

# Case+Study = Case Study?

A Methodological Inquiry into Image  
Production at Potsdamer Platz, Berlin

**Ute Angelika Lehrer<sup>1</sup>**

**Good research is not about good methods as much** as it is about good thinking (Stake 1995: 19). This paper was specifically prepared for the panel “Case Study as a Research Method” presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) conference in Pasadena, California in November 1998.<sup>2</sup> It examines selected findings of my dissertation on Potsdamer Platz and emphasizes the case study approach used for studying contested land use issues and the politics of city-building in Germany’s

new/old capital cities. The structure of this paper generally follows the questions raised by the panel organizer. While most of the questions deal with why and how to do case studies, more details about selected results of my research are also presented.

## **Background**

This case study started with the goal to combine issues on economic restructuring, land use, and urban design. During the process of defining the research agenda, increased attention was given to a particular case. Thorough research questions were developed only after the selection of the case Potsdamer Platz (see Yin 1993).

Potsdamer Platz, a deserted piece of land in the middle of Berlin, was just on the verge of being transformed into a glossy new center for offices, entertainment facilities, retail business, and some luxury apartments. Since World War II, this former “no-man’s-land” located in the heart of Berlin had been dissected by the carceral landscape of the Berlin Wall. In the reunified Berlin, Potsdamer Platz had become the prime object of large-scale international investment and simultaneously the symbol of Berlin’s search for a reinvented central-urban identity. Since the Wall came down, this prime area has attracted investors who have turned it into Europe’s largest inner city construction site. In the early 1990s, the city-state of Berlin sold the land at Potsdamer Platz at market value to three multi-national investors (Daimler Benz, Sony, and A+T). A major controversy erupted not only about these land deals but also about the intended functions and the

proposed type of architecture. At the same time, the future land use of the site was decided through a series of ensuing architecture and urban design competitions.

While there had been certain planning traditions in place in both parts of the city, in the reunified Berlin city-building processes had to be renegotiated. This was particularly true because of the high interest of (foreign) investors who wanted to be part of Berlin’s “Gold Rush” in the real estate market. Potsdamer Platz was the first, and largest, single-building project, and it was a test case for what role planning would play in the new Berlin. In addition, Potsdamer Platz represents mechanisms of city-building processes that are not necessarily unique to Berlin but can be found in other cities as well. The difference, however, is, that these transformations are more legible in a city that undergoes such rapid and dramatic changes as Berlin has since 1989.

Before the Wall came down, there were hardly any foreign companies interested in investing in the city. Berlin’s only competitive advantage over other places in West Germany was that it was a highly subsidized city with generous package deals, including tax incentives, for corporations (Campbell 1999). After the fall of the Wall, this situation changed completely. The city became part of the capitalist marketplace literally overnight, and it was swamped with international real estate investors scouting out the territory for good opportunities.<sup>3</sup> While other cities had quite a bit of exposure to this kind of pressure during the eighties, direct foreign invest-

ment in the real estate market was fairly new to Berlin. Deregulation and increased flexibility and competition were also practices hardly heard of in Berlin until that moment. In other words, when most of the other (capitalist) cities in Europe already had felt the stiff winds of global competition, Berlin still lived its comfortable life as a highly subsidized city (both in East and West Berlin).

### **Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework of this case study is informed by two similar approaches that help us to integrate the city into a theoretical framework. The first one is what Rosalyn Deutsche calls an “urban-aesthetic” discourse (1996). In this approach, theories of the city, of social and public space, are linked to ideas of the arts, architecture, and urban design. Along the same line but more specific to urban planning is Robert Beauregard’s concept of “city building processes” (Beauregard 1990). The advantage of this approach is that it does not reduce planning to mere physical issues or to a static entity but broadens the view to an integrative concept. City-building is a dynamic concept, intrinsically historical, easily traced to specific agents and forces, important for social well-being and public life, and the city as a place is a target for large-scale capital investment and disinvestment (Beauregard 1990: 212).

The guiding question of this case study is how the global economy articulates itself locally. In order to show this “global-local connection” (Beauregard 1995a), I investigated the politics of city-building as it is played out in the built environment at

Potsdamer Platz. In this analysis, the built environment is understood as a materialized place where planning processes are not only shaped by regulations and conventions, but also by local and global actors.

