

Introduction

Eren Keskin was born in 1960, one year before representatives from the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the Republic of Turkey signed the bilateral labor contract that would change the course of his life. Thirty-three years later, in a bar in the Berlin district of Wedding, he sat across the table from a German historian to tell her his story of the intervening years. His parents had seen the recently signed contract as an opportunity to improve their family's financial situation, and became two of the eventual hundreds of thousands of Turkish *Gastarbeiter*, or guest workers, who moved to the Federal Republic to work for West German companies. Young Eren, however, was initially left behind and spent most of his childhood in the family's small home village in rural Turkey. At age thirteen, his parents brought him to live with them in West Berlin. Although he described that transition as a "trauma," the teenaged Keskin was quickly distracted by the excitement of living in a big city. But the veneer, he told the historian, soon wore off, and at age sixteen he was already working to earn money for his family. By twenty-two, Keskin had married and started his own family, later becoming the owner of the small *Kneipe* (pub) where the interview was taking place.

But Keskin was not interested in talking about his experiences as an immigrant or his success as a business owner. Instead he focused on changes in his neighborhood that made him uneasy. His neighborhood of Sparrplatz, in Wedding's Sprengelkiez quarter, had been more ethnically mixed when he was younger, and he had known all of his neighbors. In the last few years, though, the population had become majority Turkish. There used to be a lot of work before the Wall fell, Keskin explained to the German interviewer, but when the Wall came down, unemployment shot up. And people from the East work for cheap! To add to it, most of the kids that hang out at the park across from his business, Keskin complained, are doing drugs. Despite these changes, however, he insisted that "we are satisfied with Sparrplatz."

The clatter of games in the background abated slightly as some of his customers paused to give their own opinions. One patron contended that

2 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

the kids were doing drugs because they didn't have any work; another blamed the drug use on boredom. Keskin agreed that unemployment, boredom, and drug use were connected, but no one could agree which was the cause and which the effect. Talk shifted to asylum seekers – Germany needs to tell them, “We're full,” Keskin posited, but they can't because of *Menschenrechte* (human rights). At this point in the discussion, apparently wanting to bring the conversation back to the men's own experiences, the interviewer interjected a question: What about getting German citizenship? Keskin replied dismissively, “Ha! We have black heads, and everyone knows that we're not Germans. You know?”¹

The interview with Keskin and the debate among his customers provide a revealing snapshot of the complex and often conflicting forces at play in the settlement of Turkish immigrants and their children in West German society. In one moment, he expresses sentiments common among many former West Germans in the wake of reunification, while in the next, he sets himself unequivocally outside that community. What does it say about the situation of the Turkish population in Germany that a man like Keskin, after twenty years of living in the country, could simultaneously feel himself to be both a part of and apart from that society? How did that conflicted sense of belonging come about? That question is the focus of this book. In the pages that follow, I examine the history of first-generation Turkish immigrants and their children in the Federal Republic of Germany, primarily from Turkey's inclusion in the guest worker program in 1961 to German reunification in 1990. In particular, I explore the ways they experienced and constructed belonging in the course of their daily lives in order to better understand the complicated and dynamic process we call integration.

The formation of a Turkish minority population in Germany began as a consequence of postwar labor policy in the Federal Republic. During the rebuilding efforts after the Second World War, the West German government began in 1955 to enter into a series of temporary labor contracts with southern and southeastern European countries. The migrant workers came to be called *Gastarbeiter*, or “guest workers,” both to distinguish them from the term *Fremdarbeiter* (foreign workers), most recently used by the Nazi regime, as well as to emphasize the intended temporary nature of their stay.² The majority of these migrant laborers

¹ Eren Keskin (pseudonym), “Wirt einer Kneipe am Sparrplatz”, interview with Ursula Trüper, audiocassette, side A, “Die Leute vom Sparrplatz” Ausstellung (DLSA), Mitte Museum Archiv (MMA), Berlin, 1993.

² The term *Gastarbeiter* was the result of a radio contest held to find a different name for these new foreign workers. See Ernst Klee, “Ein neues Wort für Gastarbeiter” in Ernst Klee, ed., *Gastarbeiter: Analysen und Berichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981), 149–157.

worked in semiskilled or unskilled positions in industry, manufacturing, and agriculture; lived in dormitory or barrack-style housing; and intended to return to their homes after completing their term of service or accumulating a certain amount of savings. Historians such as Ulrich Herbert and Klaus Bade have shown how the *Gastarbeiter* program built on preexisting patterns of foreign labor employment, including the types of work for which migrant workers were hired, the areas of the country where they were employed, and the social and political separation of native Germans and foreign laborers.³ More recently, scholarship has uncovered startling similarities between Nazi Germany's and the Federal Republic's treatment of foreign workers, including the methods of transportation used to bring workers to Germany and the vocabulary West Germans used to describe those "transports."⁴ These studies have begun the critical work of integrating the postwar labor program and its resultant ethnic minority communities into the broader narrative of German history, an effort this book continues.⁵ Yet this earlier historical scholarship has primarily approached postwar immigration from a German perspective, a focus heavily influenced by its German-language sources and reflected in the questions asked of these sources. In addition, these earlier studies often conceived of the guest worker program as "a history of men," discussing women almost solely in connection with later family reunification.⁶ As we will see in the coming

³ See Ulrich Herbert, *A History of Foreign Labor in Germany, 1880–1980: Seasonal Workers, Forced Laborers, Guest Workers*. Translated by William Templer (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 211–253; Klaus Bade, ed., *Auswanderer-Wanderarbeiter-Gastarbeiter: Bevölkerung, Arbeitsmarkt und Wanderung in Deutschland seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 1984); Klaus Bade, *Europa in Bewegung: Migration vom späten 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2000), 314–330.

