

The Reluctant Multiculturalist: Investigating Possibilities for Applying Canadian Multiculturalism in Germany

Friederike ALM

Abstract. This paper offers a comparative analysis of the Canadian and German implementation of multicultural policies and carefully argues for the application of some aspects of the Canadian model of multiculturalism for immigrant integration to the German context. It analyses the current policies that the two countries have implemented according to their ranking in the Multiculturalism Policy Index (MPI) for immigrant minorities and also takes into account the difficulties when one national model is applied to another. To contrast the two cases, I use data from the MPI and my additional research to show how two policy areas in particular, the official affirmation of multiculturalism at the state level and the implementation of affirmative action policies, are already strongly entrenched in the Canadian case, but have only seen reluctant implementation in the German case. I claim that the implementation of Canadian model of multiculturalism in Germany could have positive effects on the discursive framing of immigrants and could further strengthen the funding and engagement for multicultural policies in the future.

Keywords: *Germany, Canada, immigrant integration; multiculturalism, multicultural policies, Multiculturalism Policy Index*

“Multiculturalism is our strength, as synonymous with Canada as the Maple Leaf.”
Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau¹

“Multiculturalism has failed.”
German Chancellor Angela Merkel²

The Canadian model of multiculturalism was first introduced in the 1970s and is hailed as the best approach to managing culturally diverse societies worldwide (Kymlicka 2004; Ley 2010, Fleras 2015). The praise of the Canadian system of immigration and integration has not been lost on Germany. Almost all German parties have argued for the adoption of the Canadian points system for immigration.³

¹ Government of Canada (27/06/2016): „Statement by Prime Minister on Multiculturalism Day“.

² The Washington Post (12/14/2015): „Multiculturalism is a sham, says Angela Merkel“.

³ The German Left Party is the only party which has not explicitly demanded the introduction of an immigration policy similar to the Canadian Points system. However, even politicians

In this paper, I argue that rather than the points system for immigration, it is the Canadian approach to immigrant integration of state-implemented multiculturalism that warrants further analysis, as it could yield viable directives for future policy developments in Germany. To substantiate my argument, this paper investigates the applicability of the Canadian approach to the German system.

This analysis will be based on the ranking of the two countries in the *Multiculturalism Policy Index* for immigrant minorities (MPI) developed by the Canadian scholars Banting and Kymlicka (2006, on-going), who propose eight policy areas which countries can use to implement multicultural policies (MCPs). I consider the MPI to be a suitable benchmark for this analysis, as it has been praised for providing both a tool for comparative research on multiculturalism, as well as a normative recommendation for multicultural inclusion politics (Schultze and Gerstenkorn 2015, 167).⁴ Two out of the eight MCP areas named by Banting and Kymlicka (2006, on-going) are examined more closely.

The first section will be dedicated to laying the theoretical groundwork by defining multiculturalism, demarcating the notion that is used for this paper, and introducing the MPI. To contextualise the analysis, the second section will briefly highlight the political and societal differences and similarities between Canada and Germany in relation to immigration and multiculturalism, including an outline of the way each country has dealt with immigration and multiculturalism. Section three will contain the analysis as well as possible counterarguments to the application of the Canadian system in Germany. In the final section, I summarize my findings.

1. Multiculturalism: From the Theoretical to the Political Dimension

Defining Multiculturalism

The ambiguity of the term multiculturalism demands some differentiation. Muchowiecka (2013) provides a differentiated demarcation of the term when she

from the right-wing AfD have asked for “an immigration system fashioned after the Canadian example” in the party principles referenced in their programme (Ghelli 2015).

⁴ It should be stressed that the MPI is not without criticism. Its underlying concept of multicultural citizenship in particular has been criticized for using the Canadian model as its blueprint (Joppke 2001, Soysal 2011), and a general discussion of the shortcomings of the Kymlicka’s multicultural citizenship has also been offered in my own Master’s Thesis “Beyond Multicultural Citizenship” (Alm 2018). For the purposes of this evaluation, the MPI serves as a useful tool, particularly for the ample amount of data connected in relation to the two country cases.

distinguishes between multiculturalism as “state measures introduced to manage diversity”, as opposed to multiculturalism as a “lived experience”. By the latter, she refers to the fact that many Western societies have developed into multicultural societies due to their “ethnic and cultural diversity”, which adds to Triadafilopoulos’ (2012, 2) description of some societies as “de-facto multicultural”.

