of a growing number of foreigners was also very much Germans' fault, not only for setting the wave of migration in motion twenty years earlier with guestworker recruitment but also for failing, two decades later, to counter "foreign infiltration [Überfremdung]" with adequate reproduction rates of their own.

After the halt of foreign labor recruitment in late 1973, newspaper stories not only redirected their focus more strongly onto foreign non-working women, but also shifted the way they told the story of guestworker migration. Already in the early 1970s, papers had misrepresented the place of Turkish women,

particularly laborers, in the larger labor migration to Germany, portraying their arrival in Germany as a dramatic, novel development when it was in fact neither. Only a couple of years later, this narrative was further rewritten and the recent history of Turkish migration to Germany was actively misremembered. Now the press tended to depict the history of Turkish migration to Germany in the classical pattern of men moving first, followed by their wives. Of course, wives also followed their husbands, but this was neither the exclusive pattern for them to move to Germany, nor their only form of migration. Furthermore, just a few years earlier, papers had told a very different story, lamenting that Turkish men exploited their wives, sisters, and daughters, by sending them to Germany as job scouts when it became comparatively difficult for male family members to find employment in Germany.

The shift away from focusing on the male members of the guestworker workforce toward their non-working partners (or at the very least having the two groups share the spotlight) became part of a larger (and long-standing) debate about the number of foreigners in Germany. Despite the recruitment ban of 1973, the guestworker population did not decrease (and actually grew), overwhelmingly due to family reunification and children born to foreigners in Germany. Already since 1972, as mentioned, Turks had made up the largest ethnic community in the Federal Republic; combined with the still-appalling economic situation in their home country, it made sense that their group would grow the most. However, in the press these developments translated into an intense focus on Turks as the main culprits of the "guestworker problem," especially since their women and

children had joined them and since a significant number of further babies were born in Germany. In the process, previous female migration (from Turkey as well as other countries) and foreign female *laborers* faded out of the picture. In these latest accounts, Turkish women were portrayed as having come as a result of their husbands' migration to Germany, and as one paper put it, "with them and their children the problems grew."[33] They became the markers for difference, the guardians of tradition, evident to the media in their mistrust toward the host society, retention of "behavior developed in their home country but not 'functional' anymore in the Federal Republic," and a general desire to return home. Physically, these characteristics became inscribed in their apparel: headscarf, billowing pants under long dress; symbols, in other words, of their (and their fellow countrymen's) unassimilability.[34] The shift toward a preoccupation with non-working guestworker women in Germany was also informed by a study published in 1977 and titled *Analysis of the Situation of Non-Employed Wives of Foreign Laborers in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Interestingly, the statistics

[33] Dr. K. H. Fischer, "Kulturschock drängt Moslem-Gastarbeiter oft ins Fremden-Getto." *Kölnische Rundschau*, 24 April 1974. It is important to note, however, that the German word "Frau" used in this quote, can both mean "wife" and "woman." From the context, it is clear however, that the article used the two terms interchangeably. In other words, the onset of the migration of Turkish wives was seen as the onset of the migration of Turkish women more generally, both claims resting on faulty premises.

[34] See Key L. Ulrich, "Die Städte und ihre Ausländer. Schwierigkeiten bei der Integration," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 January 1975; Gerd Koch, "Duisburger Untersuchung alarmiert NRW-Regierung. Trotz Anwerbestopp immer mehr Ausländer," *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2 June 1977; Renate Mreschar, "Eltern ausländischer Kinder kennen ihre deutsche Umwelt kaum," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 19 July 1977; Jürgen Bertram, "Mustafa im Hinterzimmer. Bilanz der bundesdeutschen Gastarbeiterpolitik: Die Integration ist nicht gelungen," *Die Zeit*, 12 May 1978; Bernd Eichmann, "...und Aischa hat jetzte eine Bankvollmacht. Eine marokkanische Familie im Rheinland." These assessments, if a bit more nuanced, were also discussed in those articles reporting on the study of non-working guestworker women. See Wolf Gunter Brügmann, "Die fremde Sprache trennt Mütter von ihren Kindern," 4 March 1977; "Einsam und unsicher in einem fremden Land," *General-Anzeiger*, 30 July 1977; Maria Bischof, "Im Teufelskreis von Tradition und neuer Welt," *Münchner Merkur*, 30 August 1977.

published in this report revealed--even though this was not explicitly addressed in the study--that 58 percent of all married Turkish women living in Germany with their foreign husbands were gainfully employed (and thereby only slightly below the average of 64 percent of working foreign wives married to foreigners in Germany[35] and certainly higher than the rate of German working married women, which was a little more than 36 percent).[36]

If articles did acknowledge Turkish women's attempts at greater independence through work, for example (and which papers seemed to interpret as integral to integration--an integration now suddenly and continually deemed to be a desirable goal) they understood these women to have failed, either blaming patriarchal husbands or the wives' own inadequacy--accusing working foreign mothers for neglecting their children, for example,[37] or for *feeling* emancipated (rather than having really achieved emancipation). In these depictions,

---

[35] Institut für Sozialforschung und Sozialwirtschaft e.V., *Situationsanalyse nichterwerbstätiger Ehefrauen ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Bonn: Bundesminister für Jugend, Familie und Gesundheit, 1977), 24. One can assume that the percentage was even higher, since many foreign women from the traditional guestworker countries--including Turkey--moonlighted as cleaning ladies who were often paid in cash, thus working outside the parameters of what these official statistics registered. The study has its problems as it only interviewed a total of a hundred women of the major ethnic minorities in Germany: Turks, Italians, Greeks, and Yugoslavs. Those interviews were divided over four German states with high guestworker rates (although Bavaria was left out). The twenty-five interviews conducted in each of these states were then further divided more or less equally among the four different nationalities. Apart from the tiny pool of interviewees, the researchers had to rely on employees at the local *Sozialbetreuungsstellen* to identify potential candidates for the interviews, thereby narrowing the group of interviewees even further to those who had previously sought help from this office, i.e. had run into problems during their stay in Germany.

[36] Eike Ballerstedt, et al., "Arbeitspotential und Erwerbsbevölkerung," in *Soziologischer Almanach* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1977), 73, table 5. Even among the age group with the highest rate of employment--around 56 percent among15- to 25-year-olds--the number was not only below that of working foreign married women more generally but their Turkish contingent as well.

[37] Sef Despineux, "Von Demokratie in der Familie halten Türken und Spanier nichts," *General-Anzeiger*, 21 December 1976; Maria Bischof, "Im Teufelskreis von Tradition und neuer Welt," *Münchner Merkur*, 30 August 1977; Ruth Herrmann, "Kein Platz an der Sonne. Isoliert und diskriminiert leben sie hinter nicht nur sprachlichen Barrieren," *Die Zeit*, 14 April 1978; Nina Grunenberg, "Was tun mit den Türken?" *Die Zeit*, 29 January 1982.

guestworker women seemed destined to fail at their attempts to arrange themselves with their situation in Germany. As one article concluded after acknowledging that a Turkish woman had taken up a job and cast off her old clothes (while also betraying a fascination with the supposed vibrancy of traditional guestworker culture): "the seven years in Germany have affected the [Turkish] wife like dye remover affects colorful fabric."[38]

At the very center of the debate, however, was guestworker (and mostly Turkish) women's high fertility rate at a time when German women had fewer and fewer children and when papers made periodic references to the "*Pillenknick*"--the German birth rate slump caused by the birth control Pill. Moreover, the discussion of guestworker fertility took place at a time when Germans heatedly debated the reform of abortion paragraph 218. Papers provided their readers with regular news of what seemed to be copiously reproducing guestworkers, publishing the most recent numbers and percentages of children born to foreign women in various parts of Germany (mostly those with comparatively large guestworker communities). This news was met with mixed reactions. Some articles reporting on the issue remarked, for example, that foreign "children multiplied mercilessly," because their mothers believed that "their only duty was...to add new children to the ones they already brought with them." And *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* remarked that "Turkish women would probably be the first...who would take advantage of the legalization of abortion."[39] But foreign

[38] Ruth Herrmann, "Immer Heimweh nach Anatolien. Ein Gastarbeiter-Schicksal zwischen 'Klein-Istanbul und Neubausiedlung,'" *Die Zeit*, 16 December 1977.
[39] Dr. K. J. Fischer, "Kultuschock drängt Moslem-Gastarbeiter oft ins Fremden-Getto," *Kölnische Rundschau*, 24 April 1974; Key L. Ulrich, "Die Erfahrung lehrt, daß die Ausländer bleiben,"

birth rates were also *admired*, especially in articles juxtaposing female guestworker women's reproductive activity with that of Germans. Papers emphasized their "diligence in having children [*Geburtenfleiß*]," and they depicted them as "conscientious about producing offspring [*nachwuchsbewußt*]" and "child-friendly," evidenced in their "joy in having children," and their "population-political activity."[40] For example, even when *Zeit* journalist Ruth Herrmann managed to criticize *both* foreign and German women when she pointed out that "74.3% of foreign mothers see the meaning of life...in having children. (70.3% of German mothers reject this attitude). When it comes to earning money, [however,] the 'meaning of life' does not matter--especially for the husband, who has the say in these families," it seemed that guestworkers at least in theory adhered to what were considered the proper values.[41] While the article faulted female guestworkers for working and thus neglecting their children, at least they

---

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 12 July 1974. Few other articles commented on the use of birth control among guestworkers, but those who did pointed to the women's inadequate application or complete ignorance of it. The culprit, as these articles saw it, was the husband, who apparently saw his manliness reflected in the number of children he produced and who prohibited the woman's use of birth control, driving her to abortion. These articles appeared at a time when the number of guestworker children began to decline overall, though not as much in the Turkish community. See Ruth Herrmann, "Immer Heimweh nach Anatolien. Ein Gastarbeiter-Schicksal zwischen 'Klein-Istanbul und Neubausiedlung,'"*Die Zeit*, 16 December 1977; "Noch zu viele Vorurteile," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 26 April 1980; Nina Grunenberg, "Was tun mit den Türken?" *Die Zeit*, 29 January 1982.

[40] Ausländische Mütter verringern Baby-Defizit," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 22 April 1975; Albert Müller, "Die Ausländerkinder kosten mehr als eine gute Familienpolitik," *Die Welt*, 11 August 1975; for further reports on guestworker fertility see also Renate Wilkes-Valkyser, "Schulen bald voller Ausländer-Kinder," *Rheinische Post*, 22 October 1974; "Die Zahl der Ausländer im Bundesgebiet steigt weiter," *Handelsblatt*, 7 January 1975; "Mehr Ausländer in der Bundesrepublik. Seit dem Anwerbestopp nur Rückgang bei Arbeitnehmern," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 January 1975; Dieter von König, "Gastarbeiter ohne Familien?" *Rhein-Neckar Zeitung*, 13 February 1975; an article under the same heading and by the same author also appeared in *Schwarzwälder Bote*, 13 February 1975; "Gastarbeiter: Ein kaum lösbares Problem," *Der Volkswirt--Wirtschaftswoche*, 21 February 1975; "Das Ausländerproblem in der Bundesrepublik verschärft sich," *Berliner Morgenpost*, 6 February 1977; "Ausländer ist die Familie wichtiger als Deutschen,"*Frankfurter Rundschau*, 2 August 1979.

[41] Ruth Herrmann, "Gastarbeiterkinder. Kein Platz an der Sonne," *Die Zeit*, 14 April 1978.

still considered having children an integral part of their lives. And while Herrmann clearly took a slap at male guestworker patriarchalism, she also faulted German women for no longer valuing children. Increasingly, Germans worked out their own confusions about feminism via their contradictory chatter about guestworkers.

As a concept, then, guestworkers' reproduction was admired, their birth rates envied. Practically, however, as *Die Welt* determined, "They [the guestworker children] provide no salvation for the [growing German] birth deficit. Despite the strongly multiplying foreign babies we have to continue to think about a sensible and affordable [*finanzierbare*] German population policy."[42] This assessment was evident in other articles as well, even those with an ostensibly more positive spin on the issue. In part, this anxiety seemed to stem from the realization that while it was morally questionable to try and regulate family reunification, it was literally impossible to reduce the number of children born to foreign families in Germany--even worse, German women refused to (literally) produce any counterweight to this development: "After all, no Spaniard, Greek or Yugoslav is responsible for the fact that the Germans have become tired of babies and that they are apparently--in the long run--determined to go extinct."[43] "Are the Germans Dying Out?" [*Sterben die Deutschen aus?*], even the usually liberal *Spiegel* worried openly in a 1975 cover story.[44]

---

[42] Albert Müller, "Die Ausländerkinder kosten mehr als eine gute Familienpolitik," *Die Welt*, 11 August 1975.
[43] Joachim Hauck, "Die vergessene Integration. Die Lage der Gastarbeiter wird immer brisanter," *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, 22 August 1978.
[44] Cover of *Spiegel*, 24 March 1975.

Even when feminism was not explicitly addressed, issues like German women's supposed refusal to have babies were seen as a corollary to their participation in the workforce and in the culture of consumerism, both of which had already come under attack during the economic miracle years. Papers thus not only attested to Germans a deficient work ethic, but also faulted their family planning, holding them responsible for slower population growth and labor shortages.[45] *Spiegel*'s story, for example, was entitled "The Children Don't Want Children Anymore" and provocatively asked if in Germany there was "In fact more sex but no long any consequences?"[46] Calculations about Germans' inadequate fertility (compared to what he deemed adequate or excessive fertility in other countries) appeared in an extensive, full-page *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* editorial by scientist and member of the Christian Democratic Party (CDU), Dr. Theodor Schmidt-Kaler, who concluded that, if current developments were to continue, one had to realize that "[t]he [German] cultural tradition is [going to be] disrupted, another nation with a different ethnic and spiritual substance will live in our country one day...Our problem is not the guestworker per se, but the Asians [in this group of guestworkers]." Ultimately Schmidt-Kaler was blaming German (women's) attitudes for the dissolution of German

---

[45] Also see part V of the series by Gregor Manousakis, "Industrielle Reservearmee? Ökonomische Nutzen der Auslanderbeschäftigung sind unanstreitbar," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 18 January 1974.

[46] "Die Kinder wollen keine Kinder mehr," *Spiegel*, 24 March 1975. The article also quoted other papers, like a 1974 article that had appeared in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* stating that "'if one subtracts the industrious guestworkers' fertile work [Wirken]'...then only 500 000 genuine Germans are born annually." Here, *Spiegel*, like other papers in the mid-1970s, juxtaposed guestworkers' reproduction rates with those of Germans. *Spiegel*, however, as it so often did, found a way to mockingly highlight the problem (as is evident in its quoting of the *Süddeutsche*) while also playing it down by listing the various benefits a lower German birthrate presented (like better quality in Kindergarten care and relief in the social realm [soziale Entlastung] more generally).

character. Returning to older values, according to Schmidt-Kaler would solve the problem: "An immense relief of the job market is...to be expected, when young women become mothers...Having children is an existential part of humans' self-fulfillment...[and it is] a gift and responsibility...What good is the prosperity of the present generation if the identity, the perpetuation of the German nation is jeopardized?"[47]

Such opinions were echoed in letters to the editor in both, liberal and conservative papers. In *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, for example, one letter writer charged that "German couples prefer consumption over children" while "for foreigners, often with traditional family ties, children are an indispensable part of their lives, and that" in the opinion of the author, was "much more human and natural."[48] In the liberal *Zeit*, Hans Rosen argued that Germans were actively corrupting their culture's value system for thinking that

> Guestworker children are supposed to even out the [German] birth deficit! The thought of counteracting diminishing population with the naturalization of foreigners appears to many a very convenient solution to the problem. What kind of society is this, which sees it as normal that guestworkers take care of not only the dirty work, but also of having children? It is a society in which the basic duty of human existence, to father and raise children for the sake of our own future...is not only not upheld, but also degraded...It is a society that tries to cover up...its deep insecurity, its inferiority complex with the frenzy of production and enjoyment. It is a society that is not interested in its self-preservation because of its inferiority complex. Those who do not respect themselves are not going to make the effort to preserve their identity for the future.[49]

---

[47]Theodor Schmidt-Kaler, "Mit wie vielen Fremden die Bundesrepublik leben kann," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30 September 1980. On Schmidt-Kaler's political importance, see Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 239.
[48] "Ausländerfeindlich (Leserbrief)," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 November 1981.
[49] Hans Rosen, "Leserbrief: Gastarbeiterkinder. Dreckarbeit," *Die Zeit,* 16 May 1980.

