

Transition and Restructuration of German Cities

Ray-May Hsung *

(ABSTRACT)

The aim of this paper is to analyze the patterns of demographic and economic transition by types of settlement and region between the period of 1980-1989 and that of 1989-1992. After the unification of Germany in 1989, the demographic transition shows a dramatic trend. The fertility in East Germany dropped rapidly and a great number of people moved to West Germany. After 1992; the net migration rate declined and decentralization was even stronger; The population of central cities in agglomeration areas still lost population through migration. Types of settlement, region, and employment growth rate can significantly explain the variation of net migration rate between 1980-1992. There exist critical social mechanisms of regional and urban policies to react toward problems of demographic and economic transition. In these social mechanism, public and nonprofit sectors play the major roles in these social mechanisms. In public sector, the strategies to react toward demographic and economic transition are the restructuration of the relationship between central and local governments, constructing metropolitan regional governments, and use public-private partnership in infrastructure. The nonprofit organizations which shape regional and urban policies are interlocked with public sectors; different nonprofit organizations are also interdependent on one another. These social mechanisms of urban development indicate the characteristics of corporatist structure in Germany. In the future, these mechanisms will deal with two major issues of urban development: development or redistribution, racial integration or racial segmentation.

Key words : urbanization, human ecology, political economy, demographic transition, and restructuration

* Professor at Department of Sociology in Tunghai University.
Acknowledgments of thanks are due to the following persons: The sponsor of this research project by the grant NSC34137F of the 34th Research Abroad Plan; Professor Hewig Birg, Dr. E.-Juergen Floethmann, Mrs. Ballhause, and Mr. Joachim Bruehs at the Institute for Population Research and Social Policy in University of Bielefeld, Germany; and two anonymous reviewers.

德國都市的轉型與再結構化

熊瑞梅*

(中文摘要)

這篇論文主要的目的是先用人口資料來分析德國從 1980-1989 和 1989-1992 兩個時段的人口與經濟結構在不同區位型態與區域之間的轉型模式，德國在 1989 年兩德統一後，人口轉型出現很戲劇化的趨勢，東德人口生育率快速下降，人口大量由東德移到西德的都市；在 1992 年以後東德移到西德都市的趨勢減緩，西德人口分散化的趨勢更加速，人口密集區的中心都市人口外流趨勢仍強。居住型態、區域、和就業成長率能顯著地解釋 1980-1992 人口淨遷移率；都市外籍人口移入越多，德國本地人口移出越多。德國在區域與都市發展政策上有關鍵性的社會機制運作來因應人口與經濟轉型所帶來的問題，在這個社會機制中主要的角色是政府公部門與非營利組織兩部門。政府部門針對德國人口與經濟轉型的幾個因應策略是中央與地方政府關係的再結構化、建構都會區域政府組織、採用公與私部門合夥的策略。區域與都市發展的非營利組織與政府部門有嵌連現象，同時各種不同類型的非營利組織也呈現分工互賴的現象，在整個都市發展的政策運作機制上呈現統合機制的特質。未來德國都市發展的社會機制面臨兩個主要議題：發展或再分配，種族整合或種族隔離。

關鍵詞：都市化、人文區位、政治經濟、人口轉型、再結構化

* 東海大學社會系教授

感謝國科會補助第三十四屆出國研究人員補助編號 34137F 計畫：德國 University of Bielefeld 人口研究和社會政策研究所的 Professor Herwig Birg, Dr. E.-Juergen Floethmann, Mrs. Ballhause, and Mr. Joachim Bruchs; 及兩位匿名的評審。

Transition and Restructuration of German Cities

Ray-May Hsung *

I. Introduction

Urban studies have reached a deadlock between approaches that explain urban development, distribution patterns, and ecological form as the result of either market force or structures embedded in the political economy (Logan and Swanstrom, 1990). In fact, the urban development in Germany has been dynamically and interactively shaped by ecological and political-economic forces.

At the beginning of 20th century, the industrialization and urbanization caused the urban problems in the North and Ruhr Areas, and local governments and associations reacted toward this urbanizing force. In the beginning of regional and urban development, open spaces and green belt became the major ideology of urban development in Germany. In most western countries, the ecological force of urbanization created huge metropolitan cities, such as New York, London, and Paris; however, this force did not create similar large metropolises in Germany. The ideology of regional and urban development in Germany has also played the critical role. The multi-centers and central place theory (Christaller, 1933) are the major theories of spatial settlement and development (Federal Ministry for Regional Planning, Building, and Urban Development, 1991; 1993). Therefore, before reunification, Germany did not have any huge metropolitan cities.

The patterns of population concentration and decentralization varied over time. Birg (1987) examined the patterns of population changes during different stages of urbanization in Germany. During the first stage of urbanization, the population in the urban areas with lower density increased faster; the population also concentrated into central cities within a region; however, the population growth in urban areas during this stage was mainly due to natural increase. In this stage, population centralization was the major phenomena. During the second stage of urbanization, interregional

* Professor at Department of Sociology in Tunghai University.

migration increased; the concentration in the central cities within a region declined, but concentration among regions increased. During the 1970s in Germany, regional concentration and decentralization of population occurred simultaneously. During the third stage of urbanization, the population in the central cities continued to move out and rural-urban regional migration stopped. This was a stage of decentralization and deconcentration of spatial settlement.

In the 1980s, the European Union and German unification were the two major political forces working to change the cities. The European Union broke the national labor market boundary and caused great numbers of foreign labor to concentrate in the central cities. German unification pushed great numbers of migrants to move from East Germany to West Germany. Native Germans have tended to move outward from central cities, and foreigners have concentrated into central cities. The decentralization of the native-born population and the centralization of the foreign population in West Germany have formed a significant trend. This study will firstly analyze the differential patterns of demographic and economic transitions among different types of settlements and different regions since 1980. Then the decentralization and regional effects on population redistribution and employment growth will be examined. The analyses of demographic and economic transitions are based on the data for the cities and counties in Germany.

Recently, the political economic approach to urban development has become an important theoretical perspective. In previous research, Neo-Marxism has been the most popular approach to urban development. This approach conceives urban development as the reproduction of class. The collective consumption in the cities reproduces class segregation. From Castells'(1983) perspective, the urban social movements were the major forces acting to change the cities. In fact, the influence of urban social movements has declined since the 1980s in many Western countries, including Germany.

The forces of urban movements have been institutionalized as regular nonprofit organizations to become a sector of the collective system in urban policy. In Germany, the corporatism institution tried to consider both ecological and political forces to design German spatial policy. The state has had the role of allocating the revenue and financial resources and reducing the regional disparities and structural

constraints. On the whole, the state or public sector has been legally and financially the most influential actors in this decision making system of urban development in Germany.

Though public sectors and nonprofit sectors have been well institutionalized to collectively construct regional and urban policies in Germany, there are some difficulties in readjusting this corporatist structure in order to adapt to the uncertainties of global restructuring. Therefore, in the second part of this study, I will explore the roles of state and civic forces (nonprofit) in the restructuring process of urban development in Germany since 1980. This part of the analyses are mainly based on literature, government documentation, and in-depth interviews.

II. Historical Background of Spatial Governance in Germany

Governance is a control structure which includes the formal state structure, and some informal networks and associations (Campbell, 1991). The spatial governance structures varied with the transition of societies from fordism to post-fordism (Scott, 1988) or from industrialization to globalization (Smith and Feagin, 1987). The spatial governance structure in Germany has also had its own unique traditional characteristics—a decentralized governance structure.

The urbanization in Germany caused problems of settlement and housing in the cities. The initial breakthrough to a modern system of planning occurred in Berlin, the capital of the former German Reich. The *Zwenckverband Gross-Berlin* (joint planning authority of Greater Berlin) was established in 1910. The primary functions of this joint authority were to plan the public railways, to establish the building-line and local plans, and acquire and to maintain the large open spaces.

In the Duesseldorf area, planning activities initially concentrated on securing open spaces and green areas. The original concept of a "Gruenfleckenkommission" (Committee for the Creation and Maintenance of Green Areas) convened in 1910. Then this committee was developed further to create the idea of a general settlement plan for the (Regierungsbezirk) of Duesseldorf in In 1920, the *Siedlungsverband Ruhrkohlenbezirk* (Ruhr Area Housing Association) was also established in order to solve the housing problems of mining workers.

In the 1920s, numerous other regional planning associations were created, primarily in areas where the dynamic process of urbanization caused by industrial development urgently required control. In 1929, the various regional planning agencies of that time joined to form a working group or association, which by 1932 covered 29 percent of the area of the German Reich and 58 percent of the population .

Before World War II, all the regional planning associations heed the common feature that they were autonomous bodies, which conducted supralocal /regional planning without possessing executive competence. In contrast, during the Weimar Republic, the state showed no inclination to take control of supralocal planning and thus preserved the bottom-up approach of spatial governance.

In 1933, the National Socialist state took full control of this spatial governance function. The requirements of military planning, the new settlement ideology, and the process of bureaucratic and party political centralization led to a drastic change in the situation.

After World War II, there was a general hostility towards spatial planning, because people believed that the spatial management would inevitably lead to a planned economy and that it was primarily a tool of control by a totalitarian regime. However, the formal and organizational structure of spatial planning on the state level continued to develop. Spatial plans were drafted for Schleswig-Holstein (1948/49), Lower Saxony(1950), and Hesse(1951). During this period, the major effort was to reconstruct the devastated cities and to resettle and integrate the expelled refugees. Nevertheless, the high level of unemployment required the Federal government to intervene to solve the regional development problems (Toennies, 1985).

