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Do inclusive societies need closed borders? Political theorists have pondered this problem for decades. The conventional view holds that in liberal democracies immigration restrictions are necessary for inclusive citizenship. By contrast, theorists arguing for a combination of inclusive citizenship policies with open borders assume that the two are compatible. This leads to an empirical puzzle: Is there a trade-off between the openness of borders and the inclusiveness of citizenship? Or, more generally, how are immigration and citizenship policies related? Quantitative findings covering 23 democracies from 1980 to 2010 indicate that, contrary to the widespread trade-off assumption, there is no systematic association between the two. Instead, there seems to be a limited conditional relationship: Immigration and citizenship policies start following a similar, restrictive or liberalizing, logic over time. In the 1980s and 1990s there is no evidence for a correlation, but a positive association clearly manifests in the period after 9/11, when issues of security and culture came to the fore, and when party systems in many democracies have become divided on the issue of globalization. Against the background of this finding, in this paper I conduct an empirical case study of Austria, which is a typical case as it shows a simultaneously restrictive pattern in immigration and citizenship policies especially after 9/11. Arguing that the main driver behind this pattern is the increasing strength of the FPÖ, I trace the tracks of the convergent logic of immigration and citizenship policies as they should have been imprinted in parliamentary debates and media discourse if the hypothesis is correct. This historical analysis is complemented by an exploration of the “cognitive maps” of current policy-makers and the political dynamics in the wake of the “refugee crisis” by drawing on a set of original interviews in addition to parliamentary debates and media content analyses. I show that even in the current situation of crisis management citizenship does not completely recede to the background; instead, it is mobilized by the current right-wing government to further demonstrate their tough stance, insisting on the Austrian “integration before citizenship” approach and through proposing to end the facilitated access to citizenship for refugees. In the end, I also shortly explore how Austria compares to Germany, where the rise of a strong far-right party is much more recent. I conclude by discussing the implications of the findings for normative political theory.