Supplement to Forschung Frankfurt

Dear reader,

Rarely has research drawn a picture of the wider interaction between universities and their locations. The essays in this supplement, which represent a selection of papers presented at a joint conference of Goethe University Frankfurt and the University of Toronto, seek to remedy this neglect. As Frank Cunningham observed, universities are often in the city but not of the city, suggesting that few interact in meaningful ways with their host cities. At a two-day event at Goethe’s Westend campus, a rich mix of presenters came together from the fields of sociology, economics, finance, architecture, geography, philosophy, political science, and anthropology, as well as practitioners in the areas of urban development, migration, and integration. They shed light on the manifold ways in which universities and cities, students and citizens, academics and policymakers influence one another.

Saskia Sassen sets the stage for this discourse with an analysis of how both cities and universities have challenged established ways of thinking and produced conditions under which citizens take “courage to demand a better world”. She argues that with the inclusion of “the excluded”, cities only stand to benefit when everyone’s rights are strengthened. Cunningham discusses what this could mean for universities in practical terms and what higher education institutions can do to promote multiculturalism. By developing what he calls a “culture of mutual concern”, universities and cities can create equal opportunities, counter ghettoisation of ethnic groups, and provide accessible public spaces.

Helma Lutz substantiates Sassen’s vision, proposing the university as a sub-forum for city-wide dialogue on the conditions of cosmopolitanism. She links this discourse to a vision shared between Goethe University and the City of Frankfurt to allow students and citizens alike to realise their full potential. Gisela Welz identifies a number of limitations that make campus-city interactions, including the type of dialogue proposed by Lutz, challenging. Prohibitive rents near campus and a high proportion of commuting students can obstruct the permeability – physical and social – of the boundary between the university and the city.

How this boundary has changed over time is at the heart of George Baird’s analysis of the built form of city and campus, which traces the physical placement of universities in and outside of European and North American cities. Early European universities were closely interwoven with the fabric of their host cities; later, the physical separation between universities and cities radically changed the way the two interacted. Still, most of today’s universities are located in metropolitan areas, and as Meric Gertler testifies, they support their host agglomerations in many ways. Universities are the most important players in the knowledge networks linking cities across the globe. Universities attract and develop talent and, as employers and drivers of urban development, contribute directly to their local economies. These positive linkages, says Gertler, are mutual: if universities are to thrive, they need high-quality urban environments.

Our authors demonstrate great opportunity in the collaboration between cities and universities. Some of those opportunities are still not fully understood, let alone fully utilised, which is why the following papers make compelling reading for academics and practitioners alike. We hope you enjoy reading them as much as we enjoyed the original presentations.

Rainer Klump and Martin Bickl

"Universities are often in the city but not of the city... these articles shed light on the ways in which the two influence one another."
Cities have long been sites of conflict, from war to racism to religious hatred. And yet, where national states have historically responded to conflict through militarisation, cities have tended to deal with conflict through commerce and civic activity. War is in the DNA of national states; it is not in the DNA of cities—except, of course, if they are military fortresses or city-states such as Genoa in the 16th and 17th centuries.

In my reading of urban histories, I have found an interesting tension that imparts a critical lesson for our times, which is that the overcoming of urban conflicts often became the source of an expanded civicness[1]. One specific actor in this dynamic is “the excluded”: immigrant minorities, citizens of the “wrong” religion, the physically disabled, or the psychologically impaired. When they—and those who advocated on their behalf—demanded inclusion and succeeded, the effect was that the rights of the included were also strengthened.

This is in sharp contrast with how the larger society—whether in Europe or the US—tends to see things. The more common view, rooted in fear and insecurity, is to think that whatever the immigrant or the “other” gains, the included loses. That view is wrong: exclusion and discrimination are a cancer in the larger social system. It is interesting to note that when surveys such as the Pew Global Attitudes Project ask about immigrant residents in their neighbourhoods, citizens in many countries around the world who stereotypically “hate” immigrants tend to report that the ones in their own neighbourhood are good people. There is something about getting to know the “other” that helps residents to accept them. Both the city and the university are ideal settings for such encounters.

Cities are spaces of intense proximities, and so are university campuses. The city centre is a space with an invisible set of rules—no matter how often you bump and jostle others in rushing pedestrian crowds, there is no added meaning or offence; people just walk on. Imag-
ine this in a smaller neighbourhood: that bump can sometimes take on a meaning of violence. Those invisible rules of the city centre are a critical glue for civicness, which we need to mobilise to make the city an open one.

**Modern challenges to the urban order**

Today’s cities are losing this capacity to foster civicness. They are becoming sites for a new range of conflicts, such as asymmetric war and ethnic and social cleansing. Furthermore, the dense and conflictive spaces of cities, overwhelmed by inequality and injustice, can also become sites for a variety of secondary, less-structured types of conflicts generated by drug wars, looming environmental disasters, and more. All of these challenge the traditional commercial and civic capacity that has allowed cities to avoid war when confronted with conflict and to incorporate diversity of class, culture, religion, and ethnicity.

This unsettling of the urban order is part of a larger disassembling of existing social organisational logics, including the logic that has structured territory, authority and rights into the dominant organisational format of our times – the nation-state. The type of urban order that gave us the “open city” concept in Europe, with its beautiful piazzas and public buildings, is still there but is increasingly a merely visual order, less so a social order.

With this unsettling, it becomes increasingly important for the university to do all it can to maintain its original civic task of supporting diversity and marking the expansion of rights for all when the excluded are finally included.

