

Urban Age is a worldwide series
of conferences investigating
the future of cities

NEW YORK/FEBRUARY 2005

SHANGHAI/JULY 2005

LONDON/NOVEMBER 2005

MEXICO CITY/FEBRUARY 2006

JOHANNESBURG/JULY 2006

BERLIN/NOVEMBER 2006

WWW.URBAN-AGE.NET

BERLIN AN URBAN EXPERIMENT?

URBAN AGE CONTACT

Summit Berlin Contact
T +49 (0) 30 3407 3527

Cities Programme
The London School of Economics
and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)20 7955 7706
urban.age@lse.ac.uk

Alfred Herrhausen Society
Deutsche Bank
Unter den Linden 15/16
10117 Berlin
Germany

T +49 (0)30 3407 4001
ute.wenand@db.com
www.alfred-herrhausen-gesellschaft.de

Cover image: One third satellite of Berlin © DigitalGlobe
exclusive distributed for Europe by Telespazio



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Alfred Herrhausen Society
The International Forum of Deutsche Bank



URBANSYSTEMS

BERLIN: A PROFILE

Stepping out from underneath the glass arches of Berlin's brand new main railway station, the Hauptbahnhof, one is greeted by a plethora of grandiose architectural gestures set against the backdrop of a vast expanse of undeveloped ground. One's gaze may come to rest on the Federal Chancellery, designed by Axel Schultes, or on the 'Band des Bundes', the 'Federal Belt' of newly constructed government buildings; one may take in Norman Foster's Reichstag cupola or the completely redeveloped Potsdamer Platz and recall that, a mere fifteen years ago, none of these structures existed. What is even more striking from this vantage point is that the city, as people's living space, does not seem to intersect with the Berlin that is the new representative centre of Germany. City dwellers and citizens evidently inhabit two decidedly distinct spheres. Unlike many other European cities, Berlin has no clearly defined city centre complete with market square, city hall and cathedral. Such central space simply does not exist here. More than ever, Berlin is a conglomeration of parallel worlds, a hotchpotch of stageries on which long-established residents, newcomers and tourists make their respective entrances.

The Berlin Wall saved the Western part of the city from the fate that, after the War, had typically befallen so many other West German cities with their emptying town centres and fraying edges, their populations slowly spilling over into the surrounding countryside. Yet there was a price to pay for this in Berlin, namely the destruction of a coherent urban structure. The bombings of World War II and the subsequent partition had carved up Berlin's infrastructure, its canalisation, its network of roads and its railway system. Vast areas of derelict land soon became a hallmark of this fragmented city.

When the Berlin Wall fell and Berlin became, albeit by a narrow parliamentary majority, the capital of the newly unified Germany, expectations ran high and grand visions abounded. Surely, the city would soon be home to six million people, and all manner of fanciful plans were drawn up for this new metropolis: Berlin was to become the powerhouse of the new Republic, the focal point for an entire 'Generation Berlin', the 'hub' that would connect East and West, a veritable 'laboratory of unification'. Such promises were directly rooted in the rhetoric and practices of the Cold War, when, thanks to huge subsidies provided by the two respective German states, West Berlin had been established as a 'Window on Freedom', while East Berlin stood proud as the 'capital of the first Workers and Peasants' State on German soil'. On either side of the Wall, Berliners themselves tended to view such labels – which bore precious little relation to the realities of their everyday lives – with a healthy amount of scepticism. While others were certainly welcome to entertain illusions of grandeur, Berliners' first loyalties lay with their neighbourhoods and their lovingly tended urban allotments.

Since the early 1990s, Berlin has, above all, been a huge building site, and architecture often had to grapple with paradoxical expectations: on the one hand, the 'Planwerk Innenstadt', a decidedly anti-modern re-urbanisation and city-centre revitalisation directive, decreed that the 'historical city' should be recovered; on the other hand, politicians and residents alike expected the

architectural fraternity to create a metropolis of the future. As a result, a lot of sound yet middling designs, but few masterpieces, were realised. Bold and innovative architectural statements are indeed very few and far between in this city. Today's general sense of disappointment with this state of affairs has less to do with the buildings themselves than with the hopes and expectations of the 1990s. People had once more been prepared to put their faith in the redemptive power of good architecture, only to discover yet again that redemption is the one thing architecture cannot offer. Most importantly, however, the new government buildings or the redeveloped Potsdamer Platz failed to project an image that Berliners could recognise. The city remained as fragmented as ever.

