MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„Voting Rights for Non-Citizen Residents in Luxembourg:

An Anthropological Study of a Political Public Debate"

verfasst von / submitted by

Ralph Petry, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2015 / Vienna 2015

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / degree programme code as it appears on the student record sheet:	A 066 656
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / degree programme as it appears on the student record sheet:	MA CREOLE - Cultural Differences and Transnational Processes
Betreut von / Supervisor:	Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ayşe Çağlar

In memory of Guy Petry 1957 – 1993

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ayşe Çağlar for kindly accepting my research thesis, for her guidance and encouragement during the whole process. The constant critical feedback during various seminars inspired and prepared me to realise this study.

Second, I would like to thank everybody that, knowingly and unknowingly, made this study possible: my interview partners, the group discussion participants, as well as the numerous people that I had stimulating conversations with during the period of my fieldwork. Thank you all for your time, patience and interest.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved ones. First of all, I would like to thank my mother Landy for all the encouraging discussions, as well as for always and patiently supporting me throughout my studies and my life. Second, I would like to thank my brothers Dan and Yan for their mental support and their guidance. Thank you for always having an open ear. Furthermore, I express my gratitude to my whole family and my grandparents Jean and Maya in particular. Thank you for your support and guidance throughout my life. Lastly, and most importantly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my girlfriend Michelle, who patiently supported me from day one. Without your mental support, your strength and your love this study would not have been completed, but remained just an idea among many. Thank you for being in my life.

I am thankful for all the rich and encouraging discussions with every one of you. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Non

Nee

Nein

Approuvez-vous l'idée que les résidents non luxembourgeois aient le droit de s'inscrire de manière facultative sur les listes électorales en vue de participer comme électeurs aux élections pour la Chambre des Députés, à la double condition particulière d'avoir résidé pendant au moins dix ans au Luxembourg et d'avoir préalablement participé aux élections communales ou européennes au Luxembourg ?

Sidd Dir mat der Iddi averstanen, datt d'auslännesch Matbierger d'Recht kréien, sech fakultativ an d'Wielerlëschten anzeschreiwen, fir als Wieler bei Chamberwahle matzemaachen, an dat ënnert der besonnescher duebeler Bedéngung, datt si op d'mannst während 10 Joer zu Lëtzebuerg gewunnt hunn a virdru scho bei Gemengen- oder Europawahlen zu Lëtzebuerg matgemaach hunn?

Befürworten Sie die Idee, dass ausländische Mitbürger das Recht erhalten, sich fakultativ in die Wählerlisten einzuschreiben, um sich als Wähler an den Wahlen zur Abgeordnetenkammer zu beteiligen, und dies unter der besonderen doppelten Bedingung, während mindestens zehn Jahren in Luxemburg gewohnt und sich vorher bereits an Kommunal- oder Europawahlen in Luxemburg beteiligt zu haben?

Oui

Jo

Ja

Figure 1: Question 2 of the referendum of 7 June 2015 in the three official languages of Luxembourg. Retrieved from the "Law of 27 February 2015 on the organisation of a national referendum on different questions in relation to the elaboration of a new Constitution" (see URL 1; my own translation)

List of Abbreviations

ADR	Alternativ Demokratesch Reformpartei
ASTI	Association de Soutien aux Travailleurs Immigrés
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CEFIS	Centre d'Études et de Forrmations Interculturelles et Sociales
CGFP	Confédération Générale de la Fonction Publique
CSV	Chrëschtlech Sozial Vollekspartei
CLAE	Comité de Liasion des Associations Étrangers
DP	Demokratesch Partei
EU	European Union
KPL	Kommunistesch Partei Lëtzebuerg
LCGB	Lëtzebuerger Chrëschtleche Gewerkschaftsbond
LSAP	Lëtzebuerger Sozialistesch Aarbeschterpartei
MINTÉ	Platforme Migrations et Intégration
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OGBL	Onofhängege Gewerkschaftsbond Lëtzebuerg
PID	Partei fir Integral Demokratie

List of Figures

1. Introduction

Do you agree with the idea that non-Luxembourgish residents should have the right, at their own discretion, to register on the electoral roll to participate as voters in the Chamber of Deputies elections, provided they have lived at least 10 years in Luxembourg and have previously taken part in local or European elections in Luxembourg?[1]

International migration increasingly challenges nation-states and their democratic boundaries. The presence of long-term non-citizen residents[2] exerts pressure on the idea of Westphalian sovereignty, which refers to the fact that "(…) a state enjoys ultimate authority over subjects within its territory (…)" (Song 2009: 607). This challenge has been referred to by some scholars as 'the boundary problem' (see Whelan 1983) or 'the problem of inclusion' (see Dahl 1989), leading Rainer Bauböck to argue that international migration "(...) thoroughly [undermines] the traditional ideas of how citizenship, residence and voting rights should be connected (...)" (Bauböck 2005: 686). This circumstance can lead to situations of democratic deficit, which "(…) arises if we take seriously the democratic idea of *popular sovereignty* – that people should rule themselves" (Song 2009: 608f, italics in original). Iris Marion Young agrees when she states the following: "If inclusion in decision-making is a core of the democratic ideal, then, to the extent that such political exclusions exist, democratic societies do not live up to their promise" (Young 2002: 13).

This is especially true for the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg. The small Western European country is the state in the European Union (EU) which, due to its long history of immigration (see Fetzer 2011; Pauly 2011; Allegrezza et al. 2007), has the largest percentage of non-citizens residing on its territory, namely 45.9% as of 1 January 2015 (URL 2). If we consider recent trends of net immigration for Luxembourg and project them to the future, the percentage is likely to increase in the years to come (URL 2). Due to its membership in the EU, Luxembourg already has a very inclusive voting regime in regards to local elections, granting

---

[1] English translation of question 2 of the referendum of 7 June 2015 (my own translation; see also xiii and URL 1).

[2] A note on terminology: throughout this thesis, I will refer to 'non-citizen residents' as people without formal citizenship of, but residing in a given state. In this sense, citizenship is understood as 'citizenship-as-status' or 'national citizenship', and is thereby equivalent to the notion of 'nationality as passport holding'. More on the notion of citizenship, see chapter 2.1.

all non-citizen residents, both EU-citizens as well as third country nationals, active and passive voting rights (i.e. to vote in and stand for local elections, respectively)[3].

However, the current state of affairs in terms of voting rights for national elections in Luxembourg, like in the vast majority of countries worldwide, is that voting rights are linked to the status of national citizenship. This means that almost half of the residents of Luxembourg are not allowed to participate in the political developments and decisions of the country on a national level. In this context, Rainer Bauböck states the following:

> „*In response to this challenge* [described above]*, political theorists have occasionally considered how to redraw the boundaries of political community, a problem that has rarely troubled policymakers or voters*" (Bauböck 2008: 2)

Scholars of citizenship and voting rights mainly debate two different ways to solve the problem of democratic deficit in regards to the lack of political participation and voting rights for non-citizen residents. The first approach consists of redefining and expanding national citizenship to facilitate more and more non-citizens to acquire the national citizenship of their respective country of residence, thereby becoming national citizens with all the respective rights and duties. The second approach argues in favour of a disconnection of the link between voting rights and national citizenship with the argument that such a disconnection would continue the path of progressional democratisation: "While the expansion of suffrage across class, race, and gender lines has been a key part of struggles toward more inclusive citizenship, many take for granted that it is legitimate to deny the vote to resident noncitizens" (Song 2009: 607).

Contrary to the statement by Bauböck that this "(…) problem (…) has rarely troubled policymakers or voters" (Bauböck 2008: 2), the current government of Luxembourg, formed after early elections[4] on 20 October 2013, determined in its coalition agreement to find a solution to the democratic deficit that persists in regards to national elections (see URL 3). The question of a possible extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents, which has been the subject of debate since the 1980s (see Scuto 2013), was one of the hottest topics of debate during the election campaign in 2013. The suggested proposition in the coalition agreement

---

[3] Chapter 4 will elaborate in further detail on the current situation of voting rights in Luxembourg. EU citizenship also grants EU citizens other rights, such as civic and social rights (see Shaw 2007)
[4] The circumstance of the early elections is of relevance in this study (see chapter 4).

was to hold a national referendum[5]. This national referendum was held on 7 June 2015 and took up the second approach introduced above, i.e. the approach of decoupling voting rights and national citizenship. During this rare event in the history of Luxembourg, it being only the fourth[6] of its nature, the citizens of Luxembourg were called to express their opinion on three constitutional issues[7]. Question 2 of this referendum posed the question to the Luxembourgish citizens whether non-citizen residents should be allowed to acquire the active voting right for national elections under two conditions: First, a time of residence in Luxembourg of at least 10 years; second, previous participation in either local elections or elections for the European Parliament (see above). It has to be noted that this proposition did not differentiate between EU-citizens and non-EU citizens, which is why it can be characterised as inclusive, liberal and non-discriminatory. The intention seemed to be to counteract the democratic deficit and elevate the political participation of long-term non-citizen residents in Luxembourg. However, it also highlighted the very deficit that it intends to tackle: only Luxembourgish citizens were allowed to vote in the referendum, since national citizenship is the necessary requirement to participate in national elections, be they legislative elections or national referenda. In other words, the people who this proposition intended to include in the electorate for future elections were not allowed to be included in the decision-making.

As academic literature on citizenship and voting rights shows, extending voting rights to non-citizen residents is nothing out of the ordinary, as there are examples across the world (see chapter 2.2.3.). What could seem rather surprising, however, are two things: First, the timing of the referendum. If we look at recent political developments in a number of European countries, a considerable anti-immigration turn seems to become more and more apparent. Recent national elections in a number of European countries as well as other political and societal developments in Europe seem to suggest an unfavourable context for this specific topic, especially in form of a referendum. This leads to the second point, namely the referendum itself which, as already mentioned, is a rather infrequently used political instrument in Luxembourg and whose history will be elaborated in further detail in chapter 4.

---

[5] Chapter 4 will elaborate in further detail on the history of this debate and the referendum of 7 June 2015.

[6] See Fayot (2005) for the history of referendums in Luxembourg.

[7] Question 1 of the referendum concerned the right to vote for the youth from the age of 16, whereas question 3 concerned the limitation of governmental mandates to ten years. For the exact formulation of these two questions, see chapter 4.3. of this paper.

In the event of a favourable result of question 2 of the referendum, a reconceptualisation of the political participation of non-citizen residents, through the concepts of citizenship and voting rights, would have been the consequence, thereby becoming what Shore, Wright and Però call a "(...) new policy world, framing the space to be governed in a radically new way and recasting the roles of both the state and individuals" (Shore, Wright and Però 2011: 2). However, the referendum turned out negative, as 78.02% of the electorate voted 'No' on the question concerning the possible extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents (see URL 4).[8] Or to put it in the wording of question 2: 78.02% of the voters did not, in principle, support the 'idea' of voting rights for non-citizen residents for national legislative elections. The dimensions of the result of this question, and of the referendum as a whole, were surprising to most observers, commentators and residents of Luxembourg themselves, as no previous polls indicated such a one-sided result.

However, it has to be mentioned right away that this study will not consist of an analysis of the end result of this election. Instead, the research design of this thesis aimed at critically analysing the debate on the subject of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in the context of the election campaign prior to the referendum. The thesis will detail which institutional and individual agents have been active during the campaign, what their respective positions and main arguments were, and how they shaped the discourse on the subject at hand during that period. This leads to the following research question:

> *Who were the agents of the debate about the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents for national elections in Luxembourg, what were their main positions and arguments, and how did these agents shape the discourse in the period prior to the referendum on 7 June 2015?*

To this end, this thesis will combine insights from *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA), building on Jäger (2004), with insights from the *Anthropology of Policy* as conceptualised by Cris Shore and Susan Wright, among others (see Shore and Wright 1997; Shore, Wright and Però 2011). A number of characteristics that both approaches have in common allow for a fruitful combination: First, both CDA and the Anthropology of Policy view discourses and policies as phenomena which actively shape and modify social realties rather than being mere passive representations of reality. In other words, both discourses and policies have agency. Second,

---

[8] Questions 1 and 3 turned out negative as well, with 80.87% and 69.93% of 'No'-vote respectively (see URL 3).

both approaches critically analyse taken-for-granted assumptions and concepts. Third, both approaches highlight the importance of the historical and socio-political contextualisation of policies and discourses, thereby allowing to uncover the complexities behind social and political processes – in this case, the referendum of 7 June 2015 in Luxembourg. In the context of the thesis at hand, CDA in particular will provide important tools to dissect the debate in question by going beyond a mere content analysis. The referendum itself will be characterised as an *discursive event* which, following the CDA approach of Jäger (2004), is defined as an event that is the subject of debate over a certain amount of time on the *discursive planes* of the media as well as in politics (see chapter 3.6. for more details). A critical analysis of the different positions and arguments taken and communicated during the election campaign will allow to detect and uncover ideological positions and values of the various agents of the debate. All these characteristics highlight that insights from the Anthropology of Policy and CDA will be of great relevance in order to answer the research question of this thesis. Furthermore, academic literature on citizenship, voting rights and political participation, among others, will help to set the debate in question in its historical and socio-political context, thereby serving as the theoretical framework of this study.

The topic in question is of great relevance at this particular moment in time since the unique demographic situation puts pressure on the Luxembourgish democracy. Considering recent trends of net immigration, it is probable that the Luxembourgish electorate will represent a minority in the coming years, thereby raising the urgency of finding an adequate solution to address the democratic deficit. In terms of the academic relevance, the study at hand could present a valuable contribution to the larger academic debate concerning the question of extending voting rights to non-citizen residents. The increase in migratory flows could pose similar challenges to more and more states and societies in the future, and it is hoped that the findings of this study will provide some valuable insights into how institutional and individual agents are able to shape the discourse on this particular subject.

The following structure will show the way through the thesis at hand:

Chapter 2 will provide this thesis with a theoretical framework, which is important for two reasons: First, through a discussion of relevant academic literature from different disciplines, the theoretical framework will put this research in a broader context of academic literature. Second, it will provide the research with theoretical concepts on how to operationalise and analyse the findings of the empirical data in order to connect this data with the theoretical framework.

In chapter 3, the methodology that has been applied for the data collection and analysis will be discussed. First, a few notes will be made concerning qualitative research methods, followed by a quick description of the fieldwork itself. After that, I will elaborate on the ethnographic material, before the respective applied methods will be presented: participant observation, interviews, group discussion and informal conversations, as well as field notes, which transit to the main method of analysis, namely the aforementioned CDA. A few remarks on positionality of the researcher will close chapter 3.

Chapter 4 will situate the debate on the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Luxembourg in its historical and socio-political context. First, the specific demographic situation of Luxembourg will briefly be discussed, before elaborating on the historical depth of the debate in the context of Luxembourg. Then, a specification of the current situation of Luxembourgish citizenship as well as of voting rights in Luxembourg is needed, before briefly addressing certain external factors and developments in Europe that might have influenced the debate or the end result of the referendum.

Chapters 5 and 6 will constitute the main chapters of this thesis. Chapter 5 will bring the institutional and individual agents that have been active during the debate, together with their respective positions and arguments, to the forefront. These agents have been political parties (including their youth sections), sectors of the civil society (NGOs, unions, among others), the media, members of the academia, as well as some individuals.

Chapter 6 will consist of a critical analysis and discussion of the respective positions and arguments of the agents of the debate. First, and drawing back on the theoretical framework, the positions and arguments will be critically analysed. Second, some of the arguments that have been most discussed and contested during the campaign will be analysed in further detail, such as the legal nature of the referendum itself or the two different notions that have been used to refer to the voting rights for non-citizen residents, among many others.

In Chapter 7, a few general reflections on the election campaign will be provided, before the implications of the negative end result of the referendum in general, as well as of question 2 in particular, in regards to the discussions on a new Constitution for Luxembourg will briefly be discussed. The end result of the referendum seems to imply that the first approach discussed above, namely the expansion of the national citizenship, will be adopted in order to allow more and more non-citizen residents in Luxembourg to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship.

The Conclusion will summarise the findings of this study, as well as provide a short outlook on future research on the topic of discussions on extending voting rights to non-citizen residents.

Before turning to the rest of this thesis, a quick note on my personal interest in the topic: During the election campaign of 2013, I started to become interested in the topic of the extension of voting rights to non-citizens residents and started to follow the campaign more closely. It did not take long for me to realise that this topic will become the subject of my MA thesis. Courses on transnational migration and cultural diversity at the department of Social- and Cultural Anthropology affirmed my endeavour to work on the topic. The thesis at hand is the result of my analysis.

2. Theoretical Framework

As already mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis, academic scholars are generally discussing two routes for answering the question of how political participation of non-citizen residents should be conceptualised: "One is to extend the franchise, the other is to facilitate and promote access to citizenship" (Aleinikoff and Weil 2006: 62). There has been a considerable amount of previous academic research concerning the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents, its origins dating back as far as the early 1990s (see for example Bauböck 1994; Hammar 1990 or Layton-Henry 1990). This previous academic research comes from a variety of different academic disciplines, such as normative political theory, sociology, anthropology, as well as constitutional, law and policy studies. It will serve as the theoretical framework for the thesis at hand, thereby putting into a broader context and making it a transdisciplinary study.

The first section will elaborate on the concept of citizenship, specifically on citizenship as a legal status. Citizenship also refers to an entitlement to political rights, leading to the second section which focusses on academic literature on voting rights and political participation. This section will also provide some examples of voting rights for non-citizen residents on various levels. The third section will put this study in an anthropological framework, mainly by drawing on literature from Anthropology of Policy, as has been explained in the Introduction. The last section will draw on literature from constitutional, law and policy studies in order to put the study in a broader legal framework.

The following quote illustrates the intertwining of studies on citizenship and voting rights, explaining why the first two sections of this chapter will elaborate on these two fields of study:

> "[T]he extension of voting rights (…) to denizens is more than a policy that *may* enhance democracy: it bears on principles, deeply rooted in liberal and republican traditions of citizenship, that are open to interpretation and controversial" (Pedroza 2014: 1; italics in original).[9]

---

[9] The term *denizen* was originally used by Tomas Hammar (1990) and refers to non-citizens with permanent residency status. For more details on the term, see section 2.1.2.

2.1. Citizenship Studies

"Citizenship is a concept with multiple dimensions. It is impossible to encompass all of its uses and meanings in a single definition. It is also pointless to try and do so since many interpretations of citizenship are metaphorical or overstretched"
(Bauböck 2008: 1)

The concept of citizenship goes back to ancient Greek and Roman scholars, and can therefore be considered as an old field of research in academia. These more classical interpretations of citizenship are traditionally referred to as *republican* and *liberal* conceptions of citizenship respectively. According to David Miller, the republican conception of citizenship "(…) conceives the citizen as someone who plays an active role in shaping the future direction of his or her society through political debate and decision-making. (…) A citizen identifies himself with the political community to which he or she belongs, and is committed to promoting its common good through active participation in its political life" (Miller 2005: 53)[10]. Contrary to the republican conception, the liberal conception of citizenship places the individual at the centre of attention: "Liberal theory, whether of citizenship or of anything else, begins with the individual" (Schuck 2000: 132). These two traditional conceptions of citizenship are still of relevance today as more modern conceptions are building on them (see below). However, the aim of this chapter does not consist of a full recap of the concept of citizenship, as it has been done more extensively elsewhere.[11]

2.1.1. National Citizenship

One basic aspect of the concept of citizenship, as mentioned above, refers to citizenship as "(...) a status designating formal state membership" (Joppke 2007: 28). Rogers S. Smith agrees when he states the following: "'Citizens' are people who are legally recognised as members of a particular, officially sovereign political community" (Smith 2002: 105). This legal status provides citizens with "(…) some basic rights to be protected by that community's government, whether or not those rights include rights of political participation" (Smith 2002: 105). Smith further stresses that, according to this meaning of citizenship, "(…) possessing 'citizenship' is understood to be effectively equivalent to possessing 'nationality' under a particular modern state" (Smith 2002: 105). In this sense, it is also often referred to as national citizenship, i.e.

---

[10] See also Dagger (2002) for further details.
[11] See, for example, Castels and Davidson (2000), Insin and Turner (2002), Magnette (2005) or Marshall (1950), among others.

citizenship of a given state. Or, in other words: "This is citizenship as pass-holding" (Joppke 2007: 28).

This leads to the question how citizenship as a legal status is acquired. The conventional way how citizenship is acquired is via birthright, which in turn consists of two different mechanisms, namely:

1. *Jus soli*, whereby citizenship is acquired via birth in a given territory
2. *Jus sanguinis*, whereby citizenship is acquired based on descent

The overwhelming majority of the people worldwide obtains citizenship via birthright (see Joppke 2007: 34). Rainer Bauböck adds the following: "Birthright citizenship specifically secures the continuity of democratic polities across multiple generations. (…) Virtually every country on the world applies jus sanguinis" (Bauböck 2008: 7). Furthermore, Christian Joppke remarks that, due to the fact that citizenship is obtained via birth, either via *jus soli* or *jus sanguinis*, state membership can be characterised as involuntarily: "(…) in *both* it is birth, not choice, which makes a citizen" (see Joppke 2007: 34; italics in original).

2.1.2. Citizenship in a Transnational World

As already indicated in the introducing words of this study, international migration increasingly poses challenges to the way that national citizenship has traditionally been viewed: [T]he arrival and settlement of large numbers of newcomers raises important citizenship questions" (Aleinikoff and Weil 2006: 54). International migration transforms people from national citizens in their respective countries of origin to non-citizens in the respective receiving country and whose rights, in the case of long-term settlement, "(…) are derived from residence rather than from formal membership, creating quasi-citizenship ("denizenship")" (Bauböck 2008: 3). The term 'denizenship' is interesting in this context. According to Bauböck, this term "(…) refers to a special legal status of long-term resident foreign nationals who enjoy most of the civil liberties and social welfare rights of resident citizens, often including rights to family reunification, some protection from deportation, and voting rights in local elections, as well as quasi-entitlements to naturalization. (…) Denizenship is thus a status of residential quasi-citizenship combined with external formal citizenship" (Bauböck 2007: 2395f).

Thus, international migration is increasingly forcing nation-states to reconfigure their conceptions of citizenship. According to Christian Joppke, Roger Brubaker was one of the first scholars of citizenship studies that took international immigration into account: "He was the

first to articulate sharply citizenship's peculiar duality to be 'internally inclusive' – that is, to allow for only one formally equal membership status within society – and to be 'externally exclusive' – that is, categorically to exclude from such equal membership status all foreigners" (Joppke 2007: 15). In this sense, citizenship is as much about equality as it is about difference-making (see also Shaw 2007).

Christian Joppke notes in this context that "(…) 'access to citizenship' is the first and foremost problem generated by the fact of immigration meeting the institution of citizenship. (…) In a liberal-democratic context, the presence of sizable, long-settled immigrant populations cannot but exert pressure toward making citizenship more accessible to and inclusive of immigrants (…)" (Joppke 2007: 36). Joppke further observes that many countries have made modifications of their laws on nationality in terms of certain liberalisations since international migration has been rising (see Joppke 2007). Countries began to combine certain elements of *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*[12], thereby rendering both approaches "(…) complementary rather than alternative" (Bauböck 2008: 7).

Normative political theory, concerned with the notion of 'what ought to be' in any given political framework, asks in this context: Can national citizenship be the sole mechanism in times of international migration? If not, who exactly is entitled to citizenship in any given case? And how should this be accomplished, via naturalisation or dual citizenship, voluntarily or involuntarily?

Naturalisation is defined by Aleinikoff and Weil as "(…) the process by which members of the first generation attain citizenship in a host country" (Aleinikoff and Weil 2006: 57). In the context of increasing international migration, and in some cases in combination with liberalisations of legal frameworks, a new mechanism has become more and more common worldwide, namely the introduction of dual citizenship: "In the conditions of the modern world, dual nationality often reflects the reality of complex loyalties and allegiances in an increasingly interconnected world" (Aleinikoff and Weil 2006: 59)[13]. Despite the liberalisations mentioned above, Bauböck states that "[b]irthright citizenship, rather than lenient conditions for naturalizations, is also the main cause for the proliferation of multiple citizenship. Children are born as dual citizens when their parents are of different nationalities or when a foreign citizenship acquired by descent is added to a domestic one obtained through jus soli" (Bauböck 2008: 8). Furthermore, recent trends

---

[12] See Joppke (2007) for more details on the liberalisations of various countries.
[13] Aleinikoff and Weil (2006) refer to dual citizenship as 'dual nationality'.

seem to suggest that countries are returning to more restrictive national conceptions of citizenship (see Joppke 2007).

The concepts of 'stakeholder citizenship' by Rainer Bauböck and 'postnational citizenship' by Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal will serve as two examples of how the normative question mentioned above can be answered. Both concepts approach the question from different angles, and which were also the subject of debate in the context of this study.

Rainer Bauböck's concept of 'stakeholder citizenship' defines citizenship as "(…) equal membership in a self-governing political community" (Bauböck 2008: 2). Bauböck answers the normative question of who is entitled to citizenship as follows: "(…) all those, and only those individuals, who have a stake in the future of a politically organised society have a moral claim to be recognised as its citizens and to be represented in democratic self-government" (Bauböck 2008: 4). He argues further that, "(…) if resident foreigners enjoy a claim to be admitted as new citizens and emigrants a claim to retain their citizenship of origin, then, as is increasingly the case, both receiving and sending countries ought to tolerate dual citizenship" (Bauböck 2008: 5).

David Owen agrees when he states that, "(…) since first generation migrants are generally stakeholders in both their countries of origin and of habitual residence, this principle lends itself to support of dual citizenship" (Owen 2011: 650). The same can probably be said for second generation migrants, but less for third generation migrants, according to Owen (see Owen 2011; referring to Bauböck 2007). Furthermore, the principle of 'stakeholder citizenship' views citizenship as legal status as important for the entitlement to voting rights (see below), which means that the nation-state is still relevant because it is the nation-state which provides the parameters for the access to citizenship. To conclude, Bauböck calls for an expansion of citizenship for "(…) all those (and only those) who have a stake in the future of the political community" (Bauböck 2008: 12) in times of international migration, as well as for a more thorough coordination between countries that accept multiple citizenship, especially in the framework of the EU where mobility between member states is facilitated and encouraged (see Bauböck 2008).

Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal has a different view on how citizenship should be conceptualised in today's world. Her 'postnational citizenship' concept starts from the opposite premise as Bauböck's 'stakeholder citizenship': „The state is no longer an autonomous and independent organization closed over a nationally defined population. Instead, we have a system of

constitutionally interconnected states with a multiplicity of membership" (Soysal 1994: 163f). Her analysis of the incorporation of guest workers in Europe "(…) reveals a shift on the major organizing principle of membership in contemporary polities: the logic of personhood supersedes the logic of national citizenship. This trend is informed by a dialectical tension between national citizenship and universal human rights. Individual rights and obligations, which were historically located in the nation-state, have increasingly moved to a universalistic plane, transcending the boundaries of particular nation-states" (Soysal 1994: 164).

