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The Economies of Urban Diversity: An Introduction

Darja Reuschke, Monika Salzbrunn, and Korinna Schönhärl

1. Two Cultural Capitals and Their Potential in Urban Diversity

As European Capitals of Culture in 2010 and metropolitan areas of immigration and transmigration, both Istanbul and the Ruhr Area (Essen was designated as European Capital of Culture on behalf of the Ruhr Area) share a complex cultural and social history. Strong human, political, and economic ties have long linked the European Capital of Culture of Turkey to Germany’s main immigration region, which is about to become a new cultural center thanks to the recognition of its industrial heritage by UNESCO (Zeche Zollverein in Essen). Even though the cultural history of each region is different, a crisscross reading of ‘parallel lives’ between the two countries helps to understand better the use and the potential of urban diversity over time.

The Ruhr Area and Istanbul are both significantly shaped by their religious and ethnic minorities. In the case of the Ruhr Area (see Figures 1.1 and 1.2), its history cannot be exhaustively told without elaborating on processes of modern immigration that started with the recruitment of Polish mining workers in the nineteenth century. During the second half of the last century, people from Turkey, among others, were increasingly recruited to satisfy the demand for cheap labor in the steel industry. The demographic structure of the Ruhr Area today reflects these diverse migration narratives. This is reflected, for instance, in current discourses in both academia and the public sphere on whether a representation of
this migration history by means of a migration museum is a worthwhile project (Baur, 2009; DOMiD, 2012). The Ruhr Area and its future viability are shaped by these cultural dynamics and, more generally, by the potential of this diversity. However, diversity is not always considered an auspicious potential: the incorporation of Muslims in a (historically)
predominantly Christian society constitutes a challenge for both sides, especially when it comes to buildings with a representative function in the cityscape. The success of populist parties in various European countries needs to be counterbalanced by fact-based discussion about the economic potential of ethnic and religious minorities. Although Istanbul has a predominantly Muslim population today, it has—like the Ruhr Area—long experience with minorities. A large number of Christians, including, for example, Greek Orthodox and Armenians, lived in the city as indigenous minorities during the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries (Alexandris, 1992).

The population flows between Turkey and Germany are an outstanding example of the complexity and heterogeneity of contemporary migration processes in the Global North. They started in the 1950s and 1960s with the recruitment of guest workers (*Gastarbeiter*)—‘invited’ workers

**Figure 1.2** Ruhr Cities within North Rhine-Westphalia.

*Source: ILS Dortmund.*
who were supposed to rotate with others, but finally stayed and were
often followed by family migration. Multiple flows of people and goods
have developed since. The growing number of journeys, including peo-
ple going back and forth, between the Ruhr Area and Istanbul indicate
how intense the relationship between these two regions has become (see
Ulusoy in this book). These are expressions of “new (global) geographies
of migration” (Hillmann, 2010). In recent years, the so-called return
migration or remigration of Turkish-Germans to Turkey, and Istanbul
in particular, has received much attention in public policy and research.
This debate is strongly linked with the discussion on brain drain and the
migration of the highly skilled (Liebig, 2005; Pusch and Aydin, 2011). The
term return migration, however, is not applicable for migratory move-
ments in which the second generation of Turks, who were born and/or
brought up in Germany, is involved. Their strong ties to Germany may
result rather in circulatory movements.

Today the Ruhr Area as a whole and most of its cities (see Figure 1.2)
suffer from population decline. As a result of deindustrialization and the
closure of coal mines and related industries, many people have left the
region in order to find jobs in more prosperous regions. For example,
between 2000 and 2011 the region’s population has declined by 4.2 percent
to 5.13 million (Regionalverband Ruhr, 2011). In-migration has therefore
become a crucial component of efforts to minimize population decline.
It is the question whether this situation could contribute to greater will-
ingness among the ancestral population to accept migrants or whether
it may rather lead to subliminal fears of foreign infiltration. In contrast,
Istanbul still receives significant numbers of internal and international
migrants, resulting in the constant growth of the metropolitan area.
In 2011 Istanbul had 13.6 million inhabitants distributed over an area
of 5.3 thousand square kilometers in 39 districts (TurkStat, 2012) (see
Figure 1.3).