In the midst of this unparalleled building activity, and while ever more grand expectations were projected onto Berlin, the city's economy collapsed: the Eastern part of the city as well as its Brandenburg hinterland were labouring under the consequences of deindustrialisation, while the Western part of the city grappled with the effects of the end of subsidisation. Since 1994, population figures have been steadily declining, and today, an entire suburban belt is economically dependent on Berlin. Meanwhile, in the city itself, more than 100,000 apartments stand empty. For years, both commercial and residential properties have been in plentiful supply and remarkably cheap to get hold of. Compared to Paris, Warsaw or London, this seems an anomaly.

Maladministration and wastefulness have left the city' crippled with debt and effectively bankrupt since 2002. The state of Berlin has withdrawn from all major building projects, which are now exclusively in Federal hands. The attempts at regenerating the city's urban infrastructure have been largely successful and, for the most part, the effects of war and partition have been overcome, but there is a painful lack of resources when it comes to maintaining the city's libraries, schools, theatres and universities. Berlin is a poor, economically weak city that is terrifically cheap to live in.

Contrary to initial expectations, no new urban elite has emerged post unification. A bourgeoisie, in whatever shape or form, that would set the tone, function as a social barometer, speak out on behalf of the wider public and take the lead on issues of common concern, simply does not exist in Berlin. Berlin is a city of ordinary people, students, newcomers fleeing the provincial backwaters of their childhoods, and a fast living and mercurial bohemian crowd made up of artists, intellectuals, journalists, freelancers and plain drifters. This latter set shapes the mood and lifestyle that dominates Berlin's inner city districts. Most of these people lead rather precarious and uncertain lives, but they have certainly made Berlin the only German city in which a carefully chosen witticism, a surprising gesture or an ingenious performance count for more than status and income. Indeed, money plays an astonishingly minor role in the social life of the city. And Berliners like to take things slowly – a fact that surprises even Swiss visitors to the city.

This bohemian scene has found a perfect form of expression in the 'intermediate utilisation' of disused buildings. There are many such empty structures all over Berlin, and squatters are swift to move in and put them to creative use – dissolving traditional bound-

aries between art and entertainment, aesthetic ambition and nightlife fun. The first such project was the 'Tacheles' on Oranienburger Straße, and eventually even the 'Palace of the Republic', the former cultural-centre-cum-seat of the East German parliament, (now in the process of being demolished) was turned into a temporary arts venue. Three old arm-chairs and a hastily cobbled together installation usually suffice to transform the fleeting moment into a memorable one. This culture of the transitory, a legacy of our love affair with everything crumbling, seems uniquely suited to the character of the city, and Berlin owes much of its attractiveness for tourists to precisely this idiosyncrasy. It has put Berlin firmly on the map in the European imagination and proves that, here at least, everything is possible and anything goes, no matter how limited your resources. A spirit of freedom is indeed key to people's life in this city.

Berlin's economic plight, its poverty, its lack of an effective elite, its fragmentation and abundance of disused spaces, the weakness of its administration and the continuing East-West divide – all these are the very conditions of Berlin's intellectual as well as real life character. Three factors will determine the city's fate over the coming years: immigration from Eastern Europe, a brain drain among the young, and the continuing lack of a city centre in the good old European sense of the word.

For most of its history, Berlin has been a rather dismal one horse town. It became the capital of Germany because it had been the capital of Prussia. Since the dissolution of Prussia, it has become apparent that the city is barely able to survive by its own efforts, surrounded as it is by an impoverished region that is gradually being abandoned by its inhabitants. The political task of countering this state of affairs with strong and effective institutions is currently tackled only hesitantly and without much energy or conviction.

What Berlin teaches architects and urban planners is, above all, humility. The building and planning frenzy of the 1990s showed that architecture cannot be expected to counteract the provisional and temporary nature of this city, nor relieve its social frailty. What it can do, however, is continue to create stages and project images. Good metropolitan architecture has much in common with good stage design – a fact more apparent in Berlin than anywhere else in the world.

Jens Bisky, journalist, Süddeutsche Zeitung

Translated from German by Alexa Alfer

¹ Like, for example, Bavaria or Hesse, Berlin is a federal state in its own right.



© Anja Schumann, Berlin, Urban Age

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE GLOBAL CITY?

Germany is currently rediscovering the city. The themes of crises and decay, which have long dominated discussions on the city, are being superseded by a new passion for the city. For some decades, German cities have been losing population and jobs. This problem affected cities in East Germany the hardest after unification, as the loss of jobs, the decline in population and the moving away of young people with qualifications meant that they were faced with dramatic levels of negative growth. However, from the beginning of the 21st century, there have been clear signs pointing to a change in urban development trends.