Ironically, a key condition that can help us move forward is the fact that, in this moment, our common challenges, such as asymmetric war, environmental catastrophes, and massive inequality, are larger than our differences. Moreover, these challenges are beginning to make life as usual unsustainable. We now know that this acute sense of injustice and unsustainability was a major source of motivation for what we saw not only in Tunis, Cairo, and other “Arab Spring” locations, but also in the recent “Occupy” protests in New York, Barcelona, Athens, Berlin, etc. – it was the courage to demand a better world. Is this not one of the same key missions that has driven scholarship in the modern university? It reminds us, again, of how critical the role of the university is in today’s world.

It is the acute sense of injustice and unsustainability in the economic, political, and environmental orders that holds the potential for renewing the city’s capacity to transform conflict into openness rather than war. However, it will not be the familiar order of the “open city” concept, nor of civicness as we have come to understand it, especially in the European tradition. It will take fundamental change, which will include a kind of denationalising of one’s sense of allegiance and the subsequent emergence of a more cosmopolitan citizenship. It is in cities that this type of project has a real chance, and the more diverse and complex the city, the more likely it can succeed. In that sense, the global city and its universities are fertile ground for this kind of work.

**For better or for worse – a long history of European immigration**

Cities and universities have long been sites where new norms and subjectivities are made. One useful example to illustrate this issue is the case of intra-European migration over the centuries, particularly as it is a window into the complex and historically variable question of the hard work required in making the European Open City. In my reading, the challenges of incorporating the “outsider” became instruments for developing the civic in the best sense of the word, in that the claims to rights by the excluded expanded the inclusions of citizenship. This is a critical, though often overlooked, dynamic throughout the history of Europe’s cities.

Anti-immigrant sentiment and even physical attacks occurred in each of the main immigration phases in all major European countries. No labour-receiving country has a clean record – not Switzerland, with its long history of international neutrality, and not even France, the most open to immigration, refugees, and exiles. French workers killed Italian workers in the 1800s, accusing them of being the “wrong” types of Catholics. The very fortunate critical detail here is the fact that there
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[Image of a demonstration or protest, with text overlaid: The university campus has a tradition of hosting citizen protests.]
have always been (present day included) individuals, groups, organisations, and politicians who believed in making our societies more inclusive of immigrants. History has shown that those fighting for inclusion succeed in the long run, even if only partially. In an example from the recent past, one quarter of French residents have a foreign-born ancestor only three generations into the past. It took effort to transform hatred of foreigners into the urban civic; even the French public transport and health systems contributed to the transformation as they are open to all, regardless of status or character. That, in effect, is the making of the civic through material conditions.

Europe’s centuries-long history of internal labour migration has tended to be in the shadows of “official” European history, one dominated by the image of Europeans as emigrants rather than receivers of immigrations. Yet, when Amsterdam built its polders and cleared its bogs in the 1700s, it brought in workers from northern Germany; when the French developed their vineyards centuries ago, they brought in Spaniards to assist. Workers from remote areas in the Alps were brought in to help develop the cities of Milan and Turin, and the Irish were brought in when London needed help building water and sewage infrastructure. In the 1800s, when Baron Haussmann rebuilt Paris, he brought in Germans and Belgians; when Sweden built its palaces, it brought in Italian stoneworkers. When Switzerland built the Gotthard Tunnel, it brought in Italians, and when Germany built its railways and steel mills, it brought in Italians and Poles.

first arrival, however, they were treated as outsiders and racialised as different in their looks, smells, and habits. These same divisions have been asserted even when migrants were of the same religious, racial, and cultural group; one such example is the post-1989 migration of East Germans to West Germany, where the East Germans were often viewed as a different, undesirable ethnic group. Even though they were all Europeans—even neighbours in the same country—their differences were experienced as overwhelming and insurmountable.

What is our equivalent challenge today—one that can force us to go beyond our differences and work together and, in that process, expand the rights of all and renew the civic? In this context, the city and the university are enormously significant spaces. Among many other purposes, both entities force a recognition and confrontation of the multiple and often contradictory ways of thinking in any given era. However, transforming our differences into an expanded civicness will only work if it is a collective process; the product of that effort can thereby become a new platform for the making of open cities and open universities. The features of today’s open cities and open universities will likely have different formats and content from past European versions. Indeed, my sense is that they will diverge from those traditional ways of experiencing the civic and the cosmopolitan. We will need a different language and content to capture the civic, but these novel formats and contents may have the power to create the open cities and open universities of our future.
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The origins and evolution of the Euro–American university campus

Universities and their host cities have enjoyed mutually beneficial, symbiotic relationships since the construction of the very first European academies. The deep connections between their physical forms—not just their functions—have endured throughout time.

There is a consensus amongst scholars that “the university” is a quintessentially European invention, and from its very beginnings, “the university” has had a powerful relationship with “the city”. Indeed, two of Europe’s earliest universities—Bologna [1] and Paris—both established identifiable, although not sharply defined, institutional precincts within the urban fabric of their respective cities relatively early on. A third early university—Oxford—followed a similar urban pattern to Bologna and Paris; however, as it grew, the university came to dominate the overall form of the city of Oxford much more than the universities in Bologna and Paris dominated in their cities [1]. However, while the idea of a university precinct is present in all three of these examples, none of the precincts in question can be described appropriately as a “campus”. The campus as an organising concept for a college or a university only came into existence in a later era.

