Who is Wilhelmsburg? Race and Space in *Internationale Bauaustellung* Hamburg

By

Julie Hume Chamberlain

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Adult Education and Community Development
Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Julie Hume Chamberlain 2012
Who is Wilhelmsburg? Race and Space in *Internationale Bauaustellung* Hamburg

Julie Hume Chamberlain

Master of Arts

Adult Education and Community Development

Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

University of Toronto

2012

Abstract

The Wilhelmsburg neighbourhood of Hamburg, Germany is characterized in local media as a problem neighbourhood. Many of its residents are racialized people struggling with low incomes, unemployment, and less formal education than average in the city as a whole, exemplifying what Razack (2002, p. 6) calls the “spatiality of the racial order in which we live.” Wilhelmsburg is also the focus of a massive urban planning and architectural project, the *Internationale Bauaustellung* (International Building Exhibition, or IBA) Hamburg 2007-2012, comprising 50 building projects that aim to transform the neighbourhood. In this thesis I use Foucauldian discourse analysis to explore IBA Hamburg’s public education materials, arguing that IBA Hamburg produces Wilhelmsburg and its residents as racialized, problematic, and in need of intervention to bring them into the future metropolis. Residents are targeted for integration through education, the effects of which are disciplinary and reproduce an unequal racial order of citizenship.
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Preface

In May 2011 a group of graduate students from across Canada met with Oberbaudirektor Jörn Walter to hear about urban planning and development in the city of Hamburg, Germany. Talking about the city-state’s major projects focusing development in the south of the city – in the Elbe islands – Walter, Hamburg’s head of urban planning since 1999, acknowledged that the largest of the islands, Wilhelmsburg, was considered a problem area in the view of the rest of the city. To solve the problems of Wilhelmsburg, he argued, the population would have to be transformed.

Local media refer to Wilhelmsburg as a “crisis neighbourhood” (Krisenviertel) and a “social flashpoint” (Sozialer Brennpunkt) (Twickel, 2011). In the weeks after meeting with Walter, as I made first visits to Wilhelmsburg, and then completed a one-month internship at Haus der Jugend, a youth-serving organization on the island, I often heard the term 'Brennpunkt' used by outsiders to characterize the neighbourhood. Walking around Wilhelmsburg, I saw more people of colour than in other parts of Hamburg, more signs in Turkish, more Portuguese cafés, more women in headscarves. Other things stood out as different from other parts of Hamburg – maybe a few more run-down buildings, a stink from a nearby factory, and a burnt out car that sat, extraordinarily, for weeks before being towed away.

The island is a vast 35 square kilometres, Europe’s largest river island. Some corners of the island remain greenhouse-flecked farmland, there are neighbourhoods of single-family homes with middle-class residents, and canals and greenery cut through much of the island. So does a major highway, isolating the run-down high-rises of mid-Wilhelmsburg from the older workers quarter of Reiherstieg. The island is bordered by
industry, and container yards of the Hamburg port, and a former toxic waste dump on
the north edge. Though administratively part of downtown Hamburg, Wilhelmsburg is
spatially and socially distinct.

At 11.7 per cent, unemployment rates in Wilhelmsburg are higher than the
education levels are relatively low: 26% of students in Wilhelmsburg leave high school
without a diploma compared to 8% in Hamburg as a whole (Analyse & Konzepte, 2010).
Every third residential unit in Wilhelmsburg is a social housing unit, and rent in the
neighbourhood is markedly cheaper than the norm in high-rent, high-demand Hamburg
(Analyse & Konzepte, 2010, 7). 55 per cent of Wilhelmsburg residents are also
identified as having “migrant backgrounds,” 73 per cent of youth, compared to 28 per
cent and 42 per cent across Hamburg respectively (Statistisches Amt für Hamburg und
Schleswig-Holstein, 2010, 52). There is an interlocking of racialization and poverty that
is observable to the naked eye on the island of Wilhelmsburg. Through this coincidence
we can see the “spatiality of the racial order in which we live” (Razack, 2002, p. 6), and
against this backdrop, Herr Walter's statement about the population needing to be
‘transformed.’ The study that I will introduce here was sparked by my suspicion that in

\[1\] The category of ‘people with migrant backgrounds’ (Migrationshintergrund) is a recently added census
term, an innovation from the former choices simply of either ‘German’ or ‘foreigner’ (Institüt für Migrations-
und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011). Migrationshintergrund signals racialization, as it applies not
only to immigrants (people with “own migration experience,” Institut für Migrations- und
Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011) but also to their descendents, and thus indicates something like
‘non-German ethnic origin.’ This term is thus quite problematic, serving as it does a racializing function as
it categorizes the population. It is however also understandably appreciated by anti-racist researchers
and organizations as a generator of more nuanced and useful statistics than the German-Foreigner
dichotomy. The addition of census terminology also coincides with changing state and public
acknowledgement of the existence of racialized German citizens.
context, Walter’s assessment of the problem with Wilhelmsburg pointed to something happening with race.

In fact a large urban development project is currently engaged in Wilhelmsburg. Beginning in 2007 and culminating in 2013, the Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg ('International Building Exhibition,' IBA Hamburg for short) is the latest in a German tradition of urban planning and design exhibitions that began in the early twentieth century. IBAs have traditionally been exhibitions of architectural innovation that seek somehow to address a unique and pressing urban development need. Previous IBAs have taken place in Berlin, in parts of former East Germany, and in the post-industrial Ruhr valley, which illustrates the large spatial transformations and re-purposing that is often intended. The scope of IBAs has expanded though, as parts of the 2009 memorandum on the future of IBA reveals:

The International Building Exhibitions have developed into an experimental field for urban development...[they] have been transformed from architectural into building culture exhibitions, in which aesthetic and technological aspects, as well as social, economic, and ecological aspects and the quality of processes and participation were increasingly emphasized


IBA Hamburg comprises 50 projects, including new residential and public buildings, renovation of older housing, transformation of public spaces, and relocation of the Hamburg urban planning department to Wilhelmsburg. €100 million are budgeted for these projects. Firms applied to have their architectural ideas included in IBA Hamburg, which is funded by the city-state of Hamburg and semi-public and private investors. IBA
Hamburg GmbH is the operating company coordinating the project, set up as a subsidiary of the City of Hamburg (IBA Hamburg, 2011).

Though such large urban development projects fell out of favour years ago after one too many large-scale planning disasters led to planners deciding to try to make smaller mistakes, there has been a renewed move in Germany towards large projects (Daldrup & Zlonicky, 2010, p.10). The upswing was driven by reunification and demand for extensive urban redevelopment in the East; Daldrup & Zlonicky argue it has also been driven by the demand for Germany to position its cities as desirable “locations” within the global capitalist economy (2010, p. 11). In this context the “fears of social polarization” that large projects provoke, and the admitted danger of creating or exacerbating socially and economically segregated areas are sidelined in the name of “competitiveness” and a belief in somehow creating “social balance” (Daldrup & Zlonicky, 2010, p. 11, 24).

Several IBA Hamburg projects have already been completed, including a €5 million floating “IBA Dock” building that showcases the project plans and houses IBA Hamburg GmbH. Renovations had begun on some of the old, red brick housing central to the Reiherstieg area when I was in Wilhelmsburg, and digging for a nearby ‘language and movement centre.’ Groups of students and other visitors could regularly be seen touring around the IBA Hamburg sites, prompting a local friend to remark that living in Wilhelmsburg lately felt like living in a zoo. From its beginning in 2007 IBA has been accompanied by extensive public education and advertising mobilization. IBA newsletters, posters, pamphlets, books, and installations can be found across Hamburg and particularly in the targeted areas of the Elbe islands. Tours, forums, presentations, and town hall meetings spread the word of IBA Hamburg’s work. The extensiveness and
high production quality of their materials caught my attention, as did some of the slogans.

IBA Hamburg's mission is “to show the future,” with the sub-missions of making “strength from diversity,” “new opportunities,” and “new spaces for the city” (IBA Hamburg, 2011a; 2011b). These are rhetorically invigorating but unspecific missions. It is clear that the project is conceived not just as an intervention in built space, but also as a social and environmental development. IBA Hamburg professes the goal of solving the “major social issues of our time” (IBA Hamburg, 2011a), truly an ambitious goal, but the specifics of those issues and how they are to be tackled are not as immediately clear as the strident slogans. “It’s not just about showing buildings,” the project's website proclaims, “It’s about real-time research and development. Like a laboratory. Except that the laboratory is in fact an entire district in the city and research leads to actual built space” (IBA Hamburg, 2011c). So the population to be 'transformed' is not so much in a zoo as my friend suggested, but in a petri dish.

In the context of the racial, “social islandization” (Hellweg, 2010, p. 115) of Wilhelmsburg, the characterization of this urban development/spatial intervention as an experiment in a laboratory is extremely problematic. Activist group Arbeitskreis Umstrukturierung Wilhelmsburg voices the concern that the 'experiment' aims to make the area more attractive to capital investment while masquerading as an apolitical 'show,' at the expense of low-income and racialized people who will be pushed out of the neighbourhood (Arbeitskreis Umstrukturierung Wilhelmsburg, 2011). My feeling while in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg was that some kind of restructuring was indeed taking place, in which the racial order was a guiding frame and a question of 'who is the city for?' particularly salient. A brief look at the current contours of racial and 'integration'
politics in Germany will serve to situate this impression and the study that developed out of it.

**Race in Germany**

Germany has for some time lived an illusion that since post-war 'denazification' it has been 'post-race' (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009; Goldberg, 2009), but it is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain this illusion. The public realization in late 2011 of the racist motivation of a series of murders committed from 2000-2007 has pushed racist violence, its frequency and commonality, into the public eye. A body of research on racism in Germany is steadily growing, providing empirical evidence of its existence and its structural, ideological, and interpersonal manifestations. As the body of research grows, racism is becoming harder to ignore or mis-characterize at official levels (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011).

Racism and xenophobia are highly visible in public and policy discourses about immigration and 'integration' in Germany. 14,871,061 people in Germany were counted as have migrant backgrounds in the year 2009, or about 18.7 per cent of the total population (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011, p. 10). Yet as recently as the early 2000s, German leaders were routinely denying even the existence of substantial racialized populations in the country by claiming that Germany was not a 'country of immigration' (Klusbmeyer, 2001). Denial of the presence of permanent (racialized) immigrant populations and their descendants served to avoid developing comprehensive immigration and settlement policy. It also reinforced discourses of a mythical, unified Germany and sense of Germanness, in which the nation-state and ethno-racial identity were implicitly or explicitly one and the same (Klusbmeyer, 2001).
Germany has thrived, however, on the intentional and systematic import of foreign, racialized bodies to labour in the *Wirtschaftswunder* ('economic miracle'), a major period of economic boom and migration that laid the foundations for many of the largest racialized communities in Germany today. From 1955 to 1973 the *Gastarbeiter* (guestworker) program recruited workers from Southern Europe to work temporarily in German industries, with the expectation that they would return home after a few years and new batches of workers would continuously arrive (Chin, 2009; Ramm, 2010). German language was not a prerequisite for migration, but rather youth and physical ability to work; German businesses profited enormously from the prime labouring years of Portuguese, Greeks, and Italians without the social security responsibilities they would have to German workers, and ordinary Germans “enjoyed better jobs, higher living standards, and an unprecedented period of economic prosperity” (Chin, 2009, p. 84).

The exploitation of guestworker labour was facilitated by a strict legal separation between the status of ‘citizen’ and ‘foreigner’ (Chin, 2009; Ramm, 2010); guestworkers were subject to a separate *Ausländerrecht*, ‘foreigner law’ (Ramm, 2010). They were often physically separate from German society, living in company barracks, and socially separated by language, class, and level of education. When an agreement between Germany and Turkey in 1961 led to guestworkers being recruited primarily from Turkey, firms favoured recruitment from the remote reaches of the country, from which they found people were most willing to work dirty, dangerous, and low-skilled jobs for low wages (Chin, 2009). To the ‘surprise’ of the German state, many *Gastarbeiter* did not leave after a few years however, but rather stayed, had families, and became part of German society whether Germans liked it or not. This guestworker history illustrates
why the largest minority community in Germany continues to be Turkish – 25 per cent of ‘foreigners’ (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011, p. 11). It also illustrates how the relationships of these ‘foreign’ residents to the state and to the German body politic began with exploitation, separation, and differential rights, features that continue to define the racial order in Germany today.

The definition of some residents of Germany – guestworkers, as well as asylum seekers and other racialized foreigners – as separate from the German population though living within it points to the role of the production of a German identity in what has now moved from denial of the presence of diversity to an Integrationsdebatte. This ‘integration debate’ – ostensibly about whether, why, and how ‘others’ can or should be integrated into German society – articulates pressure for racial, cultural and political others to assimilate, though in the language of ‘integration’ (Brubaker, 2001, p. 541; Ehrkamp, 2006, p. 1675). It also establishes the impossibility of ever really doing so, as Germanness is defined against what it is not – Slavic-ness for example in an earlier historical period (Rasmussen, 2011, p. 46) or Turkishness and Muslimness today (Ehrkamp, 2006).

The concept of racialization, which I have already used here, is helpful to understanding this process of the definition of ‘us’ versus ‘them,’ and how therefore though the racial ‘other’ might change over time, as I will touch on below, the effect on the German ‘we’ can be roughly the same. Starting from an understanding of ‘race’ as a social construction, racialization describes the process through which groups of people are assigned racial categories and thus produced as raced (Mirchandani et al, 2011, p. 123-124). The production of racial categories happens in different ways in different historical moments and contexts, so that a group might be racialized in certain
times/places but not, or differently, in others. Racialization serves the central purpose of differentiation of 'self' from 'other' and 'us' from 'them,' through classifications and significations that can be social, economic, cultural, psychological and, as the following chapters will demonstrate, spatial in nature. Racialization is also the precursor to differential relations based on race, or racism (Mirchandani et al, 2011).

Two themes are particularly key to understanding the current context of racial politics and discourse in which the following study is situated. One is the racialization of Muslims in Europe (and North America for that matter); the other is the 'cultural' guise of racism and the atmosphere of taboo around race and racism in Germany (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009; Institut für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011). Any investigation of the racial order in Germany must be situated within its history of genocidal racist violence in which millions of people were killed, a history that still lies within living memory. The systematic marginalization, exclusion, physical exploitation and murder of 'others' during the Nazi period – Jewish people, Sinti and Roma, gay and lesbian people, religious and political others – was certainly made possible by the fascist form of government facilitating the creation of a racial state. Post-war denazification has focused on restricting the likelihood that such a government could rise in Germany again. And yet the current racial order must be approached in terms of continuities as well as ruptures from the Nazi past and beyond (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009; Rasmussen, 2011).

There is an ongoing popular belief in discontinuity, in a Stunde Null, a 'zero hour' at the end of the war, at which Germany awoke from its nightmare and moved into a post-race dawn. In this formulation, racism is over-identified with the Nazi era and its particular, biological bases for racism and antisemitism (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009;
Goldberg, 2009). The imperative to appropriately remember the Nazi past and not to repeat it became central to the building of a democratic Germany identity post-war (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009, p. 22); today it fuels a hyper-vigilance towards extreme right manifestations of racism at the expense of comprehensive awareness and analyses of the country’s racism problem. Contemporary forms and targets of racism are often not seen as such if they fall outside of the realm of antisemitism, right-wing extremism, and bodily violence (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009; Goldberg, 2009; Institut für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011; UN General Assembly Human Rights Council, 2010).

Racism appears in more varied guises in Germany today, with 'culture' taking the place of 'race' per se, or race as a supposed biological reality, in all but the most extreme racist discourse (Chin, 2009, p. 82; Rasmussen, 2011, p. 46). This 'cultural racism' still thrives on essentializing discourses about immutable characteristics of certain groups (Seidel, 2005). In recent years the racialization of Muslims has been a central form of this ‘cultural racism.’ David Theo Goldberg identified a figure of 'the Muslim' circulating in European discourse that illustrates this racialization. This 'Muslim' figure is “a collection of lacks: of freedom; of a disposition of scientific inquiry; of civility and manners; of love of life; of human worth; of equal respect for women and gay people” (Goldberg, 2009, p. 165). In this image, Islam is not a religion that people understand and adhere to in diverse ways as can be said about Christianity, but rather a set of characteristics – unchanging, fixed. These fixed characteristics are exactly the opposite of ‘German democratic values' developed post-war and clung to as central to mainstream German identity today (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009; Ramm, 2010).
Thilo Sarrazin, former finance minister of Berlin and board member of the national bank, made a widely-publicized contribution to this racializing discourse when he argued in his 2010 book *Deutschland schafft sich ab* (‘Germany does itself in’) that Muslims are generally not as smart as Germans, refuse to integrate, and are quickly taking over the country by having more kids than Germans (Follath, August 31, 2010). He was certainly labelled a racist provocateur and slammed for his selective use of statistics to support his claims, but his ideas do have traction among much of Germany society – he expressed a very real popular Islamophobia, and sold a lot of books (Follath, August 31, 2010). Christoph Ramm (2010) illustrated that a 'Muslimization' of Turkish people has been running parallel to the racialization of Muslims: anti-Turkish discourses have shifted in places from those based on inferior culture, to those based on an essentialized Muslim figure much like the one identified by Goldberg. This shifting of racist discourse continues to serve the reproduction of a German identity, conceptualizing “a democratic and secular German identity against a vision of Islam untouched by the Enlightenment and liberal emancipation” (Ramm, 2010, p. 194). The targeted Turks do not even have to be Muslim to be produced by this discourse as “underdeveloped,” not fully part of the German body politic, and therefore targets for assimilation through development. Against this backdrop social scientist Wilhelm Heitmeyer recently found that, “more than 50 percent of people surveyed today say that they would have a big problem moving into an area where many Muslims live” (Heitmeyer, in Spiegel Online, December 14, 2011). Research shows that racialized people are discriminated against in work and education, and are vulnerable to racist attacks of all kinds (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011); the murders committed by the ‘National Socialist Underground’ as well as the murder of
Marwa El-Sherbini in a Dresden courtroom in 2010 illustrate that these attacks are indeed sometimes fatal. This is the racial order that is manifested in spatial relations in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg and, this study will demonstrate, in the IBA Hamburg urban development project.