Stuart Hall also refers to multiculturalism as a “variety of political strategies” (Hall 2001 in Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010, 2), which include measures in the area of public recognition, education, social services and other policy provisions that seek to accommodate the needs of minority groups such as immigrants (ibid. 3). Banting and Kymlicka claim that such policies

“(…) go beyond the protection of the basic civil and political rights guaranteed to all individuals in a liberal-democratic state, to also extend some level of public recognition and support for ethno-cultural minorities to maintain and express their distinct identities and practices.” (Banting and Kymlicka 2006, 1)

Multiculturalism as a normative policy framework introduced by the state delineates the relevant notion of multiculturalism for this paper. The MPI by Banting and Kymlicka proposes such a framework and will be outlined in the next section.

Banting and Kymlicka’s 8-point multiculturalism index

The theoretical premise of the analysis in this paper will be based on Banting and Kymlicka’s proposal of three MPIs, with varying contents, differentiating between policy provisions for sub-state minorities, indigenous peoples and immigrants (Banting et al. 2006, 52). For the aim of this paper, the immigrant MPI was chosen. Banting and Kymlicka propose the following eight policy measures for immigrants:

- “1. Constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism, at the central and/or regional and municipal levels.
2. The adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum.
3. The inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing.
4. Exemptions from dress codes, Sunday-closing legislation etc. either by statute or by court cases.
5. Allowing dual citizenship.
6. The funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities.



7. The funding of bilingual education or mother tongue instruction.

8. Affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups.” (Banting et al. 2006, 56f.)

According to Kymlicka, the measures provided through these eight policy areas serve to support a process of “multiculturalism-as-citizenization”. By this Kymlicka means that the state should provide these policies to recognize its citizens’ diversity of needs in order to allow them to become fully contributing members of society. Spanning across “economic, political, social, and cultural dimensions” (Kymlicka 2010, 38), this process is a “deeply transformative project both for minorities and majorities”, which will allow the public “to enter new relationships, and to embrace new concepts and discourses, all of which profoundly transform people’s identities and practices” (ibid. 39).

I have chosen to analyse two out of the eight policy areas proposed by Banting and Kymlicka more closely. The contrast in these two policy areas is considered the starkest and therefore fit for a fruitful analysis: Policy area one “constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism, at the central and/or regional and municipal levels” was chosen because it constitutes the very basis of a state to normatively take its multiculturalism into account. While this has been acknowledged constitutionally in Canada, Germany has been very reluctant, at best “self-conscious”, about its status as an immigration country and the ensuing politics of difference (Schönwälder 2010). Policy area eight “affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups” was chosen because affirmative action represents a politically contentious issue in German politics, as it does in many other continental European countries (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010). In contrast, the use of affirmative action policy could be considered quotidian in the North American context. Since the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation in Germany 15 years ago, there is now renewed incentive to review ‘best practice’ examples for further implementation.

2. Canada and Germany: Different but similar?

Despite their very different political responses to immigration and multiculturalism that will be presented in the following, both Canada and Germany share a history of immigration to their respective countries, making them “de-facto multicultural societies, as a result of liberalizing changes to their migration and

citizenship policies.” (Triadafilopoulos 2012, 2). As Triadafilopoulos notes, Canada is usually classified as a “classical immigration country”, while Germany is characterized as a “prototypical labour recruiting country” (ibid.). In considering the underlying systemic and societal similarities, a closer look at the potential of Canadian approaches to multicultural policies is warranted, since its potential to be replicated in other nations with similar immigration trajectories is widely acknowledged in the literature (Schultze and Gerstenkorn 2015, 152; Fleras 2015, 322). To substantiate the contextual backdrop to the policy analysis in section three, the following section is dedicated to tracing the histories of both Canada and Germany’s respective policy responses to immigration and multiculturalism.

Canada: the “classical immigration country”

Given its status as a “settler society”, immigration has long been a “cornerstone” of Canadian nation building (Ley 2010, 191; Triadafilopoulos 2012, 9). There has been a consistent and regulated influx of roughly 1% (250,000 to 300,000 new Canadians) of the total population each year, which places Canada among the countries that have the highest percentage of immigrants among their population (Schultze 2008, 81; World Economic Forum 2019).

Canada’s commitment to multiculturalism therefore stems from this long history of immigration to the country. Multiple acts concerning both immigration and multiculturalism have contributed to the establishment of the Canadian multiculturalism model since 1971, when Prime Minister Pierre E. Trudeau declared that Canada would adopt a multiculturalism policy (Schultze and Gerstenkorn 2015, 165). While the initial commitment to multiculturalism can be traced to the “quiet revolution” of Quebec as an offer of appeasement to this sub-state national group in committing to bi-culturalism and bi-lingualism (Ley 2010, 191), it evolved to encompass three pillars: the recognition of rights for the Québécois, for indigenous peoples and immigrant groups (ibid. 162).

