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Part 1
Introduction: Purpose and context of the study information

1.2 Objective of study

Immigration is a complex issue involving many types and levels of international, national and local policy. This paper investigates immigration trends in Germany and Berlin, and particularly the role and response of local urban labor market and housing market policy relative to the pressures of urban immigration. Urban immigration policy should promote economic development and social cohesion by encouraging equal participation in the workforce and equal access to housing among immigrant and native residents. The objective of the study is to demonstrate that equal participation and access can be supported by labor market policy that promotes workforce integration and housing market policy that accepts, and in some cases promotes, the choice of residential concentration.

The sequence of information and analysis presented is:

- general effects of immigration on the urban function in terms of the labor market and the housing market,
- economic and spatial restructuring of the city in relationship to immigration,
- immigration policy and activity compared between traditional immigration countries and non-immigration countries,
- immigration trends in post-war Germany and Berlin,
- perspectives on the benefits of immigration to urban areas,
- labor and housing policy measures to encourage the benefits of immigration.

1.2 Causes of immigration

The causes of international immigration are many and varied, but for the most part are dependent on income and standard-of-living differentials. Various theoretical analyses of immigration provide different perspectives on its origins and functions. Neo-classical economic theory describes immigration as resulting from re-establishing of equilibrium through comparative advantage by the movement of workers to new
locations where they can be more efficiently employed (Martiniello, 1995). In a neo-classical analysis, the individual makes the immigration decision based on an economic rationality, whereas in behavioral analysis, other aspects of the conditions of the host society and destination society are considered, such as selective information and social networks (Malmberg, 1997). Marxist theorists would consider immigration as fulfilling capitalist interests by providing a reserve of low-cost labor to absorb the shocks of economic recession or expansion (Martiniello, 1995).

Individual immigration decisions are influenced by a wide range of circumstances within families, groups and countries such as personal and financial security, social networks, and connections to cultural and physical environments. Specific processes and mechanisms of immigration must be analyzed in relation to their contexts, as the causes and effects can be fundamentally different under different conditions.

1.3 Immigration in the global context

Immigration is a geographic process with spatial, economic, social and political attributes. It is a global phenomenon that has a range of regional and local consequences. As of the end of the twentieth century, there were about 100 million international immigrants, or people living outside of their country of birth. In contrast, approximately six billion people had not left their native country. Although immigration is a significant geographic process, the figures show that more than 98 percent of the world’s population remain in their native countries (Hammar and Tamas, 1997).

Historically, most immigration movement has been from less developed countries to more developed countries, or from countries with a lower GDP per capita to countries with a higher GDP per capita. Additionally, most immigration has been to urban areas. Recent analyses have demonstrated that, since World War II, eighty percent of international immigration has been to cities, making immigration a primarily urban issue (Boal, 1996).
Part 2

Immigration in the contemporary city

2.1 The importance of the labor market and the housing market

The two most important mechanisms of social and spatial allocation are the labor market and the housing market. They represent “two pivotal sorting agents in a market economy.” The labor market is the “essential social allocation mechanism….Through the distribution of jobs, people are assigned to certain positions within the social stratification” (Kloosterman, 1998). Labor market participation and employment structure are among the most important indicators of integration into the host society (Thieme and Laux, 1996). A sharply segmented labor market may generate a polarized social and spatial classification. In some urban areas, high concentrations of immigrants are associated with the lower ends of both the labor market and the housing market, displaying low economic activity, low incomes, high unemployment and poor housing conditions.

2.2 The effects of economic restructuring on immigrant groups

In the last decades of the twentieth century, economic restructuring in developed, post-industrial countries has evidenced itself largely in the shift away from dominance of employment in the manufacturing sector to dominance in the service sector. Many labor-intensive manufacturing functions have relocated to developing countries where low-cost labor enhances production competitiveness. Manufacturing plants that have remained in developed countries have seen dramatic changes over the last three decades, transforming from the Fordist system of large-scale assembly line mass production, to the post-Fordist production system using sophisticated technological manufacturing processes. Post-Fordist systems favor small and medium size firms, using advanced technological processes, which can exercise production flexibility, agility and quick response times to changing market demands. These production changes have been reflected in a reduced labor demand for manufacturing workers. Those manufacturing jobs that do persist in the new economy call for increasingly skilled and educated workers. This systemic transformation has hit immigrant groups the hardest, as foreign workers typically immigrated to work in the
low skill manufacturing jobs that have seen significant reduction during restructuring. The restructuring of the formal economy and the growth of the informal economy has led to a bifurcation of the labor market, where low skilled and immigrant workers are increasingly polarized into the secondary economy.

Immigrants tend to bear the brunt of economic restructuring (Castles, 1992). Recent labor market trends suggest the emergence of a lasting split in post-industrialized economies along ethnic lines (Kloosterman, 1998). With a weak and high-risk position in the labor market, immigrants are particularly susceptible to economic trends and generally exhibit exaggerated responses to changing conditions. During economic recessions, immigrants are among the first to be released from their jobs; during recovery, they are among the last to be re-hired. In this fashion, the presence of an immigrant labor group provides a kind of protective buffer for native workers. The immigrants absorb the shock of employment changes, allowing native employment to remain more stable.

2.3 The effects of globalization on immigrant groups

The process of economic globalization, in combination with economic restructuring, is creating an urban transformation that has spatial, social, cultural and political repercussions. Globalization of economic activity entails a widespread pattern of product standardization, generally reducing skilled labor requirements. By contrast, the other side of consumer demand associated with globalized culture is the market for high-end goods and services that are more often produced through labor-intensive methods. The increase of standardization helps to create a growing enthusiasm for specialized, sometimes “ethnic” products (Hillman and Rudolph, 1997). This market polarization can be seen as part of a growth in a multi-cultural market in which the city is the key location.

The spatial response to globalization is seen in the regionalization that has altered the structure of the city. Much economic investment has shifted to sub-urban and ex-urban locations, leaving the inner city areas, where immigrant groups tend to live, as areas of disinvestment. The political transformation is being created by emerging transnational groupings, among the more significant being the European
Union. This regional political and economic integration is altering the significance of national borders, and simultaneously establishing new regional policies that impact developing spatial structures.