In their early years, none of these European institutions occupied buildings specifically built for university use. However, as these new urban institutions continued to grow, new buildings were erected for specific academic and university purposes. Both on the continent and in Britain, these buildings followed a model derived from a palazzo or monastery: a linear building form organised around a courtyard. This pattern of urban university precincts consisting of courtyard-type buildings is one that defined the built form of the university for the first four centuries or so of its history as an urban institution.

New universities, new campuses, new models

In the 19th century in North America, an alternative university model was conceived by Thomas Jefferson, an American president. His idea of a utopian, ex-urban university turned out to be enormously influential for a century and a half and is represented by the University of Virginia, which was designed by Jefferson in conjunction with architect Benjamin Latrobe in 1817 [2]. This ex-urban model of the university was used by planners of numerous new institutions of higher learning across the United States throughout the 19th century. One of the most notable and influential amongst later examples is Stanford University in Palo Alto, California, designed in 1888 by Frederick Law Olmsted [3].

Even when new university campuses were designed in North American cities, the University of Virginia model remained a powerful influence. I believe it is safe to say that the urban model, represented by Bologna and Paris, and the ex-urban model represented by Virginia continued to serve as precedents for university campus design throughout Europe and North America up until the middle of the 20th century. The most significant exception to this rule is...
However, is an unfortunate one. During the first half of the 20th century, campus sub-precincts emerged on both continents in order to accommodate studies in engineering and laboratory sciences. The buildings required for such studies were not anticipated in either of the historic models described thus far, neither the urban nor the ex-urban one. Because there were no models to follow, and also due to a gradual weakening of the utopian aspirations of earlier campus designers, these engineering and science sub-precincts became clusters of ad-hoc buildings, erected without any reference to any legible idea of a campus, or of a university at all.

Following World War II, a new era of ambitious university planning began; two major factors influenced the form of the newly designed campuses. The first was a sociological and demographic consideration: a dramatic increase in the number of students entering higher education was expected in the near future. The second factor was the new architectural trends in the 1950s and 60s that influenced the plans for new cities being developed outside of existing settlement areas. An especially famous and influential example of this concept is Brasilia, the capital of Brazil. In university planning circles, references to examples such as Brasilia in the mid-1950s strongly reinforced the appeal of the ex-urban campus model already familiar from the example set by the University of Virginia. Just as Columbia University moved from midtown Manhattan to the Upper West Side in the early 20th century, so also Université Laval in Québec City moved in the mid-20th century from its venerable Grand Seminaire buildings in the heart of the historic city out to the open fields of suburban St. Foy. Perhaps an even bolder Canadian example was the formation of Simon Fraser University, outside of Vancouver, which was designed by Arthur Erickson and Geoffrey Massey.

### The revival of urban universities

Before university planners had completely forgotten their original utopian goals, an important group of young—and openly revisionist—European architects began to develop a powerful set of new ideas. One such group, known as Team 10, attempted to replace older modernist ideas with fresher, more organic ones. One of their first new urban planning ideas involved the concept of “stem” [7]. Conceived by Shadrach Woods of the firm Candilis-Josic-Woods, “stem” proved to be an immensely influential urban idea. It can even be detected far from Europe, such as in the famous Canadian example of Scarborough College at the University of Toronto, designed by John Andrews in the 1960s [7].

But the reconceptualisation of urban planning sparked by Team 10 in the late 50s and early 60s did not end there. One member, Jaap Bakema, published a fascinating analysis of the city of Split, then part of the former Yugoslavia. As early as the 15th century, the Italian architect and theorist Leon Batista Alberti theorised that a house could be thought of as a small city, and a city as a small house—this intriguing idea sparked Team 10’s interests in Split. Bakema pointed out that a large part of the centre of Split comprised a centuries-long renovation of a palace built there by the ancient Roman emperor, Diocletian [8].

These ideas had a profound influence on two important projects from the 1960s: the first one
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[4] Brasilia, the capital of Brazil.


being an unimplemented plan for rebuilding a war-damaged area in central Frankfurt, and the other being the eventual creation of the Freie Universität Berlin [9]. In the first of these two projects, a new urban precinct was conceived as a complex building matrix that reproduced a historic urban pattern of streets and blocks of buildings, albeit with the “streets” being elevated and reserved for pedestrians. In the second one, an entirely new university was itself conceived as such an urban precinct.

The presumed sophistication and openness of these new architectural ideas were very appealing to young designers for a number of years. Two relevant examples from the oeuvre of John Andrews include his own design for the new Graduate School of Design at Harvard University in 1972, and a student initiative called “The Campus as the Campus Centre”, which he sponsored during his chairmanship of the Department of Architecture at the University of Toronto. However, it became clear over time that such radically decentralised constructions could lead to the complete dissolution of the entire conception of a “campus”; in later years, university administrators experienced problems at their institutions due to highly permeable building forms with multiple entrances on all sides of the structure. This led to an at least partial re-affirmation of the importance of the “campus” as an institutional presence.

In recent years, innovation in campus planning has been incremental and less revolutionary, and many of the new forms have also involved strategies of revenue generation. Nevertheless, these innovations have continued to involve a deep rethinking of the relationship between the built form of the university and the built form of its host city. Examples of such subtle modifications include the creation of entire new urban residential precincts adjacent to original academic campuses, such as at Simon Fraser University near Vancouver. And of course, mention must be made at this point of Giancarlo de Carlo’s remarkable and exemplary decades-long project for the Università di Urbino, begun in the 1960s and conceived as an initiative of urban restoration as well as that of institutional architecture [10].