This framework led to a set of inquiries about: (a) the historical context of the place and its relation to current debates around issues of center and periphery; (b) the processes of deal-making and land use decisions; (c) the design/implementation process; and (d) the image production. The first three elements inquired about the evolution of the site as shaped by the internal and external tensions in the city; their various details are beyond the scope of this paper. I wish to explain and emphasize the last point about image production. By image production, I specifically mean the images produced in cities and by cities in a period of globalization. In understanding this project, images include three overlapping and communicating levels of visual, symbolic and metaphorical products and processes: the “image of a city” (Lynch 1970); images produced through and in the built environment (Sudjic 1992); and contested images of everyday life (Lefebvre 1991; Deutsche 1996).

At the core of this research is the assumption that the production of images has to be understood as a process through which members of society make sense of their individual worlds and of each other’s discursive and visual contributions to the general process of communication in society (Habermas 1979; Young 1990). Images are treated as parts of the “materiality of the urban” (Prigge 1987), as substantial elements in the three-pronged spatiality

people encounter in cities—perceived, conceived, and lived (Lefebvre 1991)—and never as mere smoke screens in front of some “real” reality. In particular, my research approach is indebted to work on the special significance of image production in the most recent period of urban restructuring and globalization (Beauregard 1991, 1994; Duncan and Ley 1993; Haila 1997; Harvey 1989; King 1996a; Knox 1993; Shields 1996; Sorkin 1992; Storper 1995; Watson and Gibson 1995; Zukin 1991, 1995, 1996).

In Berlin, I reflected on the production of the image of the “service metropolis” and capital city between 1989 and 1998, which I consider the local versions of attempting to key the city into the global interurban competition accelerated by global city formation (Sassen 1991, 1994; Friedmann 1986, 1995; Friedmann and Wolff 1982; Knox and Taylor 1995; King 1990a). By using Berlin’s Potsdamer Platz as the case, I specifically analyzed the built environment as an expression of an imagery adopted by Berlin to (re)gain global status. Further, I looked at how the production of such images is articulated with virtual and real (economic, social, spatial) processes of global city formation. To do so, I investigated: (a) the activities and strategies by which hegemonic groups produce an “image” of Berlin and how this image is contested by other groups in urban civil society; (b) how particular images are produced through the built environment at Potsdamer Platz; and (c) how these images are challenged by the practices of everyday life.

## **Specific Research Methods**

Fieldwork was articulated around a combination of visual analysis rooted in the history of art and architecture and expanded in spatial theory (Sorkin 1992; Sudjic 1992; Lefebvre 1991; King 1996a, 1998), textual and communicative action analysis (Forester 1998; Flyvbjerg 1998; Schmals and Heinelt 1997; Healey 1997), and ethnographic research as discussed in current planning theory (Sandercock 1998; Jacobs 1996). Different interview techniques and photographic documentation of the construction site over time supported this extensive fieldwork.

Secondary sources were used for the description and the analysis of specific processes specific to Berlin’s formation as a world city (Rada 1997; Mayer 1997; Campbell 1999; Strom 1996a). My primary research builds on this literature while adding to it by providing a largely undocumented aspect that is a theoretical and empirical connection of political, economic, social, and geographical processes with questions of cultural and aesthetic production of images, art, and architecture.

## **Sources of Information**

The case study on Potsdamer Platz relied on three sources of information: interviews, archival research and site observations of the built environment.

### *Interviews*

Given the plurality of opinions existing in Potsdamer Platz on issues of social impact, economic benefit, and spatial aesthetics, I applied a technique similar to investigative journalism

(see Fainstein 1994: 17). Based on the role of the interviewee within the city-building process, either open-ended or focused interview techniques were used to better understand different perspectives in the planning processes at Potsdamer Platz.

One of the main hurdles with the interview technique is to overcome the interviewer's own biases which result in the asking of suggestive questions. However, it is not only the interviewer who has the power to influence the outcome of an interview, but also the interviewee. By arguing for a certain course of events and against another, interviewees often try to rewrite a certain story or to support their current position on an issue.