The changes presented by globalization, the polarization of consumer demand, specialization of consumer services, opportunities for new investment in areas of neglect, and transnational linkages are creating a new opportunity structure in the urban economy (Hillman and Rudolph, 1997). Immigrants and ethnic minorities are one of the key groups in this new urban construct. Depending on policy applications, opportunities for economic mobility and social cohesion can be either undermined or enhanced by globalization and economic restructuring.

2.4 Housing policy, the housing market, spatial concentration and segregation

The housing market is the primary mechanism of spatial allocation, shaping the composition of residential neighborhoods. Governmental policy and participation in the housing market modifies market forces and “decomodifies” parts of the housing stock. Public involvement in the housing market can effect price levels, investment levels, the quality and maintenance of the stock, the rate of turnover and the social mix of residents. Policy can also enable access to better quality housing or home ownership, facilitating social mobility.

Suburbanization in the last few decades has created many openings in the lower end of the urban housing market, often located in or near center cities. Immigrant communities, especially new or recently forming groups, have taken advantage of the low cost urban locations, and have tended to cluster in inner city areas. There have been some efforts at immigrant deconcentration, however dispersal policies have often failed as migrants have tended to move to established concentrations of their compatriots.

Spatial consequences of immigration can range from spatially distinct ethnic enclaves, seen most often in the United States, to scattered settlements with little localized identity in the urban area. Some ethnic groups disappear into the urban landscape while others are quite visible in their distinctive community forms and occupational niches. Some are socially and economically marginalized within their
broader urban and national settings, suffering from poverty and lack of access to resources, while others have been able to build social capital and create cultural advantages to enjoy prosperous conditions.

In general, studies comparing the degree of residential segregation in cities in the United States with that in European cities show lower segregation levels in European cities. The racial divide in the United States, a consequence of the previous forced immigration of Africans, is exhibited in highly segregated residential patterns between blacks and whites, and makes a unique contribution to the international variation in levels of segregation (Boal, 1996). Segregation levels of ethnic minorities other than African American also tend to be higher in the United States than in European countries.

Some degree of residential spatial concentration may benefit immigrant communities. Concentration can mediate the adjustment of both established and newly arriving immigrants through cultural support and the provision of various resources available to the group. The maintenance of a distinctive set of cultural attributes can be useful to establish identity and solidarity within the wider society.

2.5 The formation of social institutions associated with residential concentration

Ethnic groups are often attracted to urban areas not only by employment and housing opportunities, but also by the existence of established ethnic communities and institutions. Ethnic groups have encouraged the formation of a range of institutions to exist parallel to both public and private ones in the dominant society, forming such institutions as social resource agencies, fraternal organizations and charities, insurance companies and in some cases even hospitals. An example of a high level of immigrant social institutions is found in the city of Stuttgart, Germany, where more than 150 immigrant associations have been formed (OECD, 1998). In many cases it is the organizations created by immigrants that attract more immigrants. Ethnic organizations can work with public and private agencies and be active in the planning and delivery of services. The existence of ethnic institutions can provide a protective environment, allowing members to learn the norms and expectations of the host society. In some cases, the system of institutions can become so developed that
immigrants can fully function in an ethnic subculture (Archdeacon, 1992). Many cities have found it a useful policy to promote independent immigrant organizations and self-help initiatives in social, cultural and political areas (Häußermann, 1998).
3.1 Immigration countries versus non-immigration countries

The main immigration countries are considered to be Australia, Canada and the United States. In these countries, nation-building has been at least partly defined by immigration policies and activities. Immigration has been considered and encouraged as permanent resettlement, with immigrants treated as future citizens, with secure residence and work status.

In general, European countries consider themselves to be non-immigration countries, but rather temporary locations for migrant laborers, or “guest-workers”, primarily from the European periphery. The classic countries of the guestworker system are Germany, Switzerland and Austria. In these countries, the labor and housing markets for immigrants tend to be restricted. Although the immigrants’ period of residence in these countries was intended to be temporary, in reality many stayed and became permanent residents, but often without the accompanying civil protections and rights. A few European countries, such as France, the Netherlands and Great Britain, which had established foreign colonies, generally welcomed their former colonials, many of whom already had citizenship status at the time of their immigration. In the immigration countries, policy encourages immigrants to participate and integrate into the host society; in the non-immigration countries, policy reinforces insecurity and instability, separation and isolation (Boal, 1996).

3.2 An example of immigration trends in the immigration country of Australia

Australia is considered a classic immigration country and a model for progressive immigration policy. Immigration activities in Australia started with British colonization in 1788. As of the early 1990s, the majority of Australians were either immigrants or descendants of immigrants, and twenty percent were either first or second generation immigrants, the highest proportion of any developed country (Castles, 1992). For more than two hundred years, federal and state governments have recruited, subsidized or encouraged immigration, providing a variety of services specially designed to accommodate immigrants. After World War II, Australia
decided that it needed to increase its population and established the Department of Immigration to promote immigration policies. During the 1950s and 1960s, the government believed that non-British immigration would threaten national identity and social cohesion. Finally, in the 1970s, Australia abolished its “White Australia” policy, and many immigrants arrived from Vietnam and Lebanon. As immigrants became more ethnically diverse, Australia promoted a policy of assimilation, believing that immigrants should be culturally and socially absorbed and become fully integrated into the predominant Anglo-Australian population. The central thrust of the 1970s assimilation policy was to treat most migrants as future citizens who were to live and work with Anglo-Australians.

In the 1980s, Australian policy evolved to recognize the benefits of a culturally diverse society to the promotion of international trade. Their naturalization policy changed from a five year required residency period to a two year required period. Their system has evolved to one of *jus soli* (rights of the soil), where immigrant children born in the country automatically become Australian citizens. The system of *jus soli*, also used in the United States and Canada, is in contrast to the predominantly European system of *jus sanguinis* (rights of the blood), where nationality is transferred only through immediate family membership. The system of *jus soli* is more supportive of an equitable multi-cultural society.

### 3.3 Comparisons among Europe, Australia and the United States

Comparing immigration trends in Europe, Australia and the United States reveals both differences and similarities among the three areas. This comparison must recognize that Australia and the United States are not only significant land masses and demographic and economic powers, but are also politically united. European countries are becoming more politically and economically united through the continued development of the European Union, however, their history is one of a collection of distinct and separate nation states. Some key areas of comparison are (Castles, 1992):

1. Natural and political border conditions create differing levels of necessary control and different likelihoods of real and perceived uncontrolled or illegal immigration. Australia’s borders are all defined by coastline and so population
flow is more controlled. Europe’s eastern border and the US’s southern border both coincide with a significant prosperity differential; population flows across these borders are large and difficult to control.