In 1965, the Federal Law on Spatial Management was passed. This is a framework law which merely contains general regulations relating to the content of spatial management plans and programs and to the organization of planning in the Laender (State or Provincial Governments). Due to historical traditions and administrative development, local government had wide-ranging powers. According to Article 28 of the Basic Law, the Gemeinde have the right of self-government and thus the right to regulate all the affairs of the local community on their own

responsibility within the limitations of existing legislation (Furst and Schimanke, 1984).

During the sixties and seventies an extension of the Federation and the Laender vis-a-vis the Gemeinden was to be observed. In the eighties, greater value was attached once again to the local level with corresponding effects on local-government policy and planning. The major force concerned with returning the governing power back to the local government and society resulted from the urban social movements of the 1970s (Hajer, 1995; 1996). Therefore, during the 1970s, the opportunities for citizen participation in urban development increased.

In sum, spatial planning was traditionally a bottom-up spatial governance mechanism in Germany. Spatial planning played an especially important role in the reconstruction of Germany between World War II and 1980 under the social market ideology.

However, after 1980, the role of spatial planning declined markedly (Mayer, 1987). One reason was that the globalization of market forces pushed the state to deregulate many regulations. The other reason was that the ecological social movements struggled for community democracy which also forced the state to decentralize the power of decision makings on urban issues and events. So, the power of local governments declined.

Urban development theorists (Logan and Swanstrom, 1990) advocated that institutional change and urban policy change could not be attributed only to the economic or industrial restructuring among spaces since globalization emerged pervasively in the United States and western European countries (Scott, 1988) in the 1980s. Different countries have their institutional histories and governance structures and these institutional conditions make different countries restructure differently. West Germany, under a social market ideology, has traditionally practiced more even resources distribution among spaces. Compared to the other Western countries, the roles of intergovernmental relations and nonprofit organizations in regional and urban development have been especially important in the spatial governance mechanism. In order to grasp the characteristics of institutional restructuring toward globalization, this paper focuses on the analyses of reactions and restructuring of these public and nonprofit organizations.

III. Research Methods

This research was done from August in 1996 to July in 1997 and under the sponsorship of the National Science Council. This research mainly used three sets of data: literature and government documentation, demographic data, and in-depth interviews.

I visited many public and nonprofit institutes for regional and urban development in Germany in order to collect important literature and documentation on the institutional restructuring of urban development in Germany. These institutes are as follows:

1. Bundesforschungstalt fuer Landeskunde und Raumordnung (Federal Research Institute for Regional Geography and Regional Planning) in Bonn: This is an independent research institute for regional and urban development. This institute includes 50 research fellow, 40 technicians, and 60 administrative staff. I interviewed the director of this institute and 6 researchers in different areas of urban and regional studies.

2. Visits to Heidelberg and Stuttgart: in Heidelberg, I interviewed a senior sociologist, who is involved in urban studies and has taken some important administrative positions on urban development in Germany. In Stuttgart, I visited the Institut fuer Raumordnung und Entwicklungsplanung (Institute for Regional Planning and Development Planning) at the University of Stuttgart. There I interviewed the director, who was the former president of the Akademie fuer Raumforschung und Landesplanung (the Academy for Regional Research and Regional Planning) and the current Chairperson of the Advisory Committee of the Federal Ministry for Regional Planning, Building and Urban Development and two other researchers.

3. The Bayerischen Staatsministerium fuer Landesentwicklung und Umweltfragen (Bavarian State ministry for Regional Development and Environmental Issues)in Muenchen: I interviewed the director of the Division of Statistics of Regional Development Statistics. He administers all types of demographic and statistical data collections for 7 regional statistical areas in the State of Bavaria.

4. The Academy fuer Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Academy for Spatial

Research and Regional Planning) in Hannover: I interviewed the Leiter des Referates "Bevoelkerung und Raumstruktur" (the project leader of "Population and Regional Structure.") This is a nonprofit association supported by members. This institute was established in 1946. The major tasks of this institute are to (1) integrate interdisciplinary professional resources and promote and support international and a domestic applied research on regional and urban development, (2) play the role of bridge between academic researchers and government administrators in constructing and modifying the law on spatial development, (3) edit and publish an almanac and handbook on regional and urban development.

5. The Deutsches Institut fuer Urbanistik (German Institute of Urban Affairs) in Berlin: I interviewed the director of this institute. This institute was founded by the Deutscher Staedtetag (German Association of Cities and Towns). In 1996, this nonprofit institute served 140 towns and cities and three municipal organizations. The aim of this institute is to identify long-term prospects for urban development and provide expert advice to municipal authorities to help them solve their problems.

6. The Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin fuer Sozialforschung (The Research Center for Social Sciences in Berlin): I interviewed the director of a large research project, "European Metropolis: Order and Disorder," studied by the Metropolitan Research Group from researchers in different European countries. The director of this project is a sociologist. This research group attempts to analyze the globalization and restructuring of great metropolises in Europe from institutional and organizational perspectives.

7. Deutscher Staedtetag (German Association of Cities and Towns) in Koeln: This association was founded by city and town governments in 1905. This is the most autonomous nonprofit association of the group without interlocking relations with federal or provincial governments. I interviewed the director of this institute. I also interviewed a researcher who specializes in the partnership between the public and private sectors in terms of urban development.

I collected literature and documentation from all the above institutes. Each interview took me one to one and half hours. The data on demographic and economic transition are from two sets of data. The first set of data are from the disk, "Laufende Raumbewachung: Aktuelle Daten zur Entwicklung der Staedte, Kreise und

Gemeinden-1992/93(Current Regional Observation: Relevant Data to Development of City, County, and Community-1992/93.” The other set of data were compiled by myself. I copied and keyed-in the data on international and internal migration in 1989 and 1994 for 327 Kreise (counties) in West Germany.

In order to better visualized the geographic location of Germany in the following analyses, The 16 states, 10 in West Germany and 6 in East Germany, are presented in Figure 1.



Regional Policy Report 1991

Figure 1: Germany in Europe

IV. Demographic Transition

Different types of settlements experience these demographic transition differently. This study uses nine "types of settlement" to describe and compare the demographic transition patterns of all nine types of settlements. The types of settlement was classified by the Bundes-forschungsanstalt fuer Landeskunde und Raumordnung (the Federal Research Institute for Regional Geography and Federal Planning). These nine types of settlement are: Kernstaedte in Regionen mit grossen Verdichtungsraeumen (agglomerated central towns), Hochverdichtete Kreise in Regionen mit grossen Verdichtungsraeumen (agglomerated high density counties), Verdichtete Kreise in Regionen mit grossen Verdichtungsraeumen (agglomerated moderate density counties), Laendliche Kreise in Regionen mit grossen Verdichtungsraeumen (agglomeration rural counties), Kernstaedte in Regionen mit Verdichtungsansaetzen (urbanized central towns), Verdichtete Kreise in Regionen mit Verdichtungsansaetzen (urbanized moderate density counties), Laendliche Kreise in Regionen mit Verdichtungsansaetzen (urbanized rural counties), Verdichtete Kreise in laendlich gepraeigten Regionen (rural moderate density counties), Laendlich Kreise in laendlich gepraeigten Regionen (rural counties).

In the recent decade, the major macro political-economic forces leading to restructuring the German communities are the European Union and German Unification. The European union policy broke the national boundary among European countries. Consequently, labor force share tended to move to favorable labor markets in Europe. Germany became the most attractive labor market for foreign migrants. High wages and good unions to protect the rights of laborer's are the major factors to attracting foreign migrants.

The urbanization patterns have been different between East and West Germany. In West Germany, regional policies guaranteeing equal life opportunities were implemented after World War II, so deconcentration and even distribution of population among multiple centers have been the major regional policies in West Germany. In contrast, the centralized distribution of population and economic resources have been the dominant policies during the period of socialism in East Germany.

Table 1-1 shows that the population of the united Germany was already over 80 million in 1992. That of West Germany was over 63 million, and that of East Germany was over 17 million. Table 1-2 indicates the differential annual population growth rates between 1980 and 1992 among different types of settlements in West and East Germany. In West Germany, the central cities of agglomeration had the lowest annual population growth rate (0.42‰) ; however, the central cities of agglomeration in East Germany had the highest annual population growth rate (4.00‰) between 1980 and 1992. In West Germany, the fastest growth areas were the peripheral areas of agglomeration (agglomeration with moderate density counties). In contrast, the areas of fastest loss of population were first ring counties close to the central cities of agglomeration.

The German Unification even strengthened this centralized pattern of settlement for East Germany. The economic disparity between East and West Germany led to a great wave of migration from East to West Germany. This movement mainly occurred in cities. The growth rates after 1989 in West Germany significantly increased. Table 1-3 shows that all types of settlements in West Germany gained population between 1989 and 1992, and those in East Germany lost population through net emigration.

The free labor movement among the countries of European Union caused the growth of the foreign population in Germany, especially in the cities. The growth rates of the foreign population have been much higher than the total population growth rates in Germany. Foreigners generally concentrated in the agglomerations. The central cities of agglomeration had the highest proportion of foreigners. The proportions increased from 11.4% in 1980 to 15.2% in 1992 (Table 2-1). The foreign population growth rates were many times of total population growth rates. In West Germany, the foreign population grew annually by 2.83% between 1980 and 1992 in agglomerated central towns (Table 2-2), but total population in this area of West Germany only grew annually by 0.42% (Table 1-2). The ratio between the foreign population growth rate and the total population growth rate was a multiple of 70. There was an evident trend for the foreign population to concentrate in the central cities and the native German population to decentralize from the cities.

