

Turkish Immigration to Germany

Student's name

Institution

CapstoneWriting.com

Abstract

Turkish immigrants have been in Germany since 1961 when the Federal Republic of Germany signed a bilateral treaty to recruit immigrants from Turkey in the country. Despite the fact that the Turkish immigrants have played an important role in the development of the social landscape in Germany, the immigrants are mostly detached from the integration policies since it is expected that the refugees will one day return to their country of origin. After the economic recession in the 1960's, recruitment of the Turkish immigrants was halted in 1973 and then resumed when the family reunification law was passed. The policies focused on discouraging more Turkish migrants from coming and at the same time, facilitate the integration of the existing immigrants in the country. The Turkish immigrants have exerted adverse economic pressures on Germany. The study proposes three major shifts in policy in order to reduce the burden of integrating Turkish immigrants into Germany. Turkish immigrants should only be allowed into Germany upon confirmation of employment slots for the immigrants, immigrants will only be allowed to work in Germany upon acquiring legal German citizenship and expulsion of immigrants after two years of residency without acquiring citizenship. The observation of these regulations will ensure that immigrants only come to Germany for the right reasons thus are not only enticed by the welfare programs in the country.

Policy Change in Germany

Allow Immigrants into Germany Only When Employment Has Been Lined up

Aydin (2016) confirms the existence of a trans-border labour market in Germany for Turkish experts and specialists whose employers have subsidiaries across the two countries. But the writer cautions of any bias in assessing the situation of immigration across the border of the two countries, noting that substantial labour movements exists from both directions. Aydin (2016) stated that for the decade preceding publication of the status report in the *Migration Policy* magazine, Germany had been documented as exporting more immigrants into Turkey. However, simple but high impact distinctions between the two channels of cross-border migration exist. According to Aydin (2016), the majority of German immigrants into Turkey were seeking retirement homes, implying that movement in that direction mainly comprised of persons in their retirement age. Obviously, Turkey is not known as a welfare state, hence German immigrants into Turkey have real financial benefit for their destination country. The migrants do not pressure resources in their destination; instead, the foreigners are a source of wealth creation because emigrants invest in cheap real estate ventures that favour their retirement statuses. On the other hand, Aydin (2016) notes that Turkish immigrants into Germany are people in their prime age, capable of working and competing with locals for employment opportunities. Some are experts who come upon being called to Germany based stations by their employers. Others are highly trained young Turkish nationals who come to Germany with the sole aim of securing well-paying jobs. On the one hand, the last class of immigrants present a real opportunity for Germany to exploit while it is necessary to deliberate whether the Turkish visitors are trained in specialties that do not have enough German experts. The answer is of course no, implying that the reasons are superfluous, but somehow the Turkish visitors manage

to find jobs at the expense of the local population. Therefore, it is only prudent that such individuals are stopped from migrating into Germany.

Block Immigrants from Receiving Government Benefits/ Welfare Until the Immigrants Acquire Citizenship Status

The Local, a German based daily reported in 2016 (at the height of the crisis of enormous inflows of Syrian refugees into Germany and the rest of Europe) that about 34000 refugees had found jobs in Germany, but an even bigger number had yet to get employment. In such a case, the state is obligated to tap its welfare resources into the vulnerable population, lest the foreigners fail to attain the most basic of human needs. Without a doubt, the influx, which has however lessened in recent months, increasing the burden on national resources, so much such that many locals have developed apathy towards the settlement of refugees in the country, as reported by Abdullah (2015). Importantly, some of the immigrants have questionable backgrounds and some come to commit terrorism into a country that has been exempt from such anarchy for decades. Economically, foreigners earning welfare benefits from the exchequer impact on the planned effects expected as outcomes from the benefits scheme to its people. The allure of better welfare schemes by the foreigners has influenced their decision to migrate to Germany and not any other European nation.