2. In Australia and in the United States, immigrants have played a large role in nation-building and in national identity. In Europe, nation-building has been largely independent of considerations of immigration, and in some cases is perceived as threatened by the presence of immigrants groups.

3. In Australia and the United States, immigration policy has been directed toward the encouragement of permanent family settlement. In Europe, programs of permanent family settlement have been somewhat isolated and viewed as exceptions.

4. In Australia and the United States, immigration policy has been inclusionary in nature, geared toward easy and quick access to citizenship status and the accompanying rights and duties. In Europe, citizenship is typically much more difficult to acquire, involving long residential requirements and other proven steps toward cultural assimilation.

5. All three regions have seen increasing non-Anglo, non-European immigration groups in recent years.

6. All three regions have experienced residential concentrations of immigrant groups in urban areas, often associated with inferior housing standards and inferior infrastructure.

7. All three regions have experienced segregation in the labor market, often with immigrants concentrated in low-skill, low-wage employment, or unemployed.
Part 4
Immigration in Germany

4.1 Post-war immigration trends in Germany

Since the end of World War II, Germany has been the destination of millions of immigrants and refugees. In the latter half of the twentieth century, Germany has seen several waves of immigration, each of a fairly distinct character. Prior to the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961, immigration was composed mostly of a slow but steady flow of refugees from East Germany (the German Democratic Republic (GDR)), and from other former German territories in Eastern Europe. After the construction of the wall, immigration from the eastern countries was totally eliminated, leaving the then booming economy of West Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)), without its earlier sources of supplementary labor.

Five phases of post-war immigration to (West) Germany can be identified (Münz and Ulrich, 1998; Honekopp, 1994; Zimmerman, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dominant migration trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>1961 – 1973</td>
<td>Labor Recruitment Phase. Migration of workers from Mediterranean countries due to active recruitment of foreign labor (Gastarbeiter) by FRG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase V</td>
<td>Since 1993</td>
<td>Refugee Restriction Phase. As Phase IV, but with the introduction of more restrictive policies and resulting immigration slow-down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1 Phase I: War Adjustment Phase

The first phase of immigration was motivated by political as much as economical reasons. This phase was comprised largely of people with German heritage, many of who were from East Germany and other former eastern territories that were ceded to Poland and Russia after World War II. The integration of these immigrants was, in general, quite smooth and effective. Jobs during this period were plentiful and unemployment was low, since the economy during Germany’s wartime recovery was expanding (Freund, 1993).

4.1.2 Phase II: Labor Recruitment Phase

The construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961 put an abrupt end to the migration from the eastern block countries. In response to the closing of the borders, from 1961 through 1963 the German government established bi-lateral agreements with the Mediterranean countries of Spain, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Morocco, Portugal, and Tunisia for the provision of “guest-workers” (Ausländerer Beauftragte, 1999). During this period, similar arrangements were made by other northern European countries that were also experiencing economic growth and labor shortages. This policy created the first significant wave of foreigners to West Germany, occurring in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The guest-workers, or Gastarbeiter, were conceived as temporary laborers, recruited to work mostly in the manufacturing industries. Their length of stay was anticipated to be one or two years. Most of the original Gastarbeiter were male, age 25 – 35, who came to Germany without their families. The recruitment program included arrangements for work and for housing. The bi-lateral agreements for temporary labor supply were intended to benefit both countries. As Germany needed manufacturing labor, so the southern countries were eager to have their workers trained in manufacturing to help shift their sluggish economies away from their agricultural dominance and toward the then preferred manufacturing industry.

In 1973, 11.9 percent of the German workforce was made up of foreigners, the highest proportion in the country’s history (Hillman, 1999; Thieme and Laux, 1996). The Gastarbeiter policy, in effect for approximately only ten years, set up social
networks that sustained immigration to Germany for the decades to follow. New waves of immigrants utilized the established networks, causing immigration to become a self-perpetuating process (Wilpert, 1992). (1)

4.1.3 Phase III: Consolidation / Family Reunification Phase

A sharp break in the immigration of Gastarbeiter came in 1973 when the first world oil crisis precipitated a wave of global economic restructuring. Responding to the economic downturn, Germany ceased its recruitment of workers from non-European Union countries. From 1973 until 1975, many immigrants returned to their native countries and there was a marked decline in the number of foreigners arriving in Germany.

During the last half of the 1970s, although recruitment of foreign workers had stopped, a new policy of family reunification resulted in an increase in the number of arriving foreigners over departing foreigners. It was during this period that the guest-workers from Turkey established themselves as a seemingly permanent immigrant group in Germany. During this period, many immigrants from countries of the European Union tended to return home, since they had the freedom to emigrate again if desired. However the immigrants from Turkey feared that if they returned home, they would not be able to re-immigrate to Germany, since they did not enjoy the privilege of membership in the EU and the freedom of movement within EU countries. This period of family reunification created a demographic shift in the immigrant population as Turkish women and children arrived in large numbers. The family reunification program created demographic conditions for growth of the Turkish population as their fertility rate then began to exceed the fertility rate of the German population.

4.1.4 Phase IV: Ethnic German Resettlement Phase

During the first half of the 1980s, immigration again declined and hit a relative low point during the recession of 1983-1984. Starting in the mid-1980s, policy changes encouraged the arrival of three new types of immigrants: 1) Refugees attracted by the liberal asylum regulations of the German constitution; 2) Ethnic
Germans (*Aussiedler*) from Eastern European countries; and 3) Other immigrants from the politically and economically repressed eastern European countries. Germany has a modern legacy of liberal asylum laws, established partly to compensate for the previous persecution tactics of the Nazi regime. This new wave of immigration represented a shift from the “pull” forces of a strong internal German economy to the “push” forces of political and economic instability in eastern Europe (Häußermann, 1998). After the collapse of the socialist system in eastern Europe in the late 1980s, the new immigration flows rose to a maximum in 1992 when there were approximately 1.2 million immigrants, surpassing even the traditional immigration countries of the United States, Canada and Australia.