In short, guestworkers' exemplary work ethic and comparatively high birth rates, combined with their supposed retention of traditional family values, came to be a point of envy as well as extreme concern to Germans whose dwindling numbers and pleasure in consumption left them weak and vulnerable to non-German forces. It also again attested to Germans' ambivalence about capitalism, which was seen as being at the heart of Germany's crisis.

Ideological Struggle and the Instrumentalization of Germany's Nazi Past

The ideological struggle evident in the guestworker debate in West Germany proved to be one of its greatest oddities. Certainly by the 1970s, the impact of the New Left student movement was making itself felt, as conservatives became increasingly more frustrated with their perceived inability to criticize at all what they saw as liberals' efforts to integrate the foreigners without being tarred with the brush of racism.[50] However, this was a decisive misrepresentation of liberals as avidly pro-integration which in turn made liberals themselves ever more defensive and ambivalent about it.

After the recruitment ban failed to halt immigration from the traditional recruitment countries (esp. Turkey, Yugoslavia and Greece), a variety of political and legal measures were enacted to rectify the problem. Their success, however, was extremely limited, because many of the restrictions excluded those foreigners coming from member states of the Economic Community, and many of the foreigners from non-EC countries had been in Germany long enough by then

[50] See "Die Schnauzbärte vom Bosporus arbeiten hart und leben karg," *Die Welt*, 12 January 1974; "Bei weniger Arbeit wird Ibrahim zum Problemfall," *Die Welt*, 1 November 1974.

to consolidate their legal standing, largely protecting them from the newly enacted restrictive policies.[51] The realization that the attempts to prevent ongoing migration had failed to take proper hold elicited strong responses from the media, and papers on both sides of the ideological fence lambasted the government for their repeatedly failed attempts to handle the problem adequately and dismissed and even mocked attempts of the political Left to point out injustices while arguing for greater tolerance toward the guestworker population.

It was precisely to counter what it saw as leftist and liberal trouble-making that *Die Welt*, like other conservative papers, offered what it saw as more positive images of the guestworkers by focusing on guestworker success stories. These emphasized that some guestworkers had indeed reached high ranks in certain industrial branches and lauded their discipline and industriousness that had earned them such positions. While praise for guestworkers could seemingly have as readily translated into support for more guestworker integration into German society, the opposite is the case. It was precisely the tension with leftists and liberals that explains the phenomenon of the positive conservative portrayal of guestworkers at this political juncture.

Thus, conservative papers lamented that guestworker successes were ignored in favor of airing, for example, socially critical TV coverage of the issue (and even though conservatives themselves regularly pointed out the problems that the presence of guestworkers caused).[52] They also belittled efforts by more

---

[51] See Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 243.

[52] "Die Schnauzbärte vom Bosporus arebeiten hart und leben karg," *Die Welt*, 12 January 1974. It was precisely, then, in order to counter what it saw as liberal trouble-making that *Die Welt*, like other conservative papers, offered what it saw as more positive images of the guestworkers by

liberal-minded forces, either accusing them of ignoring the guestworker problem because it did not fit their "progressive philosophy"[53] or of merely condemning it, disseminating "emotional, empty rhetoric [*pathetisch-wertlose Deklamationen*] without taking any action.[54] All seemed to agree that the guestworker situation had become "a favorite object of emotional agitation." But as *Frankfurter Allgemeine* in an article entitled "Guestworkers--More, Less, or None at All?" reminded its readers, "The woman who might be enraged [about the way guestworkers are treated] does not understand that maybe her neighbor's son is unemployed because around two million guestworkers are employed in our country while one million German citizens have to endure the sad fate of unemployment."[55] *Welt*'s assessment that "first and foremost our state has to be committed to its own citizens" echoed this sentiment that Germany had not only overextended itself, thereby neglecting its own population in the process, but that more than enough was already being done for the guestworkers and their families.[56]

Over the course of the next decade, conservative papers became increasingly indignant about the seeming inability--as they saw it--to present a balanced picture that also contained any kind of criticism either of guestworkers

---

focusing on guestworker success stories. These emphasized that some guestworkers had indeed reached high ranks in certain industrial branches and lauded their discipline and industriousness that had earned them such positions. The tension with leftists and liberals is crucial in understanding the phenomenon of the positive conservative portrayal of guestworkers, which (to us in hindsight) might otherwise appear bizarre because praise for guestworkers could of course have been as readily translated into support for guestworker integration into German society.

[53] Henk Ohnesorge, "Spätes Erwachen. Das Gastarbeiter-Problem wird jetzt auch Thema für die Bundesregierung," *Die Welt*, 20 February 1975.

[54] Henk Ohnesorge, "Eine Million zweispachige Analphabeten," *Die Welt*, 14 December 1976.

[55] Jürgen Eick, "Gastarbeiter--mehr, weniger, gar keine?" *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 23 March 1976.

[56] "Den Gästen ein Angebot," *Die Welt*, 20 February 1976.

themselves or what were perceived to be extremely liberal guestworker policies. Conservatives felt backed into a corner by proponents of more liberal views whom they accused of making it impossible to discuss the issue without being deemed racist. As a consequence of what one paper called "thorough and fundamental disagreements"[57] in decisions about guestworker policies, the presence of foreigners in Germany had become an extremely serious problem. "Everybody with an undogmatic perspective can see that Germans are not racist or think nationalistically, but that the integration of around 2.5 million guestworkers and their families is more than they can take."[58] Attempting to distinguish between merely xenophobic and more serious right-wing extremist tendencies, Friedrich Karl Fromme maintained in a headline: "Dangers can also be fabricated [*Gefahren kann man auch herbeireden*]." In his article, he charged, "The readiness to overemphasize foreigner-hatred, to equate it with right-wing extremism, and then fearfully to identify this as a grave danger, possibly even to add into the mix delayed mastery of the past [*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*], is building in certain circles."[59] Here then, left-leaning groups were accused as the ones creating the problem, not merely because they hindered the process of

---

[57] Henk Ohnesorge, "Bei weniger Arbeit wird Ibrahim zum Problemfall," *Die Welt*, 1 November 1974.

[58] Kurt Naujeck, "Zuerst entlassen?" *Rheinische Post*, 27 March 1975; for the same argument regarding Germans' inability to integrate the foreigners, see "Beschämend: Bonn und die Gastarbeiter," *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, 7 April 1981. Apparently in response to leftist accusations regarding the unfair treatment of guestworkers as an industrial army reserve, *Rheinische Post* argued that "we have to keep in mind that the guestworkers and their families were not pushed into the proletarian mentality by industrialists, capitalists and imperialists, but by neighbors, colleagues and fellow men." In this way, *Rheinische Post* supported the opinion of the other papers regarding the difficulty Germans had in dealing with the foreigners while also defiantly exculpating those at the center of (economic) power. See "Das neue Proletariat," *Rheinische Post*, 15 April 1976.

[59] Friedrich Karl Fromme, "Gefahren kann man auch herbeizaubern," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 27 August 1982.

dealing with the guestworker situation adequately but also because they were the ones repeatedly re-creating an inappropriate burden of German guilt.

Conservatives thus did not deny that problems among Germans existed with regard to the foreign population. However, at the same time conservatives accused liberal policymakers of interpreting more conservative and more restrictive measures and anti-integrationist voices as automatically right-wing extremist or National Socialist in spirit. Therefore, finding strategies regarding the guestworker problem while simultaneously discussing them in racially and politically neutral terms became almost impossible. The attempt at debating guestworker integration measures in a neutral language, conservatives maintained, only led to a different form of extremism without leaving room for any middle ground. According to one journalist, one was caught between "'Foreigners Out!' and 'Love thy foreign neighbors' and had to decide if one wanted to be a Nazi pig or a humanist." He claimed further that accusations the leftist and liberal habit of indicting Germans for their "fascistic potential" or their less-than kind "treatment of those who are weaker," had, in fact, "made foreigners the stronger ones a long time ago."[60]

As early as 1974, Henk Ohnesorge of the conservative *Die Welt* lamented that anybody supporting strategies to reducing the number of guestworkers (like guestworker rotation or reinforcement of only temporary residence for foreigners, foreign development aid or simply advancing the idea that foreigners really should go *home*) was "accused of inhumanity, rigid profit orientation and--yes,

---

[60] Horst Schlötelburg, "Sagen wir doch ruhig einmal danke," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 March 1982.

even of--master race mentality."[61] Statements like these anticipated and exaggerated--and in this way attempted to preempt--the way that left-liberal critics would make a connection between the current guestworker problem and the Nazi past. By the early 1980s, Hans-Jürgen Schilling, general secretary of the German Red Cross, became one of the more polarizing figures in the guestworker debate as he attested to Germans an "inner distance toward those ethnically different [*ethnisch Andersartige*]" and a desire to preserve their own identity rather than drown in a mush of nations [*Völkerbrei*]."[62] Not long thereafter, he wrote in the conservative *Rheinischer Merkur*:

> Does Auschwitz oblige us to the defiant determination to keep even those minorities who cannot be integrated, since we have not even been able to protect our own Jewish citizens who, for the most part, were German-nationally minded and had been assimilated into German culture for hundreds of years? Or shouldn't such horrendous memories rather help to bring us to our senses, that nothing, nothing at all justifies our assumption that the reformed [*geläuterte*] post-war ethic could set an example in the world as to how multiracial co-existence could work?[63]

Schilling tried to free the debate about guestworkers from Germany's past--even as he presented an offensively distorted vision of the Holocaust *and* sought to instrumentalize the Holocaust himself.

Following Schilling's public and highly divisive proclamations on the issue of Turks in Germany, in late 1982 he was uninvited from a meeting at the Protestant Academy (*Evangelische Akademie*) Arnoldshain/Taunus on the situation of foreigners in Germany. In his extensive evaluation of the conference,

---

[61] Henk Ohnesorge, "Bei weniger Arbeit wird Ibrahim zum Problemfall," *Welt*, 1 November 1974.
[62] Jürgen Schilling, "Sind wir fremdenfeindlich, vermufft oder gar rassistisch?" *Die Zeit*, 21 November 1980, quoted in Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik*, 240.
[63] Hans-Jürgen Schilling, "Warnung vor humanitären Utopien," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 9 January 1981.

Konrad Adam, journalist at the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* brought forth a number of the arguments and criticisms conservatives had proffered against their liberal and leftist opponents. Adam, like many conservatives, believed that West German liberals had become far too in thrall to the New Left. He agreed with Schilling's reasoning that the Arnoldshain Academy was "not so much interested in dialogue" but rather was intent on enforcing a left-leaning "conformity of opinions." The remainder of the article made clear that Adam feared that "The Price of Multiculturalism"--his title--was the dissolution of German character as he criticized "questionable historical parallels"--drawn by one of the more progressive attending historians--that were "meant to demonstrate that Germany had been the melting-pot of nations for ages" and bitterly argued that German national identity (which he portrayed as the opposite of a multicultural society) was therefore "inevitably a chimera, an archaic bugaboo [verstaubter Popanz] that only those malicious or stupid enough could mourn." Bitterly, he charged that

> The willingness to analyze the pros and cons of integration and in addition to the hoped-for benefits also to calculate the probable costs, had no chance in Arnoldshain against the headlong flight into a utopia thoroughly saturated with contradictions. One acted all impressed with the attempt to preserve Islamic identity, but could see nothing in the yearning for German identity but evidence of a reactionary version of human nature.

In the end, and even as he brilliantly exposed the core liberal dilemma of how to deal with ethnic self-assertion, Adam, like Schilling before him, also downplayed the legitimate critiques that liberals, under pressure from the New Left, had brought to the fore. Adam, in fact, even attempted to accuse leftists and liberals of being the truly nationalistic ones, as he charged them with being beholden to an "unbroken belief in the universal healing powers of the German

essence [*Wesen*]." Adam went so far as to declare that nationalism in its left-leaning incarnation "has always and forever tended toward excessiveness," and thereby described progressives as the ones propelling Germany toward its undoing.[64]

However, conservatives here were, as noted, engaging in a major misrepresentation of liberals. Under the conservative counterassault against the New Left, liberals became increasingly perplexed about the desirability or possibility of integration. Liberal publications did lament the difficulty in improving German-guestworker relations, pointing to what they saw as the flaring up of racism among parts of the German population and finding ubiquitous evidence for it in newspapers, schools, the workplace, the soccer stadium, as well as guestworkers' poor housing.[65] In particular, references to the Holocaust and claims that Turks were the "new Jews," expressed in threats toward Turks like "You can be sure that your men will be sent to the oven," were clear signs for liberals that there was a decided lack of mastery of the past (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*) in German society.[66] However, liberals did not

---

[64] Konrad Adam, "Der Preis der Mulitkultur. Ausländer und Deutsche--eine kritische Masse?" *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 23 November 1982. Adam was very pleased that at least one attending academic, historian Hans Ulrich Wehler, dared to disturb the "academic peaceableness" at the conference when he "contested [the notion] that all foreigners were the same, distinguished between Catholic Italians and an Anatolian Muslim, and thought it advisable to create a more stringent right of political asylum while also proposing to promote Turks' return home on a tenable scale [in vertretbarem Rahmen]."

[65] See, for example, "Leben auf Abbruch," *Stern*, 23 October 1980; "Terroristen: Der importierte Bürgerkrieg," *Stern*, 28 May 1981; "Ehen mit Ausländern," *Stern*, 10 December 1981; Nina Grunenberg, "Was tun mit den Türken?" *Die Zeit*, 29 January 1982; "Gastarbeiter in Deutschland. Herzlich Willkommen," *Stern*, 24 June 1982; "Wie die Juden so die Türken," *Stern*, 26 August 1982; "Schulen: Gegen Türken und 'Kanaken,'" *Stern*, 10 November 1983; "Ausländerhaß. Den Türken 'aus Spaß' aufgehängt," *Stern*, 19 July 1984; see Willi Grandrath, "Die vergessenen Mitbürger" *Vorwärts*, 22 May 1980.

[66] Christian Bockemühl, "Ständiger Kampf gegen Unverständnis," *Vorwärts,* 10 December 1981, 10.

unequivocally support laws that would create more of a legal and political equilibrium between Germans and foreigners. Instead, like the conservatives, they severely criticized the previous liberal politics that had supposedly created a dangerous situation in which immigration to Germany had gone unchecked, resulting not only in an untenably high number of foreigners in Germany but also failing to stem ongoing immigration. Frustrated with what one article portrayed as the "muddling along from day to day without any concept," liberal papers were even more aggravated by the apparent inaction of the Social Democratic German government, resulting in what they saw as the erosion of liberal values: "Just as during the heyday of laissez-faire liberalism, unhindered by overarching population-political plans--that did not exist in the first place--the authorities have catered to the desires of big industry."[67]

By the early 1980s, the debate about harnessing immigration to Germany became ever more contentious. This was also because of a sharp increase in applications for political asylum, many of which were initially submitted by Turkish citizens. At the time, liberal and conservative publications alike, particularly from Germany's southern states (like Baden-Württemberg and Hesse, where the percentage of foreigners was particularly high), believed that proposals by the head of the state of Baden-Württemberg, Lothar Späth to limit family reunification from Turkey, could offer a viable solution to the "problem."[68]

---

[67] Peter Diehl-Thiele, "Grenzen der Freizügigkeit," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 29 December 1975.
[68] See, for example, Jürgen Dunsch, "Gegensteuerung," *Mannheimer Morgen*, 9 July 1981; "Späth will Zustrom von Ausländerfamilien eindämmen," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 9 July 1981; "Späth will Einwanderung von Türken bremsen," *Die Welt*, 9 July 1981; "Späth will den Zustrom der Ausländer bremsen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 9 July 1981.

Not unlike the jabs conservatives had directed at the liberal community, the more liberally inclined weekly *Zeit* charged in 1982 that "those only familiar with the Turk problem through their local [Turkish] tailor shop, have never really had their liberality tested. It is mostly the German underclass that has to pay for the consequences of a failed foreigner politics."[69] Not only had the political struggle about guestworkers suddenly and conveniently become a class issue--thereby permitting liberals to style themselves as sensitive to German workers--but by dismissing (intellectual) efforts to ameliorate the situation without limiting and even rolling back guestworker rights, liberals, just like conservatives, forcefully argued for restrictive guestworker politics. Moreover, *Zeit* declared, "None of those who already believe that a reform in the asylum law would be dangerous would so much as open their mouths to lament the rotting of the much-praised state under the rule of law [*Rechtsstaat*]. The main thing is that the liberal façade remains intact."[70] What politicians supported then, according to this assessment, was a misunderstood liberalism hampered by legacies of the Third Reich that had resulted in the most generous asylum laws but that now acted as decaying forces, bringing the much praised democratic West German state to its knees.