A concrete example for this is the difference in recollecting the story about how and when the land deal between the city and Daimler-Benz took place. Michael Schreyer, who was the Commissioner for Urban Development and Environmental Protection for the Berlin government at that time, argued that in the Fall of 1989, the Senator for Construction and Housing, Walter Nagel, wanted to build social housing on parts of Potsdamer Platz. Schreyer's version of the story implies that there had been no real interest in Potsdamer Platz from the investor's side, since at a time this site was very peripheral to the rest of the city. When I confronted Walter Nagel with this proposition, he denied having suggested social housing on Potsdamer Platz.<sup>4</sup>

The timeline of the land deal between the city of Berlin and Daimler-Benz had been a key argument as for why the multinational investor had to pay a

relatively low price for the land. Since most of the negotiations about this site took place behind closed doors, Schreyer's recollection cannot be ignored, in spite of the lack of any supportive material.<sup>5</sup>

From this example, it is clear that when using interviews as empirical evidence, information should always be verified by other sources. Known as triangulation, this method is necessary to elucidate certain agendas. However, the fact that an interviewee's story does not stand up against the evidence of what everybody else is saying does not mean that the story being told is not valid. Of course, in the end it is always the researcher who has to decide whether it is fact or fiction. In the example presented above, I believe that the "truth" lies somewhere in the middle.

Since the planning processes around Potsdamer Platz were quite diverse—with various perspectives, recollections, and possible interpretations—I interviewed representatives from different interest groups: elected officials, investors, planning directors, public intellectuals, scholars, urban critics, and activists. Before I present their image of what Berlin is and what it should become, I want to discuss further sources of information used in this research.

#### *Archival Research*

To a lesser extent, I used public reports, announcements, and proposals. Due to the German practice of keeping reports, figures, and memoranda and the like closed to the general public (Strom 1996a), I concentrated on the reports of the print media for stories around Potsdamer Platz.<sup>6</sup> Despite attempts at

reporting events as accurately as possible, it is important to recognize that newspapers are not neutral observers of events. By advancing a certain opinion and condemning another, newspaper articles are (f)actors in the discourse of city-building processes.

In Berlin, the media has played a significant role in shaping, as well as in providing a platform for, public debate. This central role of the media became obvious during preliminary fieldwork conducted in 1996.<sup>7</sup> Through a close collaboration, media and public relations departments developed and implemented promotional strategies using the built environment for the redefinition of Berlin. I identified these strategies as part of an orchestrated effort to promote Potsdamer Platz as the central place of the new Berlin. I called these strategies the “spectacularization” of the building process. Hence, the research design expanded in that direction as well.

While most of the historical aspect of the case study came from current secondary sources, historical records were also used to locate maps of the area, illustrating the changes in the land—in terms of use, density, and ownership—over time.

#### *Site Observations of the Built Environment*

Another component of my case study approach rests on direct site observations. During the time of the field research from May 1996 to October 1997, I made several trips to the construction site at Potsdamer Platz, to the so-called Info-Box, and to other related significant places in Berlin. Site observations were casual visits and represented a wide span of activities ranging from “hanging out” to watching

the activities around the construction site. As a participant observer, I took pictures, visited the Info-Box, and took part in guided tours around the construction site. I documented the evolution of the construction by taking an extensive amount of photographs and fieldnotes.

The social laboratory of Potsdamer Platz is not enclosed, and as a result I had many informal encounters with Berliners, tourists, unionized laborers, and security patrol officers with whom I shared the space. Their views of the building process at Potsdamer Platz found its way into the study. Furthermore, by interviewing people at their workplace, I had the opportunity to gain more insight into the work environment of some of the movers and shakers of urban development in Berlin, as well as of other people critical of it.

During repeated visits to the site, different opinions about the kind of city that was going to be built were tested. For example, some of the critics were arguing that buildings at Potsdamer Platz were too high and the distance between the building blocks too narrow, not allowing enough sun on the streetscape. This opinion has to be understood as a response to those who advocated increasing height limitations in Berlin, arguing that buildings in New York were even higher. Visiting Potsdamer Platz on a sunny October day around noon, one easily experiences the geo-climatic particularities of Berlin as formulated by the critics in their argument of too-high buildings and too-narrow streetscape.

## Case Study: Berlin between World City and *Posemuckel*

Berlin combines the disadvantages of an American metropolis with that of a German provincial town (Tucholsky in Bluhm and Nitsche 1996: 102).

Berlin is both open to the world and provincial, sublime and uncouth, inviting and distant, clumsy and agile, sentimental and heartless, brave and weakhearted, loudmouthed and buttoned-up, innocent and corrupt, glittering and shabby; it is Atlantis and sausage stand. The largest German city and the only one that fully fulfills the promise of the metropolis (Hassemer and Eckhardt in Rada 1997: 97).