Race and Space
The *Internationale Bauausstellung* Hamburg is a spatial project. It may seek to impact the social conditions of Wilhelmsburg, and to mobilize discourses of education to do this, as I will discuss in Chapter Three, but its main instrument is space. Though I will look at the relationship between race and space in general and in IBA Hamburg in more detail in Chapter Two, it is necessary to conceptualize the connection between the social and the spatial before approaching the project. Henri Lefebvre (1991) theorized three types of production of space that illustrate the interlocking of the social and the spatial: *representations of space, representational space, and spatial practices*. Each aspect feeds into the others. *Spatial practices* relate to the ways in which space is interpreted and used (Razack, 2002, p. 9). *Representational space* is the realm of art and the imagination, manifested for example in the Wilhelmsburg produced through the films of Hamburg director Fatih Akin. Urban planning operates mainly in the realm of *representations of space*, producing what Lefebvre called 'conceived' space through maps, diagrams, pictures, and words. Representations of space in a sense always operate at the level of *perception*, because they are not “directly lived” (McCann, 1999, p. 172). They nonetheless affect how people understand space and their place in it by influencing spatial practices and representational space. As expressions of the will of the state and of capital, planning initiatives like IBA Hamburg also have the power to transform physical space. Planning produces conceived space using its mapping and
diagramming techniques, techniques that tend to naturalize and normalize hegemonic constructions of geography and identity (Phillips, 1997, p. 45), and then they move out of abstraction into materiality by building that conception brick by brick. The configuration of space in this way is how urban planning pursues the spatialization of life as its goal (Pløger, 2008, p. 61).

The maps, diagrams and drawings that comprise Lefebvre’s idea of representations of space are in fact forms of discourse, as are the words used to describe a space. Discourses produce the objects of which they speak by embodying power, communicating and transmitting power. Discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power (Foucault, 1969/2009, p. 101). As an introduction to the nature and implications of discourse, which I will discuss in more detail in Chapter One, Mele (2000) and Fusté (2010) provide illustrations of the connections between discourse and space. Christopher Mele (2000) explored how trends in thinking shaped approaches to the urban space and people of immigrant, working-class ‘ghettos’ of Manhattan’s Lower East Side in the 1920s and 1930s. Shifts from social reformist to rational planning discourses and thus from the dominance of a discourse of uplift and improvement to a discourse of ‘best land use’ and integration into the larger city system, produced quite different conceptions of who and what the Lower East Side was, and justified and legitimized different spatial and social interventions (Mele, 2000). Dominant discourses produced various definitions of the ‘problems’ of the area and therefore various ‘solutions.’

Fusté (2010) showed how discourses about the degeneracy and incorrigibility of racialized, impoverished bodies in 1950s and 1960s Puerto Rico informed the planning and building of housing geared towards their ‘betterment’ and disciplining. Power-laden
knowledges about who the racialized poor were circulated in discourse and shaped the planning and realization of spatial projects targeting them. In both of these examples a racial order is entrenched, and its expressions through space, and through spatial interventions can be tracked. To quote Jane M. Jacobs, “the processes of urban transformation are part of the means by which a racialised architecture of power – material and ideological – operates” (Jacobs, 1996, p. 72). The necessary problematization, therefore, of urban transformation processes and of the role of discourse in the operation of this racialised architecture of power, forms the basis of my study.

Description of the Study
The following study employs Foucauldian discourse analysis to explore the implication of urban development in a racial order of citizenship. Looking at the current Internationale Bauaustellung Hamburg, the study broadly asks: where is race in this project? How might the project be situated or distinguished from the particular racial political context in Germany? How are Wilhelmsburg and the people who live there produced in and through the intervention of IBA Hamburg? How and why were they marked for this intervention? These are the basic guiding questions determining my inquiry.

The interconnection of race, space, and discourse illustrated briefly above, illustrates that applying critique to discourse can be an effective means of uncovering the functioning of the racial order. Foucauldian discourse analysis identifies the knowledges that are transmitted in discourse in order to reveal some of the power bound up in them. According to this methodology, maps, images, descriptions of space and people are more than passively representative, they are productive “tactical
elements or blocks in [a] field of force” (Foucault, 1976/1990, p. 102). The materials that I take up as data in this study are the public education or marketing materials of IBA Hamburg. These include an extensive website in both German and English, print pamphlets and posters, which are also available on the IBA Hamburg website, the project's newsletter, an online video, and two books produced by IBA Hamburg. In general, the following chapters focus in on particular parts of these materials, and I specify throughout the text which parts those are.

The study has two main focuses, linked together by the guiding questions and view of the reproduction of a racial order of citizenship. In Chapter One I present my methodology of Foucauldian discourse analysis in more detail, establishing both its appropriateness to the questions at hand and the specific steps of how I understood and used it. The first focus is concerned with analysis of the racialization of the space and residents of Wilhelmsburg. To explore this I look at how IBA Hamburg produces the space of Wilhelmsburg in the past, present, and imagined future, and at who and what the residents of these times/spaces seem to be. In Chapter Two I present my findings and discussion on this focus, arguing that IBA Hamburg's materials produce Wilhelmsburg as empty space to be claimed, and Wilhelmsburg residents as a racialized and problematic mass.

The second focus of this study is concerned with analyzing the targeting of Wilhelmsburg residents for 'education' through IBA Hamburg's advocacy of an 'education drive' (Bildungsoffensive) in its project area. In Chapter Three I explore how the racialized people and space of Wilhelmsburg are linked with notions of education by IBA Hamburg, arguing that the discursive production of a need for adult education in particular marks racialized residents as non-citizens whose responsibility it is to
transform themselves into worthy participants in the city (economy) of Hamburg. 'Education' is, like 'integration,' a precondition for inclusion in the German body politic, but also an impossibility. I argue that in this discourse/process, racialized bodies are marked for a permanent condition of studenthood and the white German subject reproduces itself.

Onward
There is a beautifully illustrative moment in the comic film *Soul Kitchen*, a film by Hamburg director Fatih Akin, when two high school friends meet after years and one says his business, the 'soul kitchen,' is in Wilhelmsburg. There is a pause, a beat, and then a look on the blond-haired German friend's face that speaks volumes about exactly what kind of place Wilhelmsburg is understood to be (Akin, 2009). My experience in Hamburg and Wilhelmsburg as a visiting student and intern was that there seemed to be a lot going on, unspoken, under the surface, when it came to race, when it came to Wilhelmsburg, and when it came to articulating visions of the future of Hamburg. This study is my attempt to delve into this space. It is as much an exploration of the methodology of discourse analysis and an enquiry into what can be known about a spatial project when one does not live in it, as it is an assertion that the spatial is never 'only' spatial, and thus can be analyzed on a variety of levels. I am mindful of the benefits of having an outsider's eyes in this study, and of speaking enough German to be able to read and analyze IBA Hamburg's materials and to research the current context in Germany. I am also mindful of the potential limitations, and I have adopted an attitude of curiosity and humility that I hope is reflected in the following chapters. Any mistakes or oversights, though certainly part of the adventure of writing a master's thesis, are entirely mine.
Chapter One
Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

The choice to use Foucauldian discourse analysis as the methodology for this study was a significant one. Like any methodology, it is shaped by values and assumptions about what can and should be studied, and has had implications for the shape the study has taken, its scope, its content and findings. In this chapter I will outline the methodology and methods I employed in this study, discussing my understanding of the central possibilities and demands of Foucauldian discourse analysis and its fit with my research questions. I will then briefly describe how I employed the methodology and the challenges I encountered, concluding with some open questions that the study has prompted.

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis
I began this study with my research questions roughly formed and chose to use Foucauldian Discourse Analysis as a methodology for the way it allowed me to approach those questions. At the core of the approach are Foucault’s understanding of the nature of discourse, and his arguments about the nature and potential of analysis. According to Foucault, discourse refers to “all utterances and statements which have been made which have meaning and which have some effect” (Mills, 2003, p. 53). Discourse can refer to statements in general, or to groups of statements that seem connected to each other, as well as to “unwritten rules and structures” that produce or affect the production of utterances and statements (Mills, p. 52). Discourse is not exclusively comprised of words, it is not only something that is said: a statement can be
in the form of a map or an image (Mills, 2003, p. 67) and Foucault occasionally analyzed paintings in his own work (cf. Foucault, 1961/1988, from p. 279).

Discourse according to Foucault is also more than ‘just’ linguistic or visual content, it does something. Discourses produce the objects of which they speak (Foucault, 1969/2009), because they are forms of practice (Hook, 2001, p. 530) and “tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force” (Foucault, 1976/1990, p. 102). As tactical elements and forms of practice, discourses communicate and transmit power, and can act both as instruments of power and effects of it (Foucault, 1969/2009, p. 101). Derek Hook argues, in an article on Foucauldian discourse analysis that has been important to my understanding of the methodology:

...one should approach discourse less as a language, or as a textuality, than as an active 'occurring,' as something that implements power and action, and that also is power and action. Rather than a mere vocabulary of language, a set of instruments that we animate, discourse is the thing that is done, 'the violence,' as Foucault (1981a) puts it, 'which we do to things' (p. 67)

(Derek Hook, 2001, p. 532). If discourse “is power and action,” then it is crucially important to turn attention to it and to ask how power is expressed, what power, and what it is doing. As I began this study initially from an observation that ‘something is happening with race’ in IBA Hamburg in Wilhelmsburg, the possibility of focusing on the nexus of discourse and power appealed to me in its terms of analysis and for its potential political utility. As discourse is “both constituted by, and ensures the reproduction of the social system,” discourse analysis can enable critique and resistance to that social system and its particular forms of domination and oppression (Hook, 2001, p. 522).

I approach Foucauldian discourse analysis as a tool of critique, and thus indeed as a political practice and a potential practice of resistance. Foucault argued that
“critique is the movement by which the subject gives himself the right to question truth on its effects of power and question power on its discourses of truth” (2003, p. 267). In Foucauldian discourse analysis one seeks to identify discourses, particularly discourses of truth, to question how they came to be uttered as truth, and what effects that has. The ‘analyst’ is directed to ask what is being said in what is said and to explore what what is being said does (Foucault, 1969/2009). To that end, the analyst seeks to identify the “knowledges contained in discourses... and how these knowledges are firmly connected to power relations in power/knowledge complexes” (Jäger and Maier, 2009, pp. 34-35).

The identification and analysis of discourse and its effects is an integral aspect of critique as the “art of not being governed quite so much,” (Foucault, 2003, p. 267); discourse analysis has the potential to shine a light on the power at play in particular discourses at particular moments, in order to get out from under their power effects to the extent possible. Mojab (2009, p. 6) argues for a distinction between critique and being critical, with ‘critique’ as description and ‘critical’ as analysis for change. For me, as the “art of not being governed quite so much,” critique is not merely description, but is disruptive of power relations by its very nature. This was a key factor in my choice of methodology.

**Data and Methods**

Jäger and Maier (2009) offer a short guide to conducting Foucauldian discourse analysis based on the descriptions of discourse and critique developed by Foucault, which I found useful for thinking through the expression of the methodology through methods. Jäger and Maier suggest that the “analyst” works to identify discourses and their structures, and then to analyze typical discourse fragments in detail, asking
themselves what each aspect of the text, whether it be linguistic or visual, means and
implies, and what effects it has (Jäger and Maier, 2009). I began by looking at all of the
IBA Hamburg public education materials that I could access, including:

- the IBA Hamburg website, including web pages, graphics, and project
drawings;
- the 2010 book *Projects and Concepts: Catalogue for the Interim
  Presentation 2010*;
  by Schultz & Sieweke in partnership with IBA Hamburg;
- pdf pamphlets and newsletters linked to the IBA Hamburg website,
  including the 2010 *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln: Infoblatt zur
  Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln – Wie eine Lernlandschaft entsteht*;
- Project documents accessed through the website, including the 2010
  interim project report *IBA Strukturmonitoring 2010 – Endbericht* written by
  the firm Analyse & Konzepte and published by IBA Hamburg, and the
  'quality criteria' *IBA-Exzellenz – Die sieben Qualitätskriterien eines IBA
  Projekts*, and
- the online video *Die Neue Weltklasse: Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln*.

I used Jäger and Maier’s checklist initially to begin my analysis process, initially
reading quite broadly, then slowly narrowing a bit according to what I found most
relevant. First I looked at the structure of the texts, identifying discourse strands and
discursive entanglements, then choosing particularly rich or representative excerpts and
images to analyze in detail. Many but not all of the materials were available in both
German and English, so where possible I read the English version of text first followed
by the German, comparing them for content and meaning. I used many of Jäger and
Maier’s (2009, p. 55) suggested questions to analyze the material, including: What are
the topics in this text and how do they relate to each other? What implications and
allusions does this text or image contain? What collective symbols are used, what references are made? And what, ultimately, are the messages conveyed by the material?

As my analysis progressed I focused in on some of the materials more than others, and on some sections more than others. I favoured ‘texts’ that were particularly rich according to my analysis, and on repeated texts and discourses, as I wondered if repeated materials and discourses might be of particular importance for the IBA Hamburg project. I looked at and read the texts and images repeatedly, highlighting areas of interest, taking notes, and developing a list of what Jäger and Maier call topics and my understanding of the connections, messages and implications. Data collection and analysis were overlapping, as IBA Hamburg continued to produce materials and the more I looked the more I found. My analysis process was cyclical, and I revisited the materials as my analysis developed. This finished product is, in many ways, just the stopping of analysis at a satisfactory level of detail and thoroughness, not an absolute point of completion.

Challenges

One of the challenges in the research process was the limits of my German language skills, which are strong but not fluent. I overcame this challenge by using both the English and German materials where possible, comparing them and noting contrasts, and seeking clarification where I was still unsure or felt it was necessary to confirm my understanding. To do this I used the online dictionary and discussion forum at http://dict.leo.org/, and the Chemnitz University online dictionary at dict.tu-chemnitz.de. For many questions I called on German speaking friends and colleagues (celebrated in the Acknowledgements), particularly colleagues from Hamburg, and was
fortunate to benefit from their thoughtful input and analysis. There is no guarantee that the study is therefore free of misunderstandings, rather I acknowledge that all discourse analysis work is subjective and reliant on interpretation.

A second main challenge in conducting this study turned out to be the changing and moving of IBA Hamburg materials. The extensive IBA Hamburg website was a particular focus of data collection and analysis, and I had collected a large amount of data and notes on the website when in late summer 2011 it moved from www.iba-hamburg.org to www.iba-hamburg.de and transformed dramatically. Much of the data I had collected and saved disappeared in the transformation, in particular many of the sections explicitly characterizing Wilhelmsburg and its residents, which I focus on in Chapter Two. The site layout, design and content also changed extensively, reflecting, in my assessment, a shift in the purpose of the website in relation to the stage of the IBA Hamburg project in advance of its 2013 culmination.

The earlier version of the website contained basic details of the project plans, but primarily focused on exposition of the goals and reasoning behind the project. Persuasion and the building of support for IBA Hamburg seemed to be core purposes of the website at that time. The new version of the website seems to be limited more to details about the individual projects that are part of IBA Hamburg, to a stream of updates about the progress of the projects, and to speaking engagements and events by IBA Hamburg principals. Description of the project themes and goals is still present, but minimally; history of the neighbourhood and of IBA projects is much shorter and selected than on the previous site. There is also now a large section devoted to information for the press and downloads of pictures and documents. On the start page one is requested to select whether one is a ‘visitor,’ ‘expert,’ or ‘journalist.’ Though I
have looked carefully at all three paths, differences in content or access based on one’s choice are not apparent to me, except that if one chooses ‘journalist’ one is taken directly to the press landing page.

It has been interesting to consider in light of these changes Foucault’s assertion that discourse constrains our perceptions (Mills, 2003, p.55). It constrains our perceptions by determining what can and cannot be said within a bounded system of discourse. In the case of the changing website I have observed that the mobilization of certain discourses over or instead of others produces the project IBA Hamburg differently. The new website produces a slicker IBA Hamburg that is more of a current event than a future plan, less in need of approval because of its advanced stage. Regarding the discursive production of Wilhelmsburg and its residents, the new website is situated in the ‘imagined future’ I discuss in Chapter Two.

After the website change, I struggled with a question of whether data from the original site was still relevant and whether analyzing material that is no longer publically available made sense in this study. Because the central concern of this study is discursive production, the conclusion I came to was yes, the discourses analyzed from the defunct website were still relevant and had indeed still been productive, and were therefore still of interest. I also found that some materials I thought I had lost access to – particularly the online video ‘Die Neue Weltklasse: Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln,’ which I analyze in detail in Chapter Three – are still available online clearly labelled as IBA Hamburg productions though not on the IBA Hamburg website.