In fact, liberals repeatedly cast doubt on the prospect or even possibility of integration, not least because they (just like the conservatives) saw guestworkers as inherently different from Germans. In their own elaboration of guestworkers' supposedly inherent differences, liberals were preoccupied with a number of

---

[69] Nina Grunenberg, "Was tun mit den Türken?" *Die Zeit*, 29 January 1982.
[70] Nina Grunenberg, "Die Politiker müssen Farbe bekennen," *Die Zeit*, 5 February 1982.

themes: the guestworkers' lower class status that supposedly created ignorance; guestworkers' resistance to assimilation; language barriers; their supposed "cultural leap" from the medieval period into modernity, from peace into restlessness, from poverty into consumption; as well as their purported distance from the German logical-realistic way of thinking.[71] When guestworkers did succeed in making a decent living and exhibited pride because of it, their motivations were challenged, their choices questioned, their supposed loss of "authenticity" mourned. For liberals, such developments did not bode well for any hope of integration. Therefore, despite positioning themselves as opposed to conservatives' exclusionary (and racist) politics, and thus styling themselves as the tolerant group that wanted to *further* guestworker integration, many liberals themselves were greatly responsible for the intensification of images of Turks as "the other." This, then, leads to two important insights: First, liberals, just like the conservatives, undercut the integration process they aimed to foster. Secondly, liberals were totally complicit in the exclusionary politics that they accused the conservatives of practicing.

It also seemed that many papers had largely given up their role of purveyors of knowledge about guestworkers meant to foster understanding in the

---

[71] See Ruth Herrmann, "Laßt uns mitspielen," *Die Zeit,* 15 July 1977; "Gastarbeiterkinder. Kein Platz an der Sonne," *Die Zeit*, 14 April 1978; Jürgen Bertram, "Mustafa im Hinterzimmer," *Die Zeit*, 12 May 1978; Gunter Hofmann, "Bürger statt Gastarbeiter. 'Einwanderungsland Bundesrepublik'?" *Die Zeit*, 7 September 1979; Erika Schmidt-Petry, "Brennpunkt Berlin" *Parlament*, 29 August 1981; Andreas Zacharioudakis, "Im innern haben sie die Reise nach Deutschland nie angetreten. Integrationsproblematik der Friehen in der Bundesrepublik" 29 August 1981; Herbert Becher, "Arbeitsintegration ja--doch was ist in der Freizeit?" *Parlament*, 29 August 1981; Bernd Eichmann, "...und Aischa hat jetzte eine Bankvollmacht" *Parlament*, 29 August 1981; "Das Türken-Ghetto." *Stern*, 20 March 1980; "Die Kinder der Gastarbeiter." *Stern*, 17 December 1980; "Tod eines Türkenjungen." *Stern*, 24 March 1982; "Ehen mit Ausländern," *Stern*, 10 December 1981; "Die Türken-Angst," *Stern*, 3 November 1983.

German public. In their self-designated antiracist debate about the guestworker question, both, liberals and conservatives, performed incredible ideological labor to perpetuate the German/foreign dichotomy, trying to keep these inherently unstable categories in place. Because German post-war identity was built upon the country's thriving economy, its continuing growth was vital for German self-esteem. The fact that foreign workers were needed to uphold prosperity already complicated and thus questioned categories of German and Other. It also raised a host of questions for Germans, not the least of which were in regards to German (re)productivity and the values of inherent in their capitalist society. In a constant attempt to circumscribe Germanness, seemingly unrelated issues like German feminism and sexuality were embedded in discussions about guestworker achievements in an unfriendly environment. Persistently, then, the guestworker debate revealed how tenuous and fluid German identity was and how tenaciously both liberals and conservatives worked at not letting it appear this way.

Moreover, and as the next chapter will explore, what the guestworker debate reveals is that the Christian Democrats (CDU) and Social Democrats (SPD) constantly criticized each other for mishandling the issue. In fact, however, there was a broad consensus in designating foreigners as the problem, and the two parties' policies turned out to be not that different. Another crucial point to keep in mind is that already by the 1970s the memory of attitudes about guestworkers in the 1950s and 1960s was getting quite actively rewritten. By the time reunified Germans in the 1990s were heatedly debating the advent of a

multicultural society, they were already operating with a thoroughly misinformed version of the West German national past and the actual evolution of attitudes about foreign labor and integration.

CHAPTER 5

"JESUS WAS A FOREIGNER, TOO," 1982-1990

Turning to the Right?

In October 1982, Christian Democratic party member Helmut Kohl was elected chancellor, replacing Social Democrat Helmut Schmidt. Kohl headed a coalition government made up by the Christian Democratic Party (CDU), the Christian Social Party (the even more conservative Bavarian offshoot of the CDU), and the Free Democratic Party (FDP).[1] As a result, German politics experienced what came to be known as the *Wende* (literally, the "turn"). Since the end of recruitment in 1973, the debate surrounding foreigner politics had become ever more central to party-political discussions, and in his inaugural speech, Kohl introduced foreigner politics as one of the pillars of his political agenda. Important political restructuring occurred when competencies regarding a reform of the foreigner law shifted away from the Ministry of Labor toward the Ministry of the Interior, and thus away from a social-political to (what was called) an order-political [*ordnungspolitisch*] focus. The minister of the interior, Friedrich Zimmermann became the engine behind the new draft of the foreigner law, presented in 1983. His proposal included, for example: the reduction, of the age of foreign children still allowed to join their parents in Germany from sixteen to six; the prohibition of second-generation guestworkers to bring spouses from home countries to join them permanently (a reaction to the fear of endless

[1] During the previous government under chancellor Helmut Schmidt (SPD), the FDP had been part of the governing coalition. Their switch to the CDU/CSU coalition prompted the early election of 1982.

immigration via spousal migration); and the active encouragement of foreigners to leave through financial incentives. One of the major motivations behind these changes was the fact that according to a 1963 European Community association agreement, Turks were supposed to have freedom of movement in Europe, starting 1 December 1986. Because 90 percent of all Turks living in the European Community had settled in Germany, the German government feared that its country had to bear the brunt of the coming "waves" of Turkish migration. Within the coalition, however, there was great disagreement about these proposals, coming to a head in 1984 when the opposition officially inquired [*Große Anfrage*] about the objectives of future foreigner politics. Lieselotte Funcke, member of the coalition's Free Democratic Party, also the key administrator for foreigner issues [*Ausländerbeauftragte*] at the time, was one of the most outspoken opponents of her own coalition's politics, and even Chancellor Kohl did not put much weight behind his minister's proposals. Exactly two years after the *Wende*, conservatives had been unable to tighten guestworker politics in a way they had envisioned when coming to power.[2]

Conservative Arguments

Ulrich Herbert has argued that there was a (negative) "far-reaching change in opinion" among Germans in the late 1970s towards the guestworkers. Certainly this shift in opinions among Germans had also helped to bring about the *Wende*. Foreigner Politics directly shaped party politics. Already in the 1979

[2] See Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge* (München: C. H. Beck, 2000), 248-250.

election campaign foreigner politics had played an important role.[3] It needs to be acknowledged, however, that at the same time, and as previously shown, there was also increasing concern in the public and growing activism as progressive groups within the Christian churches and other left-leaning initiatives endeavored to defend (and expand) guestworker rights and to rally for greater understanding in an effort to counter popular and institutional racism. To these groups, it was a fact that Germany had become a permanently multicultural society. As it turns out, however, their ideas for paving the way for acceptance for guestworkers were also frequently problematic. Their ideological positions were not only (and not surprisingly) attacked by conservatives, but also at times, (and at first glance, a bit more surprisingly) by foreigners themselves.

Conservatives criticized leftist arguments on a number of levels, charging, for example, that the leftists were playing on emotions rather than taking action and were drawing on catchphrases that were supposedly "as memorable as they were out of touch with reality." In response to the anti-racist slogan "Jesus for a foreigner, too," an article in *Die Welt* charged, for example, "In his lifetime and for the Jews among whom he lived?"[4] Trying to ridicule the snappy slogan the article also completely missed the point it was trying to make, in the process exposing the very exclusionist and conformist ideology conservatives so routinely

---

[3] Ibid., 249.

[4] Henk Ohnesorge, "Getto, Knast und viel Gefühl. Gastarbeiter sind doch bessere Menschen: Bücher zu einer heiklen Frage," *Die Welt*, 21 January 1983. Regarding the use of emotions and (ineffective) rhetoric rather than action, see, for example, Henk Ohnesorge, "Hand in fremder Tasche," *Die Welt*, 18 June 1984; Henk Ohnesorge, "Die Union besteh auf sechs Jahre als Nachzugsalter für Kinder," *Die Welt*, 12 February 1985; "Fordernde Woche!" *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30 September 1985. On the argument that left-liberals were using the foreigners' plight for their own liberal political gain, see Matthias v. Lübcke, "In Hamburg eskaliert die Gewalt von und gegen Ausländer," *Rheinischer* Merkur, 8 February 1986.

advanced while also confirming leftists' belief in the need for educational efforts among Germans about the foreigner situation. Conservatives instead turned leftist-liberal intentions on their head, arguing that their efforts did not help the foreigners at all, but rather harmed the minority groups, because more liberal policies meant more foreigners in Germany, including adolescents who had nothing to build on and were thus--it was argued--predestined for a life of crime, a fact that some already saw reflected in police statistics.[5] Instead, in their own eyes, conservatives provided the real solution. Even though Zimmermann--the architect of the new foreigner law draft--was "tough, controversial, and contentious," he was also "honest. The seeming compromise [recommended by leftists and liberals] intensifies the problem instead of contributing to its solution."[6] Another commentator went so far as to advise the German government to continue "its restrictive foreigner politics [even though] it was detrimental to its [Germany's] international reputation."[7] Conservatives, in short, positioned restrictive politics as the more difficult but, ultimately, also more benevolent plan of action. Indeed, as *Die Welt* argued, "At the moment, foreigners have to fear

---

[5] See Walter Bajohr, "Zwischen Staatsräson und Menschlichkeit. Die Grenzen der Aufnahmefähigkeit sind erreicht," *Christ und Welt*, 11 March 1983; Walter Bajohr, "Fehlzündungen beim Regieren," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 5 October 1984; "Junge Ausländer. Studie warnt vor ungesicherter Lebensperspektive," *Handelsblatt*, 28 December 1984. As liberals repeatedly pointed out, however, the statistics were skewed for a variety of reasons: they only listed those suspected of a crime, rather than those convicted; they did not distinguish between those foreigners who were in the Federal Republic legally or illegally and also counted stationed foreign soldiers, people in transit, and tourists in the larger "foreigner" category; furthermore, certain crimes like visa infractions could only be committed by foreigners; and last not least, the statistics did not account for the cultural and ethnic bias of those taking suspects into custody. See, for example, Christian Feist, "Polizei und ausländische Mitbürger," *Tagesspiegel*, 6 December 1985; "Ausländer: 'Wenn je ein Problem vorausschaubar war.' Einwanderungsland Bundesrepublik (IV): Reizthema Ausländerkriminalität--was ist wirklich dran?" *Spiegel*, 6 March 1989; "Asylanten, Aussiedler, Gastarbeiter. Vorurteile der Bundesbürger--und die Wirklichkeit," *Stern*, 22 February 1989.

[6] "Mißglückt," *General-Anzeiger*, 5 January 1984.

[7] Rainer Nahrendorf, Eine Heimkehr ohne Tränen," *Handelsblatt*, 17 January 1984.

more danger from their self-proclaimed friends than from their enemies. Whoever wants to heal, sometimes has to administer bitter medicine, which is difficult in a country where placebos and sleeping aids have become a habit."[8] Further trying to weaken left and left-liberal outcries against immigration restrictions, conservatives also pointed out that current policy considerations to tighten immigration laws hearkened back to suggestions the Social Democratic government had already entertained from 1981 onwards (and which had included the more controversial ideas of dropping the age limit for children of guestworkers wanting to join their parents in Germany).[9]

While confronted with what they understood to be left and left-liberal accusations of fostering racism via exclusionary rhetoric, conservatives responded by faulting their opponents for the emotionalization of the foreigner discourse and rejected any ties between Nazi racism and contemporary xenophobia. Indeed, they argued, what existed was "in reality merely a Turk problem." Conservatives felt particularly justified in their assessment (that the problem was not as severe as others made it out to be) after the Allensbach

---

[8] Henk Ohnesorge, "Liebe Deinen Fernsten," *Die Welt*, 7 April 1984.

[9] See, for example, "Die FDP siegt," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 October 1984; Friedrich Karl Fromme, "Aus dem Ausland zu den Eltern. Der 'Familiennachzug' als verfassungsrechtlich verbrämter Wahlkampf-Streit," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 14 January 1987. Liberal papers who pointed out this fact were few and far between, but the more conservative-liberal *Die Zeit*, did not mince words and charged "Since the [political] turn [*Wende*] German Social Democrats have become more consistent again in their plea for human rights in Turkey. When they were governing, they still had to evaluate. At that time, they were still interested to regulate the guestworker problem in cooperation...Today that is forgotten: The protests roll more easily off their tongue." Nina Grunenberg, "Sie kommen nicht aus Höflichkeit zu Besuch. Die Botschaften aus der Bundesrepublik verwirren Ankara," *Die Zeit*, 8 June 1985. An article in *Süddeutsche Zeitung* that also pointed to the social-democratic roots of restrictive measures saw the situation more benignly, believing that liberals now reflected rather critically on their former policy goals and that the opposition now had forced itself to support legislation that would provide legal clarity and facilitate integration. All sides agreed, however, that the end of recruitment should remain a permanent rule. See Udo Bergdoll, "Abschied von der Ausländerpolitik," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 18 April 1984.

Institute for Public Opinion Research concluded that German attitudes vis-à-vis foreigners were for the most part of a friendly nature.[10] In confining the problem to one minority, conservatives attempted to dismiss any parallels being drawn between Jews and Turks, despite the continual manifestation of such parallels in racist slurs, graffiti, and jokes comparing Jewish and Turkish fates. By calling it a "Turk problem," conservatives also blamed Turks themselves for causing the difficulties. According to this line of argument, the problem existed because Turks constituted a group that "tend[ed] towards ghettoization and at the same time ha[d] an anti-integrationst attitude." Furthermore, they epitomized a "foreign culture with a foreign faith" and "conceived of the world in completely different ways [*ganz andere Vorstellungswelt*]."[11]

Left-Liberal Arguments

Despite the conservative finger-pointing, however, left-liberals themselves continued to be rather torn about how to interpret (and who to fault for) the much-

[10] Manfred Schnell, "Vertagt," *Die Welt*, 4 October 1984. See also, for example, Walter Bajohr, "Zwischen Staatsräson und Menschlichkeit. Die Grenzen der Aufnahmefähigkeit sind erreicht," *Christ und Welt*, 11 March 1983; "Die Türken und wir," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 September 1984; "Die FDP siegt," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 4 October 1984. For conservative commentary on the Allensbach survey, see, for example, "Sich selbst halten die Deutschen nicht für ausländerfeindlich–nur ihre Landsleute," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 December 1985; Eberhard Nitschke, "Ausländer finden freundliches Klima," *Die Welt*, 7 December 1985.