Without an established thorough system of conducting background checks into every new immigrant, Germany needs to be sufficiently cautious of 'housing' and 'pampering' potentially harmful individuals within its borders. It not only drains national resources (albeit with sufficient consideration of Germany's international obligations in mitigating human suffering even in other countries) but also sets a bad precedent dissuading foreigners seeking to visit and reside in the country. The trend is tremendously worrying when part of the crisis emanates from people with

good bodily and mental health, from peaceful countries such as Turkey. In the ensuing situation, and considering that some sections of the population (especially refugees from the war torn countries such as Syria and Libya) are absolutely vulnerable, the place of Turkish immigrants who seek welfare protection in Germany becomes a precariously careless burden for the nation to bear. Consequently, it would be important that strict measures are put in place to authenticate the situations under which foreigners are granted social protection in Germany. Undeniably, any needy immigrant is bound to receive a measure of social protection, but such should be considerably lowered for foreigners whose real state of need has not been established. The approach will encourage such persons to go for formal citizenship recognition, and ease pressure on the local welfare system since nationals have better chances of acquiring jobs and taking care of their needs to the extent that the foreigners would not need social welfare protection. Restating the point more directly, the system has to be seen as not abetting the strain on the social welfare and protection program. The approach has good benefits for the section of immigrants who come into Germany with the intention to live a lazy life and exploit the generosity of the social welfare scheme. Such individuals are rather hesitant to make any moves that could make the foreigners lose the benefits, and it would be to their benefit and in the interest of the national good that the visitors work for the sustainability of the economy and future beneficiaries.

Expel Immigrant that Fail to Acquire Citizenship within Two Years of Arrival

Apparently, the security system has to establish new evaluations to establish the reasons why some sections of the immigrant society or just individuals within that population fail to go for or secure citizenship in Germany. Importantly, the role of such an evaluation has to lie between identifying the system's weaknesses such that it abets or inspires restraint and identifying loopholes used by immigrants to remain in a state that ensures foreigners stay as

perpetual immigrants when alternative avenues are available. Seamless border movements occasioned by troubles in the Eurozone and the humanitarian requirement to shield refugees from possible attacks in their nations. Such evaluation should then be succeeded by an evaluation of the particular reasons belying the non-formalization of citizenship statuses for each individual immigrant. For Turkish nationals to have established a 'likely' sustained migratory avenue to Germany means that loopholes exist which could with time be exploited by persons with all manner of intentions, including carrying out terrorist attacks to foreigners in the country. This would be happening at the detriment of national security, whose primary target is the local population.

Abdullah (2015) noted that Germany currently harbours the largest ever population of terrorist elements compared to any other point in time. While some of the individuals have entered into Germany through the open immigration policy within the European Union (from potentially more affected countries such as France) and the welcoming of thousands of Syrian immigrants, the role of Turkey in being a source for a significant number of the terrorists cannot be overstated. Predictably, Turkey has experienced greater levels of radicalization of its citizens than most other European countries due to its close proximity to the perpetually conflict-laden Middle East, sharing direct borders with the Al-Qaeda and ISIL infested Iraq and Syria. Imperatively, it makes it a probable destination of many terrorist organizations and terror-linked individuals. Therefore, for the stated reason, it can be assumed that some dangerous elements could be hiding in Germany among the documented immigrants, with the sole intention of unleashing terror at some point. Yet it would not be farfetched to claim that such individuals would, with all their ill intentions, be unwilling to be legally recognized because it could unearth their dubious pasts and links to acts of terror, or could make their identification much easier, and

hence tracking their actions and movements. Building onto the above point, it therefore appears attractive for immigrants with sinister objectives to not want to be formally documented or to attain German citizenship. With such an alarming reason being among the potential reasons why some Turkish immigrants may defy the pressure to acquire formal German citizenship, it appears totally reasonable to want to expel foreigners who fail to acquire citizenship over a period of time. On the backdrop of the explanation, two years would appear to be a suitably long period for any immigrants to have understood the local system well, adapted into it, and made firm decisions over whether to acquire local citizenship. Apparently, in areas with no confirmation of immigrant's decision at the lapse of the period, the state should have clear guidelines that there will not only be consequences but could include ejection of the individuals. Establishing a consequence based system of decision making is not a way of threatening any person, but a formal way of ensuring adherence to a set of laws, and has been practically applied across every other section of government operations. Of course, there arises the question of how much terror an attacker could have undertaken over two years of their initial stay, or whether forcing immigrants to be documented at the lapse of the period would be a sustainable, practicable, and fruitful way to eradicate conspiracies against national security. However, it is also important that such reflections also bear the comprehensive outlook of the security and welfare system, such that any efforts to retain or expel unnaturalised individuals are evaluated from a comprehensive list of matters of national interest.

