Berlin Diversities

The Perpetual Act of Becoming of a True Metropolis[1]

Stephan Lanz

At a global level, Berlin today has the image of a cosmopolitan metropolis, characterized by a dynamic ethnic and cultural diversity. This image of the city increasingly correlates with everyday experiences, where public spaces in inner city districts like Mitte, Kreuzberg, or Neukölln exhibit, if you will, a Babylonian diversity of languages or cultural symbols previously only associated with global cities like New York or London. Until recently, the dominant perception in the German city was one that recognized a diversity of lifestyles on the part of the native majority, but regarded immigrants – usually equated with guest workers – merely as members of supposedly homogeneous ethnic or national cultural groups.

In the following text, I use the example of Berlin to analyze the question as to what extent, why, and in what manner this fantasy image of a city in which immigrants were considered an "alien presence," or at least as supposed "others," was transformed into one of the city as an ethnically and nationally diverse metropolis. To do that, I'd like to reconstruct the *dispositifs* that politically condition the sphere of activity "migration/city," and in doing so identify their core elements at the local and national level, as well as mark the historical breaks that have made possible the transformations thus outlined. According to Foucault (1977), the term *dispositif* denotes "a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid." In other words, a *dispositif* is the entirety of "means, mechanisms, and measures established for the treatment of a specific problem" (Keller 2001: 134). Foucault assumes that a (new) *dispositif* emerges from a state of emergency

when an (existing) *dispositif* becomes precarious and generates the need for action. Thus, with regard to their specific sphere of activity, *dispositifs* have the strategic function of fending off a state of emergency, plugging a kind of "leak" (to use Gilles Deleuze's term).

My argument is that in the formation of an "immigration/city" *dispositif*, a central role is played – alongside the national political culture and the respective dominant conception of the nation – by the "urban meaning" of a city (Castells 1981), that is to say, the always contested identity and meaning attributed to a city corresponding to the interests and values of the dominant social actors at a given time.

1871 FF.: THE *DISPOSITIF* OF THE NATIONAL-HOMOGENEOUS BIG CITY

The enormous boom experienced by Berlin as a result of its transformation into an industrial city and its new status as capital of the German Empire after 1871 was accompanied by strong migration to the city, including foreign workers. The *dispositif* of the national-homogeneous big city, the predominance of which survived three regimes and only subsided at the end of the 1970s, developed in the space between the priorities of the construction of the German nation as an *ethnos*, a closed door policy with regard to Eastern Europe, and the extreme growth of Berlin, the size of which increased tenfold over the course of a few decades.

A large part of the labor migration to Berlin, in particular from Poland, was temporary: out of the prevailing *jus sanguinis* "there developed since the beginning of the economically motivated immigration [...] of Eastern European workers to the German Empire a principle of rejection toward foreigners, based upon the exclusivity of blood descent" (Herbert 2001: 68). The racist admission practice selected members of Western nations as "related" and "worthy," as distinct from Jews and Slavs, who were to be rejected as "undesirable elements." This closed door policy supplemented by mass deportations went hand-in-hand with selective conditional immigration on the basis of "usefulness" (cf. Ha 2003). In Berlin, large scale industries received special permits to employ foreign workers, particularly for large public construction projects like *U-Bahn* and *S-Bahn* tracks, or the *Reichstag* building. Thus, despite the ban on employment for foreign Poles, a dual labor market emerged, in which foreigners with the lowest wages served as a buffer against changes in the economic cycle. In the case of an economic downturn, mass deportations followed, legitimized by a "national-political demagoguery" (Herbert 2001: 49). Legally employed industrial workers were housed in mass accommodation separate from the rest of the population, to prevent them from becoming settled. In the First World

War, this repressive regimentation changed into outright slave labor, in order to compensate for the shortage of labor-power caused by the war. That would not have been possible without debates about "foreign infiltration" spanning decades and repressive special laws for foreigners.

In the Weimar Republic, policy on foreigners remained an "ethno-nationalist anti-Polish closed door policy" (Oltmer 2003: 87). When a few hundred thousand Russian émigrés nonetheless moved to Berlin and Paris in the 1920s, this was considered a threat in Berlin, whereas in Paris it was regarded as a confirmation of its outstanding importance (cf. Kiecol 2001). In contrast to Paris, whose cosmopolitanism led to its consolidation as the "capital of the 19th Century" (Walter Benjamin), Berlin experienced rapid growth, becoming the third largest city in the world, but was perceived as an anonymous and threatening agglomeration. At the same time, the dominant actors from the period of the Empire until the Nazi era constantly pursued the goal of developing Berlin as an imposing symbol for Germany's status as a world power, while nonetheless condemning the "Babylon on the Spree" (meaning the internationalism and liberalism of the modern metropolis) as a threat to society. Even left-liberals usually engaged in polemics against its international flair.

