

Vulnerability Through Resilience?

An Example of the Counterproductive Effects of Spatially Related Governance in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg

Tobias Schmidt

Received: 8 October 2011 / Accepted: 15 June 2012 / Published online: 14 July 2012
© Springer-Verlag 2012

Abstract In dealing with perceived threats and hazards by coordinating and bundling diverse actors' efforts, governance approaches potentially face a problem. Perceptions of threats as well as adequate action strategies aiming to build up resilience are both based on processes of social construction. Therefore, what at first sight seem to be promising strategies for building resilience for all actors can conversely be considered as new threats and vulnerabilities by particular actors due to their differing perceptions. Within the context of a governance that intends to increase resilience this can potentially cause counterproductive effects. This paper demonstrates this possibility by means of a social constructivist notion of vulnerability and resilience. Socio-spatial identity building processes between the "International Building Exhibition" ("*Internationale Bauausstellung*": IBA) and actors in the local area of Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg are used as an empirical example. This paper illustrates that historically developed social knowledge in the form of socio-spatial identities and local discourses can play an important role because it influences the specific perceptions of local actors.

Keywords Vulnerability · Resilience · Governance · International Building Exhibition Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg · Local actors · Socio-spatial identity · Discourse

Vulnerabilität durch Resilienz?

Ein Beispiel kontraproduktiver Effekte raumbezogener Governance in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg

Zusammenfassung Ansätzen von „Governance“, die das Handeln unterschiedlicher Akteure im Umgang mit wahrgenommenen Gefährdungen bündeln sollen, stellt sich ein potenzielles Problem. Wahrnehmungen von Gefährdungen und Handlungsentwürfe zur Bildung von Resilienz sind jeweils soziale Konstruktionsleistungen. Zunächst für alle Akteure aussichtsreich erscheinende Strategien zur Resilienzbildung können deshalb auf Grund unterschiedlicher Wahrnehmungsweisen zu neuen Wahrnehmungen von Verletzbarkeit für einzelne Akteure führen und so im Rahmen einer resilienzorientierten *Governance* kontraproduktive Effekte erzeugen. Dies will eine Analyse des empirischen Beispiels sozioräumlicher Identitätsbildungsprozesse zwischen dem Stadtentwicklungskonzept „Internationaler Bauausstellung“ (IBA) und lokalen Akteuren in dem in besonderer Weise gefährdeten und stigmatisierten Stadtteil Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg mittels eines sozialkonstruktivistisch gefassten Konzepts von Vulnerabilität und Resilienz zeigen. Der Beitrag weist darauf hin, dass in diesem Zusammenhang historisch gewachsene, soziale Wissensbestände in Form sozioräumlicher Identitäten sowie stadtteilbezogene Diskurse eine wichtige Rolle spielen können, weil sie spezifische Wahrnehmungsweisen lokaler Akteure beeinflussen.

Schlüsselwörter Vulnerabilität · Resilienz · Governance · Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg · Lokale Akteure · Sozioräumliche Identität · Diskurs

T. Schmidt, M.A. (✉)
Leibniz-Institut für Regionalentwicklung und Strukturplanung
e.V. (IRS), Flakenstraße 28–31, 15537 Erkner, Germany
e-mail: t.schmidt@irs-net.de

1 Introduction

From a social constructivist perspective, human handling of endangerments cannot be considered in isolation from the modes of perception that form the basis for the assessment of the endangerments. Perceptions of endangerments should also not only be seen in terms of dependence on the circumstances of spatial situation, for instance whether a place of residence is close to a nuclear power plant. They must also be considered in relation to the changeable historical, social and cultural contexts in which they emerge (see Christmann/Ibert in this issue). For example, the perception of the danger of nuclear power can change abruptly after a disaster like Chernobyl or Fukushima.

Different perceptions of hazardous situations and appropriate ways of dealing with them can lead to counterproductive effects when joint action approaches are to be developed (see Christmann/Ibert/Kilper et al. 2011). This can be empirically demonstrated using the example of the “International Building Exhibition Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg” (*“Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg”*: IBA).

In a cooperative collaboration between politics, planning, business, administration and numerous experts, the IBA Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg has endeavoured to develop solution strategies for dealing with the multifarious hazardous situations¹ in the Hamburg district of Wilhelmsburg since 2006. The IBA can thus be interpreted as an urban spatially based governance arrangement (see Keim 2003; Bogumil/Holtkamp 2004; Benz 2004; Mayntz 2004; Mayntz 2005; Blatter 2005; Benz/Lütz/Schimank et al. 2007; Walk 2008; Schnur/Drilling 2009; Kilper 2010).

Building up resistance against such endangerments is a key aim of the governance arrangement of the IBA. Although this IBA can connect with the perceptions of endangerment of local actors in goal setting and solution

approaches, in terms of action counterproductive effects manifest themselves on the local level. IBA strategies for image creation and discourse management are particularly affected by this, as local actors have already also intensively engaged in re-interpreting their space. IBA solution strategies in this area are seen not as enabling resilience, but rather as new endangerments.

This paper uses this example to demonstrate that counterproductive effects for a governance arrangement such as that of the IBA can arise from the fundamental interrelation between perceptions of vulnerability and resilience building.

A social scientific perspective on vulnerability and resilience, as developed by Christmann/Ibert (in this issue), is used for the analysis. This perspective allows actions intended to build resilience to be viewed in connection with the perceptions of endangerment on which they are based. The approach is outlined in Sect. 2. In the chosen example in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, social knowledge in the form of constructions of identity and local socio-historically rooted discourses plays a significant role for local actors, who use it for orientation when dealing with endangerments such as marginalisation or stigmatising external images of the district. Relevant aspects of socio-spatial identity and discourses are thus briefly expounded in Sect. 3. Section 4 then discusses the context in which the IBA in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg developed, and recapitulates a summary of its key goals. Here perceptions of problems shared by the IBA and local actors are also outlined.² In contrast, using the example of socio-spatial identity creation, Sect. 5 reconstructs and discusses local actors' resilience building strategies that are distinct from those of the IBA. Section 6 summarises the important findings and reflects on the possible implications for governance arrangements such as that of the IBA in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg.

2 A Socio-Spatial Perspective on Vulnerability and Resilience³

Here the focus of the analysis of vulnerability and resilience is on an urban district affected by potentially hazardous situations of both physical-spatial and social nature. These terms are used in the following as analytical concepts, and vulnerability and resilience are viewed from a socio-spatial perspective that is based on social constructivism. Key to this approach is the notion that potentially hazardous situations—no matter whether they are, for instance, physical,

¹ Inhabitants of Wilhelmsburg are confronted with fundamental threats, such as the risk of flooding due to the natural island position of the district, health-threatening emissions from local industry, toxic ground, traffic noise pollution, spatial marginalisation due to natural barriers between the district and the rest of the city (the River Elbe) and the extensive port areas to the north and west, and economic problems (low purchasing power, low growth rates especially of smaller and medium-sized companies). In addition, residential areas are threatened by expansion of the port (Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002: 2 ff.) and threats to social cohesion, quality of life and the chances of upward social mobility for many inhabitants due, for instance, to integration issues of multi-ethnic population structures, low levels of education and high unemployment rates. Further threats are negative images and stigmatising media discourse about the district that have become established over a long time. This particular endangerment results in an entire urban district being assigned an enduring negative image. Developmental perspectives can thus be constricted and social problems exacerbated. Not least, devaluing external images about an urban district can even threaten the identity of its residents, if positive self-images are overlain, and can endanger potential commitment to the stigmatised space.

² On the basis of available empirical data, the focus of the paper is on the perceptions of local actors.