[11] Walter Bajohr, "Zwischen Staatsräson und Menschlichkeit. Die Grenzen der Aufnahmefähigkeit sind erreicht," *Christ und Welt*, 11 March 1983; Mascha M. Fisch, "Sokrates soll Deutscher sein. Viele Ausländer gehören gar nicht mehr in ihr Herkunftsland: Sie haben bei uns ihre Heimat gefunden," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 16 December 1983; "Die Türken und wir," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 September 1984. Such attitudes could also be expressed in absences such as when *Rheinischer Merkur* condemned the media for heightening the tensions through their use of catchphrases such as "asylum flood" or the label of "economic refugees," because "after all, all foreigner have to suffer for it, especially Italians, Spaniards, Greeks, Yugoslavs, and the Portuguese who have been in the Federal Republic of Germany for ten years and more." Not including Turks in this enumeration suggests that the labels did not victimize them because they presumably *fit* the descriptions of the members of the Turkish minority. Wolfgang Delitsch, "Die Ausländer in den Medien," *Rheinischer Merkur*, 28 January 1983.

talked-about and growing resentment of Germans against foreigners. As *Die Zeit* suggested in 1983 not without criticism, left-liberals—suddenly finding themselves in opposition rather than being part of the ruling coalition--felt more at liberty to defend more progressive pro-foreigner, pro-integrationist sentiment than they had a few years earlier. Left-liberals did criticize the proposed reform of the foreigner law and were opposed to the 1983/84 financial incentives offered to guestworkers to return home. One paper quoted--now Chancellor, then top SPD candidate for the position of Minister President of Lower Saxony--Gerhard Schröder who detected in those tactics "'a flavor of gilded expulsion.'"[12] And *Zeit* claimed that guestworkers also returned home because of the "apparent parallels between 1933 and 1983," wondering just "How long will it be until Turks have to wear the crescent on their lapel?"[13] *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt* illustrated an article about the political impasse with a cartoon of a German *Michel* [everyman] in front of the TV, horrified by the Holocaust film he is watching, while oblivious to the fact that somebody is spray-painting "Foreigners out!" on the wall visible outside his window.[14]

But liberal attitudes toward Turks also continued to resemble those of the conservatives. Liberals too expressed fears of foreign infiltration, which were informed by serious doubts about Turks' willingness and ability to integrate properly into German society rather than permanently separating themselves

---

[12] "Offene Feindseligkeit beklagt. Schröder: Verhältnis zu Ausländern verschlechtert," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 8 October 1985.
[13] "Halbmond am Revers," *Zeit*, 15 July 1983.
[14] See Ada Brandes, "Bonn, die Türken und das Grundgesetz: Abschieben, abfinden, aufnehmen?" *Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt*, 31 July 1983.

from it.[15] An exposé on the history of the Turks, published by *Stern* magazine and called "The Turkish Fear: For 1000 Years, a Nation has Sought Its Way Westward," is reflective of the broad range of notions regarding Turks that informed the ambiguous position left-liberals occupied on the Turkish question. In its opening paragraph, *Stern* asserted that "The Occident has always been a temptation for the Turks. However, their Oriental spirit still dominates their culture." With this statement as the main argument of the article, *Stern* proceeded to walk its reader through the tumultuous history of the Ottoman Empire and, subsequently, Turkey. Spanning almost a millennium, *Stern's* article emphasized that, in the pursuit of greatness and progress, its pursuers repeatedly resorted to brute force, as in the case of the Ottomans, who "feel it to be their mission to spread Islam through a world of non-believers. [However,] they do not want to convert like Christian missionaries. They want to conquer and subjugate to disseminate the power of the prophet." The problematic parallels are obvious, the juxtaposition of gentle Western world tradition with brutal Oriental measures left unquestioned. *Stern* further asserted that "[t]he Turkish state needs war because only then is it able to function. It needs new land to exploit and humans to extort money from them, so that the military and the state

---

[15] See, for example, Nina Grunenberg, "Dagegen ist kein Kraut gewachsen. Friedrich Zimmermann nimmt sich die Ausländerpolitik vor," *Die Zeit*, 29 July 1983; "Unsere Türken oder Nagelprobe der Toleranz," *Stern*, 6 October 1983; Jens Feddersen, "Die Türken-Grenze. Ab nach Deutschland?" *Neue Rhein-Ruhr-Zeitung*, 7 September 1984. Even when the argument about Turks' unassimilability was contested, it was still unclear if that indicated a belief in the ability of Turkish integration or Germany's ability to accept a distinct minority in its midst. The most important point of the article arguing in this ambiguous manner, however, was that guestworkers were desirable because of their financial contribution to the Federal Republic (making it worthwhile for Germans to accept the foreigners). See Joachim J. Savelsberg, "Zu wenig Rente? Mit Hilfe der Ausländer im Lande ließe sich ein deutsches Problem aus der Welt schaffen," *Die Zeit*, 11 January 1985.

machine can be paid." *Stern* concluded that Turkey had "the spirit of the Orient, the money from the Occident" and was thus "a nation [that] has searched and still searches desperately for its identity."[16] For *Stern*, Turkey was a place to be pitied, caught up in what the magazine interpreted as (always already) futile attempts to "westernize" as it was guided by and unable to escape the Orient. "The Turkish Fear" mentioned in the title of the article could thus be read either as an expression of Germany's fear of a continued and growing Turkish trek westward or as a manifestation of Turkey's repeated and--as this article argued--frustrated attempts at westernization (which only seemed to propel Turkey's out-migration). Regardless of which viewpoint *Stern* advanced, guestworker culture in this depiction stood in opposition to and, as such, was unable to gain a place in German culture. Overall, then, even as left-liberals took a stronger stance on foreigner acceptance and integration in the *Wende* years they also continued to be complicit in underscoring ethnic difference, and, just like the conservatives, to elaborate on the "Turk problem."

The Churches

Some of the most outspoken defenders of foreigners at the time were the Christian churches in Germany. They supported the right for foreigners to participate in local elections and also lobbied for a simplification of the naturalization process. From the first, church welfare organizations had provided care--subsidized by the state--for the guestworkers, greeting them at the train stations when they first came to Germany, and providing a host of social services

[16] "Die Türken-Angst," *Stern*, 3 November 1983.

for them thereafter.[17] The Catholic organization *Caritas* was in charge of Italians, Spaniards, and Portuguese and the Protestant *Diakonisches Werk* took care of the Greek Orthodox, while the secular *Arbeiterwohlfahrt* (historically affiliated with the Social Democratic Party) was in charge of the non-Christian Turks, Yugoslavs, Moroccans and Tunisians. It took some time to develop clear objectives in the organizations' guestworker care and those dealing with guestworker issues initially came from a range of professional backgrounds. It was only in the early 1970s, when it became obvious that the presence of foreign laborers (and, increasingly, their families) was not a temporary phenomenon, that a clear job profile of the "certified social worker [*Sozialberater*] for foreign employees and their families" emerged.[18]

Debates emerged in the early 1970s about the organizations' focus on "care [*Betreuung*]," while falling short of developing a clear social-political concept. According to Ernst Klee, one of the church's most ardent leftist critics--and who had also coined the caustic phrase "The Niggers of Europe" as a description for the current role he saw guestworkers occupying in German society--"Whoever wants to see the presence of the so-called guestworkers merely from the standpoint of humanitarian and charitable assistance only cements the injustice....he is becoming politically active by tolerating unjust

---

[17] For a helpful overview of the origins, structural evolution, and competencies regarding guestworker social care among the church welfare organizations and the Arbeiterwohlfahrt, see Franziska Dunkel and Gabriella Stramaglia-Faggion, *"Für 50 Mark einen Italiener." Zur Geschichte der Gastarbeiter in München* (München: Buchendorfer Verlag, 2000): 185-206; for an illustration of the work of Caritas among Italian guestworkers, see also Yvonne Rieker, *"Ein Stück Heimat findet man ja immer." Die italienische Einwanderung in die Bundesrepublik* (Essen: Klartext, 2003). 71-81.

[18] See Dunkel and Stramaglia-Faggion, *Gastarbeiter in München*, 187-8.

structures."[19] In theory, the organizations advocated guestworkers becoming part of the German citizenry [*Mitbürger*] and being allowed to vote on the local level. In practice, however, the churches' attitudes vis-à-vis their charges was ambivalent, also because, as Klee documented, they still harbored a host of prejudices about them. However, the public debate that ensued at the time certainly contributed to the churches' more surefooted and outspoken stance on guestworker issues beyond those affecting the industry. Between 1973 and 1975, the *Arbeiterwohlfahrt* as well as the church organizations in charge of guestworkers for the first time formally presented broader conceptualizations of the challenges confronting foreigners, making statements that also addressed political issues, which in turn provoked the government to respond in kind.[20]

The "Catholics' Debate [*Katholiken-Streit*]" in 1984 serves as an illustration of how complicated and contested the role of the churches in the guestworker debate remained. Catholic bishops had repeatedly voiced their opposition to interior minister Zimmermann's new foreigner law proposal but the Central Committee of German Catholics (*Zentralkomitee der deutschen Katholiken--ZdK*)--the lay branch of the Catholic church administration--opposed the German Bishops Conference (*Deutsche Bischofskonferenz*) as a resolution proposal presented at a ZdK conference made clear. The leadership of the laity, in other words, diagreed with the church leadership's pronounced progressivism.

---

[19] Ernst Klee, "So kam Nikolaus zu den Gastarbeitern. Das Frankfurter Aktionsmodell setzt neue Maßstäbe," *Publik*, 18 December 1970; see also idem, "Die Nigger Europas. Gastarbeiter werden sozial diskriminiert,"*Frankfurter Rundschau*, 16 January 1971; idem, "Als Almosenempfänger zu Wohlfahrtsverbänden. Ausländische Arbeitnehmer wollen sich selbst helfen," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 24 April 1971; idem, "Caritas vor Gericht," *Die Zeit*, 7 April 1972. See also Klee's book-length contributions to the guestworker debate: *Die Nigger Europas* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1971) and *Gastarbeiter. Analysen und Berichte* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1972).
[20] See Dunkel and Stramaglia-Fagggion, *Gastarbeiter in München*, 188.

Interestingly, the ZdK's president, Professor Hans Maier, also held the position of Bavarian Minister of Culture and belonged to the Christian Social Union, a member of the coalition that tried to pass the new law. Other members holding positions in the ZdK were also members of the coalition parties.[21] After some debate the document's claims were modified. However, commenting on an ecumenical conference called "Living Together, Today and Tomorrow" and which took place the following February, *Süddeutsche Zeitung* scathingly criticized ZdK president Maier, who had inquired "what was bothering the foreigners [*wo der Schuh drückt*]." While Maier's statement sounded paternally caring at first, so the paper argued, in reality it was a sell-out: "After all, for about three decades now foreign employees and their families have lived in the Federal Republic...Therefore, whoever is only bothering now to find out what is troubling the foreigners, unwittingly confesses that they have heard about [the issues affecting guestworkers] only in passing or not at all so far."[22] Internal divisions and mere lip service to the guestworker cause therefore seemed to continued to hamper church initiative.

The Left

Together with the church organizations, leftists at this time emerged as the most ardent supporters of facilitating international understanding and the guestworker cause, in the course of the 1980s repeatedly and explicitly

---

[21] See "Katholiken-Streit um Ausländerpolitik," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 23 November 1984; "Nachzugsbeschränkung 'untaugliches Mittel'. Katholische Bischöfe äußern sich zur Ausländerpolitik," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 23 November 1984; "Bischöfe gegen starke Zuzugsbeschränkungen," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 23 November 1984.
[22] "Eine Bankrotterklärung," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 25 February 1985.

positioning themselves against the (proposed) guestworker politics first of the Social Democratic-Free Democratic coalition and then, after the election of Helmut Kohl, against the Christian Democratic-Christian Social-Free Democratic government. Efforts by those trying to make more transparent guestworker experiences and thereby pointing to German misconceptions about the foreigners, however, played as much into the hands of those in favor of more restrictive policies as they helped in creating a public forum for foreigner voices because *all* (leftist, left-liberal, and conservative) lines of argument were based on notions of inherent difference between Germans and Turks.

To dismiss the momentum that public interest created, however, would mean missing what can only be understood as a genuine desire to understand the guestworker situation (albeit at times in misguided ways). Before Günter Wallraff dressed as a "Turk" for his undercover investigative journalism piece *Ganz unten* (*Lowest of the Low*), school classes, college students, and reporters repeatedly "dressed Turk" to experience the extent of German xenophobia first hand. A whole class of students in Cologne experienced in this very personal way "'how fast prejudices come into being,'" and a journalist writing for *Stern* in roughly the same get-up as the students got himself turned away at a restaurant and a disco, rejected even by German prostitutes and at a homeless hangout.[23] Marlene Schulz, a German university student examining Germany's "foreigner phobia," donned the female equivalent of what was considered standard Turkish

[23] "'Bei den Kerlen kann man ja nie wissen.' Kölner Schüler verkleideten sich als Türken und machten schlimme Erfahrungen," *Stern*, 20 January 1983; Gerhard Kromschröder, "Als ich ein Türke war. Wie ausländerfeindlich sind die Deutschen?" *Stern*, 14 October 1984.

garb and encountered similarly hostile situations.[24] Günter Wallraff's modus operandi, then, is only the most spectacular and well-known example of this phenomenon that appeared recurrently n the early 1980s.

In 1985, Günter Wallraff's *Ganz unten* was published and became a sensational bestseller in Germany. Portraying his version of an illegal immigrant named "Ali," Wallraff dressed in old, out-of-style clothes, a black wig, and mustache, speaking broken German with an affected Turkish accent and, looking for employment, encountered atrocious working and living conditions wherever he went. Wallraff's muckraking exposé evoked an enormous outcry, about the treatment of guestworkers as well, but primarily about the politics of the companies Wallraff had exposed (McDonald's and the steel company Thyssen among them) even though--as literary critic Anna Kuhn has rightly pointed out--he also documented numerous occasions (albeit rather unreflectedly) of comparisons made by Germans between Jews and Turks, particularly in suggestions about how to best "get rid of" the Turks. Most critics' responses to the publication, however, never thematized the issue of virulent racism in a constructive and insightful way, but rather focused almost exclusively on the economic injustices perpetrated.[25] Moreover, while some of Wallraff's Turkish co-

---

[24] Stefanie von Viereck, "Was Frau Keskin erlebte," *Die Zeit*, 2 March 1984. According to Gail Wise, both, the school class projects and Schulz's explorations were explicitly inspired by Kromschröder's actions, which were ultimately published in a book called *Als ich ein Türke war* (Frankfurt/Main: Eichborn, 1983). See Gail Wise, "Ali in Wunderland: German Representations of Foreign Workers," (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1995), 163-4.

[25] For an instructive critical reading of *Ganz unten* and its critics, see Anna Kuhn, "Bourgeois Ideology and the (Mis)Reading of *Ganz Unten*," New German Critique no. 46 (winter 1989): 191-202; Gail Wise, "Ali in Wunderland," 154-84; for a juxtaposition of *Ganz unten* with the representation of Turkish life in Germany by a Turkish artist, see Rita Chin, "Re-writing the 'Guest Worker': Turkish-German Artists and the Emergence of Multiculturalism in the Federal

workers, who spoke out against Wallraff's work, did not explicitly protest the author's portrayal of guestworkers in general nor the lack of a critical analysis of the ways they were treated by Germans (instead, they objected to Wallraff's sole claim to authorship, the lack of promised financial support from royalties, and unequal remuneration in comparison to their German colleagues when helping Wallraff) the Turkish co-workers' "entry into the Wallraff controversy most certainly did have the effect of unequivocally unmask[ing] as false one stereotype informing Wallraff's portrayal of Ali as an ignorant, illiterate Turkish worker."[26]

While Wallraff's book itself perpetuated and possibly even reinforced German stereotypes about guestworkers, it also drew members of the Turkish community into the public debate and thereby concretely challenged the very stereotypes *Ganz unten* had purveyed. The growing outspokenness, then, of guestworkers themselves, both about their own participation in and contribution to Wallraff's work, as well as more generally on their own and in conjunction with the gradual emergence of leftist and church-sponsored German antiracist initiatives, was yet another sign of the increasingly multi-ethnic discourse on the issue.

Aside from the critical response Wallraff's work eventually received from progressive American scholars, especially with regards to the problems that were inherent in Wallraff's conceptualization, execution, and ultimate telling of his story, what is equally interesting is the overwhelmingly positive reception *Ganz*

Republic of Germany, 1961-1989 (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1999), 185, 199-201. Both Kuhn and Wise also reflect on the popular reception of book.