The economic development of both metropolitan areas has also been
strongly linked to in-migration and out-migration. Historically, both
areas’ urban economies used to depend largely on migrant entrepre-
neurs and workers. While non-Muslim entrepreneurs, particularly Jews
and Greeks, were the drivers of Istanbul’s Ottoman economy, the rise of
the Ruhr Area as the industrial core of the German economy from the
second half of the nineteenth century was highly dependent on Polish
migrants, once local and regional resources of coal mining workers had
been exhausted. In Istanbul, on the other hand, the flight of non-Mus-
lims from the city as a result of ‘Turkification’ policies in 1923–1924 and
pogroms in 1955 changed the economic base and performance dramati-
cally. As a result, the city became predominantly Turkish and Muslim and
Figure 1.3  Map of Istanbul.

Source: Harald Krähe.
only little remained of what used to be the cosmopolitan Constantinople where half of the city’s population was non-Muslim (Gökürk et al., 2010, p. 7). With industrialization processes in the second half of the twentieth century, both the Ruhr Area and Istanbul experienced massive immigration, changing the urban population dramatically. While foreign immigrants, mainly from Turkey, entered the Ruhr, it was rural migrants from the south and east of Turkey that came to Istanbul in search of jobs in manufacturing.

This edited volume deals with ethnic and religious minorities in urban economies: the main interest being economic and social issues and the opportunities of urban diversity. At the same time, endogenous potentials are relevant. These are discussed with regard to their utilization in economic development. Previous literature has looked at culture and art in cities and has explored the entwinement of cultural and economic issues by addressing the economic impacts of cultural events (Göktürk et al., 2010). This volume adds to this research by employing a wider approach using concepts of urban diversity, superdiversity, and ethnic entrepreneurship, and highlighting the linkages between urban diversity and economy in a historical context. It also gives an innovative reply to critiques of methodological nationalism in the migration literature (Glick Schiller and Çağlar, 2011) by linking social geography, urban studies, and social and economic history to migration studies. It aims to develop a novel perspective on the economy of culture and diversity by taking a transdisciplinary approach and dealing with ethnic and religious minorities from a diachronic and synchronic perspective. This contributes to a better understanding of the incorporation processes of the ‘other’ in an urban fabric.

By focusing on Istanbul and the Ruhr Area, this book pursues the questions of how diversity in ethnical and religious terms represents itself, how it is communicated, and, more specifically, how it is merchandised (or not). It asks for traditions and concepts about how to deal with ‘the other’. Thus, the contemporary perception of diversity in the Ruhr Area is highlighted and mirrored with the past and present situations in Istanbul, thereby unraveling the incorporation processes of the ‘other’ in these metropolitan areas. How was the economic potential of urban diversity in the Ruhr valued in the nineteenth century and during the guest worker period of the twentieth century? How did the Ottoman Empire deal with the religious and cultural diversity of its inhabitants, compared to the Ruhr Area? What kind of conflicts with the majority population emerged during the Ottoman Empire and how were they communicated and reconciled? Past developments and experiences are furthermore applied to present urban contexts. To what extent are there continuities in the way Istanbul handles its minorities in past and present? Has the situation of the
minorities changed over time? What new inequalities in the metropolitan area of Istanbul can be observed today through residential segregation and state-led urban regeneration? How is the cosmopolitan past of Istanbul perceived and exploited in present economic and urban contexts? And to come back to the German Capital of Culture: is the situation in Istanbul comparable to the situation in the Ruhr Area? Why is migration in the Ruhr and Germany, as in Istanbul, more generally perceived as a challenge rather than as a benefit? Studying historical and contemporary issues of urban diversity in Istanbul and the Ruhr Area helps to understand better the situation of ethnic minorities in metropolises today.

In both past and present times economic factors have played an important role for the success or failure of immigration processes, and the role of networks and related structures are crucial for urban economies. It is therefore important to investigate incorporation processes of minorities through an economic lens. Migrant businesses are no longer part of a “niche economy” (OECD, 2010). For example, in many districts of the Ruhr Area migrants support not only local service supply structures but also operate in sectors like handcraft, manufacturing, and business services. What are the limitations and potentials of the economic strengths of migrant businesses in the Ruhr Area? Does the Ruhr Area possess adequate policies to use, support, and develop these potentials? Can transfers from the Ruhr Area to Istanbul and vice versa be made in this respect?