In observing these developments through time, we can observe the remarkable, enduring significance of the relationship between the built forms of a university and its city—it is a relationship that will continue to evolve in future.
Universities and cities: An intimate economic relationship

Universities play a critical role in the production and propagation of knowledge. At the same time, they are a major economic and social presence in their host cities. How does this two-way relationship work, and what are its implications for public policy development?

Despite the longstanding presence of universities within cities, the nature of the relationship between institutions of higher learning and their urban environments is still not completely understood. At a time when governments at all levels are redesigning public policies to leverage this critical knowledge infrastructure more effectively, it is important that they be guided by a clearer and more comprehensive appreciation of the impact that universities have on their cities – and vice-versa.

Universities as producers of knowledge

A central element of a university’s academic mission is to foster the production of new knowledge, both fundamental and applied. This fundamental knowledge generation can be measured by the volume of externally funded research, publication output, and/or publication citations.

First, this methodology reveals that the production of fundamental knowledge is concentrated in a surprisingly small number of places, predominantly large city-regions. Second, despite the availability of information technologies that transcend geographic borders, research has shown that scholars are more likely to cite publications produced in the same or nearby cities than those produced in farther-flung locations. These findings suggest that cities foster the formation of social networks amongst scholars, thereby advancing knowledge at a faster rate than would otherwise be possible.

Cities are also primary sites for the production of applied knowledge, often led by university-based scholars, measurable in terms of patents, technology licences, university spin-offs, and industry-sponsored research at universities. In urban settings, this activity is housed increasingly in innovation spaces shared by the academy and key applied research partners.

Universities as global knowledge portals

Current literature on universities’ impact on their surroundings has emphasised their role as generators of knowledge within local economic clusters. More recently, though, we have come to appreciate that the most innovative, economically dynamic clusters also possess strong linkages – or knowledge “pipelines” – to other centres of knowledge production around the world. These connections are crucial because no single metropolitan region or country could ever be fully self-sufficient in the production and use of knowledge.

Meric S. Gertler, Professor of Geography and Planning and Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science, University of Toronto

[1] Toronto’s MaRS centre: Strategically situated to collaborate with both university and city medical science partners.
These knowledge pipelines are driven by professional interactions between scholars, which can occur via conferences and meetings, research teams, and visiting lecturer appointments, or through a variety of virtual interactions. In this way, universities constitute key portals to global knowledge networks, forging critical links between their host cities and other leading knowledge production centres around the globe.

Universities as anchors of talent
The work of scholars such as Florida [5], Saxenian [6], and others [7] underscores the centrality of highly educated and creative workers in the contemporary economy. Moreover, it confirms that the “geography of talent” is highly uneven. While all city-regions aspire to attract and retain talented workers, surprisingly few are positioned to actually succeed at this. As major players in global labour markets, universities play a critically important role in attracting international talent to their host cities.

Universities attract talent by virtue of their ability to offer well-paid, secure employment and highly desirable working conditions. Conversely, it is not surprising that those cities that score most highly on comparative rankings of “talent” are also home to at least one – and frequently more – universities. This effect is compounded further by the role universities play in producing successive generations of talent as documented above.

Universities as anchor tenants
Universities also exert important influence over their host cities through their physical presence alone – they constitute anchor tenants in the urban environment. As long-lived “bricks and mortar” institutions, universities almost always remain firmly rooted in their original location for many decades or even centuries. They are also among a city-region’s largest employers.

Universities also are considered a prestigious and attractive use of land within a city, frequently offering appealing green spaces, high-quality built forms, and cultural facilities that are open to the local public. Universities tend to raise property values in their immediate vicinity as well, and even have a positive effect on property values throughout a city-region.

For these reasons and others, cities without universities have gone to considerable lengths in recent times to attract new campuses. A case in point pertains to the University of Waterloo, whose School of Architecture recently decamped roughly 30 minutes south to the city of Cambridge, enticed by Cambridge’s offer of free space in a vacant building.

The relationship between universities and cities: Two-way and mutually constitutive
The preceding argument emphasises the various ways in which universities benefit cities. It is important to note, however, that the opposite is also true. In many ways, the success of universities depends fundamentally on the quality of the urban environments in which they are situated.

Drawing from my experiences as dean, I can personally attest to this. First, prospective faculty frequently weigh employment prospects for their partners or spouses in their potential new home. Second, the knowledge produced through university-industry research partnerships often provides the impetus for new ideas and discoveries. And third, local employers represent an important source of internship and co-op placements for students.

Hence, while strong universities clearly make for strong cities, the reverse is also true: strong cities underpin strong universities. Higher education policy, innovation policy, and urban policy, which often operate in silos, ought to be far more closely coordinated than they typically are at present; while one sees sporadic attempts to link up innovation policy and higher education policy, the urban context for supporting innovation is overlooked far too often. If we are to find a sustainable path towards prosperity out of the world’s current economic woes, this state of affairs will have to change.
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Cosmopolitanism and the importance of public urban dialogue

Modern cities are microcosms of the world as a whole, with both difference and similarity existing in the same space. It is becoming more and more important to facilitate public dialogue between all groups and individuals within a city in order to address these complexities successfully.

In common speech, the word “cosmopolitan” has come to describe someone who is sophisticated or urbane – which differs from the academic meaning of the term, defined as being of and belonging to the whole world. In the field of sociology, the ethical concept of “cosmopolitanism” is consistent with this academic meaning in that it combines perceptions of justice, democracy, and human rights for all people. It would be reasonable to expect that tolerance be a precondition for cosmopolitanism, but the term is actually unclear in that regard. On the one hand, tolerance assumes mutual recognition (e.g. of different lifestyles) and the establishment of political equality, while on the other hand it can be used an instrument of power, domination, and exclusion (“repressive tolerance”).