4.1.5 *Phase V: Immigration Restriction Phase*

Because of the overwhelming numbers of immigrants in the early 1990s, just after the fall of the Berlin wall, and coinciding with the structural challenges of German reunification, restrictions were placed on the admission of *Aussiedler* and political refugees. In 1993, regulations were adjusted to share the asylum of political refugees among all of the countries of the European Union. In the mid-1990s, as a reaction to the huge numbers of asylum seekers arriving in Germany, regulations were again changed to restrict immigration of asylum seekers to those who can prove persecution in their homeland. Funds were made available to encourage repatriation of immigrants who wished to return to their native countries. The restrictions were effective in reducing the flow of immigrants to the newly united Germany.

4.2 *Immigrants in divided East Germany*

During the Cold War period, from approximately 1950 until 1989, the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) in East Germany also enacted some recruitment policies, although considerably fewer workers were involved than in West Germany. Intergovernmental agreements were established with countries of similar socialist political systems such as Vietnam, Poland, Mozambique, Angola, Algeria and Cuba for temporary foreign workers. In East Berlin, unlike in West Berlin, at the completion of the agreements, most foreign workers returned to their homelands. In
general, however, East Germany was characterized primarily by extreme emigration, a condition that led to its eventual collapse. During the period of 1950 to 1994, East Germany lost 4.9 million people to West Germany. The East German population, although its fertility rate exceeded its mortality rate, declined during this time by a total of 2.9 million people (Münz and Ulrich, 1998).

4.3 German identity and concept of nationality

Nationality policies of Germany have been influenced by the relatively politically insecure and transitional history of the German nation-state. As late as the latter half of the nineteenth century, the region was still an amalgamation of separate states. Originally proclaimed as a united Germany under King Wilhelm I in 1871, the country continued to endure periodic territory disputes, conflicts and wars with neighboring countries until the end of World War II and the creation of a new nation, the Federal Republic of Germany, in 1949. After enduring the construction of the Berlin Wall during the height of the Cold War in 1961, and then its collapse in 1989, borders changed again. Modern German history is a series of repeated and failed attempts to establish and sustain a strong, independent nation state (O’Brien, 1992). This tumultuous and insecure history, full of threats to German solidarity, helped to embed the concept of German-ness as a shared cultural, ethnic and lingual identity needing protection, and not a strong political identity as is the case with historically secure nation-states. The historical political insecurity has been a factor in the maintenance of relatively regressive immigration policies.

4.4 German citizenship policy

The policy on German nationality and citizenship is one of genetic transference through direct inheritance, without regard to place of birth. This system of nationality, *jus sanguinis*, is in contrast to the system of *jus soli* that is more typically used, especially by immigration countries such as Australia, Canada and the United States (Janoski and Glennie, 1995). Immigrants in Germany, as well as immigrants in Switzerland, Austria and the Scandinavian countries, tend to maintain their original foreign nationality. Immigrants in the nearby countries of France, England, Spain and
Portugal, countries with a tradition of colonialization, tend to come from the former colonies and so are both ethnic minorities and citizens of the host country. Even considering some recent liberalization of naturalization laws, it has been a rare occurrence for a foreigner to gain German citizenship through naturalization. Many critics claim that Germany’s legal system of *jus sanguinis* is antithetical to the development of an integrated multicultural society. (2)

### 4.5 Immigrant status in Germany

The majority of immigrants in Germany maintain foreign citizenship and are considered foreigners or *ausländer*, instead of immigrants or *einwanderer*. This distinction affects their political, social and economic status and is one of the main policy concerns surrounding the issue of immigration. These definitions imply that citizenship and immigrant status are mutually exclusive categories; consequently, once citizenship is attained, there is no longer any official recognition or documentation of race, ethnicity or ancestry (Thieme and Laux, 1996), implying a policy position of denial of the evolution of a multicultural society. (3)

### 4.6 Immigration and contemporary nation-building

The issue of immigration is particularly salient to Germans since reunification. The political restructuring of the FRG in 1949 was effective in its effort to form a completely new nation-state with a new democratic constitution. Immigration trends are complicating national identity by influencing the membership and identity of the new Germany. Recent studies have shown that Germans have been resocialized away from the past nationalism and have adopted a new national identity based on Western liberalism (O’Brien, 1992). However, immigration policy has not evolved to reflect the new liberalism.

During the creation of the FRG, the constitution was written in such a way to influence the effects of immigration on nation-building. Article 16 of the constitution guarantees political asylum to politically persecuted people around the world. This policy was created as a kind of compensation to those who accepted the persecuted Germans who fled the country during the Nazi regime (O’Brien, 1992). Additionally,
even during division, the constitution was written to recognize only one Germany. The responsibility of looking after the welfare of its citizens, regardless of residence, was constitutionally assigned to the FRG through Article 116, which offers immediate citizenship to all people of German heritage. It is Article 116 that provides the basis for Ausseidler immigration that brings ethnic Germans (Ausseidler) back to Germany as full citizens from a central and eastern European diaspora. Although the constitution establishes a national policy of broad acceptance of immigrants, immigrants live in Germany without the full rights, duties and protections of citizenship.

4.7 Migration of ethnic Germans

The Aussiedler program that grants citizenship to ethnic Germans, presents an interesting bundle of policy issues that is having a significant socio-economic effect on reunified Germany. Lifting of the mobility restrictions at reunification brought an increase of Aussiedler to Germany. Between 1950 and 1993, a total of approximately 3,069,000 Aussiedler arrived in Germany (Jones, 1996). Since 1945, more than half of the immigrants arriving in Germany have been ethnic Germans (Munz and Ulrich, 1998). These immigrants have a preferred status and are offered language training, work training and housing subsidies. At the same time they tend to be low-skilled, bringing few job skills to contribute to regional economic activity. The government has enacted a policy of “Equality of Burden” that institutionalizes a system of distribution and settlement according to the distribution of the general population. However, as is typical of ethnic communities, many new settlers eventually relocate to reestablish their traditional social networks, tending to create a mismatch of the location of labor supply and demand. The new states, or Länder, in the eastern part of the country that have been experiencing declining populations have recently been offering opportunities for Aussiedler to settle there in an attempt to stabilize their populations. This is an ironic twist for an area with a lagging economy, high unemployment, as well as some demonstrated xenophobic anti-foreigner attitudes, to be encouraging the foreign relatives of former exiles to settle there.
4.8 Polarization in the German labor market

Significant differences between Germans and foreigners can be seen within the structure of the labor market. In 1990, 40 percent of foreigners worked in manufacturing while 23 percent of Germans worked in manufacturing. Within the Turkish community, the largest immigrant group in Germany, 52 percent of immigrants worked in manufacturing (Häußermann, 1998). In 1992, as the effects of reunification and restructuring peaked, 56 percent of foreigners in Germany were in unskilled or semi-skilled labor positions; sixteen percent of native Germans were in unskilled or semi-skilled labor positions (Münz and Ulrich, 1998).