2. Diversification of Migration

Up to the 1980s migration was often perceived as being permanent and unidirectional (migration for settlement). An increasing body of literature in the social sciences and humanities, however, has recently shown that migratory movements are much more diverse and complex in nature: circular migration—short term expatriation as well as return migration or remigration—has substituted the binary model of migration processes (Brickell and Datta, 2011; Constant and Massey, 2002; Dustmann et al., 1996; Glick Schiller et al., 1992; Lundholm, 2012; Dick and Reuschke, 2012; Reuschke, 2010; Salzbrunn 2008; Samers, 2010; Steinbrink, 2009). The diversification of migration is due to various factors: the ongoing division of labor, the globalization of capital and labor along with the emergence of knowledge-based economies, demographic factors that lead to global care chains, climate changes, civil wars, etc. In urban areas, economic shifts have led to a concentration of service sector jobs at both ends of the qualification and income spectrum, which has attracted an influx of people to many countries in the Global North. However, there is
also important South-South migration as well as increasing North-South migration, in particular following the economic crisis that started in 2007–2008. Although migration increases social and economic inequalities in most sending countries, contemporary migration is facilitated by improvements in transportation and communication technology and is accompanied by changing social norms and attitudes regarding gender, mobility, and employment. Currently, half of the migrants in Europe are female, but European policies tend to overemphasize family migration without considering independent female labor migration (Salzbrunn, 2010), which has a long history in both the Ruhr Area and Istanbul.

While circular migration means that people circulate between different locations more or less frequently, recent research argues that people have not become ‘rootless’ but tend to develop multiple place identities (Brickell and Datta, 2011) or notions of multiple belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006). They are in touch with their fellow diaspora, community, or network members in person or virtually. Most people with multilocal (or translocal) living practices and belongings develop a number of ties of differing strength and intensity to several places. Their locally anchored social networks in different places/countries may be autonomous or connected. Hence, a network-based concept has emerged, which is not tied to only one place (Rainie and Wellman, 2012). However, after a tendency to overemphasize networks and nomads, most recent studies have convincingly argued in favor of ‘relocating’ migration (studies), as migrants strongly influence the urban spaces in which they reside and not only their countries of origin (Glick Schiller and Çağlar, 2011; Salzbrunn, 2011). This linking of migration and urban studies is partly due to autocritiques by key authors in transnational studies.

The concept of transnational migration (Glick Schiller et al., 1992, 1995; Levitt et al., 2003; Mahler, 1998) departs from a severe critique of the binary conception of emigration and immigration. It applies a multidimensional and longitudinal perspective on migration processes. Transmigration is generally defined as a “process by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement” (Basch et al., 1994, p. 6). During the last 20 years, the concept has been successfully fine-tuned by scholars all over the globe and across disciplines. Ludger Pries (2001), for example, has combined organizational sociology with actor-oriented comprehensive sociology in his migration studies, and Gildas Simon has brought geography and migration studies together by creating the MIGRINTER research group at Poitiers University. Despite the ongoing efforts to take into consideration the complexity of migration processes in transnational studies, critics still see a subtle entertainment of methodological nationalism here (Glick Schiller and Çağlar, 2011).
Inspired by research by social scientists, social historians have established migration as a leading topic on their research agenda. They research case studies of migration in the Ancient World (Merrils and Miles, 2010), in the Middle Ages (Lachenicht, 2010), in Early Modern Times (Reves, 2012) as well as in Modern Times (Fanning, 2011; Harper and Constantine, 2010; in feminist history see, for example, Aubeleand and Pieri, 2011). Historical case studies show that migration, even in its present-day extent and complexity, is by no means a modern phenomenon. In fact, migration occurred in many periods of time displaying many different facets. However, this does not imply that concepts from the past or different cultural contexts may be copied and applied to the present in order to analyze modern or contemporary phenomena of migration. Migration history shows how complex and singular situations of migration and migrants are, while offering a large pool of ideas and concepts (also for the social sciences) with which to examine present migration. Overviews over methods used by historians are provided in Bade (2003), Bade (2011), and Hahn (2012).

Sociological studies also prove that migration is not as global as the public discussion sometimes suggests. In fact, certain groups of privileged people now travel more often, as Eleonore Kofman (2005) reminds us with her critique of Beck’s concept of cosmopolitanism (2004) and Urry’s ideas about mobility (2000). Also, people’s daily lives are still dependent on strong social and spatial ties. Thus, for example, the bulk of social and leisure-related contacts is locally embedded (Mok and Wellman, 2007). Against this background, it is not the scale of transmigration and circular migration that is new in postindustrial knowledge-based societies (as many authors seem to suggest) but rather the diversity and density of people moving back and forth across countries. In addition, the public attention paid to international migration is much larger than it ever was in the past. This, in turn, puts contemporary migration and diversity not only on the agenda of population and migration studies, but also means that the impact of these flows on urban population and economies also requires attention from (urban) economists.