A third challenge I experienced in this study was inherent in the methodology – the challenge of grappling with how Foucault suggested to analyze discourse. Foucault was
interested in a “pure description of discursive events” (1969/2009, p. 29, emphasis in original). “For Foucault,” wrote Rabinow and Rose, “the most profound thought is that which remains on the surface” (2003, p. xviii). It is enough to explore the manifest level of what is being said, what is not being said and how. One can identify and analyze discourses and the (re)production of truth and power without asking what the speaker ‘really meant to say,’ or what their hidden, even involuntary intent might have been (Foucault, 1991).

Foucault rejected working as though a manifest discourse is just a veil for an underlying meaning. He stressed: “We do not seek below what is manifest the half silent murmur of another discourse” (1969/2009, p. 31). This assertion is one of the defining features of Foucauldian discourse analysis, and, I found, demanded continually asking myself whether I was treating the study as a work of excavation or, more appropriately to the methodology, as one of historicization, contextualization, and interpretation of manifest discourse. My approach has been to take this challenge as a call for reflection at every turn rather than as a demand for an elusive perfect realization of ‘what Foucault would do.’

In the following chapter I begin to introduce the data and my analysis, starting with the production, through IBA Hamburg’s materials, of Wilhelmsburg and its residents.
Chapter Two
Racializing Wilhelmsburg:
The Production of Race and Space in IBA Hamburg

Introduction
In this chapter I will explore how the Internationale Bauaustellung Hamburg – IBA Hamburg – produces the island of Wilhelmsburg and its residents as a space and as bodies arranged in space through discourse. I will argue that IBA Hamburg produces a past, present and future for Wilhelmsburg, a temporal trajectory that moves from past uninhabitable emptiness through present uninhabited emptiness to future full integration into the aspirational metropolis of Hamburg. This trajectory is one of civilization and modernization, culminating in discourses of the potential and opportunity for the future of Wilhelmsburg. Indispensable to this production of space is the co-production of its residents, who are paradoxically produced as non-existent and yet a mass of foreign bodies in the past and present. The future residents of Wilhelmsburg are produced as quite different bodies all together, white bourgeois bodies, suggesting that in the civilization and modernization of Wilhelmsburg the foreign mass disappears. Spaces of education are the exception, and in Chapter Three I will explore IBA Hamburg’s use of education and the production of an ‘integration imperative.’ This chapter will explore the mechanisms and discourses that facilitate the production of Wilhelmsburg as a particular kind of space and its residents as particular kinds of non-citizens.
The Production of Space

Henri Lefebvre argued that urban planning and bureaucracies are agents that produce a *representational or conceived* type of space, through maps, drawings, project plans and so on (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 38; McCann, 1999, 172). This representational form of space, argued Lefebvre, is always abstract, existing in conception rather than in lived spatial practices. And yet this abstract space, produced through discourse, has material effects. If, as Foucault asserted, discourse produces its objects, then the discourses employed by IBA Hamburg as an urban planning and design project produce the space and people of which they speak just as surely as they build physical structures.

Space has a dialectical relationship with the identities and performances within it. Lefebvre emphasized that identity, use of space, and the materiality of space are constantly co-creating each other (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 38-39; McCann, 1999, 168). Using the example of black anti-police-violence protests in Lexington, Kentucky, McCann (1999) extended this to show how the presence and actions of racialized vs. white bodies are more possible in certain spaces, and threaten to transform other, white spaces by transgressing their spatial and performance boundaries. Blomley (2003, 122) likewise asserted that space is produced by the performances that take place within it, while it simultaneously “disciplines the performances that are possible within it.” The plans and actions of IBA Hamburg act upon Wilhelmsburg and its residents within the frame of this dialectic, shaped by residents' identities and spatial practices and shaping how they know themselves as citizens of Hamburg. By seeking to transform Wilhelmsburg as a space, IBA Hamburg seeks to transform what is possible within Wilhelmsburg and who may live there.
IBA Hamburg is very much a mapmaker: a symbolic Cartesian subject that undertakes to map the frontier of Hamburg. The mapmaker, said Kirby, “describes [the land] as much as possible as if he were not there, as if no one is there, as if the island he details exists wholly outside any act of human perception” (1998, 48). IBA Hamburg does this literally as well as symbolically/ discursively: the IBA Hamburg Atlas of Wilhelmsburg (2008) presents and compares a wide array of maps and images of the island, without showing human life within it. Traces of bodies might be guessed at through the labelling of built spaces and infrastructure, but the viewer/reader must know that human labour and demand created the factors and locations being compared: the bodies of residents and builders past and present are not visible.

In this production of Wilhelmsburg as empty, a romantic vision of 'discovery' is mobilized. In the opening paragraphs of Schultz and Sieweke’s (2008) IBA Hamburg Atlas of Wilhelmsburg, managing director of IBA Hamburg Uli Hellweg writes:

...the earliest atlases still in existence date back to the 16th century and are a reflection of the special 'can-do' spirit of their age – a time of discovery and the conquest of new worlds. They also illustrate a new view of past and present – and include the vague contours of what might lie ahead, the as yet undiscovered territories (p. 7).

Hellweg thus obliquely produces Wilhelmsburg as an 'undiscovered territory' like the 'new worlds,' and IBA Hamburg as an agent of intrepid discovery and capability. He also links IBA Hamburg to colonization in an uncritical and adventurous imagining of what this means. Colonization of the 'new worlds' involved a special 'can-do' spirit all right: where I live, in the settler-colonial state of Canada, that spirit displaced and murdered the Indigenous people of the decidedly already 'discovered' territories and continues to systematically oppress Indigenous people today.
The image of colonizing power is one of violent land theft and the extreme marginalization or disappearance of Indigenous people to make this possible. It seems then like a terribly violent but very illustrative choice of a ‘metaphor’ for an urban development project. It conflicts with IBA Hamburg’s self-image: the project touts the importance of resident participation to its planning and development process, saying that “No major decisions are to be made without the support of the people living on the islands” (IBA Hamburg, 2012). Exploration and claiming of ‘undiscovered territory’ is no democratic, participatory process however, on the contrary: “Colonization was from the start arranged hierarchically, not as a meeting between equals: the explorers wish to influence and possess the world they meet, but take great pains to be sure that it will not substantially inform them in return” (Kirby, 1998, p. 49). The discourse of discovery produces a powerful and strapping self-image for the urban developer, and enforces the possibility of the enclosure of Wilhelmsburg while beginning the selective erasure of the Wilhelmsburg resident from the development narrative. In order to gain access and ultimate ownership of the island, it must be produced as an empty space.

IBA Hamburg achieves this in two principle ways: by taking hold of the past of the island and retelling it in a way that naturalizes its uninhabitable emptiness, and by constructing the island as a “metrozone” in the present. A metrozone is uninhabited periphery, border urban space, fallen into disuse and ripe for reclamation (IBA Hamburg, 2011d). It is an urban frontier waiting to be closed (Blomley, 2003). In both the past and present narratives the people living in Wilhelmsburg are not substantially present: they are missing, occasionally in the way, and major events in their history, the
Wilhelmsburg Past

IBA Hamburg acknowledges that there is a psychic and a physical gap to be bridged if it is to pull the island of Wilhelmsburg into the metropolis. When Hellweg refers to the island as “terra incognita for the city’s inhabitants” (in Daldrup & Zlonicky, 2010, p. 115), he reinforces the discourse of exploration and conquest, while at the same time pointing to the separateness of Wilhelmsburg from the city as a whole. “For years the rest of Hamburg was barely aware of the existence of the Elbe islands” (Schultz & Sieweke, 2008, p. 7). Hellweg suggests that this was in part because the islands were:

…like a peg between the development centers of Hamburg and Harburg, strengthening the historically defined and psychologically deeply anchored dichotomy between the Hanseatic north and the Prussian south of the city, forcibly incorporated into the city only in 1935


Wilhelmsburg is historically a literal and symbolic borderland, part of the constitution of a political division on practical and psychic levels. It is also a space that has been conquered before through “forcible incorporation.” The IBA Hamburg atlas of Wilhelmsburg goes on to muse that, in a bit of splendid symbolism, “one of the most popular city plans in Germany, the Falkplan, cuts off Hamburg just south of the harbour.

2 I use “body” in this paper in a similar sense as Kawash (1998), not to denote the person, nor the actual corporeality of the residents of Wilhelmsburg, but rather a contingent corporeality against which meaning is made.
Wilhelmsburg is not shown as part of the city but only on a secondary map, which is rather complicated to find thanks to a patented folding method” (Schultz & Sieweke, 2008, p. 18). To go to Wilhelmsburg is to fall off the map.

IBA Hamburg calls the divide between Wilhelmsburg and the rest of Hamburg “artificial,” but naturalizes certain aspects of it. The story told is a conflicting one: Wilhelmsburg is not naturally good land to live on, but it has been inhabited since the 14th century (IBA Hamburg, 2011c). It is described as great luck that the northern parts of the island were only thinly populated, so that the Hamburg port could build its large container ship docks there in the late 1800s. Yet an area of Wilhelmsburg nearest the container yards went from 5,000 residents in the height of industrialization to 850 in the mid-20th century (IBA Hamburg, 2011e).

Bodies seem to be there and yet not there in Wilhelmsburg’s history. A chapter on the rise of the discipline of urban planning in Hamburg illuminates this:

the geestland (i.e. the higher sandy terrain) is the natural living area for city development... But the marshland is the natural area for work, as its low level facilitates excavation work, for the construction of docks and industrial canals. Urban development kept to this scheme for a very long time.

(IBA Hamburg, 2011f).

Bodies that live in a “natural area for work” are labouring bodies, not living bodies. They cannot possibly be European, Cartesian subjects and thus fully human, because they are marked by their physical labour in industry. “The proper, ideal subject is one with property but no body” said Mohanram (1999, 38); people living in natural areas for work have bodies, but little or no property. Thus they are there and yet not there: on the one hand they simply do not particularly count, on the other they are mentioned when they
are in the way of industrial development. Their presence is an obstacle to be gotten around, as in a colonial venture (see for example Razack, 2002).

The inhabitants of Wilhelmsburg are also produced as having, at certain historical moments, been dangerous to themselves because they lived in uninhabitable areas. In 1962 a storm surge flooded parts of the north coast of Germany and the Netherlands in the middle of a winter night, and 300 people were killed in Hamburg. Over 200 of those were residents of Wilhelmsburg who lived in the lowest-lying northern parts of the islands, and in low-cost housing that was particularly vulnerable. The flood is still within living memory of many people of Wilhelmsburg, and is visible as a trauma in the life of the space, memorialized through monuments and plaques around the island. The event is part of the collective memory of the place and of the people who lived in Wilhelmsburg past and present, and thus has a role in the production of the space and identities of the residents.

Figure 1: Examples of memorialization of the 1962 flood in the Reiherstieg area of Wilhelmsburg
The IBA Hamburg website remembers the flood for its effects on Wilhelmsburg's relationship with Hamburg as a whole. After the flood the state moved to abandon the housing in the most vulnerable, northern part of the island (Reiherstiegviertel), and met with extensive and successful local protest (IBA Hamburg, 2011g). The importance of this turning point in Wilhelmsburg's history is that it seems to mark the beginning of the neglect of the neighbourhood by the city-state, and an escalation of discursive production of the island as a problem place: the “backyard” of the city, where waste is dumped and work is done (IBA Hamburg, 2011g). This positions IBA Hamburg as a new and benevolent intervention, one that can civilize a space that has become uncivil over time via a combination of forces.

A major missing piece in the history of Wilhelmsburg is the years of the Third Reich and post-war occupation by Britain. This stands out as a forty year gap in the timeline of the island that was a feature of IBA Hamburg’s website until mid-2011. By skipping these years IBA Hamburg misses dealing with Wilhelmsburg’s role as a space of enslavement and disciplining of degenerate bodies, and decontextualizes prominent architectural remnants of the Nazi years. It also, interestingly, skips over the imperative to appropriately remember the Nazi past as an ongoing part of German public life (Chin & Fehrenbach, 2009).

During the war years Hamburg was an important centre of the war industries. Many of the port businesses, as well as small businesses and even homes “employed” slave labourers, primarily Eastern Europeans taken from their homes and imported for the purpose (Gedenkstätte Neuengamme, 2011). From 1943-1945 Wilhelmsburg was the site of a “work education camp” (Arbeitserziehungslager), a Gestapo detention
centre that focused on ‘retraining’ slave labourers who had broken rules, resisted, or otherwise not performed as desired.

These camps were often established in close collaboration with companies, because the management wanted to continue using the workers it had reported to the police after their imprisonment. By returning the tortured prisoners to the factories, the system of terror in place at the ‘work education camps’ was intended to also have a disciplinary effect on the entire workforce and especially non-German slave labourers (Gedenkstätte Neuengamme, 2011).

In a system of ‘discipline’ that acted on the bodies and minds of enslaved workers, at least 5,000 people passed through and were tortured there (Gedenkstätte Neuengamme, 2011). The camp was destroyed in a 1945 bombing campaign (Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung Hamburg, 2007). Figure 2 shows a detail of a map of Wilhelmsburg marked with spaces of slavery from 1939-1945 (Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung Hamburg, 2007). Figure 3, in contrast, shows a similar detail marked with IBA Hamburg project locations (IBA Hamburg, 2011h).

Figure 2: Spaces of slave labour in war industry 1939-1945, detail of Wilhelmsburg (Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung Hamburg, 2007).
The choices made of what to map are clearly shaped by the interests of the mappers – the first a researcher into forced labour in Hamburg, and the other an urban development project. This juxtaposition illustrates how the mapmaker in a sense shapes the space they map in their own image. Authors of the Wilhelmsburg Atlas Schultz and Sieweke, an architect and an urban planner/landscape architect, argue that every map carries the individual signature of their authors (2008, p. 12). Maps are not objective renderings of space, but rather subjective and selective. Phillips (1997) states this in much stronger terms, arguing “the power of geographical narrative rests partly on its ability to block other narratives, other maps of geography and identity” (Phillips, p. 67, referencing Said, 1993). Thus as an aspect of production of geographical narrative, the mapmaker’s choice of what to put on the map, what is labelled on the map, renders other features, other histories, and other ‘narratives of geography and identity’ unmappable or unlabelable. Schultz & Sieweke say that maps document “our
understanding of the world," (2008, p. 12), but this understanding and the 'we' behind this 'our' is neither singular nor uncontested.

The dominant narrative of the business and influence of IBA Hamburg in Wilhelmsburg in Figure 3 might, in this conception, be mapped another way entirely. It depends on the mapper and the purpose. In the context of the tabooing of race and racism in Germany, it might be interesting to superimpose the IBA project map and the locations of forced labour in Hamburg on top of each other in order to visually put the history of enslavement of racialized people and the intervention of urban development within the same spatial field. The complexity of Wilhelmsburg would then be 'mapped' in different, and greater, detail.

One of the lasting signs of the Third Reich is the target of an IBA Hamburg project. The anti-aircraft bunker in mid-Wilhelmsburg still stands as an imposing reminder of racist violence and the Second World War. IBA Hamburg is turning it into an "Energy Bunker," a power station from which to produce green energies. Figure 4 shows local kids playing in the playground at the bunker's base (from IBA Hamburg website, 2011); Figure 5 shows an architectural drawing of the bunker's planned transformation through IBA Hamburg (IBA Hamburg GmbH & HHS Planer + Architekten AG, 2012). Note the differences in the bodies depicted: the real bodies of kids of Wilhelmsburg today versus the indistinct, white bodies using the space in the future. The bodiless white subject appears as the future resident.

Figure 6 is a photo I took from the street in July 2011, which shows how the bunker dominates the immediate skyline. My feeling as a visitor was that it has a strong impact on experience of the surrounding space, as a kind of empty monument to
violence. The project of transformation of the bunker does not seem to take up the significations of the monument, but to focus on the innovative use of a large structure that could not be knocked down.

Figure 4: The flak bunker today (IBA Hamburg GmbH, 2011); Figure 5: Architect’s drawing of the future ‘Energy Bunker’ (IBA Hamburg GmbH & HHS Planer + Architekten AG, 2012).

A second major missing piece in IBA Hamburg’s history of Wilhelmsburg is the years of the guestworker program. The program was a key mechanism through which a sizeable minority of Turkish people came to live in Germany, including in Wilhelmsburg (Chin, 2009, p. 80). Beginning in the 1950s, labour migration agreements were signed between Germany and Turkey as well as other Southern European countries, and by the 1970s more than two million guestworkers had come to Germany (Chin, 2009, p. 80). Men were recruited to work in the German industrial boom based on their physical strength and health, especially doing dangerous and dirty work in the port industry. Guestworkers were considered to be entirely separate from the German social body, which made it possible to deal philosophically and practically with the presence of so many people without the same rights as Germans (Chin, 2009, p. 83). Racialized Turkish bodies, many of them Muslim, imported for their labour capacity, began to take up residence in Wilhelmsburg in a period and process that is left out of the history of the
IBA Hamburg. Many Wilhelmsburg residents were formerly guestworkers or have fathers, grandfathers, uncles who were guestworkers.

If, as Lefebvre and Blomley asserted (Blomley, 2003; Lefebvre, 1991), identities and performances are co-producers of space, the bodies of guestworkers performing hard industrial work made a significant contribution to the production of Wilhelmsburg materially and symbolically. The temporary migration of guestworkers was a foundational event in the development of separate racial communities in Germany today, and the lack of accompanying social policy and migrant support is considered key in some of Germany's present struggles with “integration” and social cohesion (Chin, 2009). Yet these stories are missing from IBA Hamburg’s historical account.