Figure 1 shows the amount of immigration in Germany as a percentage of the total population and the percentage of immigrants with social insurance. (The graph of the percentage of immigrants with social insurance is divided by ten to make the scales of the two lines similar and the trends more easily comparable.)

![Figure 1: Percentages of immigrant population and immigrants with social insurance in Germany](source: The Federal Government's Commissioner for Foreigners' Issues)

In 1972, 35.7 percent of the population were immigrants, while 66 percent of immigrants had social insurance. In 1996, 8.9 percent of the population were
immigrants, while 27 percent of immigrants had social insurance. Inclusion in the social insurance program is an indication of employment security and social stability. The declining rate of immigrants with social insurance relative to the increasing population rate is a sign of polarization and lack of integration of immigrants in the formal labor market.
Part 5  
Immigration in Berlin

5.1 Uniqueness of and complexities in Berlin

The duration of the Cold War from 1950 through the 1980s, and its abrupt end in the late 1980s, had unique effects on the economic, social and spatial structure of the city of Berlin. At the end of World War II, Berlin was stripped of its capital status. Due to its political and geographic isolation, it lost much of its function as a center of major national and international business activity and was cut off from both supply and demand functions of its regional hinterland. It suffered from political instability that encouraged many firms to move their more important commercial functions to more stable locations. Its exceptional political status made Berlin the beneficiary of large federal subsidies to firms and individual tax reductions to workers. As a result, competitive economic mechanisms were totally distorted, preference was given to high-capital, low-skill production, and Berlin did not experience the modernization of economic restructuring. (4)

At reunification, socialist industry collapsed in East Berlin and subsidies disappeared from an artificially supported and non-competitive market in West Berlin. The economic turbulence was accompanied by rising unemployment and growth in the informal economy. Real estate development and construction activities associated with the re-building of a new capital city are being accomplished partly with undocumented workers from central and eastern Europe. Since reunification, informalization has also developed in more marginal segments of the labor market, such as street trading and performing, rather atypical activities for developed countries (Hillman and Rudolph, 1997).

5.2 Reunification effects unemployment

Since the reunification of Berlin, unemployment throughout the labor force has increased dramatically. The increase has occurred in both East and West Berlin, and has effected immigrants much more than native Germans. In 1991 almost twelve percent of the labor force in Berlin were immigrants; by 1997 their share had dropped to 7.2 percent (9.6 percent in West Berlin). Unemployment among immigrants has
increased much more than among natives. In January 1998, the general unemployment rate in Berlin was 17 percent, while the unemployment rate for immigrants was 34.4 percent. Figure 2 shows the contrast of documented monthly income of immigrants and Germans in Berlin in 1997, indicating the relatively low-income status of the immigrant population. Figure 3 compares the unemployment rates of the immigrant population to the total population, showing the general rise in unemployment since reunification and the disproportionate rise in immigrant unemployment. (5)

![Figure 2: 1997 Monthly Income of Berlin Residents](image)

(Source: Statistisches Jahrbuch Berlin 1998, from 1997 Microcensus, accessed through Berliner Institut für Vergleichende Sozialforschung)

5.3 **Reunification, restructuring and ethnic entrepreneurship**

Since the economic downturn following reunification, the numbers of self-employed among both the native and the foreign populations have grown. In times of growing unemployment associated with economic restructuring, it is often the case that self-employment opportunities are more readily available and offer an alternative means to economic survival. Ethnic entrepreneurship has recently been recognized as
a valuable strategy for economic advancement of those groups who may face discriminatory treatment in the mainstream workplace. In Berlin, as in other European and US cities, self-employment is seen as an effective strategy to cope with a deteriorating employment situation. The total number of self-employed among immigrants in Berlin showed a remarkable growth of more than 40% during the early 1990s, from 9,300 in 1991 to 13,300 in 1993. The share of immigrant self-employed among the total self-employed population increased from 7.1 percent in 1991 to 12.1 percent in 1997. However, on average, firms with immigrant ownership show higher fluctuations and shorter life cycles than firms in German ownership (Hillman and Rudolph, 1997). Figure 4 shows the recent overall decline in immigrant participation in the workforce, while self employment and skilled labor have maintained steadier levels of participation. Figure 5 compares the creation of new firms between the total population and the immigrant population showing the overall decline in the total number of new firms, with the recent rate of closings exceeding the rate of start-ups. The total number of new immigrant firms has also declined in recent years as the number of closings approaches the number of start-ups.
5.4 Ethnic enclave economies

The creation of ethnic enclave economies is a particularly US phenomenon that has been one characteristic of the ethnic division of labor in the US. Ethnic enclaves are usually large, concentrated, spatially distinct, diversified markets, linked to the general economy. (Examples in the US are Chinatown in New York; Chinatown in San Francisco; the Latin Quarter (Little Havana) in Miami.) In the case of the ethnic enclave, the economy is large and diverse enough to be both self-supporting and to serve as an export platform, encouraging expansion. Export industries generate surplus income that recirculates through the enclave economy and trickles down to local merchants. This multiplier effect allows further diversification, with businesses expanding by moving back or forward along the supply chain. The growth of the enclave hinges on access to customers beyond the ethnic community (Aldrich, 1990), and can contribute to the larger urban economy. Ethnic enclaves often provide opportunities for economic success for immigrants and so can be a means of economic mobility and integration (Neymarc, 1998). It has been noted that the concept of the
ethnic enclave, as developed in the United States, cannot be directly transferred into the European or German context, and that interest in research on ethnicity as an organizational principal of the labor market is just emerging in the EU (Hillman and Rudolph, 1997). This contrast is due to a variety of factors such as differences in historical conditions of immigration to Germany, the influence of the guest-worker policy that originally directed immigrants into manufacturing sectors, the non-immigration policy that discourages informal ethnic cultural expression, the systemic resistance to citizenship that discourages full economic participation, and the tendency for relatively lower levels of residential ethnic concentration.