Much literature has pointed out the regional disparity between the North and South (Hausermann and Siebel, 1990) in West Germany. The North has declined and

the South has grown. Whether this regional disparity has slowed down or whether the changes varied with different types of settlement will be the major concerns of this study. This study, furthermore, classifies the States in West Germany into three regions. The Northern region includes Schleswig-Holstein, Hamburg, Niedersachsen, Bremen. The middle region includes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz, and Saarland. The southern region includes Baden-Wuerttemberg, and Bayern.

Migration has played important roles in the urban population change. The following analyses will focus on the differential international migration and internal migration patterns among the different types of settlement in North, Middle, and South Regions in West Germany. Owing to the boundary changes of counties and cities and the lack of data on employment in East Germany, the following analyses will only focus on West Germany.

The International in-migration rates among all types of settlements in 1989 were more than twice those in 1994 (Table 3-1 and 3-2). In the North and South of West Germany, the foreign in-migration rates were high in the central cities of agglomeration and urbanized areas. The peripheral or rural areas had lower foreign in-migration rates. In the North and the Middle, there are some specific areas with an extremely high volume of foreign in-migration. They are Goettingen county, Osnabrueck independent city and Osnabrueck county in the North, and Unna in the middle region. All these four cities or counties have immigration centers. These centers were built at different times. The immigration center in Goettingen county was built after World War II. The center in Unna was established in the 1960s. At the end of 1980s, the East European communist countries collapsed, and many East Europeans moved to the northern region. The centers in Osnabrueck city and county were established in the end of 1980s.

In 1989, foreign in-migration contributed to the in-migration among different types of settlement. Table 3-1 indicates that foreign net migration rates were higher than internal net migration rates among all types of settlement.

There are some interesting relations between international migration and internal migration in 1989. The areas with extremely high foreign in-migration tended to push out internal migration from those areas. The areas with high foreign in-migration rates had high internal out-migration rates. For example, the northern

urbanized central cities and moderate density counties had much higher foreign net in-migration rate and higher net internal out-migration rate. In the middle region, there were two different patterns of migration among two different agglomerations. They are the declining Ruhr areas and the growing Frankfurt areas.

Table 3-2 shows that the foreign immigration rates decline about 1/2 but the foreign out-migration rates did not change too much. This was mainly due to the new law on the change of Asylum in 1993 which required refugees from safe areas to go back to their homelands. Generally, with the exception of some special counties, most central cities of agglomerations had higher rates of foreign migration. In the North and Middle, the central cities of agglomerations had the lowest rates of internal in-migration.

Based on the total net migration rates and redistribution effects, the central cities of agglomeration in the South lost population through net outmigration even more strongly than those in the North and Middle. Except for the central cities of agglomeration, the other types of settlement in the South tended to have higher total net migration rates in 1989. However, in 1994, all types of northern settlements seemed to have higher net migration rates than the other two regions.

In the 1960s, the regional policy focused on the imbalance of development between agglomerations and rural regions. During this period, cities experienced the problem of concentration due to in-migrants from rural areas. The distribution in transportation and educational resources between urban and rural areas improved in the 1970s, and then the suburbanization trend started. Cities lost population through net out-migration (Birg, 1982; 1987).

The decentralization in West Germany is much stronger than in France or in England. This is in part due to the outcome of a state regional policy. The German regional and urban development policy stresses central place theory and green belt design. Before German unification, West Germany only had two cities with populations over 1 million, namely Berlin and Muenchen. There were many cities of medium and small size.

The foreign population in German cities has increased since 1980, and it increased even faster after 1989. Many German larger cities contain a higher proportion of foreigners. Twenty-six percent of Frankfurt's population was foreign,

and twenty-two percent of Muenchen's was. Germany has had a low fertility rate, but the surrounding East European or African nations had high fertility rates. After the European Union, and the national patrol of boundary was lifted, it became easier for illegal immigrants to move to the cities. In addition, since the Basic Law promised to accept refugees, Germany became nation with the largest number of refugees. This caused the fiscal deficit of the cities to become even more serious (Freeman and Saunders, 1991).

The characteristics of the settlement structure in Germany have been based on the principles of multiple centers and central place urban system. The central cities in the urban system are the trade and cultural centers. Generally, the central places were designed by the provincial government. The patterns of more even distribution of the population among regions and decentralized from the cities are unique characteristics of German settlement.

V. Economic Transition

The regional disparity between North and South in West Germany is an outcome of economic structure, historical process and political policies. The North was the traditional old industrial area, such as coal and steel mines. Since the South lacks natural resources and has developed recently, the regional policy set the newly developed high-tech industry in the South. The major industries in the South are Electronics and Aircraft. The Siemens company even moved its headquarters from Berlin to Muenchen because of the availability of high-tech human resources. In the 1960s, the government subsidized the newly developed industries in the South.

In the 1970s, the value of the German Mark rose up in the international money market, and this made the export market less competitive. Many German factories moved to other countries. This caused a loss of manufacturing jobs (Hausermann and Siebel, 1990).

The globalized market forces also pushed the economic restructuring. The major restructuration of economic structures occurred as follows: the factories of multinational corporations moved out of the cities and homelands, the old industries with the technological structure of mass production declined and the high-tech

industries with flexible ways of production grew. The manufacturing industries declined and business and service industries increased. In Germany, the shipyard industries in Hamburg and the coal mining and steel companies in the Ruhr areas declined while the finance and service industries in the Frankfurt areas grew. The high-tech industries in the South increased.

The disparities of economic opportunities between regions was significant in the 1980s, but declined in the 1990s. Between 1980 and 1989, the employment growth was the lowest in the North and fastest in the South. The employment opportunities dispersed to suburban and fringe areas of agglomerations in the middle and southern regions. The degree of decentralization of job opportunities was especially high in the southern agglomerations in the 1980s.

The restructuration of old industries occurred in Duisburg, Essen, and Bochum and pioneered the major policies of urban development. Building high-tech parks and public and private partnerships were the most popular strategies for urban development in these cities. These policies seemed to slow down the regional disparity of employment opportunities after 1989.

Since 1989, the employment growth in northern agglomeration areas has increased faster than in the Middle and South regions (Table 4-1). The population redistribution through net migration has also reacted to this improvement of economic opportunities.

The industrial structure has also showed some regional differences (Table 4-1). The middle and southern regions had higher proportions of manufacturing employment than the northern region. The manufacturing industries were decentralized and the service industries tended to be centralized. The farther away from the central cities, the higher the proportion of manufacturing seemed to be. In contrast, closer to the central cities, the proportion of service industries tended to be higher. In all types of settlement, the manufacturing industries declined and the service industries increased.

What are the effects of regional disparity and decentralization on economic restructuration and population redistribution? Several regression analyses presented the effects of types of settlement and regions on the employment growth and international and internal net migration rates. In these regression models, two types

of dummy independent variables were designed. The first type are five types of settlement variables for the analyses. I regrouped the nine types of settlements into five groups. I grouped high density counties, moderate densities, and rural counties in agglomeration areas into agglomeration suburbs, then grouped rural moderate density and rural counties into rural areas. These rural counties became the contrast group to the dummy variables. The second type of variables are the three regions. The North region is the contrast variable.

Table 5-1 indicates that types of settlement and regions shows the effects on employment growth rates between 1980 and 1989 and between 1989 and 1993. For employment growth rates between 1980 and 1989, central cities of agglomeration areas lost employment opportunities more and suburban areas of agglomeration increased employment more than rural areas. The South had significantly higher employment growth rate than the North by 7.846%. In contrast, the regional difference in employment growth changed between 1989 and 1993. Between 1989 and 1993, central cities of agglomeration and urbanized areas had significantly lower employment growth rates than rural areas, but suburban areas had no difference from those of rural areas. During this period, the regional difference in employment growth is not significant.

Furthermore, to examine the effects of types of settlement, regions, and employment growth rates on population redistribution (net migration rates), Table 5-1 shows that suburbanized areas of agglomerations and urbanized areas had a more significant net gain population through net migration than rural areas during 1980 to 1992. During 1989 to 1992, the significant net outmigration rate was in central cities and the net immigration was in the suburbs of urbanized areas. The employment growth significantly explains the net migration rates of 1980-1992 and 1989-1992. The South had significantly higher net in-migration rates between 1980 and 1992 than the North even after controlling for the other variables.

Table 5-2 presents the regression models to explain the 1989 and 1994 net migration rates. In 1989, the unification (political factor) had a strong impact on the population redistribution. East Germans moved to the central cities of West Germany, and truncated with the suburbanization of West Germany. So the decentralization effect was not obvious. In 1994, the decentralization effect became significant again.

The South changed from a significantly higher net in-migration rate to a lower net migration rate than the North. This is not the internal migration effect, but due more to foreign net migration in the North than in the South.

VI. The Social Mechanism in the Restructuration of Cities

The demographic and economic transition in Germany shaped social environments which were not favorable for urban development. The major environmental uncertainties which cities face are as follows: (1) high unemployment and low employment growth, (2) a higher net in-migration for foreigners and a greater loss of German population through net out-migration, (3) a high fiscal deficit.

What roles did different social actors play to enable urban policies to deal with these problems (Mollenkopf, 1983)? The fiscal shortage in most German cities made them depend on the subsidy from provincial or federal government more. Besides, city government transformed their roles of administration into entrepreneur managers. Given greater uncertainty, city governments collectively strengthened their nonprofit bodies to institutionally fight for city interests and professionally looked for solutions to city problems.

Traditionally and historically, public and nonprofit sectors have played the most important roles in the governance of regional and urban development. The following analyses will focus on the roles of public sectors and nonprofit sectors in urban policy formation as a reaction to the urban problems and uncertainty.

1. Role of Public Sectors

Restructuration has mainly been defined from an economic perspective. Global economic competition forced production system to change over from the mass production system of Fordism to the flexible production system of Post-Fordism (Logan et al., 1990).