Figure 6. Haus der Jugend Wilhelmsburg youth centre seen in the shadow of the bunker
The absence of the people of Wilhelmsburg as acting entities in historical events and processes that IBA Hamburg tells reflects the unidirectional endeavour of mapping that is a central function of the project as it produces a representation of space. The relationship between the mapper and the mapped, between IBA Hamburg and the people of Wilhelmsburg, is unidirectional (Kirby, 1998, p. 48). There can be no information, experience, or detail communicated from the people within the mapped space past and present. This is interesting in contrast to the project that produced the map in Figure 2, for example, which shows the many sites of slave labour in Hamburg during the war and links them to the stories and accounts of real people (Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung Hamburg, 2007). In IBA Hamburg, major points of impact of the mapped space on bodies – points that brought working bodies to Wilhelmsburg, bodies that would be racialized, and points that enslaved and tortured foreign and degenerate bodies – are left out entirely. This serves to block other, more troubling narratives (after Phillips, 1997), narratives in which race figures explicitly, and to produce Wilhelmsburg as empty and available for the taking.

Wilhelmsburg Present

The frontier is the line that separates property and control over the land from an external ambiguity of entitlement (Blomley, 2003, 124). In colonial ventures the frontier advances and moves as white settlers enclose and secure title over land they “discover” and bring under control. The frontier is also the line between the white West and the “savage”; the savage always lays beyond the frontier, evicted or killed as settlers take the land as their property. The frontier is thus a spatial construct, a legal one, and a construct that informs identity: settler versus savage, civilized versus uncivilized (Blomley, 2003). The frontier remains active and important in urban areas. Discourses
of property in the city rely on notions of inside and outside and marginal space against which other spaces can be measured (Blomley, 2003, p. 135). IBA Hamburg constructs Wilhelmsburg today as just beyond the frontier, a “no man’s land” that is neither inside Hamburg nor fully outside.

Mobilization of images like the “border” and “urban periphery” draw on the historical positioning of Wilhelmsburg as part of a political and psychological borderland to produce it today as a rough, unfinished place available to be developed. In many cities this marginal space against which property is defined is the inner city: “the inner city becomes discursively constituted as an urban wilderness of savagery and chaos, awaiting the urban homesteaders who can forge a renaissance of hope and civility” (Blomley, p. 125). In IBA Hamburg the urban wilderness is defined as a “metrozone” and symbols such as borderlines and rough edges are used in text and images to produce Wilhelmsburg as potentially of the future metropolis but needing to be drawn into it, an unfinished place available to be developed. The metrozone is defined like this:

Many European metropolises have spaces like this, often on the edges of the inner cities: derelict industrial sites and workers' housing, long since abandoned by the workers. These areas offer completely new opportunities for urban development.

(IBA Hamburg, 2011d).

As a liminal space Wilhelmsburg is both inside Hamburg and yet peripheral, of the metropolis and yet needing to be drawn into the metropolis. The run-down parts of Wilhelmsburg stand in for the multi-faceted whole. Derelict and abandoned space is highlighted and extensive active industrial sites and inhabited workers' housing is left out, not to mention farm and parklands and other community uses of space. Wilhelmsburg is thus emptied of its residents and produced as a “no man's land.” This is
an exercise of enclosure, as per Blomley (2003): a no man's land is negative space, unused, uncultivated, and thus needs to be claimed as property of the city-state by IBA Hamburg. It is also a discursive strategy that sets limits of what can be said about Wilhelmsburg, as it is a "no man's land."

Goldberg (1993, p. 185) and Razack (2002, p. 3) have both emphasized how the creation of myths of emptiness have been essential in the conquest of racialized spaces. The doctrine of *terra nullius*, empty land, supported British colonialism and allowed colonizers to pull off the double move of claiming the empty land as their property while simultaneously defining those who would be outside of the colony – those who were not Christian, commercial, agricultural, et cetera (Razack, 2002, p. 3). Goldberg (1993) drew on the example of South Africa to make the same point: "Conquering space is implicated in and implies ruling people. The conquest of racialized space was often promoted and rationalized in terms of (where it did not itself prompt) spatial vacancy" (p. 185). IBA Hamburg's interventions in Wilhelmsburg are promoted and rationalized on exactly those terms: the land is not currently put to valid use, has not been properly enclosed and put to use in the past, and the people who live there are scarce and savage-like, not fully part of the Hamburg, Germany body politic.

Indeed according to IBA Hamburg a metrozone like Wilhelmsburg does not even "exist per se," it exists as *a result of its functions* (2010, p. 107). This is a remarkable spatial manifestation of what Mbembe (2004) referred to as "superfluity." Superfluity, according to Mbembe (2004, p. 374) is the produced condition of black bodies in the South African context: they are completely expendable and yet indispensable to the production of wealth. Wilhelmsburg (and, I will demonstrate, its residents) are
expendable and yet indispensable. Examples from the interim presentation catalogue and the IBA atlas of Wilhelmsburg:

All kinds of programs have been dumped onto the island for decades. This was literally waste, but also undesirable elements from the city of Hamburg, such as vast logistic centres, loud harbour-related functions or evacuated immigrants. Prejudice against Wilhelmsburg grew. The resulting spatial and social cacophony complicates the desire to find a coherent logic for the whole island

(Schultz & Sieweke, 2008, p. 139).

With its large housing complexes, a waste disposal site, and a sewage plant, Wilhelmsburg assumed major urban tasks, which once again entailed profound changes of the landscape


As superfluous space, Wilhelmsburg performs indispensable but base functions – dumping, storage, shipping, reception of the unwanted of all kinds. It can be poisoned and polluted, and yet is integral to the functioning of the city and its economy. This treatment of Wilhelmsburg as Hamburg’s backyard echoes Jennifer Nelson’s (2002) discussion of the location of a dump in Africville in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Nelson argues that “racial minority spaces frequently come to house the wastes of society, be they pollutants from industrial manufacturing, sewer systems and garbage disposal areas, or houses for others deemed undesirable” (2002, p. 219). The moving of a dump into Africville, like the location of industry and dumping of toxic wastes in Wilhelmsburg, encouraged a “self-fulfilling prophecy” of the increased identification of the space and people with the “waste of the white community” (p. 218). This linkage is a feature of the production of a racial order of citizenship: “Garbage, by definition, is material that is

3 The reference to ‘evacuated immigrants’ appears only in the English version of the text, and it is unclear to which immigrants they are referring.
useless, has been thrown out. It is not a legitimate part of your space. It must be taken away from where you live, to another place” (2002, p. 220). Wilhelmsburg, like Africville, is “another place,” outside of the white community, legitimately and even naturally a waste receptacle. It is also again a space of work, with labouring bodies performing work for the city as a whole.

This superfluous space is lamented as ‘incoherent,’ provoking anxiety it seems particularly on the part of the IBA Hamburg Atlas authors who note “spatial and social cacophony” above, and wonder, “if the porous urban tissue will not serve as a coherent structure, could it not be the landscape?” (Schultz & Sieweke, 2008, p. 78). Wilhelmsburg is again produced as a mismanaged kind of space: a quality associated with the kinds of bodies that inhabit the space, as I will address below. The expressed anxiety produces a pivotal role for IBA Hamburg in harnessing and developing the metrozone and imposing coherent spatial structure.

Wilhelmsburg as such a frontier appears in relation to a metropole that is also discursively produced in IBA Hamburg materials. The metropolis is both symbolic and material, produced as a current reality and as an aspirational future for the city of Hamburg with particular qualities and kinds of people living there.

A metropolis is a truly “big” city. It is home to creative people, the doers and the tireless, those in whom hopes are vested, reformers and mavericks. Where trends emerge, ideas are born, conflicts resolved and powers unleashed. Metropolises are the research laboratories for co-existence

(IBA Hamburg, 2011i).

IBA Hamburg imagines the metropolis as diverse and energetic, productive, and vested with a specific kind of active citizen. But the metropolis also has problems:
These cities have charm and charisma – and some pressing problems. How to cope with the pressures of globalization without sacrificing their traditions? How can a metropolis be an economic success and still remain a place for all cultures and layers of society? How can we prevent the urban community in all its diversity from disintegrating – and with it the loss of innovative energy generated by the disparate?

(IBA Hamburg, 2011i).

In the metropolis, globalization seems to threaten traditions, economic success conflicts with being a place for all, and the “disparate” (inequality?) generates innovative energy. The “urban community” is produced as a unit containing diversity that is a threat to its own integrity. The metropolis is produced through the identification and claiming of difference (racialization), constructing itself “as a ‘we,’ not by requiring that ‘they’ fit into a ‘standardised pattern,’ but by the very requirement that they ‘be’ culturally different” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 96). To this extent the metropolis already exists: Hamburg is a metropolis in which Wilhelmsburg embodies diversity and threat. If, however, the “creative people, the doers and the tireless, those in whom hopes are vested, reformers and mavericks” are already in residence, they are not featured.

Mbembe (2004, p. 373) argues that the metropolis has always been linked in European thought to the idea of civilization and capitalist rationalization. In IBA Hamburg the metropolis is locked in intense capitalist competition: “cross-border, intercontinental, economic and cultural competition” (2011h), competition that is naturalized and produced as inevitable. Wilhelmsburg’s role in the metropolis, particularly as port space, is claimed within this frame of competition: “the Elbe islands and port belong together,” (IBA Hamburg, 2011j); Wilhelmsburg is reproduced in a position of (indispensable/expendable) service to the metropolis.
The invocation of urban marginality through the concept of the metrozone signals part of IBA Hamburg's development strategy for Wilhelmsburg. The peripheral space is to be eliminated, “wiped away” both materially and symbolically (Goldberg, 1993, p. 189). The periphery will be drawn into the future metropolis and into modernity through IBA Hamburg. Lefebvre names this process in another way, as absorption of difference and heterogeneity: “sooner or later...the existing center and the forces of homogenization must seek to absorb all such differences” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 373). In IBA Hamburg the absorption of differences is indeed produced as a metropolitan process, involving on the one hand the claiming of ‘diversity’ as a hopeful opportunity, and on the other hand the expulsion of those who are a threat to the coherence of the city. According to Ahmed (2000, p. 100) both contribute and are necessary to the constitution of the nation, a process I will discuss in more detail Chapter 3. In the following section I will demonstrate how this is a racial project that, in IBA Hamburg, sets the terms of inclusion and eviction from the Hamburg, Germany body politic.

**Foreign bodies: The residents of Wilhelmsburg**

The way in which IBA Hamburg discursively produces the residents of Wilhelmsburg present and future interlocks with the production of the space to shape a vision of what needs to be done on the island, and to signal who the citizen is who will live in the Wilhelmsburg of the future. Current residents are produced as a racialized mass through terms of ‘diversity,’ ‘culture,’ and ‘foreignness.’ They are linked with conflict and superfluity (Mbembe, 2004) and marked for education as a way into modern, German personhood. In IBA Hamburg's vision of the future, these racialized bodies appear only in spaces of education, and the bourgeois white subject takes the central position.
In the materials on IBA Hamburg’s website through to the mid-2011 website redesign, Wilhelmsburg residents appear in two main discursive forms: as a racialized, abstracted mass, and as a handful of token bodies in ethnic costumes. In both of these forms they are linked with conflict and social segregation. The following excerpt of IBA Hamburg’s description of its guiding “cosmopolis” theme is typical of how Wilhelmsburg residents are represented:

As the diversity of cultures in our cities increases, so too do the conflicts: and segregation is a close companion to diversity. But where different cultures and lifestyles come up against each other, at the borderlines and rough edges of the urban community, opportunity beckons: The combination of different views and ideas creates something really new – new ideas, products and attitudes to life. For that to happen, the divides that threaten to appear in the metropolis must be overcome. The Elbe islands, where people from over 40 different nations share 28 square kilometres, can show how different cultures and viewpoints may develop a common civic pride

(IBA Hamburg, 2011k).

As most of the website to 2011, this paragraph is a portrait of IBA Hamburg’s vision of Wilhelmsburg, of itself as a project, and of the future metropolis. Residents of Wilhelmsburg are marked within the “diversity of cultures,” and within the “different cultures and viewpoints,” and are spatially located at the edges of a singular yet diverse “urban community.”

They are produced as inherently prone to conflict and as divided, in a relation that is naturalized through the ‘as… so too’ structure. In an example of what Foucault called claims to nature, a kind of discourse to which he urged particular attention, “segregation” is produced as a natural by-product of “diversity” (racialization). Two aspects of this are particularly powerful: the linking of race and segregation without explicit analysis or critique, thus appealing to a common sense, and the very raising of the spectre of “segregation.” The spectre of segregation is so potent in German public
discourse that it needs only to be gestured towards to produce Wilhelmsburg residents as segregated by country of origin, speaking only their mother tongues, and not participating in German society.

This image of the racialized other has great currency in the ‘Integrationsdebatte’, so much so that it has its own term: the “parallel society” (Parallelgesellschaft). The Parallelgesellschaft is both a fearsome potential and a frantically lamented reality of social separation, with the blame for separation typically understood to rest on the racialized other. The Wilhelmsburg resident is produced as potentially or already contributing to this naturally-occurring phenomenon. Drawing attention to the racially marked mass it is engaging with, IBA Hamburg signals clearly but without detail the racial nature of its project. This excerpt in particular is a beautiful illustration of restrictions and rules of discourse after Foucault (see Mills, 2003, 54): diversity, cultures, internationality, can all be discursively linked with conflict and segregation while the taboo against talking about race and race relations is scrupulously observed.

Residents are produced as a vague mass in the above paragraph and where they are (indirectly) referred to elsewhere in IBA Hamburg materials, with an effect that is de-personalizing and de-specifying. With terms like “cultures” and “lifestyles” producing them as a vague mass, residents seem to be identified quite directly with the space itself, ‘coming up against each other’ just as the margins touch the centre, themselves embodying spatial segregation. As a “diversity of cultures” they are themselves conflict. And yet in a formation reflective of Ahmed’s (2000) analysis of the multicultural society, they embody simultaneously this threat and a “diversity” that can potentially be incorporated and consumed. Ahmed argues that multiculturalism can allow “differences that can be neutralised and accommodated,” but rejects as a betrayal
and a threat other differences that “challenge the supposedly universal values upon which that culture is predicated” (i.e. segregation and division here) (2000, p. 110, emphasis in original). Thus “the divides that threaten to appear in the metropolis must be overcome,” and this is possible through consuming the potential for creating “something really new – new ideas, projects, and attitudes to life” that residents embody (IBA Hamburg, 2011k).

Wilhelmsburg residents appear as concrete people only in occasional photos in which they are depicted performing in costume, either dancing, parading, or playing music. The visual discourses are of the exotic and colourful, at the level of superficial cultural difference. Costume vividly illustrates the residents’ “diversity,” and they are produced particularly as Turkish. In one of the few photos, young girls are shown dressed in Turkish folk costume and are dancing in a parade while neighbourhood adults, many of them women in hijab, look on. The caption reads: “Graceful and foreign. Some people are bothered by the customs and demands of various ethnic groups – 'Cosmopolis' promotes tolerance and inter-group ties” (IBA Hamburg, 2011k).
Residents are again accompanied by conflict, and the threat of segregation is raised through the need for “inter-group ties,” which IBA Hamburg will promote. Yet the consumable aspect of the stranger – ‘grace,’ the cultural performance – is also present. Ahmed (2000, p. 106, emphasis in original) notes that “those cultural forms that are ‘more acceptable’ are precisely those that may look different, but are in fact the same underneath.” The photo and caption here open a question of whether the (Turkish) Wilhelmsburger is perhaps enough like a German under their dress (Ahmed, p. 106) that “inter-group ties” are possible and desirable.

And yet the “foreignness” of Wilhelmsburgers is foregrounded and reproduced, perversely through the marking of the bodies of little girls. “Tolerance” is something that might be had for the figure of the Muslim, the “collection of lacks” (Goldberg, 2009, p. 165) that is foreign and demanding, with bothersome customs. The costumed girls stand in for the bodies of residents more generally, who are produced as non-German through the text and as Muslim through the image. It is the female body that encodes boundaries and reveals difference here, to use the words of Mohanram (1999, p. 61), especially when girls and women in hijab are depicted.

The “foreign” marker deserves special attention because as well as being racializing, it marks material exclusion from the German body politic. Despite fairly recent policy changes, entitlement to German citizenship remains based primarily on *jus sanguinis* – citizenship based on ethnic descent – and many of the residents of Wilhelmsburg (33%) are not German citizens (Ehrkamp, 2006, 1673; Statistisches Amt für Hamburg und Schleswig-Holstein, 2010, 52). Thus the Wilhelmsburg resident as a marginal non-citizen is a mixture of symbolism and literal material reality.
Of fifty IBA Hamburg project drawings, only one shows bodies that resemble the racialized Wilhelmsburg resident. All of the architectural projects – the sustainable housing, the renovations, the Energy Bunker – seem to be accompanied by white, bourgeois subjects identifiable by their colour, clothing, and symbols of wealth. The education centre is the one project in which people of colour and women in hijab are visible, suggesting that racialized Wilhelmsburgers have a particular place as ‘learners’ and consumers of education, which will be discussed in the next chapter. Even this visual representation changed with the website redesign: Figure 8 shows the depiction of the education centre to 2011; Figure 9 shows the drawing now exclusively featured in the project website’s exposition of the centre.