### 5.5 Women in the Berlin ethnic economy

Filicitas Hillmann, in her 1999 article “A Look at the ‘Hidden Side’: Turkish Women in Berlin’s Ethnic Market”, found that women entrepreneurs often do not
consider themselves part of the ‘ethnic economy’. She found that the concept of “ethnic entrepreneurship” as has often been described in recent literature, is primarily a male concept. Entrepreneurial women, seeking some level of independent success, often must extract themselves from the ethnic market and establish business relationships with the mainstream formal labor market. This aspect of ethnic female entrepreneurship then promotes economic integration of ethnic and native businesses.

Figure 6: Immigrants in selected German cities as of 1995

(Source: The Federal Government's Commissioner for Foreigners' Issues)
5.6 Immigrant communities in Berlin

As of the beginning of 1999, the total population of Berlin, the largest city in Germany, was approximately 3.4 million people. Of the total population, there were approximately 440,000 immigrants from more than 180 countries living in the 23 districts of Berlin. Figure 6 shows a graphic comparison of the total and immigrant populations of the German cities with the largest immigrant populations. It can be seen that Berlin has the largest absolute number of immigrants, however not the largest relative immigrant population. The proportion of immigrants to the total population in Berlin has continued to increase. In 1998, it was 13 percent.

Table 1: 1999 Native and foreign population by district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>% foreign of total pop</th>
<th>% German of total German</th>
<th>% foreign of total foreign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mitte</td>
<td>73,723</td>
<td>64,130</td>
<td>9,593</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tiergarten</td>
<td>89,359</td>
<td>63,722</td>
<td>25,637</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wedding</td>
<td>154,435</td>
<td>106,665</td>
<td>47,770</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prenzlauer Berg</td>
<td>129,971</td>
<td>119,202</td>
<td>10,769</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Friedrichschain</td>
<td>96,446</td>
<td>88,133</td>
<td>8,313</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kreuzberg</td>
<td>146,884</td>
<td>97,874</td>
<td>49,010</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Charlottenburg</td>
<td>174,412</td>
<td>141,803</td>
<td>32,609</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spandau</td>
<td>215,693</td>
<td>192,306</td>
<td>23,387</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Wilmersdorf</td>
<td>138,105</td>
<td>118,224</td>
<td>19,881</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Zehlendorf</td>
<td>97,435</td>
<td>88,154</td>
<td>9,281</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Schoneberg</td>
<td>145,504</td>
<td>113,026</td>
<td>32,478</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Steglitz</td>
<td>188,265</td>
<td>169,512</td>
<td>18,753</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Tempelhof</td>
<td>188,505</td>
<td>169,459</td>
<td>19,046</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Neukolin</td>
<td>304,375</td>
<td>240,651</td>
<td>64,324</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Trepтов</td>
<td>112,020</td>
<td>107,956</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kopenick</td>
<td>115,457</td>
<td>110,562</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lichtenberg</td>
<td>151,837</td>
<td>137,171</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Weissensee</td>
<td>73,406</td>
<td>71,345</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Pankow</td>
<td>121,430</td>
<td>116,412</td>
<td>5,018</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Reinickendorf</td>
<td>248,317</td>
<td>225,562</td>
<td>22,755</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Marzahn</td>
<td>138,762</td>
<td>133,695</td>
<td>5,067</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Hohenschonhausen</td>
<td>109,175</td>
<td>103,802</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hellersdorf</td>
<td>126,771</td>
<td>123,744</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total, Berlin  | 3,340,887 | 2,903,110 | 437,777 | 13.1% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| West Berlin    | 2,091,889 | 1,726,958 | 364,931 | 17.4% | 59.5%  | 83.4%  |
| East Berlin    | 1,248,998 | 1,176,152 | 72,846  | 5.8%  | 40.5%  | 16.6%  |

Source: Statistisches Landesamt Berlin

The distribution of the immigrant population throughout the districts of Berlin is spatially concentrated in several districts of former West Berlin, located in the area of disinvestment adjacent to the previous location of the Berlin wall. The
districts with the highest percentage of immigrants are Kreuzberg, Wedding, Tiergarten, Neukölln, and Schöneberg. (Refer to Table 1.) More than half of the immigrants in Berlin were either born or grew up in these five districts.

In Berlin, local immigration bans, or dispersal policies, were established in the 1970s that led to a reduction of the non-German population in the districts of Tiergarten, Wedding and Kruezberg. In 1977, the family reunification policy allowed spouses and children to join immigrants, again enlarging the immigrant population and increasing the concentrations. In 1979, the Berlin Senate instructed housing

associations to allocate ten percent of public housing to foreign households. This quota was raised to fifteen percent in 1982, however the quotas were not well monitored or maintained (Häußermann, 1998), and the policy effort of dispersal was not successful.
Figure 7 and Table 1 show recent and current populations of city districts of Berlin, with their German and immigrant populations. Figure 7 shows that in the center city districts, German population is declining, while immigrant population is increasing. The districts in the former East Berlin had negligible immigrant population at reunification; since reunification, the inner city districts of the former East Berlin are a popular destination for immigrants. (Refer to Appendix B for a map of the districts of Berlin.)

5.7 Berlin’s Office of Foreigner’s Affairs:
Ausländerbeauftragte of the Berlin Senate

In 1979, the Berlin Senate published its first policy report on immigrants in Berlin, titled “Guidelines and Measures for the Integration of Foreigners in Berlin”. The report officially established:

? Most immigrants wished to stay in Berlin;
? Future immigration should only come from within the European Union;
? A job training program for immigrants should be provided;
? Immigrant labor should be expanded into the public service sector.