[26] Kuhn, "Bourgeois Ideology," 200.

unten received among the German public. In her study of guestworker representations in German society and culture, literary critic Gail Wise points to this factor of reception as one of the major reasons for *Ganz unten*'s larger significance. "Whether one chooses to view the *Ganz unten* narrative as 'true' or not, the readers' response suggests that it served this function for much of the West German reading public."[27] According to her, Wallraff's extensive focus on certain parts of the industry scene, the horrible working and living conditions--likening them to the aftermath of a nuclear war--conjured up an "apocalyptic scenario [that] played on Cold War fears that were circulating particularly in 1985 in West Germany." Moreover, these fears were further compounded by a German population already very much concerned with a variety of alarming social, political, and economic developments, such as unemployment, a growing global-economic imbalance, and environmental deterioration, to name a few.[28] A reading of Wallraff's book in the context of its contemporary historical moment can only explain part of its success, however. Wallraff's exposé also needs to be understood as yet another example of the New Left's fiercely held belief that capitalism had been preeminently to blame for the rise of Hitler, a stance which continually relegated the issue of anti-Semitism to the sidelines.[29]

---

[27] Wise, "Ali in Wunderland," 165, 164-73.
[28] Ibid., 167.
[29] On the point that New Leftists treated antisemitism as an "ancillary" epiphenomenon rather than the core of Nazism, see Andrei Markovits, "Coping with the Past: The West German Labor Movement and the Left," in *Reworking the Past: Hitler, the Holocaust, and the Historians' Debate*, ed. Peter Baldwin (Boston: Beacon, 1990), 262-75; and Dany Diner, "Fragmente von Unterwegs: Über jüdische und politische Identität in Deutschland," *Aesthetik und Kommunikation* 51 (1983): 11-13. On the complex psychological dynamics that may have been at work when West German New Leftists emphasized capitalism rather than racism as being at the heart of Nazism, see the statements by Peter Schneider, "Im Todeskreis der Schuld," *Zeit*, 27 March 1987; Claus Leggewie, "Antifaschisten sind wir sowieso," *Zeit*, 19 February 1988; and Reimut Reiche,

Other problems were evident in New Left interventions, as well. Already in 1980, for example, the leftist journal *Kursbuch* had dedicated an issue to the "Multiethnic State of the Federal Republic."[30] It was an odd and sometimes esoteric mix of literary, ethnographic, sociological, economic, and historical reflections on foreigners in Germany, covering a variety of nationalities, among them first and foremost Turks but also Poles, Italians, Greeks, Japanese, and Yugoslavs. One of the contributions was by Werner Schiffauer, a pedagogue, and was entitled "The Violence of Honor,"[31] about the concept of honor in male Turkish society and the violence it--purportedly--inherently precipitated. In 1983, the book length version of this study appeared. It is worthwhile to discuss it at greater length because it serves as a prime example for the problems inherent in much of the German leftist activism that attempted to make more visible (and thereby create greater understanding for) the experience of Turks in Germany. Significantly, Schiffauer's work dealt with what he understood to be male Turkish gender roles and sexually charged interethnic relationships and misunderstandings, topics that had not lost any of their sensationalist appeal since labor migration began in the mid-1950s.

Over the prior decade, interest in the social and cultural issues of foreigners had increasingly become the focus of scientific studies, particularly among sociologists as well those who provided social services to the foreigners,

---

"Sexuelle Revolution--Erinnerung an einen Mythos," in *Die Fruechte der Revolte*, ed. Lothar Baier (Berlin: K. Wagenbach, 1988); as well as the analysis in Dagmar Herzog, *Sex after Fascism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2005): forthcoming.

[30] *Vielvölkerstaat Bundesrepublik. Kursbuch* no. 62 (December 1980).

[31] Werner Schiffauer, "Die Gewalt der Ehre," *Vielvölkerstaat Bundesrepublik. Kursbuch* no. 62 (December 1980), 1-16.

social workers, and those in the field of social pedagogy.[32] Schiffauer, who had studied social pedagogy and had done fieldwork in Turkey, spoke with an air of scientific expertise and authority. What is more, he knew personally most of the subjects he discussed in his study, thus strengthening even more his claim to be an incontrovertible expert voice in the matter. The point of departure for Schiffauer's study was the group rape of a young German woman by fourteen Turks, all but one of them teenagers. According to the account that unfolded in court, during a night in May 1978, one of the teenagers had taken the victim to his apartment, where, by her own admission, she had followed him without being actively forced to do so and despite repeated opportunities for her to flee. In the course of the night and the next day, the Turkish teenager and his friends had repeatedly raped her. When she was asked by one of the Turkish teenagers to follow him to his apartment, she was able to escape her attackers. A gynecological exam corroborated the apparent absence of a struggle, as there were no signs of injuries due to shoving or pushing.

In his subsequent discussion Schiffauer set out to explore the dynamics that could have led to this kind of event, inquiring into the reasons for the victim's lack of resistance but mostly focusing on finding answers to the Turkish men's behavior as he presented eight of the perpetrators' biographies, explained the concept of "honor" in Turkish communities--particularly in the context of what he understood to be patriarchal gender norms--and elaborated on notions of male friendships in Turkish society.

---

[32] See also, Chin, "The Emergence of Multiculturalism," 211.

What is most problematic is Schiffauer's instrumentalization of the horrible incident of group rape to extrapolate larger claims about Turkish culture, particularly the mutual constitutiveness of honor and violence, and what seems to be the ultimate argument about the complete mutual incompatibility of German and Turkish culture, and he explained the perpetrators' behavior as part and parcel of their cultural makeup. According to Schiffauer, the male Turkish youth were not aware that they had done anything wrong, thus feeding German fears that it could happen again at any time. Schiffauer maintained that:

> One cannot escape the impression that the crime inevitably results from the situation of the Turkish youth in the Federal Republic of Germany: They grow up in the context of a traditional Turkish and Islamic culture, which structures gender relations in fundamentally different terms; these norms and values are reinforced in the *peer group* and colored by a focus on brotherhood [*Männertümelei*], a *peer group*, on which they are dependent in their clashes with the discriminatory environment.[33]

While giving a nod to the hostile environment Turks were facing in Germany as one piece that could explain the puzzle, for Schiffauer the ultimate explanation for the sexual violence that had transpired lay in inescapable cultural differences. The fact that Schiffauer's argument had been endorsed by *Kursbuch* speaks volumes about the difficulties also leftists had in freeing themselves of sexualized racist stereotypes.

Married to Foreigners

Schiffauer's work had focused on the detrimental effects of Turkish patriarchal culture, and incompatibilities between male Turkish culture and

---

[33] Werner Schiffauer, *Gewalt und Ehre. Erklärungen zu einem türkisch-deutschen Sexualkonflikt* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983), 139.

conceptions of German gender norms. Most of the focus at the time had been on the *Turkish* victims of such a culture--Turkish women. The popular outrage over male guestworkers' sexual overtures toward German women and the violence that had also at times been associated with it, however, had subsided over the years. Interestingly enough, by the 1980s, serious romantic relationships between foreign men and German women were not peremptorily dismissed anymore. The portrayal of Turkish men in these relationships, however, was still very much colored by the standard notions of Oriental masculinity (even as those traits were said to make them more attractive to some German women). Pioneer in gaining greater acceptance and more rights for interethnic relationships between German women and foreign men was the organization--as it was then called--Interest Group for German Women Married to Foreigners (*Interessengemeinschaft der mit Ausländern verheirateten deutschen Frauen (IAF)*).

It was founded in September 1972 by Rosi Wolf-Almanasreh, a German woman who at the time was married to a Palestinian. While she had to deal with discrimination on a regular basis because of her marriage to a Middle Eastern foreigner, Wolf-Almanasreh's impetus to create the organization came in the wake of the terrorist attacks at the 1972 Munich Olympic Games, when she had to fear that her Palestinian husband could be deported despite being married to a German. She admits that, "at the time [she] was already politicized," having been an active union member and feeling energized by the "Zeitgeist of opposition" sweeping parts of Germany at the time. Through Wolf-Almanasreh's efforts to

find other women in similar situations and a press release to the electronic and print media, word about the organization traveled rather quickly, and local branches of the initiative formed as a result. Beyond providing women with a venue for talking about and exchanging their (often negative) experiences in their German communities, other goals of the organization included public relations work and legislation reform. In 1973, the IAF organized a demonstration in the German capitol to protest the gender-biased naturalization law, because it neglected to confer automatically German citizenship to children born to German women married to foreign men. A bill introduced to rectify the problem passed in 1975.

The importance of IAF's work and the need for it can be illustrated with a number of news reports about Turkish-German marriages. On the one hand, as a headline in the *Stuttgarter Nachrichten* declared in 1984, "Turks have 'Replaced' Americans: For German Women They are the Most Favorite Husbands among Foreigners."[34] Quoting from a study by the Federal Institute of Population Studies [*Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*], the paper reported that twice as many German women married Turks than Americans. It also rejected the assumption that this development was very much influenced by sham marriages, in which Turks desperate to get a German residence permit paid a German woman to pose as a wife. Instead, according to the study, the shift was due to a growing number of interethnic marriages among the second generation of foreigners in Germany, who were often exceedingly familiar with the German

[34] Horst Zimmermann, "Türken haben die Amerikaner 'verdrängt.' Sie sind bei deutschen Frauen unter den Ausländern die beliebtesten Ehemänner." *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 12 January 1984.

language and German habits. Intercultural relations, it seemed, between Germans and the guestworkers and their descendents were changing for the better.

On the other hand--in large part also because of political initiatives to curb the "Turk problem"--an increasing number of Turks were apparently resorting to finding German women to marry for the sake of a residence permit.[35] However, as IAF's work and challenges also make clear, many "legitimate" interethnic couples faced legal discrimination as well, and some of them tried to minimize those barriers through marriage when they might have otherwise waited to do so or chosen to forego marriage altogether. Even after marriage, certain legal issues persisted, which in certain instances could put a strain on the relationship and facilitate its erosion. Nevertheless, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*'s interpretation of the statistics is telling when it argued that "apparently the more ethnic, cultural, and religious differences have to be overcome, the more a marriage is in danger [of failing]...By a wide margin, marriages between Germans and Turks fail most frequently."[36] Ignoring any of the legal challenges faced by interethnic couples, the article drew on common ethnic and cultural stereotypes that seemed plausibly to explain the high rate of divorces among bi-national couples. In the early 1980s, there were still key legal barriers to be

---

[35] See, for example, Lorenz v. Stackelberg and Evelyn Bohne, "Deutsche Braut gegen Honorar kommt viele Ausländer teuer," *Münchner Merkur*, 23 February 1985. Interestingly, the article quoted an official of the Bavarian Interior Ministry remarking that "'In the past, one would have never thought that German women would be a party to anything like this,'" and without interrogating his statement, flatly maintained: "The times have changed." Of course, the official remembered the past as he would have liked it to have been rather than the way it really had been, as my previous chapters indicate.

[36] "Scheidungsquote bei Ehen mit Ausländern besonders hoch," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2 February 1985.

overcome. In 1983, the Federal Constitutional Court passed a verdict that a German woman could not be expected anymore to follow her husband abroad (a proviso often used by the authorities when denying the foreign husband a residence permit). Finally, IAF lobbied to change the German international civil law, because it stated that a German wife married to a foreign husband was subjected to the family law of her husband's country. The law was changed in 1985.

By the time the IAF finally moved its federal administrative offices into its very own quarters, the organization had already established a national reputation for itself. Today, the organization is called "Association for Bi-national Families and Partnerships, IAF," reflecting the changes in contemporary understandings not just of romantic relationships and the effect it has on partners as well as their children, but also of the potential need for advice to *all* people in bi-national relationships, not just German women.[37] Articles in the early 1980s that reflected on the difficulties interethnic couples faced highlighted German society's prejudices towards them and condemned the double standard that existed for marriages between German men and foreign women. *Stern* even interpreted the pat on the back German men often gave each other when having scored with (or mail-ordered) an exotic foreign woman as evidence for "master race mentality." Women quoted in the articles, however (one of them Wolf-Almanasreh), also called attention to the differences between Germans and foreigners, even as

[37] See Rosi Wolf-Almanasreh, "Dreißigjähriges Jubiläum der IAF. Festakt der IAF-Initiativgruppe München am 8. September 2002," *http:www.almanasreh.de/IAF%20Muenchen%2030jaehriges%20Jubilaeum.rtf*, downloaded 17 August 2003.

they criticized German behavior and culture. Wolf-Almanasreh, for example, argued that the foreigners she knew had a much greater "emotional tolerance" than Germans.[38] And Heidi B., whose experiences as the German wife to a Turkish husband were depicted in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, tellingly volunteered that while she had had difficulty coming to terms with "orientals' much more strongly developed sense of family," she did not "'want to impose Germanness [*Deutschtum überstülpen*] on Osman," her husband. Rather, she declared, "'He ought to remain a Turk; after all, he doesn't even look like a German."[39] Allegiance with foreigners and an insistence on their differences while at the same time accepting these people *despite* (or, possibly, exactly *because)* of their supposed differences then could also be understood as an act of resistance against what some believed to be holdovers of fascist of *völkisch* ideology.

Turkish Wives

This insistence on difference while proclaiming solidarity was also particularly strong at this time in discussions about foreign mothers and wives. They had garnered attention since the early 1970s, when family reunification and the migration of children to their parents in Germany created excitement, warranting for the government the first federal investigation into their situation in 1977. Subsequent reports on the *Situation of Foreign Employees and Their Families in the Federal Republic of Germany*, published by the Federal Ministry

[38] "Ehen mit Ausländern," *Stern*, 10 December 1981.
[39] Sabine Reuter, "Heikle Ehen mit Ausländern. Heidi, Osman und Vorurteile. Warum es eines starken Willens bedarf, sich an einen Partner aus einem anderen Kulturkreis zu binden," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 13 March 1981.

of Labor and Social Order, continued to treat this group of women as a distinct category, devoting to it a separate chapter of the study.[40] Moreover, by the 1980s papers increasingly worried about the second generation of foreign females and the dilemmas they purportedly had to face because they were living in two cultures (what were considered, respectively, the highly restrictive Turkish one and the more open German one).[41] According to those commenting on the life of foreigners in Germany, however, the biggest problem remained the suffering of married foreign women, guided by the popular belief that they were the ones most under the detrimental influence of their culture's patriarchal structure.

Turkey's tragedy, as *Stern* portrayed it, was the fact that in all its attempts to move forward, it actually remained in its medieval mindset, where, for example, and representative of its backward culture, according to the writings of a young Turkish teacher in an Anatolian village, "the woman...is the man's slave....It never happens that she does not obey his words...The husband beats, hits, and berates her, he can even break her arms and legs...This is Turkey as it

---

[40] See Peter König et al., *Situation der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen in der Bundesrepublik. Repräsentativuntersuchung '80* (Bonn: Der Bundesminister für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, 1981); also Ursula Mehrländer, *Situation der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen in der Bundesrepublik. Repräsentativuntersuchung '85* (Bonn: Der Bundesminister für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, 1986).