Trudeau’s commitment to multiculturalism in 1971 was also further entrenched in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1981, which institutionalised collective and communal fundamental rights (ibid. 88). In 1988, the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was passed. The Multiculturalism Act states that “federal institutions shall promote policies, programmes and practices that enhance the ability of individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to the continuing evolution of Canada” (Canadian Multiculturalism Act 1988). Over the last



decades, the priorities of Canadian multiculturalism politics have evolved, adapting to changes in society. Pointing to the 2004-5 Annual Report on the Multiculturalism Act, Ley highlights that the programme areas of the act are committed to emphasizing “active citizenship, not heritage cultures” (Ley 2010, 197).

Germany – the prototypical labour recruiting country

Unlike the Canadian approach of an open commitment to multiculturalism in light of immigration as a cornerstone of its society, Germany has historically been suspicious of newcomers, viewing itself as a “complete society”, where immigration was viewed as a “anomaly or regrettable necessity” (Fleras 2015, 80). As the above quote illustrates, Germany was ready to welcome immigrants for labour shortages in the 1960s, when it facilitated a substantive influx of immigrants from southern Europe and Turkey. The term “Gastarbeiter” (guest worker) is indicative of the status that was assigned to these immigrants. This wave of immigration in post-war Germany was not met with multicultural policies, since their arrival was seen as “needed but not wanted” (ibid.). Their residency was viewed as a temporary economic exchange that was meant to benefit both sides – but they were expected to either leave or assimilate (Muchowiecka 2013). As Muchowiecka points out:

“(…) Assimilation did not equate with becoming a citizen, it was rather perceived as a process of becoming an ‘unproblematic foreigner’. In an official statement of 1982, Chancellor Kohl defined integration as ‘fitting into German society without conflict and without access to the right of citizenship.’” (ibid.)

However, the guest workers did not leave, but established themselves in Germany, with 25,5% of German residents now holding the status of having an “immigration background”⁵ (BPB 2019). Hence, Germany’s de-facto status as a multicultural society has not sprung from a deliberate choice to become one, as in Canada, but rather out of necessity and a lack of political strategy in accommodating newcomers (Muchowiecka 2013). In light of this, it could be viewed as contradictory that “multiculturalism has become a derogatory term in present day Germany”

⁵ According to the definition of the German Federal Agency for Migration and Refugees “all immigrants that came to the federal republic of Germany after 1949, all foreigners born in Germany, all Germans born in Germany or born as German who have at least one parent that was not born in Germany” are considered persons with a so-called “immigration background” (BAMF 2020).

(Schönwälder 2010, 152). Despite its avid rejection by high officials such as the chancellor, an official policy framework, like the Canadian one, never existed (*ibid.*).

However, the last two decades have seen some significant changes in policy regarding immigration, which indirectly affect the rights of immigrants. The Citizenship Act of 2000 and the Immigration Act of 2005 accepted past immigration as a fact and a “political consensus” emerged, substantiating the belief that more efforts must be made to improve the integration of immigrants (*ibid.* 153-154). Nevertheless, the announcement of a paradigm shift has not been met with immigrant group rights and accommodations (*ibid.* 154). The dominant framework with which integration is associated, is one which puts the onus of “obligations and adjustments” on the immigrants, while the German state does not provide any explicit accommodations entrenched at the federal level, contrary to the “active state” model in Canada (*ibid.* 156).

However, several small developments have taken place at the regional and local level, such as the establishment of “multiculturalism agencies” in some major cities (e.g. the office for multicultural affairs – OMCA in Frankfurt) (Schönwälder 2010, 162; Radtke 2015, 60). Despite these efforts being arguably un-coordinated with the federal level, they show that there is “room for manoeuvre” to implement multicultural programmes below the federal level (Schönwälder 2010, 162).

3. Applying the Canadian model of Multiculturalism to Germany?

In this section, I analyse the steps taken by the respective countries in the policy areas chosen from the MPI in order to demonstrate which aspects of the Canadian model could be useful for the German context. In the overall index, Canada scores 7.5 out of 8 points in 2010, the latest point of calculation (6.5 in 1990; 7.5 in 2000). Germany’s index score is at 2.5 out of 8 points in 2010 (0.5 in 1990; 2.0 in 2000).⁶ In the whole index, Australia has the highest score (8/8), while Denmark and Japan score the lowest (0/8 each) (Tolley and Vonk 2016, 4). In the following subsections, the data assembled for MCP indicators one and eight will serve as a starting point for the analysis, with my own research added to update the data.⁷

⁶ The MPI has ranked 21 Western countries according to the MCP policy framework developed by Banting and Kymlicka (Multiculturalism Policy Index 2020). For more information on the index and its ranking, refer to the indicated website.