Progressive city administrators confronted the accusation that Berlin was alarmingly unstable – intensified by the shock to traditional orientations during the First World War and the revolutionary events immediately following it – by stylizing the city as a symbol of youth: Berlin "strove, with the attribute of youthfulness, to awaken associations such as ability, energy, optimism, and vitality and to equate them with the post-war youth" (Stremmel 1992: 155). But this fragile structure had already collapsed during the world economic crisis after 1929, as a large part of the population was impoverished. In the crisis, a "defensive attitude toward everything foreign" (ibid.) intensified. It was not only conservative currents that saw the vision of a modern Berlin as a failure and attempted to curtail urban diversity.

After the Nazis came to power, they adopted some of the images of Berlin from the Weimar Republic, in order to present a model capital to the world. They also propagandized for Berlin as a global city of modern technology and resorted to symbols of youth: the official guide to the city, "Das neue Berlin," presented a "young, clean, bountiful city, full of joie de vivre" (ibid.: 278). However, the Nazis also attempted to eliminate any kind of international or liberal urban diversity, whereby their institutional racism toward "foreign workers"[2] was distinguished, according to Ulrich Herbert (2001: 187) not so much by its principled orientation so much as its radical escalation of the decades-long practice of racist discrimination, particularly against Eastern Europeans. The

---

2 | Translator's note: the German word *Fremdarbeiter* has a more explicitly Nazi connotation than the comparatively mild-sounding English translation.

living conditions of the slave laborers imported after 1940 were linked to traditional racist hierarchies, which classified Soviet citizens at the very bottom, along with Jews and "gypsies." They had to live as undernourished prisoners in camps, whereas Western European slave laborers received the same wage as Germans and could move freely through the city. Despite an order by the Gestapo to transfer all foreigners to camps, 120,000 "foreign workers" are presumed to have lived in private dwellings in the middle of Berlin.

After the war, Berlin lost its significance as one of the most important metropolises of Europe. In West Berlin, economic growth and wage levels remained far behind those of the Federal Republic of Germany. Only when cross-border commuters could no longer work in West Berlin as a result of the construction of the Berlin Wall did industry start to suffer from a shortage of labor-power. As foreign "guest workers" were now recruited primarily in Turkey, since people willing to emigrate could hardly be found among West European treaty partners, general legal and political conditions were cemented in the Federal Republic of Germany. The intended "rotation system" and the identity card (*Legitimationskarte*) that had survived three different social systems illustrate the striking continuity of immigration policy and expose the narrative of a (police order on foreigners, APVO for short) and the new beginning as a "fiction" (ibid.: 201): in the 1950s, the order concerning foreign workers (*Verordnung über ausländische Arbeitnehmer*) of the Nazi regime were re-implemented. In the continuity of the APVO, the Law on Foreigners of 1965 was aimed at making it possible to comprehensively account for all non-Germans and, if needed, to deport them. Selection according to place of origin and skin color was official policy. Thus, so-called "Afro-Asiatics," as a "total category of the incompatibly foreign" (Schönwälder 2001: 259), were denied residency permits as a matter of principle.

The attitudes of politicians and the media had also hardly changed since the time of the German Empire: the deployment of foreign workers was regarded positively as a mobile counter-cyclical economic buffer. When the economic usefulness of this strategy became questionable during the first recessions, public discourse concerning a "foreigner problem" began to solidify, which culminated in an end to the recruitment of foreign workers in 1973. Manners of speaking concerning "otherness" and a lack of assimilation rested upon a conception of a national economy and culture being illegitimately appropriated by foreigners. "Evidently this threat scenario, so influential within German nationalism since the end of the 19th century, was still familiar and had not been disavowed as a result of history" (ibid.: 200).

The central element of the *dispositif* of the national-homogeneous big city is the conception of the foreigner as an alien element. In the city, this was materialized through the two spatial types of the camp and the "ghetto." From the perspective of state apparatuses, the camp granted the possibility of keeping

immigrants under complete control. The "ghetto," on the other hand, understood as a voluntary spatial concentration, embodied precisely the danger of losing this control. Authorities therefore sought to house as many foreigners as possible in camps, in order to segregate them from German nationals. In 1971, 400 immigrant hostels still existed in Berlin. The "keeping of humans" in overcrowded, poorly furnished barracks, the monitoring of their private sphere, as well as the spatial surveillance of their residency all recalled the practice of rule in the former German colonies (Freiburghaus and Kudat 1974: 51).