In other words, we are currently living in a time in which "(…) national citizenship is losing ground to a more universal model of membership, anchored in deterritorialised notions of persons' rights" (Soysal 1994: 3). This argument begs the question of what makes non-citizens rightful members of a state, if not national citizenship? Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal answers this question as follows: "(…) it is grounded in a shared public, social space (…)" (Soysal 1994: 166), in other words, the fact that they live in the same social space as national citizens.[14]

As a conclusion serves the following quote by Shaw, highlighting that particularly for diverse compositions of societies, "(…) normatively, postnational or transnational forms of membership do seem to offer attractive alternatives to bounded versions of citizenship which are simply empirically closer to reality of life within complex polities (…)" (Shaw 2007: 34f).

What do these considerations mean for the second aspect of citizenship (i.e. citizenship as entitlement to political rights)? Caramani and Grotz answer this question as follows:

> "Under circumstances in which nationality laws have a narrower role in giving access to voting rights, electoral laws acquire a centre-stage position in granting voting rights" (Caramani and Grotz 2015: 803)

---

[14] See also Pries (2001a; 2001b) on the notion of transnational social space.

2.2. Studies on Voting Rights

"Large-scale immigration presents a challenge for states to the extent it produces a settled population of less-than-full members with less-than-full rights and duties" (Aleinikoff and Weil 2006: 54)

A second basic meaning of citizenship characterises "(…) a citizen (…) [as] a person with political rights to participate in processes of popular self-governance. These include rights to vote; to hold elective and appointive governmental offices; to serve on various sorts of juries; and generally to participate in political debates as equal community members" (Smith 2002: 105). In other words, this second meaning of citizenship refers to an entitlement to political participation as an equal member of a political community.

In his article *Expansive Citizenship – Voting Beyond Territory and Membership* (2005), Rainer Bauböck sketches "(…) four contrasting ideal-typical positions, which emerge from combining positive and negative answers (…)" (Bauböck 2005: 685) to the following question: "Which general ideas support or reject electoral rights beyond territory and beyond citizenship?"

Figure 2: Four Ideal-Types of Expansive Voting Rights. Corresponds to "Table 2. Perspectives on expansive electoral rights" retrieved from Bauböck (2005: 685)

(Bauböck 2005: 685). These typologies, despite being ideal-types, will help to differentiate the different positions on the normative question of who is entitled to voting rights, and will serve as analytical tools for the critical analysis and discussion of this thesis (see chapter 6).

All four typologies accept the reality of a world that is increasingly becoming transnational, albeit they propose differing answers to the challenges posed by international migration. The first two typologies (1) and (2) argue that national citizenship should be, or remain, the precondition for the entitlement to voting rights. The ladder two typologies (3) and (4) argue that voting rights should be disconnected from national citizenship as a precondition for the entitlement to voting rights.

2.2.1. Voting Rights Connected to National Citizenship

Rainer Bauböck refers to the first principle that he introduces as 'civic republicanism' (1), which is described as a "(…) traditional republican position [that] must reject both types of enlarged citizenship" (Bauböck 2005: 685). This position refuses electoral rights for both non-resident citizens (i.e. expatriates) because "[o]nly citizens who are present in the polity can govern themselves by participating in making its laws" (Bauböck 2005: 685), as well as for non-citizen residents since they "(…) must be an exclusive privilege of citizens" (Bauböck 2005: 685). In other words, national citizenship as well as residence in the country are essential preconditions in order to be viewed as full members of the political community. Bauböck notes that this principle is generally open to new members who acquire national citizenship, but the political community is free to determine who can become a citizen and under which conditions (see Bauböck 2005).

The second principle that Bauböck refers to is called 'ethnic nationalism' (2), and as a principle close to the republican position as well, it "(…) supports the inclusion of expatriates but rejects political rights for non-citizen residents. It conceives of the nation as a community of culture, imagined descent, and destiny that has a right to self-determination" (Bauböck 2005: 685). As members of a community with a common culture, of imagined descent as well as with a common destiny, long-term or permanent expatriates are included in what Benedict Anderson has famously called the 'imagined community' (see Anderson 1991 [1983]) usually characterised as a nation. This principle seems to make the sharpest distinction between people who are nationals of a given nation-state and people who are non-nationals, outsiders, or foreigners. Insofar as this principle has an ethnic conception of citizenship, the question arises if, in a strict sense, non-nationals can ever become nationals, meaning full and equal members of the nation.

Advocates of these two principles express the view that citizenship, and thereby nationalisation, should be preferred to the extension of voting rights to non-citizens because (potential) citizens should have strong feelings of belonging, self-identification and loyalty towards their respective nation-state (see for example Miller 2005). Other scholars argue that these two principles are close to what is commonly referred to as assimilation: "[they are] based on the complete assimilation of the immigrant into dominant, traditional national values and perceived common identity" (Shaw 2007: 245). From an anthropological point of view, especially principle (2) seems to be the most questionable, as it utilises ambiguous notions

such as culture, identity, tradition or nation – notions that have been subject of critique in anthropology for a long time.

As these considerations illustrate, the overwhelming majority of legal frameworks worldwide apply some variation of these two principles. Most countries allow their expatriates to participate in national elections, whereas others lose their entitlement to political rights after a certain period of residence outside their state of origin.

The following quote by Jo Shaw concludes this section: "In practice, the continuing case against alien suffrage in modern polities is generally premised upon versions of communitarianism combined with more formalist notions of sovereignty, boundaries and membership" (Shaw 2007: 55)

2.2.2. Voting Rights Disconnected from National Citizenship

Proponents of the extension of voting rights to non-citizens argue that, in a world that is becoming increasingly transnational, the state should allow mechanisms for people without formal citizenship to access political rights, thereby eliminating the connection of national citizenship as a necessary precondition for electoral rights. In this sense, such voting rights have sometimes been described as 'transnational voting rights' (see for example Caramani and Grotz 2015)

Let us return to the two last typologies of Bauböck which both allow electoral rights for non-citizen residents. The first, which Rainer Bauböck calls 'territorial inclusion' (3), "(…) regards a democratic polity as a community of individuals who are subjected to the same political authority and its laws and who have therefore equal rights to representation and participation in the making of these laws" (Bauböck 2005: 686). Consequently, "[e]very permanent resident in a territorial jurisdiction should (…) enjoy voting rights" (Bauböck 2005: 686). According to Bauböck, this can be achieved by two different ways: First, by "(…) automatic naturalization of all who have legally resided in the country for a certain number of years" (Bauböck 2005: 686, referring to Rubio-Marín 2000). Second, by "(…) disconnecting electoral rights from formal citizenship status" (Bauböck 2005: 686). Understood in the strict sense as an ideal-type, voting rights for non-resident citizens, especially long-term or permanent expatriates, are not really welcomed, or it is even required to exclude them (see López-Guerra 2005), because they "(…) may (…) be seen as undermining the integrity of the democratic process since those who live permanently abroad should not be able to influence the making of laws to which only internal

residents will be subjected" (Bauböck 2005: 686, referring to López-Guerra 2005). David Owen argues that the position of 'territorial inclusion' (3) in this strict understanding of the term as shared by López-Guerra (2005) might be characterised as a *jus domicile* principle (see Owen 2011: 646), since *"(…)* given the territorial jurisdiction of the state, being resident on the territory of the state is a necessary (as well as sufficient) condition for being subject to the collectively binding decisions of the state" (Owen 2011: 645f).

This principle is very close to the classical arguments of 'full inclusion' and the 'principle of intrinsic equality' made by Robert Dahl: "The demos must include all adult members of the association (…)" (Dahl 1989: 129). Robert Dahl characterises as members "(…) all adults subject to the binding collective decisions of the association" (Dahl 1989: 120). Dahl argues in favour of an inclusive democracy because "(…) an exclusive demos is unlikely to protect the interests of those who are excluded" (Dahl 1989: 129). In academic literature, this principle is also often called the 'all-subjected principle', referring to the fact that everybody that is subjected to legal framework of a state should be entitled to partake in the decision-making.

The fourth principle introduced by Bauböck is called 'affected interest' (4) and is the most inclusive way of conceptualising voting rights because it includes everybody that might be affected by political decisions. This principle is often referred to as the 'all-affected principle', and it is characterised by Rainer Bauböck as a position that "(…) naturally leads to including resident non-citizens in elections, but it also may be invoked by expatriates if some of their vital interests are affected by political decisions taken in their country of original citizenship. A principle of affected interests may even justify voting rights for non-citizen non-residents when the decisions of governments profoundly impact on the interest of other countries' populations" (Bauböck 2005: 686).[15] According to Sofia Näsström, "(…) the all-affected principle is a popular device in debates on cosmopolitan democracy (…)" (Näsström 2010: 116) and is mostly referred to in combination with human rights claims. However, Bauböck himself points to the fact that this principle is problematic because national elections usually don't coincide with only specific laws that might affect some groups and others not, but are "(…) decisions about who will enjoy general powers of law-making and enforcement within an already given polity" (Bauböck 2005: 686).[16]

---

[15] In the context of Luxembourg, this principle would support the argument that cross-border workers would also enjoy an entitlement to voting rights, since some political decisions taken in Luxembourg also affect non-citizen non-residents that come to work in Luxembourg every day.
[16] See, for example, Näsström (2010) or Owen (2011) for further details.

According to these rather liberal positions, individuals have to be seen as bearers of rights who should have free choices of belonging: "If belonging is not to be forced, but chosen, it makes sense to open as much space as possible for resident migrants to decide when and if to become part of the polity, without denying them the right to participate in the place where they reside" (Pedroza 2014: 6). In this sense, proponents of the extension of voting rights to non-citizens are of the opinion that "(...) normatively speaking, the right to vote offers a principle superior to citizenship-as-nationality as a guide to advance democratic citizenship" (Pedroza 2014: 6)

Rainer Bauböck himself stresses the point that these four ideal-types are "defective" (Bauböck 2005: 685; see also Bauböck 2008). Drawing on his concept of 'stakeholder citizenship' discussed in the previous section, he combines components from republican and liberal positions:

> *"From the former it retains the idea that citizenship is a status of full membership in a self-governing polity and that voting rights should generally be attached to such status. From the latter it derives a principle of inclusion that would give stakeholders a subjective claim to membership and electoral rights"* (Bauböck 2005: 686)

2.2.3. Examples of Voting Rights for Non-Citizen Residents[17]

The analysis of more quantitative and descriptive research on the extension of voting rights to resident non-citizens shows that the topic is not as rare as one might think, even though, as Rainer Bauböck points out, "[v]oting rights for expatriates are more common than for non-citizen residents" (Bauböck 2005: 683). Lucy Pedroza agrees when she states that discussions about the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents have been, and are, taking place in all continents, although "(...) overwhelmingly restricted to local-level elections" (Pedroza 2014: 2). An exact number of states that have implemented such rights in one form or another is not easy to determine because "(…) denizen enfranchisement [is being] treated as a homogenous policy trend, although (…) it is rather a heterogeneous policy trend that defies easy characterization" (Pedroza 2014: 2).

One varying condition is, for example, the required years of residence in a state, which can differ greatly, from one year of permanent residency in New Zealand up to 15 years in Uruguay

---

[17] For more information on voting rights for non-resident citizens (i.e. expatriates), see for example Bauböck (2007) Lafleur (2015), López-Guerra (2005), among others.

for example. Some countries have granted voting rights to resident non-citizens only on the local level, others have added regional levels, and again others also permit resident non-citizens to vote on the national level (see below). But even in these cases, the populations that are integrated in the various electorates differ. In most cases, voting rights are only granted to selective parts of the non-citizens residing on the national territory. Examples are a number of member states of the EU, which grants voting rights, to varying degrees, on the local and supranational level to citizens of the member states of the EU, or Spain and Portugal, who grant voting rights on the local level (in both cases) or on the national level (in the case of Portugal for Brazilian nationals) through "(…) reciprocity and linguistic commonality" (Bauböck 2005: 685). There are currently only five countries that permit "(…) a residence-based right to vote in national elections that does not discriminate between different citizenships" (Bauböck 2005: 684): New Zealand (after 1 year of legal permanent residence), Chile and Ecuador (after 5 years of residence), Malawi (after 7 years of residence) and Uruguay (after 15 years of residence) (see Bauböck 2005; Escobar 2015). The referendum of 7 June 2015 intended to add Luxembourg to this list, since question 2 of the referendum did not differentiate between EU-citizens and third country nationals.

The article *Immigrant enfranchisement in Latin America: From strongmen to universal citizenship* (2015) by Cristina Escobar provides an in-depth overview of the varieties and historical reasons of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Latin America, whereas the article *Expanding the Electorate: Comparing the Noncitizen Voting Practice of 25 Democracies* (2014) by David C. Earnest compares the subject in question in 25 states on a variety of different levels. The *European Union Democracy Observatory on Citizenship (EUDO Citizenship)* provides many informations on voting rights procedures within the EU and beyond (see URL 5).

In summary, Pedroza states that "[e]xtensions of voting rights to foreign residents around the world are characterised by several variations, from the conditions upon which the vote can be exercised, to the level at which non-citizens may vote, to the population of non-citizen residents covered by the franchise and, last but not least, to the actual success of the reform and its implementation" (Pedroza 2014: 2).

2.3. Anthropology of Policy

"[T]he anthropology of public policy is devoted to research into policy issues and processes and the critical analysis of those processes"
(Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop 2005: 31)

In recent years, public policies are increasingly becoming areas of interest for anthropological scholars and studies. Cris Shore and Susan Wright, two leading figures of the Anthropology of Policy, already stated in 1997 that policy "(…) has become an increasingly central concept and instrument in the organization of contemporary societies. Like the modern state (to which its growth can be linked), policy now impinges on all areas of life so that it is virtually impossible to ignore or escape its influence. More than this, policy increasingly shapes the way individuals construct themselves as subjects" (Shore and Wright 1997: 4). This is ever so true in today's world. Despite this prominence of the notion of policy, "(…) there is still little agreement on an authoritative definition of policy" (Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop 2005: 35). However, as Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop continue to argue, an authoritative definition of policy is not necessarily needed from the viewpoint of an Anthropology of Policy (see Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop 2005).[18] Rather than trying to agree on a working definition of what a policy is, the Anthropology of Policy provides a useful venue to understand public policy as "(...) a fundamental 'organising principle' of society which (…) provides a way of conceptualising and symbolising social relations, and around which people live their lives and structure their realities" (Shore, Wright and Però 2011: 2). In this sense, it is argued that "[t]he anthropology of policy (…) leads straight into issues at the heart of anthropology: norms and institutions; ideology and consciousness; knowledge and power; rhetoric and discourse; meaning and interpretation; the global and the local (…)" (Shore and Wright 1997: 4), among others.

Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop state that "[t]he starting point of an anthropological approach to public policy is to examine the assumptions and framing of policy debates. (…) Policies arise out of particular contexts (…)" (Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop 2005: 33), and thereby "(…) encapsulate the entire history and culture of the society that generated them" (Shore and Wright 1997: 7). In other words, any given policy does not manifest itself in a historical or political vacuum. It is in this sense that one component of this study necessarily consists of mapping out the historical background as well as the socio-political context of the

---

[18] For an etymology of the term 'policy', see (Wedel, Shore, Feldman and Lathrop 2005; 35f).

debate on the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Luxembourg (see chapter 4).

A second important component of studying policies through an anthropological lens is to look at policies not as static or monolithic entities, but as "(...) productive, performative and continually contested" (Shore, Wright and Però 2011: 1) social phenomena, originating from and having implications on people. In this sense, policies are not only instruments of rule and governance that comprise certain contents. Instead, policies have to be studied and analysed as carriers of meaning as they "(...) often migrate into new contexts and settings, and acquire a life of their own that [have] consequences that go beyond the original intentions" (Shore, Wright and Però 2011: 3). In other words, if we are to understand policies as carriers of meaning, policies are not to be considered as being neutral. More often than not, they carry dominant values, which in turn are never static as well, but constantly contested, thereby resulting in social change.

But how can we grasp policies as anthropological fields of study? Shore and Wright note that the anthropology of policy, understood as described above, "(…) offers the potential for a radical reconceptualization of 'the field'; not as a discrete local community or bounded geographical area, but as a social and political space articulated through relations of power and systems of governance" (Shore and Wright 1997: 14). The field of study changes: "It is no longer a question of studying a local community of 'a people'; rather, the anthropologist is seeking a method for analyzing connections between levels and forms of social process and action, and exploring how those processes work in different sites, local, national and global" (Shore and Wright 1997: 14). This leads to the assessment that anthropological research on policies is in need of multi-sited ethnography, in terms of different sites and scales that are no longer limited to geographical localities, but are rather understood as "(…) contested political spaces" (Shore and Wright 1997: 15).

Gregory Feldman, who prefers the notion of 'apparatus'[19] instead of policy, calls for a 'nonlocal ethnography' in this context, whereby 'nonlocal' "(…) describes discourses that are present in multiple locations but are not of any particular location" (Feldman 2011: 33). Feldman highlights that nonlocal ethnography "(…) does not involve the abandonment of participant observation. Rather, it calls for a deep assessment of the kind of knowledge that participant-observation

---

[19] The notion of 'apparatus' is drawn from the notion of 'dispositif' or 'dispositive' by Michel Foucault (see Foucault 1972).

delivers in order to create a flexible methodology that is not too fixed to a few places" (Feldman 2011: 46). Furthermore, Feldman sees displacement while conducting anthropological research as no longer limited to 'going somewhere else':

"Nonlocal ethnography would interpret 'displacement' to describe any inquiry that problematises what the researcher would otherwise take for granted. Displacement – the removal from familiarity – need not be reduced to matters of physical location, but rather deepened to include any experience in which discourse – the taken for granted assumptions that establish norms and deviation – is interrogated, problematised or, in a word, 'situated'" (Feldman 2011: 46)

One can take from this quote that Feldman defends the idea of conducting scientific research in one's own socio-political context, provided that one "(…) problematises what the researcher would otherwise take for granted" (Feldman 2011: 46).

The reassessment of the conventional conception of the anthropological field also entails a shift when it comes to analysing relevant anthropological material. Among the most important materials in this regard are government policy documents (see Shore and Wright 1997). In the framework of the thesis at hand, policy documents on multiple subjects and from various origins, but also other forms of information material, such as election brochures by political parties, will constitute one part of the research materials (see chapters 3.2. and 4).

The language and discourses communicated through such policy documents and other 'non-local' anthropological materials are of great relevance: "Policy language and discourse (…) provides a key to analysing the architecture of modern power relations" (Shore and Wright 1997: 12). What is important, according to the Anthropology of Policy, are the meanings that the different actors of society are giving to the discourse. As already mentioned, CDA will provide analytical tools to detect and critically analyse the respective positions and arguments of the agents in the debate.

Another important component of the Anthropology of Policy is the fact that it not only focusses on the decision- and policy-makers, but specifically "(...) conceives an active role for the governed, as well as the technologies that mediate between them" (Shore, Wright and Però 2011: 12). To conclude, in the framework of this thesis, policies are understood as entailing the following characteristics: being active, dynamic and constantly contested; carrying meaning and linked to different discourses, which in turn entail values and ideologies. All of

these notions are closely linked to the CDA, which will serve the analytical framework for this thesis (see chapter 3.6.).

2.4. Constitutional, Law and Policy Studies

Academic literature from constitutional, law and policy studies also needs to be taken into consideration. Even though it is situated in the framework of a specific state, the case study of this paper needs to be contextualised in broader European and international legal framework in order to enable a deeper comprehension of the various components. In the context of European legal framework, Luxembourg as a member state of the European Union ratified the Maastricht Treaty (TEC) in 1994 – a treaty which is now called the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). In this context, the following TFEU articles are relevant for this thesis:

- Article 19 (1) TFEU[20]: "(…) the Council (…) may take appropriate action to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation"
- Article 20 (1) TFEU[21]: "Citizenship of the Union is hereby established. Every person holding the nationality of a Member state shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall be additional to and not replace national citizenship"
- Article 20 (2) TFEU[22] : "Citizens of the Union shall enjoy the rights and be subject to the duties provided for in the Treaties. They shall have, inter alia:
    (a) the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member states;
    (b) the right to vote and to stand as candidates in elections to the European Parliament and in municipal elections in their Member state of residence, under the same conditions as nationals of that State"

However, scholars such as Jo Shaw find fault with Article 20 (2) b) TFEU, considering it as "(…) very limited. It does not cover access on the part of EU citizens to the most important elections taking place within the Member states, namely, general or national elections (…)" (Shaw 2007: 7). Article 20 (2) b) also excludes non-citizen residents in EU Member states that are nationals of third country (i.e. third country nationals). In this sense, the non-discrimination

---

[20] Ex Article 13 (1) TEC.
[21] Ex Article 17 (1) TEC.
[22] Ex Article 17 (2) TEC

on grounds of nationality, as mentioned in Article 19 (1), does not extend to third country nationals[23]. Jo Shaw also highlights the fact that, despite the 'establishment' of EU citizenship, "(…) access to citizenship of the Member States, and thus [via Article 20 (1) TFEU] to citizenship of the Union, remains essentially a matter of national law" (Shaw 2007: 51). Furthermore, the Council of Europe adopted the Convention on the Political Participation of Foreigners in Local Life, which was concluded in 1992 and entered into force in 1997, offering "(…) a template of incremental steps towards enhancing the political participation rights of non-nationals, up to and including the right to vote in local elections (…)" (Shaw 2007: 65).

In search for international human rights instruments, there are a few conventions that can be named in this regard, "but there are – as with most international instruments – no sanctions for non-compliance" (Shaw 2007: 65). As an example serves "(…) the most important general international instrument on migration and migrants, the UN convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families [which] merely states that 'migrants workers *may* enjoy political rights in the State of employment if that State, *in the exercise of its sovereignty*, grants them such rights'" (Shaw 2007: 64; italics added by Shaw)[24].

---

[23] For more details on the legislative framework of the EU, as well as on EU citizenship, see Shaw (2007; especially chapters 4 and 5).

[24] For more details on international human rights instruments, see Shaw (2007: 64-70).

3. Methodology

"Just as method is always profoundly theoretical in its provenance, so its substance ought always to be practice-based and context-sensitive"
(Comaroff and Comaroff 2003: 159)

The following chapter elaborates on the methodology that has been applied in the framework of this thesis for the collection and the analysis of the data. As a study within the field of Social and Cultural Anthropology, the methodology utilised for the data collecting consisted in large part of qualitative and ethnographic research methods. According to DeWalt and DeWalt (2011), qualitative research "(…) has as its goal an understanding of the nature of phenomena, and is not necessarily interested in assessing the magnitude and distribution of phenomena (i.e. quantifying it)" (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 2). On the basis of the theoretical framework discussed above, the methods discussed in this chapter will help to link the gathered empirical data with said theoretical framework in order to "(…) construe the processes by which realities are realised (…)" (Comaroff and Comaroff 2003: 159). But before elaborating on the utilised methods in further detail, I will locate the field of study in the following section.

3.1. Fieldwork

As an anthropological study with a qualitative framework, ethnographic fieldwork in the respective local context is an essential part. To this end, the fieldwork for the thesis at hand took place in Luxembourg over a period of four months, from mid-February 2015 up until mid-June, so approximately until a week after the referendum of 7 June 2015. This allowed to be present during the most important phase of the election campaign prior to the referendum and to follow the campaign on a daily basis, monitoring the media for its coverage on the subject and attending as many information events as possible. The small size of the country was to my benefit in this respect, allowing me to cover a large number of the meetings and information events held during the period of fieldwork on site.

Furthermore, as we have seen in chapter 2, this study also entails elements of nonlocal ethnography, thereby going beyond the local geographical context of Luxembourg towards the gathering and analysis of policy documents and other information material on the subject at hand (see chapter 2.3.).

3.2. Policy Documents and Information Material

As already mentioned, the debate about the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Luxembourg has a long history which dates back to the 1980s. Therefore, a literature research of relevant historical and current policy documents constituted a first step of the fieldwork. This allowed to trace the historical genealogy of the debate, as well as to illustrate that the context of the debate is not only locally bounded, but goes beyond the boundaries of Luxembourg, as chapter 4 will elaborate on in further detail. In other words, this approach enabled me to put the topic of the research in what Jean and John Comaroff refer to as an *awkward scale* (Comaroff and Comaroff 2003), meaning that the subject in question is mapped out in a broader context, both historically and geographically. Furthermore, it provided this research with an overview of the variety and number of agents that have been involved in the debate at different periods, thereby influencing the discourse.

The following policy documents have been of important value for the purpose of this thesis:

- Policy documents on citizenship and voting rights in Luxembourg, such as the Luxembourgish Constitution of 1868 (URL 6), the Electoral Law of 2003 (URL 7), as well as the Law on Nationality of 2008 (URL 8).
- Policy Documents helping to trace the historical depth of the debate, as well as the origins of the referendum itself, such as protocols of the 'Commission of the Institutions and the Constitutional Revision' of the Luxembourgish Parliament[25] and the coalition agreement of the current government (URL 3).
- Policy Documents illustrating the broader international context of the topic have already been discussed in chapter 2.4.

It has to be noted that, in the context of Luxembourg, most of the policy documents are only available in French, as French is the legislative language of Luxembourg (see URL 10). For this reason, a translation that reflects the content of the material as accurately as possible had to be conducted.

---

[25] The protocols can be found on the website of the Luxembourgish Parliament (see URL 9). For abbreviation, I will be referring to this commission as the 'parliamentary commission' in what follows.

As for the data constituting chapter 5, other ethnographic material has been compiled and analysed, such as:

- Newspaper articles, radio and television interviews
- Election brochures and other information material distributed during the election campaign by the political parties and parts of the civil society in order to canvass votes

The majority of this material was in Luxembourgish, and to a lesser degree in French or German, so the same considerations about an accurate translation apply to this data material as well. This phase of literature research for policy documents and other information material by the various agents of the debate, as well as monitoring the media and social media, is considered by some as a form of 'nonparticipation' (see DeWalt and DeWalt 2011; see below).

3.3. Participant Observation

Participant observation, being "(…) accepted almost universally as the central and defining method of research in cultural anthropology" (DeWalt and Dewalt 2011: 2), presented an important method. Situated between involvement and detachment, it "(…) supports and complements the other types of data collection commonly used in most ethnographic studies" (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 15). Kathleen M. and Billie R. DeWalt continue by stating that "[m]aking explicit the process of participant observation allows the reader to better understand the information presented by the ethnographer" (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 36).

For the purpose of this research, participant observation was mostly employed during meetings and information events organised by a variety of agents of the debate in question (see below). In reference to the anthropology of policy discussed above, the attendance of these different meetings and information events enabled me to go beyond the mere written contents provided by the gathered information material – to perceive the debate 'in (inter)action'. In this sense, this practice provided an important insight into how the different agents debated the topic in question, how they positioned themselves during the discussions, how they communicated their respective arguments; in short, how they interacted with the audiences and among themselves in live verbalised settings. Or, to say it in the words of Gregory Feldman, "(…) 'being there' shows the ethnographer what is actually happening in contested moments" (Feldman 2011: 46).