The Negative Economic Effects of Turkish Immigration to Germany

Ireland (2004) noted that the influx of Turkish immigrants in Germany has been associated with the loss of employment opportunities to the members of the Native German societies. As such, the labor market portrays marginalization of the Turkish communities which

is facilitated by the discrimination of the immigrants along cultural and religious lines leading to the development of a parallel Turkish society. The results of the discrimination of the Turkish immigrants' results in limited education opportunities hence low socio-economic status. The Turkish immigrants that cannot secure employment in Germany result to crime. According to a 2014 crime report by the German Federal Criminal Office, immigrants who account for less than 10% of the population were responsible for 18% rapes and 30% murders. Moreover, 5 immigrants from Turkey were involved in the assassination of residents and 8 foreigners were involved in sexual assaults (Karlin, 2016).

Essentially, the increase in Turkish immigrants in Germany is related to suppressed wages among the native born workers. When immigrants arrive in a host nation in large numbers, the labor market experiences "labor supply shock" since there are more employees than can be supported by the labor force (Ireland, 2004). The systemic changes lead to reduced wages among all the worker groups meaning that the natives will be doing worse economically than the immigrants. Despite the fact that the total employment rate in Germany increased substantially due to the increased immigration, employment among the natives declined since the reduced wages caused most of the native Germans to withdraw from the labor market. Increased unemployment among the native Germans' is associated with negative economic impacts due to reduced purchasing power.

Increased immigration among Turkish citizens to Germany is associated with positive impacts among the German employers. Overall, the employment rates have increased hence the employers pay lower wages than the employers were paying the native Germans previously.

Essentially, immigration increases the national output, negatively affects the native labor force and positively affects the owners of production. Lien (2016) noted that employers also have an

upper hand in employee selection since the businesses can easily substitute the average immigrant workers with the natives. However, sometimes it is not possible since most of the immigrants do not have the skills required to work due to their low education attainment levels. Also, immigrants are affected by language barrier since foreigners cannot converse in fluent German and have less experience as compared to the natives. The situation indicates that the native Germans and the Turkish immigrants are imperfect substitutes in the labor market since no group can work on behalf of the other.

The issue of reduced wages among the native Germans can be explained through the education attainment and age of the immigrants. The balance between the quality of education between Germany and Turkey is yet to be tested in the labour market. When the share of immigrants has low educational attainment and is young, the employment rate of the host country falls. The changes results from the direct competition between the immigrants and the natives. Ireland (2004) suggested that while immigrants from the developed countries have a small effect on the German labor force, Turkish immigrants largely affect the wages in the labor force since the workers are many, have low education attainment and most of visitors are young. The young immigrants as compared to most of the German natives who are older hence have higher experience levels. As such, the labor market in Germany adapted to the labor supply shocks through the development of policies that dictate the hourly wages.

Considering the skills that immigrants and the natives have, the two groups have distinct expertise in different fields. The natives have higher education attainment while the immigrants are educationally disadvantaged. The native workers who have similar or almost the same skills as the immigrants will most likely be harmed by the labor market through low wages while the immigrants with sufficient skills that compete with the natives benefit through better wages and

higher employment rates (Lien, 2016). As such, more natives will be de-motivated to work in fields where Germans are directly competing with the immigrants hence the high levels of unemployment among native Germans. Besides, the natives are likely to be choosy in the jobs Germans work as compared to the Turkish immigrants who are only interested in earning a living.

The use of strict legal frameworks is associated with reduced promotion prospects among the low-skilled native born Germans. In most cases, the natives take on more complex and demanding roles in organizations when immigrants take on the monotonous and manual duties at the workplace. Since the immigrants are not fluent in the German language, the foreigners usually take on the substitute roles meaning that labor supply mainly expands in the lower level occupations (Ireland, 2004). The value of the complex and higher level jobs increases and the natives move to the jobs which are complimentary to the manual jobs performed by the immigrants. When the natives cannot perform as expected in their new more complex higher positions in the firm, Germans are pushed out of the labor market thus indicating an increase in the number of unemployed native Germans in the society.