[41] See, for example, Michael Holzach, "'Ausländer? Aber ick bin hier doch jewöhnt...' Eine Million Gastarbeiterkinder wachsen in der Bundesrepublik auf. Sie fragen sich, und das zumeist in deutsch: 'Wohin gehören wir?'" *Zeit Magazin*, 31 December 1976; "Die Kinder der Gastarbeiter. Einwanderungsland Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *Stern*, 17 December 1980; "Ein deutsches Dorf kämpft um seine Türken," *Stern*, 14 May 1981; Jutta Roitsch, "Erhan träumt noch vom Zuckerland. Junge Türken strömen nach Deutschland," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 20 June 1981; Gerd Kröncke, "Gastarbeiter in Deutschland: Wenn die Integration mißlingt. Bist nie richtig weggegangen und nie richtig angekommen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 26 September 1981; "Tod eines Türkenjungen," *Stern*, 24 March 1982; "Die mit den Kopftüchern," *Stern*, 27 May 1982; "Klassenreise. Elf Tage waren Hamburger Hauptschüler ninn der türkischen Stadt Konya," *Stern*, 18 October 1982; "'Du bringst Schande über uns,'" *Stern*, 23 February 1984.

is still being hushed up in the middle of the 20th century."[42] "Beaten or Chased Away," a *Spiegel* story focusing on abused foreign women in Germany only appeared to be the natural (and sadly unsurprising) corollary to *Stern*'s assessment.[43] One of the women highlighted in the story had been forced by her husband to stay in Turkey after a family visit to their home country. Upon her eventual return to Germany, she found her husband (who had moved in with a new girlfriend), who proceeded to harass her and mistreat her to get her to leave. The portrayal of the cheating abusing husband served a placeholder for the barbaric Oriental patriarch more generally. *Spiegel* also highlighted the legal difficulties foreign women in Germany faced, but according to the magazine, those only amplified the problems, ignoring the fact that these legal difficulties were contributing factor to causing the problems in many guestworker families in the first place.[44]

---

[42] "Die Türken-Angst," *Stern*, 3 November 1983.
[43] "'Schlagen oder Verjagen'--mißhandelte Ausländerinnen," *Spiegel*, 16 May 1983.
[44] An article in *Süddeutsche Zeitung* provided a welcome and much needed contrast to this dominant narrative as it focused on the isolation these women faced and which the article saw as a result of a lack of opportunities and places to meet, as well as the laws that discriminated against those women who had followed their husbands (by denying them work permits, for example). Criticizing "Foreigner Days"--festivities highlighting particular of foreign cultures, especially food and folkloric elements, and meant to bring Germans closer to the foreign culture--the article quoted a Turkish woman bitterly assessing that "'we are only considered folkloric mannequins. For the Germans we remain dirty foreigners." Christian Schneider, "Ausländerinnen in der Bundesrepublik. Leben ohne Kontakt. Die stummen Schaufensterpüppchen," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 29 September 1981. Studies on Turkish women also wavered between cautiously optimistic and bleak interpretations. The 1984 publication of a study in North-Rhine Westphalia apparently lamented the "total isolation" many of the Turkish women and girls experienced, and cited the fact that only one in four Turkish women worked outside the home while among other nationalities the quota was twice as high. See "'Die Rückkehrhilfe aus Bonn kann man einfach vergessen.' Farthmann legt Studie über Ausländerinnen in Nordrhein-Westfalen vor," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 2 February 1984. Reports on a study done among Turkish male heads of household in Berlin in the early 1980s did remark that interviewers observed Turkish women entering into the conversation casually and without tension. The interpretation of a later survey among Turkish women in Berlin also pointed those women's increasing openness toward their German environment. Still, as one of the papers maintained, "while 85 percent of those questioned would allow their sixteen-year-old daughter to choose a profession for herself, only 53 percent would

The persistence of images of uncivilized backward oriental culture was highlighted in a 1990 *Spiegel* story entitled "Club in the Back, Baby in the Belly."[45] The article reflected on what it saw as the pervasive oppression of Turkish women, discriminated against by German society and oppressed by their husbands. Not unlike Schiffauer's approach to understanding Turkish male behavior, the magazine extensively discussed the concept of honor in Turkish society, drawing on an impressive array of Turkish proverbs to illustrate its claims. However, the problem, according to *Spiegel*, could not be completely dissolved in the German environment either: "In the progressive West, Turkish women are not much better off than in their patriarchal home country. This is not only due to the inherited Christian burden [*christliche Erblast*] of misogyny but also to the incomplete emancipation [of women] in the Federal Republic. Women earn less, have fewer careers—therefore Turkish women do not have it any easier in these parts." By positing German women as victims too, *Spiegel* got to position itself as a supporter of women's liberation, while at the same time diminishing the importance of ethnicity as a factor by lumping together German and foreign women. Much of the report was informed by a study published by German sociologist Karin König.[46] It drew extensively on König's own

---

tolerate the daughter dressing like German girls or women." It is unclear what dressing "German" in this way meant. No comparative statistics were provided about how many German mothers liked their daughters to dress in this manner. Birgit-Ingeborg Loff, "Türken wollen Integration, aber nicht Staatsbürgerschaft," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 6 March 1984; "Integrationswille der Türken wächst," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, 6 March 1984; "20 Prozent der jüngeren Türken wollen deutsche Staatsbürgerschaft," *Der Tagesspiegel*, 6 March 1984. The fact that over half of those questioned would allow their daughter to dress "German" (whatever that meant) was not considered.

[45] "Knüppel im Kreuz, Kind im Bauch," *Spiegel*, 29 October 1990.

[46] See Karin König, *Tschador, Ehre und Kulturkonflikt. Veränderungsprozesse türkischer Frauen und Mädchen durch die Emigration und ihre soziokulturellen Folgen* (Frankfurt/Main: Verlag für interkulturelle Kommunikation, 1989).

experiences gathered in the course of her research and thus spoke with seeming authority of the Turkish women's plight. The problem however, lay in the generalizations the study tended to make to speak for all Turkish women. As pedagogue Helma Lutz has maintained, "The authors of media discourses, journalists, for example, do not have to invent these patterns of explanation [*Begründungsmuster*], because the scientific literature that dominates the market provides enough support."[47] Presenting such patterns, however, also made it possible to show compassion for this group of women while at the same time elevating what were considered to be Germany's comparatively enlightened gender norms, both for men and women.[48] In this context, "xenophobia [was] seen as an additional component, which merely reinforces the original misery that supposedly originated in their [the Turkish women's] cultural background." What is overlooked, according to Lutz, is an "analysis of racism in German society as a constitutive element for the oppression of Turkish women."[49] It thus proved difficult for German audiences to entertain the idea that emancipatory impulses among Turkish women even existed, or that there was plenty of secularity in both Turkish and Turkish German culture.

This also explains cultural historian's Rita Chin's observations about the prevalent misreading of (fictional) literature and film created by Turks about Turks, as in the case of Saliha Scheinhardt's oeuvre.[50] Scheinhardt left Turkey in

---

[47] Helma Lutz, "Rassismus, Sexismus, Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten," in *"Ein Herrenvolk von Untertanen." Rassismus--Nationalismus--Sexismus*, ed. Andreas Foitzik et al. (Duisburg: DISS, 1992), 71.
[48] Ibid. 70.
[49] Ibid., 71.
[50] See Chin, "The Emergence of Multiculturalism," 89-137. For another example of misreading Turkish portrayals of Turkish life, see also Chin's discussion of *40 m² Deutschland*, a film by

the late 1960s to work in Germany and became one of the early contributors to the genre of "guestworker literature." Particularly her *Frauen die sterben ohne daß sie gelebt hätten* (*Women Who Die Without Having Lived*) was well and widely received among the German reading public. However, "rather than being appreciated as specific representations of Turkish life among a variety of possibilities, her [Scheinhardt's] 'ethnographies' are conventionally read in essentialist terms."[51] Because Scheinhardt--a Turkish woman--made the experiences of Turkish women the focus of her book, its content automatically took on the cachet of authenticity, thus granting a work of fiction the authority of scholarly studies or documentaries. At least equally importantly to keep in mind, however, Scheinhardt's work was often read out of its specific historical and cultural context, so that the particular circumstances and environment in which the stories take place tended to be ignored, making it difficult to understand the stories beyond the limiting (and unhelpful) but already very familiar stereotypes associated with the situation of Turkish women.[52]

Talking Back

Increasingly, however, foreigners themselves intervened in the debates also via the mainstream and leftist press, not just to counter conservative

---

Tevfik Baser, a Turkish-born filmmaker who came to Germany as a college student in the 1980s. *40 m^2 Deutschland* is the story of a Turkish wife who, after joining her guestworker husband in Germany, gets locked up by him in their apartment. Once again, among its German audience the movie has often been understood as a confirmation of the inhumane qualities of Turkish patriarchy--as *Spiegel*'s "Club in the Back, Baby in the Belly" portrayed it as well. However, as with Scheinhardt's writings, what is being ignored in this reading of the movie is the difficult interplay between the husband's fear, the lack of understanding in his German environment, and his actions toward his wife. See Chin, "The Emergence of Multiculturalism," 138-202.

[51] Ibid., 93.

[52] Ibid., 105

perspectives on migration and integration issues but also to address the problematic assumptions about foreigners' cultural identity, assumptions that had been disseminated also by some of their most ardent defenders. By 1987, two-thirds of the guestworkers had been living in West Germany for more than 10 years, i.e. had settled there. Their increasingly diverse economic and social participation as well as Germans' growing interest in the guestworker issue can account for the fact that in the course of the 1980s the terms of the debate shifted. For example, literature by non-Germans published in Germany (and mostly dealing with their German experience) increasingly appeared on the German literary market. Writing competitions for foreigners and the creation of the annual Adalbert von Chamisso Prize in 1985 for the literature of this genre also supported the development and increasing visibility of the genre in particular and the non-Germans' voices in general.[53] As Gail Wise has pointed out, the interest in foreigners' personal narratives that developed at this time about "experiences in what was perceived to be a restrictive society" coupled with an increasing number of calls for action against racism pointed to a "tentative acceptance of foreigners as members of West German society."[54] The emergence of a foreign literary intelligentsia in Germany, whose first publications appeared in early 1970s, had thus become well-established and started reaching the wider German public a decade later.[55]

---

[53] See Sabine Fischer and Moray McGowan, "From *Pappkoffer* to Pluralism" *Writing Across Worlds. Literature and Migration*, ed. Russel King, John Connell, and Paul White (New York: Routledge, 1995), 39-56.
[54] Wise, "Ali in Wunderland," 154.
[55] See Chin, "The Emergence of Multiculturalism," 237.

One of these writers was Aysel Özakin, who had already been a well-known author in her home country before coming to Germany in 1981 at the invitation of the Literary Colloquium in Berlin. She ultimately decided to stay in Germany because of the military coup in Turkey at the time. One of her interventions into the leftist foreigner discourse occurred in the pages of the leftist journal *Konkret*, where she addressed (and refuted) a number of popular (leftist) misconceptions about foreigners in Germany. The impetus for her response was the publication of Günter Wallraff's *Ganz unten*. Özakin was unhappy with Wallraff's portrayal of "Ali" not least because Wallraff, supposedly in solidarity with Özakin as a kindred leftist spirit, had instead exposed for her the segregation (and thereby reification) of the downtrodden. As she explained why she took offense, "I don't have anything to do with the reactionary, racist circles in the Federal Republic, I do not grant them the right to judge me. But the oppositional culture with whom I have, since I have lived here, had exchanges on a conscious, spiritual and emotional level, affects me completely." For Özakin, Wallraff's action brought into stark focus the gulf that still existed between German leftist activists and the groups for and with whom they were supposedly fighting. More generally, she felt that as a member of the Turkish community and as an artist, she was expected to take on the role of spokesperson for its members, expressing their suffering and oppression, thereby being denied an individual identity, something that leftists had claimed for themselves in tandem with their rejection of a national identity.

It was exactly *Ganz unten*'s equation of oppression with suffering to the exclusion of any other possibilities of emotion for those it claimed to portray that bothered Özakin. Indeed, she believed that this tendency toward "dualistic vision" was slowly emerging as a "social position." Mocking what she perceived as the New Left's belief to be free of historical guilt, Özakin provocatively queried where the tendency "to think in clichés and rigid categories" could have come from: "From the bureaucracy, the militaristic and hierarchical social structure of the past and a matching school system?" The pitying gaze was equally evident (and maddening), she argued, in the depiction of Turkish women's lives in Germany, as there seemed to prevail an inability to accept that inconsistencies existed in Turkish women's lives (and presumably German lives as well). Pity, as she pondered, might well be "the most high-class form of disdain and contempt," suggesting also that pity, especially if it was the only reaction. "[did] not fundamentally change hierarchies but merely [gave] them a different form."[56]

Similar sentiments from among the Turkish-German intellectual community surfaced in the debate about the amendment of the foreigner law, which, after a decade of fiery debates, finally passed in July 1990. Earlier that year, writers Zafer Senocak and Bülent Tulay responded to the ongoing struggle and published a "Plea to Overcome the Crisis between Orient and Occident." They called for a greater awareness of the lived realities of the second generation of foreigners in Germany and explored how people understood and what, according to authors, actually constituted a multicultural society. For them, it was neither the coexistence of discrete cultures in one country (as some

[56] Aysel Özakin, "Ali hinter den Spiegeln," *Konkret* no. 10 (Oktober 1986), 64-6.

apparently understood the concept) nor was it what others defined as integration but which really resembled assimilation, i.e. the disappearance of any kind of variety among people living in Germany.

They charged that those political camps playing on a general German fear of foreigners benefited from "a general and widespread undifferentiated perspective regarding the foreigners." This was particularly true in the context of a sharp rise in applications of asylum during the 1980s in Germany, a country well know for its until then exceedingly liberal postwar asylum laws. As Senocak and Tulay saw it, "Ironically enough, the leftist perspective [was the conservatives'] mirror image. Whoever decides at the party convention to grant a general right to residence to all foreigners who come [to Germany], neither seems to have been blessed with very good skills of differentiation nor with a keen sense of reality. Vilification and glorification of the foreigner resemble one another [*liegen nah beieinander*], both are defense mechanisms and neither one is grounded in a sense of partnership but instead based on a relationship of power [*Herrschaftsverhältnis*]." As an antidote, the authors encouraged all Turks in Germany to finally speak up, organize, and define themselves, especially the second generation, to get beyond what until then was defined as a "split identity." Rather, "it is exactly in the contradictions of both [Turkish and German] cultures, in the conflict between the modern and the traditional that Turks in Germany can summon creativity that will lead to a particular culture. In the process, one's own

roots are marveled at as something foreign, and the foreign is recognized as belonging to oneself [*als Eigenes wahrgenommen*]."[57]

Part of the current problem seemed to be Germany's past that still existed undigested among people in Germany, or so Senocak and Tulay argued. They believed that the history of Jews in Germany could offer a useful background of experience that had not yet been analyzed and which they believed had to inform the conception of a multicultural Europe.[58] At the same time they wondered if the anti-Semitism as it existed in European history was in danger of being expanded to include "a version of medieval and updated anti-Islamism." According to the writers' observation it seemed to unsettle Germans that German citizens of Turkish background were at the same time German citizens of Muslim faith. Senocak and Tulay then enumerated the qualities of a growing multiculturalism, i.e. the emergence of a specific discourse, "a public conversation that gave a name to the development of hybrid identities and attempted to define their boundaries"[59] At the same time, they openly challenged Germans' own understanding of their identity, not just as participants in a multicultural society at the end of the twentieth century, but also as heirs to a fascist past, a fact that needed to be acknowledged because it continued to inform all aspects of intercultural life in the present.

---

[57] Zafer Senocak and Bülent Tulay, "Ausländische Mitbürger im dreißigsten Jahr der Immigration. 'Hier gilt die Devise: Je fremder, desto gefährlicher,'" *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 17 May 1990.
[58] In the 1990s, parts of the Turkish-German community actually patterned their claims for minority status after Jewish rhetoric and experience. See Gökce Yurdakul, "'We are not Immigrants, We are a Minority': The German-Jewish Trope as a Model for German Turks," paper presented at the CES graduate workshop, Harvard University, 17 April 2004.
[59] Chin, "The Emergence of Multiculturalism," 214-5.

Even if claims from the political conservative camp that left-liberal activists were only using the guestworker debate for their own political goals would have been accurate (and even if leftists themselves often reinforced rather than broke stereotypes about foreigners), the fact that German progressives did side with foreigners helped minorities to pave the way--albeit unevenly and not without conflict--to step out of the shadow of their German defenders. It made possible the beginnings of what so many thought to be an elusive goal: integration, or better, multiculturalism. In 1987, the Berlin daily *tageszeitung* proclaimed "For the first time, a foreigner from the so-called 'guestworker' generation, the 36-year-old Sevim Celebi-Gottschlich, will move into a parlament of the Federal Republic." Granted, Celebi-Gottschlich had not been elected but rotated into the Berlin parliament as a member of the Alternative List, the Berlin version of the Green Party.[60] Still, her arrival could be (and was) read as a political-multicultural milestone. However, those who had previously been the ones espousing that Germany come face to face with its Third Reich history now themselves faced strong criticism about their own shortcoming in doing so. The demand to work through Germany's Nazi past now increasingly emanated from within the ranks of the first and second generation of foreigners in Germany and thereby laid bare

---

[60] "Eine Türkin zieht in das Berliner Parlament ein," *taz--die tageszeitung*, 23 April 1987. Celebi kept her position until 1989. She stayed in politics until at least the 1998 elections, where she ran as an independent, apparently explicitly positioning herself against the Green party candidate in Berlin. For this move, she was officially chastised in an article in a Green Party organ on the importance of the migrant vote. See Özcan Mutlu, "Die Wahlen und die neuen Inländer," *Stachelige Argumente*, 15 October 1998. That Celebi was not in complete harmony with her leftist brethren already became clear in the 1987 *taz* article, when she was quoted as saying, "I am going to show: We are here! And the leftist public has to learn as well not to make the foreigners' decisions for them [*bevormunden*]. They don't like to see that foreigners can handle their own problems self-confidently."

how much of the fascist legacy still remained internalized, unresolved, and misunderstood.

CONCLUSION

MULTICULTURALISM OR *LEITKULTUR*: NO COMMON GROUND?