In the following paragraphs I will present some actors and their opinions on how Potsdamer Platz can be or is being used in redefining the image of Berlin. As mentioned earlier, the research is based on a systematic review of newspaper articles, reports and other written documents, as well as interviews conducted between June 1996 and October 1997. “If only the city could speak, what would it say to us?” asks Robert Beauregard in an article about how the city is represented as the site of collective action (1995b: 59). To follow along the same lines: What would the city say about being the object of image production? Or put differently, how was Potsdamer Platz represented in the imagination of different actors?

### *Pro-Potsdamer Platz Voices*

To Walter Momper, mayor at the time of the land deal between Daimler-Benz (one of the three multinationals occupying the site) and the city of Berlin, Potsdamer Platz symbolizes the reunified

Berlin/Germany and the reentrance of Berlin onto the global stage.<sup>8</sup> His vision for Berlin was very much the image of both a “capital city” and a “service center” on global stage. The term that he (and others) used for defining this new role was “Service Metropolis Berlin.” Both service metropolis and capital city became the official image in politics.<sup>9</sup>

When planning processes at Potsdamer Platz did not go according to his agenda, Ernst Reuter, former CEO of Daimler-Benz and the single most important figure favoring the location of the multinational corporation at Potsdamer Platz,<sup>10</sup> made shock waves with his characterization of Berlin as a *Posemuckel* (back of beyond).<sup>11</sup> This image was so strong that in the following years, the question of Berlin’s faith was discussed as either world city or “back of beyond.”

Peter Martin, from the public relations agency *Partner für Berlin*, an agency founded specifically for the promotion of the new Berlin, saw Potsdamer Platz as the “heart” of the newly reunified and capital city Berlin, the symbolic center of Berlin’s entrance into the service industry economy. Referring to Potsdamer Platz as a “viable animal,” Martin argues that Potsdamer Platz would become a strong animal if “people give it a chance to get its first steps going.”

### *Planning Voices*

City planning director Hans Stimmann, a man with authority in Berlin, wanted to have a “European city” at Potsdamer Platz.<sup>12</sup> Stimmann believed that not only should there be no skyscrapers, building facades should be made of stone, not glass and steel. Because of pressure from the investors to build as much space as possible, Stimmann agreed to change

the height limitation from twenty-five meters (which corresponds to the traditional four- to five-story building block in Berlin) to thirty-five meters. Since thirty-five meters is the traditional height limitation in Milan, Stimmann could rationalize this change of policy by arguing that Milan is a European city. In addition, Stimmann was keen on following the urban fabric of the old Berlin with a parceled structure.

Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, a public intellectual who gave Stimmann the idea of the European city, is responsible for a number of images that were created during the past decade. Large-scale urban development was the antithesis of how he saw Berlin's thriving future, arguing instead for small-scale, diverse development with an architectural language representing the local traditions.

#### *Negotiation Voice*

When I interviewed Michael Schreyer, Commissioner for Urban Development and Environmental Protection and member of the Green Party, her power had changed from being in the executive seat to being in the oppositional seat within the city parliament.<sup>13</sup> She criticized the (process of the) land deal between the City of Berlin and Daimler-Benz, calling it a "prostration before big capital" (Schweitzer 1996). She also coined the term *Lex Daimler* (Daimler's *de facto* law) in reference to the bargain price paid by the investor. Schreyer argued from the very beginning that the future of Berlin was going to be decided at Potsdamer Platz, and she therefore continually insisted that the future layout of the site be determined through an open concept competition.

#### *Voices Contra-Potsdamer Platz*

The proposal for turning Potsdamer Platz into a major office and entertainment center was contested on a number of levels. In a book-length discussion, journalist Uwe Rada criticizes the official image generated by the politics of capital city and service metropolis (Rada 1997). Instead Rada calls the new Berlin the "capital city of eviction."

Wolfgang Kil, an urban sociologist from the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) and an active voice against the "western domination" of planning in the current Berlin, calls the whole City of Berlin a "single landed property."