Having said this, on an aggregate national scale circular migration may apply only to a minor fraction of the working population. Nonetheless, focusing on a lower spatial scale, that is, for certain, economically weak cities or regions, shows that in many countries the quantitative incidence of circular migration is much higher (Dick and Reuschke, 2012). Theoretical approaches that can be used to explain these processes thus clearly need to incorporate different geographical scales. City regions and metropolitan areas, which have invariably attracted large numbers of migrants, both from within countries and internationally, are focal points of circular migration processes due to the growth of high-end, well-paid formal services and an intensification of economic informalization.
3. Superdiversity in City Regions

The number of countries represented among immigrants is growing exponentially in most contemporary societies. At the same time, the absolute size of population per migration group is decreasing in many cases, like for the Turks in Germany. Immigrant populations have also become part of a “superdiversity” of contemporary Western societies, as Steven Vertovec has shown taking Great Britain as an example (2006, 2007a, b). His concept is useful for understanding contemporary population dynamics in urban contexts since it is not focused—unlike traditional population studies and mainstream economics—on net immigration, ethnicity, and/or nationality. At the same time, it shifts the focus from multiculturalism to structural inequalities and local differences. Here, superdiversity comprises a set of variables that refer to the immigrants’ cultural background/country of origin (ethnicity, religion, nationality, language, etc.), migration channels (including networks), legal status, socioeconomic features (age, gender, etc.), and geographic factors (Vertovec, 2006). It thus stresses that societies are now “superdiverse” in terms of the national backgrounds, ethnicity, cultural practices, religion, and migration experiences of its members. Although superdiversity may remain concentrated in global cities such as London (Sepulveda et al., 2011), it is important to stress that a diversification of diversity takes place in many urban areas. For example, in the Ruhr Area 186 different nationalities are counted in official registers (Zentrum für Türkeistudien, 2002, 43). The nature of diversity is highly local due to structural factors and historical pathways. This complex picture of diversity, in turn, requires localized tailored approaches in urban policies.

The limitation of nationality-/ethnicity-based concepts in urban planning and policies is most visible in contemporary Istanbul. Here, the “otherness” is constructed not according to nationality but to ethnicity, social status, and urban-rural disparities. Turkish-Kurds and travelers are excluded from participation in urban life, the labor and housing markets, and political decision-making, resulting in extremely high levels of residential segregation, societal exclusion, and vulnerable housing situations. From the second half of the last century rural in-migration added to this a radical form of segregation along urban-rural lifestyles and social class. This is manifested in socially deprived gecekondu settlements, which were built by rural migrants on squatted land. If only nationality is considered, contemporary Istanbul would appear to be a contrasting case to Vertovec’s concept of superdiverse cities. The vast majority of its population is ‘officially’ of Turkish nationality. Even though undocumented immigration would reduce this number by a certain extent, the percentage share of
people with a different nationality would still be significantly lower than in every Western European country. However, class differences and ethnic issues, especially concerning the Kurdish population (see Yonucu in this volume) are also part of the urban diversity, and are crucial to understanding urban economies. In contrast, the third generation of Turks, who were born and educated in Germany, are still perceived as ‘other’ in German society regardless of nationality, language, and social class (see Ulusoy in this volume).

4. Urban Economies and Diversity

How are urban diversity and the economy linked with each other? What does superdiversity mean for urban economies? How can concepts of (super)diversity be used for economic development in urban areas? How does ‘new’ diversity meet ‘old’ diversity (Vertovec, 2009), as in both areas this book explores a long existing variety of populations has encountered new and different migration flows? Diversity studies originally grew up in the context of social movements in the second half of the twentieth century and dealt with race, class, and gender differences. Later on, sexual preferences, (dis)ability, and age were considered and analyzed as additional factors of positive or negative discrimination in diversity studies. On these grounds, diversity concepts have been introduced by some companies and universities, initially in 1978 in the United States (Salzbrunn, 2012, p. 378), to manage an increasingly diverse workforce in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, and (dis)ability. However, their application in urban planning remained limited for a long time.