⁴ Jennifer Miller, "On Track for West Germany: Turkish 'Guest-worker' Rail Transportation to West Germany in the Postwar Period," *German History* 30, no. 4 (December 2012): 528–549.

⁵ On the need to locate the history of postwar immigrants to Germany within German history, see Konrad H. Jarausch, "Unsettling German Society: Mobility and Migration," in Konrad H. Jarausch and Michael Geyer, eds., *Shattered Past: Reconstructing German History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003): 197–220.

⁶ 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 Hanna Schissler, ed., *The Miracle Years: A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949–1968* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 199. Here, Herbert and Hunn are specifically addressing the 1960s, arguing that more than two-thirds of participants in the guest worker program in 1962 were single men. While true, this position overlooks the fact that even in the 1960s and especially in Berlin, women were actively recruited by West German companies, and that, by 1962, there were already approximately 220,000 *Gastarbeiterinnen* (female guest workers) in the Federal Republic. See Monika Mattes, "*Gastarbeiterinnen*" in der Bundesrepublik: Anwerbepolitik, Migration, und Geschlecht in den 50er bis 70er Jahren (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2005), 9. More recent scholarship, such as Jennifer Miller's study mentioned in note 4, work to correct this incomplete perspective of the guest worker program.

4 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

chapters, West German companies recruited both male and female guest workers, all of whom played an active role in shaping their work and living environments.

In 1961, when construction of the Wall halted the flood of people pouring in from East Germany, the Federal Republic looked to Turkey for labor, and thousands of Turks took advantage of the opportunity, becoming the largest national group of guest workers in the country by 1972. As Karin Hunn has demonstrated, German and Turkish migration politics; the state of, interests, and actions of business; and the attitudes of German society as well as Turkish immigrants all affected the shape and character of Turkish participation in the program and experiences in West Germany.⁷ Although many early Turkish guest workers returned home after a stint in West Germany,⁸ increasing numbers of these migrant laborers began renewing their work and residence permits and bringing their families from Turkey to live with them.⁹ Due to their larger numbers and to Germans' perceptions of them as particularly "foreign" culturally, Turks became more visible and controversial than any of the other *Gastarbeiter* groups.

This important development coincided with two others in the history of the *Gastarbeiter* program. First, by the early 1970s, family reunification prompted many in West Germany to realize that these so-called guest workers were transforming into immigrants. Second, the global oil crisis of 1973 and the resulting economic downturn gave West German politicians, already considering the possibility, a clear opportunity to stop recruitment for the *Gastarbeiter* program.¹⁰ That action had the opposite effect to the one intended; seeing the waning opportunity to return to West Germany to work at a later point, many guest workers – and especially Turks – responded by bringing their families to live with them and settling into established multigenerational immigrant communities. Whereas earlier scholarship argued that, until after 1973,¹¹ the Federal

⁷ Karin Hunn, "Nächstes Jahr kehren wir zurück...": Die Geschichte der türkischen "Gastarbeiter" in der Bundesrepublik (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2005), 21.

⁸ Brian Joseph-Keyser Miller, "Reshaping the Turkish Nation-State: The Turkish-German Guest Worker Program and Planned Development, 1961–1985," (PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 2015), 165–203.

⁹ In Chapter 1, we will see how West German companies, contrary to the initial aims and stipulations of the guest worker agreements, facilitated and encouraged renewal of work and residency contracts in order to retain their now-trained workforce.

¹⁰ Herbert and Hunn, "Guest Workers and Policy on Guest Workers in the Federal Republic," 187–218; Marcel Berlinghoff, *Das Ende der "Gastarbeit": Europäische Anwerbestops 1970–1974* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2013).

¹¹ See Herbert, *A History of Foreign Labor in Germany, 193–254*; Stephen Castles, "Migrants and Minorities in Post-Keynesian Capitalism: The German Case," in Malcolm Cross, ed., *Ethnic Minorities and Industrial Change in Europe and North America* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 36–54.

Republic did little to nothing to help guest workers and their families integrate into West German society, more recent studies, including this one, demonstrate that what might have been the case on the federal level was not uniformly consistent on the city level. Sarah Hackett's comparison of the city-state of Bremen with Britain's Newcastle upon Tyne reveals authorities in that West German city (as well as the British one) were actively concerned with the integration of their growing population of foreign residents long before the official recruitment halt in the early 1970s.¹²

The growth of substantial ethnic minority populations, a direct consequence of the *Gastarbeiter* program, contributed to two major developments in postwar Germany and Europe more broadly than this book addresses. First, it has spurred debate and examination of dominant political and cultural identities. In the case of the Federal Republic, cultural and intellectual interventions of minority-background writers have compelled a significant rethinking of that perennial and problematic question, "What is German?" Historian Rita Chin's groundbreaking book *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany* examines the formative role of minority elites in this debate, and is critical to our understanding of the political and cultural history of the guest worker question. In particular, it explores the postwar histories of concepts such as integration, multiculturalism, and German identity.¹³ Yet, with its focus on cultural elites, Chin's study does not give us a clear picture of the extent to which the lives of "ordinary" Germans, immigrants, and second-generation youth matched these ideological debates. Nor does it explore how those without access in wider realms of discourse and power — a situation shared by the majority of Turkish immigrants and their

¹² Sarah Hackett, *Foreigners, Minorities and Integration: The Muslim Immigrant Experience in Britain and Germany* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2016), 9–10.