Dirk Kaden, who grew up in the East, is an activist against a number of large-scale projects in Berlin (e.g., Citizen Initiative Alexanderplatz). He argues that Potsdamer Platz was perceived by the general public as fallow land, and therefore, to build anything on it would be seen by the non-involved majority as a positive thing. In addition, he points to the *Stadtforum* (city forum), which was introduced as a means of broad citizen participation in urban development, as a legitimization of Berlin's post-fall-of-the-wall urban politics. Therefore, he contends that the *Stadtforum* was nothing more than a "placebo."<sup>14</sup>

The urban historian Harald Bodenschatz, who was fighting against the spatial transformation of Berlin under the pressure of capitalism, sees Potsdamer Platz as a "laboratory product" and a "bridgehead of the West" (Schweitzer 1996: 109).



### *Voice of Analysis*

Werner Sewing, an urban sociologist, sees Potsdamer Platz as a “dress rehearsal” for post-Wall urban development in Berlin. While in the beginning the city (i.e., politicians, city planners, and local architects) won out over the investors by insisting on a concept competition for the area, the investors later, with the help of some of the architects, got what they wanted. Further, Potsdamer Platz symbolizes, in Sewing’s view, a battle of the “prima donnas” in architecture. He does not share the image of a service metropolis but instead calls Berlin the “East European Metropolis of the Poor.”

### *Riding the Tiger?*

Why is it relevant to know about these different characterizations of Berlin? Images and their connotation were central in the debate about which direction the reunified Berlin should take. For example, when the concept competition for Potsdamer Platz was taking place and the winners presented an architectural language that did not seem to be attractive to the investor, the press representative of Daimler-Benz, Matthias Kleinert, was very outspoken:

Instead of “world city niveau,” “a corporate business card for the investor/developer,” or an “accentuated urban landscape,” the jury’s decision of the competition would represent the provinciality of its members. The trust of the investors would be over. And at a symbolic site...the anti-capitalist games of the walled-in idyll would be played (Kleinert in Rada 1997: 42).

In response to this judgmental statement from the investor/developer, the Commissioner for Urban

Development, Volker Hassemer, responded with a counter-attack arguing that from now on, the city would “ride the tiger.”

This is just one of many examples of city-building processes in Berlin where images constantly were created and recreated. How does this image production help us to understand planning processes at Potsdamer Platz? As I argue in my dissertation, Potsdamer Platz was a means to debate the future role and identity of the new Berlin.<sup>15</sup>

But how can Potsdamer Platz work as an explanatory case for other situations? How can one generalize from the findings of this very specific case? To use Potsdamer Platz as a case study, embedded in city-building processes of the current political, spatial, economic, social, and cultural transformation of Berlin, not only adds to the history of planning processes, but—because Berlin is so exceptional—reveals the current underlying structures of city-building processes. Potsdamer Platz encapsulates the transformation of planning processes that can be linked to both local and global dynamics. In this transformation, the production of images and the discourse about it seem to have increased in importance. The description and the analysis of the specificity of Potsdamer Platz adds to the emerging literature on globalization and the built environment, where large-scale projects play a particular role (Fainstein 1994; Crilly 1993).

### **Advantage of Case Study over Other Research Methods?**

The advantage over other methods is that a case study approach is helpful when the research topic is

broadly defined, relies on several sources of evidence, and wants to cover contextual conditions (Yin 1993: 65-76; Stake 1995: 33). Because of the nature of the research interest, i.e., a “contemporary phenomena within real-life context” (Yin 1994:13), a case study approach seems to be the most appropriate method. This is particularly true for Potsdamer Platz, where city-building processes are still in the making.

Since individuals played a strong role in city-building processes at Potsdamer Platz, the case study method as an interpretive research approach allowed me to place a substantial emphasis on how actors in Berlin’s city-building processes made sense of what was going on (Creswell and Miller 1997). Further, a case study approach was helpful because of its richness of different techniques for analyzing the city-building processes at Potsdamer Platz. It allowed me to draw from a variety of data collection methods that I had acquired in my previous professional life as a journalist and architecture critic. Furthermore, fieldwork took my research in a direction not previously anticipated. Since I used a case study method I was able to be flexible, re-adapt, and progressively redefine relevant issues (Stake 1995: 29).

### **The Use of this Case Study in Teaching**

Given the story about image production at Potsdamer Platz, what lessons can be drawn for planning practice and planning theory? (1) Image production is a practical means to discuss the future of a city. (2) Images give the opportunity to involve a broader audience since they are legible to non-professionals (at least they are more approachable than formal plans, evaluations, and reports). (3) Images also

can be used to cover up hidden agendas and to distract the general audience by having mock fights over what kind of image should represent the future of one particular city. (4) Planning is a practice where not just the “expert” has influence on the future shape of the city.<sup>16</sup> (5) The example of Potsdamer Platz shows that the dominant discourse is a discourse among the powerful, not among a broader range of society.