Connections of the economy with culture and diversity started to gain importance in urban development and regeneration not earlier than the 1990s. With the deindustrialization of cities, culture was discovered as an economic resource. In this context, the ‘cultural value’ of immigrants and ethnic populations has been used in the marketing of cities (e.g., China Towns). Interestingly, the European Capital of Culture initiative (ECoC) of the European Union (formerly called European City of Culture initiative) was launched originally to bring Europeans together, to highlight the diversity of European culture, and to interchange culture across Europe (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004). Since 1999 economic development and more specifically the development of high-quality and innovative cultural tourism are explicitly mentioned as ‘official’ aims of the ECoC initiative (Decision 1419/1999/EC, see in Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004). In fact, cities very quickly used the initiative and the label ‘European Capital of Culture’ for economic reasons, that is, to present themselves
to Europe and the wider world, aiming at delivering a renewed postindustrial image to attract tourists and with them capital and long-term investments. For example, the first industrial city to be nominated as European Capital of Culture was Glasgow in 1990 (subsequent to Athens, Florence, Amsterdam, West Berlin, and Paris). The economically and socially deprived city, which faced severe problems of urban decay after the closure of its shipbuilding industry, used the initiative and the prestigious label to kick-start the economic restructuring process. Liverpool’s presentation as European Capital of Culture in 2008 was widely perceived as a success story. Now the UK is going to replicate the EU’s ECoC initiative by launching its own UK-wide Culture City initiative, again with formerly industrialized cities such as Dundee (Scotland) applying for the first round.

The construction, perception, and marketing of diversity can be understood as a result of interactive communication processes. Historic writings, political debates, and academic discourses lead to a construction of differences over time. At first sight, it seems obvious that ethnicity, gender, class, or sexual preferences are constructed. But feminist studies have shown that even attributes like sex or (dis)ability are socially constructed, as they considerably differ according to the social context, the historical period, and the geographic area (Salzbrunn, 2012, p. 376).

Another relevant area that connects ethnicity, economy, and place are entrepreneurial activities. In recent years there has been an increased interest both in policy and research in the field of ethnic entrepreneurship: the focus being on micro and small businesses owned by people with a migrant or ethnic background (OECD, 2010). Starting point for an interest in ethnicity in entrepreneurship research was the finding that some ethnic groups (in particular national contexts) are more entrepreneurial or more likely to run their own businesses than others (Evans, 1989; Light, 1972). In previous ethnic entrepreneurship research three approaches to understanding business ownership among different ethnic groups can be distinguished (see Ram and Jones, 2008 for an overview). (1) Early studies were focused on ethnic resources and diasporic cultural identity (ethnic-resource model) and pointed to the importance of social capital (coethnic networks) for ethnic entrepreneurship (e.g., Light, 1972). (2) Later, this one-sided approach was extended by external factors, and the mutually reinforcing interplay between (internal) ethnic resources and external context (opportunity structure)—business environment, suppliers, financial and commercial institutions—was identified as influencing ethnic entrepreneurship (interactionist approach) (Waldinger, 1990; Ward, 1987). (3) More recently, the mixed embeddedness approach has been applied, further developing the interactionist approach by paying
particular attention to structural barriers in terms of state institutional context and regulatory regimes (Kloostermann and Rath, 2003).

Migrants and thus ethnic businesses are concentrated in cities. Debates about ethnic entrepreneurship are therefore closely connected with urban policy and the urban economy. Comparative studies in the field of ethnic entrepreneurship barely exist. Most studies are designed as case studies or are descriptive analyses that do not provide further insights into local, regional, or national effects (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp, 2009; Masurel et al., 2002; van Delft et al., 2000). Following the mixed embeddedness approach, however, it seems reasonable to assume that the same ethnic group can show different tendencies towards entrepreneurship and self-employment in different geographic contexts. For example, studies for the Netherlands suggest a great tendency for business ownership amongst Turks (Masurel et al, 2002). In contrast, owning a business or being self-employed seems to be less common amongst Turks in the Ruhr Area (see Fischer-Krapohl in this volume). From an urban economy point of view the theoretical conceptualizations therefore provoke some crucial questions: (1) What particular opportunity structures do cities provide for ethnic entrepreneurship? (2) How can cities mitigate structural barriers in order to foster entrepreneurial activities among migrants that, in turn, facilitate their social mobility? (3) How can cities use the potential of ethnic entrepreneurship for urban regeneration? Entrepreneurship, it should be noted, does not however always equate with upward social mobility processes. Often, especially amongst immigrants, business ownership is a survival strategy (Barrett et al., 1996) due to lack of opportunities on the labor market and discrimination. These processes enhance “enclave economies” that are bounded by coethnicty and location (Zhou, 2004). In this regard, it is important for cities to identify (4) whether enclave economies exist and how they can be integrated in the urban economy. In order to find answers to these questions, the superdiversity of economic practices in urban areas needs to be considered and ethnic businesses be placed in a structural and historical context.