¹³ Rita Chin, *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Similarly, Alexander Clarkson has written an excellent book on interactions between homeland-oriented immigrant activists and the West German state during the Cold War, which argues, in part, that such activism was "at the core of this process of community building, adaptation and paradoxically, integration" (186). Clarkson demonstrates how collective action and building networks with the West German government worked to both integrate immigrant activists within West German political spaces and prompt the FRG to engage with the idea and reality of diversity. Yet such activists, as with the cultural elites of Chin's work, represented a minority within West Germany's immigrant population. In addition, the large immigrant communities formed as a result of the guest worker program arguably forced the West German state to deal with issues of diversity, and the long-term implications of that diversity for German identity and society, to a greater and more lasting extent. See Alexander Clarkson, *Fragmented Fatherland: Immigration and Cold War Conflict in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1945–1980* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2015).

6 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

children – shaped understandings of belonging in their own spheres of influence. In this sense, what I am doing here is shifting the focus from broader level debates about belonging to the more mundane efforts to construct it, and thereby demonstrating the agency of “ordinary” individuals in and the importance of everyday life to that process.

The debates surrounding German identity and the meaning of integration have taken on a particularly sharp tone in regard to perceived cultural differences stemming from the fact that the majority of people of Turkish background in Germany identify as Muslim. In retrospect, it is somewhat surprising to us now that both the West German and Turkish governments gave the religious lives of Turkish guest workers so little thought. Partly as a consequence of this oversight, practicing Muslims initially observed their religious duties relatively informally and largely outside the attention of the broader West German public. Then, in the 1970s, two developments dramatically influenced the character and perception of the Turkish immigrant community and, in particular, its Muslim members: the *Anwerbestopp* (recruitment halt) and the Iranian Revolution. The halt of the guest worker program in 1973 and the regulations on foreign residency that followed had the unintended consequence of speeding up the rate of family reunification among guest workers who decided to stay in West Germany. Now a growing multi-generational community with more diverse social, cultural, and religious needs, Turkish immigrants, including observant Muslims, became a more visible presence in local neighborhoods and schools.

The Iranian Revolution and the founding of the Islamic Republic were international events with distinct domestic ramifications in the Federal Republic. What began as a series of protests against the rule of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi in the fall of 1977 grew into a full-scale revolution that ended in his ouster in January 1979. Although the participants in the revolution had come from diverse religious and political backgrounds, the new government that assumed control instituted a theocratic state that strictly regulated all areas of life based on its fundamentalist interpretation of Islamic law. News coverage of these events shocked the Western world and gave Islam a revolutionary political character that caused great unease. West German politicians and media, and by extension the West German public, started to look at their local Muslim communities with new and increasingly suspicious eyes, imagining the radicalism they witnessed in Iran flourishing in Turkish immigrant mosques.¹⁴

¹⁴ I will address the role of the West German media in the construction of Muslim identities in Chapter 5.

In this environment, family reunification and the seeming hostility of West Germans toward Turkish immigrants contributed to an increasing importance of Islam among elements of the immigrant community¹⁵, and feelings of insecurity prompted some parents to emphasize more conservative religious and cultural values that reinforced a patriarchal family structure.¹⁶ Yet, just as the presence of ethnic minority communities have prompted Germans to reconsider their national and cultural identity, so, too, has immigration to and settlement in West Germany led Turkish and Turkish-German Muslims to reexamine what it means to be Muslim, particularly in the European context.¹⁷

Critical to these identity-based debates is the issue of gender.¹⁸ From the inception of the guest worker program, gender played an important role both in the motivation for employing foreign laborers and the types of work given to male and female *Gastarbeiter*.¹⁹ Earlier scholarly attention to first-generation working migrant women found that their participation

¹⁵ See Andreas Goldberg, “Islam in Germany,” in Shireen T. Hunter, ed., *Islam, Europe’s Second Religion: The New Social, Cultural and Political Landscape* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002), 30–47; Yasemin Karakaşoğlu, “Turkish Cultural Orientations in Germany and the Role of Islam,” in David Horrocks and Eva Kolinsky, eds., *Turkish Culture in German Society Today* (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1996), 157–179.

¹⁶ See Shireen Hunter, ed., *Islam, Europe’s Second Religion: The New Social, Cultural and Political Landscape* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002); Barbara Freyer Stowasser, “The Turks in Germany: From Sojourners to Citizens,” in Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad, ed., *Muslims in the West: From Sojourners to Citizens* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2002); Dursun Tan and Hans-Peter Waldhoff, “Turkish Everyday Culture in Germany and Its Prospects,” in *Turkish Culture in German Society Today*, eds. David Horrocks and Eva Kolinsky (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1996).