In spite of its uniqueness—or because of its uniqueness—the case study of Potsdamer Platz can teach the planning student a number of lessons. It tells a planning story, and therefore, adds to the knowledge production in planning history. Planning processes, which usually follow a standard procedure, were not routinized at Potsdamer Platz but were part of a negotiation process between different actors (such as investors, politicians, planners and architects, citizens, activists, and environmentalists). Thus, this case study demonstrates the obvious—not all actors have the same influence. What it also shows is how sophisticated, but also how simple and crude, can be the strategies actors employ at times, as well as how the influence of actors can change during the planning process. And lastly, but not finally, the example of Potsdamer Platz also can be used to demonstrate a different cultural and political context of planning—different from the one dominantly represented in the Anglo-American literature.

I do not claim that these conclusions are particularly original. Rather, I see these lessons confirming the recent approaches in planning theory and prac-

tice that argue for a multiplicity of voices (Sandercock 1998). Planning, as I understand it, is a practice within society (Douglass and Friedmann 1998), therefore planning practice and theory should be related not only to professional planners, but also to a broad and diverse range of other participants in the urban discourse.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> The author would like to thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their encouraging comments.

<sup>2</sup> A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 14<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Sociology (ISA-RC21) in Montreal (Summer 1998).

<sup>3</sup> This euphoria of foreign investors lasted for only about two years. Germany's planning regulations and Berlin's task to solve land claims after reunification, as well as reasons that were of an international and global nature, discouraged the "big boys" of real estate from playing their game in Berlin. To prevent international investment in Berlin was not the intention of city government. To the contrary, in order to make it easier for investors in Berlin, a number of institutions were established. One of them is the KOAI (see Lenhardt 1998).

<sup>4</sup> The differences in the two stories also have to do with the fact that the two interviewees were from two different parties within the governing Red-Green Coalition. This coalition lasted only from 1989 to 1990 and the break-up was due partly to major differences regarding how to proceed at Potsdamer Platz.

<sup>5</sup> Daimler-Benz originally paid only 1505 German Marks per square foot to the State of Berlin, half of the then-current market value of the land. The European Commission for Economy (*Wirtschaftskommission*) disqualified this land deal as an indirect subsidy to the multinational investor by Berlin and asked Daimler-Benz to pay an additional 33.8 million German Marks to the State of Berlin (Schweitzer 1996: 99-100). Up to this day, the full amount of payment was never publicly disclosed. When I inquired about this issue, a representative of Daimler-Benz was willing to give me the date but not the amount of money paid to the State of Berlin.

<sup>6</sup> Newspaper articles came mainly from two sources: (1) from a close reading of *tageszeitung*, a critical, leftist daily newspaper produced in Berlin with local bureaux in Hamburg and Bremen, and a German (and international) distribution system; (2) from an examination of the archival collection of newspaper clippings starting in the early 20th century at the *Zentrum für Berlin-Studien*.

<sup>7</sup> Preliminary research was made possible through a generous research grant from UC Berkeley, German and European Study Center.

<sup>8</sup> This image of Potsdamer Platz as the site of reunification is very much part of Momper's own history. When the first holes were cut into the Wall in November 1989, he was shown on television around the world standing next to the Wall at Potsdamer Platz, his red scarf waving in the wind.

<sup>9</sup> In the summer of 1998, this image was reduced to just capital city, since the service industry never really made its way to Berlin.

<sup>10</sup> Reuter saw Daimler-Benz as a modernizer of Berlin and part of the capital city.

<sup>11</sup> “Don’t beat about the bush but roll up your sleeves. It is not about back of beyond.” Reuter made this statement on April 1991 during the opening of the *Stadtforum*, a public forum on urban redevelopment questions in Berlin (see Rada 1997: 41ff).

<sup>12</sup> At a public event on Potsdamer Platz, Stimmann also said that “large scale projects always were developed undemocratically. It is an error to believe that through citizen participation, the city would look better” (Stimmann at “Potsdamer Platz: Vision oder Trauma?” discussion, Berlin, June 18, 1996).