In order to change the production system, the restructuring of municipal regulations and control systems are inevitable. The regime politics is influenced in systematic ways by particular kinds of bargaining environments. Since the 1970s, the regime dynamics of the cities in West Europe and the United States have been

restructured by the interactive forces of local democratic developments, market environments and intergovernment networks (Kanton, Savitch, and Haddock, 1997).

Germany is a federal state in which local governments have a strong governmental autonomy. The urban development of cities should follow the law of urban planning at the local level and the laws of regional planning at the provincial and federal levels. The regional and urban development policies also respond to the establishment of the European Union and German reunification.

After the European Union was established, some regional and urban development policies in Germany were nested in the control system of the European Government. For example, the renewal projects of old industry in the Ruhr area were subsidized by the European Union. The renewal projects are attempting to attain the goals of economic restructuring and ecological conservation.

After the unification between East and West Germany, the Federal and Provincial governments followed the "Guidelines of Regional Planning" (Federal Ministry for Regional Planning, Building, and Urban Development, 1996 a; b; c). The decentralized settlement patterns in West Germany are conceived as positive sustainable spatial developments. Therefore, "decentralization" will still be the future policy of regional development, consistent with the goal of sustainable development.

Constructing urban networks and deregulating laws on regional and urban development are the major Federal regional policies for responding to global economic restructuring. Constructing urban networks is a relief strategy to solve the problems of decentralization of agglomeration areas. Building large metropolitan regional networks or governments will be another strategy to compete with the other global cities in the world.

Deregulating the law on regional and urban development facilitates private investment and releases fiscal pressure on the public sector. The regional policy has played a less important role in the recent spatial development. Globalization has forced public sectors to deregulate the law and attract more private investments. In addition, regional policies have implemented and reduced the regional disparities, so that the importance of regional policies on development has declined. This line of reasoning and these perception are reported by the administrators of regional

development at Federal and Provincial levels.

The Federal regional policies have responded to global restructuring, but these policies have remained at the discussion and debate stage. There are some difficulties in implementing these policies. The gaps between government-espoused policies and implementation can be observed from the social mechanisms of policy implementation. This study will further analyze the mechanisms by which German cities respond to global uncertainty: the relationship between the central and local governments, between metropolitan inter-governments and between public and private partnerships.

A. Relationships between Local and Central Governments

Generally, the roles of local and central governments are as follows: (1) The central governments focuses on the regulatory political sphere (foreign, legal and financial policy) and local governments focus on social policy. (2) The central government focuses on the economic development and capital accumulation, and local governments focus on the less important values such as ecology. (3) In the policy formation process, the central government organizes the differences among different states and builds up the corporatism structures. Parliament set the general rules and legitimacy. Local governments deal with concrete problems and issues. The role relations between local and central governments in Germany are more like those in other European countries than those in the United States. In the United States, local governments play a more important role in economic development and capital accumulation.

Compared to the other nations, Germany is usually considered to be a country with a tradition of strong local government. Local politics are institutionalized. The tradition of a professional civil service has also contributed to the primacy of administration at the local level.

Even so, the Basic Law in Germany protects local democracy and autonomy. The fiscal policy in Germany has made the local government lack autonomy. The director of a nonprofit institute for urban interests said,

“We have a good self-government system, but we do not have enough autonomy. The major reason is the tax law. The city government can not fully used her revenue from

local tax. The 30% of city income comes from the city government, 40% comes from the Provincial government, and 30% comes from Federal Government."

Local autonomy is restricted to mobilizing and coordinating the programs of the central state. So its role as a counterbalance to central state is limited.

Before 1980, local politics tended to be an area of non-politics or merely symbolic politics: claiming responsibility without being responsive to the locality (Roth, 1991). During 1969-73, the welfare state fiscal policy (deficit policy) centralized the power in the Federal and Provincial governments. This caused tension between the central and local governments during 1974-1982. Since 1982, the public has paid more attention to urban issues. Many local governments have been forced to find new and alternative ways to deal with the fiscal restrictions imposed by the long-term consequences of economic restructuring, unemployment, and rising welfare costs. Besides, this local competition for resources was strong and forced local governments to develop local social resources.

Globalization has reduced the traditionally stronger influence of the local business elite because of the fragmentation and the flexibility of production. The local governments of cities faced stronger pressure and uncertainty about urban development. The larger deficits of cities made them depend on the subsidy from the Federal and Provincial governments more. After unification, the Federal government even faced a stronger financial crisis because of the financial cost of rebuilding East Germany. The cuts in the subsidy from the central government forced city governments to develop more strategies to improve their own financial situations.

Is the decline of the city inevitable in a post-Fordism society? The restructuring of production systems has caused the capital to move to other areas which benefit capitalists more. Restructuring the deployment of capital and the use of labor have become more flexible. This has resulted specialization, decentralization and deregulation. The competition among different cities has become stronger.

In an industrialized society, the central state regulated the local development and integrated it into an organized functional system. In the post-Fordism society, local government is developing flexible arrangements for the initiation and stimulation of the accumulation of private capital.

Local governments have become the initiators of entrepreneurial effort in urban business. The exploitation of local resources and the building up of the endogenous potentialities of a region demand institutionally innovative and comprehensively integrated actions by the local government.

The current situations encourages local variations and experiments of both mainstream (pro-business) or progressive (pro-labor and community) varieties. Different types of city-community restructuration has used different strategies. The strategies of restructuring are as follows: (1) The fiscal crisis creates new social relations between public and private sectors. (2) Cities choose a policy focusing on economic growth or redistribution. (3) Cities choose to mobilize local resources or outside resources. Local resources can generate local competence and capital. Outside resources attract outside capital. In Germany, the mentality of entrepreneur city has become the dominant management ideology for city governments.

In addition, different local governments have reacted to urban problems differently and manage the cities with different degrees of effectiveness. From the previous analyses on the effects of types of settlement and regions on population redistribution and economic restructuring, the South has had more success in economic restructuring and positive population redistribution than the other regions. Consequently, the southern region has a low unemployment rate and fewer deficits.

Cusack(1997) analyzed the effects of forms of German local government on their performance. He classified German local governments into four types of institutions: the South German Council, the North German Council, Magistrat, and Strong Mayor (Table 6). Different forms of local government have different forms of election system and power structures. The southern governments also have higher efficiency of political integration, citizen participation, policy specialization, and fiscal soundness (Table 7). The stronger the mechanism governing to economic restructuration in the South is, the better their urban development is.

In sum, the globalization forces caused regional disparities in 1980s. The North functioned using mass production, and the South used high-tech flexible production. The gap in economic development increased. The unemployment rate was high in the North and low in the South. The economic restructuring revived the effectiveness of local governments. Since 1990, the role of local governments has begun to change

from the role of administration to that of management. The potential for the growth of entrepreneurial cities needed to be worked out.

B. Metropolitan Inter-Government Cooperation

In Germany, the regional policy of central-place system has led to more even distribution of German population into multiple cities. Before Unification, the largest city was less than 2 million. Even now, there are only about three cities whose population is over 1 million. Germany did not have such populous cities as London and Paris in Europe. In Britain, in order to solve the metropolitan expansion problem, inter city governments build up regional governments. In 1972, the Local Government Reorganization Act created 6 new metropolitan counties, the Greater London Council. The French government uses regional councils to equalize development in metropolitan areas and to plan infrastructure.

In order to compete with globalized cities, the regional metropolis needs to be built up. The reasons are: (1) the growing functional interdependence between central cities and peripheral counties; (2) the intensification and internationalization of interlocal and interregional competition because of the Common European Union; (3) the growing regionalization of funds; (4) the growing globalization of the economy and financial markets and the parallel shift of the center of the capitalist world economy.

In Germany, the regional metropolitan governments have been emerging since 1990. These intraregional cooperation unions are limited to fragmented cooperation rather than comprehensive and multiple functional governments. The intercity networks have been prevalent both institutionally and financially within the central state in recent years. Generally this cooperation and integration is instigated and supported by the central state.

Whether the regional metropolitan governments should be institutionalized by the legal processes is still a controversial issue. The major points of debate are as follows (Heinz, 1997): (1) intraregional governments will lose this identity as communities; (2) small cities can not compete with other international and national cities; (3) regional governments will counter the provincial government, and threaten the interests and authority of provincial governments; (4) restructuring the power structure will make some actors lose power and interest. So any change is facing

strong resistance.

Now, the Frankfurt regional metropolitan cooperation associations are limited in their cooperation to transportation, land use, and waste management among the different counties. Greater Hannover is also limited to the integration of transportation networks. The Stuttgart Regional Union was set up in 1994. This union replaced the function of neighborhood associations (joining six larger cities in Baden-Wuerttemberg). This Union is responsible for coordinating regional economic development and tourism marketing.

The demands for intensified intraregional cooperation are a recurrent phenomenon in West Germany. Starting in the early 90 the debate on the issue of supralocal organizations and institutions took a leading role (such as German Association of Cities and Towns). Another way to organize the metropolitan government is seen in the province of Hesse which built up a Regional county Rhein-Main, equivalent to the establishment of the Region Hannover (Heinz, 1997).

Building metropolitan governance organizations is a means to respond to the strong competition due to globalization. In Germany, different provincial governments have different laws and strategies to build up large metropolitan governments. However, there are still many controversial issues regarding large metropolitan governments, especially their potential to violate the traditional spirit of even distribution among spaces. How the philosophy of social market deals with the global market force be one of the essential forces to change the German cities.