During the four month period of fieldwork, I attended approximately 30 of these meetings. These different events were organised by sectors of the civil society, such as different NGOs, scholars, the media and other public or private agents, by most political parties, by so-called 'municipal consultative commissions on integration' of a number of municipalities, as well as official information events organised by the parliament.

Not only did the attendance of these different events over an extended period of time allow to perceive how the agents of the debate interacted with the population or among themselves, it also allowed to detect what type of questions, statements or concerns the attendees of these events communicated. Furthermore, it became clear that different compositions of these events in terms of the participating agents attracted different types of audiences.

Every public meeting and information event that took place in a public setting was audio-recorded, while notes had been taken during the events. The recordings as well as the notes represented an important part of the data collection and served for the analysis of said data. During the attendances of these events, varying degrees of participation, following DeWalt and Dewalt (2011), were applied:

- 'Passive participation', referring to the fact that "(…) the researcher is on the spot, but acts as a pure observer" (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 23), thereby being a simple member of the audience. This has been applied while attending the numerous meetings and information events. Due to the fact that the aim of his research was to critically analyse the debate surrounding the extension of voting rights, I made sure not to get involved in, influence or shape the debates at these events in any way.
- 'Moderate participation' has been applied during informal conversations before and after the events while interacting with members of the involved agents and attendees of these events (see below).

3.4. Interviews, Group Discussion and Informal Conversations

Three in-depth interviews were conducted for this study and all of them were problem-centric expert interviews. According to Mayring (2002: 67), who in turn refers to Witzel (1982; 1985), problem-centric interviews centre around a subject matter clearly defined by the interviewer, and are characterised by their open and half-structured nature. Problem-centric interviews are open in the sense that the interview partner is free to answer the questions without any pre-given response options, and they are half-structured in the sense that the interviewer carries a list of questions that he or she would like to have discussed and answered, but remains open

to develop new ad hoc questions during the interview (see Mayring 2002: 67ff). In this sense, prior knowledge that has already been acquired by the interviewer is important and allows to cover possible blind spots, thereby increasing the knowledge of the researcher on a particular subject.

Such problem-centric interviews as described above were conducted with the Minister of Justice of Luxembourg Felix Braz (The Green Party), with Member of Parliament (MP) and current President of the 'Commission of the Institutions and the Constitutional Revision' of the Luxembourgish Parliament, Alex Bodry (LSAP), as well as with the president of the NGO ASTI, Laura Zuccoli. These interviews provided this research with more thorough knowledge about the subject matter at hand, in particular the history of the debate, the organisation and the process, as well as the possible aftermath of the referendum in question. It is in this regard that these interviews are considered as expert interviews. The duration of these interviews was between 50 and 60 minutes, respectively.

One group discussion was also held during the period of fieldwork. This group discussion took place during a Luxembourgish conversation session in the women's centre *Kopplabunz*[26] and lasted for approximately 90 minutes. In order to guarantee the comfort and anonymity of the women attending this conversation session, the character of the conducted group discussion was very open and informal. The discussion was therefore not audio-recorded because this might have influenced the dynamic of the discussion or the conduct of some of the women. A number of nine women were present during this group discussion, the majority being migrants of various nationalities and three women who had recently acquired Luxembourgish citizenship, either via naturalisation or dual citizenship. Communication among the attendees was encouraged, which allowed for a fruitful discussion with multiple perspectives on the subject in question.

Lastly, since the referendum affected many different people of the Luxembourgish society in general, innumerable informal conversations have been conducted as well, with organisers and attendees of the different information events, politicians of various parties, members of NGOs and other sectors of the civil society, journalists, friends and family. These conversations were essential for the purpose of this study in the sense that they provided a broader view on the debate and, similar to the group discussion mentioned above, allowed for a better understanding due to the different perspectives from various angles of society. Furthermore,

---

[26] The women centre *Kopplabunz* is a service under the umbrella of *Femmes en détresse a.s.b.l.* in Luxembourg City.

these conversations were invaluable in terms of feedback, enabling a constant reassessment of the research process (see below).

3.5. Field Notes

Field notes constitute an essential component of ethnographic fieldwork. They are the primary method of capturing data from participant observation, as well as from any form of conversations and interviews with people in the field (see Dewalt and Dewalt 2000). The importance for this stands to reason:

> *"If the researcher's daily reactions to events and contexts are not recorded, it will be virtually impossible to reconstruct the development of understanding, and to be able to review the growing relationship between the researcher and study participants in a manner that allows for reflexivity at the end of the process"* (Dewalt and Dewalt 2000: 271).

To this end, field notes have been written down in note-books and on my laptop, as well as audio recorded on a regular basis in order to be read and reread routinely during the period of the fieldwork. This approach allows for a continuous reassessment, to analyse and reflect about the research at every stage, to add some questions and ideas while putting others more into the background.

Equally as important, field notes are crucial during the phases of analysis and writing of the thesis. DeWalt and DeWalt refer to the analysis of field notes as an "(…) iterative process. The fundamental techniques are reading, thinking and writing; and rereading, rethinking, and rewriting" (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 179). In this sense, "(…) field notes are simultaneously data and analysis" (see DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 159), thereby being indispensable for anthropological fieldwork.

Different types of field notes have been applied, depending on the circumstances and the time at hand: from jot notes (little bits of information in the form of words or sentences), to more expanded and descriptive notes, thoughts on methods, meta-notes for the analysis of the data, as well as a journal entailing a chronology of the attended meetings and information events.[27]

---

[27] See Bernard (2006), DeWalt and DeWalt (2011), Emerson et al. (1995) or Sanjek (1990) for more details on field notes.

3.6. Critical Discourse Analysis

Building on the theoretical framework of the Anthropology of Policy introduced in the previous chapter (see chapter 2.3.), the CDA approach enabled the thesis at hand to break down the debate in question into subsections, thereby making it accessible for a more elaborate critical analysis. Situated in the broader realm of discourse analysis in the social sciences, CDA builds on the theoretical insights of French philosopher and historian Michel Foucault. Foucault characterises discourses as "(…) practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault 1972: 49). Concerning this characterisation of the notion discourse, Sara Mills notes: "In this sense, a discourse is something which produces something else (an utterance, a concept, an effect), rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analysed in isolation" (Mills 1997: 17). Sara Mills further refers to the work of Michel Pêcheux, who highlights that discourses don't occur in isolation, but in a particular social context, which in turn is always "(…) the object and site of struggle. Discourses are thus not fixed but are the sites of constant contestation of meaning" (Mills 1997: 16; referring to Pêcheux 1982). This "conflictual nature of discourse" (Mills 1997: 14) in Pêcheux's work refers to the notion of interdiscursivity, i.e. the fact that discourses constantly influence each other (see also Fairclough (1992) on interdiscursivity).

Here we see the similarities of CDA and Anthropology of Policy, which, as we have seen in chapter 2, also views policies as entities originating out of specific contexts, out of constant contestation and exerting agency (see chapter 2.3.). A discourse isn't merely verbal communication, but is, similar to a policy, constitutive and entails agency as well, thereby actively exerting influence.

Building on these considerations on the notion of discourse, the following paragraphs will elaborate on the approach applied in this study, namely CDA following Jäger (2004)[28]. However, it needs to be noted that no strict application of CDA will be conducted here. Jäger (2004)[29] follows an approach which has much more of a linguistic focus than the study at hand will have. To explain why this particular approach is useful nonetheless, it needs to be mentioned that advocates of CDA themselves argue that CDA is to be understood as a "school" or a "research programme" (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 5), rather than a predefined theoretical

---

[28] There are a number of other approaches in the realm of Critical Discourse Analysis. See for example Fairclough (1992), Reisigl and Wodak (2009), Van Dijk (2009), van Leeuwen (2008; 2009).
[29] Since Jäger (2004) is written in German, I will quote from Jäger and Maier (2009), which is a summarised version of the main notions of Jäger's approach in English.

concept with a specific methodology. With this in mind, I will only draw on those elements of the CDA approach by Jäger (2004) which will allow me to dissect and break down the discourse/debate in question. In other words, I will use CDA similar to what Foucault described his own approach of discourse analysis, namely as a 'toolbox'. The following elements of this approach will be relevant to this end:

Discourse strands are characterised as "(…) flows of discourse that centre on a common topic" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 46). Jäger and Maier argue that every *discourse strand* can be examined *synchronically* and *diachronically*: "A synchronic analysis of a discourse strand examines the finite spectrum of what is said and sayable at a particular point in time" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 46). The diachronic dimension of a discourse, on the other hand, refers to the fact that every discourse has a starting point, i.e. a history which is equally important: "When analysing a topic, the analyst has to keep an eye on its history. To identify the knowledge of a society on a topic, the analyst has to reconstruct the genesis of this topic" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 47). Here, one can clearly see Foucault's influence on this particular approach. Examples of discourse strands could be, among others, immigration, identity or economy.

Each *discourse strand* is constituted by a multitude of discursive elements "(…) traditionally called texts" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 47), but for which they prefer the term *discourse fragments*. A *discourse fragment* refers to "(…) a text or a part of a text that deals with a particular topic (…)" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 47). More often than not, a discourse fragment "(…) refers to various topics and therefore to various discourse strands. (…) These discourse strands are usually entangled with each other" (Jäger and Meier 2009: 47), and are therefore referred to as *discursive knots*.

Discourse strands often take place on different *discourse planes,* which "(…) can be characterised as social locations from which speaking takes place. [They] influence each other and relate to each other" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 48). Examples of discourse planes are, among others, the media, academia, politics, business, education, everyday life, etc. Additionally, *discourse planes* consist of various *discourse sectors*: the discourse plane 'media' consists of different discourse sectors such as newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations, etc. (see Jäger and Maier 2009).

A *discursive event* occurs only "(…) if it appears on the discourse planes of politics and the media intensively, extensively and for a prolonged period of time" (Jäger and Maier 2009:48). According to Jäger and Maier, it is important to identify discursive events because they (might)

influence the development of the discourse in either direction. Furthermore, a chronological documentation of a discursive event enables the generation of the history of the discourse for an ensuing diachronic analysis (see above).

A *discursive position* is described as a "(…) ideological position from which subjects, including individuals, groups and institutions, participate in and evaluate discourse" (Jäger and Maier 2009: 49). CDA allows for the identification of *discursive positions* by analysing how discourses are being led by the various agents that are taking part. Jäger and Maier note that the media, as well as people in their everyday lives (partly through the media) are taking up different *discursive positions* while making sense of the world and communicating their worldviews (see Jäger and Maier 2009: 49f).

All of these different components of discourse together form the overall societal discourse, which, in turn, is part of a global discourse (see Jäger and Maier 2009: 50). In this sense, overall societal discourses are very complex, as they take place on various different topics, on various different levels by many different agents.

In the context of the thesis at hand, the analytical tools discussed above will be applied to break down the *discursive event* of the referendum of 7 June 2015 in Luxembourg. Different *discourse fragments* (i.e. the different positions and arguments by the agents of the debate) of this *discourse event* touch on different *discourse strands (i.e. immigration, integration, citizenship, voting rights, political participation, identity, etc.)*, which, in turn, are located on various *discourse planes* (i.e. politics, civil society, everyday life, the media, academia, etc.). Ultimately, the *discourse fragments* shed light on the respective *discursive positions* (i.e. the respective ideological positions) of the agents of the debate.

3.7. On Positionality

Before turning to the main chapters, a few quick notes need to be made on my positionality in the field, as both a researcher and a citizen of Luxembourg. Following a reflexive anthropological approach, it is important that an anthropologist reflects on his or her positionality as a researcher while doing fieldwork. Kathleen M. and Billie R. DeWalt see "(…) reflexivity as a beginning point rather than as an end to ethnography" (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011: 36).

One aspect of reflexivity in the context of my research is the fact that, as Luxembourgish citizen myself, I am part of the society that was being analysed and was thereby also obligated to vote on 7 June 2015.

Furthermore, as already mentioned above, to analyse a public political debate required me not to get involved in the debates during the attendances of the various meetings and information events.

4. Situating the Debate in its Socio-Political Context

"[Voting Rights] are nested within a complex framework of legal and political structures, with long and complex histories of their own which are hardly susceptible to generalizations. But one point is clear: The role of law in the transformation of citizenship is linked not only to formal institutional change, but also to the patterns of political and ideological contestation which provide the more informal framework within which formal institutions are nested" (Shaw 2007: 86)

The following chapter will contextualise the debate on voting rights for non-citizen residents in Luxembourg and put it in its *complex framework of legal and political structures*. First, the reader will be provided with more details on the specific demographic situation of Luxembourg, before the chapter will be elaborating on the history of the debate and the referendum itself, as well as on the current situation of national citizenship and voting rights in Luxembourg. A few remarks on external factors that might have repercussions on the nature of the debate will close this chapter.

4.1. Demographic Situation of Luxembourg

Luxembourg owes its current prosperity primarily to two main economic sectors, the steel industry, from the 19th century up until the mid-20th century, on the one hand, and to the financial sector since the 1960s and 1970s on the other hand. Both economic sectors relied on foreign workforce, making Luxembourg an immigration country for more than hundred years now (see Fetzer 2011; Pauly 2011; Allegrezza et al. 2007). For this reason, the percentage of non-citizen residents has been high over a long period of time in Luxembourg:[30] for example, in 1981 the percentage of non-citizen residents has been listed as 26.3% (URL 11), a percentage that is higher than in most other European countries today.

As of 1 January 2015, Luxembourg has a resident population of around 563.000, with 54.1% holding Luxembourgish citizenship and 45.9% holding a non-Luxembourgish citizenship (see URL 2). Portuguese and French nationals constitute the two largest immigrant communities, representing together more than half of the non-Luxembourgish citizens, or 16.1% and 7.0% of the total resident population of Luxembourg (see URL 2). Despite the fact that more than

---

[30] For more details on the evolution of the percentage of non-citizen residents in Luxembourg, see URL 11.

160 nationalities are represented in Luxembourg (see URL 12), 86% of all non-citizen residents are citizens of the European Union (see URL 12)[31]. Net immigration in Luxembourg was a little over 11.000 for the year 2014, and has been consistently high in the last couple of years (see URL 14). The number of naturalisations, on the other hand, lay between 4.500 and 5.000 over the last couple of years, which means that the gap between citizens and non-citizens is increasing (see URL 15).

It is also important to note the particular language situation of Luxembourg, as the country has three official languages, namely Luxembourgish, French and German – the first being the national language, whereas all three languages are administrative languages (see URL 10).

4.2. History of the Debate over Time

It has been indicated several times that the debate about the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents has a longer history in the specific context of Luxembourg. The following section will highlight some of the main steps and key events of this longer history.

The discussion about integrating non-citizen residents into the electorate by extending their rights to vote has the longest history among a number of NGOs and other organisations, such as the immigration sections of Luxembourgish labour unions (Interview 3). The two NGOs that need to be mentioned in this regard are ASTI (Association de Soutien aux Travailleurs Immigrés)[32] and CLAE (Comité de Liasion des Associations d'Étrangers)[33].

ASTI was founded in 1979 in Luxembourg City and the main reason for the creation of the organisation has been "(…) the common demand for the right to vote by different persons and associations of diverse horizons and different nationalities" (Kollwelter and Zuccoli 2010: 26; my own translation). The organisation has been actively demanding this extension of voting rights since its foundation. Especially during the first years, this demand focused on the extension of voting rights to local elections (Interview 3), as well as for social elections, such as the elections in the Professional Chamber or the Chamber of Commerce (see Kollwelter and Zuccoli: 26). ASTI was also the initiator of the yearly *Festival des migrations, des cultures et de la citoyenneté[34]* in Luxembourg City in 1981 (see Kollwelter and Zuccoli 2010), which has been taken over by the CLAE later on.

---

[31] For the exact numbers, see URL 13.
[32] English Translation: "Association for the support of immigrant workers"
[33] English Translation: "Liaison comity of foreign associations"
[34] English Translation: "Festival of migrations, cultures, and citizenship"

CLAE was founded in 1985 by the ASTI, but is functioning as an independent NGO today (see Kollwelter and Zuccoli 2010). It is an umbrella organisation for more than hundred smaller NGOs of foreign origin in Luxembourg, and has been, similar to the ASTI, actively fighting for a "residential citizenship" (URL 16) since its foundation.[35]

As early as 1981, the monthly newspaper Forum published an issue having the extension of voting rights to non-citizens residents as the main topic (see Forum 1981). This was at a time, as we have seen in the previous section, when the demographic situation was very different from today.

The signing of the Treaty of Maastricht (TEC) in 1992 and its ratification in 1994 brought changes to the situation of voting rights in Luxembourg, resulting in a gradual extension of voting rights to local elections in Luxembourg (see also section 4.3.2.). This led to a change of strategy in the claim-making of the NGOs, focussing now on the claim of extending the right to vote on the national legislative level as well.

Since Article 52 of the Luxembourgish Constitution prescribes Luxembourgish citizenship as a precondition to become eligible to vote in national elections (see URL 6), it becomes clear that an extension of voting rights requires a revision of the Constitution (see below). In an interview with the president of the responsible 'Commission of the Institutions and the Constitutional Revision' of the Luxembourgish Parliament, socialist Deputy Alex Bodry stated that the discussions surrounding a complete revision of the current Luxembourgish Constitution has been ongoing since the 1980s (Interview 2). However, for over two decades, the modifications to the Constitution had mainly been made step by step, usually as a reaction to political developments. It wasn't until 2005 when 'the parliamentary commission' began to work on a complete revision of the Constitution (Interview 2).

In another interview, Minister of Justice Felix Braz[36] of the Green Party stated that the specific subject of a possible extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents has been the topic of discussion "relatively early" (Interview 1) within the 'parliamentary commission'. According to the Minister of Justice, the reason for this was that the Treaty of Maastricht (TEU) which introduced the European citizenship in 1994 as well as the extension of voting rights to citizens of EU member states for local elections (Interview; see also section 4.3.2.). According to the Minister of Justice, the discussion within the 'parliamentary commission' during the last couple of years centred around the question whether Article 52 should be taken out of the Constitution

---

[35] See chapter 5.2.4. for more details on the NGO CLAE.
[36] Before becoming Minster of Justice, Felix Braz has been working in the 'parliamentary commission'.

and be inscribed in the Electoral Law instead. But no consensus was found between the respective political parties of the parliament within the 'parliamentary commission' at that time.

Meanwhile in 2007, a number of youth sections of the Luxembourgish political parties came together to create the initiative 'Refresh Democracy'. The aim was to call attention to the challenges of integration and democracy (see URL 17). One of the propositions highlighted the need of a "(…) revaluation of universal suffrage" (URL 17). The proposition further called to integrate the largest number of people into the decision-making as possible because the decisions taken in parliament "(…) concern the foreign citizens to the same extent as the Luxembourgers" (URL 17). The initiative was put forward in collaboration with the aforementioned NGO ASTI. The youth sections of almost every political party at the time signed the propositions, which in detail were[37]:

- Chrëschtlech Sozial Jugend (CSJ – The youth section of the CSV)

- Déi Jonk Gréng (DJG - The youth section of déi Gréng)

- Jeunes Communistes Luxembourg (JCL – The youth section of the KPL)

- Jeunesse Démocrate et Libérale (JDL – The youth section of the DP)

- Jeunesse Socialistes Luxembourgeoises (JSL – The youth section of the LSAP)

Déi Lénk also signed the proposition, since they did not have a youth section at that time yet. The youth section of the ADR, *ADRenalin, déi jonk ADR*, was the only youth section that did not sign the propositions (see chapter 5 for further details).

During the national elections campaign of 2009, only the election programs of *Déi Lénk* and *déi Gréng* made the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents a subject for discussion (see Scuto 2013). The other parties had been reserved in terms of this subject at that particular time.

In March of 2012, the Chamber of Commerce released a publication entitled 'La diversité règne, l'intégration piétine: La Chambre de commerce analyse l'apport socio-économique des étrangers et plaide pour une meilleure intégration politique'[38] This analysis of the socio-economic contribution of non-Luxembourgers to the Luxembourgish economy and society came to the conclusion that important modifications and implementations towards more

---

[37] See chapter 5 for a more in-depth explanation of the different political parties in Luxembourg, as well of their respective youth section.
[38] "Diversity reigns, integration stands still: The Chamber of Commerce analyses the socio-economic contribution of foreigners and argues for better political integration" (see URL 18; my own translation).

political integration on the local and the national level needed to be made by the politicians in order to translate the contributions made by non-Luxembourgers (see URL 18). 75% of the workforce of Luxembourg are non-citizens, residents as well as cross-border workers, but all non-citizens are excluded from political representation on the national level. Therefore, one proposition of the document argued, among others, for a revaluation of the procedures to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship, as well as a reinforcement of the political participation of foreign residents on the local and the national level (see URL 18).

Also in 2012, the NGO ASTI launched an anti-racism campaign entitled 'Making Luxembourg'. Numerous institutions and organisations[39] in Luxembourg joined the campaign that aimed at promoting solidarity, integration and anti-racism: "Instead of looking for what separates us, we are looking for what brings us together in the economic, cultural, social and political construction of Luxembourg" (URL 20). As mentioned above, ASTI has been actively arguing for more political participation for non-citizen residents for decades. One of the main partners of this campaign was the Luxembourgish Chamber of Commerce (see Interview 3).

In January 2013, this topic was the subject of a conference organised by these two agents, the Chamber of Commerce and ASTI, in the framework of the 'Making Luxembourg' campaign.[40] It can be stated that it was in the context of this conference that the subject became a topic of public debate (see Scuto 2013). According to Alex Bodry, in early 2013, the then-president of the 'parliamentary commission', MP Paul-Henry Meyers of the Christian Socialist Party CSV, reached an agreement within the 'parliamentary commission' that would have made a modification of the Constituion possible. (Interview 3).

Later in the year, after a spy scandal involving the Luxembourgish secret service, the LSAP withdrew from the government, thereby forcing the then Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker to resign. As a consequence, early elections were held on 20 October 2013 in Luxembourg and a new government was formed.[41] As already mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis, the subject of the extension of voting rights became one of the most discussed subjects during the election campaign. The majority of the election programs of the political parties included a statement, either in favour or against the extension the voting rights to non-citizen residents, with varying opinions and conditions.

The coalition agreement of the newly formed government determines that the government "(…) has the mission and the courage to undertake the reforms necessary to propose a project of

---

[39] See URL 19 for more information.
[40] The conference can be watched online on the website of the Chamber of Commerce, see URL 21.
[41] See URL 22 for more details on the formation of the current government.

the future [with] a new dynamic for our country and all its inhabitants" (see page 3 in URL 3; my own translation). Democracy, transparency and "(…) the dialogue in our multicultural society" (see page 3 in URL 3; my own translation) will be reinforced. This "democratic renewal" will "(…) strengthen the association of the citizens to the political life and promote participatory democracy" (see page 6 in URL 3; my own translation). Concerning the new Constitution, the coalition agreement stipulates the following:

> *"In the course of 2014 the parties of the coalition will organise citizen-forums in view of a large debate about the challenges and the objectives of the modifications of, and in view of a consent of the majority of the citizens to the new Constitution.*
>
> *In 2015 the people will be consulted via referendum on essential questions, namely:*
>
> - *the financing of the ministers of recognised religions,*
> - *the political rights of fellow non-Luxembourgish citizens,*
> - *the political participation of young people from the age of 16 years onwards,*
> - *the timely limitation of ministerial mandates.*
>
> *By the end of 2015, after a first vote in parliament, the text of the new Constitution will be submitted, according to the constitutional procedure, to a second approval vote of approval via referendum."[42]* (see page 3 in URL 3; my own translation)

According to Article 51 (7) of the Constitution, the parliament is required to pass a specific law in order to hold a national referendum. The first draft of a legislative proposal to organise a national referendum on the aforementioned questions was tabled on 4 November 2014 by three deputies of the majority parties, namely Alex Bodry (LSAP), Eugène Berger (DP) and Viviane Loschetter (Déi Gréng) (URL 23).[43] This legislative proposal contains the first draft of the exact wording of the four initial questions of the referendum, as well as explanatory notes on the history and the aim of the referendum and its questions.

Similar to the wording of the coalition agreement, the text of this legislative proposal speaks of a "consultative referendum", containing "(…) controversial questions in relation to the Constitution" (see p.2 in URL 23; my own translation). Concerning the second question of the referendum, the text reads that "(…) in the short run, the Luxembourgish electorate will

---

[42] On 23 October 2014, it was announced that the date of the referendum would be 7 June 2015.
[43] The referendum is thereby a project of the parliament, not the government. The mentioned law is Law No. 6738.

represent only a minority of the people living in the country. The positive experiences of the local and European elections allow to envision this opening of political rights to new categories of citizens" (see p.5 in URL 23; my own translation). Furthermore, the text states that this will only concerns the active voting rights and that the proposition does not make a distinction between EU citizens and third country nationals (see p.5 in URL 23; my own translation).

On 26 January 2015, it was announced that the government signed an agreement with the ministers of recognised religions about their financing, which meant that the respective question was no longer included in the referendum of 7 June 2015 (URL 24).

The three questions that have been retained for the referendum of 7 June 2015 were the following (see URL 1; my own translations):

1. Do you agree with the idea that Luxembourgers aged between 16 and 18 should have the right, at their own discretion, to register on the electoral roll to participate as voters in the Chamber of Deputies elections, European elections, local elections, as well as referenda?
2. Do you agree with the idea that non-Luxembourgish residents should have the right, at their own discretion, to register on the electoral roll to participate as voters in the Chamber of Deputies elections, provided they have lived at least 10 years in Luxembourg and have previously taken part in local or European elections in Luxembourg?
3. Do you agree with the idea to limit the maximum period during which a person can continuously be a member of government to ten years?

The respective law to organize a national referendum on 7 June 2015 was voted in parliament on 24 February 2015 with the following result (see URL 25):

- 34 votes in favour of the holding of the referendum of 7 June 2015 (by the three parties of the majority (32 votes in total), as well as the smallest opposition party Déi Lénk (2 votes)
- 26 votes against the holding of the referendum of 7 June 2015 by the remaining two opposition parties, the CSV (23 votes) and the ADR (3 votes)

4.3. Citizenship and Voting Rights in Luxembourg

4.3.1. Luxembourgish Citizenship[44]

The main principle for the acquisition of Luxembourgish citizenship has always been *jus sanguinis* (Scuto 2012; Scuto 2013). The new and current Law on Nationality from 2008 brought a number of important modifications.[45] The reintroduction of double *jus soli*[46], and especially the introduction of the dual or multiple citizenship, led Denis Scuto to label the new law as a "milestone" (Scuto 2013: 11; see also Scuto 2012). Since 1 January 2009, a non-Luxembourger applying for citizenship no longer needs to prove that he or she has renounced his or her citizenship of origin, nor does he or she lose his or her citizenship of origin when he or she acquires the Luxembourgish citizenship (see Scuto 2013: 11).