<sup>13</sup> Michael Schreyer was the only interview partner who refused to allow the conversation to be recorded.

<sup>14</sup> Placebo is the term I used to best translate the views of Dirk Kaden.

<sup>15</sup> “Place Making by Design: City-Building Processes at Potsdamer Platz, Berlin,” dissertation manuscript, Department of Urban Planning, UCLA.

<sup>16</sup> I want to argue that it is important for the discipline of planning to include also other active voices in the city-building process. For the case of Potsdamer Platz, therefore, it is helpful to define planning as a process where representatives of state, market, and civil society are negotiating with each other about the production of urban space, and to define planners as participants (with, of course, different impact) in this urban discourse.

## References

- Andranovich, Gregory D. and Gerry Riposa. 1993. *Doing Urban Research*. Applied Social Research Methods Series 33. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Beauregard, Robert A. and Anne Haila. 1997. The Unavoidable Incompleteness of the City. In *American Behavioral Scientist*. 41: 327-341.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1995a. Theorizing the Global-Local Connection. In *World Cities in a World-System*. Edited by Paul L. Knox and Peter J. Taylor. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1995b. If Only the City Could Speak: The Politics of Representation. In *Spatial Practices*. Edited by Helen Liggett and David C. Perry. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1994. Capital Switching and the Built Environment: United States 1970 to 1989. In *Environment and Planning A*. 26: 715-732.
- Beauregard, Robert A. 1990. Bringing the City Back In. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 56: 210-215.
- Bluhm, Detlef and Rainer Nitsche. 1996. *Berlin ist das Allerletzte: Absagen in den hoeschsten Toenem*. Berlin: Transit.
- Campbell, Scott. 1999. *Cold War Metropolis: The Fall and Rebirth of Berlin as World City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Creswell, John W. and Gary A. Miller. 1997. Research Methodologies and the Doctoral Process. In *Rethinking the Dissertation Process: Tackling Personal and Institu-*

- tional Obstacles, New Directions for Higher Education.* Edited by Lester F. Goodchild et al. 25 (3): 17-32.
- Crilly, Darrel. 1993. Megastructures and Urban Change: Aesthetics, Ideology and Design. In *The Restless Urban Landscape*. Edited by Paul L. Knox. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cuff, Dana. 1989. The Social Production of Built Form. In *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 7: 433-447.
- Deutsche, Rosalyn. 1996. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Douglass, Mike and John Friedmann (eds). 1998. *Cities for Citizens: Planning and the Rise of Civil Society in a Global Age*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Duncan, James and David Ley (eds). 1993. *Place/Culture/Representation*. New York: Routledge.
- Fainstein, Susan S. 1994. *The City Builders: Property, Politics, and Planning in London and New York*. Cambridge MA.: Blackwell.
- Fainstein, Susan S. 1991. Promoting Economic Development: Urban Planning in the United States and Great Britain. In *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 57 (1): 22-33.
- Featherstone, Mike (ed). 1990. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Fischler, Raphael. 1995. Strategy and History in Professional Practice: Planning as World Making. In *Spatial Practices*. Edited by Helen Liggett and David C. Perry. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. 1998. *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Forester, John. 1998. Rationality, Dialogue and Learning: What Community and Environmental Mediators Can Teach Us About the Practice of Civil Society. In *Cities for Citizens*. Edited by Mike Douglass and John Friedmann. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1979. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Haeussermann, Hartmut, and Elizabeth Strom. 1994. Berlin: The Once and Future Capital. In *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*. 2: 35-46.
- Haila, Anne. 1997. The Neglected Builder of Global Cities. In *Cities in Transformation, Transformation in Cities*. Edited by O. Källtorp. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Harvey, David. 1991. The Urban Face of Capitalism. In *Our Changing Cities*. Edited by John F. Hart. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Haxthusen, Charles and Heidrun Suhr. 1990. *Berlin Culture and Metropolis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Healey, Patsy. 1997. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Jacobs, Jane M. 1996. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. New York: Routledge.