However, even during the German Empire, most Polish immigrants had spread throughout the working class districts. Even the Nazis were unable to place all foreigners in camps. In this framework, the inner city Scheunenviertel of Berlin (whose name literally means "barn district") served as a projection screen as a "politically threatening agglomeration" of poorer and often Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe. From 1906 on, the city administration began a demolition and redevelopment project, later continued by the Nazis, in order to oust unwanted immigrants and deport them as "burdensome foreigners" or resettle them in peripheral barracks. In West Berlin, the ghetto discourse also structured the debate concerning policy on foreigners. When neighborhoods where foreigners were conspicuously visible started to emerge in the early 1970s, fears arose concerning the emergence of "ghettos" and a disintegration of "established society." In 1973, warnings about explosive situations in the cities became dramatic: The revived term *Fremdarbeiter*, which hinted at plundering slave laborers at the end of the war, connoted foreigners as a "walking time bomb." The "ghetto" was established as the central metaphor of the foreigner as an "alien presence" that intentionally separated itself from Germans. In order to decrease their spatial "concentration," the Berlin Senate passed an ordinance prohibiting foreigners from moving to Kreuzberg and two other districts. Kreuzberg, a poor working class district in which many foreigners who had been pushed out of the Scheunenviertel had found accommodation, soon developed into the nationwide symbol of the ideological battles concerning the immigration complex, and was regarded as an "appalling" ghetto inhabited by foreigners and drop-outs, posing a threat to German citizens (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, June 13, 1975).

1981 FF.: THE *DISPOSITIF* OF THE MULTICULTURAL-DIFFERENTIAL METROPOLIS

Over the course of the 1970s, the ideological consensus concerning policy on foreigners ended up in a contradictory relationship with enduring processes of immigration and corresponding everyday urban experiences. Previously, immigrants were defined as temporary guest workers and understood as a uni-

form category of "members of foreign ethnicities." But in the everyday life of the city, some "foreigners" were hardly still perceived as such, while others were even more so. As increasing numbers of non-European asylum seekers reached Europe, a new system of classification emerged based upon cultural and ethnic differences. Over the course of the 1980s, the question of the ability of immigrant groups to integrate was tied to a national and cultural identity which, like that of ethnic descent, was considered "mentally and spiritually innate" (Morgenstern 2002: 315).

In Berlin in the 1970s, Social Democratic urban development policy – which strove to create a homogeneous urban space separated into functional zones, as well as standardized living conditions – entered into a crisis: processes of social reorganization "demolished the system of Social Democratic socialization" (Homuth 1987: 101). The overall concept of the modern city collapsed in the face of decreasing opportunities for taxation on the part of the state and declining financial means, as well as the broad resistance of the population. It was ultimately a construction scandal in 1981 that ended the decades-long predominance of the Social Democrats in Berlin and brought the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) to power. The CDU, with a brief interruption, dominated Berlin politics until 2001. 1981 thus marks, as I would like to show in the following, the emergence of a new migration/city *dispositif*, that of the multicultural-differential metropolis, which reacts to the state of emergency of the crisis-ridden *dispositif* of the national-homogeneous big city, and becomes interlaced with it.

Particularly in Kreuzberg, "the cartel consisting of construction companies and state planners" fell apart in the face of the resistance of the population (Krätke and Schmoll 1987: 53). In 1981 in Kreuzberg, numerous squatted houses were defended, sometimes violently. In order to confront the crisis of the Fordist city with appropriate urban renewal strategies, the Senate of Berlin initiated an International Building Exhibition (IBA). It encompassed social pedagogic, spatial-construction, and self-help promoting concepts and employed a Turkish Commissioner for Foreigners in order to advance the integration of immigrants. This "careful urban renewal" was oriented toward the needs of residents and functioned as a sort of preventative social policy. The Senate for Social Affairs in turn set up a support program for self-help groups that soon supported 50 groups with a focus on foreigner policy. The buzzwords of this "transformation of municipal activity" (ibid.: 61) – flexibilization, decentralization, self-help, participation, and "endogenous development" – were just as attractive for neoliberal CDU positions that aimed at rolling back the welfare state in favor of local communities, individual responsibility, and market-oriented regulation, as they were for an "alternative" scene that was able to impose its interests through participation procedures.

The programmatic orientation of the foreigner policy of the new Senate corresponded with this transformation of urban and welfare policy: previously

understood as a "problem of state planning" foreigner policy was now established as "commissary policy" (Schwarz 2001). Berlin was the first federal state (*Bundesland*) to introduce the office of a "Commissioner for Foreigners" that conceived and coordinates measures for foreigner policy. Barbara John, who held the office for 22 years, followed an ambivalent political course. Its conservative side sought to reduce the number of foreigners, in harmony with the national conservative government in power since 1982. At the same time, it focused upon the cosmopolitanism of Berliners and promoted the acceptance of "other cultures." If self-organized immigrant groups were previously regarded as entities promoting ghettoization, now a temporary "emphasis upon one's own ethnic identity" was no longer interpreted as inhibiting integration per se. Rather, the self-help coffer of the Senate supported a "dignitary politics" (in the words of Thomas Schwarz) drawing upon conservative traditions that no longer perceived immigrants as victims, but rather as independent subjects. Increasingly, the focus shifted to social problems such as the inadequate educational situation of youths, or increasing unemployment among immigrants as a result of urban deindustrialization. This political course of the Senate, which promoted the social activity of foreigners not least in order to compensate for their exclusion from the political system, transformed organized communities. Initiatives that had previously been political now founded neighborhood centers or youth projects in order to fulfill the criteria to receive funding.