¹⁷ Peter P. Mandaville, “Muslim Youth in Europe,” in Shireen Hunter, ed., *Islam, Europe’s Second Religion: The New Social, Cultural, and Political Landscape* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002), 219–229; Ruth Mandel, *Cosmopolitan Anxieties: Turkish Challenges to Citizenship and Belonging in Germany* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

¹⁸ Scholars such as Helma Lutz and Nira Yuval-Davis have stressed the importance of gender as a category of analysis in migration and ethnic studies, showing it to be a constitutive element of both the self and subjected identities of ethnic minorities and a central factor of how immigrants experience migration and settlement. See Mirjana Morokvasic, “Birds of Passage Are also Women...” *International Migration Review* 18, no. 4, Special Issues: Women in Migration (Winter, 1984): 886–907; Caroline B. Brettell and Patricia A. de Berjeois, “Anthropology and the Study of Immigrant Women,” in Donna Gabaccia, ed., *Seeking Common Ground: Multidisciplinary Studies of Immigrant Women in the United States* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992), 41–64; Helma Lutz, Ann Phoenix, and Nira Yuval-Davis, eds., *Crossfires: Nationalism, Racism and Gender in Europe* (London: Pluto Press, 1995); Annie Phizacklea, “Gendered Actors in Migration,” in Jacqueline Andall, ed., *Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 2003), 23–37.

¹⁹ Monika Mattes, “*Gastarbeiterinnen*” in der Bundesrepublik: *Anwerbepolitik, Migration, und Geschlecht in den 50er bis 70er Jahren* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2005).

8 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

in the workplace and economic contribution to their families had an emancipatory effect.²⁰ Yet, as the second-generation Turkish Germans began coming of age in the later 1970s and the 1980s, researchers argued that conflicting expectations from both immigrant communities and West German society hampered their integration.²¹ Women, and especially women's bodies, have been a measuring stick against which German politicians, the public, and researchers have evaluated the success of integration, but the focus shifted in the 1970s and 1980s from socioeconomic issues to concerns about perceived religious or cultural differences in the 1990s and 2000s. During these decades, public attention in Western Europe grew increasingly focused on Muslim women's head coverings (known in Germany as the *Kopftuch*, or headscarf) as a symbol of Islam's incompatibility with modern Western, democratic values. Historian Joan Scott argues convincingly that, in France's case, this idea of incompatible cultures was not the cause of "differences between France and its Muslims" but rather "the effect of a very particular, historically specific political discourse."²²

While France's headscarf debate began in 1989 with the rights of schoolchildren, Joyce Mushaben locates the origins of its German version in 1997 Baden-Württemberg when Fereshta Ludin, the daughter of an Afghani diplomat, found herself barred from completing her teaching degree and obtaining a position due to her wearing a headscarf. A series of legal actions and political debates ensued about whether civil servants, as employees and representatives of the state, were or should be allowed to wear a headscarf, which opponents argued constituted a form of proselytizing.²³ Both Scott and Mushaben argue that the headscarf debates create false dichotomies that proscribe the belonging of Muslims in European society and obscure the deeper political and socioeconomic

²⁰ Nermin Abadan-Unat, "Implications of Migration on Emancipation and Pseudo-Emancipation of Turkish Women," *International Migration Review* 11, no. 1 (Spring 1977): 31–57; Ayse Kudat, "Personal, Familial, and Societal Impacts of Turkish Women's Migration to Europe," in UNESCO, ed., *Living in Two Cultures: The Socio-Cultural Situation of Migrant Workers and Their Families* (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1982), 291–305.

²¹ Umut Erel, "Gendered and Racialized Experiences of Citizenship in the Life Stories of Women of Turkish Background in Germany," in Jacqueline Andall, ed., *Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 2003), 155–176.

²² Joan Wallach Scott, *The Politics of the Veil* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 7.

²³ Joyce Marie Mushaben, *The Changing Faces of Citizenship: Integration and Mobilization Among Ethnic Minorities in Germany* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 294. The Berlin Assembly's response to the headscarf debate in connection with the civil service was the 2005 Neutrality Law, which banned the head covering for officials serving in schools, legal professions, and law enforcement. See Mushaben, 303.

challenges that hinder immigrants and their children from becoming full members of the receiving society. It has been easier, in other words, to point to the headscarf and claim it as evidence of essential and incompatible cultural difference than to address basic assumptions of political membership and national belonging. Interestingly, debate about the headscarf was scarce in West Germany before reunification. Instead, focusing on the local level prior to reunification reveals how behaviors and expectations served as the primary markers of perceived cultural differences.

The rising discourse of cultural difference was not limited in focus to Muslim women who both began and continued to wear a headscarf, however. Public debate and political attention expanded to include growing concern about the assimilability of Turkish and Muslim men (those two identities often being conflated). The headscarf as a symbol reflected equally on Muslim women and men. Anthropologist Katherine Pratt Ewing explores how German society has used specific definitions of Turkish and Muslim masculinity as a tool of publicly accepted xenophobia, a way to exclude and justify the exclusion of certain identities from being “German.”²⁴ Ewing’s approach to the post-reunification period is especially effective in illuminating the “new racism” focused on cultural difference, but it is also critical to consider the impact of the Iranian Revolution and the formation of the Islamic Republic as well. As noted earlier, in the period between the beginning of postwar Turkish immigration and German reunification, the FRG’s perception of these developments significantly influenced the conflation of Turkish and Muslim identities and the characterization of Islam as an internal threat.²⁵

Related to the reexamination of “German” and “Muslim” identities is the second challenge to the Federal Republic that emerged from the guest worker program: the place of immigrants and their children in relation to German society. This second challenge clearly interweaves with the first, as identity constitutes the critical determinant of belonging, yet it also contains a spatial element. Where and how have immigrants fit? Spatial belonging – fitting in – has both abstract and practical implications. In regard to public discourse, use of the word and image of a

²⁴ Katherine Pratt Ewing, *Stolen Honor: Stigmatizing Muslim Men in Berlin* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008), 2–17.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 27–55. Ewing thoughtfully mines “the genealogies of contemporary representations of Turkish and Muslim manhood” (27) from nineteenth-century European travelers to the Ottoman Empire to twenty-first-century Turkish feminists and scholars, and produces an insightful analysis for how those representations converged, but that representation needs to be expanded to account for the impact of the Islamic Revolution. See Chapter 5.