Together with these measures of liberalisation, a number of restrictions have also been applied. First, the minimum number of years of residence to apply for citizenship has been raised from the previous 5 consecutive years to now 7 consecutive years. Second, to acquire the citizenship, the applicant needs to pass a test in the spoken Luxembourgish language[47] and is obligated to attend at least three citizenship courses (see Scuto 2012: 321f). Third, the possibility to obtain the Luxembourgish citizenship via marriage is no longer applicable due to the end of the clause for spouses (see Scuto 2012: 323).

The previous government of CSV-LSAP (2009-2013) already announced and worked on a revision of the current Law on Nationality. The events surrounding the early elections in 2013 brought these discussions to a halt. The current government also announced a revision of the Law on Nationality in their coalition agreement in 2013 (see URL 3).[48]

4.3.2. Voting Rights in Luxembourg

To begin with, it has to be noted that the Luxembourgish electoral system has a compulsory voting procedure. Every Luxembourgish citizen between the ages of 18 and 75 and residing in

---

[44] For this section, I will mainly refer to the work of Luxembourgish historian Denis Scuto who wrote his PhD thesis on the history of the Luxembourgish citizenship (see Scuto 2012; see also Scuto 2013).
[45] For the history prior to the most recent Law on Nationality see Scuto (2012).
[46] Double *jus* soli: a child born in Luxembourg to non-Luxembourgish parents, one of whom was born in the Grand-Duchy, has Luxembourgish citizenship.
[47] The necessary requirements are the levels B1 for the oral comprehension, and A2 for the oral expression of Luxembourgish in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)
[48] For more details, see chapter 7.

Luxembourg is automatically registered on the electoral roll and is thereby obligated to vote in all elections in the Grand-Duchy, including the elections for the European Parliament (see URL 7)[49]. Luxembourgish citizens that reside permanently outside of the Luxembourgish territory can participate in the legislative elections via absentee voting, but are not obliged to. In other words, the compulsory voting only concerns Luxembourgish resident citizens.

Article 52 of the Luxembourgish Constitution, as well as Article 1 of the election law of 2003 prescribe that the Luxembourgish citizenship is a precondition for electoral rights when it comes to national legislative elections. This means that, at this moment in time, only Luxembourgers participate in national legislative elections, so that non-citizen residents wishing to exercise such political rights need to acquire the citizenship. However, Article 9 of the Constitution also states that "(…) the [Electoral] law can confer the exercise of political rights to non-Luxembourgers" (URL 6; my own translation). This sentence was added in a revision of the Constitution in 1994 as a result of the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty (TEU), extending voting rights to citizens of EU member states for local and European elections.

According to Article 2 of the Electoral Law of 2003, all non-Luxembourgish residents enjoy electoral rights in local elections, under the condition that they won't lose any voting rights in their country of origin and have resided at least five years in Luxembourg prior to the elections (see URL 7). In order to be able to vote, non-citizen residents need to be inscribed on the electoral roll. It is important to note in this context that once non-citizen residents are inscribed on the electoral roll, they are subject to the compulsory voting regime to the same extent as Luxembourgish citizens. In other words, once a non-citizen residents has been inscribed on the electoral roll, he or she is subject to the same conditions as Luxembourgish citizens. Non-national EU-citizens were granted this right in 1995 and third country nationals in 2003 (see Scuto 2013). There are no regional elections in Luxembourg.

4.4. External Factors and Developments in Europe

Although not being specific focal points of this thesis in terms of analysis, external factors and developments in Europe need to be taken into consideration as well. There seems to be a considerable anti-immigration turn recently, at least in parts of European societies across the continent. Recent national elections in a number of surrounding European countries are

---

[49] The obligation to vote expires at the age of 75, but one has the possibility to enrol on a voluntary basis for every subsequent election, respectively.

sending alarming signals, with large gains in electoral votes for nationalist political parties in France, Austria, Hungary, or Denmark for example. Other recent events that might need to be taken into consideration in this sense are, for example, the rise of the PEGIDA movement in Germany, the two Islamic attacks in France in January and November 2015, as well as what become known as the *refugee* or *migrant crisis* in Europe[50].

As all these events took place in the same year as the referendum in Luxembourg, they might have had repercussions on the nature of the debate during the election campaign or the end result of the referendum. Further research would be needed to analyse these implications in further detail, as they were not explicitly analysed within the framework of the thesis at hand.

After the *complex framework of legal and political structures* has been the subject of this section, the following two main chapters will elaborate on the *informal framework of political and ideological contestation* of the debate on the subject of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Luxembourg.

---

[50] It important to note that the so-called *refugee* or *migrant crisis* did not really affect the debate surrounding the referendum, as these developments only began to dominate news headlines after the referendum on 7 June 2015.

5. Institutional and Individual Agents of the Debate

The first of the two main chapters of this study will portray the different positions and arguments by the different agents that have been active during the election campaign of the *discursive event*[51] that is the subject of this study, namely the referendum of 7 June 2015. These positions and arguments, which we have characterised as *discourse fragments*, touch on various *discursive strands* (i.e. common larger topics) and originate from different *discursive planes* (politics, civil society, media, everyday life, etc.). The *discursive positions*, meaning the various values and ideologies entailed in these *discursive fragments* by the agents involved, will be the subject of the critical analysis of chapter 6.

But before elaborating on these positions and arguments, a few important points need to be made: First, and as a reminder, the ethnographic material presented in this chapter was overwhelmingly in Luxembourgish, and to a lesser degree in French or German (see chapter 3). Therefore, the content of what follows is for the most part my own translation, accept when marked otherwise. Since the exact wording is of particular relevance for the study at hand, particularly great attention has been paid to translate the different positions and arguments as close to the original meanings in Luxembourgish as possible. Second, and related to the previous point, insofar as they have been used, the respective Luxembourgish terms '*Awunnerwahlrecht*' and '*Auslännerwahlrecht*'[52] have been retained in what follows, since these terms will be subject of critical analysis in chapter 6. Third, it has to be noted that not every single argument made during the several-month long election campaign can be displayed here for reasons of shortage of space. As I attended many information events and followed the media coverage on a daily basis, I was able to identify the main arguments presented by the different agents.

To begin with, the positions and arguments of the political parties, including the positions of their respective youth sections, will be discussed, as there is one deviation from the position of the main party. Different agents of the civil society will follow after that, continuing with elaborating on the positions of sections of the media, members of academia before closing with a few words on individuals.

---

[51] As a reminder, the definitions of the notions in italics in this chapter have been discussed in chapter 3 (see chapter 3.6.)

[52] 'Wahlrecht' is the Luxembourgish term for 'voting right', 'Awunner' corresponds to 'resident(s)', whereas 'Auslänner' refers to 'foreigner(s)'.

5.1. Political Parties

The political landscape of Luxembourg counts nine political parties, of whom six are represented in parliament as of 2015. The following section will contain the slogans of each of the nine parties during the election campaign in Luxembourgish as well as in an English translation (insofar as there has been a slogan), and the positions and main arguments of each party. To begin with, the positions of the three parties that form the current government will be presented, followed by the positions of the parliamentary opposition parties and the three parties that are currently outside of parliamentary representation[53]. A section on the youth sections of the parties will conclude with first part of this chapter.

5.1.1. DP – Demokratesch Partei

Slogan: 3 Mol Jo! Jo zur Jugend, Jo zur Villfalt, Jo zu méi Demokratie - (3 times Yes! Yes to the youth, Yes to diversity, Yes to more democracy)

The DP[54] is a liberal party in Luxembourg that, as of 2015, holds 13 seats in parliament and provides the Luxembourgish Prime Minister, Xavier Bettel. As one of the three parties of the majority, it was also one of the initiators of the referendum of 7 June 2015, as well as one of the authors of the law of 24 February 2015 to hold the referendum. The following arguments of the DP are drawn from an election brochure (see DP 2015):

'Yes' to the '*Awunnerwahlrecht*':
- Luxembourg needs an *'Awunnerwahlrecht'*
  - 44% of the population does not have the Luxembourgish passport. Half of the inhabitants of Luxembourg is thereby excluded from national elections, even though they contribute to the social life and the prosperity of our country. Democracy thrives on as much political participation as possible.
- Dual citizenship is not enough
  - A lot of countries deny their nationals dual citizenship. By acquiring the Luxembourgish citizenship, they are forced to renounce their original citizenship even though they still feel connected to their native country. Many foreign fellow citizens are well integrated in our society, and this without a Luxembourgish

---

[53] The respective positions and arguments by these three parties are taken from radio and television interviews since these parties were not included in the official information events organised by the government and did not organise own information events either.

[54] The English translation of the party name is: Democratic Party.

passport. The acquisition of the Luxembourgish citizenship still remains an important step on the way to the integration of foreign residents.

- The *'Awunnerwahlrecht'* has its conditions
    - Non-Luxembourgers have to been residing in Luxembourg for at least 10 years and have to have participated in local- or EU-elections in order to be able to participate in national elections. It is an active voting right, which means that one could not be elected or become a member of the government as a Non-Luxembourger. Furthermore, the voting right will only be granted if one has enrolled on the electoral list.

Politicians of the DP argued during numerous information events that all three questions of the referendum are important because they are questions that directly deal with the Constitution, i.e. the most important law of a state, as well as with participatory democracy. A 'Yes' on all three questions would adjust the legal framework to the political realities of Luxembourg, and thereby promote the modernisation of the country's democracy. In a radio interview given to RTL Radio, Prime Minister Xavier Bettel argued that voting rights should be disconnected from national citizenship:

> *"A passport has to do with history, with emotions (…) Elections have to do with the future, so one should differentiate the two. (…) I prefer that people wanting to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship do it because they want to become Luxembourgers, not only in order to be granted the right to vote"* (Bettel 2015).

To conclude, Prime Minister Xavier Bettel stated at numerous occasions that the referendum of 7 June 2015 should be considered as a mirror. Every person should look at him- or herself and ask the question: What type of country do I want to have, and in which direction should this country go? (see Bettel 2015).

<u>5.1.2. LSAP – Lëtzebuerger Sozialistesch Aarbeschterpartei</u>

Slogan: Mattbëstemmen, Zesummeliewen, Erneieren: Méi Demokratie fier Lëtzebuerg: 3x JO – (Participate, living together, innovate: More democracy for Luxembourg: 3 times YES)

The LSAP[55] is a Luxembourgish social democratic party that, as of 2015, holds 13 seats in parliament. As one of the parties of the majority, it was actively involved in the initiating of the referendum. In terms of the referendum in general, the LSAP stated that, although the referendum was not legally binding, it is "(…) without a doubt politically binding" (LSAP 2015a). It is referred to the fact that Luxembourg has a compulsory voting system, which is why a referendum is "(…) much more than an extensive poll" (LSAP 2015a). Without stating a specific name, the LSAP states the following:

> *"Particularly in a representative democracy, the direct opinion of the voters must not be ignored. When a majority of the voters pronounces itself with a 'Yes' or a 'No' on a specific question, than this vote should be fully taken into account. Whoever does not do that, proves a minority right, which violates the founding principles of our democracy. The credibility of our political system would be called into question"* (LSAP 2015a)

The referendum as a whole is viewed as an "(…) important step in a process of modernisation that the new government has been initiating consequently after the elections" (LSAP 2015b). Concerning question 2 of the referendum, the LSAP stressed the point that Luxembourg is taking a step towards an '*Awunnerwahlrecht*': "23 years after our fellow citizens have obtained the active and passive voting rights for the European and local elections, they should now obtain the possibility to participate in the governmental elections as well" (LSAP 2015a), but exclusively in terms of active voting rights. After explaining the necessary conditions as provided in question 2, it is noted that the two conditions that will allow the exercise of the active voting right "(…) need to be inscribed in the Constitution" (LSAP 2015a).

One important argument of the LSAP was the reference to the positive experiences that Luxembourg has made since the extension of voting rights after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty (TEU). It is mentioned that around 30.000 foreigners were registered for the last local elections, corresponding to 10% of the total electorate of Luxembourg. These registered voters, it is noted, "(…) have shown that they are interested in the politics and the community life of Luxembourg. It is important for a democracy that a majority of the people that

---

[55] The English translation of the party name is: Luxembourgish Socialist Worker's Party.

work and live in a country, should also be allowed to participate politically. The positive experience of the local elections shows that this is the right way. Today, a foreigner can already become a mayor or an alderman" (LSAP 2015a).

Furthermore, it was referred to the fact that there are some countries that already apply some form of voting rights for residents, such as the United Kingdom and Ireland, as well as New Zealand and a number of countries in Central and South America. The demographic situation of the country would be so unique in the European context that Luxembourg could no longer exclude 46% of the population from "(…) important political decisions" (LSAP 2015a). The information brochure also asked the following two question: First, why long-term expatriates should be allowed to participate in national-elections and why should non-national that meet the conditions of question 2 of the referendum be excluded from those same elections? And second, "[w]hy does the Luxembourgish state want to recruit European soldiers to defend us, and deny foreign citizens voting rights for parliamentary elections?" (LSAP 2015a).

To conclude, it was stated that a "(…) '*Awunnerwahlrecht*' is not a sell-out of our citizenship. To candidate at parliamentary elections, one still needs to be Luxembourger in the future. We don't give anything up as Luxembourgers. We only give a number of fellow citizens a possibility to participate. That is a strong signal for an open, tolerant and democratic Luxembourg" (LSAP 2015a).

5.1.3. déi gréng

Slogan: 3x Jo fier méi Demokratie – E grouse Schrett fier Lëtzebuerg – (3x Yes for more Democracy – A giant leap for Luxembourg) [56]

déi gréng[57] is a green political Party in Luxembourg that, as of 2015, holds 6 seats in parliament. It stands in the tradition of other green parties across Europe. As one of the junior partners in the government, the Green Party was one of the initiators of the referendum of 7 June 2015. According to the Green party, the Luxembourgish voters were asked to express themselves on the question "(…) weather they want to expand and stimulate democracy (…)" (URL 26) with the referendum on 7 June 2015. The party noted: "For years, our country has suffered from a serious democratic deficit: The gap between the number of residents and the

---

[56] The quotes in this section are not my own translations since the election leaflet is available in English online (see URL 26)

[57] The English translation of the party name is: The Greens.

49

number of voters is increasing, today almost 50% of residents are precluded from casting their ballot in national elections" (URL 26). The proposed introduction of a voting for foreigners, as well as the introduction of a voting right for young people from the age of 16, "(…) would widen the pool of eligible voters (…)", thereby strengthening the "(…) democratic legitimacy of politics" (URL 26). By accomplishing this, the party stated that Luxembourg "(…) could set a positive example on the national and international stage and become a European leader, as it has done many times before" (URL 26). A 'Yes' on all three questions of the referendum might be considered as only a small step for each individual voter, but it would be "(…) a giant leap for Luxembourg. Our society can only prosper in the long-term if we continue to develop our democracy" (URL 26).

The election leaflet stressed three central arguments in favour of the right to vote for all residents (URL 26):

- <u>Already working on the local level</u>
  Since 1999, people not holding a Luxembourgish passport are allowed to cast their vote in local elections, and the number is increasing. Therefore, the party stated: "Taking part in national elections would also strengthen their participation in the Luxembourgish society and foster social cohesion" (URL 26)

- <u>Decisions are made on the behalf of everyone</u>
  "According to the Constitution, the members of parliament represent the entire people and act in the interest of the country and on behalf of all its residents. (…) As many residents as possible must be allowed to vote for their MPs. The pool of voters needs to be expanded by giving the right to vote to non-Luxembourgers. People who have been living, working and paying taxes in Luxembourg for years, should not be excluded from political participation on a national level. Those who are interested in social life in Luxembourg want to participate in parliamentary elections. Being able to participate in parliamentary elections increases the feeling of being politically represented" (URL 26)

- <u>Getting citizenship is not the only solution</u>

  "The introduction of dual citizenship and the simplified access to Luxembourg citizenship are important steps when it comes to including citizens in the Luxembourgish society. Nevertheless, civil rights are not strictly attached to the citizenship. Citizenship alone cannot prevent the dwindling number of voters within the population. Extending the right to vote in national elections to all residents will strengthen our democracy" (URL 26)

Minister of Justice Felix Braz stated at numerous occasions that the referendum of 7 June 2015 was about asking oneself what perspectives for the future the Luxembourgish society wanted (Interview 1). To conclude, the Green Party appealed to the voters: "Help Luxembourg take a giant leap, say 'YES' to the right to vote for all residents" (URL 26).

5.1.4. CSV – Chrëschtlech Sozial Vollekspartei

Slogan: Opgepasst! En Kräiz ass schnell gemaach. Gitt gudd informéiert an den Referendum – (Attention! A cross is quickly made. Be well informed for the referendum!)

The CSV[58] is a conservative Christian democratic party in Luxembourg that, as of 2015, holds 23 seats in parliament. As already mentioned before, the CSV voted against the holding of the referendum of 7 June 2015. However, the party did not vote against it because "(…) it questions the instrument of the referendum in itself. On the contrary!" (CSV 2015a) The party argued that it is in favour of more citizen participation in general, as well as in the context of the revision of the Constitution (see CSV 2015a). However, the referendum as a "political instrument" (CSV 2015a) should be reserved for important events in the history of a nation-state. As an example, they referred to the referendum that is scheduled to be held in 2017 as a decisive vote on the revision of the Constitution (see CSV 2015a). The questions of the referendum of 2015, with the exception of question 2 concerning the *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*, don't fall under this category, according to the party (see CSV 2015a).

The CSV further considered the revision of the Constitution as a matter of finding a consensus because such modifications would need the support of a large majority in parliament as well as of the population. The largest opposition party argued that the current majority was not seeking for a consensus, thereby risking a cleavage in society (see CSV 2015a). The party also stressed its discontent with the way the majority parties approached the whole procedure. To reduce the question of voting rights for foreigners to a simple choice between 'Yes' and 'No' would not take into account the complex nature of the matter. This would require a profound discussion within society, which is not the case here (see CSV 2015a).

It has to be noted that the information material does not contain a recommendation for the voters, but rather argued that the voters "(…) should be as well informed as possible (…)" (CSV 2015b), which in turn "(…) means to deal with the questions and the possible effects"

---

[58] The English translation of the party name is: Christian Social People's Party.

(CSV 2015b). Central arguments why the CSV positions itself against the *'Auslännerwahlrecht'* were therefore the following:

- Participation in national elections and citizenship are closely connected
- Citizenship is a more effective factor of integration than an optional voting right
- No European country separates voting rights from citizenship

Politicians of the CSV have stated at numerous occasions that the party has similar objectives as the parties that were in favour of a 'Yes' during the campaign, namely to further promote social cohesion and the political participation of foreign residents. The pathway to achieve these objectives is what separates the party from most of the other parties. As an alternative to the proposed voting rights for foreigners, the CSV suggested "(…) concrete measures that will, in the future, allow non-Luxembourgers to acquire our citizenship more quickly and thus participate politically" (CSV 2015c). To this end, the party formally presented a legislative proposal in parliament on 24 February 2015. Key elements of this proposal are:

- The introduction of *jus soli*. Children born to foreign parents would obtain the Luxembourgish citizenship automatically at the age of 18 without any formalities, if they have permanently resided at least five years in Luxembourg after the age of 12.
- The reduction of the clause of residence from now seven years to five years.
- The abolition of a residence clause for the spouses.
- The maintenance of the language condition, while simultaneously redefining and facilitating the requirements by considering possible learning difficulties. Integration in terms of language should be promoted and should not exclude.
- A dispense for the language test for citizens that are residents in Luxembourg for over 20 years.

To conclude, the CSV said: *Yes to participation – No to the 'Auslännerwahlrecht'*

The CSV International, "(…) which regroups more than 500 members of the CSV of foreign origin (…)" (URL 27), supported in a statement of 21 May 2015 the position as well as the legislative proposal of the CSV. It thereby also favoured the integration of non-Luxembourgers via the acquisition of the citizenship. The statement closed with the following quote: "To achieve its objectives, the CSV International **makes an appeal** to everybody for whom the

'living together' is a value to join us. Because at the CSV International, even if we're coming from all parts of Europe, even from all parts of the worlds, we see ourselves as Luxembourgers" (URL 27; highlights in original).

5.1.5. ADR – Alternativ Demokratesch Reformpartei

Slogan: "Nee, Nee, Nee" - (No, No, No)

The ADR[59] is a conservative party in Luxembourg that, as of 2015, holds 3 seats in parliament. Similar to the CSV, the Alternative Democratic Reform Party (ADR) also voted against the law to hold a referendum on 7 June 2015. The party expressed fundamental critique of the procedure of said referendum, a critique that went beyond the reasoning of the CSV. The party argued that "(…) the pathway to change the Constitution with a referendum at a preliminary stage is not compliant with the Constitution" (ADR 2015a), calling the procedure "unconstitutional" (ADR 2015b).[60] Since the parties of the majority did not hold the required majority of two/thirds (40 of 60 deputies) at that point in time, the ADR criticised the way that the parties of the majority handled the whole procedure:

> *"Luxembourg cannot be forced to throw its Constitution and its way of living overboard, just because a razor-thin majority wants it that way. The government knows that this reform is the only way to make sure that it will reobtain a razor-thin majority from time to time in the future. That is the real reason, and not sympathy for foreigners or the youth (…)"* (ADR 2015b: 5)

For this reason, the ADR guaranteed to respect the votes given to the party during the last elections in 2013 by not being pushed into voting against their values or their electoral program. Apart from this fundamental critique of the referendum of 7 June 2015, the ADR provided their sympathisers, voters and members with an information flyer as well as with a multi-page document containing a list of 22 arguments against an *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*. The following regroups some of the main arguments by the ADR in a slightly paraphrased way because of shortage of space:

- State and nation are inseparably linked. It is the nationals who ought to elect the national parliament

---

[59] The English translation of the party name is: Alternative Democratic Reform Party.
[60] The ADR refers here to Article 51 (7) and Article 114 of the Constitution (see URL 6).

- A voting right entitles to decide over questions of national sovereignty. For this reason, the right to vote should therefore remain linked to Luxembourgish citizenship

- There are almost no countries in the world that grant an *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*, so why should Luxembourg do it?

- Luxembourg already offers many more opportunities to foreigners in terms of political participation than other countries

- Through acquiring Luxembourgish citizenship, a foreigner is granted active and passive voting rights. With the possibility of dual citizenship, a foreigner does not even need to renounce his or her original citizenship

- Foreigners can acquire Luxembourgish citizenship after 7 years of residence, the proposition of question 2 of the referendum would grant them voting rights after 10 years, so if they really wanted to participate, they could have acquired Luxembourgish citizenship by now

- Granting foreigners the right to vote would be an irreversible step no matter how the Luxembourgish society would develop in the future

- Even though question 2 speaks only of an active voting right, it is likely that great pressure will be build up in the aftermath of the referendum, so that foreigners would also be granted passive voting rights in the future, meaning that they can also be elected to the parliament

- The proposition of question 2 does not entail a language clause, which is why it is appropriate to ask what would become of the Luxembourgish language in the future

- An *'Auslännerwahlrecht'* would create two categories of voters: Luxembourgers who can only vote in Luxembourg, and foreigners who could vote in Luxembourg in addition to their respective country of origin. This would lead to conflicts of interests if people are entitled to vote in two separate countries

To conclude, the ADR saw many reasons why Luxembourg should not implement a voting right for non-citizens. Luxembourg would present a positive case in terms of integration of its foreign fellow citizens. In their view, the acquisition of the Luxembourgish citizenship would represent the last step of a successful integration, which is why this mechanism should be favoured.

Slogan: "Jo. Demokratie stäerken!" - (Yes. Strengthen democracy!)

Déi Lénk[61] is a democratic socialist party in Luxembourg that, as of 2015, holds 2 seats in parliament and which stands in the tradition of other leftist parties in Europe. As the only parliamentary opposition party that voted in favour of the law to hold a referendum on 7 June 2015, Déi Lénk supported the referendum and its topics. According to the party, there is a "lack of eligible voters" to consider Luxembourg a "full-fledged democracy" (Déi Lénk 2015). The party asked: "Are we a representative democracy in Luxembourg when our parliament is elected by **only 54%** of the people (tendency declining)?" (Déi Lénk 2015; highlights in original). It was argued that citizenship and voting rights are two separate matters. On the one hand, there is national citizenship, which is connected to the status of a person as well as to the passport. Voting rights, on the other hand, are something more practical. No one should be forced to acquire the citizenship of another country for the simple reason to be allowed to vote in the country that is the centre of one's life (see Déi Lénk 2015). In this sense, the party stated: "Integration will not succeed by issuing passports. It will, however, succeed when all people are equally called upon to decide on the future of the country that they reside in" (Déi Lénk 2015).

As a leftist party, Déi Lénk had a different view on the notion of 'sovereignty':

> *"The more people can participate in parliamentary elections, the louder the voice of the people will be. The more pressure can be applied to politics. The better our democracy will be. That is the sovereignty and the self-determination that this referendum is about"* (Déi Lénk 2015: S. 4)

It was further argued that it is not the non-Luxembourgish worker or neighbour that undermines the sovereignty of the country, but rather trade agreements such as the TTIP for example (see Déi Lénk 2015).

The party stated that the living together in Luxembourg is and has always been characterised by various differing inputs and factors (see Déi Lénk 2015). Also, the people that would possibly obtain the right to vote on a national level already have this right at the local or the

---

[61] The English translation of the party name is: The Left.

European level (Déi Lénk 2015)[62]. Furthermore, it was stated that "[t]hey don't constitute a homogenous entity that would be confronted by a homogenous Luxembourgish entity. (…) The needs and the interests of the people are, just as their demands for policy-making, independent of their citizenship" (Déi Lénk 2015).

Déi Lénk was also the only parliamentary opposition party that submitted suggestions for the revision of the Constitution. The other two parliamentary opposition party, the CSV and the ADR, did not submit any suggestions because, as a reminder, both parties expressed fundamental critique of the referendum itself. Although the party agreed with the questions of the referendum, it was of the mind-set that proposed questions did not go far enough, which is why the drafted an alternative Constitution[63].

To conclude, the party proclaimed it to be "logical" (Déi Lénk 2015) to recommend 3 times 'Yes' for this referendum in order to strengthen democracy, despite the fact that, as an opposition party, they are often called upon to say 'No' to antisocial and neoliberal politics (see Déi Lénk 2015).

5.1.7. Piratepartei Lëtzebuerg

Slogan: Jo. Zu méi Mattbëstemmung – (Yes. To more participation)

The Piratepartei[64] is a political party in Luxembourg that was founded in 2009 and stands in the tradition of the political doctrine of the Swedish pirate party. During the campaign of the referendum, the Pirate Party of Luxembourg was the only political party that differed from the recommendation to answer the three questions *en bloc*. Sven Clement, president of the party, appealed on various occasions to the voters to analyse and answer each question separately. In a radio interview given to RTL Radio on 13 May 2015, the party president stated that while the Piratepartei would support procedures of direct democracy such as referenda, they would regret that the referendum of 7 June 2015 was initiated by the government and that the people were not asked to be involved in the decision-making of it (see Clement 2015a). Furthermore, it was criticised that the questions were the wrong questions because they could have been resolved via the conventional political mechanisms. More important questions could have been asked, such as the question on the financing of the ministers of recognised religions which

---

[62] As a reminder, this is one of the two conditions of the proposed reform.
[63] The alternative Constitution is available online in French, see (URL 28).
[64] The English translation of the party name is: Pirate Party Luxembourg.

was no longer considered after an agreement prior to the referendum (see chapter 4), or a question on the form of government[65] (see Clement 2015a).