Since the techniques of intervention described above derived their inputs from the socio-cultural needs of those affected, urban cultural policy increasingly became an instrument of social control. Although the depletion of West Berlin by a decline in the population, increasing unemployment, and constantly increasing federal subsidies became emphatically clear by 1985, the head of the local government, Eberhard Diepgen, described Berlin as a cultural metropolis that could measure up to Paris, London, and New York. As was the case with previous regimes: "Berlin is primarily a young city, a city for youths" (Presse- und Informationsamt 1985: 29). Urban renewal, an increasing number of mass festivals, as well as the promotion of socio-cultural initiatives coalesced into an "identity politics" (Homuth 1987: 103). The promise of cultural tolerance and diversity was supposed to symbolically integrate those milieus which were drifting apart in the process of socio-economic reorganization.

The Senate's concept of integration was a part of this socio-cultural identity politics, to the extent that it focused upon feel-good aspects and culture, but not upon social rights: integration meant "the greatest possible tension-free coexistence, [...] feeling comfortable and at home with each other." For the first time ever, "the coexistence of different customs and cultures [could] be experienced as enrichment through diversity." The Berlin Senate thus prioritized "programs of integration" that left "a wide space for the cultural independence of foreigners" (Der Senator für Gesundheit 1982: 6 f.). Diepgen emphasized

that "a metropolis like Berlin [lives] from diversity, from variety, from immigrants" (Presse- und Informationsamt 1985: 30). On the one hand, Diepgen boasted that the decline of Turkish foreigners was a result of CDU policies, while on the other hand he no longer linked the presence of foreigners to their economic contribution, but rather with their contribution to the cultural diversity of the metropolis. Here a transformation becomes manifest, from the "big city," which stood for a unified culture and social equality, to a "metropolis," in which social antagonisms are naturalized through the plurality of lifestyles. An "assimilative multiculturalism" (cf. Lanz 2007) became predominant, which tolerates, promotes, and makes use of cultural diversity, but which also conceives of a hierarchical relationship between a majority society representing a norm and immigrant communities that are expected to conform to preexisting norms.

Whereas the "part of an ambiguous political approach that dealt with integration policy was delegated" (Schwarz 2001: 132) to the Senate for Social Affairs and the Commissioner for Foreigners, the right-wing conservative Interior Senator was responsible until the year 2001 for the repressive aspects inherited from the *dispositif* of the national-homogeneous big city, making the immigration of family members of foreigners already living in Germany more difficult, pushing for deportations, making repressive integration demands, and reviving the ghetto discourse in the late 1990s.

The brief interregnum of a Red-Green coalition government, the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the unification of the city and the decision to make it the capital of Germany did not bring any essential changes to city policy on foreigners. On the one hand, the ridiculous boom fantasies – politicians and experts predicted that after 1990 Berlin would make a great leap in importance toward becoming a global city with six million residents – were accompanied by (traditional) closed door policies against Eastern European immigration, imagined as a threatening tidal wave. This was legitimized by a racist anti-Slavic discourse, which had already dominated the *dispositif* of the national-homogeneous big city. On the other hand, questions of integration policy were regarded as being of secondary importance in the face of the task of reunifying Berlin and making infrastructural preparations for the supposed boom: Berlin, asserted Eberhard Diepgen in his government policy statement of 1991, could not become a city of immigration in this situation of radical change. Even the SPD, now a participant in government as part of a grand coalition, was primarily focused upon "reducing the estrangement between East and West [Berlin]" (SPD-Berlin 1991).

Whereas repressive measures by the Senate of the Interior aimed at rolling back immigration – not least by means of mass deportations of Poles, the Commissioner for Foreigners delved further into a multiculturalism that allowed immigrants the representation of their "cultural identities" while at the

same time aiming for their socio-political self-help. In order to "set a concrete signal for the growing cultural diversity" of Berlin, the Commissioner founded a "Workshop of Cultures" (John 2005: 9), which since 1996 has organized a "Carneval of Cultures," which has quickly grown to become a tourist mega-event. Within the framework of the historical German concept of defining cultures as ethno-national units, this "identity spectacle" (Levent Soysal) followed the logic of an "exhibition of peoples" in public perception until well into the 2000s, in which "foreign" ethno-cultures are presented to the majority society.