³ Of relevance to this section are the papers Christmann/Ibert (in this issue) and also Christmann/Ibert/Kilper et al. (2011).

social, economic or ecological—undergo social processing before leading to subjective perceptions of threat. This is based on the assumption “that actors may develop different perceptions of potential threats and of the precautionary measures that are to be adopted—even though the nature of an endangerment seems clear and proven” (Christmann/Ibert in this issue). The approach thus makes such perceptions and the social constructions of actors the centre of attention, without needing to blend out material, physical-spatial and temporal factors.

The empirical example chosen for consideration in this paper is intended to demonstrate that an analysis of vulnerability and resilience cannot take *factual* exposure or coping ability with regards to endangerments as a starting point for investigation. It is rather the case that processes of social construction in the societal handling of endangerments are involved.⁴ As social constructs, vulnerability and resilience cannot be accepted as objective givens, but are to be analysed as acting entities relative to perceptions and calculations of risk and in relation to the social, physical-spatial and temporal conditions in which they are embedded. Only through social processing do actors perceive events as being (potentially) endangering or threatening and develop action strategies to build up resilience.

Explicit reference is also made to the factor time. Although social processes of construction orientate themselves on scenarios involving the potential effects of endangerments or potential powers of resilience in the future, they are not created independently of experiences from the past—and they can change over time in the face of changing perceptions of endangerment.

The notion that actors’ constructions of vulnerability and resilience are linked to their individual interpretations of reality and knowledge relations is of particular relevance when actors relate their actions to a shared problem area in the form of governance. Hence, the communicative processes of negotiation and agreement that are continually necessary in governance processes can represent a problem. They may be the starting point of contention between governance actors, in so far as specific constructions of vulnerability include specific interpretations of problems that then suggest certain ways of building resilience while excluding other possible solutions. This can lead to non-intended (and for the aims of a governance potentially even counterproductive) effects. Such unwanted consequences can then be perceived anew by actors as endangerments and can be made the object of new constructions of vulnerability. In general terms, Christmann/Ibert (in this issue) comment in

this context “that these different constructions have consequences for coordinated action, for instance in governance processes, and are therefore particularly worthy of attention”.

The following discussion thus pays particular attention to these different constructions, using selected resilience approaches adopted by the IBA and Wilhelmsburg actors in the context of socio-spatial identity formation. This brief presentation of the concept underlying the analysis clarifies that construction processes in the present feed on the experiences of the past and are connected with acquired social-cultural knowledge. Before turning to the analysis therefore, light is shed on significant aspects of the creation of social knowledge in the form of socio-spatial identities and discourse, as far as they are especially relevant for the chosen case study.

3 Socio-Spatial Identity and Discourses

Through socio-spatial identity constructions actors can develop feelings of belonging and spatial attachments. They can base their actions and judgements on shared viewpoints and assessments, as locally specific, spatially related identities offer patterns of interpretation of the self and the world. Socio-spatial identities set self and other in relation to one another, bringing them into a mutually meaningful order. As a form of social knowledge they offer shared frames of orientation. They can, however, change in the course of local history, which leads to processes of negotiation about such shared frames of orientation.

Socio-spatial identities feed, among other things, on handed-down knowledge of collective experiences of the past. These reach into the present through processes of collective remembering and are part of local actors’ shared body of knowledge. However, depending on the context, only certain sections of this body of knowledge are recalled. This can occur in the form of museums or the writing of histories, but also if reference is made to part of the body of knowledge in everyday communication (see Assmann 1988; Knoblauch 1999; Assmann 2006).

In this context account should be taken of discourses. In the form of discourses a multitude of communicative actions are topic-specifically linked with one another. In this way individual aspects of significance can thematically densify, leading to the emergence of their own knowledge systems (see Keller 2011: 7 ff.). Discourses thus only allow certain thematic connection possibilities while excluding others. This can in turn be decisive for which elements of identity constructions and handed-down knowledge are recalled and updated through communications. Over time discourses

⁴ Dangers, that is threats, that as endangerments represent potential damages to a good, are aspects of social vulnerability constructions, but are not to be seen as the equivalent of this term (see Christmann/Ibert in this issue in reference to Birkmann/Böhm/Buchholz et al. 2011: 8 f.).

with their thematic focuses, their “topoi”⁵, can themselves become part of the knowledge system of locally specific identity constructs (see Christmann 2003: 3 and 13).

Discursive topoi are then part of the collective production of knowledge in the form of local identities and offer only very specific connection possibilities. This view has implications for the practical level of social action. Thus it can be of great significance whether a spatial image that presents an urban district as a dynamic, liveable and economically prosperous space can be discursively established, for instance if the interest of external investors is to be attracted or if the area’s position on the housing market is to be strengthened.

Such interests also fall within the scope of tasks of the IBA in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg. The IBA, however, also wishes to create “a graphic, accessible image of realms of experience (*Lebenswelten*) that so far have only existed as ideas in people’s heads”.⁶ The focus of the IBA is thus not on material redevelopment alone, but rather also on the transformation of social bodies of knowledge about this space. This is necessary because so far topics of hazard and vulnerability have framed the image of this urban district. Such topoi of vulnerability, that influence the discourse of the Wilhelmsburg district, are recapitulated in the following. It will become clear how the situation led to the initiation of an IBA and the extent to which local actors’ perceptions of problems have been picked up on by the IBA.

4 The Elbe Island as a “Community with a Shared Destiny”: Topoi of Vulnerability as Shared Frames of Reference for the IBA and Local Actors

The city of Hamburg made the district Wilhelmsburg⁷ a focus of urban development policy as early as 2004. Since 2006 it has been the showplace for an IBA.⁸ Using the motto

⁵ “Topoi have emerged in the communicative pasts of city related discourse, extend through past and present interpretations of the reality of the city and spread their influence even into the personal identity of the city’s citizens. Topoi are thus important elements of city culture” (Christmann 2004: 50; own translation).

⁶ See http://www.iba-hamburg.de/de/01_entwuerfe/3_mission/mision_zukunftzeigen.php (last accessed 13.06.2011); due to a website relaunch most documents from www.iba-hamburg.de which were used for analysis are no longer accessible online since 07.03.2012.

⁷ The urban district Wilhelmsburg lies in the south of Hamburg on a large river island between the north and south arms of the Elbe.

⁸ From 1998 the city of Hamburg organised its urban development policy goals, programmes and funding structures in Wilhelmsburg through the federal state programme “Social Urban District Development” (“*Soziale Stadtteilentwicklung*”) and since 2009 through the “Framework Programme for Integrated Urban District Development” (“*Rahmenprogramm integrierte Stadtteilentwicklung: RISE*”). Since 2006 this has been carried out in the form of the “International Build-

“leap across the Elbe”⁹ and combined with an international garden exhibition, the goal is to use urban planning issues as guiding themes with which to simultaneously tackle local social problems. By 2013 the district should be known to offer liveable residential space and an attractive location for investment, but should also provide a model for the future management of social problems in neighbourhood development.