⁷ For brevity, area one “Constitutional, legislative, or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism at the central and/or regional and municipal levels and the existence of a

Affirmation MCPs in Canada and Germany: Putting Multiculturalism on the Map

In the area of affirmation MCPs, Canada scores a full point, whereas Germany scores 0.5 points. This is hardly surprising, considering that an official commitment to multiculturalism has been part of the Canadian constitution since the entrenchment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of 1982, which states under section 27: “This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians” (Tolley and Vonk 2016, 25).

An official commitment to multiculturalism can also be found in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988. Canada has a Department of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, explicitly responsible for the implementation of the Multiculturalism Program intended by the Multiculturalism Act. However, it should be noted that the implementation of multicultural policies varies across regions and municipalities, with some provinces having more explicit recognitions of multiculturalism (Ontario, Québec⁸) than others (Newfoundland, Labrador) (ibid.). Despite this regional variation, the Canadian commitment to multiculturalism at the federal level has been steadfast and strong (ibid.).

This is not the case in Germany. As the previous account of German engagement with multiculturalism has already shown, commitment to an official multicultural society at the federal level has never been in place with sporadic efforts to have so-called integration into the policy arena at the federal level. The data assembled for the MPI support this general contention. Germany does, however, score 0.5 in this policy area, which is due to the sporadic efforts to support multiculturalism at the regional levels, which were also addressed in section two (ibid. 45f.). Germany’s main efforts at the federal level can be summarised as the “support and demand” approach for immigrants, that is, shaping policy that supports immigrants to become “unproblematic foreigners” (Muchowiecka 2013), another contention that is supported by the MPI data (ibid.). Unlike Canada, Germany does not have a state department exclusively concerned with immigration and multiculturalism. However, increasing efforts have been made at the regional and

government ministry, secretariat or advisory board to implement this policy in consultation with ethnic communities” will henceforth referred to as “Affirmation MCPs” and area eight “Affirmative Action for disadvantaged groups” will henceforth referred to as “Affirmative Action MCPs”

municipal levels to integrate a multicultural policy.

To add to the MPI findings, it is worth noting the office of the federal commissioner for migration, refugees and integration (henceforth integration commissioner). This office is noteworthy for two reasons: the federal commissioner is part of the federal government. This means that Annette Widmann-Mauz, the current commissioner, is an active advisor of chancellor Merkel. Her tasks include supporting “the integration of all immigrants living on German federal territory” and “enabling a relaxed cohabitation of Germans and foreigners” (Federal Integration Commissioner 2020). Having her as an advisor to the chancellor does warrant some attention, since it implies that her input is wanted and recognized at the highest level. This is not an official affirmation of multiculturalism as such but could be considered as a recognition of Germany’s non-homogenous society, something German political elites have historically been reluctant about (Joppke 1999, Triadafilopoulos 2012). These findings demonstrate that the official German commitment to multiculturalism has been hesitant at best, having not formed “as a consistent political programme” (Kraus and Schönwälder 2006, 206) as opposed to the Canadian explicit adoption of multiculturalism in the constitution.

Given the normativity of an official affirmation of multiculturalism, the effects of this affirmation are hard to be measured numerically. Rather, I would argue that such an affirmation forms a fundamental starting point for any further entrenchment of multicultural policies, as it has in Canada. Schönwälder additionally argues that an official commitment holds the power to change the rhetoric to be more inclusive:

“Political declarations do make a difference and should not be dismissed as mere rhetoric (...). High-level celebrations of the values of diversity and the contributions of immigrants may influence public opinion and further convince immigrants that they are welcomed and regarded as an integral part of German society.” (Schönwälder 2010, 163)

In Canada, the official affirmation of multiculturalism dates back to 1971 and one effect of this official affirmation could be seen in 54% of Canadians stating that multiculturalism is an important symbol of Canadian national identity (Focus Canada, 2015). Germans do not view multiculturalism as a symbol of national identity, and recent surveys have found that 52% of Germans want immigrants to adapt to the “culture of mainstream society” (Benoit et al. 2017). One could therefore argue that an official state-level commitment to multiculturalism at the federal level could put



multiculturalism on the map for Germans, as has been the case in Canada. This would support Schönwälder's contention when she claims that "a society that generally sees itself as being shaped by immigration and as gaining from its plurality will be less likely to have an 'us' versus 'them' mentality, in which immigrants are expected to adjust to a given entity." (Schönwälder 2010, 163).