Within the Berlin Senate Office of Health and Social Services (Senatsverwaltung für Gesundheit und Soziales) is the Commissioner of Foreigner’s Affairs, the Ausländerbeauftragte. The Berlin Ausländerbeauftragte was established in 1981 to respond to the need for improved social, legal and economic integration of foreigners. It was the first such office to be established in Germany. The office is the primary information source for those seeking advice on immigration policy, including legal and social matters. It is the central coordinating location for immigrant services provided by other departments such as education, youth, labor, and culture. The main purpose of the office is to “diminish impediments to integration in legal, administrative and social spheres; in the long run, it is these impediments which jeopardize the peaceful coexistence of people of different origin, nationality and religion.” (Ausländerbeauftragte, 1999).
Within the office is a working group for the promotion of non-violent, multicultural understanding. Among its activities is the organization of training courses to combat discrimination and violence. It also provides direct counseling in individual cases of discrimination. In its public relations work, the office publicly promotes “integration, openness and understanding” within its informational role. It provides support with prizes and awards to groups and projects concerning the promotion of integration. The office also provides support for repatriation with counseling and supplementary payments to cover moving and travel expenses for low income foreigners wishing to return to their native countries.
Part 6  
Conclusion: Inferences drawn about policy interventions in the immigrant labor and housing markets

6.1 Benefits of immigration to urban areas

Immigration has, in many locations, counterbalanced the forces of deindustrialization and urban decline. Immigration to cities can maintain population levels or add to growth by filling the void left by the departing middle class. Immigrant groups often repopulate cities and settle in areas of the city that might otherwise be partially abandoned (Garson, 1996). The emergence of ethnic commercial activity can help stabilize the local economy and contribute to the economic, cultural and symbolic importance of the center city (Lin, 1998). Communities with linkages to international locations can promote economic globalization (Boal, 1996).

In the United States, some researchers have suggested that immigrants have influenced the resurgence of the nation’s small business sector. In the US, immigrant entrepreneurs have revitalized many urban neighborhoods: Dominicans in Manhattan’s Upper West Side have made Washington Heights a dynamic and culturally diverse community; Cuban immigrants brought life to Miami’s Little Havana, helping to make it a thriving export-driven economy, and a gateway to international trade. “Global city” theorists claim that some urban changes may offer economic opportunity to immigrants as service sector employment grows in both upper level and lower, or entry, level jobs (Garson and Neymarc, 1996). The danger in this situation is the possible reinforcement of the polarization between the privileged mainstream culture and the marginalized ethnic cultures. Although cities can benefit from the cultural enrichment and employment niches sometimes provided by ethnic groups, it is often at the cost of some internal conflict as groups compete for adequate housing, jobs, education and political representation. The negative side of ethnic conflict exhibits itself in discrimination and xenophobia that threaten urban stability.
6.2 Policy comparisons among countries

Immigration policies vary widely among countries, often reflecting the history and role of immigration in the country. Sharp differences can be seen between the perspectives of traditional immigration countries (Australia, Canada, United States) and European countries. In the traditional immigration countries, lack of integration is not usually perceived as such a pressing concern as it is in European countries. There is little agreement on procedures to make integration policies in the EU more effective, due to a lack of assessment and evaluation (OECD Proceedings, 1998).

The policy in Australia, often considered a model country for effective immigration policy, promotes acceptance of cultural pluralism within carefully defined limits. Immigration levels and categories are worked out as a balance between economic needs, needs of ethnic communities, such as family reunification, and international responsibilities, such as providing asylum for refugees. Three dimensions of policy promoting multiculturalism were defined in 1989:

1. Cultural identity: The right to express and share heritage.
2. Social justice: The right to equality of treatment and opportunity and the removal of barriers.
3. Economic efficiency: The need to utilize skills and talents of all, regardless of background.

In Australia, the United States and Canada, it is considered that citizenship is key to economic, social, and political rights. Although citizenship does not preclude xenophobia, it is critical to full access to the labor and housing markets, a sense of belonging, and the security necessary for long-term participation and civic commitment. It implies full labor market rights, eliminating the tendency to undercut wages or work in clandestine situations. Exclusion from citizenship can create marginalization, threats to good labor relations, and social conflict. Figure 8 shows a spike in documented xenophobic crime in Germany during 1992 and 1993, years of rapidly rising immigration, unemployment and social instability. After the immigration restrictions of 1993, xenophobic crimes began to decline at a greater rate than the decline in immigrant population.
6.3 Recent policy approach in Berlin

In Berlin, the Senate in 1994 published the “Report on Integration and Immigration Policy”, describing policies aimed at promotion and development of mutual understanding and tolerance. The points of emphasis in the report are:

1. Public relations: the promotion of the public image of ethnic groups
2. Promotion and partial funding of social services, language training, job training, legal advice, and women’s issues
3. Informational and consulting services for those seeking help
4. Coordination of immigration office with other departments
5. Naturalization campaign
6. Cooperation with ethnic associations

6.4 Policies for a multi-cultural urban environment

Analysis of the information gathered for this study indicates several policy considerations for the contemporary multi-ethnic global city. The relevant policy measures in the urban context can be viewed as tools of inclusion, civic membership
and participation, promoting cultural identity while combating the forces of exclusion. Although the precise relationship of geographic and economic concentration, segregation and integration of immigrant groups relative to the host society is difficult to determine, several policy measures to promote inclusion and participation can be identified. This report, addressing the immigrant labor and housing markets, suggests the following policy components of a prosperous multi-ethnic city:

6.4.1 Membership or citizenship rights

To promote equal access and participation in the labor and housing markets, information in the study indicates that public policy must guarantee equal access to full civil rights, duties and protections. Typically, this level of political and civic inclusion is associated with citizenship. The German legal system of *jus sanguinis* has a strong exclusionary effect on immigrants, and precludes free and full participation in the labor and housing markets. Another component of these rights, currently lacking in Germany, is anti-discrimination legislation.

6.4.2 Integration of the labor force

Within the policy package of civil rights and duties must be policy promoting integration of and balanced participation in the labor force. The data show that immigrants tend to occupy the lower tiers of the labor market in low skill, low wage and insecure jobs. During economic stability or expansion, this role can be of some value to both the entry level employee, the employer and the economic system. However, during economic recessions, immigrants are among those who suffer the most from unemployment and the array of concomitant difficulties for both the unemployed and the urban system. To alleviate the concentration of urban unemployment, urban labor policy should promote workforce integration with training, information and promotion of opportunities among the immigrant communities and employers. Policy should support efforts to build human capital, knowledge and skill levels using proactive strategies and internal community
resources (Bargeman, 1992). A political and regulatory climate must be created that supports immigrant initiatives in business creation. The ethnic enclave economies of the United States have generally strengthened cultural identity, social cohesion and economic prosperity. Policy supporting diversified, culturally-expressive, ethnic enclave economies should be pursued.