The overall urban development policy goal that Hamburg links to the IBA is, in addition, an “increase in the international attraction” of the entire city (Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg 2003: 74; own translation). For Hamburg as a “growing city” Wilhelmsburg represents an important space for expansion on the other side of the north branch of the Elbe, particularly for residential development. Thus, in urban development terms, the IBA has the aim of making the “leap across the Elbe” reality and developing the space thus gained to supply housing near the city-centre. The planning policy basis is provided by the guiding principle “Metropolis Hamburg—Growing City”. This guiding principle has been developed and formulated taking the perspective of the city as a whole. Thus the “leap to the south across the Elbe” (Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg 2003: 72; own translation) is seen as a “chance to grow on centrally situated areas in the middle of the city This will benefit not only the people locally. The urban development in the core district of Hamburg will lead to a development process that will have a great impact beyond the Elbe island”.¹⁰

Goals are thus formulated that point beyond Wilhelmsburg. In this context overcoming stigmatising images of the area plays an important role. So far this district struggled with a distinctly negative image in Hamburg and in supra-local media reports, but now a positive image should be created in order to form a basis from which it is possible to attract investors, solve local social problems and develop ecologically sustainable innovations. The reframing of the stigmatising discourse and negative images relating to Wilhelmsburg was identified from the start as a precondition for increasing the attraction of the Elbe island. Only when based on a positive representation of the urban district that emphasises its potentials, do the urban development policy aims of the IBA seem to have a chance of success.

The initiators of a “Future Search Conference”¹¹ (*Zukunftskonferenz*) in Wilhelmsburg emphasise, however, “the leap across the Elbe is not a trademark of the Hamburg

ding Exhibition Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg”, combined with an international garden exhibition.

⁹ See the programmes in: Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg (2002); Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg (2003).

¹⁰ See <http://www.hamburg.de/contentblob/135220/data/sprung-elbe-burgerbroschuere.pdf> (last accessed 20.01.2012).

¹¹ For Future Search Conference as a method see Weisbord (1992) and Weisbord/Janoff (2000).

Senate. It is a demand made by the Future Search Conference Wilhelmsburg”.¹² The Future Search Conference was only held after urging, protests and continued demands by local actors. It can be seen as the kick-off for the formation of a governance arrangement between residents and experts and as a significant impulse for the fact that residents’ perspectives have been more strongly integrated in the thematic agenda of the IBA 2013. Clearly already in 2001 and 2002 actors from the city and the local area were involved in a process of discussion and consultation about hazardous situations in Wilhelmsburg.

Together with the public authorities, planning offices and experts, committed residents formed working groups on what were seen as urgent topics.¹³ The result of this Future Search Conference was the “White Book: Island in the River—Bridges in the Future” (*Weißbuch: Insel im Fluss—Brücken in die Zukunft*), that bundled local residents’ perceptions of problems and formulated starting points for joint action approaches. The rudiments of a shared guiding principle for this space are sketched out, so that the potential social, economic and ecological hazards are contrasted with the developmental potential of the waterside residential location (“advantage of location”), relative proximity to the city centre (“advantage of situation”) and social innovative strength of multicultural living (“advantage of diversity”) (Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002: 5 ff.). But above all, comments one actor involved in the process, this guiding principle made the attempt to find “a new identity ... for this space” (Interview H-ER 17).¹⁴

¹² See <http://www.sprung-ueber-die-elbe.de/index.htm> (last accessed 07.03.2012).

¹³ Themes: Overall spatial concept, transport, employment and economy, residential, living together, schools and education, free-time and culture (see Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002).

¹⁴ This paper uses qualitative data from the Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning project “Spatial pioneers in the urban neighbourhood—towards communicative (re-)construction of restructuring spaces” (*“Raumpioniere im Stadtquartier—Zur kommunikativen (Re-)Konstruktion von Räumen im Strukturwandel”*) (2009–2011). Against the background of the more recent social constructivism (Knoblauch 1995; elaborated by Berger/Luckmann 1969) the project investigates knowledge structures in the form of spatial images and spatially related identities upon which the social practice of individual and collective actors in urban neighbourhoods is based. An integrated perspective guided the research. The investigation therefore followed the methodology of focussed ethnography in line with Knoblauch (2001). This allows not only the delimiting of the object of investigation through use of prior theoretical knowledge, but also the triangulation of various sorts of qualitative data and evaluation methods. So from the middle of 2009 until the end of 2010 theme-focussed interviews were carried out with spatially based committed individuals from Berlin-Moabit and Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg in their living environments, and their ego-centralised project network compiled. In selected groups and at public events in these urban districts participatory observation was undertaken, and in addition documentation and press materials were collected and evaluated. To ensure anonymity, all

Participating local actors frame such initial approaches to building resilience in the socio-historical context of the vulnerabilities perceived in Wilhelmsburg to date. In contrast to the past, it is emphasised that in the future joint efforts are required “without the shackles of disadvantages that have grown up through history” (Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002: 6; own translation).¹⁵

The background to this is formed by a social history of negative events that has been discursively established among local actors. One of its points of culmination was the death in 2001 of a six-year-old boy attacked by a dangerous dog, which gave rise to sustained negative headlines portraying Wilhelmsburg as the Hamburg “Bronx” (Interview H-ER 17). Local actors made this event, among others, the springboard for a Future Search Conference.¹⁶

The neighbourhood discourse includes social themes like unemployment and especially problems in the fields of education and culture. In addition, the local public sphere reveals the threatening perspective of a latent heteronomy. In this context local actors ascribe potential endangerment to the “growing city” and the “expansion drive of the powerful neighbour to the north” (Humburg 2009: 3; own translation), among others. Perceivable symbols of exclusion in public spaces have the effect of strengthening this, as is for instance the case with the port customs fence that divides the northern quarters of the Elbe island from the waters and river banks lying behind it, and thus blocks both the access to and the view of the inner city. In the narratives of local actors it has become a symbol of social-spatial exclusion.¹⁷ There is hence a perception of being downgraded to a useable space, to a “space for the rest” (Interview H-ER 17), and a feeling of being threatened by social marginalisation and stigmatisation.

Adjoining the port in many places, the transit and commercial space of the Elbe island Wilhelmsburg is also dissected by numerous important transport connections. It is affected by considerable heavy goods transport and com-

those interviewed are identified in this text by formal abbreviations (e.g. H-ER 01).

¹⁵ The chances to develop attractive housing in the turn of the century area Reiherstieg are, for instance, threatened by plans for the further expansion of the harbour docks in this district. Plans for the expansion have represented a continued endangerment scenario for the chances of upgrading the district since the flooding disaster of 1962.

¹⁶ “When this SPD-led Senate just didn’t want to understand what’s going on here, we organised a press conference ... with the title: Cry for help from the Bronx ... [T]here was suddenly all of the Hamburg press around the table. And that built up so much pressure ... that the Senate gave permission for the Future Search Conference” (Interview H-ER 17).

¹⁷ In reaction to continued public pressure the customs fence was opened with festivities in 2012. Following this the first concern of residents was a ferry connection so as to achieve a further possible connection to the rest of the city (see Rebaschus 2010).

mercial traffic and subject to particular quantities of noise and odour pollution. Ecological problems thus also form a socio-historical constant in the discourse of the district.¹⁸

Probably the most influential event to date was, however, the storm surge of 1962, a natural disaster that cost the lives of over 200 people on the Elbe island Wilhelmsburg and made 20,000 residents homeless. It is not only in the local public sphere that the flood continues to be interpreted as a profound break in the social development of the district (Paech 2008: 171; see Humburg 2009: 3 and Lübke 2011: 3). Not least as a consequence of this storm surge experiences of vulnerability became a memorable entity and continue to be present today in public urban space as elements of collective memory in the form of the so-called flood marks seen on many houses.