Concerning the discovery of superdiversity and transmigration as a research field, business historians who have been concerned with migration processes and their economic consequences seem to be ahead of social scientists. They have investigated not only the reasons for migration, which are often economic in nature, but also the influence that the way of life of minorities has on the economic standing of these groups within the majority society (Simon, 1999). How did different religious or national traditions, for example, in terms of constructing networks of trust, in arranging marriages, or in dealing with risk, form the economic behavior of a certain group (Chatziioannou, 2010)? Why was
one minority group more or less successful in economic terms than the majority? To what extent did members of the minority assimilate to the economic behavior of the majority, and was this useful for their economic success (Schiff, 1999)? Transnational companies are also in the focus of historical interest (Cotrell, 2007). Historical case studies provide a large reservoir across various periods of time and countries from which to find answers to these questions (German Historical Institute and University of Maryland, 2012).

Given the rich body of literature on transmigration and the various case studies on historical transnational entrepreneurship, it is surprising that only a few studies in the social sciences have looked at the emerging landscape of current transnational entrepreneurship (Sepulveda et al., 2011; Zhou, 2004). Most studies measure transmigration through number of journeys, political engagement, symbolic practices, and remittances while the economic impact of this type of migration has been under-researched. Likewise, most entrepreneurship studies with an interest in space explore entrepreneurship in relation to the place/regional environment in which the business is located. A wider understanding of the spaces of entrepreneurship in the light of transnational circular migration is required (Wai-chung Yeung, 2009). Some ethnographic studies suggest that five types of transnational entrepreneurs are relevant (Zhou, 2004, p. 1055). The first does business in the financial services, the second in import and export, the third type is related to the creative industries (film, music, etc.), the fourth type includes manufacturing firms, and the fifth type are micro businesses of return migrants (re-migrants) in labor-intensive sectors such as restaurants and car sales. Location-specific capital, particularly localized networks and social ties, in (at least) two places, and the “knowledge of two cultures” (van Delft et al., 2000) can be assumed to facilitate transnational activities of transmigrants. However, these may play out very differently in different urban contexts. In an urban context such as the Ruhr Area, where a critical mass of consumers demands Turkish products, small import-export businesses run by Turks who circulate regularly between Germany and Turkey may be of certain importance. Istanbul with its cultural and creative industries might attract cultural transnational entrepreneurs who seek to live in the Turkish metropolis on a regular basis.

5. About This Book

Historical and contemporary analyses of economic, societal, demographic, and cultural development in the Ruhr Area and Istanbul reveal
conditions and characteristics of complex migration processes in these two metropolitan areas. The motives of contemporary migrants are scrutinized and the factors that influence their decisions examined. Inclusion and exclusion processes, such as the increasing marginalization of the urban poor in the context of public investment, are illustrated. Sociospatial disparities both in the multiethnic cosmopolitan city of Istanbul in the late Ottoman Empire and the Ruhr Area in the nineteenth century are examined and contemporary urban politics discussed with regard to migration, housing and urban development.

Conceptual and theoretical perspectives on urban diversity and economy across time and space are presented in Part 1. A comparison between Istanbul and the Ruhr Area through time is not without methodological challenges and demands in-depth theoretical discussion. Monika Salzbrunn provides a critical overview of the notion of diversity in the Anglo-Saxon, French, and German-speaking social sciences. Edhem Eldem then discusses problems and chances related to both metropolitan areas as a critical starting point of this volume.

The Ruhr Area and Istanbul are both significantly shaped by their religious and ethnic minorities. Part 2 of the volume deals with the population flows affecting the two metropolitan areas. During the second half of the last century people from Turkey, among others, were increasingly recruited to satisfy the demand for cheap labor in the steel industry. The demographic structure of the Ruhr Area today reflects these diverse migration narratives. Yunus Ulusoy deals with the history of the Turkish migration to Germany, focusing on the role of Istanbul and the Ruhr Area in this migration process. The history of the Ruhr Area cannot be exhaustively told, however, without elaborating on a modern immigration history that started with the recruitment of Polish mining workers in the nineteenth century. The chapter by Michaela Bachem-Rehm deals with Polish migrants and their incorporation in the Ruhr Area, which in the end was more or less an assimilation: today very few individuals with Polish names are aware of the migration backgrounds in their ancestry.