The question then, is whether all kinds of cultural and ethnic differences can or should be tolerated, and/or how repressive or permissive forms of tolerance can be legitimised. If one sees tolerance as a precondition for cosmopolitanism, then the question is: what can cosmopolitanism mean in the context of ethnic and cultural plurality?

In today’s democratic urban spaces, plurality cannot be the elitist project of a “cosmopolitanism from above”, but must instead be a “cosmopolitanism from below”. The cultural theorist Stuart Hall speaks of the latter as “vernacular cosmopolitanism”, which derives its meaning from the everyday experience of encountering different cultural lifestyles. However, Hall warns against perceiving culture as a clear-cut, coherent set of rules and traditions: “…the world is not divided up neatly into particular distinct cultures wedded to every community”.[/1] Instead, we need to be aware of the limitations of any one culture or any one identity, and understand that individuals are not defined by a single community or group. Particularly within urban spaces, the confrontation and mutual influence of a great variety of cultural expressions is the norm.

At the same time, there is great variation in the appreciation of and response to differences. While some people focus on or are even obsessed with visual differences – such as habits, clothes, and traditions – and see them as an expression of distance from their own way of life, others concentrate on similarities in practices, values, and customs. Cosmopolitanism in practice means negotiation – negotiating compromise between equality and difference, and not just once but continuously. This negotiation process is by no means a harmonious enterprise; it is quarrelsome, controversial, and exhausting.

A dialogue between cultural equality and difference

Let me use my city, Frankfurt, as an example. In preparation for a major change in city policy, the Integration Commissioner of the city of Frankfurt, Nargess Eskandari-Grünberg, introduced a new approach to integration and diversity. Over the course of 2010, approximately 47,000 people of both genders and of various ages, religions, social classes, and ethnic groups gathered in hundreds of local meetings and online groups to participate in the discussion. Instead of only debating the political tradition of treating migrants as isolated ethnic groups, the goal was to focus more on the cultural needs of these individuals who represented many diverse lifestyles. In the end, politicians received a lot of popular support for listening to, acknowleding, and sometimes even challenging the views of ordinary citizens.

However, Frankfurt has not been free from the cultural conflicts that have affected the rest of Germany. During the summer of 2010, a controversial debate was kicked off by Thilo Sarrazin, then a prominent member of the Board of Trustees of the German Central Bank (also located in Frankfurt), with the publication of his book *Germany Does Itself In* (Deutschland schafft sich ab). In this book, Sarrazin paints a future characterised by the extinction of “the German people”, caused by German welfare recipients and Muslims. Just as the authors of the infamous *The Bell Curve* argued that social problems among African-Americans were caused by genetics, Sarrazin tried to link cultural decay to genetic characteristics of marginalised populations in Germany – professedly basing his arguments on “purely scientific grounds”.

Although Sarrazin’s thesis was not new, his book – which became a national bestseller with over a million copies sold – had a tremendous impact on the political climate in Germany. The author, a social democrat and former minister of financial affairs of Berlin, was embraced by
many intellectuals and politicians. His supporters focussed less on his genetic argument and more on his view that out-of-control political correctness had limited debate about migration, that multiculturalism was a fantasy of the political left, and that migrants – in particular, Muslim migrants – caused problems. Media attention only added to the publicity surrounding the debate and the book itself.

There were several themes in this public debate:

- the argument that politicians and the government are too distant from the people, that they make decisions without the consent of the majority, and that they are not concerned with people’s real worries;
- the belief that German society is supposed to be culturally homogeneous and Islam is a threat to that; and
- the belief that Germany is not a country of immigration and that migrants are only a temporary phenomenon – the fact that they stay is seen as a genuine problem for society and for the national identity.

On the one hand, many politicians and intellectuals publicly opposed Sarrazin’s views. The Social Democratic Party tried to exclude Sarrazin (though he ultimately kept his membership), and the German Central Bank pressed for his exclusion from the Board of Trustees, a matter conveniently settled by Sarrazin’s early retirement. On the other hand, high-ranking politicians from all parties, along with well-known feminists, academics, and artists, have supported Sarrazin’s views, in particular his bashing of Islam. Extreme rightist groups have also built momentum around Sarrazin’s claims, some even resorting to violence; the most alarming case of this was the late 2011 uncovering of the murder of ten Muslim immigrants, allegedly committed by the extreme right-wing terrorist group NSU over the course of the late 1990s and early 2000s.

One positive outcome of this public discourse has been the emergence of a complex constellation of voices and interests both in favour of and against migration and Muslims. Overall, however, the atmosphere is remarkably tense – it seems there is very little chance of bringing any kind of rationality into this debate. Those who have tried to challenge Sarrazin’s conclusions, pointing to various research results that contradict his empirical claims, seem to be fighting a losing battle. This embittered spirit, one could say, has been released from the bottle and the sorcerer’s apprentice seems unable to put it back in.

A time for academic reflection – or action?
What does this mean for the debate on diversity in Frankfurt? Those in the field of sociology would study it by observing the various parties involved, analysing the press coverage and media wars, and putting on academic “blinders” in order to write a “balanced” article or book on the aftermath of the Sarrazin affair. That is what Max Weber would call “sociology as a profession”: the separation of science from politics, and the commitment to purely “value-neutral description”. This kind of sociology, however, is challenged by what Burawoy called “public sociology from below” – a perspective that interconnects civil society and its agents. From the viewpoint of public sociology, as Theodor Adorno and other Frankfurt School scholars suggested long ago, it is imperative to intervene in debates that threaten or distort open and respectful contact and communication, especially when certain minority groups become scapegoats through populist demagogy.