This centre will be called the “Gateway to the World,” (Tor zur Welt) a motto often used for the city of Hamburg. The story told in these two ‘visualizations’ is one of transformation of the space and of the population, from the racialized mass of “conflict” and “diversity” today, to a future white, bourgeois resident. Figure 10 below shows one of many architectural visualizations of future housing and the kind of people who will inhabit it.

“Whiteness,” said Radhika Mohanram, “has the ability to move; second, the ability to move results in the unmarking of the body. In contrast, blackness is signified through a marking and is always static and immobilizing” (1999, p. 4). It is the marked body that is produced in IBA Hamburg’s descriptions of Wilhelmsburg. Residents are marked as diverse, as cultural, and as foreign. These bodies are not immobilized in the sense that they cannot leave Wilhelmsburg – they may very well have to as a result of rising rents. The bodies of Wilhelmsburg residents are discursively immobilized: they do not seem to act, but solely to be attached to the space, and to other people’s
perceptions of them. They are marked by a quality of inherent difference, inactivity and marginality.

(Fig. 8, above) The ‘Gateway to the World’ educational centre as imagined in 2010 and 2011 materials. (Fig. 9, below) the version of the rendering used on IBA Hamburg’s website as of July 2012 (Both images by Architekten und Breimann & Brunn Landschaftsarchitekten, 2011 & 2012).

In this produced condition, Wilhelmsburg residents embody Mbembe’s (2004) ‘superfluity.’ As a problematic racialized mass they are expendable, while as workers – servants of the city of Hamburg – they have been and continue to be indispensable. The
industrial buildings and old workers’ housing that IBA Hamburg argues defines Wilhelmsburg as a metrozone was built and powered by racialized bodies labouring in the production of wealth for the city. They worked in the port industries that embody the very nature of the city of Hamburg, and their presence built Wilhelmsburg spaces like the red brick dockworkers housing in Rieherstieg that is being renovated by IBA Hamburg (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 49). They have been indispensible ‘willing’ and forced labour.

Racialized bodies were also expendable in the space of Wilhelmsburg: employed in dangerous jobs, sent home after a few years as guestworkers, and replaced by automatization of port operations (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 17). The years of the Third Reich brought the ultimate in expendability, with racialized people murdered and worked to death. And again these racialized bodies remain indispensible today as the other against which the “German” continues to be defined, labouring in undesirable and informal industries, exposed to greater risk of poverty and death, and constituting the imagined multicultural nature of the nation, for some. Though they are not apparently the subjects of Wilhelmsburg’s future according to IBA Hamburg, the metropolis thrives on the presence of racialized bodies in the conflicts that are imagined to be resolved, and the coexistence of “cultures and interests” (IBA Hamburg, 2011i). The superfluous bodies of Wilhelmsburg are a shadow presence in the future metropolis, called, as I will show in the following chapter, to pursue a precarious, conditional citizenship through a process of ‘integration’ and education.
Conclusion

The paradox and tension that Mbembe captured in the concept of superfluity is an effective way of summing up the overarching quality of both space and bodies of Wilhelmsburg produced by IBA Hamburg. Both are endlessly available to be manipulated: the land, through development and redevelopment according to the shifting goals and needs of the city of Hamburg; the people, through a combination of exclusion and 'education' to take up particular positions within the economy and body politic. The focusing of the city’s gaze on the superfluous Wilhelmsburg through IBA Hamburg does not promise to transform the superfluity into full inclusion, but rather exemplifies a ‘changing face’ of superfluity in public discourse in Germany. A racial order of power and citizenship is still present – in the circulation of neo-colonial discourses, in the characterization and enclosure of the ‘problem neighbourhood’ as
frontier, and in the production of people as a racialized mass. In this way Wilhelmsburg remains a working space that is available to be harnessed at the city's will, but not just for dumping of waste – this time for the settlement of middle-class people and capital. In the following chapter I will explore where today's residents of Wilhelmsburg 'go' in this process of 'development.'
Chapter Three

“The divides that threaten to appear in the metropolis must be overcome”: IBA Hamburg’s ‘Education Drive’

The IBA Hamburg claims to be much more than ‘just an exhibition’ (IBA Hamburg, 2011). Though its mission is to “show the future,” (2011a) the ‘showing’ is an active intervention into spatial and social relations. Part of this intervention is educational, in the form of a Bildungsoffensive, an ‘education drive,’ aimed at the residents of Wilhelmsburg. In this chapter I will continue the discourse analysis of IBA Hamburg materials, with a particular focus on the goals, purposes and methods of the Bildungsoffensive as they are produced in parts of the IBA Hamburg website, books, a newsletter, and a brochure. I will go into particular depth about a short video produced by IBA Hamburg on the education drive: “Die Neue Weltklasse: Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln” (‘the New World Class: Elbe Islands Education Drive’) (IBA Hamburg, 2008).

I will argue that with the education drive IBA Hamburg builds on the foundation of its production of Wilhelmsburg as racialized space and Wilhelmsburgers as racialized people to target residents for ‘integration’ through education. I will explore what the project’s materials say about why education is mobilized, who is to be educated, and what the goals of that education seem to be. To do this I will engage with the educational concepts employed by IBA Hamburg and problematize the concept of ‘integration’ in depth. I will discuss the production of Wilhelmsburg residents as ‘dis-integrated,’ the proposed consumption of their difference, and the coinciding production of a good, white German subject. I will argue that in its materials IBA Hamburg discursively produces an ‘integrative education’ that is treated as a self-evident good,
the contours and effects of which are in fact disciplinary and reproductive of the racial order in the context of real inequality of racialized people in Germany.

The *Bildungsoffensive*: Wilhelmsburg as a ‘Learning Landscape’

Why has an architectural, urban planning project taken up a special focus on education? IBA Hamburg identifies this question itself in a brochure on the education drive (von Kalben et al, 2008) and on the new version of its website (IBA Hamburg, 2012a) where it asks “Eine Bauaustellung macht Bildung – warum?” (‘A building exhibition does education – why?’). The explicit answers are stated as values and as goals, tending not to answer why IBA Hamburg in particular is engaging in an education drive, but rather stating certain discourses about why education is important generally. They argue that good educational offerings should be publicly available to all people in a city for example, and continue: “one of the challenges of the metropolis of today is to achieve future-oriented educational opportunities for all people living here” (IBA Hamburg, 2012b, my translation). The project sees a role for itself in addressing this challenge:

> To redesign entire neighbourhoods into a ‘learning landscape’ – that’s the ambitious task of the ‘Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln’ (Elbe Islands Education Drive). The aim of this cross-section project by the IBA Hamburg is to create educational opportunities with far-reaching integrative effects on the neighbourhoods and at the same time promote education as a decisive location factor to the outside world


At an explicit level this does not so much answer ‘why’ as ‘how,’ but produces a guiding discourse: Wilhelmsburg must be “redesigned” because it is not currently a “learning
landscape,” because “integration” is desired, and because it should be attractive to the outside world.

But what is a “learning landscape”? From IBA Hamburg’s description it seems to be a place with an abundance of good quality education. A brochure on the initiative states for example that in a learning landscape educational institutions and workers are connected, there are ‘lifelong learning spaces’ close to home, there is qualitative improvement of educational experiences and spaces, and there are spaces of ‘encounter’ where the “potentials” of citizens, such as multilingualism and cultural diversity, are used and supported (von Kalben et al, 2008, p. 2). As well as emphasizing potential cooperation between educational institutions and locating its role as a networker/facilitator in that capacity, through the mention of multilingualism and cultural diversity a particular focus begins to emerge for the education drive: the ‘learning landscape’ is connected to integration. “Through the improved learning landscape the societal integration chances of residents should be raised and the Elbe Islands made more attractive as a living location” (von Kalben, 2008, p.1, my translation).

Donovan Plumb (2005) argues that spatial/educational concepts – like the ‘learning landscape’ or the ‘Learning City’ he focuses on – have taken off as ideas to guide urban development (p. 1). Education initiatives under the ‘learning space’ umbrella are often primarily oriented towards integrating people and spaces into the global capitalist economy, he argues, and should be approached with suspicion (Plumb, 2005, p. 2, 4). Given the extreme inequality that characterizes capitalism – inequality that is racially ordered – and indeed the systemic production of “surplus humanity” in capitalism, Plumb questions the ethics and effects of such spatial/educational concepts, and their potential to contribute to polarization in urban life (Plumb, 2005, p. 1, 2).
Enhancing the competitiveness of German cities in the global economy is indeed a central goal of contemporary large urban development projects, of which IBA Hamburg is one (Daldrup & Zlonicky, 2010, p. 11). While the building and spatial interventions of IBA Hamburg focus on physically transforming Wilhelmsburg, the education drive focuses directly on transforming the residents towards the same goal of increased participation in Hamburg’s and the global economy. Oberbaudirektor Jörn Walter pointed to this in his introduction to the project’s Catalogue for the Interim Presentation:

The technological leap into the information ages, the globalisation of economy, climate change, the internationalisation of urban society, and population development represent new challenges for cities… they require new ways of thinking and different images of the future about the role and function of the city in a knowledge-based and sustainable service society (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 7).

From IBA Hamburg’s perspective a shift is required from Wilhelmsburg’s past function as a space of work and waste in the industrial era, towards a residential and recreational role in the future, “knowledge-based” metropolis. While the space is transformed to take up its future role through building and new uses of space, the residents are to be transformed through education: current residents are to be ‘integrated,’ and new residents attracted to the neighbourhood. The 'learning landscape’ is thus as much about the landscape as the people in it. In order to identify who is targeted, I will now turn again to how Wilhelmsburg residents are produced in IBA Hamburg within the framework of the Bildungsoffensive in particular.
Education for Whom? The Dis-integrated Immigrant

Whereas many of IBA Hamburg’s materials produce the residents of Wilhelmsburg as absent or as a problematic mass as discussed in the previous chapter, within the framework of the Bildungsoffensive the possibility appears that residents might be gainfully transformed. The production of residents as an inherently problematic mass of bodies does not disappear, but is discursively linked to the need for and possibility of education. The discursive lynchpin is ‘integration,’ and the production of Wilhelmsburg residents as dis-integrated⁴, ultimately in keeping with Sara Ahmed’s (2000) assertion of the roles of ‘others’ in the production of the (white) nation. The Bildungsoffensive goals of “integrative effects” and “social integration” (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 33; von Kalben, 2008, p. 1) signal the dis-integration of Wilhelmsburg residents. This production is comprised of spatial location, un- and under-education, and racial otherness in the guises of ‘migration’ and ‘diversity.’ Education is both an indicator and a means of integration.

An education drive searches not only for new pedagogic and conceptual ways to improve the educational situation in quarters characterized by migration, rather there will also be new, trend-setting educational facilities built in the context of the IBA Hamburg (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 11-13, emphasis added).

In this statement from the CEO of IBA Hamburg, a need for improvement of the educational situation is linked to the nature of Wilhelmsburg as a space. Wilhelmsburg is produced as a “[quarter] characterized by migration;” educational need is embedded

⁴ With this term I hope to convey that positioning outside of integration is a complex construction and judgment of value and belonging that serves particular purposes, rather than an objective, quantifiable condition.
in the place itself, as the place and the people inhabiting it are one and the same. This is the basis for the ‘learning landscape.’ Wilhelmsburg is currently a landscape of un/der-education.

This productive discursive knot of Wilhelmsburg equalling migrants and migrants equalling un/der-education depends on unsaid content as much as what is said (Jäger & Maier, 2009). It points to German public discourse about immigrants and integration, in which immigrants are often produced as less educated and at times even less smart (cf. Sarrazin’s racist thesis, 2010). An assumption is also reflected that there is a role for the state – the city-state of Hamburg through IBA Hamburg – in educating the un/der-educated immigrant. Interestingly here ‘the Immigrant,’ or rather a disembodied “migration,” is conflated with all Wilhelmsburg residents, contributing to the full racialization of the space and all of its residents. I am arguing throughout this thesis that it is indeed important that more than half of adult residents and three quarters of young people of Wilhelmsburg are perceived or categorized as not White. IBA Hamburg uses this characterization unevenly and productively in its materials, ignoring it in some places and highlighting it in others. “Characterized by migration” serves here as a shorthand explanation for the need for the education drive.

When expanding on the education drive elsewhere, the significance of Wilhelmsburg’s characterization by “migration” is made explicit: the Bildungsoffensive section of an IBA book argues that “generally speaking the migrant population’s level of education is lower than that of the native German population” (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 25). Furthermore,
Social segregation in urban society is nowhere more obvious than in the questions of educational opportunities, participation in education and educational success. The socio-spatial image of our cities perfectly matches the educational profile


Wilhelmsburg residents are again discursively linked with “social segregation” here, a link that confirms their dis-integration as much as the produced lower-level of education does. Education is also inscribed as a defining feature of integration and dis-integration, and of the “socio-spatial image” of the neighbourhood in relation to Hamburg, an image that is racialized and generally negative (the “crisis quarter,” “social flashpoint,” and so on). In fact, as the previous chapter details, the socio-spatial image of Wilhelmsburg produced by IBA Hamburg itself is one of original emptiness and un-inhabitability followed by problems, chaos, and conflict attached to working, racialized bodies and space. For an educational profile to “perfectly match” this negative image reinforces both the image and the necessity of intervention, while again producing residents as a mass undifferentiated from each other but starkly differentiated from the rest of Hamburg.

The “educational profile” of Wilhelmsburg, linked to the ‘migration’ characterization of its residents, is described in this way:

The residents of the neighbourhoods Veddel and Wilhelmsburg are young, culturally diverse, financially weak by comparison, and often ‘uneducated.’ Many of the youth leave school without a diploma, there are considerably less high school graduates than on average in Hamburg, and a high percentage of the students have not even completed secondary school. As a consequence of the given circumstances, many children and youth from families with low income and a poor educational background cannot take advantage of their potential

(IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 35).
The educational “circumstances” seem to be bleak: families with “poor educational background” producing children and youth who are less likely than average to graduate from any tier of high school. “‘Uneducated’” is, interestingly, located within quotation marks, suggesting it is not meant as an absolute, or perhaps means ‘so-called uneducated.’

Viewed with the rest of the paragraph it produces an image of residents who are uneducated in comparison to the whole or the average. Combined with ‘cultural diversity’ it produces a racialized/immigrantized group again, and points to a discourse of the dis-integrated immigrant, a public discourse with a good deal of currency in the German ‘integration debate’ (cf. Güvercin, 2011; Kaddor, 2010; Ramm, 2010). As a result of this dis-integration Wilhelmsburg residents cannot achieve their potential.

This “profile” is not very different from the one I presented in the preface to this paper, in which I wrote about the education and employment situation of Wilhelmsburg in comparison to Hamburg, and demographics of the neighbourhood. The differences lie in contextualization and in which part of the profile is problematized. The “educational profile” offered by IBA Hamburg above problematizes the “given circumstances,” the un/der-education itself. It problematizes a poverty and lack of education of immigrant families as producing a lack of support for high school graduation. Situated within the broader web of discursive production in IBA Hamburg materials, it produces ‘migrantness’ and having ‘migration background’ as the source of this educational

\[\text{\footnotesize\ref{footnote5}}\]

\footnote{The word used in the German version of the text is \textit{Bildungsfern}, which does not have a satisfying English translation without the kind of negative connotation that ‘uneducated’ has when the quotation marks are left out.}

\[\text{\footnotesize\ref{footnote6}}\]

\footnote{By ‘immigrantized’ I mean treated as or produced as immigrant, regardless of actual migration history. Part of the production of racialized people as \textit{outsiders} to Germany is the common conflation of the racial mark with immigrant status, such that the racialized person can never originate from within Germany, even when they do (see Asumang below on this).}
profile. In the absence of any statement to the contrary, un/der-education is naturalized as a feature of migrants, it is just ‘how things are:’ the need for integrative education is discursively located within the migrant nature of Wilhelmsburg as a space and people. Being ‘uneducated’ is a cause and a marker of dis-integration.

The location of un/der-education within the Wilhelmsburg resident highlights one way in which the discourses of education and integration are interwoven: the faultiness of the immigrant body/mind when it comes to getting educated is treated as a reason for endeavours like ‘integrative education,’ and also as an obstacle in the way of both integration and education. Thus the educational profile and socio-spatial image recall Ramm’s (2010) discussion of “the drama of ‘non-integrated Turkish Muslims,’” a drama that he argues plays and replays whenever:

controversies over headscarves or the building of a mosque arise, or whenever cases of violence against Muslim women occur, real or supposed religious extremists are exposed, or the lack of socioeconomic and educational participation among marginalized Turkish-German groups is addressed (Ramm, 2010, p. 191-192).

This drama is a sensationaHy negative story about dis-integrated ‘immigrants’ and, at its core, about the terrible difficulty of ‘integrating’ the problematic Racial Other. A recurring part of integration discourse (it ‘plays and replays’), the drama feeds calls for integration, and thus also for ‘integrative education.’ Ramm argues that in German public discourse Turkish immigrants are produced, particularly through focusing on an essentialized ‘Muslimness,’ as an underdeveloped group in need of the “development aid” of integration (2010, p. 194). In IBA Hamburg the drama of the un/der-educated of Wilhelmsburg, concentrated in a space “characterized by migration,” seems to produce a similar message: Wilhelmsburg residents are targeted for “development aid,” with
education as both a marker and means of development. The educational drive’s fields of action: language support, graduation, connections, lifelong learning, and cultural education (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 35) will provide that development aid.