In the context of this volume Istanbul is not only of interest as a starting point and destination for migrants to and from the Ruhr Area. Although the Turkish metropolis has a predominantly Muslim population today, it has itself—like the Ruhr—long experience with minorities. The economic role of these ‘others’ in the urban space of the two metropolises is of special interest for the book. Part 3 draws attention to the legal and institutional frame of ethnic entrepreneurship in the Ruhr Area and in Istanbul. The first step is a retrospective look at the history
of Istanbul. A large number of Christians, for example Greek Orthodox and Armenians, lived as indigenous minorities in Istanbul during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Maria Christina Chatziioannou and Dimitris Kamouzis deal with the economic role and influence of these minorities, which formed an elite in terms of education and trade in the Ottoman Empire. As a result of their extensive trade networks that spread all over Europe, Christians acquired wealth and political influence that they then wanted to benefit from and display to the outside world. Ayse Ozil investigates their attempts to represent their economic wealth in the urban space of Istanbul and the specific problems that appear in the very special context of ‘incorporation’ in the Ottoman Empire. What kind of conflicts with the majority population resulted from this situation and how were they communicated and reconciled during the period of the Ottoman Empire? These two historical chapters show that minorities in the Ottoman Empire normally did not mix with other groups of population, but inhabited separate parts of the urban space. Ivonne Fischer-Krapohl shows how Turkish businesses have developed over time in the city of Dortmund in the Ruhr Area. In contrast to the often cited argument in German debates that migrant businesses are concentrated in disadvantaged urban areas and mainly serve their own ethnic groups, Turkish businesses have diversified in terms of both location and industry sector. Local context factors of ethnic entrepreneurship are discussed and ways of promoting businesses run by Turkish migrants suggested.

Part 4 focuses on residential segregation processes and their economic outcomes. Darja Reuschke and Sabine Weck investigate residential segregation of Turkish migrants in Ruhr cities, explaining the historical reasons and the actual problems for the incorporation processes. The focus then shifts to contemporary Istanbul. Inclusion and exclusion processes, such as the increasing marginalization of the urban poor in the context of public investment, are illustrated by Deniz Yonucu. She looks at Istanbul and its Kurdish migrants, focusing on their difficult life in the metropolis’ gececondos. The reasons why the Turkish majority tries to pull out and even criminalize these migrants are explained. Against the background of sociospatial disparities in the multiethnic cosmopolitan city of the late Ottoman Empire, contemporary urban politics are then discussed with regard to migration, housing and urban development by Nil Uzun. She continues to disentangle urban segregation patterns in Istanbul by describing gentrification processes in the twentieth century and raising the issue of the consequences for the inhabitants. What new inequalities in the metropolitan area of Istanbul can be observed through residential segregation and state-led urban regeneration, particularly in terms of class differences?
6. Main Lessons Learnt and Outlook

Our comparative approach was influenced by the fact that both the Ruhr Area and Istanbul were European Capitals of Culture in 2010. We asked each author to identify, among other things, connections between their research and the European Capital of Culture initiative (ECoC) and to discuss the question of how the ECoC has influenced the economic perception and incorporation of ‘the other’ in urban space in their case studies. At first, we were surprised that most contributors discussed the ECoC only briefly, if at all. However, we interpret this as one outcome of this book: the ECoC initiative has not significantly influenced the incorporation of the ‘other’ in urban space either in the Ruhr or in Istanbul. The reconstruction of diversity undertaken within the ECoC was rather folkloristic in the case of Istanbul (e.g., dance performances, architectural projects) or was reduced to particular aspects of immigration history, namely the guest worker period, in the case of the Ruhr. Our interviews with German and Turkish economic stakeholders also show that the cultural mega event was regarded rather as an additional cultural offer than as an opportunity to present economic potentials in urban diversity. Therefore, the economic dimension of diversity in both past and present remained hidden in Istanbul, while in the Ruhr Area the image of the Turkish guest worker was reaffirmed. However, the first evaluation of the ECoC initiative 1994–2004 (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004) revealed that formerly nominated cities generally perceive the economy (in terms of the number of attracted tourists and newly founded businesses) as an output rather than as part of the cultural construction and marketing process. How the ECoC can use urban diversity as an economic potential for urban development thus remains a question for future European Capitals of Culture.