Whereas the "Carneval of Cultures" developed into a symbol of lived multiculturalism esteemed by all, socio-economic crisis scenarios gained ground in Berlin. The dreams of urban boom had burst after a short period of time, and two-thirds of industrial jobs had disappeared. The unemployment rate fluctuated between 15 and 20 percent. Berlin plunged into a dramatic debt crisis and the grand coalition established austerity policies that cut and privatized municipal services. In public discourse, gloomy crisis scenarios, which envisioned Berlin's socio-economic decline, held sway from 1997 on. To the extent that precisely inner-city immigrant districts exhibited high rates of unemployment and poverty, a ghetto discourse was revived that contained discursive figures identical to those of its historical predecessors and was aimed at the very same urban spaces, Kreuzberg and later Neukölln. Once again, discussion focused upon the allegedly voluntary self-segregation of foreigners from "Germans," their lack of willingness to integrate, and an ominous slumification. Nonetheless, the public funding program "Soziale Stadt" (social city) was established, which was used to intervene in disadvantaged districts with the aid of a preventative social policy focused upon self-help and participation that had been developed in the early 1980s.

2001 FF.: THE *DISPOSITIF* OF THE COSMOPOLITAN-DIVERSITARIAN METROPOLIS

In the year 2001 the grand coalition disintegrated, again due to a scandal, and after new elections the SPD and the PDS (Party of Democratic Socialism, today part of "Die Linke") formed the so-called red-red coalition. Again, this political rupture was preceded by a profound transformation related to both the "urban meaning" of Berlin as well as national immigration and integration policy. The resulting crisis of the dominant immigration/city *dispositif* of the multicultural-differential metropolis generated a "state of emergency" in which a new *dispositif* was established: that of the cosmopolitan-diversitarian metropolis.

At the national level, the reforms of the citizenship laws by the red-green coalition government since 1998 broke for the first time with the concept of *jus sanguinis* and declared Germany to be a country of immigration. Chancellor

Gerhard Schröder also started a "green card" initiative that was intended to recruit foreign laborers for the first time since the ban on recruitment in 1973. Although it only managed to achieve a modernized system of recruitment, tailored to "highly qualified guest workers," it fixed a new idea in the national political discourse, which linked immigration with the international competitiveness of the country.

In the context of the political philosophy of the red-green national government and its move from Bonn to Berlin, the picture of Berlin in the media – which in 1998 was still dominated by scenarios of urban decline – underwent a fundamental transformation. Already in 1999, in its issue number 36 from 1999 with the cover story "New Berlin – Aufbruch zur Weltstadt," *Der Spiegel* hyped Berlin as New York's successor as the paradigmatic global metropolis of the new century. With the red-green national government, the figure of the *culturepreneur*, a new type of cultural businessman, became a part of Berlin's landscape as the national capital as well as the image politics of the government. In his intention to reform national identity after the Kohl era, chancellor Schröder stylized an urban "new center" as the main addressee of his policies. To the extent that the subcultural diversity of post-*Wende* Berlin became increasingly commercialized and attracted all kinds of culture industries – such as MTV or Universal Music – to the city, Berlin appeared as a cool territory with optimal development possibilities for innovative *culturepreneurs* (Lange 2005). In the perception of the media, Berlin became a "human workshop" and an "experimental laboratory for long overdue changes" (Der Spiegel 36/99). Not least, this new Berlin discourse construed new immigrants, considered to be especially dynamic, as pioneers of a neo-liberal process of social reconstruction oriented toward individual self-responsibility.

Internationally, Berlin was also increasingly perceived as an "exciting" metropolis characterized by a dynamic cultural scene, social liberality, and the availability of spaces that had not yet been commercially exploited. Alongside tourism, temporary forms of migration began to boom among young adults who arrived as students, artists, or long-term travelers and stayed for a while. Once again, the label of Berlin's youth came to the foreground of the city's official marketing. The message was: "Young Berlin: Berlin gets a new face: fresh, dynamic, young" (Berlin-Brief 99/01). Berlin was conceived of as a city of the future, as the cultural capital of the 21st century (cf. Hurtado 2005) with the attributes of cosmopolitanism, urbanity, and diversity. As in the 1920s and 1980s, the "urban meaning" of the city was constructed around its cultural force and diversity as well as its supposed youth, in order to point a way out of the city's deep socio-economic crisis.

Not least in the context of urban experiences in which news forms of international mobility and cultural hybridization began to become a part of everyday life, the authority of a *dispositif* of a multicultural metropolis that understood

cultures as delimited units existing alongside one another within a historical continuity began to crumble. The image of Berlin characterized by narratives of urban decline manifested in the ghetto discourse, which stood in diametric contradiction to the cultural dynamics experienced in everyday life in Kreuzberg, was also no longer sufficiently convincing. In contrast to the 1920s, when "foreigners" were considered undesirable or at least as suspect alien elements, and to the 1980s, when they were kept at a distance as an ethno-cultural "other," for the first time there emerged within this new framework a discourse that no longer split off an ethno-national/cultural "other" from one's "own," but rather declared national, cultural, ethnic, as well as social diversity to be characteristic features of a metropolis and worth supporting.