10 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

“ghetto” to describe particular locations associated with immigrants has reduced Turkish-German places of belonging to specific urban sites, thereby emphasizing difference and foreignness and ignoring the transnational spaces of Turkish Germans that make them a part of Berlin beyond their ethnic or religious ties.²⁶ Such urban sites have often been viewed as part of a *Parallelegesellschaft* (parallel society), a separate space hindering the integration of Turkish immigrants and their children into larger German society. This perspective often conceives of integration as a linear journey with an endpoint where one essential identity (Turkish) converts to another (German). In the context of daily life, however, the Turkish-German community has often utilized those physical spaces to localize their identity and enable themselves to engage with the host society on their own terms in ways that have challenged commonly held understandings of “integration.”²⁷ Connected to this, examination of how members of the Turkish-German community shaped and understood “home” more abstractly gives insight into the impact of gender and generation on immigrants’ sense of belonging.²⁸

By bridging these three themes resulting from the *Gastarbeiter* program – the impact on postwar German history, the implications of a growing Muslim population, and the place of immigrants in a host society – this book examines the history of Turkish immigrants and their children from the beginning of Turkey’s participation in the guest worker program to German reunification in a way that recognizes their integration as a process that is historical, reciprocal, and spatial in nature. The Turkish-German community actively made a place for themselves within, and at times alongside, West German society by constructing spaces of belonging within the context of their daily lives. A number of factors influenced that process, from individual agency and community dynamics to larger institutional factors such as educational policy and city renovation projects, but it was profoundly linked to local-level daily life and experiences.

“Integration” is a word assigned many meanings, some at odds with each other, that seek to describe the relationship between immigrants and host societies. Earlier, both policy makers and scholars used “integration,” or its antecedent “assimilation,” to describe the endpoint of

²⁶ Ayşe S. Çağlar, “Constraining Metaphors and the Transnationalisation of Spaces in Berlin,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27, no. 4 (October 2001): 601–613.

²⁷ Patricia Ehrkamp, “Placing Identities: Transnational Practices and Local Attachments of Turkish Immigrants in Germany,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31, no. 5 (March 2005): 345–364.

²⁸ Esin Bozkurt, *Conceptualising “Home”: The Question of Belonging Among Turkish Families in Germany* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2009).

a process through which an immigrant shed those attributes that distinguished him or her significantly from the host society and became identified with it. That linear conception of migration, settlement, and assimilation no longer fits (if it ever truly did) in an era of increasing ease of travel of people, ideas, and goods, and with the proliferation of transnational spaces. Being integrated has meant being a full member of society, and that is determined by a set of diverse but interrelated elements inherent in a particular historical context. Given these changing contexts and its consequential nature as a moving target, the meaning of integration shifts, making it a process without an ultimate endpoint.

Understanding integration as a spatial process allows us to investigate it as the interaction between people, ideas, and environment over time. This approach takes into account not only what integration meant to the host society but also to the immigrants – those of whom it was being asked. By exploring integration spatially, we can chart how immigrants and their children took an active role in making space for themselves in their “new” home (which, in some cases, had been home for decades), how those spaces exerted their influence within and beyond the immigrant communities, and the impact of spaces and space-making on identity formation. Integration is a process directly linked to identity and to how a given identity allows (or precludes) belonging to a society or a nation. Just as the spaces that immigrants create and inhabit can and do have conflicting influences on their relation to the broader society, so, too, are place-based identities subject to the constant flux of both internal dynamics and connections to external networks. And so, for this book, integration is understood and deployed as a space-making process that reflects the relationships within immigrant communities and between those communities and the broader host society within given historical contexts. Although the primary focus of the study is between the beginning of Turkey’s participation in the guest worker program and German reunification, given this conceptualization of integration I will also examine briefly how the spaces that developed during that period extended into the 1990s and early 2000s.

The nature of this type of investigation requires a marriage of sorts between the disciplinary approaches of history and geography, in particular social and cultural geography. The geography side brings to the union a key theoretical understanding of space-making and the methods required to read those spaces. As defined by philosopher and sociologist Henri Lefebvre, a space represents a place of convergence of meaning, routines, geography, and built environment. It is produced through the interaction among three processes over time: (1) representations of space, (2) the ideals or imaginations contained within, and (3) daily

12 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

practice.²⁹ Geographers employ this framework to explore how societies use and are influenced by spaces, in addition to focusing on how groups form an “everyday landscape” of meaning through material objects.³⁰ Yet the connection between space, social relations, and meaning “inherently implies the existence in the lived world of a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces: cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another, or existing in the relations of paradox or antagonism.”³¹ While Doreen Massey was primarily interested in space in terms of class and gender relations, her conception of space, particularly its role in “the production of the social,” is highly relevant to the study of immigrant communities.³² It allows us to investigate both how the diversity of spaces that immigrants and their children encountered, created, and inhabited shaped their own self-understanding, or identity, as well as how these spaces can have conflicting effects. Further, by understanding how place-based identities – which are formed through spatial interactions – are impacted by internal dynamics and connections with external networks, the dependency of these geographical functions of integration on historical context comes to the fore.