Another main result of this book is that residential segregation processes are engendering new inequalities that transcend ethnic and religious differences. These processes therefore bring class issues back to the research agenda. It is striking that in some case studies the economic differences between the majority and the minorities seem to be the most important factor for social and political problems. If the economic and class issues do not exist or are not strong (as in the case of the Poles in the Ruhr Area), their incorporation is unproblematic or a total assimilation of the immigrants can even result. Descendents of this group are rarely considered as being part of the ‘second’ or ‘third’ generation of immigrants, which indicates that their supposed cultural differences are no longer noticed in everyday practices, that is, after several decades of sedentarization. In contrast, incorporation processes become more complicated when differences in property, economic wealth, and education
between the migrants and the indigenous population are large. This is the case when migrants have a higher socioeconomic status and are wealthier than the majority population (as in the case of Christians in Istanbul in nineteenth and twentieth centuries), and also in the opposite case when migrants are noticeably poorer (e.g., Kurds in Istanbul since the 1960s). Correspondingly, many Germans of Turkish origin are perceived as ‘other’ in German society even in the third generation—unless they have managed to reach a high economic and educational level. Class issues seem to play the key role in incorporation processes. However, most actors involved in current public discussions mainly focus on religious and ethnic differences. Especially in the context of post-9/11 debates, religious difference has become an issue and therefore reinforces the supposed otherness of people with Turkish ascendants in Germany. However, the presented case studies show that religious and ethnic differences are not the most important factors for successful or nonsuccessful incorporation. Recent political debates in Germany underline the importance of the cultural potential of different parts of society and recommend respecting cultural diversity. The ‘Charter of diversity’, signed by thousands of firms and administrations in Germany and France in 2007, reflects these changes in the minds of political and economic leaders. Firms and administrations are not only engaged in fighting racism and homophobia, they also promote the diversity of their employees in order to polish their image and their corporate identity. Obviously, this does not mean that the Charter is well applied in practice. The ‘marketing of diversity’ in the context of the celebrations of the Ruhr and Istanbul as Cultural Capitals of Europe is also a result of these important changes in perception, consideration, and finally economic exploitation of differences, even though it was manifested more in folklore events than as a profound will to valorize the present diverse society. However, it is a further sign that diversity is shifting increasingly into the focus of public attention, which might be useful for incorporation.

As regard entrepreneurship and the economic potential of urban diversity, the case studies support Vertovec’s assumption that there is a reluctance of institutional structures to adapt to urban diversity and promote ethnic entrepreneurship. This is why foreign-born people face difficulties in pursuing entrepreneurial activities in Istanbul (Turkey) even if they are Turks by nationality. In the Ruhr Area, business services that provide tailored approaches to address migrant businesses are still lacking. Local economic policy in the Ruhr Area has not responded to the special needs of migrant businesses. Other German cities, such as Mannheim, have established and funded partnerships with migrant business owners for training and qualification. This approach acknowledges that migrant businesses are less involved in training schemes than German ones, which, in turn, influences the creation of qualified jobs.
Finally, situating population dynamics in Istanbul in a historic context shows that minorities are defined as such by the political, economic, or academic representatives of the majority and that thus even this terminology reflects a kind of hegemony. Research therefore needs to be conscious of the difficulties involved in handling such a complex subject as diversity and must take these semantic and theoretical challenges into consideration.

Notes

1. This industrial UNESCO labeled area was very recently joined by the Bassin industriel du Nord de la France, which has a comparable history and which is close to Lille, a former European Capital of Culture. An intercultural comparison of the two cities is given in Ernst and Heimböckl, 2012.
2. For a critique on migration studies and scholars who overemphasized nomadism and circulation see Salzbrunn, 2008, p. 78.
3. On the European Social History Conference in Edinburgh in April 2012, 26 sessions dealt with migration in history (ESSHC, 2012).
4. This volume is part of the Studies on Historical Migration Research, edited by Klaus J. Bade and Jochen Oltmer, in Schoeningh publishing house, see http://www.schoeningh.de/katalog/reihe/studien_zur_historischen_migra.html.
5. Although the concept draws a great deal on intersectionality and class-race-gender studies (Salzbrunn, 2012).
6. Analyzing the complexity of cities from an interdisciplinary perspective is the main objective of the research group “Urban Systems” at the University Duisburg-Essen, see http://www.uni-due.de/imperia/md/content/urbane-systeme/01_uni_megacitys_gb_141112.pdf (accessed June 27, 2013).
7. The concept of “othering” is often used in gender studies as well as in studies about racism. By creating the “other,” the “self” can establish norms and values as standards, and dominate and/or exclude certain groups from fundamental rights (e.g., Butler, 1988).
8. Interviews were conducted during our field trip to Istanbul in September 2010 with representatives from the German Consulate, the Turkish-German chamber of commerce, members of the organizing committee of Istanbul Cultural Capital of Europe as well as with many informants who wanted to remain anonymous.
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