It is possible, of course, to problematize the so-called ‘educational profile’ differently, in terms of the real material inequality of migrants and racialized people in Germany, inequality that recalls Foucault’s (2003a) assertion that in the realm of biopower, racism manifests as increased exposure to death. “Death” need not only take place by murder though that is certainly one way; Foucault includes “every form of indirect murder” (p. 256): exposure to death, increased risk of death, political death, rejection, exclusion, and so on. Poverty is an intensity of exposure to death and risk of death, particularly in relation to the majority of the population. Lack of access to equitable education is a form of increased exposure to risk of death, affecting as it does all manner of life chances.

There is extensive evidence of serious structural inequalities in education systems across Germany, which has called into question the basic equity of education in the country (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011; UN General Assembly Human Rights Council, 2010). UN Special Rapporteur on Racism Githu Muigai reported in 2010 that the organization of German schooling into a three-tiered system of early-streaming leads to “overrepresentation of minority students in the lower school stratum” (p. 11). This issue alone has been repeatedly documented, and people from across German “civil society” argue that “for children of migrants the educational system is not conducive to good performance leading to university-level qualification” (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011; UN General Assembly Human Rights Council, 2010, p. 11).
Education in Germany demands an remarkably thorough knowledge of the system, advocacy skills, and German language capacity on the part of students and parents. The school system thus reproduces inequality: “Class bias in the German school system… is one or even the major reason why a majority of students of Turkish background fare so poorly at school” (Söhn & Özcan, 2006, p. 113). Furthermore, children who have a first language other than German are unlikely to receive sufficient language instruction to acquire the perfect German that is needed to achieve the higher school strata (Söhn and Özcan, p. 116).

Racialized children and adults also face extensive systemic and interpersonal racism in educational settings – racism that is not effectively monitored nor dealt with (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011, p. 16, 19, 20). In IBA Hamburg’s discursive production of the educational situation in Wilhelmsburg, and thus of its plans and interventions, these systemic and contextual factors are not mentioned, which reproduces the problematization of racialized people themselves and the dis-integration drama. When mentioning the perfect matching of the educational profile and the socio-spatial image of Wilhelmsburg, IBA Hamburg (2010, p. 25) does mention “questions of educational opportunities,” but this seems to be primarily about facilities and location (von Kalben, 2008).

Racialized people in Germany also face exclusion from the realms of civic life and employment, and thus deep inequality in German society. As touched on earlier, German citizenship is based on ethno-cultural, rather than civic belonging (Koning, 2011, p. 3), reflected in the fact that Turkish immigrants to the country have the lowest naturalisation rate in the European Union (Yukleyen, 2010, p. 449), meaning they cannot participate in federal politics. Dual citizenship is not allowed, so even if one can
access formal citizenship, one must give up one’s other passports to do so. In practice, this discourages German citizenship, not only because it threatens hybrid identity but because of material consequences such as undermining inheritance from Turkey (Yukleyen, 2010, p. 448).

Reichl (2010, p. 39-40) argues that inequality in employment is also a matter of exclusion: racial discrimination restricts access to the labour market that, once one is in it, is in fact highly regulated to prevent inequality. This exclusion means that unemployment is twice as high among non-citizens as among Germans (Open Society Institute, 2010, p. 115), and Turkish immigrants have particularly ‘poor labour market outcomes,’ which are then associated with high welfare dependence (Ripbahn, Sander & Wunder, 2010, p. 6). In a sense, just as guestworkers were legally considered to be entirely separate from the German social body, which made it possible to deal philosophically and practically with the presence of many people without the same rights as Germans (Chin, 2009, p. 83), racialized people today, and particularly Turks, remain outside of the social body in economic and civic terms.

They also face increased exposure to death in a very direct sense, in the form of racist violence, as several recent examples vividly illustrate. In 2009, Marwa El-Sherbini was stabbed to death in a Dresden courtroom by the man she had sued after he called her a “terrorist” and “Islamist whore” in a playground. The murder was not officially/legally counted as an act of racist violence because the perpetrator was not a member of a far-right organization, highlighting one of the central problems in documentation and prosecution of racist crimes in Germany (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011). Many observed an extremely slow and low-key response from German authorities to the murder: “although there was no question that
the attack was racially motivated, the debate in Germany concentrated more on the issue of the lack of courtroom security," (Connolly & Shenker, 2009), leading many to ask what needed to happen for politicians to grasp the “serious social problem” that the murder of El-Sherbini horrifically embodied (Baghajati, 2009).

In 2011 the “serious social problem” of racist violence became publically unavoidable, if already long-apparent to those vulnerable to it, with the revelations that the murders of nine Turkish and Greek small businessmen from 2000 to 2007, the murder of a police officer, and bombings targeting people of Turkish descent were all committed by one group, with the same weapon, specifically targeting racialized people (Spiegel Online, 2012). Until this discovery the murders had been referred to as the ‘Döner murders’ in a racist caricature of the Turkish businessman, and were assumed to be related to family tensions or criminal ties, an assumption criticized as racist by victims’ families (Smith, 2012). The scope and frequency of the problem of racist violence has shocked many as the ineffectiveness and indeed complicity of elements of the Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (Office for the Protection of the Constitution) in these racist crimes has come to light over the past months (Pidd, 2011).

It has not shocked everyone though; there are ample enough stories of racist violence committed every day, from insults to murders, and of official indifference and incompetence in addressing it (cf. Reimann, 2011). These manifestations of increased exposure to death act on the bodies, minds and spirits of racialized people. One man whose mixed-race family has experienced insults, physical violence, and death threats has developed trouble sleeping: “‘I am afraid,’ [he says] ‘I feel the presence of an unpredictable threat’” (Reimann, 2011). The ‘educational profile’ of Wilhelmsburg, and its ‘socio-spatial image,’ must be viewed within this unequal and violent context.
Integration: Educating Immigrants

In IBA Hamburg and particularly within its materials on the *Bildungsoffensive* the concept of ‘integration’ is explicitly and implicitly mobilized as an educational and social goal for the project. ‘Integration’ should be approached as a suspect concept that conceals anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim forces (Razack, 2008, p. 108), and serves as a “disciplinary device to sustain social hegemony and whether openly avowed or not the dominance of the majority’s Leitkultur” (Ramm, 2010, p. 194). In this section I will discuss how this disciplinary device operates through the identification of who is to be integrated and into what, highlighting the spatial aspects of determining belonging. I will argue that ‘integration’ seems ultimately to be a never-ending process: integration as an end goal is impossible, racialized and immigrantized bodies must be constantly educated and *integrating*. I will demonstrate the relationship between the discourses of education and integration and a colonial discourse of civilization and civility (Coleman, 2006) and discuss its function in the production of the white subject and white nation. It will be against this background that I will further analyze the *Bildungsoffensive*’s ‘integrative’ goals and the figures of ‘integrated citizens’ that are presented in the video “The New World Class: Elbe Islands Education Drive” (IBA Hamburg, 2008).

A powerful public discourse about immigrants and racialized people, known locally as the *Integrationsdebatte* (‘integration debate’), has been raging in Germany for years. It deals explicitly and implicitly in all manner of questions about immigrants in Germany, who they are, what it means to be German, and how people should or should not live together. A constitutive question of this ‘debate,’ is who is to be ‘integrated.’ Turkish immigrants and people from Turkish backgrounds are the largest racialized minority group in Germany, and their cultural inferiority and suspected cultural
unassimilability has been a concern since it became clear that, though initially ‘guestworkers’ in large numbers, they were not going to be leaving (Chin, 2009; Ramm, 2010). The Integrationsdebatte is nominally interested in all immigrants, but Turkish-German author Feridun Zaimoğlu argues, “When they talk about foreigners, they actually mean Turks. In recent years, the Other has been coded with the term ‘Muslim.’ So they mean the Turk or the Muslim when they say foreigner.” (Güvercin, 2010, p. 4, my translation). Ramm (2010, p. 188) confirms that there has been a shift of focus from immigrants as ‘foreigners’ to immigrants as ‘Muslims,’ and in keeping with Razack (2008), argues that the ‘religious’ is no less a racial marking in this context.

Skin colour is also a marker of foreignness and therefore a possible need for integration regardless of whether one is an immigrant. Mo Asumang, a prominent, Black, German television presenter and filmmaker reflects:

I think it is very important that one can totally normally respond to sentences like ‘where are you from?’ I would like to be allowed to answer that I’m from Kassel [northwestern Germany], without people breaking out in laughter. Unfortunately I have to say it is still like this in 2010. People laugh when I say I’m from Kassel because they simply don’t want to accept that one maybe has two roots… that I was born here, speak perfect German, did my [university stream secondary education] here… all of that is simply suppressed, as though it didn’t exist.

(Güvercin, 2010, p. 5-6, my translation).

Belonging and Germanness reveals itself here as racially defined. People are marked by language, culture, religion, and race as not German, and therefore not integrated in German society. To put it another way, Germanness is defined by what it is not, in an ongoing, relational process between the insider and the outsider, the integrated and the dis-integrated (Ehrkamp, 2006, p. 1676). To be German is to be not-Turkish (p. 1678). To be German is to be not-Muslim, and therefore to be democratic, Enlightened, and
emancipated (Ramm, 2010, p. 194), and Asumang shows above that to be German is to be not-Black; ‘Germanness’ is defined along racial lines.

In dominant discourse, it is good to be integrated and bad to be dis-integrated, and as it is the racial Other that is marked as dis-integrated, it is good to be German and bad to be non-German. One relies on the other, however: integration requires dis-integration. Uzma Shakir (2006, p. 2) captured this in regards to the related concept of ‘inclusion:’ it defines “an exit and entry point… to a pre-given although uncontested entity.” The concept of integration similarly defines the bounds of an entity into which one might be integrated – in this case a field of Germanness, German identity and German society with all its political, economic, and social relationships. For one to be ‘integrated,’ there must be “a national culture and universal values (possessed automatically by all ‘original citizens’) in which newcomers must be instructed” (Razack, 2008, p. 129-130).

Thus “the boundaries of nations are not simply geographical or geopolitical (though they take both these forms), but also discursive” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 98). The discourse of ‘integration’ produces a German nation, a ‘we’ that is already integrated, which appears pre-given and uncontested while requiring outsiders against which to produce itself (Ehrkamp, 2006; Rasmussen, 2011). Racial others are these ‘outsiders,’ and German identity and thus also the dis-integrated, is constantly being produced, contested and reproduced. IBA Hamburg contributes to this constant process.

Integration is, however, often approached as a measurable condition, rather than as a contested concept and discourse. Recent research of the German federal Ministry of the Interior took on a particular definition of integration from Frank Gesemann that
includes: a) cultural integration (learning the language of the ‘host country,’ and taking on certain cultural capacities), b) structural integration (graduating from high school and completing education), c) social integration (development of ‘intercultural contacts’ and of acceptance, and decreased prejudice), and d) integration in identification (identification with democratic structures and basic values of the adopted society) (Bundesministerium des Innern, 2011, p. 638, my translation). The “cultural integration” and “structural integration” components of this framework are neatly represented in the fields of action identified for IBA Hamburg’s education drive (Bundesministerium des Innern, 2011, p. 638; IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 35). The “social integration” and “integration in identification” are, I think, the subtext throughout IBA Hamburg’s materials – the immigrantized other is expected to learn liberal, German values including ‘decreased prejudice’ in a highly prejudicial context.

This discourse of integration is a contemporary version of a colonial narrative, in which the primitive/savage has to be civilized in order to enter society. The narrative serves to define what that society is and thus in this context what white Germanness is. The above criteria produce the white German as highly educated, cultured, accepting, tolerant, and identified with democracy. The white German is again located within the modern, enlightened realm [against, in particular, the backward and pre-modern Muslim (Razack, 2008)] and has, significantly, the capacities to live multiculturally. The white German is assumed to naturally already be modern like this, and thus to always already be integrated; it is the racialized other who needs to be educated in these values and attributes.

As they are integrated (indeed they are the subjects around which integration is constituted) white people are assumed to be predisposed to be ‘civil,’ whereas the racial
other, particularly the Muslim in contemporary Germany, is assumed to be ‘uncivil’ (dis-integrated). ‘Civility,’ argued Daniel Coleman (2006), as a particular form of whiteness,

...projects an ideal of social interaction (all members of society should be freely included and accorded equal respect) as something to which white individuals should aspire: if you wish to join the egalitarian progressive company, you must be willing to improve yourself, to become worthy of the respect that characterizes the civil group

(Coleman, 2006, p. 11).

This civility, and today’s integration discourse with it, serves as a mode of “internal management,” compelling white subjects first to be integrated themselves, by exhibiting the norms and values of white Germanness, and then help others to integrate. As in colonial discourse civil/uncivil, integrated/dis-integrated are not simply opposing characterizations, but conceptions of progress that have a temporal aspect. Those who are civil/integrated, because they are more advanced, are responsible for managing the uncivil/dis-integrated and for assisting them into civilization (Coleman, 2006, 12-13). Through the IBA Hamburg Bildungsoffensive the integrated, cosmopolitan Hamburg assists the racialized other to enter civilization through education, while at the same time fulfilling the terms of their own civility (Coleman, p. 11) through willingness to assist and to consume the racial other.

A key part of this dynamic is the definition of who can be civilized/integrated and who cannot. Ahmed (2000) refers to ‘strangers’ versus ‘stranger strangers.’ The ‘stranger’ is only superficially culturally different, and is thus consumable and assimilable into the multi-culture, allowing the nation to “imagine itself as heterogeneous” (p. 96). The ‘stranger stranger’ is unassimilable and allows us to “face
the ‘limit’ of the multicultural nation,” (p. 106) and thus to produce on the one hand the discipline required to achieve civility and the limits of the reaches of that civility.

Certain attributes are marked as signs of unwillingness to integrate and thus of being a ‘stranger stranger.’ Language is an important marker and is a primary field of action in the *Bildungsoffensive*: Ehrkamp (2006, p. 1638) found that speaking Turkish was often perceived as a sign of rejection of Germany and Germanness. The headscarf is another, a visible symbol of Muslim difference (and essential ‘sexism’) (Ramm, 2010), in which women’s bodies play a central part in marking of identity and belonging (Ehrkamp, 2006; Mohanram, 1999). One must also prove one's willingness through one’s feelings: “‘The’ Germans love the question: do you feel German, or Turkish, Arab, Chinese…? As the ‘party in question,’ one must have an answer down pat for this” (Kaddor, 2010, p. 106, my translation). This is not only an occasional poke at one's belonging and commitment to Germany, but rather part of a broader, productive suspicion that immigrants do not even want to be German: they just want to reap the benefits of the German economy and social welfare system, and are thus resistant to civilization and integration.

These suspicions and demands for demonstration of willingness to integrate have spatial elements and manifestations. One of the most powerful discourses within German integration discourse is the ‘parallel society,’ an imagined form of total segregation that is produced as a terrible threat to the integrity of Germany. Ramm (2010, p. 187) argues that this is a variation of the term “ghetto,” which has been a key organizing concept in German discourse about diversity and immigration over many years. As noted in the previous chapter, IBA Hamburg mobilizes this discourse of the parallel society when it problematizes spatial and social relations in Wilhelmsburg. The
spatial concentration of racialized people and communities in places like Wilhelmsburg [a literal “ethnic island” to match integration discourse (Ramm, 2010, p. 188)] is considered a sign of failure to integrate (Ehrkamp, 2006). The very location of racialized and immigrant people in Wilhelmsburg, as well as their language, skin colour and religions, marks them for education.

Ultimately integration turns out to be impossible: regardless of the facets listed officially, the integrated and dis-integrated, insider and outsider, are in fact defined in immutable, racial terms, and racialized bodies remain marked indefinitely for ongoing integration. Mo Asumang illustrates this when she says it does not matter that she was born in Germany, or speaks perfect German – even her top tier education, which we see in IBA Hamburg is expected to contribute to integration, is not enough to integrate her (Güvercin, 2010, p. 5-6). Her feelings of being German even despite being told otherwise do not mean she gains entry into Germanness in the social imaginary or in the minds of the people she encounters. Though the responsibility is put on the immigrant and the racialized person to do the integrating, it is the majority society that produces and assigns the integrated/dis-integrated label.

Thus Lamya Kaddor argues that integration/assimilation is a myth for racial and religious Others:

It also helps nothing if I eat sauerkraut with pork knuckles, or put on lederhosen, sit myself down at the bar with a glass of Weissbier and philosophize about the long-lost Spielkultur of the national football team. In Europe I can’t flee from my Asian or African origin, my religious roots. They will come to the surface eventually and be made into an issue… the German past has frequently demonstrated that

Drawing on stereotypes of the ‘German’ culture into which she is expected to integrate, Kaddor argues in effect that there is always a ‘stranger stranger’ waiting to be identified, suspected to be lurking under the surface. Integration is debated, demanded, but ultimately denied and thus is a process that racialized people must continuously perform: one must always be integrating.