- King, Anthony D. 1998. Writing Trans-national Space: Fantasy, Imaginings, and Reality in India's (Non-Resident) Suburbs. Paper presented at the 14th World Congress of Sociology. Montreal.
- King, Anthony D. (ed). 1996a. *Re-presenting the City: Ethnicity, Capital and Culture in the 21st-Century Metropolis*. New York: New York University Press.
- King, Anthony D. 1996b. Worlds in the City: Manhattan Transfer and the Ascendance of Spectacular Space. In *Planning Perspectives*. 11: 97-114.
- King, Anthony D. 1991. *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representations of Identity*. Binghamton NY: Department of Art and Art History, State University of New York at Binghamton.
- King, Anthony D. 1990a. Architecture, Capital and the Globalization of Culture. In *Global Culture*. Edited by Mike Featherstone. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- King, Anthony D. 1990b. *Global Cities: Post-Imperialism and the Internationalization of London*. London: Routledge.
- King, Ross. 1996. *Emancipating Space: Geography, Architecture, and Urban Design*. London: The Guilford Press.
- Knox, Paul L. and Peter J. Taylor. 1995. *World Cities in a World-System*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell.
- Lenhardt, Karin. 1998. 'Bubble-politics' in Berlin, Das Beispiel Koordinierungsausschuss fuer Innerstaedtische Investitionen: eine 'black box' als Match- und Entscheidungszenrale. In *Prokla*. 110: 41-66
- Liggett, Helen and David C. Perry (eds). 1995. *Spatial Practices: Critical Explorations in Social/Spatial Theory*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Lynch, Kevin. 1970 (1960). *The Image of the City*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Mayer, Margit. 1997. Berlin - Los Angeles. Berlin auf dem Weg zur Global City? In *Prokla*. 109: 519-545.
- Maxwell, Joseph A. 1996. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Applied Social Research Methods Series 41. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Prigge, Walter (ed.). 1987. *Die Materialitaet des Staedischen: Staatentwicklung und Urbanitaet im Gesellschaftlichen Umbruch*. Basel: Birkhaeuser.
- Przeworski, Adam and Frank Salomon. 1988. *On the Art of Writing Proposals*. Social Science Research Council.
- Rada, Uwe. 1997. *Hauptstadt der Verdrangung: Berliner Zukunft zwischen Kiez und Metropole*. Berlin: Schwarze Risse/Rote Strasse.
- S(t)andOrt Berlin (special issue). In *Prokla*. 110.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1998. *Toward Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1994. *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Schmals, Klaus M. and Hubert Heinelt (eds). 1997. *Zivile Gesellschaft: Entwicklung, Defizite, Potentiale*. Oplanden: Leske + Budrich.
- Schweitzer, Eva. 1996. *Grossbaustelle Berlin*. Berlin: Nicolai.
- Shields, Rob. 1996. A Guide to Urban Representation and What To Do About It: Alternative Traditions of Urban Theory. In *Re-presenting the City*. Edited by Anthony D. King. New York: New York University Press.
- Smith, David A. 1991. Method and Theory in Comparative Urban Studies. In *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*. 32(1-2): 37-57.
- Sorkin, Michael (ed.). 1992. *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Storper, Michael. 1995. City Beautiful, City Ugly: Urban Form as Social Convention. Paper presented to the symposium: The Question of Economic Value. Austin TX.
- Strom, Elizabeth. 1998. The Global and the Vernacular: International Real Estate, Local Politics and Urban Development in Berlin. Paper presented at the 14th World Congress of Sociology. Montreal.
- Strom, Elizabeth. 1996a. Berlin Becomes Bigger, the World Becomes Smaller: Central City Development in United Berlin. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: City University of New York.
- Strom, Elizabeth. 1996b. The Political Context of Real Estate Development: Central City Rebuilding in Berlin. In *European Urban and Regional Studies*. 3(1): 3-17.
- Sudjic, Deyan. 1992. *The 100 Mile City*. London: André Deutsch.
- Watson, Sophie and Katherine Gibson (eds). 1995. *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Cambridge MA.: Blackwell.
- Yin, Robert K. 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Second Edition). Applied Social Research Methods Series 5. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Yin, Robert K. 1993. *Applications of Case Study Research*, Applied Social Research Methods Series 34. Thousand Oaks CA : Sage.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1996. Space and Symbols in an Age of Decline. In *Re-presenting the City*. Edited by Anthony D. King. New York: New York University Press.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1991. *Landscapes of Power: from Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

UTE ANGELIKA LEHRER is a doctoral student at UCLA, currently finishing her dissertation on "Place Making by Design: City-Building Processes at Postdamer Platz, Berlin." Her research interest centers on the built environment and its relation to processes of globalization.