Over the course of most of the second half of the twentieth century and beyond, the guestworker debate was a vital forum for Germans to process a variety of post-war developments and historical legacies that reached beyond those immediately connected to the employment of foreigners (like economic and infrastructural considerations). Studying this debate has allowed insights into Germany's genealogy of the management of ethnic and cultural difference. It has demonstrated the centrality of gender issues to conflicts over economics and national identity. And it has offered a new vantage point on Germany's changing memory regimes with respect to the Third Reich.

Even though they initially came from European Christian countries like Italy, Spain, and Greece (only much later did the balance tip toward immigrants from non-European Muslim countries), discussions about guestworkers from the first emphasized ethnic and cultural differences that cast doubt on their abilities as workers. By the same token, memories of the Third Reich unabashedly found their way into the earlier debate, mostly as an argument *against* hiring foreigners. In those stories, Germans were depicted as the victims of vengeful forced foreign laborers (who also came from Italy) at the end of the war. While later discussions veered away from such distorted versions of the past, throughout the debate, Germany's fascist legacy reappeared in a number of different guises, both to

bolster and to reject arguments regarding Germany's evolution into an immigration country.

Almost as soon as the economic miracle had taken off and guestworkers had evolved into trusted coworkers, Germans started expressing unease about the fruits of their economic success. It seemed that the meaning of labor, Germans' work ethic, as well as the increasing amount of leisure time available to Germans also caused them to question the consequences the miracle had wrought. Supposedly vacuous values also epitomized in the rising acquisition of consumer goods, but particularly the growing sexual freedoms already in the 1950s and early 1960s caused much anxiety, especially when German women were involved in interethnic relationships with guestworkers. The same was not true, however, in similar relationships between German men and female guestworkers. Rather, initially some commentators actually underscored as an asset foreign women's embracing of Germany's more liberal (sexual) mores, thus freeing themselves from what were perceived to be highly restrictive patriarchal societies. Throughout these debates, Germans were fascinated with what they perceived to be authentic traditional guestworker culture, whose apparent loss was mourned when foreigners showed signs of integration and assimilation of German values and customs. By the same token, however, foreigners' attempts to break out of their traditional niche as semi- and unskilled laborers in the primary sector (as much out of a need to find alternative employment in a climate of economic depression as out of a desire to work more independently) was often ill-received by German commentators for a variety of reasons. Spurred on by the

economic recession of the early 1970s that brought with it the permanent halt in foreign labor recruitment, guestworkers at a growing rate stepped out of their prescribed bounds of employment and thus encroached on "German" territory, both in economic and spatial terms. Moreover, guestworkers' determination to find success in Germany (rather than to return home) also meant that more than ever foreign families joined their breadwinners in Germany. At the same time, the focus of the debate shifted onto non-working foreign wives and mothers, and the supposed dangers they posed to the prospects of integration. In the process, their role as laborers was misremembered and previous assessments about their positive impact on integration seemingly forgotten. In the context of a continuing decline in the German birth rate, guestworkers' supposedly wholesome family life thus emerged as a fact not merely to be admired but also dreaded.

By the 1970s a number of developments converged that made the matter of guestworker employment that much more salient. Driven by the impetus of leftist activism, especially as it created contention within the churches, the marginalization of guestworkers in German society gained ever-greater visibility and was publicly discussed and denounced. The economic downturn in the wake of the oil crisis fueled the already contentious guestworker debate, and finally the increase in--mostly Turkish--in-migration as a corollary to the foreign labor recruitment ban insured the continued visibility of the topic in the public. Taken together, these events explain the increasingly prominent role the debate occupied in West German papers and also helps us comprehend how the press came to define itself as educators and popular mediators in the debate.

Unsurprisingly, then, the debate about the presence of non-German residents in the Federal Republic has been ongoing. The diffuse threat of "foreign infiltration," most commonly understood to express itself in cultural differences that hindered integration and which lingered in the earlier debates about foreigners in Germany, transformed in the 1990 into a threat of fundamentalism and political-religious agitation carried out on German ground.[1] One of the most indicative examples of this focus on the fear of foreign agitation in the Federal Republic was the 1997 *Spiegel* cover story, which proclaimed "Foreigners and Germans: Dangerously Alien," and announced the failure of multiculturalism in Germany. Also feeding the pessimistic outlook were the increasingly frequent clashes between long-time foreign resident youth and the more recently settled ethnic Germans from the former eastern German territories (*Aussiedler*). Aside from the influx of migration from Eastern Europe and Russia, the dynamics of the debate further changed as a result of the dire economic situation in eastern Germany, most horrifyingly manifesting itself in right-wing violence against foreigners.

Anxieties about foreign nationals in Germany were fed by narratives and images such as those proffered in the dramatic *Spiegel* cover story. The image on the issue's cover provided a visual introduction to what the article had to offer, as it showed a woman, the veins in her neck standing out, shouting something while waving a Turkish flag held high in her right hand. As an article in *Süddeutsche Zeitung* later revealed, however, *Spiegel* had completely

[1] Fears about the impact of Koran schools and Turkish political associations in Germany can be seen as precursors to this phenomenon.

misrepresented the Muslim woman as a supporter of Turkish nationalism, when, in fact, she was protesting for greater tolerance after the neo-Nazi arson attacks on the home of a Turkish family in Solingen in 1993 that killed five people.[2]

The lead article itself was equally problematic. Many of the stereotypes first introduced in the early days of the guestworker debate were still very much in evidence: German men were annoyed with Turkish men for hitting on their German girlfriends; the knife was still considered the Turkish weapon of choice (also underscored in the article by an oversized picture focused on a hand holding a knife with a sizeable blade); and Turks in Germany were portrayed as the underclass. The article focused on violence and crime perpetrated by young Turks and *Aussiedler* and declared "ethno-conflicts" as among the major source of problems facing reunified Germany. To bolster its claims about impending disaster and the inevitable clash between East and West, the magazine further cited conservative American scholar Samuel Huntington's *Culture Wars* and also did not shy away from quoting "historian Helmut Kohl" (the former Christian Democratic Chancellor), who revealed that, "'in geography class, I never learned that Anatolia is part of Europe.'" In the article's analysis, Germans were depicted as victims--if they appeared at all. Any broader reflections on German culpability in what *Spiegel* had determined was the failure of multiculturalism were solely confined to an essay by renowned Turkish actress and author Renan Demirkan (who had lived in Germany since the age of seven), as part of a group of short

---

[2] "Gefährlich fremd: Das Ende der multikulturellen Gesellschaft," *Spiegel*, 14 April 1997; Florian Sendtner, "Die geschwärzte Fremde," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 16 May 2000. Both articles are cited in Y. Michal Bodemann, *In den Wogen der Erinnerung. Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland* (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2002), 183 n. 15.

articles complementing the cover story. It was here that the readership learned about the every-day occurrences of racism in Germany, and that many Turks were clinging to what they considered the safety of Turkish identity as a self-protective reaction to an unfriendly German environment; and only here that readers were informed about the systematic discrimination inherent in the legal system that (at this point) denied foreigners dual citizenship and insisted on visas for the children of foreigners in Germany.

The federal elections in 1998, resulting in a victory for the Social Democratic-Green Party coalition (or, as it was also called, the "Red-Green" coalition), ended a sixteen-year period of conservative federal government. Coupled with strong reactions to the tumultuous post-reunification years, the election results reflected as much the strong desire to end the "era Kohl," as they indicated the public's hope that the Red-Green coalition could provide more socio-economic justice for the German populace (and more balance between the eastern and western parts of the country).[3]

In early 1999, in response to the new Red-Green coalition's proposal to change Germany's citizenship laws to allow for dual citizenship, the CDU started a petition campaign in protest. According to the Red-Green coalition, dual citizenship would dispose of one of the biggest hurdles to the integration process in Germany. The conservative petition campaign against the dual citizenship proposal, however, turned out to be a phenomenal success. The Christian Democrats were able to regain the state of Hesse in subsequent elections,

---

[3] See "Fauler Zauber. Rot-Grün und die Magie des Wechsels," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 21 October 1998.

provoking the leftist *tageszeitung* to remark bitterly, "Signature Results in Vote."[4] Not surprisingly, and as critics pointed out, the initiative also fed and even generated anti-foreigner sentiment. Citizens signing the petition and asked what they thought it was for, simply stated that it was "against foreigners." This undifferentiated view brings home how much questions regarding asylum seekers, *Aussiedler*, and long-time foreign residents of Germany were conflated in the imagination of the general public. However, some saw the debate that ensued in the wake of the dual citizenship proposal and the conservative counter reaction as a catalyst leading also to a constructive opening up of the debate within the conservative camp. Even the *tageszeitung* optimistically remarked--while crediting the Greens for this development: "The Greens have achieved more than they could have previously hoped for in the past: the deideologization [*Entideologisierung*] and the objectification [*Versachlichung*] of integration and minority politics."[5]

However, the 2000-01 debate about "dominant culture [*Leitkultur*]" once again raised many familiar specters. Friedrich Merz, then head of the conservative Christian Democratic-Christian Social opposition coalition in parliament, proposed in October 2000 that Germany think about the need to defend *Leitkultur* in light of what he considered the failure of multiculturalism.[6] Those in favor of a *Leitkultur* as a guiding principle for the people living in

---

[4] "Signatur bringt Kreuzchen," *taz--die tageszeitung*, 9 February 1999.
[5] Eberhard Seidel, "Ein grüner Erfolg. Die CDU/CSU will eine neue, sachliche Ausländerpolitik," *taz--die tageszeitung*, 15 December 1999.
[6] Similarly insensitively, Jürgen Rüttgers, then top Christian Democratic candidate in the elections in North-Rhine Westphalia, suggested that rather than start a Green Card program for information technology specialists (badly needed in Germany) from India, Germans should raise their own children to become more technology-savvy. The proposal became know under the rather unfortunately named motto "Kinder statt Inder" (literally: "Children instead of Indians").

Germany defined multiculturalism as separate cultures existing side by side, a description that closely resembled the notion of (and thereby expressed fear about) a German version of "Balkanization." (Apparently no one could imagine defining Multiculturalism in terms of hybridity and a mutually beneficial blending of traditions.) The idea of *Leitkultur* was to defend and celebrate unapologetically the need to make German and European (Christian) culture the "dominant" or "leading" culture in Germany. Liberals and leftists were flabbergasted and an outcry against this conservative proposal ensued even from within the CDU. Yet, in the debate that followed Merz's proposal, it became obvious that, once again, the main political factions agreed more than they disagreed.

On the one hand, the CDU's stance became more moderate. In an article in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Heiner Geißler (CDU), who emerged as one of the most progressive forces among his party's members, proposed as an alternative basis for citizenship and politics the notion of "constitutional patriotism." Adherence to the basic tenets on which the Federal Republic was built should serve as the foundation for all living in Germany.[7] In this sense, he was very much in *agreement* with the defenders of *Leitkultur*--even as his proposal also helpfully detached values from biological heritage. In a letter to the editor of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Bernhard Mihm, a member of the CDU in Frankfurt, conceded that "maybe all the talk about the 'German' *Leitkultur* that should apply to everybody in our country was not precise enough...'Culture' is the sum of all prerequisites needed for a humane co-existence. And so we

[7] Heiner Geißler, "Leitkultur einfordern," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 29 October 2000.

arrive at [*und damit sind wir bei*] the constitution, the Basic Law."[8] Ultimately, when the CDU published is formal position paper on the issue, it defined *Leitkultur* as containing three elements: a willingness to learn the German language; a belief in the tenets of the German Basic Law; and the acceptance of the traditions (as practiced in Germany) of humanism, the enlightenment, and Christianity.[9]

On the other side, and remarkably, members of the SPD and the Green Party proved to be not completely hostile to the idea of *Leitkultur*. Cem Özdemir, Germany's first elected Turkish member of parliament, for example declared, "'Everybody talks about the Basic Law...When one looks beyond [*wegläßt*] the inflammatory rhetoric, we [both sides of the political spectrum] are not that far apart [in our opinions]."[10] Ultimately, and not least under the impact of political reconfiguration in the wake of 11 September 2001 and the emerging global war on terror, the *Leitkultur* debate petered out. And yet, the concept remains an important reference point in German cultural debates.

Meanwhile, one of the most contentious elements of Germany's foreigner politics--German citizenship law--has actually seen a number of revisions over the years, even if those revisions always constituted major compromises and provoked complaints from all political parties. Before 1992, citizenship was still dependent on cultural assimilation (familiarity with German customs and the

---

[8] Bernhard Mihm, "Leserbrief: Leitkultur einfordern," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 29 October 2000.
[9] See Jens König and Severin Weiland, "Im Zweifel für die Leitkultur," *tageszeitung*, 7 November 2000.
[10] "'Leitkultur'-Debatte als Schritt in Richtung Einwanderungsgesetz gewürdigt," *Welt am Sonntag*, 5 November 2000.

German language, for example) and happened at the state's discretion; each application was examined on a case-by-case basis, in terms of the applicant's economic situation, cultural orientation and crime record. After 1992, assimilation was simply deduced from an applicant's length of residence, for all intents and purposes being eliminated as a criterion of one's being granted citizenship. What was happening, in short, was a shift from an ethno-cultural understanding of nationhood to one based along civic-territorial lines.[11] The latest revisions to the citizenship law came in January 2000, when Germany finally added the law of territory (*ius solis*) to the law of blood (*ius sanguinis*) in determining citizenship. Children born in Germany to foreign parents who have been legal residents in Germany for at least eight years, now automatically get dual citizenship (that of Germany as well as that of their parents' country of origin). However, by age twenty-three they have to decide what nationality they want to keep. Thus, dual citizenship was, finally, partially granted, but--as the ongoing debates show--has not pacified either left-liberals (who had proposed the possibility of permanent dual citizenship) or conservatives. Furthermore, since the late 1990s, German politicians have also been debating a new law on in-migration (*Zuwanderungsgesetz*)--the German term itself expressing ambivalence, as *Zuwanderung* is still one step removed from actual *Einwanderung* (immigration). Significantly, one-time Green party member, now Social Democratic Minister of the Interior, Otto Schily, had already proclaimed in a 1998 interview that even if Germany were to consider a new immigration law, "the migration commission

[11] See Christian Joppke, "How Immigration is Changing Citizenship: A Comparative View," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 no. 4 (July 1999): 629-52.

would have to set the migration quota at zero. Through in-migration, Germany's capacity limits have already been exceeded."[12] Once again, there was more consensus than one might think.

The dual impulses informing Germany's relationship to its ethnic minorities--a gradual acceptance of different cultures and a feeling of "normality" regarding the presence of long-time foreign members of Germany's society, but also the continued agonizing over the fact that they are *not* Germans, exhibited in their appearance or passport--continue unabated. Most recently, for example, Hamburg-born filmmaker of Turkish descent, Fatih Akin, won the "Golden Bear" at the 2004 Berlinale, an annual international film festival taking place in Berlin. Set in Hamburg and Istanbul, his movie *Against the Wall* depicts the story of a young German woman of Turkish descent who marries an older fellow Turkish countryman. Despite this seemingly standard "guestworker" story, Akin expressed hope that the award would ensure that his films would now be able to transcend the niche traditionally occupied by Turkish-German movies.[13] Moreover, Turkish-German Green Party member Özdemir stumbled over something as banal as the illicit use of frequent flyer miles earned on the job, which prompted his resignation, and which even managed to push aside the fact that--only shortly before--it had become known that he had taken a credit from one of the most powerful lobbyists in Germany--a net, in which other German politicians had gotten tangled up as well. His ethnicity never became an issue in either scandal.

---

[12] "Der Rechtsextremismus ist die größte Gefahr," *Der Tagesspiegel*, 15 November 1998.
[13] See Holger Mehlig, "So sehen Gewinner aus," *Spiegel Online*, 15 February 2004, http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/kino/0,1518,286519,00.html.