Concerning question 2 of the referendum, Sven Clement articulated that it is incoherent that one can acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship after a period of 7 years of residence, whereas the proposition of the referendum would only grant a right to vote after a period of 10 years of residence (see Clement 2015a). Nevertheless, and in accordance with their slogan, the Piratepartei was in favour of the extension of voting rights as proposed by question 2 of the referendum. It was argued that, despite their criticism of the duration, the proposition entailed a condition of a certain period of residence, which would mean that potential voters are already integrated to a certain degree because "(…) one cannot live in a country for 10 years without being active in the society. These people deserve to decide over their future and the management of this country" (Clement 2015b). The fact that one would have to enrol on the electoral list means that potential voters would reflect and think about taking that step, "(…) a step that would certainly render Luxembourg more democratic" (Clement 2015b). To conclude, the Piratepartei was in favour on question 2 of the referendum because it considered national citizenship as "something definitive" (Clement 2015b), whereas a right to vote should be granted via the criteria of residence.

5.1.8. KPL – Kommunistesch Partei Lëtzebuerg

Slogan: Déi richteg Äntwert op déi falsch Froen: Wäiss wielen! – (The right answer to the wrong questions: Cast blank ballots!)

The KPL[66] is a communist party in Luxembourg, which can be viewed in the same tradition as other communist parties worldwide. During the election campaign for the referendum, the party took a position which also separated itself from the position of every other political party. It characterised the referendum as a "farce" (Ruckert 2015a), which is why they recommend casting blank ballots in order to articulate a form of protest against what is happening in politics. The referendum was considered a farce for two main reasons: First, Aly Ruckert, president of the KPL, argued in a radio interview with RTL on 11 May 2015 that the referendum posed the wrong questions to the people (see Ruckert 2015a). The party regretted the fact that question 4 concerning the separation of Church and the State has been taken out of the referendum

---

[65] Sven Clement asked in this context if the current form of government, Luxembourg as a monarchy, is still up-to-date (see Clement 2015a).
[66] The English translation of the party name is: Communist Party Luxembourg.

because of an agreement before the referendum (see chapter 4). According to the party, other questions should have been asked, such as a question on a right to strike, children rights or on the form of government (i.e. the question if Luxembourg should remain a monarchy or become a republic). Second, the party argued that, in any case, the referendum would not be binding, but only consultative in its nature. President Aly Ruckert characterised the referendum as "political move (…) to trick people" (Ruckert 2015a) because of the fact that the government did not hold the necessary majority of two/thirds to modify the Constitution.

Considering the subject of the extension of voting rights, the party argued against the proposition. The president of the party stated the following during an interview on RTL Television: "There could have been another way to find a solution to this question, the question divides people and it is not directly linked to our democracy" (Ruckert 2015b). It is referred to fact that non-Luxembourgers would be politically represented in their respective countries of origin: "So they are not discriminated. We are of the opinion that voting rights for national elections should stay linked to national citizenship" (Ruckert 2015b). The party president further stated that the responsible politicians "(…) should have introduced dual citizenship earlier. The conditions to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship should be facilitated. If everybody acquires voting rights without citizenship, than there is no more incentive to acquire it. Somebody who wants to become integrated no longer needs to renounce his citizenship. But then to the same rights and duties as a Luxembourgish national, he has is obligated to vote, and can stand as a candidate too" (Ruckert 2015b).

To conclude, the KPL considered the referendum itself a farce because it entailed the wrong questions, which is why they recommended to the voters to cast blank ballots. Concerning question 2, the party argued that voting rights and national citizenship should remain connected.

5.1.9. PID – Partei fir Integral Demokratie

Slogan: none

The PID[67] is a political party that was founded in 2013[68] by Jean Colombera, a former deputy of the ADR and now the leading figure of the PID. The position of the PID concerning the topic

---

[67] The English translation of the party name is: Party for Integral Democracy.
[68] As of 2015, the party participated in only two elections with results under 2% of the votes.

in question sets itself apart from the other political parties in the sense that it was the only party that did not make any explicit recommendation to the voters, and even to its own party members: "We are convinced that the citizen knows what to decide if he is well informed. We want that the citizen votes on its own. I think it's sad that the other parties positioned themselves in such a way that some say yes and the others say no, and now they try to force their voters to decide how they want the decision to be" (Colombera 2015a). For this reason, the president of the PID made it clear that the views he communicated were his personal views, and should therefore not be understood as a recommendation to the voters.

During an interview given to RTL radio on 6 May 2015, Jean Colombera stated that the party is in favour of more direct democracy and follows a holistic approach of democracy, meaning that everybody is welcome to contribute to the party and to communicate his or her views and that nobody will be excluded for the simple reason of having different views on certain subjects (see Colombera 2015b). Concerning the referendum of 7 June 2015, Jean Colombera argued that, generally speaking, the PID would be in favour of referendums, and that it is a good initiative to ask the people for their opinions. However, he also argued that the party would prefer it if the citizens could actually contribute to the process of which questions are to be asked during referendums (see Colombera 2015a). Concerning question 2 of the referendum, Jean Colombera stated the following:

> "[I]*f one thinks in an integral* [i.e. holistic] *manner, one should vote yes to the three questions. The foreigners work in Luxembourg, they are integrated, they are members of associations of all kinds, they participate, they pay for our pensions, and they pay taxes… This is the reason why, if one thinks in an integral manner, one should say: Okay, they should be allowed to vote and to participate in the political process"* (Colombera 2015b)

5.1.10. Youth sections

As already mentioned in chapter 4, a number of youth sections of the Luxembourgish political parties already manifested themselves on the subject of voting rights for non-citizens in 2007 with the initiative 'Refresh Democracy'. As a reminder, the signees of the initiative were: the CSJ (the youth section of the CSV), the DJG (the youth section of déi gréng), the JCL (the youth section of the KPL), the JDL (the youth section of the DP), the JSL (the youth section of the LSAP), as well as *Déi Lénk*, who did not have a youth section at that point (see URL 17). The *Piratepartei* and the PID were not yet founded at that point.

The youth section of the ADR called '*ADRenalin, déi jonk ADR'*, was the only youth section that did not sign the propositions by 'Refresh Democracy'. In an official statement from 2012, *ADRenalin, déi jonk ADR* agreed that the democracy in Luxembourg needs a 'refresh', it disagreed, however, that foreigners should obtain the right to vote for national elections. It was argued that "[t]hose foreigners who want to participate in the making of our country and our nation should demonstrate their willingness to integrate by acquiring the Luxembourgish citizenship, possibly also dual citizenship" (URL 29). It was also insisted that the clause of the requirements for the knowledge of the language as well as the clause of the necessary period of residence should not be changed. The youth section of the ADR argued in similar ways during the election campaign prior to the referendum of 7 June 2015 by adopting basically the exact same arguments as the ADR (see therefore section 5.1.5.).

In regards to the electoral campaign for the referendum of 2015, the CSJ, the youth section of the CSV, published a resolution on 21 March 2015, which underlined its position on the extension of voting rights once again. The youth section stated, in contrast to the CSV, that it supports the "democratic instrument of the referendum" (URL 30), considering it as "(…) an important first step in the necessary process of the revision of the Constitution. The growing number of non-Luxembourgish residents within the population of the Grand-Duchy entails a growing lack of legitimacy of the elected nationals" (URL 30). Not only would the extension of voting rights "(…) reach out the hand to our fellow foreign citizens living on the national territory" (URL 30), it would also constitute an important step in further shaping the social cohesion of the country as a whole (see URL 30). However, the CSJ criticised that the conditions and the formulation of question 2 in the referendum "(…) lack political courage and (…) clarity" (URL 30). The requirement to have resided in Luxembourg for 10 years, whereas the Luxembourgish citizenship can be acquired after 7 years of residence, was considered to be paradoxical. The second condition, a previous participation at either local or European elections, did not make much more sense to the CSJ either. Instead, they favoured "(…) integration into society via the language" (URL 30). This is why the resolution presented a counterproposition to question 2 of the referendum, with differing criteria:

> *"Do you agree that resident non-Luxembourgers should have the right, at their own discretion, to register on the electoral roll to participate as voters in the Chamber of Deputies elections, provided they have continuously resided at least 5 years in Luxembourg and can provide a prove of a basic oral comprehension of the Luxembourgish language, the standard being determined by the law?"* (URL 30; my own translation)

On 3 April 2015, the youth section of the four largest political parties, namely the CSJ, the DJG, the JDL and the JSL, published a joint statement that reflected the position that the signees were, in principle, in favour of "(…) voting rights for residents without Luxembourgish citizenship" (URL 31). It was argued that voting rights should no longer be exclusively linked to citizenship. In view of the demographic situation, Luxembourg would need to find a way to integrate a large portion of residents without Luxembourgish citizenship (see URL 31). The four youth sections argued that the best way would be "(…) an opening up of the active voting right" (URL 31). However, they further argued that the two conditions of question 2 of the referendum were "(…) too restrictive. Further efforts are needed to reduce the democratic deficit and to guarantee the integration of our fellow citizens without Luxembourgish citizenship" (URL 31). The statement further read that the four youth sections were pleased that there was an effort to integrate the citizens more in the process of policy-making and that they would be consulted in view of the revision of the Constitution. However, they regret that there hadn't been a larger debate in society up until that point (see URL 31).

After the respective positions and arguments by all political parties of Luxembourg, including their respective youth sections (if existing), the following section will elaborate on the agents of the civil society in further detail.

5.2. Civil Society

Parts of the civil society had been very active during the election campaign, while the contribution of other sectors had been rather passive, limiting themselves to the publication of press releases and position statements. The following section will therefore begin with the two most active agents in this context, the platform MINTÉ on the side of the proponents and the collective nee2015.lu on the side of the opponents of the voting rights for non-citizen residents. Other agents will also be introduced in the subsequent sections.

5.2.1. MINTÉ – Platforme Migrations et Intégration

The platform MINTÉ is combining about 20 different organisations from the civic society in Luxembourg (see URL 32), among them the two largest labour unions OGBL and LCGB (see below), and has been very active during the election campaign. The platform was established in 2007 in the context of the discussion about the reform of the Law on Nationality (Interview 3), and one of the key organisations of the platform is the already mentioned NGO ASTI (see

chapter 4). MINTÉ saw itself as a "(…) place of exchange, reflection and deepening on challenges posed by immigration and integration" (URL 33).

In the framework of the referendum of 7 June 2015, MINTÉ was the organiser, in cooperation with integration commissions of different municipalities and the research institute CEFIS (see below), of more than 10 information events on the topic of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents. To this end, they formulated a number of different information brochures containing their position and their arguments on the '*Awunnerwahlrecht'*, as well as containing answers to the arguments of opponents of the extension of voting rights (see MINTÉ 2015a).

After highlighting the historical perspective of the debate, the platform argued that, in the context of national legislative elections, the link between the status of citizenship and the right to vote should be abolished, as it had already been for local and European elections. In this sense, MINTÉ called for the introduction of a 'residential voting right' on all levels (see MINTÉ 2015b: 3), with the argument that "(…) casting a vote is a fundamental democratic right. It refers to expressing one's trust towards those politicians or political parties that seem to be able to provide the best answers for the main concerns (…) of our society" (MINTÉ 2015b: 3). In other words, to extent voting rights to non-citizen residents coincides with "(…) doing justice to a democratic right" (MINTÉ 2015b: 3), since "[t]he democratic principles demand that all citizens that are subjected to the public order should be allowed to influence the political debates and decisions that affect this public order" (MINTÉ 2015b: 3).

According to the platform, this would also provide a more accurate political representation of the current unique demographic situation of Luxembourg, as more than 45% of the residents of Luxembourg are non-citizen residents, while at the same time being key contributors to the economic and social wealth of Luxembourg. Furthermore, such an extension would also work against the gap between the eligible voters and the residents overall. It was argued, leaning on the findings of the statistical office STATEC, that this gap keeps increasing and cannot be met with an increase of naturalisations alone – a situation which would constitute a democratic deficit that needed to be met, according to the platform (see MINTÉ 2015b: 4f). Moreover, the Luxembourgish identity has always been characterised by its multilingualism.

Taken all together, the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents would prevent communitarianism (see MINTÉ 2015b: 4f), as well as render the Luxembourgish society more socially and politically dynamic, since the political parties would be forced to be more considered of the needs of the entire population, and not only of the eligible voters (see MINTÉ

2015b: 5f). By extending the right to vote to non-citizen residents on the national level, Luxembourg could become a pioneer in Europe, according to MINTÉ. This would even more be the case since the large majority of the non-citizen population are EU-citizens, and the motivation to become a Luxembourgish citizen is probably relatively low. In this sense, it is argued, they are "(…) not as foreign" (MINTÉ 2015: 6) because the only real difference between EU-citizens and citizens with a Luxembourgish citizenship is the Luxembourgish passport (see MINTÉ 2015: 6).

5.2.2. nee2015.lu

One of the most active opponents in the debate during the election campaign was the collective *nee2015.lu*.[69] The founder of the collective itself, secondary school teacher Fred Keup, stated on several occasions that the collective was initially founded by a friend of his and himself as a reaction to what they felt was an underrepresentation of the opponents of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents.

Initially established as a website and a Facebook group in March 2015, *nee2015.lu* quickly gained recognition in the media, online, as well as in the Luxembourgish society overall – to the point that they have been invited to communicate their position and their argument at numerous media platforms and information events. *nee2015.lu* viewed itself as "(…) politically independent, representing the political centre as there are (…)", in the words of Fred Keup articulated during an information event on 21 April 2015, "(…) many people who are against the '*Auslännerwahlrecht'*, even across party lines as polls illustrate" (Keup 2015)

The main argument of the collective rested on the perception that the link between national voting rights and citizenship should be maintained. It was argued that "(…) there is no other European country in which foreign nationals are allowed to vote in national elections, so why should we allow it?" (Keup 2015). One of the points that was stressed at numerous occasions by the collective in this context was the following: "The '*Auslännerwahlrecht'* was not the idea of the foreigners, nor of the Luxembourgers. The foreigner never asked for the right to vote. It is an idea that comes from the Chamber of Commerce. It does not come from the people" (Keup 2015). As for the other main arguments of *nee2015.lu*, the following list of 10 arguments[70] was taken from the collective's website (see URL 34):

---

[69] 'nee' is the Luxembourgish term for ,no', so the collective's name translates as *no2015.lu*.
[70] Highlights in original.

1. Everybody may acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship and show that he identifies himself with our identity, our **language** and our culture, and that he has an emotional connection to the country.

2. The Luxembourgers give up their **sovereignty** with the voting rights for foreigners. Because the article "The sovereign power resides in the nation" of the Constitution would need to be crossed out. This would be the beginning of the end of our **nation**. The Luxembourgers had to make great sacrifices to sustain their national sovereignty. What would our parents and grandparents think if we would give this up voluntarily now?

3. The voting rights for foreigners will lead to the fact that **our language** will disappear little by little on the political level. Later on in the public service and in the schools as well probably.

4. The Luxembourgers abroad will also not get the voting rights. And it is wrong to speak of an '*Awunnerwahlrecht*' because in that case, the 34.000 Luxembourgers that live abroad wouldn't be able to vote anywhere.

5. The parliament represents the nation and the nation is the Luxembourgers, no matter where they live. The parliament does not represent the foreigners. They have their **own parliaments**. We open up our nation for those people that want to be part of our nation.

6. The foreigners are, in part, subjected to the laws of the countries of which they also have the passport and not to the Luxembourgish laws. With a voting right for foreigners, they would vote on **laws** that would only concern the Luxembourgers.

7. Only those people should vote that are interested **long-term** in the future of Luxembourg and are not here for only a couple of years and then return to their home.

8. The living together between Luxembourgers and foreigners is **without problems**. The foreigners never asked for a voting right for the Luxembourgish national elections. Now there is the risk that our society will be divided: on the one hand the Luxembourgish voters and on the other hand the foreign voters.

9. With a voting right for foreigners, there is the question why the foreigners will now receive a voting RIGHT and why the Luxembourgers still have the **DUTY to vote**.

10. In the event of a voting right for foreigners, the foreigners would have less motivation to become Luxembourgers and to become, by this means, completely **integrated** in the Luxembourgish society.

Furthermore, zhe Luxembourgish voters were called not to be "deceived" by the propositions of question 2: "It's a back trick. Once the citizenship clause is taken out of the Constitution, it becomes possible to drop those conditions little by little via a simple vote in parliament" (URL 34). Fred Keup often ended his speech with a variation of the following sentences:

> „For over 100 years, we have been doing fine, many migrants have become integrated, and all that was accomplished without an 'Auslännerwahlrecht', image that. We don't need it" (Keup 2015)

5.2.3. CEFIS – Centre d'Études et de Formations Interculturelles et Sociales

The CEFIS is a research institute for studies on intercultural and social phenomena in Luxembourg that conducts research on the "(…) social and political participation of foreigners in Luxembourg as a means and a sign of their integration into the society of Luxembourg" (CEFIS 2015: 2). In this context, it has published a number of studies in their own publication series called *RED*.[71] Many of the statistics that they collected can be accessed on their website.[72]

In the context of the referendum, the research institute saw itself as a contributor to the debate in terms of presenting statistics of the demographic development and current situation of Luxembourg, as well as presenting findings of their respective studies. In January 2015, they published a document containing relevant information on the subject in question, providing a historical perspective on the extension of voting rights to non-citizens in the context of the already mentioned Maastricht Treaty (TEU) as well as some of the findings of their studies concerning the political participation of non-Luxembourgers on a local level (see CEFIS 2015). As already mentioned above, the CEFIS also worked closely together with the platform MINTÉ in the context of organising a series of information events during the election campaign.

5.2.4. CLAE – Comité de Liaison des Associations d'Étrangers

As has been mentioned in the Chapter 4, the NGO CLAE has been an active agent in the discussion about voting rights for non-citizen residents for a long term. As an umbrella

---

[71] See URL 35 for more information on the respective publications.
[72] See URL 36 for more information on the demographic situation of Luxembourg, and URL 15 for further details on the statistics on naturalisations in Luxembourg.

organisation of smaller NGOs of foreign origin in Luxembourg, the CLAE has long been in favour of such voting rights.

As for their position in light of the referendum of 7 June 2015, the NGO issued a statement that has been adopted at an extraordinaire general assembly on 27 January 2015 (see URL 37). The statement reads that, in the eyes of the NGO, the introduction of the universal suffrage in 1919, as well as the introduction of social and political rights in the framework of social, local and European elections, among others, are viewed as a "(…) dynamic process of enlargement of citizenship" (URL 37), a process that would need to be continued. The reform of the Law on Nationality in 2008 provided non-citizen residents with an opportunity to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship without renouncing the citizenship from their country of origin (see Chapter 4), but that would not be enough to face the current challenges posed by the demographic situation, according to the CLAE. In this sense, the extension of voting rights to foreigners is considered to be a "principle of equality" (URL 37). The main argument of the NGO contains different aspects, and reads as follows:

> *"The CLAE positions itself in favour of the voting right for residents with foreign nationalities, because it would permit to reinforce the legitimacy of the representative system, it would ensure a better representation of the entire population* [and] *it would reaffirm, both factually and symbolically, the principle of equality which, as a consequence, permits a society to think and build a future, while providing a new dynamic for the democratic discourse"* (URL 37)

The statement concluded that every revision of the Constitution would be an important event in the history of a country, and that for this reason, a large public debate would be needed where the reflections and critical exchanges by different agents in the debate need to be accounted for. During the election campaign, the CLAE showed restraint in terms of actively campaigning for the right to vote for many of their member organisations. It limited itself to organize a public discussion on the subject during their annual *Festival des migrations, des cultures et de la citoyenneté* in March 2015, as well as organising a similar discussion in the week after the referendum. The reasons why the NGO took this particular, rather passive position in the period prior to 7 June 2015 were explained during this discussion in the aftermath of the referendum, and will be discusses in chapter 7.

5.2.5. Unions

The Luxembourgish labour unions had been rather passive during the election campaign of the referendum, limiting themselves to press releases and position statements for the most part. The following is an overview of the positions of some of the main unions in Luxembourg.

5.2.5.1. OGBL – Onofhängege Gewerkschaftsbond Lëtzebuerg

The OGBL[73], as a "multi-professional and multi-sectorial labour union confederation" (URL 38), constitutes the largest union in Luxembourg (see URL 38). In the context of the topic in question, the union published a short interview with its president André Roeltgen (see URL 39)[74]. In this interview, the president of the union elaborated on the position of the union, reaffirming their position taken at the occasion of their last congress in 2014 (see URL 39). It is stated that Luxembourg has been an immigration country for a long time. More than 45% of the Luxembourgish population "(…) are of foreign nationality [today]" (URL 39). Those who have been living and working in Luxembourg for over ten years should be allowed to take part in the political decision-making because "[t]he right to vote should necessarily apply to those who are part of a country – and they are part of Luxembourg, they are citizens of Luxembourg. They are entitled to the right to vote, which is a fundamental democratic right" (URL 39).

The president of the union further stressed the point that the conditions as proposed by question 2 of the referendum correspond with the views of the union. The specific topic of extending voting rights to non-citizen residents would be of relevance for the union because "(…) many of our members are concerned, the OGBL as a whole, the history of our union, the past, the present and the future is marked by our immigrated work colleagues" (URL 39). To conclude, the union called their members to vote 'Yes' on question 2 of the referendum, for the following reasons:

> *"Those who vote 'Yes' on June 7 vote against a serious democratic deficit in our society, those who vote 'Yes' on June 7 strengthen the democratic legitimacy of the parliamentary elections here in Luxembourg, strengthen Luxembourg as a country of democratic progress and strengthen Luxembourg as a society overall"* (URL 39)

---

[73] The English translation of the union name is: Independent Labour Union Confederation Luxembourg.
[74] The article appeared in the union's own journal called '*Aktuell*' (No. 5; March 2015). Since I did not have an issue of the journal, I will be quoting from the article that is accessible on the union's website.

<u>5.2.5.2. LCGB – Lëtzebuerger Chrëschtleche Gewerkschaftsbond</u>

The LCGB[75] is the second largest labour union in Luxembourg. On 29 November 2014, on the occasion of the 59th congress, the union voted a notion in favour of the extension of voting rights to resident non-citizens – a position that was reiterated in a press release on 7 May 2015 (see URL 40). The extension of the right to vote for non-Luxembourgers was regarded as "(…) a fundamental question" (URL 40) due to the democratic deficit that would exist because of the demographic situation of Luxembourg, and the inherent exclusion of almost half of the resident population from the political decision-making (see URL 40). It was also noted that "(…) fellow non-Luxembourgish citizens (…)" (URL 40) already have voting rights on the local as well as the European level, "(…) so that no objective reason exists why the active and passive voting right shouldn't be granted for parliamentary elections" (URL 40). Furthermore, it was highlighted that the extension in question is linked to period of residence, which should not be shorter than the period of residence to become a citizen (see URL 40). The Constitution would also still prescribe that a member of the government needs to be of Luxembourgish citizenship.

All in all, the union was of the opinion that the extension of voting rights to non-Luxembourgers "(…) is an important step towards more political balance, as well as in the interest of the employees of the private sector" (URL 40). However, the press release concluded by stating that the union would have preferred it if the political parties had been able to find an agreement "(…) instead of clarifying these question via referendum and thereby risking a divide in the society, especially in regards to the question on the voting right" (URL 40).

<u>5.2.5.3. CGFP – Confédération Générale de la Fonction Publique</u>

The CGFP[76] is the main union representing employees of the public sector in Luxembourg. In March 2015, the union published a longer article entitled *'The right to vote for foreigners'* (see URL 41)[77]. In this article, the CGFP highlighted that "[t]he discussion about the right to vote for foreigners (…) is a collateral consequence of the economic and social evolution of Luxembourg over the last thirty years" (URL 41). It was argued that the economic growth has bypassed the national workforce capacity, thereby rendering the Luxembourgish economy to rely on foreign workers, both through immigration and cross-border workforce (see URL 41). According to the union, in order to prevent foreign residents to become the majority in Luxembourg, dual

---

[75] The English translation of the union name is: Luxembourgish Christian Labour Union Confederation.
[76] The English translation of the union name is: General Confederation of the Public Service.
[77] The article appeared in the union's own journal called '*fonction publique*' (Issue No. 238). Since I did not have an issue of the journal, I will be quoting from the article that is accessible on the union's website.

citizenship was introduced "(…) about ten years ago" (URL 41) by the government, thereby "(…) allowing foreigners that decided to stay in Luxembourg for good to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship while keeping their original one, thereby conferring them the right to vote on the national level" (URL 41). Furthermore, the article argued, the right to vote has been granted to foreign residents on the European and the local level, which is why they ask "(…) why, then, go even further?" (URL 41). The union further argued that the responsible politicians should have worked towards a "(…) compromise that is acceptable for a large majority" (URL 41) instead of "(…) unloading their own responsibility [by utilising] referendums in an abusive way to solve the country's crucial problems (…)" (URL 41). Proponents of the extension would be of the opinion, the article continues, that the right to vote should be granted "(…) for free, without anything in return (…). [W]hat motivation would they then have to become Luxembourgers and become integrated into the Luxembourgish society for good (…)?" (URL 41). The union further asked what would become of the Luxembourgish language, its national history, its national identity, national anthem and collective national memory (see URL 41). For these reasons, the union was of the opinion that the right to vote in national elections should be linked to the acquisition of Luxembourg citizenship, concluding the article by stating the following:

> *"The CGFP, always defending the ultimate interest of the nation-state, has a very clear position:*
> *- 'Yes' to the access of voting rights on the national level for foreigners via dual citizenship*
> *- 'No' to the right to vote for foreigners as such"* (URL 41)

5.2.6. Other Sectors of the Civil Society

Other sectors of the civil society that have been less present, but still communicated their views in official statements, are the following:

5.2.6.1. The Luxembourgish Economy

Different sectors of the Luxembourgish economy also positioned themselves in the election campaign. The following is are some of these sectors.

The UEL (Union of Luxembourgish companies) published a short statement on its website entitled *Democratic Representation in Luxembourg: A necessary evolution* on 1 April 2015

(see URL 42). The employers' association stated that Luxembourg "(…) currently suffers from a significant democratic deficit" (URL 42), again referring to the demographic situation in Luxembourg. The association stated that more than half of the employers and the employees in Luxembourg are foreign nationals, "(…) so it is them who preponderantly produce the wealth of our country, but they are excluded from the political process" (URL 42). However, the UEL also stressed that it won't explicitly comment on question 2 of the referendum. The voting rights for foreigners would be one possible solution, but it is not for the association to pronounce itself on an "(…) exclusively political question (…)" (URL 42).