The history half of the study makes its own important contributions, namely in terms of time frame and scale. Turkish *Gastarbeiter* began arriving in West Germany in the early 1960s, and certainly the community has undergone significant changes in the intervening half century. Understanding those developments requires a long view that takes into account how their experiences – and the process of integration – have been shaped by the historical contexts in which they lived and operated. In addition, to learn how members of this relatively marginalized community created space for themselves, one needs to look at the level where they could and did exert the most influence: at the local level in the course of their everyday lives.³³ A local-level perspective allows us to see

²⁹ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).

³⁰ For a historiography of cultural geography’s use of place in migration studies, see Rachel Silvey and Victoria Lawson, “Placing the Migrant,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89, no. 1 (March 1999): 121–132.

³¹ Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 3.

³² *Ibid.*, 4.

³³ As a historian studying marginalized communities, I use space as a way to examine how certain groups circumvented their political or social disadvantage through activity in various physical and social spaces. In doing so, I draw on the examples set by historians of minority and/or marginalized communities: Donna Gabaccia, *From the Other Side: Women, Gender, and Immigrant Life in the U.S., 1820–1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994);

immigrants' participation in the host society as a series of nuanced and active negotiations that challenge authority even as they operate within it.³⁴ As Joyce Mushaben has argued, the connection between integration and national identification is considerably weaker than it is between people's everyday experiences in their local contexts.³⁵

A concentration on daily life, or *Alltagsgeschichte* (everyday history), necessitates a sharp focus to uncover and understand the historical significance of seemingly mundane and ordinary actions. As such, this book primarily examines the history of one Turkish-German community in the Berlin-Wedding neighborhood of Sprengelkiez in order to take an in-depth look at how its residents created spaces of belonging for themselves in places they lived and operated on a daily basis. Although this study cannot be taken as representative of all Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic (nor is it intended to be), it is important to remember that these smaller building blocks construct the larger pictures that come to form our understandings of those broader developments and narratives.³⁶ In addition, as Massey has argued, places are sites of "intersecting social relations," some of which are contained within a given place, but others of which "stretch beyond it, tying any particular locality into wider relations and processes in which other places are implicated too."³⁷ In stretching beyond its own porous borders, the local both reflects and impacts developments at different levels of society.

For immigrants, part of the process of integration is the construction of a sense of belonging in one's everyday life. Belonging, here, is related to the process of integration, but not synonymous with it.³⁸ Rather, it

Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870–1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Bronwen Walter, *Outsiders Inside: Whiteness, Place and Irish Women* (London: Routledge, 2001).

³⁴ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

³⁵ Mushaben, *Changing Faces of Citizenship*, 54. Mushaben argues that a city-level analysis is necessary to understand the dynamics of integration, but I contend here that an even tighter focus – that of the district and neighborhood level – is necessary in order to analyze the agency of first-generation Turkish immigrants and their children as well as to chart how integration as a reciprocal process occurred on a more subtle but fundamental level.

³⁶ For an excellent explanation and defense of *Alltagsgeschichte*, see Andrew Stuart Bergerson, Paul Steege, Maureen Healy, and Pamela Swett, "The History of Everyday Life: A Second Chapter," *The Journal of Modern History* 80, no. 2 (June 2008): 358–378.

³⁷ Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 120.

³⁸ "Belonging," here, is connected to the concept of home, which Esin Bozkurt reminds us "is a multi-dimensional and dynamic concept that refers to emotional, spiritual, social, cultural, territorial and political self-location over time and space." See Esin Bozkurt, *Conceptualising "Home": The Question of Belonging Among Turkish Families in Germany* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2009), 25.

14 Turkish Germans in the Federal Republic of Germany

encompasses both the feeling of “fitting in” to one’s surroundings and of having a degree of authority or legitimacy within them, by creating spaces of belonging or “a sense of place, a structure of feeling that is local in its materialization, while its symbolic reach is multilocal.”³⁹ In this sense, immigrants created a home for themselves, “a place not only where they belonged but which belonged to them, and where they could afford to locate their identities.”⁴⁰ The integration of Turkish immigrants and their children needs to be understood through their efforts to create belonging within their everyday landscapes and social spaces embedded therein. In this case, spaces of belonging are ones that the Turkish-German community constructed, came into contact with, operated within, shaped, and were shaped by on a daily basis. These spaces were affected by the composition, motivations, and activities of their participants; the physical sites in which they were located; and the reactions of those “outside” the spaces. Whether they helped connect immigrants to the broader host society, estranged them from it, or a complex combination of the two, the spaces were embedded in and drew legitimacy from the local environment.

In order to chart the complex dynamics of these spaces of belonging, this book pulls from materials produced across the various levels of society, from the individual to the institutional. To include the voices and experiences of the people most directly involved in the daily lives of Turkish immigrants and their children, I conducted a series of oral history interviews with former *Gastarbeiter*, second-generation Turkish Germans, German residents of Sprengekiez, teachers and administrators, representatives of local religious institutions, and neighborhood activists.⁴¹ I also utilized a collection of interviews of Sprengekiez residents

³⁹ Anne-Marie Fortier, *Migrant Belongings: Memory, Space, Identity* (Oxford: Berg, 2000), 163.