As I have shown, an adoption of an official affirmation of multiculturalism, as has been achieved in Canada, could have a two-fold successful result for Germany: Firstly, it would legitimate more funding and further entrenchment of existent multicultural policies as well as more government engagement. Secondly, a change in rhetoric to viewing immigrants as fully contributing German citizens rather than "foreigners" would mark a fundamental discursive shift. It would open up discussion about immigration and multiculturalism in an inclusive state that does not place the 'burden' of integration as assimilation entirely on immigrants themselves but takes on a more active role in the promotion of "multiculturalism-as-citizenization" in Kymlicka's sense.

Affirmative Action MCPs in Canada and Germany: Moving from "positive discrimination" to equity

Affirmative action MCPs concern efforts in the area of anti-discrimination and equity policies. For this MPI indicator, Canada scores a full point, whereas Germany scores zero. In this section I will take a closer look at the benefits of the Canadian Employment Equity Act of 1995, as well as evaluate the potential that German policy holds in this area.

For Canada, Tolley and Vonk list two specific policies in the area of Affirmative Action MCPs, namely the Canadian Human Rights Act of 1977, which gives protection against discrimination on the grounds of inter alia race and ethnicity and the Employment Equity Act (EEA) of 1995 (amended from the initial act of 1986) (Tolley and Vonk 2016, 29). The EEA was implemented to "ensure that all Canadians have the same access to the labour market" and in doing so requires all employers "to ensure the full representation of members of the four designated groups within their organizations" (Canadian Human Rights Commission 2013). The four designated groups are women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and members of visible minorities (ibid.). Employers are therefore required by law to ensure diversity at the workplace by actively identifying barriers for these four designated groups and developing a plan to reduce these barriers, as well as report

on the progress of increasing diversity (*ibid.*). Annual reports on the representation of the four groups in the labour market are submitted by the Department for Employment, Workforce Development and Labour. The latest annual report shows that the representation of visible minorities has consistently increased since the act was first implemented in 1986, raised from 5% of representation (with 6.3% labour market availability) to 22.8% in 2018 (with 17.8% labour market availability). This makes visible minorities the only designated group that has surpassed representation as opposed to labour market availability since 2007 (Government of Canada 2018). While one cannot associate these positive outcomes exclusively with the implementation of the EEA, they are nevertheless remarkable.

While Germany has anti-discrimination legislation, it does not have equity policies. The German Equal Treatment Act (GETA) was implemented in 2006. The GETA forbids discrimination in the areas of goods and services as well as employment on the grounds of *inter alia* race and ethnicity. It allows affirmative action programmes, but it does not establish a requirement of such programmes for employers, as the Employment Equity Act does (Tolley and Vonk 2016, 51).

The 2006 GETA also prescribed the establishment of a Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (FADA), which could be added to Tolley and Vonk's findings. This agency fulfills three tasks: Providing legal counsel for individuals who have experienced discrimination, promoting diversity and anti-discrimination measures at the federal level and funding research on the area of anti-discrimination in Germany (FADA 2020, 38). This agency could provide a fruitful ground for the proliferation of affirmative action programmes. In fact, the FADA has published numerous guidelines concerned with entrenching diversity at the workplace, both for companies and for public service. These guidelines include recommendations for equity measures. Despite these well-intentioned efforts, it is the GETA's weakness in not requiring any affirmative action by employers, along with funding issues, which impede the FADA's work (Schönwälder 2010, 163).

Apart from the FADA's commitment to anti-racism and equity in employment, there has been no official recognition of certain groups being disadvantaged. This is, however, the case, as the FADA-commissioned survey on "Discrimination in Germany" shows that 23.2% of respondents with an immigration background had experienced discrimination (FADA 2017)

There is a definitive lack of commitment to render the GETA stricter on Affirmative Action MCPs. This lack of commitment can be associated with a



general scepticism regarding affirmative action programmes in Germany, which are often dubbed measures of “positive discrimination” (Kraus and Schönwälder 2006, 209). The term itself is indicative of the disregard that is generally held of such policies. In fact, in their evaluation of the Canadian model of multiculturalism, the German authors Schultze and Gerstenkorn (2015, 172) explicitly dub the Canadian affirmative action programmes “positive discrimination”, stating that these are “problematic” and should be viewed critically.