As already mentioned in chapter 4, the Chamber of Commerce has been in favour of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents before the election campaign of 7 June 2015 (see chapter 4.2.).

On 3 June 2015, only a few days before the referendum, over 50 business leaders in Luxembourg published a full-page advertisement in every large national newspaper, expressing themselves in favour of a 'Yes' for question 2 of the referendum. The text reads the following:

> *"We say 'Yes' to these voting rights, which are about voting Luxembourgers to the Parliament, because we are of the opinion, that this is a unique chance for Luxembourg and not a threat to Luxembourgers. (…) Together with many actors of our society we say 'Yes', because we are convinced that this choice is important for our democracy and right for our country"* (URL 43).

5.2.6.2. The Catholic Church of Luxembourg

On 30 April 2015, a statement by the archbishop of Luxembourg, Jean-Claude Hollerich, was published on the website of the Luxembourgish Catholic Church (URL 44). It referred to the demographic situation of Luxembourg, the fact that 46% of the residents of Luxembourg are non-nationals, and stated that "[a]ll these people are part of our society, of its life, of the wealth, the beauty, the diversity of our country. (…) Without our immigrants, Luxembourg could not live nor survive" (URL 44). The archbishop noted that he won't express himself in his function as the head of the Catholic Church "(…) in one way or the other on such a complex subject" (URL 44). Although without expressing a direct recommendation, the statement read the following:

"I am also keen to stress that a country mustn't exclude from the politic life all those who contribute in a daily manner to its economic, social, cultural and religious life and who are fully taking part in it. I would also like to send an appeal to everybody to inform themselves and to engage in the public debate. A democracy lives off of the engagement of its citizens" (URL 44)

5.2.6.3. Creative Artists

On 28 April 2015, around 40 creative Luxembourgish artists published a co-signed statement that made an appeal to vote 'Yes' on 7 June 2015 concerning question 2 of the referendum. In the statement, it was referred to the fact that Luxembourg has been a multilingual and multicultural country for centuries and that this diversity should be appreciated: "This diversity needs to strengthen our democracy, as well as our cultural and political dialogue, and should help to create an inclusive society" (URL 45). Many residents in Luxembourg don't have the Luxembourgish citizenship, but they still contribute to the Luxembourgish society in many ways. However, they are not allowed to participate in the parliamentary elections where the laws are being voted, laws that also affect non-nationals, according to the written statement. The main argument in the statement was the following:

"Now citizenship is not necessarily linked to nationality. Citizenship basically contains rights and duties to participate in the public and political life. It is precisely the equality of those rights and duties, which are part of the citizenship that lead to the emergence of social relationships. To participate in the political decision-making means that, in a democracy, the equality of the citizens needs to be acknowledged, as well as their diversity and everyone's freedom" (URL 45)

The statement further read that if citizenship is restricted to the sole notion of nationality, it does not take the reality of diversity, European citizenship or migration into account, leading to the fact that "(…) [we would] still remain in the old conception of strict national sovereignty" (URL 45). Therefore, the signees of the statement expressed themselves in favour of question 2 of the referendum, which could provide Luxembourg with a better image of being innovative, and away from "(…) negative clichés (…)" (URL 45). To conclude, the statement reads that this won't be negative for the Luxembourgish citizens:

"It will also not hurt the country, on the contrary, it will work against the risk of cleavages in the society between one part of the residents that are allowed to decide on their

political destiny and another part that needs to accept this situation, despite its productive and social contribution to the country" (URL 45)

5.3. Media

The media also played an interesting role during the election campaign. First and foremost, the media contributed in a variety of ways to the debate: by its daily coverage and by providing information from various angles and perspectives, but also by presenting different platforms for the active agents in the debate, enabling them to communicate their respective positions and arguments. These platforms took on different forms: from interviews in newspaper, radio networks or television to the organisation of special broadcasts and conferences on the different topics of the referendum. On the other hand, some sections of the media also positioned themselves in the debate, as the following examples will illustrate.

5.3.1. Luxemburger Wort

A noticeable statement in this context came from the most read newspaper in Luxembourg, namely the 'Luxemburger Wort'. In its editorial of 23 May 2015, entitled *If the 'Wort' were allowed to vote*, editor-in-chief Jean-Lou Siweck, in the name of the newspaper, elaborated on the position of the newspaper towards the three questions of the referendum, stating they see it as their task as a newspaper to have an opinion and communicate it to their audience. While the newspaper rejected the other two questions that were posed, it expressed itself in favour of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents (see Siweck 2015).

After briefly indicating the history of the debate, which dates back a couple of decades, the texts reads that the '*Auslännerwahlrecht'* is of fundamental importance. For this reason, the newspaper considered "(…) the referendum itself as coming too early, especially in form of a 'Yes' or 'No'-question. It should come at the end of a process of opinion finding, not at the beginning" (Siweck 2015). The article noted that the separation of voting rights for national elections from the status of citizenship would be an "exceptional step" (Siweck 2015). It acknowledged that there are examples of such a step, but it was also underlined that these examples are only partly comparable to Luxembourg, as each example has its own origin and specific reasons (see Siweck 2015).

The article stated that it agrees with the concept of a nation as a "(…) description of a deep connection of a population with a geography" (Siweck 2015). Along those lines, it expressed

scepticism towards the "(…) ideological argument [of a] self-evident fact, or even a duty to open up the right to vote to non-Luxembourgers (…)". The 'Luxemburger Wort' rather referred to a more "arithmetic" (Siweck 2015) explanation: "If Luxembourg is called to the ballot boxes, not even half of the residents is concerned" (Siweck 2015). It saw the legitimacy of the democratic institutions at risk, therefore posing the question "(…) if we would still meet the requirements as being a democratic society in the long run" (Siweck 2015). Furthermore, the current electorate, being older and less professionally active as the overall residents of the country, would no longer represent the socio-economic situation of Luxembourg. While supporting dual citizenship, as well as a reform of the current Law on Nationality, the newspaper doubted that these two mechanisms will suffice to "(…) permanently solve the very concrete legitimacy problem" (Siweck 2015). Considering the fact that immigration to Luxembourg is generally permanent, and most of the immigrants are EU citizens, it should be recognised that the incentive to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship is probably limited for EU citizens, according to the article.

On the basis of these explanations, the editorial stated that it would support the extension of active, but not passive, voting rights to non-citizens that have been residents in Luxembourg for 10 years: "We don't see a risk for the political order, nor for the Luxembourgish language, which we experience livelier than ever" (Siweck 2015). However, and contrary to the proposal of question 2 of the referendum, the newspaper argued that it would favour compulsory voting for the non-citizens residents as well, thereby preventing discrimination. And above all, the editorial concluded, this would be the only mechanism that would really fix the objective of the 'Auslännerwahlrecht', namely the current democratic deficit (see Siweck 2015).

5.3.2. woxx

The independent weekly newspaper *woxx* also took position to the three questions of the referendum in its edition of 5 June 2015. While the newspaper stated on its cover that it would put trust in its readers to make the right decisions "[c]ontrary to others (…)" (URL 46), it expressed itself in favour of all three questions in its editorial entitled *Position statement: Of Course!* (URL 46). The newspaper has been in favour of an extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents for a long time, an extension which they view as a necessity, not only for demographic reasons. Three reasons are communicated to support their position:

> *"Because participating in the political life of the country where one lives should not be linked to a piece of paper or to the utilization of a language. Because it is the essence*

of a democracy to be allowed to decide over the same laws to which one is obliged to obey as a consequence. Because we don't think that the right to vote should be a privilege, reserved to a caste of 'true Luxembourgers' that is becoming smaller and smaller" (URL 46)

However, the newspaper questions the conditions as proposed in question 2: "[W]hy a period of residence of ten years? Is one not concerned by the political life prior to the ten years? Why, on the other hand, not think of more political participation for cross-border workers?" (URL 46). The article also regretted that other important questions were not subject to the referendum, especially the question concerning the separation of the Church and the State, i.e. the question that was left aside due to a solution prior to the referendum (see chapter 4.2.), or a question concerning the monarchy. Nevertheless, it was concluded that it was "(…) almost by nature that we don't have any other choice than to say three times 'YES'" (URL 46).

5.4. Academia

The academic world had less been directly active in terms of scholars communicating their own personal positions, but the University of Luxembourg and a number of scholars from this university were involved in organising a couple of information events during the election campaign. Scholars to be named in this regard are Prof. Luc Heuschling (law and constitutional studies) from the Faculty of Law, Economy and Finance as well as Philippe Poirier and Raphaël Kies (political sciences) from the Faculty of Letters, Human Sciences, Arts and Educational Studies.

5.5. Individuals

A few individuals have also been very active during the debate, mainly by attending a number of information events of all sorts and either posing (often almost the same) questions to the speakers (politicians, representatives of the civil society or scholars) or by communicating their own point of view. Since the large variety of the different positions and arguments by individuals have been, for the most part, similar to those presented in this chapter, they won't be reiterated here, but discussed in the next chapter.

6. Critical Analysis and Discussion

The previous chapter illustrated the varying positions and arguments of the agents that have been actively involved in the debate concerning the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Luxembourg as proposed by question 2 of the referendum of 7 June 2015. The chapter showed that a large majority of the agents of the debate were in favour of the extension of voting rights, whereas the result of the referendum of 7 June 2015 provided a very different picture, namely 78.02% of the electorate voting 'No'. However, and as a reminder, the following chapter will not be an attempt to answer the question why the result of the referendum turned out as it did. Further studies would be required to answer this question. Rather, the various *discourse fragments,* i.e. the different positions taken and arguments communicated by the agents during the *discursive event* of the election campaign, will be critically analysed in this chapter. In the first section (6.1.), the respective positions will be linked back to the theoretical framework as discussed in chapter 2, before the remaining sections will highlight and critically analyse some of the main arguments that have been articulated the most during the campaign. To reveal the contested nature of the debate and the discourse surrounding the topic in question, the method of CDA, as discussed in chapter 3, will be utilised.

6.1. Connecting Empirical Data and Theoretical Framework

Looking at the findings of chapter 5 and linking them back to the theoretical framework, one recognises that the different positions of the subject of voting rights for non-citizen residents are a reflection of the academic discussions among scholars. In general, the proponents of question 2 argued in a similar way to the positions of liberal theorists and scholars who support the idea of disconnecting voting rights from national citizenship as a legal status. It was argued that there are, especially in the framework of liberal democracies, reasonable arguments to be made that voting rights should be made accessible to non-citizen residents who want to partake in the political processes of their country of residence. Considering the fact that one of the two conditions of the proposition of question 2 entailed the requirement that one would need to have participated in a previous election, one would already be part of the electorate anyway.

Opponents of such an extension of voting rights, on the other hand, argued that political rights should remain linked to the status of national citizenship. States should have the right to determine whom they want to allow to become a member, and thus whom they allow to transfer political rights to. It was argued that the possession of national citizenship would be the only

valid argument to be granted voting rights on a national level, especially because national elections should be separated from local elections. In addition, everybody who wants to participate in the decision-making on the national level has the possibility to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship. Even dual citizenship is a possibility, so there would be no need for a specific voting right for non-citizen residents.

After these general considerations, let us now turn to the different positions taken more specifically. Due to the fact that the three ruling parties were the initiators of the referendum, analysing question 2 will highlight the positions taken by these three parties during the election campaign. As already mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis, question 2 can be characterised as inclusive and non-discriminatory in the sense that it did not differentiate between citizens of EU member states and third country nationals. Linking it back to the theoretical framework, it becomes clear that the proposition of question 2 did not fall under any of Bauböck's four ideal-types of expansive voting rights. Rather, it was a combination of the typologies (2) and (3): the focus clearly lay on the territorial inclusiveness (3), meaning that residence should be taken as the main criteria in determining who is entitled to political rights, whereas the principle of ethnic nationalism (2), i.e. the entitlement of voting rights for citizens living abroad, was not put into question. In sum, question 2 of the referendum was similar to Rainer Bauböck's 'stakeholder' principle. As a reminder, Bauböck argues that those who hold stakes in the future of a political community have the right to claim membership, i.e. citizenship, of this community. In the context of question 2 of the referendum, however, the stakeholder principle wouldn't have applied to an entitlement to claim citizenship as a membership status, but to an entitlement to political representation only, i.e. voting rights without the requirement to acquire national citizenship first. In other words, the idea consisted of a 'stakeholder voting rights' rather than a 'stakeholder citizenship'.

Most of the other supporters of a 'Yes' for question 2 of the referendum argued in similar ways as described above. The platform MINTÉ argued that voting rights are "democratic rights" that should be available to everyone wanting to exercise them, whereas the NGO CLAE or the collective of creative artists campaigned to view the right to vote as a "principle of equality", highlighting the similarities between residents of a state rather than the differences in terms of their respective citizenship. Déi Lénk also agreed by arguing that neither the Luxembourgish citizens nor the non-Luxembourgers would constitute homogenous entities and that the respective needs and interests of the people would be independent of their respective citizenship.

All in all, the supporters of question 2 of the referendum saw the extension of voting rights as a step towards more inclusiveness of and political participation by non-citizen residents in Luxembourg.

There has been somewhat more variation in the positions taken by the main opponents of question 2 of the referendum. The largest opposition party, the Christian Socialist People's Party (CSV), stressed the point that it has similar goals in mind as the ruling parties, namely to elevate the political participation of non-Luxembourgers in general, not only on the national level. However, an alternative way should be taken to achieve more political participation. In the eyes of the CSV, it is indispensable that non-Luxembourgers who want to partake in the decision-making acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship as a precondition. The introduction of dual citizenship would be a concession to non-Luxembourgers who don't want to renounce their national citizenship. Drawing on the findings of the theoretical framework, it can be argued that the CSV took a position that was very similar to Rainer Bauböck's 'stakeholder citizenship' principle.

The second opposition party that campaigned for a 'No' on 7 June 2015, the conservative Alternative Democratic Reform Party (ADR), also argued somewhat similar to the 'stakeholder citizenship' principle. Similar to the CSV, it was stated by the ADR that national citizenship is a necessary precondition for the claim to political rights by non-Luxembourgers. However, the ADR also articulated a number of arguments that come much closer to the ideal-type (2) that Bauböck introduced as 'ethnic nationalism'. Notions that were utilised in this context were, among others, national identity, national language or sovereignty. The subsequent sections will look at some of these notions in further detail. Furthermore, the acquisition of the Luxembourgish citizenship is viewed as a step that would need to be taken at the end of the integration process.

The same holds true for the other two main opposing agents, the collective nee2015.lu and the labour union of the public sector, the CGFP. The collective nee2015.lu deserves closer attention in this context. Starting out as a collective founded by two friends on a website and on Facebook, the collective came onto the scene as a surprise to many people and became one of the most active agents, gaining a lot of media attention and presence in a relatively short period of time. Many of its arguments introduced in chapter 5 are closely linked to the conception of 'ethnic nationalism'. At the centre of their argumentation were, for example, the notions of nation, language, identity or sovereignty – all notions that, in the eyes of the collective, Luxembourgers would give up or would disappear in the event of a 'Yes' on question

2 of the referendum. In order to be granted with political rights, non-Luxembourgers are asked to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship, thereby showing identification and an emotional connection with the country. It was argued that only the acquisition of the Luxembourgish citizenship would be a sign of complete integration. Furthermore, by comparing the collective's interpretation of the notion of '*Awunnerwahlrecht*' with the analysis of question 2 (see above), one comes to the conclusion that nee2015.lu misinterpreted this notion. Contrary to their literal interpretation of typology (3) by Bauböck, i.e. that Luxembourgish citizens living abroad would lose their right to vote in Luxembourg, question 2 did not put expatriate voting rights into question.

To conclude, it can be stated that, in a lot of ways, the positions and arguments taken by the ADR, the collective nee2015.lu as well as the union CGFP show many similarities. They referred to a lot of the same notions, ranging from identity, language and culture over to notions of nation and sacrifices. In adding "we" or "our" to the respective notions just mentioned, the opponents of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents rather highlighted the differences between Luxembourgers and non-Luxembourgers. And while the CGFP posed the question what would become of Luxembourg as a nation in the event of such extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents, the collective nee2015.lu proclaimed that it would be "(…) the beginning of the end of our nation" (URL 34). Taken all together, the various arguments communicated by these agents appealed to feelings of national pride and identification with Luxembourg as a nation, while at the same time emphasising the differences within the Luxembourgish society.

Before turning to the critical analysis of some the main *discourse fragments* which have been most discussed during the election campaign and which have touched on numerous *discourse strands* along the way, an important points needs to be stressed. Within the framework of CDA, which interprets discourses as having active agency, one can say that the topics that will follow in the next sections had a certain effect on the Luxembourgish society in general. This is reflected by the fact that many of these topics have led to (sometimes heated) discussions among many attendees of information events or on social media. The study at hand, however, cannot determine how these different positions and arguments have impacted either voters as it pertains to their respective decisions to vote 'Yes' or 'No', or people in general. It is not the aim of this study to measure exact degrees of impact, or to detect which subjects or which arguments had an impact, and why. Further research would be needed in this context.

6.2. „Legally Binding or Merely Consultative?"

Before the law required to hold a referendum was voted in parliament in February 2015 (see chapter 4.2.), a debate about the legal nature of the referendum itself emerged, the main question being the following:

Are the nature and the result of the referendum legally binding or merely consultative?

The opposition party ADR, as illustrated in chapter 5 (5.1.5.), questioned the legality of the referendum in general. During the parliamentary session on 24 February 2015, MP Roy Reding of the ADR argued that the referendum would be a violation of the Constitution, referring to Article 114 of the Constitution.[78] He highlighted that the mechanism of the referendum is not foreseen in the Constitution for the modification of the ladder. Instead, a vote of at least two/thirds of the assembly is required, and not a simple majority via a referendum. He stated: "If you want to conduct a poll to know what the population thinks, than conduct a poll. But don't call it a constitutive referendum, because it is not". In other words, the ADR considered the referendum of 7 June 2015 as merely consultative since, in their view, a referendum is not foreseen in the Constitution in the framework of the modification of the Constitution.

Shortly after, in March 2015, the debate continued among legal experts. Law professor Luc Heuschling from the University of Luxembourg stated at numerous occasions that he considers the referendum to be legally binding (see for example URL 47)[79]. Professor Heuschling referred to the three previous national referenda in Luxembourg, as well as to Article 1 of the Constitution to underline his position. Article 1 of the Constitution describes Luxembourg first and foremost as a democratic state: "Can it be, that in a democracy, in which the 'demos' should rule or be sovereign, you ask the people their opinion and then politics does what it wants afterwards anyways?" (URL 47). Luxembourgish lawyer Marc Thewes disagreed with Professor Heuschling, arguing that, due to the ambiguous formulation of Article 51 (7) of the Constitution[80], it would not be possible to determine that the referendum had to be characterised as legally binding (see URL 47). Furthermore, he pointed to the formation of the referendum questions in which the voters were asked if they would or would not agree with

---

[78] The protocols and videos of parliamentary sessions can be accessed via the website of the parliament (see URL 9).
[79] For further details, see Heuschling (2015).
[80] Article 51 (7) of the Constitution reads as follows: "The voters can be asked to express themselves via referendum in cases and under the conditions determined by the law", my own translation) (see URL 6)

certain 'ideas' (see URL 47), which would render, in his view, the referendum merely consultative.

A look at the coalition agreement (see URL 3) and the excerpt of the legislative proposition of the law to hold the referendum might be helpful in this regard (see URL 23). The exact wording suggests that the authors of these texts considered the nature of the referendum to be merely 'consultative'. The three parties of the majority, the Democratic Party (DP), the Socialist Party (LSAP) and the Green Parts (déi gréng), being the authors of said texts, referred in this context on numerous occasions that they considered the referendum to be 'legally consultative' but 'politically binding'. The following section will illustrate this position in further detail, as it is closely linked to one particular argument or statement that had been communicated by these three parties on numerous occasions.

It has to be noted that this debate on the legal nature of the referendum itself led to a level of dissatisfaction among some people during the campaign, especially on social media, but also during informal conversations. Quite a few people expressed the opinion that politicians in general or the government in particular would do as they see fit anyways, no matter the outcome of the referendum.

6.3. „We Will Fully Respect the Public Vote!"

During the election campaign, the parties of the majority often emphasised that they would fully respect the public vote of the referendum, whether the result would be a 'Yes' or 'No', and however close the result would be. In other words, the parties of majority considered the referendum to be 'politically binding'. At first glance, this seems to be a pretty straightforward point to make. In the case of a 'Yes', they would have obtained the result that they hoped and campaigned for in the first place. In the case of a 'No', they wouldn't have had any other choice then to respect the vote of the referendum. So one could ask the following: Why make such a seemingly obvious statement? In trying to answer this question and to detect the motivation that may lie behind this type of statement by the parties of the majority, one needs to go back and remember how the referendum came into being.

As a reminder, the law required to hold the referendum was voted on 24 February 2015 with the votes of the three parties of the majority and the leftist opposition party Déi Lénk, adding up to 34 votes in favour of the referendum (see chapter 4.2.). The other two opposition parties, the CSV as well as the ADR, voted against the law, whereas the large majority of these votes

came from the CSV, namely 23 of the 26 votes. This means that, and as we have seen in chapters 4 and 5, these two parties voted against the holding of the referendum and expressed fundamental critique of the whole procedure.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that the procedure to finalise the revision of the Constitution requires a first vote in parliament with at least two-thirds of the votes by the MPs, i.e. 40 of the 60 elected representatives. Since the supporters of the referendum, and thereby the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents, were short of the required two-thirds of the votes, it becomes clear that they would still need the support of at least parts of the largest opposition party, the CSV, to take a first vote in parliament. In other words, a revision of the Constitution is not possible without at least a partial support of the CSV.

It is in this context that the position of the three parties of the coalition introduced above needs to be analysed. During the election campaign, they often expressed, sometimes implicitly and sometimes explicitly and directly, critique towards certain positions taken by the two opposition parties. First, they criticised the ADR for arguing that they would vote against a new Constitution in the first vote needed in parliament even in the event of a 'Yes' for question 2 of the referendum of 7 June 2015, thereby voting against the will of the people. Second, and even more vehemently, they criticised the CSV for not clearly communicating how they would proceed in the event of a 'Yes' for question 2 of the referendum. The CSV had been very reserved during the election campaign in terms of clearly expressing how they would proceed during the first vote required in parliament. They often argued that they would take the vote of 7 June into consideration in terms of their thought processes on how to proceed during the first vote in parliament. As mentioned, this led to a lot of criticism, especially by the parties of the majority, not only during discussions on information events, but also, as we have seen in chapter 5, in some of the information materials that was distributed (see chapter 5.1.2.).

Another argument repeatedly communicated during the election campaign by politicians of the parties of the majority is noteworthy in this context. The interviews with Minister of Justice Felix Braz (déi gréng) and LSAP MP Alex Bodry serve as an example in this regard. Asked about the reason to hold a referendum on these three questions, the Minister of Justice answered: "We have been discussing these topics for over 10 years in the competent 'parliamentary commission' without coming to an agreement. Therefore we thought, let's leave the decision up to the people" (Interview 1). At the same time, the current president of the 'parliament commission' MP Alex Bodry stated that there was a brief moment of agreement, under the

previous president of the parliamentary commission of CSV MP Paul-Henry Meyers (CSV), just before the previous coalition came to an end (Interview 2).

Critically analysing this reasoning uncovers what was only implicitly communicated, namely that no agreement could be reached with the CSV in previous legislative periods. Considering the fact that the CSV is currently not a member of the government after constituting previous governments for decades, one can voice the question if these proceedings and the way these specific positions have been taken by the coalition parties were meant to put pressure on the largest opposition party, namely the CSV. A number of people voiced similar thoughts during informal conversations after a number of information events. Considering that the result of the vote on 7 June 2015 turned out to be so clearly against the question on the extension of voting rights, one could say that this critique directed towards the parties campaigning for a 'No' was rather unimportant in the end. However, it is noteworthy in my opinion, as it seems to reveal what was at stake in the eyes of the parties of the majority.

6.4. „*'Awunnerwahlrecht'* or *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*?

After these rather general critical approaches to the referendum, and how it came to be, the following section will discuss the two notions that have been utilised in debate to refer to the voting right for non-citizen residents, namely the Luxembourgish notions of *'Awunnerwahlrecht'* and *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*. As already noted, the first notion translates as *voting right for residents*, whereas the second notion translates as *voting right for foreigners*. Most, but not all of the agents that campaign in favour of the extension of voting rights used the notion of *'Awunnerwahlrecht'*, whereas all the opponents of the proposition used the term *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*. The following two stickers by the two most active agents of the civil society, MINTÉ and nee2015.lu, serve as an illustration in this context:

Figure 4: Sticker distributed by MINTÉ (scanned)

Figure 4: Sticker distributed by nee2015.lu (scanned)

By referring to anthropological literature on concepts such as 'othering' (see Said 1979), one can observe that the first notion is more inclusive, rather highlighting the similarities between people as residents (e.g. "we are all residents of Luxembourg"), whereas the second notion is more exclusive, rather highlighting the differences between people (e.g. "we are Luxembourgers, they are non-Luxembourgers or foreigners"). By adding CDA as a method of analysis, one can argue that the usage of the notions *'Awunnerwahlrecht'* and *'Auslännerwahlrecht'* shows what values or ideologies the respective agents in the debate stand for. This does not mean, however, that those agents should be considered as xenophobic or the like for the sole reason that they prioritised the usage of foreigner over resident. It is certainly not the mere usage of a certain term in this specific context, but rather the way that one puts forward one's argumentation that is determining to conclude if a statement is considered as being xenophobic or the like. In this context, I want to stress the point that no agents in the debate, to my knowledge, articulated arguments or positions that could be characterised as xenophobic or the like. Nevertheless, I would argue that, from an anthropological point of view, the usage of *'Auslännerwahlrecht'* is more problematic in the sense that it seems to overemphasise what differentiates people, while at the same time reflecting homogenous conceptions of one's own community as well as of non-Luxembourgers as a whole (see also Anderson 1991 [1983]; Hobsbawn 1984).

6.5. „What Identity Do We Have and What Language Do We Speak?"

One of the notions that became subject of most discussions during information events, especially during events organised by the civil society, was the notion of 'identity', especially in regards to the linguistic situation of Luxembourg. As we have seen in chapter 4.2., Luxembourg is characterised by three official languages, and the two most active agents of the civil society, namely the platform MINTÉ and the collective nee2015.lu, employed the notions of 'identity' and 'language' in very different ways. Analysed within the framework of CDA, one can observe that the usage of these notions by these two agents corresponds with their respective conceptualisation of citizenship and voting rights, as discussed in previous chapters.

The platform MINTÉ thinks of 'the Luxembourgish identity' mainly as being culturally diverse and multilingual, thereby viewing Luxembourg, as it has been expressed at various events, as "the European Union on a much smaller scale". They asked the question why Luxembourg should conceptualise its identity only in the framework of a singular nation-state with closed boundaries, viewing that Luxembourg has always been influenced by different cultures and

languages. It is in this sense that MINTÉ favoured the extension of voting rights in order to adapt to the unique composition of the Luxembourgish society.