Through engagement with such recurring and always latent threats the common, shared notion has emerged among actors in the social space of Wilhelmsburg that they are a “community with a shared destiny” (Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002: Vorwort; own translation). Made stable as a topos in the discourse of the district, this is a perspective that is particularly sensitised to possible endangerments and today serves as a reference point for the perception of multiple endangerment scenarios even for those who did not themselves experience the disaster. With reference to their space, in particular the self-portrayals of local actors seem to be dominated by the topoi of exclusion and marginalisation, disenfranchisement and also being forgotten. Dissociated from, but not independent of, the urban history of the Hamburg north of the Elbe, Wilhelmsburg is on the one hand presented as “ideal space, ... that promotes identity, just because of the ... geography ... And also because of the history” (Interview H-ER 17). But there are at the same time accounts of the numerous past and present threatening aspects: “[F]or the last 100 years this space had the function of space for the rest ..., as backyard, dumping ground, land reserve” (Interview H-ER 17).

Derived from this is the image of an “island mentality” combined with the “feeling of the community with a shared destiny behind the dyke. So this feeling of threat and endangerment” (Interview H-ER 17). The storm surge is made primarily responsible for this. It was said to be “certainly in a dramatic way identity-promoting”, but at the same time of relevance was “also ... the experience of hundreds of years of having others make the decisions” (Interview H-ER 17). Together with the threatening situation of the natural environment, the self-image presented is thus also determined by the “fate ... [of being] the colonial backyard ... for the

rich metropolis” (Interview H-ER 17). Written into the local self-image, that constitutes itself through dissociation from the whole city in an asymmetrical heteronymous power relation, remains therefore the latent “feeling of endangerment ..., neglect or disadvantage ..., where there is always also something rebellious in there: them up there as colonial authorities in the Hamburg Town Hall and [us] here” (Interview H-ER 17).

As an external actor the IBA thus entered a field of tension characterised by the island existence of the inhabitants and, on the part of local actors, strongly influenced by perceptions that are not only related to fundamental threats (like the flooding hazard presented by the natural environment) but that have also long regarded external actors from politics or planning as potentially endangering rights of self-determination and empowered involvement in the affairs of the Elbe island. They see their chances of political participation and sovereignty over their self-images as being repeatedly threatened. After all, in the eyes of local actors Wilhelmsburg has long been the problem child of urban development. After the flooding disaster, Hamburg urban development policy identified a “planning vacuum” for Wilhelmsburg (Paech 2008: 172). Without an overall spatial planning concept on the part of the city the residents of the district were confronted with general planning uncertainty over a long period of time, particularly as since 1961 doubt had been cast on the continued existence of the district by the port extension act and, particularly, by plans to abandon residential quarters after the 1962 flood. Action by the Senate, for example the redevelopment programmes of the 1980s and 1990s, tended to be fragmented when seen against the complexity of the overall social and spatial context (for example the simultaneous need for local social-political action as a result of increased numbers of immigrants moving into the area, a situation that finally induced local actors to develop their own successful initiatives to support the social integration of the newcomers; see Dietz 2008: 108 f.).

Against this background and in the course of preparatory planning for Hamburg’s Olympic bid in 2003, the impression evolved among local actors that the district was a “playing field” (Interview H-ER 10) for external actors and a testing ground for planning (see Interview H-ER 17). Such perceptions were intensified in the light of an international design workshop on the topic of “leap across the Elbe” that in 2003 temporarily made Wilhelmsburg the centre of interest for international planning experts.

As part of its design process the IBA therefore attempted to orientate itself on the locally specific, socio-historical perceptions of endangerment of residents. Thus the White Book from the Future Search Conference represented an important content basis from which the IBA sourced its three key themes: Metrozones (urban planning problems of the “inner urban fringes”), “Cosmopolis” (social problems such

¹⁸ A drastic ecological vulnerability experience was, for instance, the scandal that in 1984 surrounded the Georgswerder rubbish heap from which dioxin was seeping. A consequence of this was the development of public protests against the building of a refuse incineration plant (Markert 2008: 193).

as intercultural living) and “City under Climate Change” (ecological problems caused by climate change, growth and urban development).¹⁹ In, for instance, the introduction to Structural Monitoring 2010 socio-cultural problems and past processes of stigmatisation are explicitly discussed. They are made the starting points for resilience endeavours because they endanger positive paths of development.²⁰ In the same way local actors’ perceptions of problems are shared in the section “City under Climate Change” (Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg 2008: 114) or, for example, in the context of an “Educational Offensive for the Elbe Island”, as the education of local actors was identified as a key topic. In places direct reference was made to the 2002 Future Search Conference.²¹

In terms of possible starting points for action, i.e. which themes and problems represent potential threats for the further development of the district, there are hence far-reaching commonalities between the perceptions of the IBA and those of local actors. Disparate developments on the action level are, however, apparent in the area of participation and cooperative management of projects and also in terms of influencing the identity forming discourse in the district. The approaches to building resilience both aim to positively reframe the spatial images of Wilhelmsburg as a “problem urban district”²². However, although they initially jointly identified fundamental hazards for the district, in this area of concern the resilience building action strategies of the IBA and local actors drift apart, as the following section shows.

¹⁹ http://www.iba-hamburg.de/de/01_entwuerfe/4_leitthemen/leitthemen_start.php (last accessed 13.06.2011). In the same way the titles of the IBA cross-sectional projects that bundle the individual projects according to topic reveal perceptions of problems from within the Future Search Conference and the White Book drawn up by residents (“Educational Offensive”, “Creative District Elbe Island”, “Intercultural Space”, “Climate Protection Concept”); http://www.iba-hamburg.de/de/01_entwuerfe/6_projekte/projekte_neuemitte.php (last accessed 05.09.2011).

²⁰ The focus is here repeatedly on immaterial, district related images and perspectives of the space—the “ideas in the heads” (http://www.iba-hamburg.de/de/01_entwuerfe/3_mission/mission_zukunftzeigen.php, last accessed 13.06.2011). Thus for instance the urban districts Veddel und Wilhelmsburg had “in the past experienced negative stigmatisation due to an unfavourable development of social structures and infrastructure” (Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg 2010a; own translation).

²¹ http://www.iba-hamburg.de/de/01_entwuerfe/6_projekte/projekte_querschnitt_boe_ueberblick.php (last accessed 03.09.2011).

²² Widespread term of reference for Wilhelmsburg in the local and supralocal press following the dangerous dog attack on a boy in 2001.

5 Resilience Building and Identity: Disparate Action Strategies from the IBA and Local Actors

5.1 The IBA: An Exclusive Governance Arrangement?

In the first instance the IBA goals are judged by local actors to be exciting and very promising (Interview H-ER 10; Interview H-ER 31). Indeed, it is less the subject matters themselves that attract criticism but rather the way in which they are communicated,²³ as well as issues of coordinating action, for instance whether and how local actors are attributed action competences.

In the field of culture, for instance, it is criticised that too little of the cooperation can be seen as “real” cooperation (see Interviews H-ER 10; H-ER 30). Thus the IBA lacks, among other things, multipliers in local relations (see Interviews H-ER 10; H-ER 30). Key figures in local milieus have been identified, but they have not been included with any formative power in action collaborations.

In addition, existing IBA instruments for participation were often judged by local groups and individual actors to be purely informative rather than participative. What is thought of by the IBA as a comparatively open forum for communication²⁴ is perceived rather as a one-sided flow of information. As far as accompanying the process is concerned, few possibilities for interaction are available and little influence can be brought to bear on the work of the IBA. Wilhelmsburg residents thus frequently see themselves as the passive recipients of measures, not as their designers: “[I]n the end it started as [a] ... bottom up process and then ... without any public announcement ... it is turned around into [a] top down process. ... [T]hat is generally ... in other processes at the IBA too ... a weakness. ... [Y]ou can’t suggest to people that they can co-determine how a house looks, when in fact they may [only decide] the colour ... of the window frames” (Interview H-ER 10).