However, part of the ongoing problem is that Germans still have difficulty accepting as German those with different original national heritage, even if they are German citizens, especially if their cultural ties originate in non-Western, non-Christian countries. As Aness Yacoubi, a German Muslim of Tunisian descent, reflecting on his very good experiences working with both Jews and non-Jews at the Washington D.C. Holocaust Museum, observes, "I find particularly positive that the Americans, in contrast to the Germans, see me as German. In Germany I am always considered a Tunisian. It is true that the Tunisian culture is important to me, but I am not Tunisian. That's what irritates me about Germany. I can do what I want, [to the Germans] I am and will always remain a Tunisian."[14] Germany's seeming (and lasting) difficulty, then, to embrace its de-facto multicultural society coupled with its ongoing antagonistic relationship to its past--a past, which, as Auschwitz survivor Theodore (Zev) Weiss recently remarked, "just doesn't go away, whether you like it or not"--therefore continues to inform the management of difference within its borders.[15]

[14] See Aness Yacoubi, "Ich will zur Verständigung zwischen Juden und Moslems beitragen," essay included in a fundraising letter of the *Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste e.V.* (an organization committed to fostering German-Jewish reconciliation), March 2004.
[15] Theodore (Zev) Weiss speaking to the course at Michigan State University on The History of the Holocaust, 28 April 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bade, Klaus J. *Deutsche im Ausland--Fremde in Deutschland.* München: C.H.Beck, 1992.

———. *Europa in Bewegung. Migration vom späten 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart.* München: C. H. Beck, 2000.

Ballerstedt, Eike, et al. "Arbeitspotential und Erwerbstbevölkerung." In *Soziologischer Almanach.* Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1977.

Beier, Rosmarie, ed. *Aufbau West Aufbau Ost. Die Planstädte Wolfsburg und Eisenhüttenstadt in der Nachkriegszeit.* Ostfildern-Ruit: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1997.

Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner. "Sex in Public." *Critical Inquiry* 24 no. 2 (Winter 1998): 548-53.

Bodemann, Y. Michal. *In den Wogen der Erinnerung. Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland.* München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2002.

Brinker-Gabler, Gisela and Sidonie Smith eds. *Writing New Identities: Gender, Nation, and immigration in Contemporary Europe.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Brumlik, Micha, and Claus Leggewie. "Konturen der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: Nationale Identität, Multikulturalismus und 'Civil Society.'" in *Deutsche im Ausland--Fremde in Deutschland. Migration in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, edited by Klaus Bade, 430-42. München: C.H. Beck, 1992.

Bundesanstalt für Arbeit. *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung--Erfahrungsbericht 1969. Ergebnisse der Repräsentativ-Untersuchung vom Herbst 1968.* Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1970.

———. *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung. Erfahrungsbericht 1970.* Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1971.

———. *Ausländische Arbeitnehmer. Beschäftigung, Anwerbung, Vermittlung. Erfahrungsbericht 1971.* Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1972.

———. *Repräsentativuntersuchung '72 über die Beschäftigung ausländischer Arbeitnehmer im Bundesgebiet und ihre Familien- und Wohnverhältnisse.* Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 1972.

Chin, Rita. "Imagining a German Multiculturalism: Aras Ören and the Contested Meanings of the 'Guest worker,' 1955-1980." *Radical History Review* 83 (Spring 2002): 44-72.

Dominik, Katja et al, eds. *Angeworben--eingewandert--abgeschoben. Ein anderer Blick auf die Einwanderungsgesellschaft Bundesrepublik Deutschland.* Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 1999.

Dunkel, Franziska, and Gabriella Stramaglia-Faggion. *'Für 50 Mark einen Italiener,' Zur Geschichter der Gastarbeiter in München.* München: Buchendorfer Verlag, 2000.

Esser, Hartmut. "Gastarbeiter." in *Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Geschichte in 3 Bänden. Gesellschaft* edited by Wolfgang Benz. Frankfurt: M. Fischer, 1983.

Fehrenbach, Heide. *After the Racial State.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005, forthcoming.

Fennell, Barbara A. *Language, Literature and the Negotiation of Identity.* Chapel Hill, London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Fischer, Sabine and Moray McGowan. "From *Pappkoffer* to Pluralism," in *Writing Across Worlds. Literature and Migration*, edited by Russel King, John Connell, and Paul White, 39-56. New York: Routledge, 1995.

———, eds. *Denn Du Tanzt auf einem Seil. Positionen deutschsprachiger MigrantInnenliteratur.* Tübingen: Stauffenberg, 1997.

Friedrichsmeyer, Sara, Sara Lennox and Susanne Zantop. *The Imperialist Imagination. German Colonialism and Its Legacy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Grossmann, Atina. "A Question of Silence: The Rape of German Women and Occupation of Soldiers." *October* 72 (Spring 1995): 43-63.

Hall, Stuart. "Encoding, Decoding." In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Simon During, 507-17. New York: Routledge, 1993.

———. "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms." In *Culture/Power/History*, edited by Nicolas Dirks et al., 520-38. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Herbert, Ulrich. "Apartheid nebenan." *"Die Jahre, man weiß nichts, wo man die heute hinsetzen soll." Faschismus-Erfahrungen im Ruhrgebiet*, edited by Lutz Niethammer, 233-66. Bonn: J. H. W. Dietz, 1986.

———. *A History of Foreign Labor in Germany, 1880-1980.* Ann Arbor: University of Ann Arbor Press, 1990.

———. *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge.* München: C. H. Beck, 2000.

———, ed. *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland. Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945-1980.* Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2002.

———. "Liberalisierung als Lernprozeß. Die Bundesrepublik in der deutschen Geschichte--eine Skizze." In *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland. Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945-1980*, 7-49. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2002.

Herbert, Ulrich, and Karin Hunn. "Guest Workers and Policy on Guest Workers in the Federal Republic: From the Beginning of Recruitment in 1955 Until Its Halt in 1973." In *The Miracle Years. A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949-1968*, edited by Hanna Schissler, 187-218. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Herrmann, Helga. "Ausländer am Arbeitsplatz." *Informationen zur politischen Bildung* 237 (4. Quartal 1992): 12-15.

Herzog, Dagmar. "Desperately Seeking Normality: Sexuality and Marriage in the Wake of the War." In *Life After Death. Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s*, edited by Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann, 161-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

———. *Sex After Fascism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005, forthcoming.

Hodenberg, Christina von. "Die Journalisten und der Aufbruch zur kritischen Öffentlichkeit." In *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland. Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945-1980*, edited by Ulrich Herbert, 278-311. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2002.

———. "Konkurrierende Konzepte von Öffentlichkeit in der Orientierungskrise der 60er Jahre." In *Demokratisierung und gesellschaftlicher Aufbruch*, edited by Matthias Frese, Julia Paulus, and Karl Teppe, 205-26. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2003.

Höhn, Maria. *GIs and Fräuleins. The German-American Encounter in 1950s West Germany.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Horrocks, David and Eva Kolinsky. *Turkish Culture in German Society Today.* Providence, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996.

Hunn, Karin. "Kulturelle Begegnungen zwischen Konflikt und Synthese. Anmerkungen zur Geschichte der Einwanderung aus der Türkei." Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Online Akademie: www.fes-online-akademie.download/pdf/Hunn.pdf. Downloaded 21 March 2004.

Institut für Sozialforschung und Sozialwirtschaft e.V. *Situationsanalyse nichterwerbstätiger Ehefrauen ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.* Bonn: Bundesministerium für Jugend, Familie und Gesundheit, 1977.

Jamin, Mathilde. "Fremde Heimat. Zur Geschichte der Arbeitsmigration aus der Türkei." In *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, edited by Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald, 145-64. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

Jamin, Mathilde, and A. Eryilmaz. *Fremde Heimat. Eine Geschichte der Einwanderung aus der Türkei.* Essen: Klartext Verlag, 1998.

Joppke, Christian. "How Immigration is Changing Citizenship: A Comparative View." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 no. 4 (1999): 629-52.

Klee, Ernst. *Die Nigger Europas. Zur Lage der Gastarbeiter.* Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1971.

———. "'Beschwichtigen und Betreuen.' Zielsetzung und Terminologie der caritativen Verbände." In *Gastarbeiter. Analysen und Berichte.* 9-23. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1972.

———, ed. *Gastarbeiter. Analysen und Berichte.* Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1972.

König, Karen. *Tschador, Ehre und Kulturkonflikt. Veränderungsprozesse türkischer Frauen und Mädchen durch die Emigration und ihre soziokulturellen Folgen.* Frankfurt/Main: Verlag für interkulturelle Kommunikation, 1989.

König, Peter, Günther Schultze and Rita Wessel. *Situation der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen in der Bundesrepublik. Repräsentativuntersuchung '80* . Bonn: Der Bundesminister für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, 1981.

Kromschröder, Gerhard. *Als ich ein Türke war.* Frankfurt: Eichborn, 1983.

Kuhn, Anna. "Bourgeois Ideology and the (Mis)Reading of Günter Wallraff's *Ganz Unten*." *New German Critique* no. 46 (Winter 1989): 191-202.

Kunkel, Klaus. "*Die Deutschen halten uns für blöd...*"*Was Gastarbeiterfamilien wünschen--wie sie leben, wohnen und arbeiten, wie sie einkaufen und wie sie informiert sein wollen.* Köln: Informedia Verlags-GmbH, 1975.

Lennox, Sarah. "Divided Feminism: Women, Racism, and German National Identity." *German Studies Review* 18 no. 3 (October 1995): 481-502.

Lorbeer, Marie, and Beat Wild, eds. *Menschenfresser--Negerküsse. Das Bild vom Fremden im Alltag.* Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1991.

Lutz, Helma. "Rassismus und Sexismus, Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten." In *"Ein Herrenvolk von Untertanen": Rassimus, Nationalismus, Sexismus*, edited by Andreas Foitzik, Rudolf Leiprech, Athansios Marvakis, Uwe Seid, 57-79. Duisburg: DISS, 1992.

Mandel, Ruth. "Turkish Headscarves and the 'Foreigner Problem': Constructing Difference Through Emblems of Identity." *New German Critique* no 46 (Winter 1989): 27-46.

Mattes, Monika. "Zum Verhältnis von Migration und Geschlecht. Anwerbung und Beschäftigung von 'Gastarbeiterinnen' in der Bundesrepublik 1960-1973." In *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, edited by Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald, 285-309. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

Mehrländer, Ursula. *Situation der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen in der Bundesrepublik. Repräsentativuntersuchung '85.* Bonn: Der Bundesminister für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, 1986.

Moch, Leslie Page. *Moving Europeans. Migration in Western Europe since 1650.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.

Moeller, Robert G. "Remembering the War in a Nation of Victims. West German Pasts in the 1950s." In *The Miracle Years. A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949-1968*, edited by Hanna Schissler, 83-109. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Motte, Jan, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald. "50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung." In *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, edited by Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald, 15-28. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

———, eds. *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung. Nachkriegsgeschichte als Migrationsgeschichte*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

Minai, Naila. *Women in Islam*. New York: Seaview Books, 1981.

Naiman, Eric. *Sex in Public. The Incarnation of Early Soviet Ideology*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Oswald, Anne von. "'Venite a lavorare con la Volkswagen!' 'Gastarbeiter' in Wolfsburg 1962-1974." In *Aufbau West Aufbau Ost. Die Planstädte Wolfsburg und Eisenhüttenstadt in der Nachkriegszeit*, edited by Rosmarie Beier, 199-209. Ostfildern-Ruit: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1997.

Oswald, Anne von, and Barbara Schmidt. "'Nach Schichtende sind sie immer in ihr Lager zurückgekehrt...' Leben in 'Gastarbeiter'-Unterkünften in den sechziger und siebziger Jahren." In *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, edited by Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald, 184-214. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

Oswald, Anne von, Karen Schönwälder and Barbara Sonnenberger. "Labour Migration, Immigation Policy, Integration: A Re-evaluation of the West German Experience." *Studi emigrazione* 38, no. 141 (2001): 115-129.

Pagenstecher, Cord. "Die 'Illusion'der Rückkehr. Zur Mentalitätsgeschichte von 'Gastarbeit' und Einwanderung." *Soziale Welt* 2 (1996): 149-79.

Pölzl, Konrad. "Sozialarbeit der Caritas für Arbeitsmigranten im letzten Viertel des Jahrhunderts." In *caritas '99: Jahrbuch des Deutschen Caritasverbandes*, 173-85. Freiburg: Deutscher Caritas Verband, 1998.

Redaktion diskus, ed. *Die freundliche Zivilgesellschaft. Rassismus und Nationalismus in Deutschland*. Berlin: Edition ID-Archiv, 1992.

Rieker, Yvonne. "Südländer, Ostagenten oder Westeuropäer? Die Politik der Bundesregierung und das Bild der italienischen Gastarbeiter, 1955-1970." *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 40 (2000): 231-58.

———. "Annäherungen an eine zweite Heimat. Die italienische Arbeitsmigration in die Bundesrepublik Deutschland." *Forum Industriekdenkmalpflege und Geschichtskultur* 2 (2002): 51-4.

———. *"Ein Stück Heimat findet man ja immer."Die italienische Einwanderung in die Bundesrepublik*. Essen: Klartext, 2003.

Rist, Ray C. *Guestworkers in Germany. The Prospects for Pluralism.* New York, London: Praeger, 1978.

Sarcinelli, Ulrich. "Massenmedien und Politikvermittlung--Eine Problem- und Forschungsanalyse." In *Medien und Politik*, edited by Gerhard W. Wittkämper, 37-62. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.

Schiffauer, Werner. "Die Gewalt der Ehre." *Kursbuch* no. 62 (December 1980): 1-16.

———. *Gewalt und Ehre. Erklärungen zu einem türkisch-deutschen Sexualkonflikt.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983.

Schildt, Axel. *Ankunft im Westen. Ein Essay zur Erfolgsgeschichte der Bundesrepublik.* Frankfurt: Fischer, 1999.

Schissler, Hanna, ed. *The Miracle Years. A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949-1968.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Schönwälder, Karen. 'Ist nur Lieberalisierung Fortschritt?' Zur Entstehung des ersten Ausländergesetzes des Bundesrepublik. In *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik--50 Jahre Einwanderung*, edited by Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, and Anne von Oswald, 127-44. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1999.

———. *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralisierung. Politische Entscheidungen und öffentliche Debatten in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik von den 1950er bis zu den* 1970er Jahren. Essen: Klartext, 2001.

Schudson, Michael. *The Power of News.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

———. *Sociology of News.* New York: Norton, 2003.

Seidel-Pielen, Eberhard. *Unsere Türken.* Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1995.

Seyhan, Azade. "Introduction." *New German Critique* no. 46 (Winter 1989): 3-9.

Statistisches Jahrbuch der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. 1981

Türkei-Program der Körber-Stiftung. *Religion--ein deutsch-türkisches Tabu?* Hamburg: Körber-Stiftung, 1997.

Vielvölkerstaat Bundesrepublik. Kursbuch no. 62 (December 1980).

Wolf-Almanasreh, Rosi. "Dreißigjähriges Jubiläum der IAF. Festakt der IAF-Initiativgruppe München am 8. September 2002."

http:www.almanasreh.de/IAF%20Muenchen%2030jaehriges%20Jubilaeum.rtf, downloaded 17 August 2003.

Zelizer, Barbie. *Covering the Body. The Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992.

Newspapers and Magazines Cited

Aachener Nachrichten

Abendpost

Augsburger Allgemeine

Augsburger Illustrierte

Badische Zeitung

Bayern-Kurier

Berliner Morgenpost

Bild

Caritas

Christ und Welt

Deutsche Tagespost

Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung

Deutsches Allgemeines Sonntagsblatt

Echo der Zeit

Europa-Union

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung

Frankfurter Neue Presse

Frankfurter Rundschau

Freie Presse, Bielefeld

General-Anzeiger

Hamburger Abendblatt

Handelsblatt

Hannoversche Allgemeine

Hannoversche Presse

Industriekurier

Ketteler Wacht

Kieler Nachrichten

Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger

Kölnische Rundschau

Lübecker Nachrichten

Main-Post

Mannheimer Morgen

Mittag

Münchner Merkur

National-Zeitung

Neue Rhein-und-Ruhr-Zeitung

Nürnberger Nachrichten

Nürnberger Nachrichten

Oberbayrisches Volksblatt

Passauer Neue Presse

Rheinische Post

Rheinischer Merkur

Rheinpfalz, Die

Rhein-Zeitung

Ruhr-Nachrichten

Saarbrücker Landeszeitung

Saarbrücker Zeitung

Schwarzwälder Bote

Sonntagsblatt

Spiegel, Der

Stern

Stuttgarter Nachrichten

Stuttgarter Zeitung

Süddeutsche Zeitung

Südwest-Presse

Tag, Der

Tagesspiegel

Vorwärts

Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung

Welt der Arbeit

Welt, Die

Weser-Kurier

Westdeutsche Rundschau

Westfälische Rundschau

Wiesbadener Kurier

Zeit, Die