The platform nee2015.lu, on the other hand, characterised 'the Luxembourgish identity' mainly nationally by stressing notions of traditions, sovereignty and one national language, namely Luxembourgish. The acquisition of the Luxembourgish citizenship is viewed as being comparable to the adaptation of a 'Luxembourgish identity', which is why national citizenship and voting rights should not be disconnected.

There is a great deal of anthropological literature and literature from neighbouring academic disciplines on the ambiguous notion of 'Identity', with differing definitions and appropriations depending on who the speaker is in any given case. As for the combination of citizenship and identity, Jo Shaw writes the following:

> *"Analytically and normatively, citizenship has been used by scholars and by political actors to express notions of identity, both in terms of commonality (citizenship as one of the ties that bind within communities) and in terms of difference (citizenship as expressing multivalent identities)"* (Shaw 2007: 37)

The contested usages of 'identity' seemed to incentivise many people in the audiences to reflect and discuss how they themselves conceptualise 'the Luxembourgish identity', not only as a country, but also as a people. A debate about contested notions such as 'identity' leads some people to agree more with the conceptions of Luxembourg as a 'multicultural country' and others to sympathise more with the emphasis on a 'national identity shared by all Luxembourgers'.

Certain arguments communicated by the opponents of question 2, mainly by the ADR and the collective nee2015.lu, also led many to question if the a positive vote on 7 June 2015 on question 2 would have consequences for the linguistic situation of Luxembourg. Would the usage of the Luxembourgish language decrease? How will future election campaign look like? Will they still be mainly in Luxembourgish? Or will there be other languages (Portuguese, French or others)? How about the usage in parliament?

To conclude, the concept of 'identity' is a very ambiguous notion that has been utilised during the referendum campaign by proponents and opponents of the extension of the voting rights

in such a manner as to support their respective arguments and conceptualisations of the subject in question.

6.6. „What about Dual Citizenship?"

Dual citizenship was extensively debated during the election campaign as well. Chapter 5 has illustrated that the notion was discussed and utilised by both sides. Whereas proponents of question 2 of the referendum argued that, despite the fact that dual citizenship is a possibility for many people, this mechanism alone would not suffice to counteract the increasing democratic deficit in Luxembourg. In this context, it was referred to net immigration in Luxembourg which, as we have seen in chapter 4 (see chapter 4.1.), is almost double the amount of naturalisations in the last couple of years.

For most opponents, on the other hand, dual citizenship is perceived as the only valid compromise. The opposition party ADR, for example, voted against the new Law on Nationality in 2008 which introduced dual citizenship in Luxembourg, but in the context of the referendum of 7 June 2015, both naturalisation and dual citizenship were preferred to an extension of voting rights. In other words, while dual citizenship constituted a problem a couple of years back, it was viewed as the only valid alternative in the context of the referendum.

Two interrelated arguments by opponents of question 2 are noteworthy in this context. First, it was argued that the extension of voting rights would mean that potential future voters would be entitled to vote in both their country of origin (because of their national citizenship), as well as in Luxembourg (because of the potential *'Auslännerwahlrecht'*). In this event, they would have more political rights as Luxembourgish citizens, who are only entitled to vote in Luxembourg. For this reason, people who want to participate politically in Luxembourg should acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship, or at least dual citizenship if they do not want to renounce the citizenship of their respective country of origin. Second, an *'Auslännerwahlrecht'* would lead to conflicts of interests if people are entitled to vote in two separate countries. What this argument ignores is the fact that dual citizens already have more political rights than Luxembourgers in that sense, because they are often, although not always, still allowed to participate in elections in their respective country of origin even in the event of acquiring the citizenship of their country of residence. Following this reasoning, potential conflicts of interests are already a reality. Nevertheless, dual citizenship is viewed as a valid alternative to a voting right for non-citizen residents, even though these two arguments are equally applicable to dual citizens.

The concept of dual citizenship even led to ambiguous usages of the notion. Fred Keup, the co-founder of the collective nee2015.lu, stated at the occasion of numerous information events that the position of nee2015.lu should not be interpreted as being directed against foreigners, as he is married to a foreigner himself (Keup 2015). However, in an interview with the Luxembourgish newspaper *Le Quotidien* on 26 May 2015 (see Braun 2015), he stated that his wife holds dual citizenship. This highlights that, similar to identity discussed above, the ambiguous nature of the concept of dual citizenship lends itself to be utilised in such a way as to support one's argument.

However, if we look at dual citizenship from the perspective of non-citizen residents or dual citizens, it becomes clear that the views concerning this concept vary as well. Informal conversations with a number of different people of various national citizenships, as well as the group discussion in the women centre *'Kopplabunz'*, underlined that the concept of dual citizenship is contested in general. A number of dual citizens or naturalised Luxembourgish citizens were sceptical about the proposition of the referendum as well. Some expressed the opinion that the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents as proposed in question 2 would be somewhat unfair to people who went through the processes of naturalisation or dual citizenship, especially when one of the reasons in doing so was the fact that they wanted to be included in the decision-making. In this sense, arguments that were similar to those of the union CGFP for example were expressed, criticising the fact that basically no service in return would be expected in that case. Again others expressed the view that they sometimes either don't feel or are not perceived as full members of society because of the fact that they are dual citizens. It was difficult for some to articulate feelings of belonging towards either a specific country (i.e. of origin or of residence) or towards both countries at the same time. Others described different types of situations in which they are sometimes perceived as 'foreigner', 'outsider' or 'not a real Luxembourger' despite the fact that they hold Luxembourgish citizenship as well. On the other hand, there are certainly many different reasons why someone wants or does not want to naturalise or acquire dual citizenship. More in-depth research would be required in this context in order to provide more adequate and representative findings.

A point that was also sometimes evoked in this context by both sides is the incoherence of EU citizenship, which was considered as paradoxical in the sense that, on the one hand, mobility between EU member states is highly encouraged and facilitated, while at the same time posing (major) difficulties in terms of political participation in the respective countries of residence. The lack of a coherent mechanism within the EU and between member states would prevent equality among EU citizens. For this reason, and according to the CSV and the ADR for

example, the harmonisation of dual citizenship on the level of the EU would be one way to solve the problem of political participation of non-citizen residents in general, and thereby also in Luxembourg in particular.

6.7. „Democratic Deficit? Legitimacy Deficit? Participation Deficit? No Deficit?"

We have seen in the Introduction of the thesis at hand, a situation in which many people are excluded from political participation and representation constitutes a democratic deficit. While the findings of chapter 5 illustrated that many of the proponents of the extension of voting rights were of a similar opinion, the notion of democratic deficit evolved in the course of the election campaign. The argumentation of parts of the 'Yes'-proponents shifted away from this notion. A RTL radio discussion on 30 May 2015 serves as an example in this regard. The already mentioned Minister of Justice from the Green Party, Felix Braz, argued that Luxembourg has a "legitimacy deficit of our elected institutions" (Braz 2015). This notion refers to the fact that merely half of the population is involved in the national elections, a situation which raises the question of the legitimacy of the political institutions, so the argument of the Minister of Justice.

However, not everybody agreed with the argument that the political landscape in Luxembourg suffers from a democratic deficit. Some agents of the debate preferred other notions in regards to the current situation, others did not see a deficit at all. The largest opposition party, the CSV, preferred to speak of a participation deficit. In the aforementioned radio discussion, CSV MP Martine Hansen elaborated on the notion of a participation deficit, stating that everybody has the possibility to participate in the decision-making if he or she chooses to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship. One could only speak of a democratic deficit if Luxembourg would not offer this possibility, either via naturalisation or dual citizenship (see Hansen 2015). It is in this sense that the CSV would rather speak of a participation deficit – a deficit which also exists on the local levels, as MP Hansen highlights.

Others, such as the opposition party ADR or the collective nee2015.lu did not see a deficit at all. Because every non-citizen resident in Luxembourg is politically representing, namely in their respective country of origin, there would be no democratic deficit, according to the ADR. Furthermore, and similar to the position of the CSV, it was argued that Luxembourg would grant voting rights to non-citizen residents via either naturalisation or dual citizenship. In this sense, one could not speak of a democratic deficit. Furthermore, during the same radio

broadcast mentioned above, MP Fernand Kartheiser also criticised the notion of a legitimacy deficit utilised by Minister of Justice Felix Braz (Kartheiser 2015). The collective nee2015.lu argued in similar fashion in this context, adding that Luxembourg would suffer from a democratic deficit in the event that Luxembourgish citizens living abroad would lose their right to vote if Luxembourg would implement a *'Auslännerwahlrecht'* in the strict sense.

Although it is factually correct that every person that holds a passport of his or her respective country of origin is politically represented, this argument, in my opinion, was beside the point. It was not questioned that non-citizen residents were not politically represented at all, or in their country of origin. The point that was communicated by arguing that Luxembourg suffers a democratic deficit is the fact that they are not represented in the Luxembourgish political landscape. Together with the demographic situation of Luxembourg, the fact that nearly half of the resident population is excluded from the decision-making process, leads to the argument of a democratic deficit in Luxembourg. This argument brings us back to the following quote by Iris Marion Young:

> *"If inclusion in decision-making is a core of the democratic ideal, then, to the extent that such political exclusions exist, democratic societies do not live up to their promise"* (Young 2002: 13)

6.8. „Who Does the Parliament Represent?"

One specific Article of the Constitution was also the topic of contested debate during the election campaign. Article 50 of the current Constitution states the following that "[t]he Chamber of Deputies represents the country" (URL 6). The rather ambiguous notion of ' the country' begs the question: Who exactly is this article referring to? Who is meant by 'the country'? Does it refer to every resident of Luxembourg, or only to the Luxembourgish citizens? Those in favour of question 2 were generally of the opinion that 'the country' needed to be interpreted as 'the residing population', whereas the opponents of the extension of voting rights generally argued that, since only Luxembourgish citizens are allowed to elect the MPs, the parliament would therefore also only represent the Luxembourgish citizens.

Once again, the ambiguity of a particular notion left enough room for interpretation from both sides, even though it can certainly not be denied that a national parliament also votes on laws that effect all residents of a country.

6.9. Other Topics of Discussion

There have been many more arguments and contested notions, but due to shortage of space, I will only quickly refer to some of them in what follows.

The subject of 'sovereignty' was one of the topics that was also debated. While the opponents of the extension of voting rights saw a risk in granting non-citizens a right to vote in terms of national sovereignty (discussed by the ADR, nee2015.lu, the CGFP), those who were in favour of question 2 did not share this view and argued that national sovereignty would not be touched.

The slogan of the CSV "*Attention! A cross is quickly made. Be well informed for the referendum!*" (see chapter 5.1.4.) provided somewhat of a controversy (see URL 48). While the political opponents accused the opposition party of deliberately fostering anxiety and fear by seeming to warn the voters, the CSV denied by arguing that they were merely incentivising the voters to be well informed before stepping into the election booth.

The only condition of the proposition of question 2 that was debated to some degree was the fact that it would have granted non-citizen residents the possibility, i.e. the *right,* to vote, whereas Luxembourgish citizens are obligated to vote. The two main conditions of question 2 (i.e. at least 10 years of residence as well as the participation in previous elections) were not discussed to the same extent.

Another topic of discussion has been the argument by the opponents of question 2 of the referendum that the non-Luxembourgers never asked for the right to vote in national elections. On the one hand, the extension of voting rights is refused by arguing against the principle itself, while at the same time lamenting the fact that it was never really asked. In addition, it was referred to the relatively low rate of participation in local elections by non-citizen residents to support this argument. The NGO CLAE held a conference in the week after the referendum during which it was referred to the fact that they did not want to get actively involved in the election campaign because they were not sure how it would be received by the Luxembourgish voters if they would claim this right to vote more publically.

The campaign itself was also a subject of discussion, especially in the aftermath of the referendum. Especially the official campaign by the parliament was criticised. While some thought that it was too short, others lamented to have being overloaded with information.

7. Reflections on the Election Campaign and Implications of the Referendum of 7 June 2015

Being present at approximately 30 information events during the four month period of fieldwork, I was able to find that the questions and statements by members of the respective audiences evolved during the campaign. The early phase of the campaign in March and April 2015 was almost exclusively led by the civil society, namely the platform MINTÉ in collaboration with the research institute CEFIS and a number of so-called municipal consultative commissions on integration. Once the collective nee2015.lu was founded in late March, it was also invented to many of these information events, even though not to all, as some municipalities did not want to invite the collective. The election campaign changed its nature once the official campaign by the parliament started exactly 4 weeks before election day. In general, I would characterise different questions that were discussed during the various information events:

- Some of the questions dealt with the nature of the referendum itself such as: What are the reasons and the origin of the referendum itself? What is the specific procedures in terms of implementation? Or what are possible consequences?
- Other questions were about the specific views and arguments of the respective agents of the debate towards the three questions of the referendum.
- Again other questions, and increasingly also statements by members of the audiences, were critical towards politics in general, specific policy areas (e.g. (un-)employment or housing policy), towards certain political parties or even certain politicians.

This last category of questions became more and more predominant the closer election day approached. Many people seemed to increasingly take the opportunity during these information events organised by the parliament to express their general dissatisfaction towards politics or towards particular parties or individual politicians. The procedure of the referendum itself was contested as well, as some agents of the debate (the CGFP or the LCGB for example) as well as individuals argued that the politicians should have worked out a political compromise instead of holding a referendum. Others, on the other hand, supported the fact that the people were consulted via the referendum, even though they did not agree with the specific questions that were asked on 7 June 2015. Let us now turn to the implication of the vote of 7 June 2015.

As already mentioned in the Introduction, all three questions that were posed to the Luxembourgish citizens have resulted in a 'No' that has been very clear, even clearer than any polls predicted prior to the referendum. As a reminder, the exact result for the question concerning the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents was the following: 78.02% of the electorate answered this question with 'No', meaning that only 21.98% of the Luxembourgish citizens were in favour of such an extension. The proposal of increasing the political participation of non-Luxembourgers on the national level via decoupling the rights to vote from the necessity of possessing the Luxembourg citizenship was thereby clearly denied. Rather than trying to analyse the reasons that might explain this clear rejection of the ideas of the referendum, and thereby of the parties of the majority, this section will try to map out some of the implications of the end result. I will mainly refer to consequences on the political level because the initiators of the referendum proclaimed wanting to solve a number of political issues. Furthermore, I will touch on a number of reactions by some of the agents that have been active during the election campaign.

The first very general, but important consequence of the result of the referendum is, that all three questions will not be taken into consideration for the revision of the new Constitution. Article 52 of the Constitution prescribing national citizenship as a precondition in order to be eligible to vote will remain, and no additional article that would allow non-citizens to participate in national elections will be inscribed in the Constitution. The works on the revision of the Constitution by the responsible parliamentary 'Commission of the Institutions and the Constitutional Revision' will be continued until its finalisation. This revision will then be submitted to the *Conseil d'État* (the 'Council of the State') who needs to revise and annotate the entire elaborated text. Once the recommendations of the 'Council of the State' have been adopted by the 'parliamentary commission', the revision procedure is completed. As has already been mentioned, the Luxembourgish citizens will be asked to approve or disapprove the text of the new Constitution in another national referendum that is planned to be held before the end of the parliamentary term in 2018[81]. In the case of an approval by the electorate, Article 114 of the current Constitution prescribes that a second vote in parliament needs to be taken, requiring two thirds of the members of parliament to approve the new text of the Constitution in order for Luxembourg to obtain a new Constitution.

---

[81] As of finalisation of this thesis, no exact date has been scheduled for this referendum since the parliament is still waiting on the review by the 'Council of the State'.

This brings the following question to the forefront: How will the current political situation, which, as we have seen, a lot of agents in the debate have characterised as a democratic deficit, be resolved? Almost half of the population still remains excluded from political participation on the national level.

The vote of 7 June 2015 seems to imply that a vast majority of the Luxembourgish citizens consider it an important precondition that fellow citizens wanting to participate in national elections need to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship, thereby becoming part of the eligible electorate. The coalition agreement of 2013 by the current government already contained the proclamation of a reform of the Law on Nationality: "[T]he conditions and procedures to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship will be simplified. The modifications will mainly concern the reduction of the level of linguistic competences in the interest of assuring social equity" (see page 6 in URL 3; my own translation). During the election campaign as well as during the interview, Minister of Justice Felix Braz stressed that the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents would constitute a supplement to the reform of the Law on Nationality (Interview 1). In the eyes of the majority of the voters it seems to have been an 'either-or' decision.

In October 2015, a first draft of a new Law on Nationality has been published, and which intends to liberalise a number of conditions, such as the period of residence from 7 years back to 5 years as well as the expected language skills in the context of the citizenship test (see URL 49). It remains to be seen if a consensus, or at least a compromise between the political parties will be attained in regards of a new Law on Nationality. But since this is merely a first draft, and thereby still open to certain changes, there is no need to go into further detail at his point in time.

The CSV, as one of the main opponents of the extension of voting rights to non-citizens residents, argued during the election campaign that the adoption of a new Law on Nationality presents for them the only alternative. To this end, the largest opposition party already introduced a legislative proposal in February of 2015 (see chapter 5.1.4.). It seems as if a compromise with the CSV is attainable. The ADR, an opposition party and opponents of the extension as well, already announced that it would oppose a revision of the Law on Nationality in the event that a reduction of the linguistic competences required by the applicants of Luxembourgish citizenship is envisioned.

As for different agents of the civil society, the conclusions that were drawn from the result of the referendum have been diverse. The platform MINTÉ, which has been one of the most active agents in the campaign, published a press release on the evening of the referendum (see URL 50). The clear result of the vote is regretted and it was referred to the fact that the reasons for this vote are diverse. Furthermore, it was highlighted that the vote would not necessary indicate that a large majority of the Luxembourgish voters would have a negative view towards foreigner. However, it is also referred to the fact that there would be a risk that it could be perceived as an expression of a lack of confidence by some non-citizen residents (see URL 50).

The NGO ASTI, one of the main actors of the platform MINTÉ, held a general assembly the day after the referendum and published a press release which, in part, referred to the result of the referendum (see URL 51). The NGO expressed its disappointment concerning the "(…) massive rejection of the political participation of non-Luxembourgers for legislative elections, a rejection that does not open future perspectives for the country" (URL 51). It came to the conclusion that the civil participation of foreigners did not necessarily have to pass via the acquisition of the Luxembourgish citizenship or the knowledge of the Luxembourgish language (see URL 51). However, it is in favour of a reform of the Law on Nationality when it comes to the years of residence required, the reduction of linguistic competences, the introduction of *jus soli* and a clause concerning spouses (see URL 51). It also called the politicians to revise the Electoral Law on the ground of local elections, advocating for the full adaptation of the Maastricht Treaty (TEU) which calls for same conditions for everybody in terms of the required years of residence. Lastly, the NGO made the appeal to the entire Luxembourgish society to be vigilant when it comes to any xenophobe or racist phenomena, and to fight against such phenomena.

It can certainly be expected that other NGOs and members of the civil society, such as CEFIS and CLAE, will also continue to raise awareness and campaign for more political participation of non-citizens as it pertains to local and EU elections in the future.

The collective nee2015.lu drew strength from the result of question 2 of the referendum and announced in a press release on election night that it would continue to be actively involved in the time to come.[82] The day after the referendum, it released a second press release, drawing

---

[82] In the same press release, the collective announced that it would change its name from nee2015 to 'nee2015-wee2015', which in English would translate as 'no2015, path- or way2050' (see URL 52)

the conclusion that "[t]he Luxembourgers decided against the '*Auslännerwahlrecht*' and in favour of the path via the citizenship" (URL 53). Similar to the ADR, it also announced to fight against a possible reduction of the "(…) already low (…)" (URL 53) requirements of linguistic competences concerning the language test in the procedure of acquiring the Luxembourgish citizenship.

8. Conclusion and Outlook

On 7 June 2015, a national referendum was held in Luxembourg, which posed three questions related to the elaboration of a new Constitution to the Luxembourgish voters. The public debate during the election campaign, in particular concerning question 2 of this referendum, was the subject of this thesis. As a reminder, question 2 read as follows:

Do you agree with the idea that non-Luxembourgish residents should have the right, at their own discretion, to register on the electoral roll to participate as voters in the Chamber of Deputies elections, provided they have lived at least 10 years in Luxembourg and have previously taken part in local or European elections in Luxembourg?

This question was rejected by 78.02% of the votes on election day. However, this study did not aim to analyse the reasons for this one-sided result. Instead, over a period of four months, on-site as well as nonlocal fieldwork was conducted in order to answer the following research question:

Who were the agents of the debate about the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents for national elections in Luxembourg, what were their main positions and arguments, and how did these agents shape the discourse in the period prior to the referendum on 7 June 2015?

In a first step, conducting literature research on a multitude of levels was needed in order to provide this study with the necessary historical and socio-political context. Second, following the daily media coverage, as well as attending approximately 30 information events allowed to investigate the various institutional and individual agents that have been active during the election campaign. These agents were the main political parties, various sectors of the civil society (a couple of NGOs, a research institute, the main labour unions, among others), the media, as well as a number of scholars. One of the most active and surprising agents of the civil society was the collective nee2015.lu, which was founded in late March 2015, mainly by two friends, and which quickly gained media attention and presence during the campaign. The various questions, comments or concerns by the attendees of these events were taken into consideration as well.

The attendance of various information events provided this study, on the one hand, with a lot of information material by the various agents. This information material has been collected and critically analysed in order to identify the respective positions and main arguments. To this end, insights from the Anthropology of Policy and Critical Discourse Analysis were employed. Both approaches have been utilised because of the fact that they both share certain common characteristics, such as attributing policies and discourses, a level of agency, a critical stance towards taken-for-granted notions, as well as an emphasis on the historical and socio-political contexts of policies and discourses. In this context, the referendum of 7 June 2015 itself has been characterised as a *discursive event* and the respective positions and main arguments of the agents in the debate as *discourse fragments*, which, in turn, allowed to detect the respective views and ideologies that were communicated.

The critical analysis and discussion of these *discourse fragments* determined that the discourse in the context of the referendum reflected similar discussions among scholars:

The proponents of question 2 of the referendum argued in a similar way to the positions of liberal theorists and scholars who support the idea of disconnecting voting rights from national citizenship as a legal status. It was argued that there are, especially in the framework of liberal democracies, reasonable arguments to be made that voting rights should be made accessible to non-citizen residents who want to partake in the political processes of their country of residence. Referring to the concept of 'stakeholder citizenship' by Rainer Bauböck, the proposition of question 2 has been characterised as 'stakeholder voting right', meaning that everybody who holds a stake in the future of a respective country does not only have the entitlement to acquire the national citizenship, but the right to political participation without the necessity of acquiring the national citizenship.

Opponents of question 2, on the other hand, argued that political rights should remain linked to the status of national citizenship. It was argued that the possession of national citizenship would be the only valid argument to be granted voting rights on a national level. Everybody who wants to participate in the decision-making on the national level has the possibility to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship. Adding to the fact that Luxembourg also grants dual citizenship, there would be no need for a specific voting right for non-citizen residents.

A number of additional results have been found in the context of this research:

The study found that Luxembourg already had an inclusive voting regime as it pertains to local and EU elections prior to the referendum of 7 June 2015. Active and passive voting rights are granted to every non-citizen resident, both EU-citizens as well as non-EU citizen, on the local level. Further awareness campaigns are needed in order to elevate the political participation in the context of these elections even further.

On the political level, the campaign did not reflect the classical distribution of parties of the majority on the one end of the spectrum and the parties of the opposition on the other end of the spectrum, as Déi Lénk, one of the three parties of the opposition in parliament, was also in favour of question 2 of the referendum. As for the three smaller parties outside of parliamentary representation, one was in favour of question 2 of the referendum (the Piratepartei), one was opposed to it (the communist party KPL) and one party did not communicate a recommendation to its voters and members. This circumstance might be explained by the fact that the context of this referendum was the elaboration of a new Constitution, which, in general, ought to be a subject that crosses political borders. However, this did not mean that no tactical 'games' between parties of the majority and parties of the opposition have been 'played' (see for example chapter 6.3.).

The proponents of the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents argued that Luxembourg could have become a pioneer in terms of political inclusiveness of non-citizens with a 'Yes' on 7 June 2015, which could have resulted in a positive image for Luxembourg on the European map. However, the idea of rendering the right to vote even more inclusive was not supported by the Luxembourgish citizens. Some people, proponents as well as opponents, feared that this might damage the image of Luxembourg instead of elevating it. However, I would argue that this fear was not justified because, in my opinion, one could legitimately ask the question if a similar question in form of a national referendum, only posed to the citizens, would have differing results in other European countries. The result of the referendum of 7 June 2015 seems to reflect a conservative view of the concept of the nation-state in times of global migration phenomena. As has been indicated in chapter 4.4., current developments in Europe seem to suggest overall processes of re-nationalisation. It remains to be seen if Luxembourg is also a small component of this seeming trend in Europe. Future elections will shed light onto this question.

In addition to providing answers to the three constitutional questions, the referendum of 7 June 2015 seems to have raised additional questions for many of the agents that have been involved during the election campaign, as well as for the Luxembourgish society in general. A number of suggestions for further studies in this context will be provided in what follows, before drawing a final conclusion:

In view of the very clear result of the referendum, further research will be needed in order to answer the question why exactly the vote turned out as it did. Was it a vote that only reflected the opinion of the Luxembourgish voters concerning the three questions that were posed to them? Or are there other reasons for this clear result as well?

The study at hand did not focus extensively on the role and relevance of social media, or the media in general. Further research in this regard, especially in the context of instruments of direct democracy such as the referendum in this case, could provide valuable insights in terms of impacts of (social) media.

It will be interesting to investigate the impact of this referendum in terms of the numbers of future naturalisations and political participation of non-citizen residents on the local level in particular. Will there be more naturalisation in the years to come, especially in light of the fact that a new Law on Nationality is currently in the making? Or will there be a decrease in this regard? The same could be investigated in terms of political participation for local elections. How is the political participation of non-citizen residents on the local level in Luxembourg compared to other member states of the EU? As has been mentioned, the research institute CEFIS is conducting studies in regards to developments in Luxembourg.

A further area of interest in this context would be to analyse the citizenship test, which is required to acquire the Luxembourgish citizenship, and compare it to citizenship tests in other countries. Is the Luxembourgish citizenship test more, less or equally difficult compared to similar test in other countries? Are language tests elaborated in a way that accommodates applicants? Are these tests more in the interest of the applicants or the respective country?

As has been indicated in chapter 6.6., more research would be needed in regards to investigating feelings of identification and belonging in the context of citizenship studies, as well as in the context of studies focussing on the political participation of non-citizen residents. Does the acquisition of the national citizenship of a respective country of residence foster or hinder feelings of identification or belonging?

A last recommendation for future research focusses on the European level. Will there be efforts to harmonise dual citizenship mechanisms between all 28 member states of the EU? How can political participation of EU-citizens residing in another EU member states be facilitated in regards to national elections?