Thus, it is important to make space for those groups who are silent, or at least inaudible – people with and without a migration background, who share workplaces, who play sports and study together in schools and universities, etc. Here, I think Goethe University and the city of Frankfurt have a key interest in common: we both want to develop and protect an atmosphere of mutual respect in which students can develop their intellectual capabilities. Ultimately, it is reasonable to assume that our students are affected in one way or another by this debate. Therefore, my plea is for a project, really a public dialogue, which takes Adorno’s question “Wie kann man ohne Angst verschieden sein?” (How can one be different without fear?) as the theme for an ongoing debate on the conditions of cosmopolitanism, involving students, teachers, researchers, professors, bankers, politicians, taxi drivers, and so on. This may be an arduous effort, but nevertheless it would be one that is not totally impossible – at the very least, it would contribute to decreasing hostilities and represent a step forward towards true cosmopolitanism from below.

The city, the university, and multiculturalism

Despite the many challenges it presents, multiculturalism is an important feature of healthy, vibrant cities – so long as certain key conditions are in place. Universities have an important part to play in protecting these conditions within their campuses.

Imagine my alarm when, flying from Toronto to Frankfurt to participate in the “University and the City” conference where this article was first presented, I read on the front page of Die Zeit an announcement by Germany’s chancellor that “multiculturalism is dead”. Was I to conclude that the topic I had chosen for my conference contribution had no relevance in a German context?

Reading the newspaper article in full, I concluded that the chancellor was not claiming that Germany was lacking people from diverse ethnic and national backgrounds – one sense of multiculturalism – but that policies aimed at supporting such diversity by enabling people to retain important elements of their native cultures, the public-policy sense of multiculturalism, had failed. In this article, I argue that although there are certainly challenges to multiculturalism, they can be met – and universities can play an important role in this process.

From boring to bustling

Multiculturalism is an important feature of my home country, Canada. Our major cities contain people from nearly all the world’s cultures – and this diversity is endorsed in the Canadian constitution, which encourages the “preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians”. This is nowhere more evident than in Toronto, where multicultural diversity is not only recognised as an inescapable fact but is celebrated as a force of urban vitality.

For those who remember when Toronto was predominately Anglo-Protestant and called itself “Toronto the Good” – or, in my experience, “Toronto the Boring” – its transformation into one of the most culturally diverse cities in the world has made it a truly interesting and vibrant place to live. There, diversity broadens citizens’ horizons and facilitates cross-cultural learning. Another advantage of diversity is that it provides a city, and through it a whole country, with international contacts and linguistic and cultural resources important for global interactions.

This is not to say that a city like Toronto is without problems. With ethnic and cultural diversity come diverse religious and other deeply held values. This sometimes sparks discriminatory and racist sentiments between recent immigrant groups and pre-existing populations and fuels hostility along ethnic and cultural lines. However, even without these sources of conflict, multiculturalism can pose persisting problems for a city.

Although some have depicted cities as nothing but convenient places for self-interested individuals to live and work, it is not hard to show that embracing certain civic virtues is essential for life in a city. Aristotle’s view on this subject is as apt today as in his time: "In the best state [the citizen] is one who is able and willing to be governed and to govern with a view to the life of virtue”[1]. Unlike in villages, most daily interactions amongst citizens in urban spaces are anonymous, which is criticised by some but celebrated by others, such as Georg Simmel or Walter Benjamin, who saw anonymity as liberating[2]. In such a society, ties of family and friendship cannot be counted on to ensure that people will look out for one another; multicultural diversity deepens this problem since common ethnic or national traditions cannot be counted on either.

The necessary ingredients for harmonious multiculturalism

For these reasons, cities require a culture of mutual concern. Also, because some cultural groups within cities value modes of life not shared across a population, a general attitude of toleration is important. A core problem, then, is to encourage commitment to these two virtues – concern and tolerance – among the many cultural groups in a city while respecting their otherwise different values.

Preconditions for addressing this core problem include:

1. Equality of opportunity. When minority groups do not have the chance to pursue chosen professions, to develop their talents, or to have a satisfactory standard of living, they will fight against what they see as a hostile majority, which for its part will develop discriminatory attitudes toward them. These positions are not conducive to civic virtue.

2. Non-ghettoisation. There is nothing necessarily bad about members of an ethnic group
choosing to live together in a neighbourhood. It is a problem, though, when such grouping is not a matter of choice or when neighbourhood divisions isolate people, just as it is when people are locked into or out of certain professions due to their ethnicity. That is when, in the language of urban theorist Richard Sennett, citizens are enclosed by impermeable walls rather than porous boundaries [3/].

3. Accessible public spaces. Parks, boardwalks, community centres, libraries, sport facilities, and so on are places where people from a variety of backgrounds can intermingle. Interaction in such public places does not guarantee that people will adopt attitudes of mutual concern and toleration, but at least allows them to discover shared interests and learn about one another.

4. Civic memory. Cities are what the French sociologist Henri Lefebvre called “ouvres”, or collective works in progress. Civic virtues are encouraged when all citizens of a city see themselves as participating in this work [4/]. This requires not just shared visions of a city’s potential future, but also a civic memory – that is, shared knowledge about its history. Due to geographic mobility or intergenerational amnesia, people from groups long established in a city may not automatically have such memory, and newcomers to a city can learn about its past and identify with common efforts to build upon (or depart from) it.