As more native Germans fall out of the labor force, the immigrants take over the jobs. When the Turkish immigrants arrived in Germany, the foreigners had low educational attainment which excluded Turkish visitors from most of the executive roles in the organizations. The influx of immigrants has a positive effect on the labor market which spreads gradually and is fully seen after a specified period when the immigrants have already settled in the host country. At first, the immigrants are absorbed in the subordinate groups in organizations (Lien, 2016). At the same time, most of the native employees are promoted to higher levels and their wages increase gradually. When the immigrants settle, the visitors seek more education opportunities meaning

that due to their increased skills, their employment rates increase while the natives lose employment. The increase in the number of immigrants usually favors the young people who have a chance of pursuing a career as opposed to the natives who are older.

In terms of welfare spending, Germany has used large amounts of financial resources in terms of welfare spending in order to integrate the Turkish immigrants in the country. The situation results from the fact that the immigrants moving to Germany have low education achievement levels hence are lowly skilled. Brady & Ryan (2014) stated that due to the welfare generosity of the host country, most of the immigrants move to the developed countries as opposed to the underdeveloped nations. The state can be explained through the “welfare magnet theory” which states that immigrants will more likely use their welfare benefits for purposes that are out of the norm such as shopping and paying for leisure.

Inside the host countries, immigrants usually cluster in areas where migrant populations are large. The situation results from the need of the new immigrants to develop networks with like-minded individuals whom are perceived to be of the same socio-economic status. The generous welfare support is usually related to low participation of the immigrants in the labor force which negatively affects the productivity of the host country (Hansen, Marie & Torben, 2017). The approach leads to a situation whereby the German government offers large sums of welfare support to the Turkish immigrants and in turn receives little or no economic benefit from the same since the immigrants are not participating in the labor force. In most cases, immigrants are the largest recipients of welfare benefits when compared to the native groups.

Ethnic mobilization is a determinant factor of class mobilization in the development of social welfare in different states. Ethnic and linguistic homogeneity facilitates class solidarity among immigrants of the same socio-economic status. Increased cultural heterogeneity leads to

the decline of class solidarity among the immigrants in the developed nations. Brady & Ryan (2014) observed that increased heterogeneity and reduced class solidarity; therefore, reduces the provision of social welfare among the immigrants. The natives lack solidarity with the immigrants since Germans seek more solidarity with the in-group members whom the locals share the same socio-economic status with in the nation. Due to the ethnic differences between the immigrants and the natives, the immigrants are less willing to spend their money on public goods.

The situation indicates that the influx of immigrants in the developed nation leads to less public support for social welfare. Increased ethnic heterogeneity among the immigrants undermines the generosity of the welfare policy in Germany. As a result, the anti-immigrant groups are used as tools to dismantle the welfare redistributive policies in the country (Hansen, Marie & Torben, 2017). Racial identity has erupted as a major issue that determines one's inclusion in the welfare policy in Germany. Recent riots against foreigners in the nations elaborate on the boiling ethnic sentiments that seek to derail the growth of Europe's super power. Furthermore, Turkish immigrants do not receive welfare benefits despite being in dire need of it due to their unfavorable race. Turkish immigrants' reduced purchasing power is associated with negative economic growth in Germany.

References

- Abdullah, A. (2015). 760 German Citizens Have Joined ISIS, 200 Returned Home: Interior Minister. *RT*. November 22, 2015. Web. Retrieved on April 14, 2018.
- Aydin, Y. (2016). *The Germany-Turkey Migration Corridor: Refitting Policies for a Transnational Age*. Washington: Migration Policy Institute.
- Brady, D. and Ryan, F. (2014). Does Immigration Undermine Public Support for Social Policy? *American Sociological Review*. 79(1): 17-42.
- Hansen, M. F., Marie, L, S-N and Torben, T. (2017). The Fiscal Impact of Immigration to Welfare States of the Scandinavian Type. *Journal of Population Economics*. 30(3): 925-952.
- Ireland, P. (2004). *Becoming Europe: Immigration, integration and the Welfare State*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Karlin, A. (2016). Immigrant Crime Rates in Germany. *The Unz Review: An Alternative Media Selection*. February 19, 2016. Web. Retrieved on April 14, 2018.
- Lien, H. H. (2016). Migrants on the European Labor Market: Some Results from the European Labor Force Survey Ad Hoc Module 2014. *Statistisches Bundesamt*. Pp. 55-65.
- The Local. (2016). So Far, Only 34, 000 Refugees Have Found Jobs in Germany. December 19, 2016. Web. Retrieved on April 14, 2018.