Precisely from an economic perspective, emphasis was now placed upon the dynamic of cultural processes of hybridization: "Positive interaction with diversity," according to the integration concept adopted by the red-red Senate in 2005, "promotes intercultural competence, the vitality and capacity for the city to act, and leads to advantages in the international competition for attractiveness" (Abgeordnetenhaus 2005: 71). In this official political document, for the first time in Berlin the essentialist concept of culture is replaced by a concept that understands culture as dynamic sets of everyday practices and discourses that constantly blend with and influence each other. Furthermore, and this also marks a shift with regard to traditional multiculturalism, this discourse is concerned primarily with the economic potential of immigrants for the globally competitive metropolis.

This "diversitarian multiculturalism" (Lanz 2007) is also reflected in an altered landscape. The focus is no longer upon urban spaces that deviate in a deficient sense from a supposed normality (ghettos), but rather upon neighborhoods conceived of as cosmopolitan, whose obvious, profoundly fluid internationality is no longer linked to the classic German image of "migration," neither in the sense of labor migration nor in the sense of a permanent process of immigration. Here, the city is only considered "sustainable" if it proves to be cosmopolitan enough to be attractive and open to globally mobile milieus. It was precisely Kreuzberg, which until recently was still maligned as a "ghetto," that was now considered a model laboratory for a successful city of immigration. Thus, the Social Senator of the red-red government, referring to the 2004 annual report of the national "Expert Advisory Board for Immigration and Integration," described Kreuzberg's diversity as a value-creating location factor effecting the influx of creative individuals and media businesses (Lanz 2007: 226).

The mayor of the Kreuzberg district attempted in 2004 to realize a "total intercultural concept" which, under the term "managing diversity," was intended to subject institutions to an intercultural opening, support the potential of ethnic minorities, as well as dismantle discrimination, all the while explicitly dis-

tancing itself from the dominant concept of integration. However, this renunciation of a paradigm of integration that unilaterally demands that immigrants blend into the majority society could not even be implemented in Kreuzberg, a district characterized by a progressive attitude with regard to questions of immigration. Nonetheless, the official government concept of integration has undergone a considerable shift in meaning. In the "Twelve Essentials of Berlin Integration Policy" that constitute the foundation for the integration concept of the Senate, integration is no longer a form of "restriction" (cf. Schulte 2000), but rather demands of the host society that it should "interculturally open institutions and procedures" (Abgeordnetenhaus 2005: 9). Integration policy is here conceived of as a permanent process involving all population groups, and which should encompass the social, economic, legal, and cultural dimensions of integration.

However, the political goal of diversity, which is linked here to equality between the most diverse social milieus and lifestyles in the city, has yet another side that dovetails with the model of the "activating welfare state" implemented by the red-green federal government: whereas municipal integration policy since the 1970s was "largely [...] identical with welfare policy" (Sackmann 2001: 17) – the multiculturalism concept of the 1980s supplemented this with a sociocultural offer of identity – this social character progressively vanished with the "neoliberal turn:" precisely in the field of integration policy, an "economization of the social sphere" became manifest (Lemke 1997: 248). To the extent that in Berlin in the last decade the unemployment rate for statistical foreigners fluctuated around the 40 per cent mark, the demand is addressed to foreigners to exhaust their economic potential. Here, integration implies a successful "interpellation" as a subject subsisting without welfare benefits, participating in urban society through individual initiative. Since the state interpellates the subject as an entrepreneurial self, "all those who are integrated have to calculate their behavior in accordance with the terms of an 'investment' in their own person and their family" (Rose 2000: 95). Education and the "activation" of the individual acquire a central position in integration policy, whereas social conditions such as institutional racism, which also disadvantages qualified immigrants in the labor market, tend to be ignored (cf. Lanz 2009).

The *dispositif* of the cosmopolitan metropolis is based upon a conception of diversity that regards the cultural, social, and ethnic diversity of individual residents to be socially enriching and economically useful, while accepting the resulting social inequalities and addressing subjects as entrepreneurial subjects responsible for their own material existence.

As was the case in the 1980s, the establishment of a new migration/city *dispositif* – at the center of which stands a conception of a socially diverse city – in no way implies that the elements of the other two *dispositifs* have entirely disappeared. In Berlin, as a consequence of the attacks in New York on September

11, 2001, political positions that invoked a *clash of cultures* and that racialized Muslims as others were strengthened. These political positions were rooted in the historical archive of German immigration discourse. Once again, a ghetto discourse was intensified, accompanied by proposals for political intervention that aimed at stigmatizing immigrants, this time focused upon the district of Neukölln. Neukölln symbolized not only the problems of a city of immigration, but also the social dystopia par excellence, in which all alleged threats – disintegration, poverty, exclusion, brutal youths, religious conflict, violence – were spatially condensed into a powerful, socially and culturally explosive mixture. Nonetheless, in the Berlin in the early years of the new millennium, such conceptions were unable to develop sufficient power of persuasion to swamp the concept of the cosmopolitan metropolis.