The Dis-integrated as Potential Attraction
An emphasis in the Bildungsoffensive on developing the attractiveness of Wilhelmsburg and on the ‘diversity’ of residents as a potential attraction to the ‘outside world’ contributes to the production of Wilhelmsburg residents as dis-integrated. In the context of the education drive the ‘diversity,’ though still clearly signalling racialization, is somewhat modified from the problematic and conflict-bound “cultures” mentioned in other parts of IBA Hamburg’s materials and discursively linked to conflict, segregation and problems (cf. IBA Hamburg, 2011b). In contrast to the ‘diversity’ that is one of the markers of Wilhelmsburg as full of “undesirable elements” (Schultz & Sieweke, 2008, p. 139), within the framework of the education drive there is a ‘diversity’ that is disciplined through integrative education and thus transformed into an attraction rather than repulsion. This disciplined diversity is a potential consumable for the future middle-class white subjects of Wilhelmsburg in the future metropolis. This ‘attraction,’ however, in its ‘acceptance’ and interest in consuming diversity “serves to conceal those differences which cannot be reduced to ‘cultural diversity’” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 95): namely the inequality discussed above, of intensity and variety, threatening racialized people’s very survival.
The *Bildungsoffensive* goal of increasing the attractiveness of Wilhelmsburg to the “outside world” (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 33) and to “all Hamburgers” (IBA Hamburg, 2012) on the one hand reproduces the current unattractiveness of the neighbourhood so thoroughly established in public discourse and in other areas of IBA Hamburg’s materials (cf. Schultz & Sieweke, 2008; Twickel, 2011). This unattractiveness is one of the reasons for IBA Hamburg’s intervention:

There were and are enough reasons: Attractive educational facilities are considered a key contribution to better societal integration and participation of the residents of the Elbe islands. At the same time, they can and should act as a magnet for the upgrading\(^7\) of stigmatized neighbourhoods (von Kalben, 2008, p. 2, my translation).

While the need for current residents to be ‘integrated’ is again produced, “upgrading” includes attracting a new kind of resident to the island, making Wilhelmsburg “more attractive as a living location” and profiling “education as a location factor” (von Kalben et al, 2008, p. 1). One of the current conditions that this implicitly refers to is the pattern of wealthier, white parents of Hamburg not wanting to send their kids to schools with larger racialized populations. This pattern, shaped by racism and by its material manifestations, leads to conflicts about resourcing and school quality (Institüt für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung Hamburg, 2011). IBA Hamburg is therefore suggesting making schools more attractive to a wealthier, white demographic, again illuminating a key goal of IBA Hamburg: the transformation of Wilhelmsburg into more of a white, bourgeois place, as shown in the previous chapter through the depiction of the resident of the future, the ‘residents’ in architectural drawings, et cetera. The

\(^7\) Alternatively translatable as ‘gentrification.’
achievement of this through schools is apparently envisioned without addressing underlying racism (i.e. why schools in racialized neighbourhoods are perceived as bad schools).

IBA Hamburg’s materials suggest that if the “better societal integration and participation of the residents of the Elbe islands” can be achieved (von Kalben, 2008, p. 2), then their ‘diversity’ will in fact be an attraction to the potential new resident. The project believes a “...unique spatial self-conception and self-awareness can emerge from the cultural diversity of the Elbe Island population,” and that a “long-term goal is to develop cultural diversity into a value-adding potential of local creative milieus” (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 27). The racialization of residents is thus turned into a potential selling feature of the neighbourhood rather than an aspect of its marginality and superfluity.

The production of ‘diversity’ as an attraction and as a marketing feature reflects interlocking phenomena identified by bell hooks (1992) and Ahmed (2000, 2004), in which the other/stranger is treated as a fetish object, and as consumable. ‘Cultural diversity’ becomes “a space or taste that can be consumed, that can be incorporated in the life world of the one who moves between (eating) places” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 117). IBA Hamburg centres a white, bourgeois subject as the consumer/fetishizer. Currently repulsed by Wilhelmsburg, the subject may, through the Bildungsoffensive, become attracted to the neighbourhood as the object/space of the other. Again as Radhika Mohanram (1999, p. 4) argued, whiteness is unmarked and has the ability to move while blackness is marked and “immobilizing”: the white future resident of the metropolis is free to arrive and consume, while the racialized resident is marked by ‘diversity’ and ‘disintegration’ as to-be-consumed. Proximity to the other will be part of the
neighbourhood’s cachet as it is now part of its stigma, made possible by the step through education into integration, neutralizing the threat in ‘diversity,’ making proximity safer.

In its production as a consumable fetish object, the Wilhelmsburg resident as ‘diversity’ appeals to the white subject’s desire to have contact with the Other (hooks, 1992, p. 22, 28). The value ascribed to the residents, to their ‘cultural difference,’ is instrumental – through ‘value-adding’ and ‘uniqueness’ they have something to offer the white subject. On multiculturalism, Ahmed argues that some differences can be claimed by the dominant community, those that are commodifiable and those that help the group imagine itself as multicultural (Ahmed, 2000, p. 96-97). The costumes and festivals in which Wilhelmsburg residents are depicted by IBA Hamburg reflect the commodifiable – dress, food, music. What cannot be commodified, or “neutralised and accommodated” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 110) must be transformed through, as I will show, integrative education, and thus moved into the realm of the ‘stranger.’

IBA Hamburg confidently asserts that “cultural and ethnic differences are seen as a source of creativity and identity in the cosmopolis, not as an obstacle” (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 23). The desire to consume the other is produced here as a sign of progressive change in attitudes towards ‘difference,’ and IBA Hamburg signals itself as a version of what hooks (1992, p. 26) calls a “commercial realm of advertising [in which] the drama of Otherness finds expression.” The instrumentality of the presence of racialized bodies in the space of Wilhelmsburg is key, constituting a drama-space to which the white subject might be attracted. Kay Anderson (1991) captures the racial nature of this move and its status as form of racialization in her charting of the development of official attitudes towards Vancouver’s Chinatown. In the 1970s, in the midst of blossoming
multicultural policy and discourse, Chinatown became a place to be valued and respected “for its uniqueness as one of Vancouver’s key ‘ethnic neighbourhoods’… for its contribution to the uniquely Canadian ideal of unity through diversity” (p. 211-212). The racialized space is marked for special status, “without regard for the history of its making,” a history of racist institutional and public practice and policy with similarities to the structural racism experienced in Wilhelmsburg and in Germany.

In IBA Hamburg’s vision of Wilhelmsburg a ‘creativity’ commodity is offered, but more importantly ‘identity’: the white subject is produced through its proximity and juxtaposition to the racial other. In the act of seeing and potentially consuming ‘cultural and ethnic differences,’ in the act of being attracted to Wilhelmsburg rather than being fixed there already, the seer/consumer is constituted as the subject from which Wilhelmsburg residents are different. The opportunity thus being sold in IBA Hamburg might be the possibility, through settling in the future Wilhelmsburg, of seeing ones (white) self as particularly enlightened in the act of appreciating difference rather than rejecting it. The future white residents will be able to feel good about themselves and their multicultural attitude (as per Ahmed 2004, para 34), and thus the white subject is made good through its consumption of the other.

Again this is a story that is distinctly colonial in form and content. It turns first on the production of a savage space, an uncivil realm that needs to be civilized; a task that only the presence of the white subject can seemingly achieve. The form of civilization then has a thoroughly twenty-first century multicultural nature that is nonetheless a “normative model of who ‘we’ already are,” the cultural diversity that the civilizer now imagines itself to be (Ahmed, 2000, p. 96). The same old racial hierarchy is reinforced, in the guise of a push towards a future urban environment that “includes” the “diversity
and heterogeneity” of residents and makes Wilhelmsburg “more liveable and attractive to all Hamburgers” (IBA Hamburg, 2012a). In the following section I will discuss how education, and particularly ‘lifelong learning’ for adults, appears to offer ways to demonstrate ones willingness to integrate and thus ones safe-ness and consumability.

“The New World Class:” Figures of Ideal Integration

IBA Hamburg has a short video on its Bildungsoffensive that produces the need for Wilhelmsburg residents to take on integrative education and lifelong learning as conditions for inclusion in the future metropolis. The video is called ‘The New World Class: Elbe Islands Education Drive’ (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Until mid-2011 this video was centrally featured in the education and Bildungsoffensive sections of IBA Hamburg’s website, and is still available online through their YouTube channel. The video takes a different tack from many of the IBA Hamburg materials analyzed thus far, by rendering the need for integration through education in ‘positive’ terms, through the presentation of images of desirable, integrating, residents. Through it another angle of the production of the integrated/dis-integrated is visible.

The five-minute video features five characters, all apparently residents of Wilhelmsburg, who each speak about a current role of education in their lives. As the video shows each character going about education activities around Wilhelmsburg, a soundtrack plays in the background, and the character narrates their story through a voiceover. Each segment of the video carries a title connected to the goals of the Bildungsoffensive, and each ‘character’ is a figure embodying one of the five fields of action of the education drive: language support, cultural education, connections, lifelong learning, and graduation. Each figure also requires integration in some way – three are racialized, immigrantized figures, and thus marked as in need of integration as
previously discussed in this chapter. The other two figures are older, white men who are marked as degenerate by their marginality in the economy – one is unemployed, the other is a retiree. All of these figures, separately and together, serve to produce and showcase acceptable educational means through which the Wilhelmsburg resident can be integrated. In the following section I will describe each segment of the video, and then discuss some of the key discourses mobilized through the video.

Figure 1: The Good Immigrant

The first character presented is Roland, a young Black boy who speaks in particular about language. The title for his segment is: “Language ability: Language promotion as the foundation for participation” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Roland appears as an ideal immigrant child: he works hard to integrate himself by learning German, by mixing with other cultures, and by aiming for integration into the work-world when he is older. “I have friends from many different countries,” he says, “from Turkey, from Ghana… only one from Cameroon” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation, emphasis in original). When they play together they speak German, he stresses, which he learned from his teachers and his friends.

His mother appears as an authority figure in the video, calling him home from the basketball court, but she is a counterpoint to his integration, a person with whom he does not speak German. She is shown to be appropriately supportive however – she walks home from the park with him, and provides a designated study area in the home, a desk in his bedroom.
Roland shows an ideal attitude towards education: “Going to school is very important to me,” he says as he is shown doing his homework. “I think that if you are going to get a good job, then you should speak good German, and other languages” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation).

Figure 2: The Helper

The second segment features Reimer, an older white retiree who volunteers at the Wilhelmsburg museum. The title of the segment is “City participants: Residents become active players in cultural education” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Reimer introduces himself as a “geborene Wilhelmsburger:” a Wilhelmsburger born and raised, producing him as an authority on the neighbourhood and positioning him against immigrant figures. When he retired he decided to volunteer at the museum, and is involved in a variety of programs there. He is a figure of the ideal retiree, one who keeps working as a volunteer, and of an educator – as a ‘native’ Wilhelmsburger and as an elder he is positioned to deliver cultural education to the ‘immigrants’ who it has been established ‘need’ it.
Reimer talks about the neighbourhood as a whole, saying that Wilhelmsburg is just as good as other (wealthier) parts of town: “What is fascinating about Wilhelmsburg? There’s nothing so fascinating about Wilhelmsburg… What [wealthier, higher status neighbourhoods]\(^8\) can offer, I can also show you here in Wilhelmsburg” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). As the voiceover plays, Reimer walks through green spaces in Wilhelmsburg on a sunny day, sees people playing by the water, and looks at hidden artwork pasted on the side of an old building. Finally he walks up the stairs of the museum, opens old files, and begins to flip through archived newspapers. Reimer suggests that Wilhelmsburg was neglected by the city for a long time, but that now it obviously wants to change that: “I’m happy to have a part in that” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation).

**Figure 3: The Hard to Integrate**

The third segment features Fatih Bostanci, a young man dressed in overalls and pictured in a metal shop. The segment is titled:

\(^8\) Blankenese and Volksdorf.
“Apprenticeship: Connections to careers: No one left behind” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Fatih is another figure of the good immigrant – he has been in an apprenticeship for years, and demonstrates that it is his top priority. He has lived in Wilhelmsburg since he came to Germany eleven years ago.

In contrast to the other immigrant figures in the video, Fatih mentions, though obliquely, that he faces challenges. He tells us that some people think he’s “stupid” for doing an apprenticeship, but he does not listen to them, because at the end he will have a profession and a chance to be employed. He also tells us he is “already married,” and suggests that family matters are secondary to apprenticeship for now (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Fatih is positioned in contrast to the discourse of ‘the immigrant community that does not properly value education,’ which is a prominent discourse about the Turkish community in Germany (cf. Güvercin, 2011). An assumption that marriage marks the ends of education is a feature of this discourse (cf. Söhn & Özcan, 2006). Though he fits the profile of the young, male, labouring immigrant body – working class, married young, apparently Turkish, but not specified – this figure values education and sees it as a path to employment. “I’m already looking further, because I want something, I want to become something” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation).

**Figure 4: The Unemployed**

Segment four features Robert, a 47-year-old recipient of ‘Hartz IV,’ German social assistance. His segment is called “Wissenschaffen: Lifelong learning as answer to the work-world’s constantly changing demands” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation).  

---

9 ‘Wissenschaffen’ means literally ‘achieving knowledge,’ and appears to be a pun on the word for ‘sciences,’ ‘Wissenschaften.’
Robert appears as a figure of the good worker in today’s economic conditions. Though he has been on social assistance for four years and not found a new job, he communicates hope about his future “chances” and appropriate gratitude for social assistance and employment programs. “The past years have been the worst I have ever experienced in my life,” he says. “I have the fortune that I get continuing education financed, which I take very seriously” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Robert is shown buying fruit from the open-air market in Wilhelmsburg, using the computers at the employment centre, and receiving training in a bike shop. I recognize the bike shop as one run by city agencies, part of the same complex as the metal shop where Fatih does his apprenticeship. Robert exemplifies hopefulness: “I do think that despite being 47 years old, I can still be successful… I hope I will have the chance to get back into the job market” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation).

**Figure 5: The Good Student**

In this final segment of the video, Alma Besič, a student in the top tier of the German high school system, appears as a figure of the ideal racialized student. The segment is titled “Graduation as the basis for careers” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Marked by her name as a student with ‘migration background,’ as a good student Alma shows enthusiasm for study, love of her school, and love of her neighbourhood. She says she has developed a real community here – people understand each other, and she thinks Wilhelmsburg is “super.” School gives her the opportunity to develop herself, to collect new experiences, and it is the basis for an academic career. “There are students here that are really engaged, and that have set big goals for themselves,” she says. “I’m proud of my school” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Alma is shown riding around Wilhelmsburg on her bike, stopping to take in
views, and chatting with friends at school. This good student plans to continue into post-secondary studies.

Conditions of Integration: Work, participation, and the right attitude
The five ‘figures’\textsuperscript{10} in the IBA Hamburg video correspond to the five fields of action outlined for the education drive: language support, cultural education, connections, lifelong learning, and graduation (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 35). Each figure embodies a part of the integration imperative that is served by education: the imperative to learn German, to submit to cultural education, to get connected to the work world, to be flexible to meet the demands of that work world, and to strive towards the highest possible level of education. These are IBA Hamburg’s articulation of the demands of ‘integration’ into German life in Hamburg and they constitute a performance of the dominant German culture. They seem to reflect the promise of a middle class economic and social belonging. The hidden lie is of course that belonging is racially defined and therefore impossible for the racially marked as well as for the degenerate body.

The video also contains discourses that bridge the five figures, discourses that are broad yet detailed and that define the desired Wilhelmsburg resident. They include discourses of participation, of correct civic attitude, positive view of one’s neighbourhood, and of work as a foundation of citizenship. Participation is repeatedly stated as both a goal and a means of education. In the title of the first segment, “Language promotion as the foundation for participation” participation is asserted as a

\textsuperscript{10} I would like to acknowledge here that the characters in the video do appear to be real people, to whom I mean no disrespect in subjecting their stories to discourse analysis. I hope not to dehumanize them by arguing they represent certain figures, but rather simply to reflect the discourses to which their stories contribute.
good. Segment two is similarly labelled, with the retiree Reimer as the “city participant,” the “active player in cultural education” (IBA Hamburg, 2008, my translation). Participation is produced as a goal, though without identifying why residents should want to participate and in what.

Participation is the opposite of unwillingness to integrate and of living in a parallel society and it is demonstrated through speaking German, participating in German culture, enacting the desire to participate, as the figures in the video do. Submission to education is part of this enactment, which locates the racialized/immigrantized person as a ‘stranger’ and therefore as welcome after a fashion, rather than as a ‘stranger stranger,’ considered a threat and betrayal of the multicultural nation (Ahmed, 2000, p. 106). The white subject is again reproduced here as already naturally participating in a multicultural society as an element of its civility; the (multicultural) nation is produced as a thing in which one can, should, and does properly participate. A subtitle of the third segment, “no one left behind” suggests that non-participation is a possibility, and not a positive one: some are left behind. The good choices of the Hard to Integrate educate the viewer about the better option, and images of the stranger stranger, such as the girls and women in hijab discussed in Chapter Two, are left out.

Participation, which promises a path towards integration, also requires a correct attitude. In the video there are two overarching discourses in this vein – one of correct attitude towards Wilhelmsburg, and another of correct attitude towards education. The figures in the video seem to be successful (ideal immigrants and citizens) in part because they have ‘the right attitude.’ One’s opinion of Wilhelmsburg must be positive:

11 “Niemand geht verloren,” literally ‘no one gets lost.’
the Unemployed and the Hard to Integrate appreciate the programs and supports that are available to them there. The Good Student appreciates the sense of community, how people understand each other, and the engagement of students. The Helper’s whole segment focuses on boosting Wilhelmsburg, on showing visually attractive parts on a sunny day, and on emphasizing what the neighbourhood has to offer. His conviction that it is a liveable place and therefore an unremarkable one is what makes him a good Helper and positions him to educate others who do not have that correct view.

The positive attitude certainly acknowledges great things about the neighbourhood and positive experiences of living there. It also crowds out possible stories of discontent or frustration (associated with the dis-integrated ‘stranger stranger’), including the discourses of dysfunction and conflict emphasized in public discourse and the earlier version of IBA Hamburg’s website. A positive story is a better advertisement to future residents and a better advertisement for the education drive; the figures and the discourses produced embody goals and means; a correct attitude is shown to be both an attainable goal and necessary for ‘integration.’