Considering this, a replication of an employment equity act similar to the Canadian one in Germany might not be appropriate. However, a first step similar to the Canadian approach would be to monitor employment of people with immigration background as closely as it is being done in Canada. This would possibly move public discourse from the contention around ‘positive discrimination’ to an acknowledgment of necessary equity measures. Consistent lobbying by the FADA might bear fruits in rendering the possibility of affirmative action programmes in the GETA more stringent. As soon as this happens, looking at the Canadian EEA as a best practice example for affirmative action MCPs could prove to be valuable. However, the analysis of affirmative action MCPs exemplifies the difficulty in applying a very specific Canadian policy to the German framework and context. It demonstrates the necessity for critical and founded evaluation. This necessity will be the subject of the next section.

Making the case for Canadian Multiculturalism: A “best practice beacon” in MCPs for Germany?

The MPI shows that Canada is clearly far ahead of Germany in the implementation of MCPs. For this paper, the MPI findings have proven useful in making the case for necessary improvements to the German MCP framework. The underlying normative assumption of the preceding analysis was that the Canadian model would offer concrete policy guidelines for the further development and entrenchment of German MCPs. However, there are two counterarguments that challenge this contention.

One concerns the actual output of Canadian MCPs, that is: whether Canada’s model deserves the positive reputation it enjoys. The other counterargument pertains to general concerns with the applicability of Canadian MCPs to other contexts. Numerous authors have noted that while Canada’s model is the “poster-child for multiculturalism” (Fleras 2015, 328) the actual outcomes of

Canadian MCPs have not led to social cohesion (Schultze and Gerstenkorn 2015, 162). Fleras (2015, 323-324) also points to unintended outcomes of MCPs: “the unintended impact of official multiculturalism or its manipulation by vested interests may be the ideological masking of racial hierarchies or the exacerbation of racialized inequities”.

Due to a lack of sufficient empirical evidence and a difficulty to distinguish policy effects from other causalities, it is challenging to determine to what extent Canadian MCPs have affected positive change (Kymlicka 2012, 10). However, Fleras points to the positive effect in national identity and institutional inclusion that MCPs in Canada have enabled (Fleras 2015, 322). Evaluating the “Canadian success story” of multiculturalism, Kymlicka (2012, 10, 13) also lists positive effects on immigrant integration, participation and general social cohesion. Highlighting the numerous paradoxes and unresolved issues in Canadian multiculturalism, Fleras points out that “[i]n Canada, multiculturalism promotes immigrant inclusion by encouraging healthy attitudes towards others and establishing responsive institutions that include rather than exclude in building an inclusive country” (ibid. 357). This is what makes the Canadian model a system “worthy of praise and emulation” (ibid. 322).

It is the “emulation” of the Canadian success story, which raises the second counterargument frequently encountered when efforts are made to apply policies of one context to another, which concern the historical and systemic differences that might undermine such an endeavour. Numerous German researchers are weary of the applicability of the Canadian model to Germany, both for historical and systemic reasons (Geißler 2003; Schultze 2010; Schultze and Gerstenkorn 2016). Kymlicka, indisputably one of the most adamant defenders of the Canadian model, is also sceptical of a replication of this model in other contexts, highlighting the uniqueness of the Canadian trajectory of immigration and its geopolitical position as the underlying factors contributing to the success of multiculturalism in Canada, something which European countries undeniably cannot emulate (Kymlicka 2004). However, in his final evaluation of Canadian and German multiculturalism trajectories, Triadafilopoulos points out that the main differences in the Canadian and German responses to their de-facto multicultural societies are not exclusively due to their differing histories and national identities, but also to differing immigration politics in general (Triadafilopoulos 2012, 160). It is this latter point, which opens the door to a possible emulation of Canadian MCPs in Germany, since politics, as opposed to history and geography, can in fact be changed.



While both of these counterarguments to applying the Canadian model of multiculturalism to Germany need to be explored in any further research on this area, they do not undermine my central argument of this paper, which is that Germany should consider adopting aspects of the Canadian multiculturalism framework. Rather, they illustrate the complexity of such an endeavour.

4. Connecting the dots - the Applicability of Canadian Multiculturalism Policies in Germany

The analysis of affirmation MCPs and affirmative action MCPs shows that there is ample ground for applying aspects of Canadian MCPs in Germany. Considering that Prime Minister P.E. Trudeau's official confirmation of multiculturalism in 1971 set the stone rolling, affirmation MCPs, as I argued, could be seen as fundamental to any further endeavours of entrenching MCPs to fulfil the other policy areas proposed by the MPI. Additionally, official affirmation of multiculturalism and diversity in Germany could serve to trigger a discursive shift towards inclusivity. The analysis for affirmative action MCPs proved to be less straightforward. Affirmative action for employment, as well as anti-discrimination policy has long been implemented in Canada. Germany's GETA, however, is a relatively new act and does not yet cover the same ground as the Canadian EEA or the Human Rights Act. However, one could argue that its implementation is a step in the right direction, since it allows for affirmative action programmes.