From the point of view of local actors, at best “tiny participation fires are burnt off” (Interview H-ER 10), which they perceive as merely procuring legitimacy. This is then construed as disenfranchising because it is seen as taking advantage of local projects and actors without truly cooperating with them (see Interviews H-ER 06; H-ER 03). One local actor with a leading function in the IBA/IGS public

²³ For instance, an IBA poster that promises to want to enable a lively urban district is cynically perceived by many inhabitants, who already experience the district as being very lively (Interview H-ER 31).

²⁴ As well as dialogue with residents, serving to inform the public about ongoing projects, the IBA/IGS Participation Council (“*IBA/IGS-Beteiligungsgremium*”) is conceived by the IBA as a central participatory body. “24 residents from the IBA presentation area (15 from Wilhelmsburg, six from Veddel and three from Harburg/Schlossinsel as well as seven politicians (the latter without voting power))” are a fixed part of the body (Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg 2010b; own translation).

information and participation forum (“IBA/IGS Participation Council”) summarises in this context: “And that there is a difference between real ... participation ... and ... informing the population ... is, I think, not clear for many at the IBA. ... [I] think that the interest of the IBA in ... real participation ... is not really there There is somehow still a link missing” (Interview H-ER 10). Although this actor is involved in the governance arrangement, the participation council seems to her to be a “fig leaf, so that it can be said that of course it was an open process” (Interview H-ER 10).

The problem here seemed in the end not to be differing perceptions of vulnerability by the IBA and local actors (the subject matter focuses of the IBA were indeed recognised as being principally correct, e.g. for education and social integration; Interviews H-ER 10; H-ER 17; H-ER 20). It was rather the far-reaching exclusion from the interactive and communicative negotiation processes of the action level that was problematised. This seems to have hindered the alignment of different points of view and the development of a common action strategy.

Discrepancies thus reveal themselves on the level of active resilience building strategies. There local actors sense exclusion—and this interpretation proves to be able to connect to perceptions already established within the local discourse, perceptions of exclusion and heteronomy.²⁵ Measures with which the IBA wishes to enable resilience are then experienced as creating or exacerbating vulnerability, insofar as it is assumed that they could repeat historical experiences of disenfranchisement.

Local actors bring up the themes of exclusion and heteronomy not only in the context of the interaction and communication processes necessary for coordinated action, but also with reference to the discursive level.

5.2 Exclusion and Heteronomy in the Context of Discourse Management

Through influencing discourses the IBA attempts to manage processes of spatially related identity formation and to make them the basis for resilience strategies. The aim is to reframe spatial images that tend to have negative connotations.

For this purpose the attempt is made to develop power over the discourse. The potential to achieve this is provided, firstly, by the wide-ranging interest that an IBA as a special planning “event” attracts, also in the media. In addition there is structural potential for influence. Thus there are, generally speaking, not only numerous contacts to representatives from business, politics and public authorities, but the existence of qualified and paid employees and dedicated

financial resources allows high-quality PR and media work to be undertaken. This makes professional contributions to the discourse in the form of PR campaigns, film and print publications or large public events possible. Such capacities for action allow representations of the urban district to be presented to a larger audience.

Whether spatially related perspectives that are transported in such representations are locally disseminated is influenced by their connectability to the order of locally specific knowledge systems, the formation of which depends not only on possible interpretations circulated by the media. The topoi of the local living environment of everyday life are always also woven into the local discourses of the urban district, because the order of their knowledge systems is formed in great part through rather unmanaged proto-governance type processes.²⁶ Whether new interpretations of the space in question are able to anchor themselves in the district, as the IBA intends, thus depends on their connectability to local discourses and their specific orders of knowledge.

Local actors have, however, also already engaged with new spatial images (for instance from the Future Search Conference). In the view of local actors supralocal media also cause exclusion, which has led to the representations of others dominating the supralocal media reports.²⁷ In terms of the local public sphere, it seems that reporters from the local media are accessible (Interview H-ER 17), but if, in order to bring their spatial images into the discourse, local actors want to attract the attention of supralocal media, then they are reliant on spectacular strategies. “[T]hey only come when the senators are there It always has to be something ... spectacular” (Interview H-ER 17), is the credo.

In these circumstances the potential media supremacy of an IBA generates perceptions of exclusion on a discursive level among local actors. They see their power of self-interpretation threatened. In contrast to the stigmatising media reports, the IBA offers positive spatial images, but from the point of view of local actors their own, locally specific identity in the supralocal discourses is again being determined by others. And as local actors are not integrated into the IBA governance arrangement for the management of supralocal media, in the end they again call on the interpretive logic of

²⁵ Those active also frequently mention the threatening exploitation and “marketing by others” of local actors’ projects by the IBA (Interviews H-ER 06; H-ER 02; H-ER 03).

²⁶ This refers to “the basal and ... more broadly arranged communicative coordination processes in which common shared spatial interpretations in groups, networks and public spheres emerge and in which dynamic spaces of culture and identity with their non-material and material forms of expression evolve”. In the contexts of governance action such communicative coordination processes occur “intentionally and strategically”, in the context of proto-governance “rather incidentally and ‘unintendedly’” (Christmann 2010: 29; own translation).

²⁷ “[I]t has always been extremely difficult to place Wilhelmsburg topics ... north of the Elbe” (Interview H-ER 17).

exclusion and heteronomy, in order to use it for their own identity management.

5.3 The “Space for the Rest”: Identity Through Dissociation as a Resilience Strategy for Local Actors

The notion established among local actors that their district is a “space for the rest” (Interview H-ER 17) is a drastic indication of their perceived exclusion. However, this perception also serves as a dissociation strategy for the active construction of a local identity that should present a counter concept to the potentially stigmatising images of others (like “backyard, dumping ground, land reserve”; Interview H-ER 17). In both the design of individual roles and also in collective action strategies local actors do not passively accept the stigma of a dependent recipient, they rather—starting from a defensive attitude and with a resilience orientation—actively strive to achieve the power to design and participate. As a “counterstrategy” to exclusion and heteronymous tendencies they reclaim the “underdog” status that helps to form a sense of identity, allowing them to use the socio-historically continual endangerment perceptions to stylise a historical victim role. This view allows local actors a positive self-image (as the victim of external circumstances). The shared, *active* engagement with their own identity lends them self-confidence.

This coping strategy of local actors is, however, not an object or component of the governance arrangement, because it has developed in dissociation from that arrangement. In terms of action, this logic of interpretation is expressed in a lively protest culture, inherent to which is a resilience-promoting strength in the form of self-assertiveness.²⁸ In the demonstrations and campaigns of local groups, threatening scenarios are metaphorically highlighted and their subject-matter scandalised through reference to past experiences of disenfranchisement (such as the threatened construction of the power plant Moorwerder). In this way local actors look to connect to common experiences of vulnerability in local social history and can delimit themselves through the common body of experiences of external impositions being made on their identity. In the current processes of identity formation among local actors, the topoi of vulnerability (for instance the experience of the flood and its after-effects) therefore retain a particularly strong presence.²⁹

²⁸ In this function this is self-confidently cultivated by local actors: “[I] think that they won’t get a single one of these motorways through Well, that [is one of] our easiest exercises” (Interview H-ER 17).