An enthusiastic, hopeful attitude towards education is also necessary for those who wish to be integrated like the figures in the video. It is vigorously argued that education is important and to be strongly valued: from the young Good Immigrant who says “education is very important to me,” to the Hard to Integrate who prioritizes his education over other responsibilities, to the Good Student who pursues higher education as a matter of course, and the Unemployed for whom education is a key to future employment (IBA Hamburg, 2008). Big educational goals are privileged. Individually and collectively the figures produce education as the way to ‘become
something,’ and thus the correct attitude is one that acknowledges that (while implicitly also recognizing, of course, that one is not already ‘something’).

IBA Hamburg draws a clear, straight line between education, the attainment of work, and the centrality of work to citizenship in the sense of full membership and participation in the multicultural nation. Even the youngest of the figures believes that education, in this case language education, is essential to getting a good job. He knows this to be the case despite being a young boy. This is also true for the Hard to Integrate, whose apprenticeship is aimed at developing a profession and a chance to be employed (IBA Hamburg, 2008). All of the figures show how one must strive to be employed. Only the Good Helper as an elder and a Wilhelmsburger born and raised does not have to do this through educating himself, he remains employed and thus a member of (civil) society, by educating others. He is thus shown disciplining his conduct “in order to participate in the civil realm,” (Coleman, 2006, p. 11) including taking up the responsibility to educate the racial other. He would run the risk of degeneracy and of becoming irrelevant if he were not to take up this role.

By focusing on work as a central goal and feature of ‘integration’ the video reproduces work as the key to “the status of active participants in the affairs of society” (Bouchard, 2006, p. 171). The discourses about work produced in the segment featuring Robert, ‘the Unemployed,’ call for particular attention. He exemplifies an attitude of faith in the connection between education and work, in which educating and re-educating oneself is the path to employment. As he says, “despite being 47-years-old,” he believes in his chances to get back onto the job market. Against the backdrop of years of unemployment, there is an urgency and poignancy to this belief, which is amplified by shots of him alone in a computer lab, or buying a single peach at the
market. There is a solitude or a loneliness that comes through that elides the collective nature of the issue of unemployment, but with the emotional effect of producing sympathy for the figure and his positive attitude.

The replacement of the public issue of unemployment with a personal issue of employability is indeed one of the effects of the discourse of lifelong learning, the Bildungsoffensive field of action with which Robert’s story is aligned (Martin, 2008, p. 7).

Lifelong learning is:

- a central concept in the hegemonic claim that lack of skill causes unemployment; it supposes that constant retraining prepares workers to be ultimately adaptable and always ready to acquire new skills as the needs of capital dictate (Mojab, 2009, p. 5).

In “The New World Class,” this is the situation in which the Unemployed man finds himself, working furiously to ‘re-skill’ and re-integrate. The concept of lifelong learning on the one hand provides a framework for belief in his chances, while reinforcing, however, his complete individual responsibility. It also produces a reality in which constant striving, constant ‘integrating’ is normal.

A ‘human capital’ approach to understanding education seems to underlie the mobilization of this lifelong learning discourse. If education is mainly a process of
acquisition of skills and knowledge that will be applied in one’s economic position, a clear, straight line can be produced through education into employment. ‘Human capital’ is a way of conceptualizing the various resources that people have in a way that emphasizes how they might be used, bought, and sold within a capitalist economic order (Bouchard, 2006). In this framework education is valued by its outcomes, by what it does for you, which in IBA Hamburg’s Bildungsoffensive is ‘integration’ and thus citizenship/participation in the nation.

Like ‘integrating,’ ‘lifelong learning’ is characterized by continuity. It is no coincidence then that racialized bodies are particularly marked as targets for this continual process by virtue of constant economic and social superfluity. The imperative to be a lifelong learner as a condition of economic participation intertwines with the demand to constantly strive for integration, with lifelong learning serving as a means of undertaking that integrating and as a superficially non-racial explanation for why it is necessary. While Mojab (2009, p. 7) argues that “turning workers into ‘learning subjects’ or ‘learning citizens’ is consistent with the politics of citizenship in liberal democracies,” the Bildungoffensive’s focus on lifelong learning and work as a defining feature of citizenship turns residents into workers.

Thus we return again to the ‘learning landscape’ and the project of integrating Wilhelmsburg into the current capitalist economy and Wilhelmsburgers into workers in that economy. The inequalities Wilhelmsburg residents face in wealth, employment, school graduations and so on are again their own individual faults: it is simply a case of (racialized/ immigrantized people) not possessing enough or the correct ‘human capital’ for the moment and context. Any connection between racism and economic oppression and between the production of the racially-defined nation and access to citizenship is
avoided, though in fact the limitation of the rights and possibilities of racialized people in terms of access to good jobs, housing, education, health, pushes them into positions from which their labour is more easily exploited and wealth more easily created for the dominant (white) group (Goldberg, 1993, 100).

Lifelong learning is a prime example of the “pedagogisation of social and economic problems” (Martin, 2008, p. 7): in IBA Hamburg it is a strategy to address disintegration, un/der-education, and unemployment. Though presented as a constant opportunity, ‘lifelong learning’ is a trap in which the individual carries sole responsibility for their success or failure. The game of ‘integration’ is one that racialized people cannot win, and lifelong learning is a productive interlocking concept because it is never intended to be won. Mastery or an end point is not possible: lifelong learning is “‘not the symbol of our unfinished development, but a guarantee of our permanent inadequacy’ and [constantly reassigns learners] to their place in the meritocracy” (Coffield, 1999, p. 489 quoting Illich & Verne, 1976, p. 13). The five ideal, integrating figures of the Bildungsoffensive video discursively produce this permanent inadequacy and yet also a blueprint for how to buy into it and perform ‘integration.’

“The useful person:” Disciplining the racialized (non)citizen

German anti-racist scholar and activist Sabine Schiffer (2010) argues that there is a basically problematic concept used in German public discourse on immigration and integration: the concept of ‘das nutzliches Mensch’ (‘the useful person’). Though efforts to recognize the extensive contributions of immigrants to Germany are laudable and the concept is often used to counter racist arguments, Schiffer argues that too much focus is put on ‘usefulness’ to society and to the economy, producing a measure of human worth that is morally, philosophically, and practically problematic. Whether and how one
is a *nutzliches Mensch* then determines worthiness for membership in German society, a calculation that Schiffer finds deeply disturbing (an assessment that I share with her). Heitmeyer similarly argues that an application of economic principles to the valuing of people is commonplace and entirely inhumane (Heitmeyer, in Der Spiegel, December 14, 2011).

*Das nutzliches Mensch* is, I think, front and centre in IBA Hamburg’s *Bildungsoffensive*, from the identification of a need for some dis-integrated residents to be educated, to the five figures’ concentration on employment as participation, to the ‘learning landscape’ as what we might call a *nutzliches Raum* (‘useful space’). Wilhelmsburg’s belonging in Hamburg is conceptualized and measured through its past contributions and future potential. Current Wilhelmsburg residents *do not* belong to the broader society, but are produced as having potential usefulness contingent upon integrating.

The education drive thus engages a constellation of highly disciplinary discourses. Foucault conceived of ‘discipline’ as a range of strategies in which power – of a regime, of an institution – is exercised through the control of the self by the self (Mills, 2003, p. 43-44). The discourses of integration versus dis-integration and of *das nutzliches Mensch* demand self-discipline, the shaping of the self to achieve a level of conformity and thus the potential for citizenship. Integrative education and lifelong learning are means of enacting self-discipline and are also disciplining discourses in and of themselves. They produce ways of thinking and behaving that are expressions of (social, economic, political, *racial*) power.
The five figures in the *Bildungsoffensive* video of the education drive illustrate this. Each figure exemplifies self-discipline within a particular frame of capitalist and integrationist discourse: ‘integrating’ leads to employment which leads to ‘citizenship.’ They also produce enforcement of the discipline of others, for example through the repetition of certain views and attitudes about the neighbourhood and about education, producing a narrow frame in which the Wilhelmsburg resident should locate themselves in order to similarly succeed. For each figure also embodies its opposite: the Good Immigrant contains the failure to learn German and thus dis-integration; the Helper contains the idle and irrelevant retiree; the Hard to Integrate contains an unsuccessful version of itself, the immigrant who does not understand the value of education, and who is “left behind.” The Unemployed contains a silent despair, idleness, hopelessness and *uselessness* in unemployment, and the Good Student contains her opposite – a disengaged student, uninterested, thinking negatively, dropping out. The figures/people who are this ‘new world class’ exemplify an integrating control of the self by the self and reproduce discourses that discipline fellow Wilhelmsburg residents.

In the current context of a hierarchical racial order, in which belonging and ‘integration’ are racially defined and the racially-marked are perpetual outsiders, ongoing discipline is, like discourse (Foucault, 1969/2009), both an instrument and an effect of power. Discipline functions as a mechanism of power to certain ends, such as the performance of linguistic and cultural conformity, as per Ramm’s assertion (2010, p. 194). The disciplining itself (the ‘integrating’), by its continual and self-applied nature, also serves to reproduce manipulability and exploitability among a racialized and immigrantized population, and thus to maintain hegemonic power. Foucault argued that discipline produces “subjected and practised bodies, ‘docile bodies’” that may be “used,
transformed and improved” (1977/1995, p. 138, 136). This is a capacity of ‘integration:’ the manner and the content of the discipline – the how and to what ends – support each other, maintaining the precariousness and vulnerability of the racial outsider. This is one way in which integration “preserves a racial hierarchy even as it appears to dissolve it” (Razack, 2008, p. 130).

Education plays a central role in the integration/discipline produced in IBA Hamburg’s Bildungsoffensive: it is an instrument that potentially extends the disciplining beyond the discursive realm and into the material in a formal and concentrated way. Education has certainly been employed this way before; back in the 1980s Robert A. Carlson wrote extensively about adult education as a tool of assimilation in the United States. He identified this assimilation project over time as indoctrination and demand for homogeneity (1987, p. 5, 6), but argued that chances to share in the opportunities presented by the land and the economy were most effective in “achieving loyalty to the nation and gradual accommodation to prevailing norms” (p. 6). While Carlson was clearly suggesting that some equity and access was more powerful than assimilationist education, his argument also points to the possible kernel at the centre of the disciplinary power of ‘integrative education’ as produced by IBA Hamburg: it promises access to the goods and opportunities enjoyed by German society generally, particularly employment and economic well-being. Viewed in light of the ongoing reproduction of the civilizing white subject visible in IBA Hamburg and of the real material inequality facing racialized people, however, this promise is not particularly promising. The nation may know itself as ‘diverse’ through the presence of others in its midst (Ahmed, 2000), but the benefits and protections of citizenship are not allocated equally to all.
Conclusion

To conclude I would like to return to the beginning of this paper, to IBA Hamburg’s articulated vision of itself as more than ‘just a building exhibition.’ “It’s not just about showing buildings; it’s about real-time research and development. Like a laboratory. Except that the laboratory is in fact an entire district in the city and research leads to actual built space” (IBA Hamburg, 2011c). Wilhelmsburg, and the International Building Exhibition, are treated as an “experimental field” in which to explore solving the “major social issues of our time” (Daldrup & Zlonicky, 2010, p. 14; IBA Hamburg, 2011a). It is my contention, and I hope a clear argument of this study, that IBA Hamburg’s “research” leads to more than built space: its effects can be expected to be social, economic, and political as well as spatial. In failing to attend to what is at least a basic contextual element of its work – the existence of a differential racial order of citizenship and power in the context of its ‘experiment’ – IBA Hamburg and the state and private interests of which it is an expression implicate themselves in that order in a decidedly uncritical manner. By the very act of treating the space of Wilhelmsburg, a lived space in which 55,000 people live daily, complex lives, as an acceptable field of experimentation the project preserves the relations of domination in which it came to be and found its mission.

There must have been moments at which this was self-conscious, as shown by former Mayor von Beust’s suggestion that certain “problem neighbourhoods” are more “ready” for change than wealthier, whiter neighbourhoods (Arbeitskreis Umstrukturierung Wilhelmsburg, 2011, p. 9, my translation). I have explored the productions of this ‘readiness,’ while asking how Wilhelmsburg became vulnerable to
experimentation at all. I continue to feel that the discourse of the experiment in IBA Hamburg is deeply problematic and indeed disturbing. Only certain kinds of people are considered appropriate and available to be experimented on; to have one’s space and sociality (and therefore oneself) experimented upon is the lot of the superfluous. I have argued that the residents of Wilhelmsburg and their ‘metrozone’ have been vulnerable to experimentation not because of an objective, freestanding supposed condition of disorder, but through the discursive and material production of their racialization, dis-integration and superfluity. Anti-racist researchers in Germany observe increases in popular beliefs that some people are more valuable than others, and that “only those who achieve something, who are useful and efficient, count for something” (Heitmeyer, in Der Spiegel, December 14, 2011). The casual enactment of an ‘experiment’ on a racialized neighbourhood in this context, in a country that has historical experience with devaluing of humans as a forerunner to terror and specifically with experimentation as a technology of terror, is chilling in its connotations.

The discourse of experiment also contributes to the illusion of the newness of the large-scale urban development project, though the approach fell out of favour because of the spectacular failure of past ‘experiments.’ As former minister for urban development for the state of North Rhine Westphalia Christoph Zöbel put it, “we have made big, barely reparable mistakes with large scale projects. We’ll go on making mistakes in urban development. But we should preferably take on small projects that would entail small mistakes” (Daldrup & Zlonicky, 2010, p. 10). In the discourse of the experiment, mistakes large and small are repackaged as part of the experimental process. This avoids responsibility for the impact on real people and spaces, and can obscure the fact that specific assumptions were chosen on which to base the
‘experiment.’ In this case for example the unreliable relationship between education and success and prosperity, particularly in an unequal racial order, might become just another lesson learned, though in fact it is a lesson already repeatedly learned.

IBA Hamburg asks in its 2010 interim project report “how can architecture and urban planning themselves become part of a spatial pedagogy?” (IBA Hamburg, 2010, p. 25). The answer is of course that they *already are*, as this study demonstrates. The socio-spatial intervention, the ‘experiment,’ and the discursive production on which it relies, is a kind of pedagogy. Spatial theorists and analysts have demonstrated this in many moments and contexts, so there is rather an old answer to what IBA Hamburg treats as a new question. I rooted this study in theorization of the coproduction of the social and spatial, after Lefebvre and Foucault and elaborated by Razack, Jacobs, McCann, Mele, Fusté, and so on, who have all demonstrated that space is not only related to how bodies may move and act, but is productive of restriction, of opportunity, and indeed of experience. Foucault’s now classic example of the Panopticon, which causes inhabitants to assume surveillance and thus to discipline themselves in accordance with power is a dramatic illustration of the epitome of spatial pedagogy (Foucault, 1977/1995, p. 201). There is, to my mind, no question of IBA Hamburg’s implementation of a spatial pedagogy, just whether it is reflecting at all on the nature of that pedagogy.

It is my observation that there is a great deal of space in and around the disciplines of architecture and urban planning to, at the very least, strengthen conversations with critical social studies, disciplines that have produced large bodies of knowledge about the production of the socio-spatial. Just a little more inter-disciplinary communication has the potential to shift the level of questioning from ‘how can
architecture and urban planning become part of a spatial pedagogy?’ to ‘as we are implicated in spatial pedagogy, what are the values, goals, and content of this pedagogy?’ The guise of the experiment would have to be left behind in this approach, or at more explicit responsibility would have to be taken for the articulation of the bases for all of the assumptions of the experiment. I am not under any illusion that this would un-implicate (particularly) normative disciplines from reproduction of the racial order, but I suggest it as a potentially fruitful step and as a partial answer to the inevitable question asked of critical work, ‘well, what are we supposed to do instead?’

I am mindful here of Sara Ahmed’s (2004, para 59) caution that “…it is important that I do not rush to ‘inhabit’ a ‘beyond’ to the work of exposing racism,” jumping immediately to an interest in what comes after exposure (para 59). She is right that there is a temptation to end on a hopeful note: the hopeful note that I wish to end on is one demanding a great deal of work, namely Lamya Kaddor’s (2011) call for the complete reimagining of ‘integration.’ I think this is a vital point in Wilhelmsburg, in Hamburg, in Germany, in Europe, and here in Canada, as well as specifically for the IBA Hamburg project. As I argued in this study, the definition of ‘integration’ that we are typically working with is one that is more or less explicitly racially coloured, limiting our imagination of our societies and how to live together to the bounds of racial thinking. The reimagining of ‘integration’ along non-racial lines would, of course, not be an antidote to the existence of a racial order. I imagine, at least, potential in the lifting of the lie of ‘integration’ racially-defined, and in the imperative to attend to the existence and effects of a racial order of citizenship.
Following the lead of Ahmed:

I am not saying that understanding racism will necessarily make us non-racist or even anti-racist, although of course I sometimes wish this was true. But race, like sex, is sticky; it sticks to us, or we become ‘us’ as an effect of how it sticks, even when we think we are beyond it. Beginning to live with that stickiness, to think it, feel it, do it, is about creating a space to deal with the effects of racism.


The conviction embodied and, I hope, communicated in this study is that awareness and analysis of discursive and material manifestations of racism are prerequisites, certainly to anti-racism, but also to the “solving of the major social issues of our time.” Without this basic exposure, there can be no ‘beyond’ to reach for.
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