C. The Public-Private Partnership

Since the second half of the 1980s, significant changes in economic structure and intensified competition have compelled cities and communities in Germany to broad scale adaptation (Heinz, 1993). A key role in this regard is being played by the extensive renewal and modernization of urban districts and their infrastructures. Globalization has cost the old industrial areas to lose jobs and taxes. Many cities see the most promising solution in a broader cooperation with the private sector and its representatives. This view has been encouraged by the current deregulation policy of the federal government. This approach entails more market and less state control. Public-private partnership as the cooperation between the public sector and financially strong private interests has thus become the motto of many cities and

communities. This strategy can relieve the burden on the local budget by finding increased access to private capital and know-how.

With German unification, cooperation between the public and private sectors has become even more important particularly in the case of complex and costly infrastructure projects. In terms of composition, public private partnerships involved in urban development and renewal projects tended in the majority of cases to be an expression of a new local corporatism (Heinz, 1993).

Molotch (1990) defined "restructuring" as a willful action by local operators of the growth machine. Regime theorists (Stone, 1989; Kantor, Svitch, and Haddock, 1997) focus on the process of inducing cooperation between public and private sectors through the formation of governing coalitions. Regimes are defined as the collective systems of resource mobilization for catalyzing this cooperation and attaining the goal of urban development. These regimes bring different actors together across institutional lines to engage in social production. These dynamic forces have a profound influence on social production by setting the rules, limitations, and opportunities under which bargaining takes place.

The public sector is very idealistic about the private-public partnership even in Germany. The public sector has forgot their mission to protect the collective interests of the citizens. Some of city governments have tried to become "entrepreneur" cities. They want to manage the city like a business.

In the restructuring of new relations between public and private sectors, the traditional role of local government to protect collective interests and justice has declined. Some urban researchers in Germany think that city governments should be trained to distinguish the separate goals of public and private sectors in order to attain the mutual interests and justice in the urban policy domain.

Successful public-private partnerships have generally got enough financial support and incentive from the public sector. For example, the Essen and Dortmund city private and public partnership could be established because they got support from the European Union. The mining company in the Ruhr area and the partnerships' own real estate companies are the major private actors of this project. The positive side effect for private actors is to understand more information about urban development.

This type of partnership to build up a lot of projects was common in the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Now, these types of projects are abundant. In East Germany, the infrastructure was more established by this partnership (Schmoll, 1990). Generally speaking, the supply of big offices and the construction of urban renewal projects through this public-private partnerships is greater than the demand now.

There has been some negative impact of public-private partnerships for urban development. These partnerships undermine the sovereignty of public planning, decrease the democratic control and accounting from the city councils. In addition, urban renewal through this partnership often pushes poor people out of cities. In the long run, this partnership will transfer more local authority to the private sector.

If public sectors prefer to take the public-private partnership strategy for urban economic development, how can the local government avoid speculative games and protecting collective interests from becoming important issues in determining the fate of this policy of public-private partnership.

2. Role of Nonprofit Sectors

Nonprofit sectors can provide a platform for restructuring political agendas. They take on roles and responsibilities traditionally reserved for the government, and they forge coalitions among and across groups, organizations, and sectors to address societal problems (Hula, Jackson, and Orr, 1997). These organizations require broad community support, embrace flexible policy agendas, and operate in the public domain. Community and political leaders have been able to forge coalitions capable of reaching concrete goals.

In the social processes of building urban policies, the nonprofit organizations have played very important roles in Germany. The most important nonprofit organizations are the National Academy for Regional Research and Regional Planning (ARL), the German Institute of Urban Affairs and the German City and Town Association. The former two organizations were sponsored by and integrated into the public sector. The federal and provincial governments are also organizational members and occupy seats on the boards of the National Academy for Regional Research and Regional Planning and the German Institute of Urban Affairs. The federal and provincial governments support these organizations financially and have

some decision making power in these two nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, the public sectors of different levels of governments can communicate and integrate all types of resources through these nonprofit organizations. The major tasks of these two organizations were already described above in the section of research methods.

The German Association of Cities and Towns, however, is a more autonomous nonprofit organization since it does not have any members of federal and provincial organizations and does not receive any money from them. This organization has tried to struggle for the structural and long-term interests of cities and has influenced concrete political decisions. This organization often provides the direct services of regular information on urban policies and the organizing of group meetings to share experiences and the solving of urban problems collectively.

By law, the position of the city governments in Germany is weak as they do not participate in the federal legislative process. The provincial governments can participate in the legislative process through the upper house—the Bundesrat. Local governments cannot foster reform without the support from the provincial and federal governments. Provincial governments have a more positive influence on the provision and redistribution of finances for local governments. In order to integrate their collective interests and implement urban policies, federal and provincial governments have also joined the most important nonprofit organizations on urban development. The city governments were already aware of the constraints from the federal and provincial governments, so they cooperated to establish a collective nonprofit organization in 1905 to struggle for their right and interests. This organization is the German Association of Cities and Towns. The major roles of the German Association of Cities and Towns are as follows:

(1) Fighting for the interest of cities, (2) providing information for cities, (3) mobilizing inter-city cooperation and support resources.

The German society has traditionally used organizational resources to bridge and to integrate the collective interests. The urban institutions are characterized as a “corporatist structure (Schmitter, 1974:93-94).” The most important nonprofit organizations to directly and indirectly shape policies on regional and urban development have already been mentioned in the above description. In order to indicate the characteristics of corporatist structure, Table 8 shows the differences and

interorganizational relationships of the German Association of Cities and Towns, the National Academy for Regional Research and Regional Planning, and the German Institute of Urban Affairs.

Based on the in-depth interviews with important informants in these three organizations I used nine criteria to differentiate these three nonprofit organizations: fighting interests, bridging all kinds of resources, providing information and services, researching, organizing working groups, relations with governments, members, and financial support.

Organizing working groups is a common strategy to organize the human resources of members to deal with regional and urban issues in these three organizations. All three organizations strongly play the role of bridger among different types of interest actors in the public, private, professional, and social movement sectors. These organizations all collect and provide information to all member organizations and individuals and provide services such as fighting interests or training individuals. In the other criteria, these three organizations vary to different extents. For example, the German Institute of Urban Affairs has 40 research scientists who do applied research on urban policies and development, but the German Association of Cities and Towns does not have any research scientists. These two organizations are however interdependent each other. The German Institute of Urban Affairs often cooperates with the German Association of Towns and Cities to share research results and run training programs.

Nonprofit sectors serve as "mediating structures" and engender trust within the community. They create and produce the social capital of a community. However, the German Association of Cities and Towns tries not to make coalitions with urban movements organizations. The principle of this organization is to fight for the interests of cities through legal processes rather than through social movements strategies. This organization tries to be more neutral from the political coalitions. In this nonprofit organization, most directors of different administrative divisions are lawyers. They protect the interests of cities through legal institutional processes instead of through informal or movement strategies. They believe that any cooperation with church or movement organizations or coalitions will damage their neutral image.

In recent years, the struggles experienced by this nonprofit organization with the Federal government shows that the global market influence has been the major consideration in urban policies. The Federal Government recently passed a law to cut off industrial taxes in order to attract more investments. This institute bargained and negotiated with the Federal Government. The compromise agreed to is to let the law pass and the Federal government to transfer the value-added tax to local governments. This institute was not satisfied with this outcome. Now, this institute has hired law professors to sue the Federal Government.

Another failed case of fighting for the interests of cities was the "Telekom" case. After German Telekom was privatized in 1993, the Federal government passed a law saying that Telekom company could build up the cable in any province in Germany without paying local government any money. The share of private business was still very low in Telekom, so the concern of the decision makers was more focused on the interest of the Federal Government than on those of the urban governments.

These failed cases of fighting for local interests indicates that the central government in Germany considers market interests above local government interests while facing strong globalized competition. Evidently, the major goals of urban policies in the 1990s are to stimulate the economic development of the whole country and increase the market of jobs. The Federal government of Germany has tried hard to reduce the cost of investment for capitalists. Through these decision making processes, the power differentiation between central and local governments is clarified. As a result, globalization has led to a weak influence by local government. The city governments are also more conscious of the threat of local autonomy, and given the financial difficulty of city governments they even more strongly support the German Association of Cities and Towns.

In sum, one of special characteristics of the policy formation of urban development in Germany is that the well integrated nonprofit and professional organizations play important roles. Though the urban social movements were strong in the 1970s, they were also finally integrated into this urban institution of corporatist structure in the 1990s.

The strongest period for urban social movement organizations was in the 1970s. During this period, the city reformation movement was strong. The urban movements

pushed the state to pass the law on citizen's hearing on urban development and advocacy planning. This right was based in the 1971 Urban Renewal Act. In the 1970s, the urban movement organizations tried to struggle for quality growth in the cities instead of the opportunities for profit by local capital.

In addition, these urban social movements facilitated the establishment of the Green Party. In addition, social movements did not increase the local influence but increased the penetration of parties into local politics. Instead of stressing citizen participation, local governments used the media to improve their relations with the public. The results of social movements was to forge coalitions to march for local councilors.

Subsequently, the urban social movement groups started to forge coalitions to participate in local elections. For example, local rainbow coalitions included urban protesters, new social movements, citizens' initiatives, and self-help groups. When grass roots representatives had just got into local councils, the operation of local political institutions was difficult. Later on, these grass roots were integrated into local politics and learned to follow the institutional rules. So, the influence of grass roots forces declined.

Once the local concerns could be institutionalized into city councils, the urban social movements declined in the 1980s (Roth, 1991). Besides, the urban movements were also absorbed and integrated into the grass roots Green Party in the 1980s, so the urban movements gradually decreased in influence. In sum, the urban movements have tended towards institutionalization and professionalization. In addition to the change of political environments, the economic pressure of globalized economic restructuring has also made the urban movement forces weaker. Therefore, the urban social movement inevitably played a less important role in the urban policy domain in the 1990s.