To conclude, there are numerous aspects of the Canadian model of multiculturalism out of the two analysed policy areas that Germany could consider adopting. The implementation of affirmation MCPs in particular could provide a much-needed normative incentive in pushing Germany to be a more inclusive society with regards to its immigrant minorities. Analysing the remaining six policy areas of Banting and Kymlicka's MPI could also provide further stimulus for Germany's policy framework. The analysis has shown, therefore, that using Canada as a best-practice "beacon of direction" (Geißler 2012, 9) would support Germany in initiating MCP policies.

However, as I have also shown, any application of Canadian MCPs demands close examination and consideration of the specificities of the Canadian and German contexts. A critical evaluation of the outcomes of Canadian multiculturalism should be part of such an application as well. While the MPI provides a fruitful foundation

for policy analysis, it is not concerned with outcomes.

As the title of this paper suggests and the analysis has shown, Germany is a reluctant multiculturalist, particularly in policy. This position is not unlike other continental European countries, which have been sceptical about state-implemented multiculturalism (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010). It is open to debate whether this hesitancy could be attributed rather to a conceptual un-ease with state-implemented multiculturalism, than the effects that such policies could have. As the Canadian model shows, those effects could undoubtedly be positive.

References

- Alm, Friederike. 2018. Beyond Multicultural Citizenship – Rethinking a Conceptual Field. Master Thesis submitted at the Faculty for Social Sciences, Goethe University (unpublished).
- Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes [Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency, FADA]. 2017. Diskriminierungserfahrungen in Deutschland – Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Erhebung und einer Betroffenenbefragung. http://www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/publikationen/Expertisen/Expertise_Diskriminierungserfahrungen_in_Deutschland.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4.
- Banting, Keith, Richard Johnston, Will Kymlicka and Stuart Soroka. 2006. Do multiculturalism policies erode the welfare state? An empirical analysis. In: *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State – Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Societies*. Edited by Banting, Keith and Will Kymlicka, pp. 49-91. Oxford University Press.
- Benoit, Verena, Yasemin El-Menouar and Marc Hebling. 2018. Zusammenleben in kultureller Vielfalt. Vorstellungen und Präferenzen in Deutschland. [Living together in Cultural Diversity. Perceptions and Preferences in Germany]. Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales (BMAS) [Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Issues]. 05/25/2016. Kurzübersicht über das Integrationsgesetz. [Short Overview of the Integration Law]. http://www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Meldungen/2016/hintergrundpapier-zum-integrationsgesetz.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=6.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF) [Federal Agency for Migration and Refugees]. 2020. Glossar, Migrationshintergrund. https://www.bamf.de/DE/Service/ServiceCenter/Glossar/_functions/glossar.html?nn=282918&cms_lv3=294952&cms_lv2=282966.
- Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration [Federal Integration Commissioner]. 2020. Amt und Aufgaben [Office and Function]. <https://www.integrationsbeauftragte.de/ib-de/amt-und-person/amt-und-aufgaben>.
- Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung (BPB) [Federal Center for Political Education]. 2019. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund. <http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/zahlen-und-fakten/soziale-situation-in-deutschland/61646/migrationshintergrund-l>.