The university’s role
While a university alone cannot provide all of these conditions for tolerant and caring multiculturalism, it can help.

1. Equality of opportunity. The university can provide scholarships and subsidised housing for students from immigrant families in financial need. It can also offer special training programmes to help new immigrants enter and succeed in university.

2. Non-ghettoisation. The university can make special efforts to provide higher education for people from all ethnic groups through special recruitment drives, for example, or through community-based education programmes. Professional ghettoisation can also be addressed by resisting tendencies of students from any one background to cluster together in certain programmes of study. Academic counselling can help in this regard; it is also important that every discipline have professors representing a range of ethnicities.

3. Accessible public space. A university is itself a public space and, like a city, possesses what Benjamin called an “aura” [5/]. Unfortunately, the auras of some Ontario universities – though not the University of Toronto – foment the attitude that they are “safe” for the white middle and upper classes. Measures like those described above can help to transform such a university’s aura into one more conducive to multicultural interaction.

A problem for some universities is that many students, particularly those from recent immigrant families, do not live near campus but commute from their parents’ homes. This plus the fact that many must also work to fund their education means that these students cannot take advantage of opportunities for interaction outside of class. This problem can be addressed by providing financial support and ample affordable student housing on campus.

4. Civic memory. Universities may have the greatest ability to support this condition by providing historical education about their home cities to residents. It is not enough for history or urban studies departments to include courses for this purpose. Instead, a general liberal-arts curriculum is required – one where all courses, including those in the natural and social sciences and in professional schools, incorporate information on ways that their discipline has contributed to the university’s home city.

The university as a crucial catalyst
Implementing these measures only requires that university faculty and staff adopt appropriate policies and redirect resources. Therefore, it is realistic to urge universities to contribute to multiculturalism. Moreover, if universities actively contribute to this goal, other institutions, including governments, might be motivated to do so as well – and multiculturalism need not be laid to rest.

References

[5] The notion of an “aura” was developed by Benjamin in a study of the aesthetics of photography and later applied by him to cities, as in The Arcades Project, p. 3/4.
Close yet isolated? Changing relations between campus and city

Neighbourhoods that surround urban universities are brought to life by the students and young professionals who live there. But what happens to the valuable cultural, social, and political connections between the university and its neighbourhood when students can no longer afford to live there – or when an entire university moves to another location?

More than 20 years ago, Thomas Bender, a renowned historian of urban life in Europe and North America, edited a book titled The University and the City. which traced the intertwined histories of universities and cities in Europe and the United States. Bender was particularly interested in how a university can productively interact with a city and its cultures, and how the university and the city can mutually reinforce each other’s image as “diverse and tolerant”1. This question remains relevant to this day, particularly in understanding the changing relations between Goethe University Frankfurt’s campuses and the urban life of the city of Frankfurt.

Cultural anthropologists claim that cities are most likely to be culturally productive when they bring together people from a variety of backgrounds, social classes, and national origins. However, diversity is not automatically necessary for urban centres to develop the creative interplay that he dubs “the cultural swirl”2. This concept is based on residents from different backgrounds intermingling in such a way that they cannot avoid being aware of each other in the course of everyday life. For “cultural swirl” to exist, spatial and social boundaries need to be permeable, allowing cultural practices, knowledge, and ideas to pass from one person to another.

We can apply these principles to the interplay between universities and cities, particularly when addressing whether the proximity between a campus and its surrounding neighbourhoods is necessarily accompanied by permeability between the university’s social sphere and the nearby parts of the city. This question is especially pertinent for Goethe University Frankfurt.

In the past decade, the university has undertaken an unprecedented project of creating two new campuses – the Riedberg sciences campus to the northwest of the city and the Westend campus close to the city centre – and abandoning its original inner-city campus located between the quiet, tree-lined streets of Westend and the lively neighbourhood of Bockenheim.

Making the move: From Bockenheim to Westend

Starting in the 1960s, a strong relationship developed between the university’s central campus and Bockenheim, a vibrant neighbourhood with affordable apartments, restaurants, and cultural venues that served students as well as immigrants from all over the world. Permeability between the campus and the neighbourhood was very high, which sometimes caused irritation amongst university officials. The campus was considered by many to be a public space – a venue for protest and social critique. Political activities influenced by the post-1968 student movement were initiated there; for people who participated in demonstrations and cultural movements over the years, collective memories remain mapped onto locations around the university.

This close relationship between the university and the neighbourhood, however, will soon be a thing of the past. The university is about to close the Bockenheim campus, moving the remaining humanities and social sciences offices – as well as all central administrative offices – to the new Westend campus.

The development of the Westend campus dates back to 2001, when several Goethe University departments moved into the former IG Farben complex, about 20 minutes’ walk from the Bockenheim campus. It is a peaceful, park-like setting considered to be one of the most beautiful inner-city campuses in all of Germany. The main building, an example of high modernist architecture, was built in the late 1920s, and was taken over by the US Armed Forces following World War II. Today, more than a decade after the first university departments moved in, the Westend campus still has problems cultivating the lively cultural ambience one associates with urban campus life. The neighbourhood has little to offer in terms of typical off-campus infrastructure and entertainment, and the Westend housing market is far too expensive to allow for the kind of environment present in Bockenheim. The Westend campus, despite its scenic landscape and impressive architecture, is more of an enclosure than a public space open to the city – though...
hopefully this will change as the new campus expands to the north and east.