Some profound economic changes occurred in cities, further accelerated by the enormous effects of globalisation and digitisation. The change from an industrial to a service-led economy, based on science and culture, particularly in the large West German urban regions of Munich, Frankfurt, Cologne and Hamburg, meant the development of a new urban dynamic. We can now see a re-urbanisation in terms of employment as well as population, and even in East German cities such as Leipzig, Dresden and Berlin the population is once more increasing.

The urban system in Germany, as in many other countries, shows that globalisation and digitisation do not lead to a disintegration of the city, as predicted by many experts, but to a re-evaluation of the city and the development of a new form of urban centrality, which, in Germany, takes the form of a process of urbanisation.

While in most other countries, dominant global cities have emerged, Germany has none, but instead has a multi-polar urban

system. As presented very convincingly by Saskia Sassen in various publications, the new type of global city takes on a strategic role. The control, integration and management functions of the commodity chains that are spread throughout the world are concentrated in the global cities. At the same time, the global city is a central location for production and a transnational market place for high quality, knowledge-based services.

How can we explain the absence of a German city high up in the hierarchy of global cities, even though Germany has held the position of 'export champion' for many years and has been exceptional with regard to the integration of its economy into the world market?

In answer to this question, the peculiarities and interruptions in German history are often referred to. Germany only gained one common capital city when the Prussian democratic empire was founded in 1871. Berlin became the seat of government and developed into Germany's dominant economic and cultural city but never achieved the centrality of London or Paris. After the historic disasters of the Nazi regime and the Second World War, Berlin's central role was totally destroyed by the break-up of the German Reich and the splitting of Germany into four occupation zones. Many companies moved their headquarters from Berlin to West Germany. Following a resolution by the American occupation government, the new Bank Deutscher Länder (Bank of German States), which was the predecessor of the Deutsche Bundesbank, was founded in Frankfurt after the closure of the Reichsbank in Berlin. As a consequence, the Deutsche Bank and the Dresdner Bank moved their headquarters to Frankfurt. At the same time,

the American occupation government decided to develop Frankfurt airport to be the central base of the US Airforce in Germany. Frankfurt's function as a gateway and an international financial centre was a direct result of these decisions. Similar historical decisions led to the specialisation of other cities: Munich became Germany's high-tech metropolis; Hamburg, its news and media centre; and, with the creation of the German Federal Republic in 1949, the seat of government was moved to Bonn. Although the role of political capital was given back to Berlin after unification, it is unlikely that Berlin will ever regain its former central economic role.

This historical sketch implicitly classifies Germany's urban network as a special case in the hierarchy of the global urban system. Can Germany really be considered to be a special case that shows deficits?

An alternative explanation can be found in the discussion on 'Varieties of Capitalism' (Hall/Soskice). If it is true that modern capitalism is not a homogeneous entity, but that different models of capitalism have developed under different historical conditions, then it is not unlikely that these different models also have correspondingly different patterns of urbanisation. The 'belated' industrial nation of Germany had already developed an alternative to the liberal production system at the end of the 19th century, which can be characterised as a form of regulated, corporate market economy. This model of 'Rheinian Capitalism' combined with strong federal structures, formed the basis for the economic and social system of West Germany. It is very likely that Germany has not only created an alternative model of production, but also an alternative and effective model of urbanisation.

Characteristic of this model of urbanisation is both the polycentrality of the urban system with its distinct complementary division of labour between individuals cities, and the phenomenon of regional 'manufacturing service districts'.

Whereas globalisation in the 1980s and 1990s led to a strong global dispersion of industrial functions in Anglo-Saxon countries, the urban regions in Germany still have

a strongly interactive dynamic of developing knowledge-intensive industries. Furthermore, the German urban system is connected to the European and global networks of cities. The individual cities can only develop their capacity and innovativeness in their specialisms with the help of very effective networks and cooperation.

As Saskia Sassen rightly points out, a global city is by definition part of a network. This applies even more strongly to the urban system in Germany, whose multi-tiered networks are of a regional, national, European and global nature. Thus the German urban system could prove to be a valid future alternative to the highly centralised model of the global city.

Dieter Läßle is Professor of Regional & Urban Economics at HafenCity University Hamburg

Translation from German by Anne Rigby

URBAN AGE

a worldwide series of conferences investigating the future of cities

organised by the Cities Programme at the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Alfred Herrhausen Society, the International Forum of Deutsche Bank

LSE THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE ■

Alfred Herrhausen Society
The International Forum of Deutsche Bank