CONCLUSION

A historical look back at the interconnection of immigrant and urban development in Berlin reveals the existence of three immigration/city *dispositifs* that were established within the context of specific historical events in order to plug a contingent "leak" caused by a rupture of the previously dominant *dispositif*. Unsurprisingly, the first event was the founding of the German nation state: the *dispositif* of the national-homogeneous big city developed – with regard to the state – from the concept of the German nation as a community of descent and common culture and – with regard to the city – from an "urban meaning" that interpreted Berlin as a permanently crisis-ridden "city without an identity." In the interrelation between the national and the urban, this *dispositif* contains core elements that are operational even today: the conception of foreigners as an alien presence, which obtains an urban-spatial manifestation in the ghetto discourse, an essentialist and ethno-nationalist concept of culture, which generates exclusionary postulates with regard to all-too foreign ethnic groups, as well as – at the urban level – an imaginary picture of Berlin on the one hand as a proletarian city without identity, stability, and a bourgeoisie, but on the other hand as a youthful, modern cultural metropolis.

Neither the transition to the Weimar Republic and then the Third Reich, nor the transition to the Federal Republic, were able to shatter this *dispositif*. Rather, only with the globalization of migratory movements as well as the decline of the Fordist welfare state model and the concept of the modern state was this possible. With the change in government consummated in 1981 from the social democrats to the conservatives, a new immigration/city *dispositif*, interlaced with the old one, was established: that of the multicultural-differential metropolis. In this new *dispositif*, the essentialist concept of culture as well as the notion of Berlin as a youthful cultural metropolis remained, but now immigrants were no

longer regarded per se as an alien presence. On the basis of a selection between "good" (related, useful) and "bad" (purportedly all-too-foreign) cultures, they were considered to be a potential enrichment of the post-Fordist metropolis, the basic principle of which was no longer homogeneity, but rather (social, national, cultural, and spatial) difference. However, all of this was to exist under the umbrella of the dominant culture of the majority society, whose imagined standard-bearers were to exclude or "reign in" (cultural or social) deviations that went too far, with the help of restrictive political intervention. Particularly in crisis situations, such as the shaking up of the borders to Eastern Europe as a result of the fall of the Berlin Wall, or the emergence of urban spaces of poverty in the late 1990s, elements of the "old" *dispositif* that had been supposedly overcome – such as anti-Slavic racism or a ghetto discourse that interpreted certain ethnic groups as an alien presence – came to the surface once again.

The *dispositif* of the multicultural-differential metropolis was exhausted within two decades. Once again, the national – the break with the concept of the German nation as a community of descent – was interlinked with the urban: on the one hand, processes of cultural hybridization and a dynamic internationalization of urban society had become everyday experiences in Berlin, and on the other hand they were now regarded as factors to be supported in establishing a location for business, and which pointed the way out of the deindustrialization crisis. In the year 2001, it was once again the collapse of the Senate and a change of government to a coalition between social democrats and socialists that consequentially enabled the establishment of a new migration/city *dispositif*: the *dispositif* of the cosmopolitan-diversitarian metropolis now broke with the essentialist concept of culture and with the distinction between one's national-ethnic-cultural "own" and an "other," radicalizes and economicize the image of Berlin as a globally important, young cultural metropolis and establishes the notion of an urban society characterized by social, cultural, ethnic, and national diversity. Here as well, the new *dispositif* does not completely replace the old one, but rather becomes interlaced with it. Numerous debates conducted in the last decade, and the political strategies derived from them concerning supposed ghettos and parallel societies, which in particular constitute Muslims as a racial "other," reveal that central elements of *both dispositifs* established earlier continue to live on and repeatedly reach a boiling point during crisis situations.

Perhaps it is precisely the economic dimension of "diversity" that speaks in favor of the fact that the *dispositif* of the cosmopolitan-diversitarian metropolis – an ensemble of specific means, mechanisms and measures based upon a specific concept of diversity that shapes the sphere of activity migration/city in Berlin – was able to establish itself in a stabile manner. With regard to the complex of immigration, this would mean that for the first time in Berlin since the founding of the German nation state, ethnic, cultural or national diversity as well as ongoing international processes of migration are officially regarded

as urban normality and the traditional dichotomy between "Germans" vs. foreigners is being dissolved.

Translated by Alexander Locascio

REFERENCES

Abgeordnetenhaus von Berlin (2005) *Ein Integrationskonzept für Berlin*. Drucksache 15/4208. Berlin.

Castells, M. (1983) *The City and the Grassroots*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Der Senator für Gesundheit, Soziales und Familie (1982) *Miteinander Leben. Ausländerpolitik in Berlin*. Berlin.

Ha, K. N. (2003) Die kolonialen Muster deutscher Arbeitsmigrationspolitik. In Steyerl, H. and Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E. (eds.) *Spricht die Subalterne deutsch? Migration und postkoloniale Kritik*, Westfälisches Dampfboot, Münster.