**New developments on the old campus**

Meanwhile, the public were in turmoil over the fate of the former Bockenheim campus. Local residents were concerned that real estate developers would disrupt the social fabric of Bockenheim by attracting a high-income clientele, and urban activists spoke out against what they saw as the privatisation of public spaces. In 2011, the planning department of the city of Frankfurt started a series of planning workshops, where community organisations and residents were invited to suggest changes in planning concepts. Social scientists and urban planners assert that municipal and private real estate developers are increasingly using this sort of citizen participation in a token fashion in order to calm local resistance, but residents, students, and community organisations remain hopeful that they can have significant input into the projects.

However, in the last two decades – long before the university decided to leave the old site – Bockenheim had already lost much of its former cachet as a student neighbourhood. Gentrification had raised rents, and the high cost of living in Frankfurt, one of the more expensive cities in Germany, was prohibitive. Therefore, students often chose to live in their hometowns or in communities outside of Frankfurt. Thus, Goethe University Frankfurt started to become a commuter university, drawing its student body largely from the surrounding region. These students’ lifestyles were not city-centred, even if many also held part-time jobs in Frankfurt.

More than 70 per cent of the students at Goethe University graduate from secondary school within the greater metropolitan area, whereas only 30 per cent come from other parts of Germany or from abroad. It is interesting to contrast this with what has been happening in Berlin in recent years. Students from across Germany and around the world flock to Berlin, where students’ lifestyles, consumption patterns, and aesthetic preferences draw on and contribute to the city’s cultural diversity, ultimately influencing whole neighbourhoods (especially those with affordable rents). This increases the competitive disadvantage that Goethe University feels vis-à-vis Berlin, whose universities have become a magnet for international academics and students.

In conclusion, I would like to return to the writing of Thomas Bender. He contends that the public life of urbanism is “produced by the overlapping of activities and uses, the conjunction of types of people, and the multiplicity of purposes – all located within a sense of a larger whole”. In the case of Goethe University Frankfurt, there is barely any linkage remaining between the campus and the social spheres of commuting students. On the Westend campus, the desire for permeability between social worlds rubs up against rather restrictive socio-economic limitations (and even patterns of exclusion). Obviously, the creation of a living, breathing connection between the new campus and the city is a challenge that the university and city planners will have to tackle together. In response to an initiative by the president of Goethe University in 2011, the Frankfurt city government has agreed to subsidise affordable student housing in the city – this is a small but necessary step in the right direction.

**Kulturcampus Bockenheim**

In August 2011, the municipal housing and real estate corporation ABG signed a contract to buy the Bockenheim location of Goethe University Frankfurt from its previous owner, the state of Hesse. Hesse promised to use income from the sale to co-fund the university’s extensive construction projects on the Westend campus.

On the Bockenheim site, ABG is set to create a large mixed-use development including offices, shops, and apartments, as well as cultural venues. A number of renowned cultural organisations, including the Museum of Natural History and the Institute for Social Research, will be among the future tenants of the newly designated “Kulturcampus”. Some historic buildings on the site will be preserved, and a percentage of the rental apartments will be reserved for low-income residents. However, critics argue that the number of low-income units is insufficient; they anticipate a ripple effect that will raise rents and intensify the trend of converting rental apartments into expensive condominiums, as is happening in other neighbourhoods close by.
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Goethe University’s international partnerships: A network of academic excellence

Dr. Martin Bickl

Goethe University’s network of strategic partnerships is built upon this connection between university and city. Ever since Goethe University was transformed in 2008 from a state-run institution to a semi-autonomous body (Stiftungsuniversität in German), the close connection between city and university has been firmly reinstated. One of the most prominent and fruitful forms of cooperation between Goethe University and the city of Frankfurt takes place via a network of shared international relationships. Goethe University has chosen a set of seven strategic partners that share this commitment to fostering relationships between the city and the university: Charles University Prague, the University of Birmingham, Tel Aviv University, Osaka University, Fudan University, the University of Pennsylvania, and, of course, the University of Toronto.

All of these partners are world leaders in research and teaching, and most are located in cities or regions with which the city of Frankfurt or the state of Hesse have special relationships. Another important criterion in selecting these partners was that they be comprehensive institutions located in key global economic regions. The most vital prerequisites of all were a true eagerness on both sides to cooperate and a shared belief that partnership adds value to the research output and teaching quality of all institutions involved.

Goethe University and the University of Toronto: A special relationship

In the case of the University of Toronto-Goethe University partnership, this eagerness has been evident from the very start. The partnership between these two institutions was built on a multitude of existing collaborative research projects that spanned disciplines ranging from molecular genetics to political theory. In 2010, both institutions signed a Memorandum of Agreement to encourage even broader forms of collaboration. Since the first joint workshop in autumn 2010, Goethe University and the University of Toronto have also started to collaborate on issues of university strategy and management. Both institutions face similar challenges in governance and finance, especially when it comes to how each university can maintain its leading position nationally and internationally in an age of reduced government involvement and investment in higher education.

Other examples of collaboration between the institutions include a public dialogue on diversity strategies and policies, most recently showcased during a conference at Goethe University in November 2011. International student exchange began in autumn of 2011, with both sides offering innovative mobility programme formats ranging from individual research internships and summer programmes to semester-long study abroad opportunities. Multifaceted, balanced, and enduring, the partnership with the University of Toronto can serve as a model for Goethe University’s development of other strategic partnerships.