VII. Conclusion

Since 1980, the globalized economic restructuring has caused an increase in foreign immigrants and decentralization of settlement from the central cities has continued to benefit native Germans. The European Union has brought about a net

in-migration of foreigners in agglomeration areas, especially in the central cities. The large foreign in-migration has pushed native German to move out of the cities. High unemployment rates and fiscal deficits have occurred in the cities of agglomeration areas. The northern and Ruhr areas have had more serious crises in their urban development.

The market model of ecological dominance and succession was generally supplanted by studies of community power and social organization long before political economy enjoyed its rise in the urban crisis of the 1970s. Markets are always embedded in particular social and political relations. However, up to now, most of comparative political economic research still stresses the conditions under which a change in their interrelationships were urged both ideologically and institutionally. These approaches are more comparative and historical. They ignore how the new regulations have reorganized the interrelationships of related agents, and how the institutionally related agents have responded to and reorganized the new regulations.

In Germany, traditionally, local governments had strong self-governance autonomy and competence, but legislatively and financially local governments lacked enough power to counterbalance the provincial and federal governments. Since 1980, the globalized competition has pushed large industrial companies to move their production to other countries. The Federal government has tried to deregulate laws to stimulate investments by enterprises in Germany. Then this policy has often caused interest conflicts with local governments. The deregulation policy has also caused some local governments to loose revenue.

One way to solve the crises due to the globalization of markets and the decentralization of settlements has been is to build up metropolitan regional inter-government cooperation bodies. This voluntary inter-government cooperation can integratively and efficiently utilize local resources and compete with the other global cities. However, large and expanding governments threaten the interests of provincial governments and imply the loss of their local identities as traditional German communities. These conflicts and controversies set up some barriers to the construction of metropolitan governments for their future urban development.

The financial shortages in German cities has convinced most city governments

to accept a myth of public-private partnerships. The role of city government is changing from that of administrator to that of entrepreneur. This business mentality of city governments has necessarily damaged some interests of the citizens and decreased the traditional characteristics of spirit of redistribution and justice between the public sectors in German governments.

The city governments voluntarily organized and established a collective nonprofit organization to struggle and fight for their interests. The well integrated bridge's role of this nonprofit organization has an unique role in urban policy formation in Germany. This well-organized coporatist system provides city government and society security, but it also causes difficulty in restructuring the functions and relations among the different sectors.

Stability or flexibility, and development (of social polarization) or justice have become the most controversial issues in urban development in Germany. The analyses of the social mechanisms to respond to global restructuring in this study only focus on the strategies for responding to the problems of the decentralization of settlement and the globalization of markets. In fact, the restructuring of urban development is shaped by multiple, dynamic, and interactive forces. The outcome of the processes will be alternative structures which will conform either to legitimate or to market forces. These social processes of restructuring deserve to be studied further with case studies for some cities.

The globalization of markets and the free movement of the countries of the European Union will cause the problem of foreign immigration in the central cities in Germany. Foreign labor will move to Germany continuously, especially to cities. The percentage of foreign population has even attained as much as 30% insome independent cities. The inner part with these cities must have an even higher proportion of foreigners. In the future, the urban policies in Germany should face the ethnic complexity of this new structure in the central cities. Germany has not traditionally embraced racial integration or had policies toward immigrants. Their mentality toward an integration policy, and institutionalized organizational sectors capable of dealing with multiple races and cultures will be important issues in urban policies in the future.

References

- Birg, Herwig.
- 1982 "On The Interactions of Job Creation, Migration, and Natural Population Increase within the Framework of a Dynamic Demoeconomic Model." *Environment and Planning A* 14:1141-1153.
- 1987 "Spatial Concentration and Dispersion Trends in Population Distribution in the Federal Republic of Germany." in Peter Friedrich and Ian Masser (ed.), *International Perspective of Regional Decentralization*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Campbell, John L., J. Rogers Hollingsworth, and Leon N. Lindberg (ed.)
- 1991 *Governance of the American Economy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, Manuel
- 1983 *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Christaller, Walter
- 1933 *Die Zentralen Orte in Sueddeutschland*. Jena: Gustav Fischer. Translated into English by C. W. Baskin, *Central Places in Southern Germany*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Cusack, Thomas R.
- 1997 "Social Capital, Institutional Structures, and Democratic Performance: A Comparative Study of German Local Governments." *FSIII* 97-201. *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin fur Sozialforschung*.
- Federal Ministry for Regional Planning, Building and Urban Development
- 1991 *Regional Planning Report of the Federal Republic of Germany*. Germany.
- 1993 *Law and Practice of Urban Development in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Germany.
- 1996a *Global Best Practices Initiative in Improving the Living Environment :German Best Practices*. Germany.
- 1996b *Human Settlements Development and Policy: National Report Germany*. Germany
- 1996c *Regional Planning Concept for the Development of the New Lander*.

- Germany.
- Freedman, Lawrence and John Saunders
 1991 *Population Change and European Security*. Brassey's Inc.
- Furst, Dietrich and Dieter Schimanke
 1984 *Changes in Economic and Social Structure in the Federal Republic of Germany: Development Trends of Densely Populated Areas and Approaches to Decentralization*. Fedral Research for Regional Geography and Regional Planning.
- Hajer, Maarten
 1995 "Politics on the Move: the Democratic Control of the Design of Sustainable Technodesign." *Knowledge and Policy* 8(4): 26-39.
 1996 "Function and Practices of Democratic Discourse: the case of mobility technologies." *paper presented at the 4S/Easst Conference 'Signatures of Knowledge Societies'*, Bielefeld Germany.
- Hausermann, Hartmut and Walter Siebel
 1990 "The Polarization of Urban Development in the Federal Republic of Germany and the Question of a New Municipal Policy." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Science* 14(3): 369-382.
- Heinz, Werner
 1991 "Towards Cities Primarily Geared to Market Requirements?" *Architecture & Comport/ Architecture Behavior* 7(4): 407-414.
 1997 *Intraregional Cooperation in Metropolitan Areas: Frankfurt and the Rhine-Main Area*. German Institute of Urban Affairs.
- Heinz, W.(ed.)
 1993 *Public Private Partnership*. Stuttgart etc.
- Hula, Richard C., Cynthia Y. Jackson, and Marion Orr
 1997 "Urban Politics, Governing Nonprofits, and Community Revitalization." *Urban Affairs Review* 32(4): 459-489.
- Kanton, Paul K., H. V. Savitch, and S. V. Haddock
 1997 "The Political Economy of Urban Regimes: A Comparative Perspective." *Urban Affairs Review* 32(3): 348-377.

- Logan, John R. and Todd Swanstrom
 1990 *Beyond the City Limits*. Temple University Press.
- Mayer, Margit
 1987 "Restructuring and Popular Opposition in West German Cities." In Michael Peter Smith and Joe R. Feagin (ed.). *The Capitalist City*. Basil Blackwell. 16: 343-363.
- Mollenkopf, John H.
 1983 *The Contested City*. Princeton University Press.
- Molotch, Harvey
 1990 "Urban Deals in Comparative Perspective." In John Logan and Todd Swanstrom (ed.) *Beyond the City Limits* 7: 175-198.
- Roth, Roland
 1991 "Local Green Politics in West German Cities." *Internal Journal of Urban and Regional Science* 15(1): 75-89.
- Schmoll, Fritz.
 1990 "Metropolis Berlin? Prospects and Problems of Post-November 1989 Urban Developments." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Science* 14(4): 676-686.
- Schmitter, Philippe C.
 1974 "Still the Century of Corporatism?" Pp. 85-131. In B. Pike and T. Stritch (ed.), *The New Corporatism*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Scott, A. J.
 1988 "Flexible Production Systems and Regional Development: the Rise of New Industrial Spaces in North America and Western Europe." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Science* 12(2): 171-186.
- Smith, Michael Peter and Joe R. Feagin
 1987 *The Capitalist City*. Basil Blackwell.
- Stone, Clarence N.
 1989 *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Toennies, Gerd
 1985 *Training Course on Establishment and Promotion of Land Information*

Table 1-1 Population in Different Types of Settlement in Germany : 1980, 1989, 1992 (thousand)

NAME	POP80	POP89	POP92
Total Germany	78395.42	78825.79	80975.3
agglomerated central towns	20140.94	20101.38	20463.2
agglomerated high density counties	12210.88	12482.50	12906.9
agglomerated moderate density counties	6311.84	6342.63	6501.2
agglomerated rural counties	3317.40	3330.50	3373.8
urbanized central towns	4550.59	4546.09	4596.1
urbanized moderate density counties	12626.46	12822.41	13219.9
urbanized rural counties	6098.73	6134.57	6263.4
rural moderate density counties	6342.25	6527.33	6710.1
rural counties	6783.97	6823.99	6940.0
West Germany	59759.43	60447.72	63117.5
agglomerated central towns	15041.00	14704.47	15116.2
agglomerated high density counties	11231.03	11576.27	12050.9
agglomerated moderate density counties	4580.18	4723.86	4969.5
agglomerated rural counties	1697.44	1755.30	1853.6
urbanized central towns	3372.52	3320.39	3436.6
urbanized moderate density counties	10035.79	10331.24	10878.8
urbanized rural counties	4173.16	4256.46	4477.8
rural moderate density counties	5039.09	5207.55	5452.3
rural counties	4588.06	4671.48	4881.7
East Germany	18635.99	18378.07	17857.8
agglomerated central towns	5102.10	5401.01	5347.0
agglomerated high density counties	979.41	903.91	856.0
agglomerated moderate density counties	1732.69	1617.42	1531.7
agglomerated rural counties	1618.96	1575.34	1520.2
urbanized central towns	1178.35	1226.98	1159.5
urbanized moderate density counties	2595.34	2490.43	2341.0
urbanized rural counties	1924.14	1881.56	1785.6
rural moderate density counties	1302.07	1318.45	1257.8
rural counties	2201.39	2150.78	2058.3