6.4.3 Choice of housing concentration

Also within the policy package must be measures promoting full choice within the housing market. The study shows that immigrant communities, especially newly arriving and forming groups, tend to choose to cluster residually in inner city areas. The residential concentrations offer many benefits to immigrants, both as a source of identity and pride, as well as a source of support for transition into membership in the system of the host society. Housing policy should promote the choice of residential concentration, while assuring acceptable health, safety and comfort standards. Residential concentrations can reinforce the positive recognition of cultural differences, as long as the concentrations are not also associated with urban difficulties of inferior quality housing stock, deteriorating infrastructure, high unemployment and high crime rates. Within a policy that accepts residential concentration should be supporting measures to promote cultural sensitivity and social cohesion. Such programs would include educational improvement, including cross-cultural education when appropriate, as well as other social, cultural or recreational programs designed to include all residents. Policy measures that encourage interaction within intermediary institutions associated with residential concentrations, such as schools, can be a useful way to both recognize the individuality of immigrants groups and simultaneously acknowledge them as members of the larger community (Garson and Neymarc, 1996).

6.5 “Melting pot” versus “salad bowl”

The United States has been referred to in the past as a “melting pot”, where various ethnic groups assimilate into one mainstream culture. More recently the
metaphor “salad bowl” has been introduced to describe the assemblage of urban ethnic communities that maintain their distinct ethnic identities and use their unique ethnic attributes as a market advantage. The “melting pot” concept represents a policy of assimilation and integration in all aspects of urban life. The “salad bowl” concept represents a policy of choice of spatial concentration, where distinct cultural differences are reinforced as social and economic advantages of the urban context, while cross-cultural social cohesion is promoted. The policy approach advocated by this report argues for the “salad bowl” concept.

6.6 Immigrant group participation

The most effective cohesion and participation policies in cities are those which create the social and institutional conditions for action on the part of immigrants themselves (Neymarc, 1998). The development of partnerships between local authorities and the immigrant communities can be accomplished through networks with immigrant associations. The establishment of such organizations by ethnic and immigrant communities is a good indication that immigrants are participating in development functions. Partnerships and networks will allow policy development to appropriately reflect the diverse needs of a multi-ethnic urban population.
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Appendix A

Contributors and discussion guidelines

Contributors
The following individuals and organizations contributed to the content of this paper:

Franz-Josef Kemper, Ph.D., Professor of Human Geography, Geographisches Institut, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany

Karin Wessel, Ph.D., Instructor of Economic Geography, Geographisches Institut, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Chausseestrasse 86, 10115 Berlin

Felicitas Hillman, Ph.D., Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH (Social Science Research Center Berlin), Forschungsschwerpunkt: Arbeitsmarkt und Beschäftigung (Research Area: Labor Market and Employment), Reichpietschufer 50, 10785 Berlin, Germany

Türkischer Bund in Berlin-Brandenburg eV. (Turkish Union in Berlin-Brandenburg) Weichselstraße 66, 12043 Berlin, Germany
Primary contributor: Safter Çinar, Sprecher

Ausländerbeauftragte of the Berlin Senate (Office of Foreigners’ Affairs) Potsdamer Strasse 65, 10785 Berlin, Germany
Primary contributor: Frau Pohl, Public Relations

Institut für Vergleihende Sozialforschung (Berlin Institute for Comparative Social Research), member organization of the European Migration Center, Schliemannstrasse 23, 10437 Berlin, Germany

Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Ausländerfragen (The Federal Government’s Commissioner for Foreigners’ Issues), Mauerstrasse 45, 11017 Berlin, Germany

Statistisches Landesamt Berlin
Alt-Friedrichsfelde 60, 10315 Berlin (Lichtenberg), Germany

Discussion guidelines
1. Why did immigrants move to Berlin?
2. Why do immigrants choose to stay in Berlin?

Housing
1. Are the housing conditions for immigrant groups satisfactory?
2. Do immigrants have choice in housing?
3. What is the extent of segregation / integration in housing?
4. Is the level of housing integration satisfactory?
5. Could it or should it be improved? If so, how?

Employment
1. Are the employment conditions for immigrants satisfactory?
2. Do immigrants have choice in employment?
3. What is the extent of segregation / integration in employment?
4. Is the level of employment integration satisfactory?
5. Could it or should it be improved? If so, how?

Education
1. What is the educational situation for immigrants?

General
1. What would improve conditions for immigrant communities in Berlin?
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*Map of Berlin showing districts and population concentration of immigrants.*
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Appendix C

Notes

(1) The guestworker policy of several EU countries has a less-well known parallel in the United States. In the 1950s, the US created a bi-lateral migrant-worker agreement with Mexico, known as the Bracero Program. Although the significant immigration of Mexicans to the US is due largely to more recent liberal policy in combination with the wage differentials and spatial proximity, the Bracero Program played an important role in the perpetuation of the immigrant flow from Mexico to the US. It originated strong connections between many Mexican people and places in the US, thus establishing familiarity and linkages with the host country that served to encourage further migration in the ensuing decades (Roseman, Laux, and Thieme, 1996).

(2) The German citizenship policy leads to some possible confusion of terms and definitions. Since immigrants in Germany are foreigners, by definition, a German cannot be an immigrant, and an immigrant cannot be a German. In Germany, the large majority of immigrants maintain their original citizenship (or their family’s citizenship) and so remain foreigners. If an immigrant attains citizenship, he is no longer an immigrant, but then a German. The Ausseidler (ethnic Germans), who bring many of the cultural differences of immigrants, are not immigrants upon arrival, but Germans.

(3) One result of the non-immigration policy of the German government is a dearth of coherent and comprehensive collection of statistical data on immigrant populations and activities.

(4) The unique political division of Berlin of the 1950s through the 1980s creates unique analytical challenges resulting from a lack of standardized data and difficulty in comparing the immigration phenomenon in Berlin to those in other cities.

(5) When data are shown that span the year of reunification (1989), the data prior to 1990 are for West Berlin or West Germany only. Data for 1990 and later are for united Berlin or united Germany. Data for East Germany and East Berlin prior to 1990 are not available.