- Canadian Human Rights Commission. 2013. Employment Equity. <http://www.chrc-ccdp.ca/eng/content/employment-equity>.
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act, Statutes of Canada 1988, c. 31. <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C%2D18.7/>.
- Fleras, Augie. 2015. Immigration Canada. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Geißler, Rainer. 2003. Multikulturalismus in Kanada – Modell für Deutschland? [Multiculturalism in Canada – A Model for Germany?]. *Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B26.
- Ghelli, Fabio (23/01/2015): Debatte um Einwanderungsgesetz - Kanadisches Punktesystem als Vorbild?. *Mediendienst Integration*, <https://mediendienst-integration.de/artikel/punktesystem-kanada-einwanderungsgesetz.html>.
- Government of Canada. 2012. Canadian Multiculturalism. An Inclusive Citizenship. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp>
- Government of Canada. 2018. Employment Equity Act: Annual Report 2018. <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/services/labour-standards/reports/employment-equity-2018.html#h2.04-h3.04>.
- Government of Canada. 06/27/2016. Statement by the Prime Minister of Canada on Multiculturalism Day. <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2016/06/27/statement-prime-minister-canada-multiculturalism-day>.
- Joppke, Christian. 1999. Immigration and the Nation-State. The United States, Germany, and Britain. Oxford University Press.
- Joppke, Christian. 2001. Multicultural Citizenship. A Critique. In: *European Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 431–447.
- Kraus, Peter A. and Karen Schönwälder. 2006. Multiculturalism in Germany: Rehtoric, scattered experiments, and future chances. In: *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Societies*. Edited by Banting, Keith and Will Kymlicka, pp. 202–22. Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will. 2004. Marketing Canadian Pluralism in the International Arena. *International Journal*, Vol. 59, No. 4, pp. 829–852.
- Kymlicka, Will. 2010. The rise and fall of multiculturalism? – New debates on inclusion and accomodation in diverse societies. In: *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. Edited by Vertovec, Steven and Susanne Wessendorf, pp. 32–49. Routledge.
- Kymlicka, Will. 2012. *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure and Future*. Washington D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.
- Ley, David. 2010. Multiculturalism: a Canadian Defence. In: *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. Edited by Vertovec, Steven and Susanne Wessendorf, pp. 190–206. Routledge.
- Muchowiecka, Laura. 2013. The End of Multiculturalism? Immigration and Integration in Germany and the United Kingdom. *Inquiries Journal/Student Pulse*, Vol. 5, No.6. <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/735/10/the-end-of-multiculturalism-immigration-and-integration-in-germany-and-the-united-kingdom>.
- Multiculturalism Policy Index. 2020. The MCP Index Project. <http://queensu.ca/mcp/about>.
- Radtke, Frank-Olaf: Multiculturalism in Germany: Local Management of Immigrants' Social Inclusion. In: *Migration, Regionalization and Citizenship: Comparing Canada and Europe*. Edited by Sarkowsky, Katja, Rainer-Olaf Schultze and Sabine Schwarze, pp. 55–76. Springer VS.

- Schönwälder, Karen. 2010. Germany: integration policy and pluralism in a self-conscious country of immigration. In *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. Edited by Vertovec, Steven and Susanne Wessendorf, pp. 152-169. Routledge.
- Schultze, Rainer-Olaf. 2008. Multikulturalismus-Politik – „made in Canada“ [Multiculturalism Politics – made in Canada]. In: *Kanada und Deutschland – Migration und Integration im Vergleich [Canada and Germany – Migration and Integration in comparison]*. Edited by Bendel, Petra and Axel Kreienbring, pp. 78-100. *Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, Schriftenreihe Band 15*, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.
- Schultze, Rainer-Olaf and Nina Gerstenkorn. 2015. Der kanadische Multikulturalismus. Ein Erfolgsmodell sozio-politischer Integration? [Canadian Multiculturalism. A successful model for socio-political integration?] In: *Migration, Regionalization and Citizenship: Comparing Canada and Europe*. Edited by Sarkowsky, Katja, Rainer-Olaf Schultze and Sabine Schwarze, pp. 151-181. Springer VS.
- Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoğlu. 2011. Reply to Will Kymlicka: 'Multicultural citizenship within multination states'. In: *Ethnicities* 11 (3), pp. 308–312.
- The Environics Institute, Focus Canada. 2015. Canadian public opinion about immigration and multiculturalism. https://www.environicsinstitute.org/docs/default-source/project-documents/focus-canada-2015-survey-on-immigration-and-multiculturalism/important-canadian-symbols.pdf?sfvrsn=a4ac18a2_2.
- The Washington Post. 12/14/2015. Multiculturalism is a sham, says Angela Merkel. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/12/14/angela-merkel-multiculturalism-is-a-sham/>.
- Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos. 2012. *Becoming Multicultural – Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Tolley, Erin and Madison Vonk. 2016. *Multiculturalism Policy Index: Immigrant Minority Policies*. School of Policy Studies, Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario. [http://queensu.ca/mcp/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.mcpwww/files/files/immigrantminorities/evidence/ImmigrantMinoritiesEvidence2016web\(1\).pdf](http://queensu.ca/mcp/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.mcpwww/files/files/immigrantminorities/evidence/ImmigrantMinoritiesEvidence2016web(1).pdf).
- Vertovec, Steven and Susanne Wessendorf. 2010. Introduction: assessing the backlash against multiculturalism in Europe. In *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. Edited by Vertovec, Steven and Susanne Wessendorf, pp. 1-31. Routledge.
- World Economic Forum. 2019. Which Countries Have the Most Immigrants? <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/03/which-countries-have-the-most-immigrants-51048ff1f9/>.