²⁹ Also, when dealing with new themes such as transport planning, it is conspicuous that active residents use symbols and metaphors that are connected with collective memories of the flooding event. Thus a self-conceived event is named “Water level Elbe Island” (“*Pegelstand Elbinsel*”). A water measuring rod serves as a visible symbol even though the topic here is not flood protection, rather all transport

Local actors do indeed meet problems with their own projects, ranging from tutoring for schoolchildren or childcare to art and cultural projects to business start-up advice. But they are also concerned to organise their own engagement and create their own independent platforms of communication in order to gather together the ideas and interests of local actors and to make them accessible to public discourse. Ultimately they see their own actions in the context of their own role in the city as a whole: “Basically it’s about overcoming the divide in the city and a dignified life with equal opportunities for the people in this district stricken by exclusion and devaluation” (Verein Zukunft Elbinsel 2011; own translation).

Starting from this perspective local actors with their local action alliances accomplish, among other things, achievements in the field of social integration through jointly tackling conflicts in the form of counter movements and protest campaigns, so as to actively proceed “against the widespread resignation and our own impotence” (Verein Zukunft Elbinsel 2011; own translation). This means that perceived exclusions are in turn used for active dissociation and self-confirmation. Conditions of vulnerability, such as the perceived heteronomy caused by external identity management, are in this case given a positive slant by being made part of local actors’ own, active identity management.

5.4 United by a No: A Lively Protest Culture

For the socio-spatial identity formation of local actors in Wilhelmsburg, self-empowering, public protest plays an important role. There may be dispute among local actors about the form and extent of individual protest campaigns, and disagreement about which communication strategies are appropriate for which individual goal. Overall, however, the “long tradition of a quite intensive protest culture” is seen to be a “great plus” for Wilhelmsburg.³⁰

Today it is possible to observe a self-image of together forming a socially cohesive district of the city with its own right to exist, rather than just being a living area for the dockworkers and thus a functional extension of the port area. This has constituted itself in the course of repeated acts of self-assertiveness since the devastating flood disaster (see Hahn 2008: 121). The flood marked not only a decisive break in the urban planning and built development of the district, but was also the key starting point for a new feeling of belonging³¹ and robust self-confidence among its

themes are to be discussed (see <http://www.insel-im-fluss.de/Pegelstand/pegelstand.htm>; last accessed 07.03.2012).

³⁰ Strategic attempts by the IBA to disseminate a positive image of the district in the media are interpreted in this context as being a “marketing machine for Hamburg” (Interview H-ER 10).

³¹ Owing to the heterogeneous nature of the population structure, the social life in the neighbourhoods of the Elbe island can of course not

inhabitants. It is thus not by chance that the White Book of the Future Search Conference is explicitly located in this context, taking the flood as the starting point for a sense of belonging in the form of a “community with a shared destiny”: “The Future Search Conference report is published in February 2002, the month in which Wilhelmsburg remembers the devastating flood from 40 years ago The vulnerability of the island in the river was never as clear as it was then. Wilhelmsburg has still not completely recovered from this trauma and the years of planning insecurity that followed it. But behind the new, stable dykes there also emerged a ‘community with a shared destiny’ that has repeatedly defended Wilhelmsburg as a place to live. This is the foundation on which our enthusiasm for the future is based” (Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002: II; own translation).

After the flooding disaster the Senate resolved to bring large parts of Wilhelmsburg under the planning regulations pertaining to the docks area, abandoning their residential functions. However “[t]he Wilhelmsburg population ..., in a cross-section through all classes and parties, successfully resisted. The residents demanded participation in the development of the district for the first time” (Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg 2002: 101; own translation). The “protest culture” that subsequently established itself today forms a “self-confident structure” that developed at least twenty years ago when residents successfully prevented the building of a refuse incineration plant in Moorwerder (Interview H-ER 10). In campaigns that aim to prevent a new motorway extension reference is also made to these successful experiences of protest: “if they do that, then we’ll just close the Elbe bridges again” one elderly man confident of victory said as part of the IBA/IGS Participation Council (Interview H-ER 10; similarly also Interview H-ER 17 on preventing the power plant in Moorwerder).

Not least thanks to the comprehensive email mailing list with qualified contacts to city-based and local actors, but also to reporters (see Interviews H-ER 17 and H-ER 07), these actors are repeatedly able to use informal networks to attract public attention with larger campaigns. An orga-

nisational focus point of this protest culture is formed by demonstrations and initiatives organised by the coalition between “Committed Wilhelmsburg Residents” (“*Engagierte Wilhelmsburger*”) and “Future Elbe Island Association” (“*Zukunft Elbinsel e.V.*”). The latter has existed since 2002,³² runs a number of websites and organises discussion forums and public campaigns. Particularly for topics related to transport policy, it functions as an organisational core for campaign alliances with other actors and groups from Wilhelmsburg and neighbouring districts.³³ Of course these are not the only committed groups and actors present locally. The focus applied here is due to the close relationship to identity revealed in public communications and the recognisable attempts to create resilience building strategies that can be identified in the way in which this commitment network and its actors deal with IBA processes. They mobilise fellow campaigners by drawing on the shared interpretive logic of being affected by acute endangerment. The linking of constructions of vulnerability with active action approaches (dissent and protest, the blocking of roads, alternative suggestions and the organisation of their own discussion forums³⁴) opens up a common space of action for the actors that transforms them into a social community. Within such action cooperation “conjunctive spaces of experience”³⁵ (see Bohnsack 1998) of joint action become possible “[b]ecause

³² The association developed from the Future Search Conference Wilhelmsburg and represents a voluntary affiliation of committed Wilhelmsburg residents. The association wants to critically accompany the implementation of ideas that were developed at the Future Search Conference 2001/2002. Simultaneously it aims to “innovatively and actively help shape” future developments in the district (Verein Zukunft Elbinsel 2003; own translation).

³³ Thus in the “Alliance Future Plan instead of Autobahn” (“*Bündnis Zukunftsplan statt Autobahn*”) there is close cooperation with the “Committed Wilhelmsburg Residents” on themes of transport policy. This loose advocacy group is made up of Wilhelmsburg homeowners who would be affected by emissions and falling house prices if public plans for the rerouting of a main road and construction of a new stretch of motorway were implemented.

³⁴ Thus—as already mentioned—the title of the self-organised series of events “Water Level Elbe Island” is a clear reference to the socio-historical experience of the flooding disaster, even though there is a wide range of themes handled, for instance issues of transport policy.

³⁵ Building on the work of Karl Mannheim, conjunctive spaces of experience refer to shared bodies of knowledge arising from the joint execution of actions that constitutes a common milieu. Conjunctive means contexts of experience that are unifying, connecting or also communitalising in effect, with the result that in joint action similar qualities of experience and attributions of meaning are shared with others (see Mannheim 1980). Accordingly, conjunctive experience is to be distinguished from communicative experience, which makes abstract the immediacy and perspectivity (subjectivity) of shared knowledge of experience in the here and now, because it is “over-personal” (Mannheim 1980: 289; own translation). Conjunctive spaces of experience with others can, for example, exist in the form of the shared experience of a flooding disaster as well as in the form of an experience at a demonstration.

be described as homogeneous, as being socially integrated from the outset. But if socio-historical investigations (such as e.g. Dietz 2008) for Wilhelmsburg can identify, on the one hand, phenomena of social segregation and disintegration in the past (as most recently in 2001 with xenophobic tendencies increasing locally and alarming election success for the rightwing populist Schill Party; see Dietz 2008: 109 f.), on the other hand the same investigations reach the even clearer conclusion: “that generally speaking the peaceful coexistence of very different population groups in Wilhelmsburg owes much to the engagement and prudence of many individuals and groups” (Dietz 2008: 110; own translation; on the contribution of the immigrant associations in Wilhelmsburg to social integration see also Hahn 2008: 121 f. and 124). Such findings underline the central role played in local social integration processes by the socio-spatially committed actors interviewed.

the people know each other from the demos anyway” (Interview H-ER 03). The development of solidarity and the joint taking of action can thus be interpreted as enabling resilience, because in this way a chance for self-determination is seized, the discursive enforcement of the same strived for and, in the process, shared convictions of the effectiveness of actors’ efforts are developed.³⁶ The resilience potential for the actors is found in the ability not to be passively affected by the strategies of external actors such as the IBA but rather to move to an active influencing of one’s own actions.