Herbert, U. (2001) *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge*. Beck C.H., München.

Homuth, K. (1987) Identität und soziale Ordnung. Zum Verhältnis städtischer Kultur und gesellschaftlicher Hegemonie. *Prokla* 68.3, 90-112.

Foucault, M. (1977) The Confession of the Flesh (interview). In Gordon, C. (ed.) *Michael Foucault. Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Vintage, New York/London.

Freiburghaus, D. and Kudat, A. (1974) *Gemeinschaftsunterkünfte für ausländische Arbeitnehmer in Berlin*. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, Berlin.

Hurtado, I. F. (2005) Zukunft zum Greifen nah. Bedingungen, Semantik und Verortung des Berliner Stadtmarketing. In Färber, A. (ed.) *Hotel Berlin. Formen urbaner Mobilität und Verortung*. Berliner Blätter (37), Berlin.

John, B. (2005) Vorwort: Noch eine Berliner Pflanze. Der Karneval der Kulturen. In Knecht, M. and Soysal, L. (eds.) *Plausible Vielfalt. Wie der Karneval der Kulturen denkt, lernt und Kultur schafft*. Panama Verlag, Berlin.

Keller, R. (2001) Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse. In Keller, R. (ed.) *Handbuch sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse*, Bd. 1: Theorien und Methoden. Leske + Budrich, Opladen.

Kiecol, D. (2001) *Selbstbild und Image zweier europäischer Metropolen. Paris und Berlin zwischen 1900 und 1930*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt a.M.

Krätke, S. and Schmoll, F. (1987) Der lokale Staat – "Ausführungsorgan" oder "Gegenmacht". *Prokla* 68.3, 30-72.

Lange, B. (2005) Sociospatial Strategies of Culturepreneurs. The Example of Berlin and its New Professional Scenes. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie* 49.2, 81-98.

Lanz, S. (2007) *Berlin aufgemischt: abendländisch – multikulturell – kosmopolitisch. Die politische Konstruktion einer Einwanderungsstadt.* transcript Verlag, Bielefeld.

Lanz, S. (2009) In unternehmerische Subjekte investieren. Integrationspolitik im Workfare-State. Das Beispiel Berlin. In Hess, S., Binder. J., and Moser, J. (eds.) *No integration?! Kulturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Integrationsdebatte in Europa.* transcript Verlag, Bielefeld.

Lemke, T. (1997) *Eine Kritik der politischen Vernunft. Foucaults Analyse der modernen Gouvernementalität.* Argument Verlag, Hamburg.

Morgenstern, C. (2002) *Rassismus – Konturen einer Ideologie. Einwanderung im politischen Diskurs der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.* Argument Verlag, Hamburg.

Oltmer, J. (2003) "Schutz des nationalen Arbeitsmarktes:" transnationale Arbeitswanderungen und protektionistische Zuwanderungspolitik in der Weimarer Republik. In Oltmer, J. (ed.) *Migration steuern und verwalten. Deutschland vom späten 19. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart.* Universitätsverlag Osnabrück, Osnabrück.

Presse- und Informationsamt des Landes Berlin (ed.) (1985) *Berliner Forum 6/85. Stadt der Chancen.* Berlin.

Rose, N. (2000) Tod des Sozialen? Eine Neubestimmung der Grenzen des Regierens. In Bröckling, U., Krasmann, S. and Lemke, T. (eds.) *Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen.* Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a.M.

Sackmann, R. (2001) Einwanderung und Integration: Handlungsmöglichkeiten der Stadtpolitik. In Gestring, N. et al. (eds.) *Jahrbuch StadtRegion.* Leske + Budrich, Opladen.

Schönwälder, K. (2001) *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität. Politische Entscheidungen und öffentliche Debatten in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik von den 1950er bis zu den 1970er Jahren.* Klartext Verlag, Essen.

Schulte, A. (2000) Von der Gastarbeiter- und Ausländerpolitik zur Minderheiten- und Zuwanderungspolitik. In Schulte, A. (ed.) *Zwischen Diskriminierung und Demokratisierung. Aufsätze zu Politiken der Migration, Integration und Multikulturalität in Westeuropa.* Iko-Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation, Berlin.

Schwarz, T. (2001) Integrationspolitik als Beauftragtenpolitik: Die Ausländerbeauftragte des Berliner Senats. In Gesemann, F. (ed.) *Migration und Integration in Berlin. Wissenschaftliche Analysen und politische Perspektiven.* Leske + Budrich, Opladen.

SPD Berlin (1991) *Wortprotokoll des Landesparteitags vom 23.11.1991.* Berlin.

Stremmel, R. (1992) *Modell und Moloch. Berlin in der Wahrnehmung deutscher Politiker vom Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum 2. Weltkrieg.* Bouvier, Bonn.