⁴⁰ Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 166. Here, Massey writes about the different meanings of “home” for the colonizers and the colonized. The colonized, she points out, do not have the same nostalgic relationship with the concept of home. Her clarification of home in this context, however, resonates with my efforts here to break down the multifaceted concept of integration.

⁴¹ I met my interview partners through a variety of means. Some I contacted directly based on their official role in the district, such as school principals, religious leaders, and government officials. Others I met through referrals from mutual acquaintances and other interview partners. All interviews were conducted primarily in German at a place of the interview partner’s choosing, most often in their home, workplace, or a neighborhood site. In one case, the adult child of one of my interview partners joined us, and occasionally assisted in translating a phrase or idea for her mother and me.

The “recovering” of experience is problematic, as people, whether wittingly or unwittingly, craft the way they remember and relate their experiences. Interview subjects, especially those given the open space of an oral history, often present their lives as a cohesive story, fitting their experiences into an overarching narrative. To interrogate the

by historian Ursula Trüper, whose work on a 1995 exhibit at the Mitte Museum first introduced me to the rich history of one neighborhood in that quarter.⁴² Trüper's interviews, conducted in the early 1990s, are a fascinating resource through which to investigate the perspectives of local residents, and her interviews with children and youth, in particular, provide a rare opportunity to hear voices not often present in historical research. Finally, I draw on unpublished and published interviews as well as memoirs of individuals from other cities to use as points of comparison and evidence of the broad spectrum of experiences in the Turkish-German community silent within the borders of Sprengelkiez.⁴³ Hackett similarly focuses migrants' integration in the context of their daily life experiences with work, housing, and education, and reveals the approaches German officials in Bremen took to help their foreign residents more effectively integrate into local life. Yet her source base includes little generated from Bremen's Turkish Muslim community,

narrative as well as its constitutive parts, I draw on the work of Joan Scott, Helga Lutz, and others, who address the challenges and opportunities of deconstructing experience and of examining migrants' own "biographical work." See Joan W. Scott, "Experiences," in Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, eds., *Feminists Theorize the Political* (London: Routledge, 1992), 22–40; Helma Lutz, "Hard Labour: The 'Biographical Work' of a Turkish Migrant Woman in Germany," *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 7 (2000): 301–319; Umut Erel, "Gendered and Racialized Experiences of Citizenship in the Life Stories of Women of Turkish Background in Germany," in Jacqueline Andall, ed., *Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 2003): 155–176.

⁴² Trüper, a Berlin-based historian and author, worked at the community center Sparladen in the early 1990s, and met her interview partners through the connections she made while there. The backgrounds of her interview partners represented the diversity of the neighborhood, and included long-term native German residents, neighborhood activists, local government officials, first-generation immigrants, businesses owners, blue-collar workers, and second-generation youth. She conducted her interviews in a variety of sites around the neighborhood: the Sparladen, schools, a local business, and her partners' homes. Her interviews with second-generation youth were conducted in German, and interviews with first-generation immigrants took place in both German and Turkish, the latter with the assistance of one of two translators, Hatice Renç and author Kemal Kurt.

⁴³ Published biographies and memoirs are often not considered representative of the "normal" experience, as they are written by people whose lives are extraordinary enough to garner widespread interest and consumption. In addition, the author often has a specific purpose in writing the book, a particular agenda that shapes their narrative. In my use of memoir literature, I take into account the motivations of the author, while at the same time taking seriously the events and situations they feel shaped their lives. I also bear in mind that the experiences of the authors or subjects were embedded in their own particular everyday landscapes, not in the same places as Trüper's and my interview subjects. While these particular features of published memoirs and interviews understandably cause one to be mindful in their use, they still represent a valuable, though not central, source.

and therefore restricts her from making an equally compelling assessment of the immigrants' perspectives.⁴⁴

This book also makes use of German- and Turkish-language print media, from local- and city-level newspapers such as *Vis-à-Vis* and the *Berliner Morgenpost* to nationally circulated periodicals, including *Die Zeit* and the European edition of *Hürriyet*. These sources help trace the development of the Turkish-German community at the local, state, and federal levels. At the same time, analysis of both German- and Turkish-print media demonstrates their active role in shaping public versions of the Turkish experience abroad and reveals how the media itself helped form these spaces of belonging. Institutional-level sources include documents from German businesses that employed *Gastarbeiter*, archival materials from local schools, and employment and demographic reports from governmental organizations at all levels. This broad and diverse source base gives critical insight into the dynamics of Turkish immigration, settlement, and integration at the local level in Sprengekiez. But why is Sprengekiez itself particularly useful in understanding those dynamics?

Sprengekiez, the focal point of this study and the neighborhood Eren Keskin called home, is situated in the formerly West Berlin district of Wedding. Although a relative latecomer to the *Gastarbeiter* program, West Berlin quickly attracted large numbers of guest workers, and by 1968 its Turkish population exceeded the other guest worker groups in that city.⁴⁵ Most of the city's *Gastarbeiter* moved into apartments in the districts of Tiergarten, Kreuzberg, and Wedding, whose locations bordering East Berlin made their real estate unappealing to West Berliners who could afford to live elsewhere in the city. Although boisterous and dynamic Kreuzberg has received more scholarly attention, the seemingly more mundane Wedding also attracted large numbers of guest workers from early on, experiencing similar challenges. As a result, the district today is home to a well-established and ethnically diverse community.