To conclude, the question what consequences the referendum of 2015 will have for the future of Luxembourg remains to be seen. It is hoped that adequate solutions will be found to counteract the significant current democratic deficit and to elevate the political participation of non-citizen residents in Luxembourg. The current and future governments, all political parties and members of the civil society, the media, scholars, the people, in short, the society as a whole needs to work together to face future challenges. As for now and probably for the foreseeable future, in regards to political participation of non-citizen residents on the national level, the following still holds true for Luxembourg, as it does for the overwhelming majority of nation-states worldwide:

> *"Still, the main avenues of political participation for noncitizens are indirect ones – foreigners' advisory committees, national and local, and unions and work councils in the workplace"* (Soysal 1994: 129)

The next scheduled elections in Luxembourg will be local elections in 2017, and every non-citizen resident enrolled on the electoral list will be eligible to vote and to be elected. The next national elections are scheduled for 2018, and will be held without the participation of non-citizen residents, as the discursive event of the referendum of 7 June 2015 did not result in a new policy world for Luxembourg.

9. References

9.1. Academic Literature

ALEINIKOFF, Alexander T.; Patrick Weil. 2006. Citizenship, in: Demetrios G. Papademetriou (ed.): *Europe and its Immigrants in the 21th Century: A new Deal or a Continuing Dialogue of the Deaf?*, 53 – 70. Migration Policy Institute.

ALLEGREZZA, Serge; Mario Hirsch; Norbert von Kunitzki (eds.). 2007. *L'immigration au Luxembourg, et après?*. Institut d'Études Européenes et Internationales du Luxembourg.

ANDERSON, Benedict. 1991 [1983]. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.

BAUBÖCK, Rainer. 1994. Changing the Boundaries of Citizenship: The Inclusion of Immigrants in Democratic Realities, in Rainer Bauböck (ed.): *From Aliens to Citizens: Redefining the Status of Immigrants in Europe*, 199 – 232. Avebury.

BAUBÖCK, Rainer. 2005. Expansive Citizenship. Voting beyond Territory and Membership, in *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38 (4): 683 – 687. American Political Science Association.

BAUBÖCK, Rainer 2007. Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting, in *Fordham Law Review* 75 (5): 2393 – 2447. Fordham Law Review.

BAUBÖCK, Rainer. 2008. Stakeholder Citizenship: An Idea Whose Time Has Come? Migration Policy Institute.
Available online at: http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/stakeholder-citizenship-idea-whose-time-has-come (01.11.2015: 09:50)

BERNARD, H. Russell. 2011. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (5th edition)*. AltaMira Press.

CARAMANI, Daniele; Florian Grotz. 2015. Beyond Citizenship and Residence? Exploring the Extension of Voting Rights in the Age of Globalization, in *Democratization* 22 (5): 799 – 819. Routledge.

CASTLES, Stephen; Alastair Davidson. 2000. *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. Routledge.

COMAROFF, Jean; John Comaroff. 2003. Ethnography on an Awkward Scale: Postcolonial Anthropology and the Violence of Abstraction, in *Ethnography* Vol 4 (2): 147 – 179. Sage Publications.

DAGGER, Roger. 2002. Republican Citizenship, in Engin F. Insin; Bryan S. Turner (eds.): *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, 145 – 157. Sage Publications.

DAHL, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and its Critics*. Yale University Press.

DEWALT, Kathleen M; Billie R. Dewalt; with Coral B. Wayland. 2000. Participant Observation, in H. Russell Bernard, (ed.): *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, 259 – 299. AltaMira Press.

DEWALT, Kathleen M; Billie R. Dewalt. 2011. *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. AltaMira Press.

EARNEST, David C. 2014. Expanding the Electorate: Comparing the Noncitizen Voting Practice of 25 Democracies, in *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, published online 29 March 2014: 1-25. Springer. Available online at: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12134-014-0334-8 (02.11.2014: 13:00)

EMERSON, Robert M.; Rachel I. Fretz; Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press.

ESCOBAR, Cristina. 2015. Immigrant Enfranchisement in Latin America: From Strongmen to Universal Citizenship, in *Democratization* 22 (5), 927–950. Routledge.

FAIRCLOUGH, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.

FELDMAN, 2011. Illuminating the Apparatus: Steps toward a Nonlocal Ethnography of Global Governance, in Cris Shore; Susan Wright; Davide Però. (eds.): *Policy Worlds: Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, 32 – 49. Berghahn Books.

FETZER, Joel S. 2011. *Luxembourg as an Immigration Success Story: The Grand Duchy in Pan-European Perspective.* Lexington Books.

FOUCAULT, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Tavistock Publications.

HAMMAR, Tomas. 1990. *Democracy and the Nation State: Aliens, Denizens and Citizens in a World of International Migration*. Avebury.

HOBSBAWN, Eric. 1984. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

INSIN, Engin F.; Bryan S. Turner (eds.). 2002. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. Sage Publications.

JÄGER, Siegfried. 2004. *Kritische Diskursanalyse (4. Auflage)*. Unrast Verlag.

JÄGER, Siegfried; Florentine Maier. 2009. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis, in Ruth Wodak; Michael Meyer (eds.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 34 – 61. Sage Publications.

JOPPKE, Christian. 2007. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Polity Press

LAFLEUR, Jean-Michel. The Enfranchisement of Citizens Aboard: Variations and Explanations, in *Democratization* 22 (5): 840 – 860. Routledge.

LAYTON-HENRY, Zig. 1990. Citizenship or Denizenship for Migrant Workers?, in Zig Layton-Henry (ed.): *The Political Rights of Migrant Workers in Western Europe,* 186 – 195. Sage Publications.

LÓPEZ-GUERRA, Claudio. 2005. Should Expatriates Vote?, in *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13 (2): 216 – 234. Wiley-Blackwell.

MAGNETTE, Paul. 2005. *Citizenship: The History of an Idea*. ECPR Press.

MARSHALL, Thomas H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays.* Cambridge University Press.

MAYRING, Philipp. 2002. *Einführung in die Qualitative Sozialforschung.* Beltz Verlag.

MILLER, David. 2005. *Citizenship and National Identity (Reprinted).* Polity Press.

MILLS, Sara. 1997. *Discourse.* Routledge.

NÄSSTRÖM, Sofia. 2010. The Challenge of the All-Affected Principle, in *Political Studies* 59 (1): 116 – 134. Political Studies Association.

OWEN, David. 2011. Transnational Citizenship and the Democratic State: Modes of Membership and Voting Rights, in *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 14 (5): 641 – 663. Routledge.

PAULY, Michel. 2011. *Geschichte Luxemburgs.* Beck.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. 1982. *Language, Semantics and Ideology.* St. Martin's Press.

PEDROZA, Luicy. 2014. The Democratic Potential of Enfranchising Resident Migrants, in *International Migration Journal (IOM Publications)*, published online 20 May 2014: 1-14. John Wiley and Sons Ltd.   Available online at:
http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/imig.12162/abstract   (03.11.2014: 14:00)

PRIES, Ludger, (ed.). 2001a. *New Transnational Social Space: International Migration and Transnational Companies in the Early 21st Century*. Routledge.

PRIES, Ludger. 2001b. The Disruption of Social and Geographic Space: Mexican-US Migration and the Emergence of Transnational Social Spaces, in *International Sociology* 16 (1): 55 – 74. Sage Publications.

REISIGL, Martin; Ruth Wodak. 2009. The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), in Ruth Wodak; Michael Meyer (eds.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 87 – 121. Sage Publications.

RUBIO MARIN, Ruth. 2000. *Immigration as a Democratic Challenge: Citizenship and Inclusion in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge University Press.

SAID, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.

SANJEK, Roger, (ed.). 1990. *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. Cornell University Press.

SCHUCK, Peter H.. 2000. Liberal Citizenship, in Engin F. Insin; Bryan S. Turner (eds.): *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, 131 – 144. Sage Publications.

SCUTO, Denis. 2012. *La nationalité luxembourgeoise: (XIXe - XXIe siècles)*. Édition de l'Université de Bruxelles.

SCUTO, Denis. 2013. *Country Report: Luxembourg*. EUDO Observatory on Citizenship. Available online at: http://eudo-citizenship.eu/docs/CountryReports/Luxembourg.pdf (01.11.2014: 12:15)

SHAW, Jo. 2007. *The Transformation of Citizenship in the European Union: Electoral Rights and the Restructuring of Political Space*. Cambridge University Press.

SHORE, Cris; Susan Wright. 1997. *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*. Routledge.

SHORE, Cris; Susan Wright; Davide Però. (eds.). 2011. *Policy Worlds: Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power.* Berghahn Books.

SMITH, Rogers M.. 2002. Modern Citizenship, in Engin F. Insin; Bryan S. Turner (eds.): *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, 105 – 115. Sage Publications.

SONG, Sarah. 2009. Democracy and Noncitizen Voting Rights, in *Citizenship Studies* 13 (6), 607 – 620. Routledge.

SOYSAL, Yasemine. 1994. Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe. Chicago University Press.

VAN DIJK, Teun A. 2009. Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach, in Ruth Wodak; Michael Meyer (eds.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 62 – 86. Sage Publications.

VAN LEEUWEN, Theo. 2008. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford University Press.

VAN LEEUWEN, Theo. 2009. Discourse as the Recontextualization of Social Practice: A Guide, in Ruth Wodak; Michael Meyer (eds.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 144 – 161. Sage Publications.

WEDEL, Janine R.; Cris Shore; Gregory Feldman; Stacy Lathrop. 2005. Toward an Anthropology of Public Policy, in *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 600: 30 – 51. Sage Publications.

WHELAN, Frederick G. 1983. 'Prologue: Democratic Theory and the Boundary Problem, in J.R. Pennock and J.W. Chapman (eds.): *Liberal Democracy (Nomos XXV)*, 13 – 47. New York University Press.

WITZEL, Andreas. 1982. Verfahren der qualitativen Sozialforschung: Überblick und Alternativen. Campus Verlag.

WITZEL, Andreas.1985. Das problemzentrierte Interview, in Gerd Jüttemann (ed.): *Qualitative Forschung in der Psychologie*, 227 – 256. Beltz Verlag.

WODAK, Ruth; Michael Meyer. 2009. Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology, in Ruth Wodak; Michael Meyer (eds.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 1 – 33. Sage Publications.

YOUNG, Iris Marion. 2002. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.

9.2. Other Publications

ADR. 2015a. *D'ADR informéiert… .* Information flyer. Alternativ Demokratesch Reformpartei.

ADR. 2015b. *Nee Nee Nee: Argumenter (Referendum 7. Juni).* Unpublished manuscript. Alternativ Demokratesch Reformpartei.

BRAUN, Frédéric. 2015. „Au fond, je suis quelqu'un de timide", Interview with Fred Keup, in *Le Quotidien*, Nr. 120, 25 May 2015, p. 2-3.

CEFIS. 2015. *Le Droit de Vote des Ressortissants de Nationalité Étrangère au Luxembourg.* Unpublished manuscript. CEFIS.

CSV. 2015a. *Op de Punkt. Spezial Referendum (Mee-Juni 2015).* Election brochure / Newsletter. Chrëschtlech Sozial Vollekspartei

CSV. 2015b. *Unnamed.* Information flyer. Chrëschtlech Sozial Vollekspartei

CSV. 2015c. *Unnamed.* Information flyer. Chrëschtlech Sozial Vollekspartei

Déi Lénk. 2015. *Jo. Demokratie stäerken.* Unpublished manuscript. Déi Lénk.

DP. 2015. *3mol Jo!.* Information flyer. Demokratesch Partei.

FAYOT, Ben. 2005. *Les quatres référendum du Grand-Duché du Luxembourg.*
Available online at:
http://www.lsap.lu/forcedocdownload.php?idfile=1601287500575 (15.09.2015: 14:50)

FORUM. 1981. *Le droit de vote aux immigrés?* (Nr.47). Rapid Press.

HEUSCHLING, Luc. 2015. Le discours sur la valeur consultative du référendum (art. 51 § 7 Const.). Une déconstruction historique, in *Pasicrisie Luxembourgeoise : Recueil Trimestriel de la Jurisprudence Luxembourgeoise*, 1 – 49. Pasicrisie Luxembourgeoise
Accessible online at:
http://orbilu.uni.lu/handle/10993/20296 (20.11.2015: 18:30)

KOLLWELTER, Serge; Laura Zuccoli. 2010. Chronique de l'ASTI 1979 – 2010, in *ASTI: 30+: 30 ans de migrations, 30 ans de recherches, 30 ans d'engagements*, 24 – 59. Edité sous la direction de Michel Pauly pour le compte de l'Association de Soutien aux Travailleurs Immigrés (ASTI).

LSAP. 2015a. *Méi Demokratie fir Lëtzebuerg. 3x JO*. Election brochure. Lëtzebuerger Sozialistesch Aarbeschterpartei.

LSAP. 2015b. *Unnamed*. Information flyer. Lëtzebuerger Sozialistesch Aarbeschterpartei.

MINTÉ. 2015a. *12 Haaptargumenter vun den Géigner vum Awunnerwahlrecht matt Äntwerten vu JO Awunnerwahlrecht*. Unpublished manuscript. MINTÉ.

MINTÉ. 2015b. *Fir d'Wahlrecht vun alle Residenten am Grand-Duché*. Unpublished Manuscript. MINTÉ.

SIWECK, Jean-Lou. 2015. Wenn das „Wort" wählen dürfte - Einmal „Ja", Zweimal „Nein": Die Position der Redaktion des „Luxemburger Wort" zum Referendum des 7. Juni 2015, in *Luxemburger Wort*, NUMMER? : 3.

> Accessible online at: http://www.wort.lu/de/politik/leitartikel-wenn-das-wort-waehlen-duerfte-555f3ea30c88b46a8ce59c50 (15.11.2015: 16:00)

9.3. Online Resources

URL 1:
http://www.legilux.public.lu/leg/a/archives/2015/0035/a035.pdf (01.09.2015: 09:50)
URL 2:
http://www.statistiques.public.lu/fr/actualites/population/population/2015/04/20150408/20150408.pdf (03.09.2015: 12:20)
URL 3:
https://www.gouvernement.lu/3322796/Programme-gouvernemental.pdf (03.09.2015: 16:30)
URL 4:
http://www.elections.public.lu/fr/actualites/2015/07-resultats/index.html (04.09.2015: 11:00)
URL 5:
http://eudo-citizenship.eu/electoral-rights (16.09.2015: 15:10)

URL 6:

http://www.referendum.lu/Uploads/constitution_gdl.pdf (07.09.2015: 11:15)

URL 7:

http://www.elections.public.lu/fr/legislation/loi-electorale-18-02-2003.pdf (07.09.2015: 12:50)

URL 8:

http://www.mj.public.lu/nationalite/droit_nationalite.pdf (07.09.2015: 13:30)

URL 9:

http://www.chd.lu/wps/portal/public (01.12.2015: 15:20)

URL 10:

http://www.legilux.public.lu/leg/a/archives/1984/0016/a016.pdf (09.09.2015: 12.30)

URL 11:

http://www.statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=449&IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=2&FldrName=2&RFPath=101 (09.09.2015: 15:30)

URL 12:

http://www.cefis.lu/resources/Luxembourg-2015.pdf (10.09.2015: 11:20)

URL 13:

http://www.statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=9396&IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=2&FldrName=1&RFPath=71 (10.09.2015: 14:30)

URL 14:

http://www.cefis.lu/resources/6-Evol-mouv-migratoire.pdf (12.09.2015: 19:30)

URL 15:

http://www.cefis.lu/page9/page40/page40.html (14.09.2015: 12:30)

URL 16:

http://www.clae.lu/clae/ (26.09.2015: 13:20)

URL 17:

http://www.asti.lu/media/asti/pdf/101207refresh.pdf (27.09.2015: 14:10)

URL 18:

http://www.cc.lu/uploads/media/AT_12.pdf (27.09.2015: 16:25)

URL 19:

http://www.makingluxembourg.lu/#!/partners (27.09.2015: 17:30)

URL 20:

http://www.makingluxembourg.lu/#!/inform (27.09.2015: 17:50)

URL 21:

http://www.cc.lu/autres-
services/manifestations/detail/?user_ccagenda_pi1%5BshowUid%5D=225
(29.09.2015: 16:15)

URL 22:

https://www.gouvernement.lu/3723809/SIP_Gouvernement_2013_EN.pdf

(25.09.2015: 14:50)

URL 23:

http://chd.lu/wps/PA_RoleEtendu/FTSByteServingServletImpl/?path=/export/exped/sexpdata/
Mag/176/320/137159.pdf (25.09.2015: 18:30)

URL 24:

http://www.wort.lu/en/politics/funding-agreement-churches-and-state-sign-on-the-dotted-line-
54c636e10c88b46a8ce5238f (09.09.2015; 15:23)

URL 25:

http://chd.lu/wps/PA_RoleEtendu/FTSByteServingServletImpl/?path=/export/exped/sexpdata/
Mag/109/443/140482.pdf (26.09.2015: 09:50)

URL 26:

http://www.greng.lu//sites/greng/files/files/TBMoonUKsmallFINAL.pdf (15.09.2015: 15.30)

URL 27:

https://csv.lu/2015/05/csv-international-promouvoir-la-participation-en-favorisant-une-
politique-dintegration-volontariste-reflechie-et-coherente/ (20.09.2015: 14:20)

URL 28:

http://verfassung.dei-lenk.lu/ (03.10.2015: 12:30)

URL 29:

http://adr.lu/refresh-democracy-virschlei-zur-starkung-vun-der-demokratie/
(17.10.2015: 19:20)

URL 30:

http://csj.lu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Resolution_droit_de_vote_2015.pdf
(05.10.2015: 14:10)

URL 31:

http://csj.lu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Demokratie-zu-Letzebuerg-2015.pdf
(05.10.2015: 18:20)

URL 32:

http://www.minte.lu/ (14.10.2015: 09:50)

URL 33:

http://emdera.net/minte/communiquepresse020215.pdf (14.10.2015: 11:30)

URL 34:

http://nee2015.lu/index.php/argumenter.html (15.10.2015: 15:40)

URL 35:

http://www.cefis.lu/page10/page10.html (15.10.2015: 19:20)

URL 36:

http://www.cefis.lu/page9/page22/page22.html (15.10.2015: 21:20)

URL 37:

http://www.clae.lu/prise-de-position-du-clae-sur-le-referendum/ (20.10.2015: 10:10)

URL 38:

http://www.ogbl.lu/nous-connaitre/introduction/syndicat-numero-1-au-luxembourg/
(22.10.2015: 15:20)

URL 39:

http://www.ogbl.lu/blog/wee-mat-jo-stemmt-staerkt-letzebuerg-insgesamt/?lang=fr
(22.10.2015: 16:50)

URL 40:

http://lcgb.lu/de/2015/05/07/referendum-du-7-juin-2015-le-lcgb-prend-position-une-fois-pour-
deux-fois-contre/ (23.10.2015: 13:30)

URL 41:

http://www.cgfp.lu/archive-details.html?ref=710 (30.10.2015: 14:50)

URL 42:

http://www.uel.lu/396-representativite-democratique-au-luxembourg-une-necessaire-
evolution (28.10.2015: 14:30)

URL 43:

https://www.wort.lu/en/politics/june-7-referendum-business-leaders-say-jo-to-foreigner-
voting-rights-556eb8870c88b46a8ce5a70f (28.10.2015: 15:00)

URL 44:

http://www.cathol.lu/article4333 (28.10.2015: 19:20)

URL 45:

http://www.culture.lu/en/58/CMSdk,7047/smid,129/culture%2C-citzenship-and-fraternity.html
(02.11.2015: 15:40)

URL 46:

http://www.woxx.lu/prise-de-position-natierlech/ (03.11.2015: 15:00)

URL 47:

http://www.wort.lu/en/politics/constitution-expert-weighs-in-can-a-referendum-be-only-
consultative-5506afe50c88b46a8ce55829 (20.11.2015: 12:20)

URL 48:

http://www.wort.lu/de/politik/csv-startet-in-die-referendumskampagne-aufpassen-informieren-
ankreuzen-5550a5310c88b46a8ce590c7 (27.11.2015: 13:20)

URL 49:

http://www.mj.public.lu/actualites/2015/10/APL_nationalite_lux/APL_sur_la_nationalite_luxe
mbourgeoise.pdf (03.12.2015: 16:30)

URL 50:

http://www.asti.lu/wp-
content/uploads/2015/06/communique_resultats_referendum_070615_final.pdf
(03.12:2015: 14:30)

URL 51:

http://www.asti.lu/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/resolution_ag_asti_2015.pdf
(04.12.2015: 10:15)

URL 52:

http://nee2015.lu/?page_n38=5 (04.12.2015: 12:30)

URL 52:

http://nee2015.lu/index.php/press/articles/de-wielerwellen-muss-respekteiert-ginn-keen-
auslaennerwahlrecht-duerch-dhannerdier.html (04.12.2015: 14:20)

9.4. Audio Resources

9.4.1. Personal Interviews

Interview 1, conducted on 07.05.2015 with Felix Braz, Minister of Justice of Luxembourg (déi gréng).

Interview 2, conducted on 26.05.2015 with Alex Bodry, MP and President of the 'Commission of the Institutions and the Constitutional Revision' of the Luxembourgish Parliament (LSAP).

Interview 3, conducted on 29.05.2015 with Laura Zuccoli, president of the NGO ASTI.

9.4.2. Information events

KEUP, Fred. 2015. Information event in Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg on 21 April 2015.

9.4.2. Radio and Television Interviews

BETTEL, Xavier. 2015. Radio Interview, in *Den Invité vun der Redaktioun* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 03.06.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/den-invite-vun-der-rtl-redaktioun/637918.html (29.10.2015: 16:50)

BRAZ, Felix. 2015. Radio Discussion, in *Background am Gespréich* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 30.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/background/636640.html (10.10.2015: 12:30).

CLEMENT, Sven. 2015a. Radio Interview, in *Den Invité vun der Redaktioun* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 13.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/den-invite-vun-der-rtl-redaktioun/631969.html (13.10.2015: 15:30)

CLEMENT, Sven. 2015b. Television Interview, in *De Journal* (Television Broadcast by RTL Télé). 29.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://tele.rtl.lu/emissiounen/de-journal/3037477.html (13.10.2015: 19:30)

COLOMBERA, Jean. 2015a. Television Interview, in *De Journal* (Television Broadcast by RTL Télé). 27.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://tele.rtl.lu/emissiounen/de-journal/3037039.html (03.10.2015: 15:15)

COLOMBERA, Jean. 2015b. Radio Interview, in *Den Invité vun der Redaktioun* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 06.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/den-invite-vun-der-rtl-redaktioun/629806.html (03.10.2015: 11:40)

HANSEN, Martine. 2015. Radio Discussion, in *Background am Gespréich* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 30.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/background/636640.html (10.10.2015: 12:30).

KARTHEISER, Fernand. 2015. Radio Discussion, in *Background am Gespréich* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 30.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/background/636640.html (10.10.2015: 12:30).

RUCKERT, Aly. 2015a. Radio Interview, in *Den Invité vun der Redaktioun* (Radio Broadcast by RTL Radio). 11.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://radio.rtl.lu/emissiounen/den-invite-vun-der-rtl-redaktioun/630927.html (04.10.2015: 15:45)

RUCKERT, Aly. 2015b. Television Interview, in *De Journal* (Television Broadcast by RTL Télé). 21.05.2015.

Retrieved from: http://tele.rtl.lu/emissiounen/de-journal/3036899.html (04.10.2015: 19:45)

10. Appendix

10.1. Abstract (english)

On 7 June 2015, a national referendum was held in Luxembourg, which posed three questions related to the elaboration of a new Constitution to the Luxembourgish voters. The political public debate during the election campaign of this referendum, in particular concerning question 2, is the subject of this thesis. Question 2 read as follows: Do you agree with the idea that non-Luxembourgish residents should have the right, at their own discretion, to register on the electoral roll to participate as voters in the Chamber of Deputies elections, provided they have lived at least 10 years in Luxembourg and have previously taken part in local or European elections in Luxembourg? The specific historical and socio-political context of Luxembourg is of relevance in this context, as 45.9% of the residing population of Luxembourg does not hold the Luxembourgish citizenship. Drawing on insights from the Anthropology of Policy as well as Critical Discourse Analysis, this thesis aimed at identifying which agents have been most active during the election campaign, which respective positions and arguments these agents took and communicated, as well as how these positions and arguments influenced the debate about the extension of voting rights to non-citizen residents in Luxembourg.

10.2. Abstract (deutsch)

Am 7. Juni 2015 wurde in Luxemburg ein nationales Referendum abgehalten. Die luxemburgischen Wähler wurden im Rahmen der Erarbeitung einer neuen Verfassung zu drei verfassungsrelevanten Themen befragt. Die vorliegende Arbeit analysiert die öffentliche politische Debatte während des Wahlkampfes dieses Referendums, in Bezug auf eine dieser drei Fragen des Referendums. Frage 2 lautete wie folgt: Befürworten Sie die Idee, dass ausländische Mitbürger das Recht erhalten, sich fakultativ in die Wählerlisten einzuschreiben, um sich als Wähler an den Wahlen zur Abgeordnetenkammer zu beteiligen, und dies unter der besonderen doppelten Bedingung, während mindestens 10 Jahren in Luxemburg gewohnt und sich vorher bereits an Kommunal- oder Europawahlen in Luxembourg beteiligt zu haben? Dem besondere historischen sowie soziopolitische Kontext Luxemburgs kommt dabei eine besondere Rolle zu: 45,9% der in Luxemburg lebenden Bevölkerung besitzt eine nicht-luxemburgische Staatsbürgerschaft. Mithilfe der Anthropology of Policy sowie der Critical Discourse Analysis geht diese Arbeit der Frage nach, welche institutionellen und individuellen

Akteure sich während der Wahlkampagne am aktivsten an der Debatte beteiligt haben, welche jeweiligen Positionen und Argumente sie dabei eingenommen und kommuniziert haben und auf welche Art und Weise diese jeweiligen Positionen und Argumente die Debatte über die Erweiterung des Wahlrechts für Einwohner Luxemburgs ohne luxemburgische Staatsbürgerschaft insgesamt beeinflusst haben.

10.3. Curriculum Vitae

Personal Details

Name:	**Ralph Petry**
Date of Birth:	17 February 1987
Place of Birth:	Ettelbruck, Luxembourg
Nationality:	Luxembourg
Email:	petry.ralph@hotmail.com

Education

1993 – 1999	Elementary School in Bissen, Luxembourg
2000 – 2004	Secondary School in Dudelange, Luxembourg
2004 – 2006	Secondary School in Luxembourg-City, Luxembourg
2006 – 2007	BA in Educational Studies, University of Vienna, Austria
2007 – 2012	BA in Social- and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna, Austria
2012 – 2015	MA CREOLE – Cultural Differences and Transnational Processes (Social- and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna, Austria

Focus of Study:
Migration, Transnationalism, Anthropology of Policy, Citizenship, Voting Rights

Languages

Luxembourgish	native
German	fluent
English	fluent
French	fluent