Table 1-2 Annual Natural Increase Rate, Annual Netmigration Rate, and Annual Population Growth Rate: 1980-1992 (per thousand)

NAME	ANI8092	ANET8092	APOP8092
Total Germany			
agglomerated central towns	-2.74	4.07	1.33
agglomerated high density counties	.02	4.73	4.75
agglomerated moderate density counties	-1.32	3.82	2.50
agglomerated rural counties	-.75	2.17	1.42
urbanized central towns	-1.16	1.99	.83
urbanized moderate density counties	.11	3.81	3.92
urbanized rural counties	-.38	2.63	2.25
rural moderate density counties	.78	4.06	4.83
rural counties	-.16	2.08	1.92
West Germany			
agglomerated central towns	-2.71	3.12	.42
agglomerated high density counties	.46	5.62	6.08
agglomerated moderate density counties	-.68	7.76	7.08
agglomerated rural counties	-.41	8.07	7.67
urbanized central towns	-2.06	3.64	1.58
urbanized moderate density counties	.53	6.47	7.00
urbanized rural counties	-.32	6.41	6.08
rural moderate density counties	.43	6.40	6.83
rural counties	-.42	5.76	5.33
East Germany			
agglomerated central towns	-2.82	6.82	4.00
agglomerated high density counties	-5.05	-5.45	-10.50
agglomerated moderate density counties	-3.03	-6.64	-9.67
agglomerated rural counties	-1.12	-3.96	-5.08
urbanized central towns	1.42	-2.75	-1.33
urbanized moderate density counties	-1.55	-6.62	-8.17
urbanized rural counties	-.49	-5.51	-6.00
rural moderate density counties	2.11	-4.94	-2.83
rural counties	.38	-5.79	-5.42

Table 1-3 Annual Natural Increase Rate, Annual Net Migration Rate, and Annual Population Growth Rate: 1989-1992 (per thousand)

NAME	ANI8992	ANET8992	APOP8992
Total Germany			
agglomerated central towns	-2.05	8.05	6.00
agglomerated high density counties	.55	10.78	11.33
agglomerated moderate density counties	-1.20	9.53	8.33
agglomerated rural counties	-1.53	5.86	4.33
urbanized central towns	-1.27	4.94	3.67
urbanized moderate density counties	.33	10.01	10.33
urbanized rural counties	-.65	7.65	7.00
rural moderate density counties	.80	8.53	9.33
rural counties	-.53	6.19	5.67
West Germany			
agglomerated central towns	-1.55	10.88	9.33
agglomerated high density counties	1.15	12.52	13.67
agglomerated moderate density counties	.35	16.98	17.33
agglomerated rural counties	.63	18.04	18.67
urbanized central towns	-.93	12.59	11.67
urbanized moderate density counties	1.45	16.22	17.67
urbanized rural counties	.57	16.76	17.33
rural moderate density counties	1.38	14.29	15.67
rural counties	.55	14.45	15.00
East Germany			
agglomerated central towns	-3.35	.02	-3.33
agglomerated high density counties	-6.88	-10.79	-17.67
agglomerated moderate density counties	-5.50	-12.17	-17.67
agglomerated rural counties	-3.88	-7.79	-11.67
urbanized central towns	-2.20	-16.13	-18.33
urbanized moderate density counties	-4.18	-15.83	-20.00
urbanized rural counties	-3.35	-13.65	-17.00
rural moderate density counties	-1.48	-13.86	-15.33
rural counties	-2.83	-11.51	-14.33

Table 2-1 The Percentage of Foreign Population: 1980,1989,1992

NAME	FOR80	FOR89	FOR92
Total Germany			
agglomerated central towns	.	.	13.2
agglomerated high density counties	.	.	10.2
agglomerated moderate density counties	.	.	5.5
agglomerated rural counties	.	.	2.0
urbanized central towns	.	.	7.6
urbanized moderate density counties	.	.	5.8
urbanized rural counties	.	.	3.7
rural moderate density counties	.	.	5.3
rural counties	.	.	3.3
West Germany			
agglomerated central towns	11.41	13.20	15.2
agglomerated high density counties	8.46	9.07	10.9
agglomerated moderate density counties	5.18	5.67	7.0
agglomerated rural counties	2.86	3.53	4.8
urbanized central towns	7.54	8.47	9.8
urbanized moderate density counties	5.22	5.48	6.8
urbanized rural counties	3.24	3.72	4.9
rural moderate density counties	4.87	5.13	6.3
rural counties	2.81	3.29	4.5
East Germany			
agglomerated central towns	.	.	7.7
agglomerated high density counties	.	.	.7
agglomerated moderate density counties	.	.	.8
agglomerated rural counties	.	.	.6
urbanized central towns	.	.	1.1
urbanized moderate density counties	.	.	.8
urbanized rural counties	.	.	.8
rural moderate density counties	.	.	.9
rural counties	.	.	.5

. is that there was no data in East Germany

Table 2-2 The Annual Growth Rate of Foreign Population: 1980-92, 1989-92
(percentage)

NAME	AFOR8092	AFOR8992
Total Germany		
agglomerated central towns	.	.
agglomerated high density counties	.	.
agglomerated moderate density counties	.	.
agglomerated rural counties	.	.
urbanized central towns	.	.
urbanized moderate density counties	.	.
urbanized rural counties	.	.
rural moderate density counties	.	.
rural counties	.	.
West Germany		
agglomerated central towns	2.83	6.13
agglomerated high density counties	3.18	8.37
agglomerated moderate density counties	3.88	9.97
agglomerated rural counties	6.93	14.47
urbanized central towns	2.70	6.60
urbanized moderate density counties	3.43	10.23
urbanized rural counties	5.19	12.90
rural moderate density counties	3.33	9.50
rural counties	5.88	14.30
East Germany		
agglomerated central towns	.	.
agglomerated high density counties	.	.
agglomerated moderate density counties	.	.
agglomerated rural counties	.	.
urbanized central towns	.	.
urbanized moderate density counties	.	.
urbanized rural counties	.	.
rural moderate density counties	.	.
rural counties new	.	.

. is that there was no data in East Germany

Table 3-1 International and Internal Migration Rates by Region and Types of Settlement: 1989 (per thousand)

Type	FINR89	FOUTR89	WINR89	WOUTR89	FNET89	WNET89	TNET89
North							
1	26.36	11.12	32.76	29.55	15.23	3.21	18.45
2	14.66	7.53	40.22	33.80	7.13	6.41	13.54
3	15.19	5.70	38.88	33.59	9.49	5.30	14.78
4	12.83	2.92	33.79	30.74	9.91	3.05	12.95
5	44.39	13.12	39.97	55.39	31.27	-15.42	15.85
6	90.32	24.59	33.53	80.18	65.73	-46.64	19.08
7	12.87	3.92	31.57	29.59	8.96	1.98	10.94
8	9.74	2.89	34.87	32.76	6.84	2.61	9.45
9	12.45	2.71	30.90	31.60	9.74	-7.70	9.04
Middle							
1	19.00	8.31	30.26	28.14	10.69	2.12	12.80
2	24.80	6.47	34.03	38.55	18.33	-4.52	13.81
3	16.00	6.40	31.46	23.89	9.59	7.58	17.17
4	13.19	3.18	31.25	23.01	10.00	8.24	18.24
5	20.67	10.03	47.14	44.96	10.65	2.18	12.83
6	15.67	5.09	30.30	26.58	10.58	3.72	14.30
7	19.56	4.09	31.40	31.59	15.47	-1.19	15.27
8	28.01	7.93	30.16	31.52	20.08	-1.36	18.72
9	16.70	4.77	27.70	24.73	11.92	2.97	14.89
South							
1	31.21	17.95	47.09	51.29	13.26	-4.20	9.06
2	19.38	8.50	37.36	36.40	10.88	2.76	13.65
3	18.47	7.96	42.71	35.38	10.51	7.32	17.83
4	19.28	4.46	38.67	31.41	14.82	7.26	22.08
5	26.30	10.88	51.64	53.17	15.42	-1.53	13.88
6	19.69	7.71	37.98	32.03	11.98	5.96	17.93
7	20.20	6.04	31.23	27.26	14.16	3.97	18.13
8	22.17	7.10	37.24	33.43	15.07	3.81	18.88
9	19.00	4.88	34.08	29.55	14.12	4.53	18.65

Type: 1-agglomerated central towns, 2-agglomerated high density counties, 3-agglomerated moderate density counties, 4-agglomerated rural counties, 5-urbanized central towns, 6-urbanized moderate density counties, 7-urbanized rural counties, 8-rural moderate density counties, 9-rural counties

North: Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Niedersachsen, Bremen

Middle: Nordrhein-Westfalen, Hessen, Saarland

South: Baden-Wuerttemberg, Bayern

Table 3-2 International and Internal Migration Rates by Region and Types of Settlement: 1994 (per thousand)