Located at the southern edge of Wedding and bordered on one side by the north bank of the Spandauer Canal is the neighborhood of Sprengekiez. As with its parent district, the good transportation connections and relatively accessible housing attracted foreign workers and their families, particularly Turks, to the neighborhood beginning in the 1970s. Although its immigrant population grew gradually, by the 1980s

⁴⁴ Hackett, *Foreigners, Minorities and Integration*, 12–14. In addition, Hackett does not describe her own definition of “integration,” nor is she explicit as to what it meant to officials and immigrants in Bremen and Newcastle at different points in time.

⁴⁵ Statistisches Bundesamt, Germany (West), *Statistisches Jahrbuch für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1968), 151.

their numbers reached a point at which some of the native German residents felt their neighborhood had “suddenly” become Turkish. The longevity of its Turkish community enables us to see how the first and second generations interacted with and influenced the local environment, and its size provides internal diversity and a broad spectrum of experiences. Longtime German- and Turkish-background residents of Sprengelkiez contribute their personal accounts and perspectives of daily life there over the past decades, while local organizations – schools, community centers, places of worship – provide institutional history and memory of neighborhood life. Finally, in addition to these critical perspectives on the everyday, Sprengelkiez’s history contains events around which local memory coalesces that provide an enlightening glimpse into its past.

Within the settings of Sprengelkiez and broader West Berlin, this book explores the connections between daily life, the construction of belonging, and space in five sites within the everyday landscape of Turkish immigrants and their children: (1) workplaces, (2) homes, (3) the neighborhood, (4) schools, and (5) places of worship. These sites represent both exterior spaces produced by and shared with Germans (workplaces and schools) as well as interior ones created by the Turkish-German community to address their own needs (homes and places of worship). The neighborhood as a built environment was originally constructed and inhabited by Germans, but as more Turkish immigrants moved in, their influence created a hybrid space that blurred the line between exterior and interior. Taken together, these sites were settings in which members of the Turkish-German community interacted both with each other and with native Germans and German institutions on a regular basis.

Each chapter follows the unfolding map of the physical sites that Turkish immigrants, and then their children, inhabited as they moved to West Germany for work, brought their families to live with them, and settled into communities. Within each chapter, I trace how particular spaces developed over time, often starting with the influences and activities of the first generation, and then exploring how those sites changed in response to the increasing participation of the second generation. As Turkish immigrants were originally brought to the Federal Republic as part of the *Gastarbeiter* program, I begin in Chapter 1 with the workplace, and examine how Turkish guest workers used the site to further their own needs or agendas, what connections and relationships were forged that tied them to their new environment, and how their experiences in that site shaped their perception of their place in broader German society.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ See Appendix for a map of Berlin with the referenced workplaces.

Chapter 2, which focuses on the home, looks at the transition from single-sex company-dormitory living to the family-centered households of Turkish guest workers and their children. Here, I examine the practical challenges to setting up and running a household in a new environment as well as the changing and conflicting meanings of home in the first and second generations. Directly connected to the construction of belonging in the home are the experiences of the Turkish-German community in the neighborhoods where they lived. In Chapter 3, Wedding, and especially Sprengelkiez, come to the fore both as a setting and as a character in the broader story of Turkish integration as I investigate the ways generational conflict, gender expectations, and inter-neighborhood dynamics shaped belonging on a local, daily level.⁴⁷

As Turkish immigrants moved into German neighborhoods and established families, their children joined other local youth at school. Chapter 4 explores the reciprocal influences between Turkish-German children and the German schools they attended, from the primary and secondary schools up through the local *Volkshochschule*.⁴⁸ School brought the second generation into direct contact not only with other school-aged Turkish and German children but also with German authority figures and institutions, playing a critical role in the formation of belonging. Chapter 5 focuses on places of worship – prayer rooms and mosques – and the ways in which they have served as religious, social, and cultural spaces for Muslims in the Turkish-German community. It also gives context to Sprengelkiez residents' experiences by including the debates in local and national media regarding the growing Muslim population and how these shaped Turkish-German belonging.

Although this book is primarily a study of Turkish-German belonging in West Germany, the spaces that the first and second generation created and inhabited continued to grow and change past the historical marker of German reunification. So, in Chapter 6, I consider the fall of the Berlin Wall and reunification, briefly examining their influence through the 1990s and early 2000s on the people, developments, and trends that formed the basis for this book. In addition to tracing postreunification developments in Sprengelkiez, I broaden the focus to the city of Berlin, where the repercussions of reunification – both in regard to the political

⁴⁷ See Appendix for maps of Sprengelkiez and important local sites in and around the neighborhood.

⁴⁸ A *Volkshochschule* is similar to the U.S. community college. It is an educational institution that offers a wide range of courses to members of the community. The *Volkshochschule* of Berlin-Wedding played an important role as a cultural educator and mediator, and will be discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

and economic climate as well as debates about the nature of German identity – became especially sharp.

When *Kneipe* owner Eren Keskin described his rootedness in his local community in one sentence and retorted that his “black head” separated him from native Germans in the next, he captured the complex and fluid nature of Turkish integration in the Federal Republic. In the pages that follow, this book investigates how Keskin and others, through their daily experiences, came to feel they belonged in Germany, if not always in German society.