This self-determination and the building up and maintenance of sovereignty of interpretation are of great significance for local actors in negotiations of spatial images. Their desire for the freedom to autonomously manage their identity is comprehensible when it is accepted that the establishment of certain images of space (for example as topoi in discourse) specifies certain corridors of development or can be decisive for possible financial sponsorship. In this context possessing sovereignty of interpretation over spatial images proves to be particularly significant also for local actors, and is therefore fought over, as the following section shows.

5.5 The “Continuous Fight for Opinion Leadership”

The first impulses for the Future Search Conference came primarily from today’s protagonists of the “Future Elbe Island Association” in 2001/2002. As innovators at that time they developed spatial images and today remain committed to the implementation and stabilisation of those images (Interview H-ER 17). In addition, however, they function—somewhat like a “social dyke defence”—in the meanwhile as guardians of the local community, motivated by notions of civil society. Based on interpretative schemata that have developed from vulnerability related topoi of the past, in the present they also identify a need to act to create resilience as soon as threats are indicated.

On the one hand the Wilhelmsburg district seems characterised in social structural terms by diverse milieus and circumstances, by different ethnicities and actors with heterogeneous interests. However, from the point of view of local actors “on the other hand it is also the case that you band together when it’s about identity ..., and then ... there is fertile soil there for a rebellious spirit” (Interview H-ER 17).³⁷ In the attempt to build up or maintain power over

individual and collective identities a “continuous fight for opinion leadership” (Interview H-ER 17) ensues in both the local and supralocal public spheres (e.g. in the form of campaigns, counter campaigns and demonstrations). When local actors strive for self-empowerment this includes a demand for sovereignty of interpretation over important themes like transport planning on the Elbe island: “For a while we leant back and said: the IBA’ll sort it out. Or, let’s see what they do But when the IBA then gave us the run-around about the transport issues, then we realised: ok, now we have to get back on the job” (Interview H-ER 17).

Particularly since the flooding disaster of 1962 strategies for creating resilience have been established locally that have taken on management tasks and filled the power vacuum. This has occurred in the blind spot of city planning politics. Local actors are thus now convinced of the efficacy of their own action: “[W]e just say, let’s do that. [Because] there are no democratic structures anymore. There are ... no local democratic levels. There is no local government and nothing at all There are ... committees that are concerned with Wilhelmsburg But ... there is a vacuum, that is also volatile and dangerous But then you just have to fill it on your own initiative” (Interview H-ER 17).

6 Conclusion

This self-confidence is fed by shared experiences of having possessed the power to act and is defended against actors such as the IBA because local actors see this power to act as being potentially threatened by other approaches to action.

With their campaigns and network combinations the local groups and individual actors in the meanwhile aim for influence in the sense of communication on equal terms. Although they still proceed from similar perceptions of vulnerability as the IBA, they follow their own action strategies. They develop and stabilise an identity space for themselves that is part of their *own* socio-spatial knowledge relations. For local actors this represents a sustainable resilience structure because it makes it possible to build up convictions of the autonomy of one’s own actions, despite the assumption of being vulnerable to heteronomy. Perceived threats through marginalisation, stigmatisation or heteronomy of self-images can thus be overcome.

This example of socio-spatial identities indicates which role this form of locally specific knowledge body can play when, despite shared perceptions of endangerment, counter-productive effects arise within the context of a governance arrangement. Images of space and identities were at the heart of the investigation because they represent particularly important parts of common social memory for locally committed actors and form an important context of orientation

³⁶ On the positive effects of convictions of self-efficacy and control see Bandura (1997).

³⁷ So in explorative interviews held locally it was reported that, for instance, when a resident of Polish origin who was wearing lilac-coloured leggings was vilified as “gay” and attacked on the street by neo-Nazis from Harburg, Turkish young people defended him with the words “We don’t do things like that here” (Memo on the explorative Interview H-Exp 1 conducted on 11.09.2009).

for their activities. In this case this knowledge is reproduced and stabilised as an “identity of dissociation”.

In the end the example of disputed processes of socio-spatial identity formation reveals an ambivalent dynamic between social vulnerability constructions and resilience constructions. Despite shared perceptions of vulnerability with regards to the district, the resilience activities of the IBA in this sphere are experienced by local actors as creating new endangerments and are made the object of renewed vulnerability perceptions. For a coordinated governance activity that involves local actors and aims for the socially sustainable anchoring of measures, this can have potentially counterproductive effects. The actions of the IBA are read by local actors using patterns of interpretation that continue to be characterised by a mistrust in powerful external actors, as incorporated in the discursive order of local knowledge systems with their topoi of constant threats. This owes much to the fact that the IBA continues to be associated in terms of ideas with the urban development policy of the city as a whole and in terms of structure with decision-makers from the political and administrative systems.³⁸

For a governance arrangement like the IBA, avoiding counterproductive effects of this sort or being able to engage with them productively thus seems to require greater sensitivity for the everyday processes of social knowledge production in the district. If the spatially related “ideas in the heads” of local actors become comprehensible and if this is communicated, then there is a chance that IBA resilience activities that aim to positively reframe the district will no longer be perceived as a hazard caused by external actors.

Empowerment processes that, as the example of Wilhelmsburg suggests, are starting to be professionalised, could in this context also be recognised as a potential. They incorporate the capacity to form local cooperative structures that should be understood and used as resources—resources that can create resilience and enable social sustainability because they connect to locally specific bodies of knowledge.