Type	FINR94	FOUTR94	WINR94	WOUTR94	FNETR94	WNET94	TNETR94
North							
1	14.17	10.69	32.66	33.24	3.47	-.59	2.89
2	8.73	7.21	44.23	37.99	1.52	6.23	7.76
3	10.20	8.07	44.94	37.57	2.13	7.37	9.51
4	7.71	6.50	43.68	31.20	1.20	12.48	13.68
5	12.32	8.61	41.24	46.12	3.71	-4.89	-1.17
6	59.39	23.24	38.86	66.62	36.14	-27.76	8.38
7	7.52	5.45	40.67	30.31	2.07	10.36	12.43
8	8.89	5.69	40.81	33.95	3.19	6.86	10.05
9	7.61	5.06	36.24	28.82	2.55	7.41	9.96
Middle							
1	12.94	10.15	28.11	32.59	2.79	-4.48	-1.69
2	12.16	8.20	34.48	33.44	3.96	1.04	5.00
3	9.58	7.84	33.01	26.96	1.74	6.04	7.78
4	8.43	5.78	34.67	25.28	2.66	9.39	12.04
5	13.40	12.57	46.16	51.77	.83	-5.60	-4.77
6	9.48	7.93	34.46	28.06	1.55	6.40	7.94
7	9.95	7.04	34.31	28.85	2.91	5.45	8.36
8	10.56	7.48	33.98	26.66	3.08	7.32	10.40
9	9.71	8.41	30.82	24.24	1.30	6.58	7.88
South							
1	22.98	22.12	41.20	48.62	.86	-7.42	-6.56
2	14.87	13.98	38.13	37.70	.89	.43	1.32
3	33.72	14.10	44.74	54.48	19.61	-9.74	9.88
4	14.54	10.36	41.11	34.76	4.18	6.35	10.53
5	19.37	17.65	54.43	56.66	1.71	-2.23	-.52
6	12.19	11.31	38.93	34.56	.88	4.37	5.26
7	18.14	11.86	33.36	32.25	6.28	1.11	7.39
8	11.12	10.15	37.71	33.80	.98	3.91	4.89
9	11.17	8.37	33.42	29.08	2.79	4.34	7.13

Type: 1-agglomerated central towns, 2-agglomerated high density counties, 3-agglomerated moderate density counties, 4-agglomerated rural counties, 5-urbanized central towns, 6-urbanized moderate density counties, 7-urbanized rural counties, 8-rural moderate density counties, 9-rural counties

North: Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Niedersachsen, Bremen

Middle: Nordrhein-Westfalen, Hessen, Saarland

South: Baden-Wuerttemberg, Bayern

**Table 4-1 The Percentage of Employment Growth and Percentage of Manuf-
 ture and Service Employment: 1989-1993**

Type	EMP8089	EM8993	MAN89P	MAN93P	SER89P	SER93P
North						
1.00	-4.53	6.37	25.32	23.22	66.16	68.12
2.00	-1.02	9.29	32.97	30.43	56.34	59.53
3.00	10.51	15.64	35.49	33.58	56.81	58.52
4.00	7.29	13.27	36.77	35.68	55.15	56.39
5.00	-2.16	4.85	34.54	32.52	56.09	58.45
6.00	1.17	10.24	37.44	35.29	54.64	56.86
7.00	1.34	11.55	40.99	39.29	50.76	52.91
8.00	.76	8.42	34.85	33.84	57.6	58.91
9.00	2.28	11.11	37.67	36.50	53.92	55.45
Middle						
1.00	-2.45	2.83	29.72	27.04	59.33	62.40
2.00	4.26	7.58	40.44	36.93	49.23	52.77
3.00	6.34	7.56	40.24	37.41	50.64	53.88
4.00	6.71	6.29	44.25	40.65	48.62	52.07
5.00	3.22	5.09	26.39	23.62	65.39	68.02
6.00	4.59	8.39	42.26	39.34	49.82	52.68
7.00	2.73	10.36	41.70	39.22	51.42	54.05
8.00	3.67	11.99	39.21	36.96	53.57	55.67
9.00	3.56	10.81	45.22	42.96	47.99	50.30
South						
1.00	1.51	2.80	26.20	23.41	62.13	64.91
2.00	12.33	6.36	40.60	37.12	48.56	51.69
3.00	13.93	10.23	42.75	38.20	48.07	52.38
4.00	14.69	9.71	43.29	40.09	50.21	53.24
5.00	2.60	4.56	32.33	29.45	58.70	61.42
6.00	8.50	8.10	45.10	41.65	47.36	50.43
7.00	12.40	10.03	46.69	43.70	46.00	48.70
8.00	8.00	6.81	44.79	41.44	47.17	50.49
9.00	8.12	8.45	46.91	43.97	46.93	49.72

Type: 1-agglomerated central towns, 2-agglomerated high density counties, 3-agglomerated moderate density counties, 4-agglomerated rural counties, 5-urbanized central towns, 6-urbanized moderate density counties, 7-urbanized rural counties, 8-rural moderate density counties, 9-rural counties

North: Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Niedersachsen, Bremen

Middle: Nordrhein-Westfalen, Hessen, Saarland

South: Baden-Wuerttemberg, Bayern

Table 5-1 the Unstandardized Regression Coefficients of Types of Settlement and Regions on Employment Growth Rates and on Net Migration Rates

	Emp80-89	Emp89-93	Tnet80-92	Tnet89-92
D1	-4.557***	-5.137***	-13.162	-6.755**
D2	4.415***	.687	14.208**	3.797
D3	-2.837	-4.981***	-10.238	.427
D4	1.542	.506	10.286***	8.011***
R1	.783	-3.178	10.210	3.641
R2	7.836***	-2.071	23.898***	6.741***
Emp80-93	-	-	.871***	-
Emp89-93	-	-	-	.358**
Constant	.806	10.833	42.563	33.627
R square	.31	.207	.263	.174
N	327	327	327	327

D1: Central cities of agglomeration;

D2: Suburbs of Agglomeration

D3: Central cities of urbanized areas;

D4: Suburbs of urbanized areas.

R1: Middle region; R2: South region

***P<.001, **P<.01,*P<.05

Table 5-2 The Unstandardized Regression Coefficients of Types of Settlement and Regions on Employment Growth Rates and on Net Migration Rates

	Wnet89	Tnet89	Wnet94	Tnet94
D1	-.998	-1.149	-6.726 ***	-6.647***
D2	-.441	-.570	-.041	.016
D3	-1.758	-.962	-6.669***	-6.672***
D4	-.269	-.011	.318	.449
R1	1.577*	.909	-1.284***	-1.472
R2	3.972**	3.404***	-2.644	-2.772***
Emp 80-89	.065	.063	-	-
Emp89-93	-	-	.390***	.395***
Fnet	-.882***	-	-.963***	-
Constant	11.531	13.639	4.930	5.096
R square	.930	.090	.877	.401
N	327	327	327	327

D1: Central cities of agglomeration;

D2: Suburbs of Agglomeration

D3: Central cities of urbanized areas;

D4: Suburbs of urbanized areas.

R1: Middle region; R2: South region

***P<.001, **P<.01,*P<.05

Table 6 Standard Classification of Local Government Forms Generally Found in the Literature

Constitutional Type	South German Council	North German Council	Magistrat	Strong Mayor
Principle Characteristics				
Sovereignty	Dualistic	Monistic	Trialistic	Dualistic
Form of Executive Leadership	Monocratic	Monocratic	Monocratic and Collegial	Monocratic
Role of Chief Executive in Council	Vote and Chair	Neither Vote nor Chair	Neither Vote nor Chair	Vote and Chair
Mode of Electing Chief Executive	Direct	Indirect	Indirect	Indirect
Old Federal States	Bavaria Baden- Wuerttemberg	North Rhine- Westphalia Lower Saxony*	Hesse* Schleswig- Holstein (large)*	Rhineland- Palatinate* Saarland Schleswig- Holstein (small)*
New Federal States	Brandenburg Saxony Saxon-Anhalt Thuringen (Mecklenburg- Vorpommern**)			

* Both Hesse and Rhineland-Palatinate recently adopted and employed a direct form of electing chief executive. In the recent (September 1996) local government election in Lower Saxony, this innovation was introduced in a number of municipalities. Schleswig-Holstein will soon introduce this change.

** Mecklenburg-Vorpommern is scheduled to introduce direct election of mayor in the near future.

Source: Cusack, Thomas. 1997. "Social Capital, Institutional Structures, and Democratic Performance: A Comparative Study of German Local Governments." FSIII97-201. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin fuer Sozialforschung.

Table 7 Standard Classification of Local Government Forms and Putative Effects

Constitutional Type	South German Council	North German Council	Magistrat	Strong Mayor
Putative Effects				
Political Integration (personal)	3	0	0/1	1
Political Integration (Policy)	3	0	2	2
Openness to Participation and Closeness to Citizens	2	0	0	2/1
Functioning of the Division of Labor between Politics and Administration	2	1	1	2
Minimization of Conflict During Decision Preparation Stages	2	0	2	2
Capacity for Appointing Good Policy Area Specialists	3	3	0	2/1
Fiscal Soundness and Efficiency	3	0/1	1/0	1
Central Control over Bureaucratic Political Ambitions and Interests	3	0	2	2

3 is the strongest in terms of that characteristics, and 0 is the weakest in that characteristics.

Source: the same as Table 6

Table 8 Typology of Nonprofit Organizations on Urban Development

	A	B	C
fighting interests	Direct	Indirect	Indirect
bridging all kinds of resources	Strong	Strong	Strong
providing information and service	Strong	Strong	Strong
researching	None	moderate	Strong
work groups	Many	Many	Many
relations with government	None	Interlocked	
Members	Cities	Individuals and Organizations	Cities
Financial Support	Sufficient Moderate	Shortage	

A: German Association of Cities and Towns

B: National Academy for Regional Research and Regional Planning

C: German Institute of Urban Affairs The author classified these three nonprofit institutes by different dimensions of characteristics from the in-depth interview data.