References

- Assmann, J. (1988): Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität. In: Assmann, J.; Hölscher, T (eds.): *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt am Main, 9–19.
- Assmann, A. (2006): Soziales und kollektives Gedächtnis. Vortragsskript zur Konferenz “Kulturelles Gedächtnis. China zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft” der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Online at: <http://www.bpb.de/files/0FW1JZ.pdf> (last accessed 07.03.2012).
- Bandura, A. (1997): *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York.
- Benz, A. (ed.) (2004): *Governance—Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen. Eine Einführung*. Wiesbaden.
- Benz, A.; Lütz, S.; Schimank, U.; Simonis, G. (Eds.) (2007): *Handbuch Governance. Theoretische Grundlagen und empirische Anwendungsfelder*. Wiesbaden.
- Berger, P. L.; Luckmann, T. (1969): *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Birkmann, J.; Böhm, H. R.; Buchholz, F.; Büscher, D.; Daschkeit, A.; Ebert, S.; Fleischhauer, M.; Frommer, B.; Köhler, S.; Kufeld, W.; Lenz, S.; Overbeck, G.; Schanze, J.; Schlipf, S.; Sommerfeldt, P.; Stock, M.; Vollmer, M.; Walkenhorst, O. (2011): *Glossar Klimawandel und Raumentwicklung*. Hannover. = E-Paper der ARL, Nr. 10.
- Blatter, J. (2005): Metropolitan Governance in Deutschland: Normative, utilitaristische, kommunikative und dramaturgische Steuerungsansätze. In: *Swiss Political Science Review* 11, 1, 119–155.
- Bogumil, J.; Holtkamp, L. (2004): Local Governance und gesellschaftliche Integration. In: Lange, S.; Schimank, U (eds.): *Governance und gesellschaftliche Integration*. Wiesbaden, 147–168.
- Bohnsack, R. (1998): Milieu als konjunktiver Erfahrungsraum. Eine dynamische Konzeption von Milieu in empirischer Analyse. In: Matthiesen, U. (ed.): *Die Räume der Milieus*. Berlin, 119–131.
- Christmann, G. (2003): Städtische Identität als kommunikative Konstruktion. Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Analysen am Beispiel von Dresden. Wien. = *Reihe Soziologie*, Band 57.
- Christmann, G. (2004): *Dresdens Glanz, Stolz der Dresdner. Lokale Kommunikation, Stadtkultur und städtische Identität*. Wiesbaden.
- Christmann, G. (2010): Kommunikative Raumkonstruktionen als (Proto-)Governance. In: Kilper, H. (ed.): *Governance und Raum*. Baden-Baden, 27–48.
- Christmann, G.; Ibert, O.; Kilper, H.; Moss, T. (2011): Vulnerabilität und Resilienz in sozio-räumlicher Perspektive. Begriffliche Klärungen und theoretischer Rahmen. *Erkner. = IRS Working Papers*, Nr. 44.
- Dietz, A. (2008): Fremdarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Einwanderer—Migration in Geschichte und Gegenwart. In: *Geschichtswerkstatt Wilhelmsburg Honigfabrik e.V.; Museum Elbinsel Wilhelmsburg e.V. (eds.): Wilhelmsburg: Hamburgs große Elbinsel*. Hamburg, 97–112.
- Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg (2002): *Leitbild Metropole Hamburg—Wachsende Stadt*. Hamburg.
- Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg (2003): *Fortschreibung des Leitbildes Metropole Hamburg—Wachsende Stadt*. Hamburg.
- Hahn, D. (2008): Wilhelmsburgs Kulturleben—nach der Arbeit das Vergnügen. In: *Geschichtswerkstatt Wilhelmsburg Honigfabrik e.V.; Museum Elbinsel Wilhelmsburg e.V. (eds.): Wilhelmsburg: Hamburgs große Elbinsel*. Hamburg, 113–126.
- Humburg, M. (2009): Wem gehören die Elbinseln? In: *Wilhelmsburger InselRundblick* 15, 1, 3–6.
- Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg (ed.) (2008): *Wasseratlas. Wasser-Land-Topologien für die Hamburger Elbinsel*. Hamburg.
- Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg (ed.) (2010a): *Strukturmonitoring 2010*. Online at: http://www.iba-hamburg.de/fileadmin/Mediathek/00_allgemein/IBA_Strukturmonitoring-2010-Endfassung-21.12.2010.pdf (last accessed 07.03.2012).
- Internationale Bauausstellung Hamburg (ed.) (2010b): *Daten und Fakten*. Online at: http://www.iba-hamburg.de/bilder_dokumente/dokumente/basispresse/basispresse-factsheet_20100801.pdf (last accessed 15.08.2011).
- Keim, K.-D. (2003): *Das Fenster zum Raum. Traktat über die Erforschung sozialräumlicher Transformation*. Opladen.
- Keller, R. (2011): *Diskursforschung*. Wiesbaden.
- Kilper, H. (ed.) (2010): *Governance und Raum*. Baden-Baden.

³⁸ More in-depth analyses of patterns of interpretation, also on the attitudes of institutional actors are desirable here. There is a need for research in this context.

- Knoblauch, H. (1995): Kommunikationskultur. Die kommunikative Konstruktion kultureller Kontexte. Berlin. = *Materiale Soziologie*, Band 5.
- Knoblauch, H. (1999): Das kommunikative Gedächtnis. In: Honegger, C.; Hradil, S.; Traxler, F. (eds.): *Grenzenlose Gesellschaft? Verhandlungen des 29. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, des 16. Kongresses der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Soziologie und des 11. Kongresses der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Freiburg im Breisgau. Teil 1*. Opladen, 733–748.
- Knoblauch, H. (2001): Fokussierte Ethnografie. In: *Sozialer Sinn* 2, 1, 123–141.
- Lübke, K. (2011): IBA-Labor zu Stadtentwicklung und Hochwasserschutz: Wir müssen leider draußen bleiben! In: *Wilhelmsburger InselRundblick* 17, 4, 3.
- Mannheim, K. (1980): Eine soziologische Theorie der Kultur und ihrer Erkennbarkeit (Konjunktives und kommunikatives Denken). In: Mannheim, K.: *Strukturen des Denkens*. Frankfurt am Main, 155–322.
- Markert, M. (2008): Der Sprung über die Elbe—Wilhelmsburgs Weg in die Mitte der Stadt. In: *Geschichtswerkstatt Wilhelmsburg Honigfabrik e.V.; Museum Elbinsel Wilhelmsburg e.V. (eds.): Wilhelmsburg: Hamburgs große Elbinsel*. Hamburg, 191–205.
- Mayntz, R. (2004): Governance im modernen Staat. In: Benz, A. (eds.): *Governance—Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen. Eine Einführung*. Wiesbaden, 65–76. = *Lehrbuch Governance*, Band 1.
- Mayntz, R. (2005): Governance Theory als fortentwickelte Steuerungstheorie? In: Schuppert, G. F. (ed.): *Governance-Forschung. Vergewisserung über Stand und Entwicklungslinien*. Baden-Baden, 11–20.
- Paech, F. (2008): “Die ganzen menschlichen Geschichten”—Die Hamburger Sturmflut von 1962 im Bewusstsein der Wilhelmsburger Bevölkerung. In: *Geschichtswerkstatt Wilhelmsburg Honigfabrik e.V.; Museum Elbinsel Wilhelmsburg e.V. (eds.): Wilhelmsburg: Hamburgs große Elbinsel*. Hamburg, 161–175.
- Rebaschus, M. (2010): Zollzaun am Spreehafen geöffnet. Online at: <http://www.abendblatt.de/hamburg/kommunales/article1555854/Zollzaun-am-Spreehafen-geoeffnet.html> (last accessed 07.03.2012).
- Schnur, O.; Drilling, M. (2009): Governance—ein neues Zauberwort auch für die Quartiersentwicklung? In: Drilling, M.; Schnur, O. (eds.): *Governance der Quartiersentwicklung. Theoretische und praktische Zugänge zu neuen Steuerungsformen*. Wiesbaden, 11–28.
- Verein Zukunft Elbinsel (2003): Präambel zur Satzung. Online at: http://www.zukunft-elbinsel.de/Satzung/praeambel_satzung.htm (last accessed 02.10.2011).
- Verein Zukunft Elbinsel (2011): 2012: 50 Jahre Bürgerinnen und Bürger als Motor der Stadtentwicklung in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg. Online at: <http://www.zukunft-elbinsel.de/50Jahre/BuergerInnen%20als%20Motor.pdf> (last accessed 02.10.2011).
- Walk, H. (2008): *Partizipative Governance. Beteiligungsformen und Beteiligungsrechte im Mehrebenensystem der Klimapolitik*. Wiesbaden.
- Weisbord, M. (ed.) (1992): *Discovering Common Ground. How Future Search Conferences Bring People Together to Achieve Breakthrough Innovation, Empowerment, Shared Vision, and Collaborative Action*. San Francisco.
- Weisbord, M.; Janoff, S. (2000): *Future Search. An Action Guide to Finding Common Ground in Organizations & Communities*. San Francisco.
- Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg (ed.) (2002): *Zukunftskonferenz Wilhelmsburg. Weissbuch*. Hamburg. Online at: http://www.pure-stuff.de/_Forum_Wilhelmsburg/weissbuch/zuko_bericht_pdf.pdf (last accessed 06.03.2012).