

MAKING A DIFFERENCE - THE ACCOMMODATION OF REFUGEES IN LEIPZIG AND OSNABRÜCK

SOPHIE HINGER and PHILIPP SCHÄFER

Received 2 October 2018 · Accepted 4 March 2019

Summary: The East-German city Leipzig and the West-German city Osnabrück, the main locations of our research, are among the pioneers of a nationwide movement for the decentralisation of refugee accommodation. At the beginning of the 2010s, local authorities in the two cities decided against housing refugees in mass accommodation centres, instead choosing to support them in leading self-determined lives by facilitating their access to private housing. However, the two cities then responded very differently to the increasing number of people coming to Germany for protection over the course of 2015. Based on empirical observations, this paper discusses an exemplary solution to a major research problem of how to compare the diverse and changing practices and discourses of refugee accommodation in local migration regimes. To find answers to this question, we develop a five-dimensional comparative model, combining the relational rescaling approach of Nina Glick Schiller and Ayşe Çağlar with Henri Lefebvre's spatial constructivist considerations.

Zusammenfassung: Die ostdeutsche Großstadt Leipzig und das westdeutsche Osnabrück, Hauptstandorte unserer Forschungen, gelten als Vorreiter einer bundesweiten Dezentralisierungsbewegung. Gegen den Trend, Geflüchtete in Massenunterkünften unterzubringen, setzte man sich dort bereits Anfang der 2010er Jahre dafür ein, asylsuchenden Personen ein selbstbestimmtes Leben im privaten Wohnraum zu ermöglichen. Auf die im Laufe des Jahres 2015 in immer größerer Zahl nach Deutschland kommenden Schutzsuchenden fanden die beiden Städte dann jedoch sehr unterschiedliche Antworten. Anhand dieser empirischen Beobachtungen diskutiert unser Paper exemplarisch Auswege aus einem grundsätzlichen Forschungsproblem: Wie lassen sich die unterschiedlichen und im Wandel befindlichen Praktiken und Diskurse der Aufnahme und Unterbringung Geflüchteter in und durch lokale Migrationsregime vergleichen? Zur Beantwortung dieser Frage kombinieren wir den relationalen rescaling-Ansatz der Autorinnen Nina Glick Schiller und Ayşe Çağlar mit den raumkonstruktivistischen Überlegungen Henri Lefebvres. Aufbauend auf diesen Arbeiten entwickeln wir ein fünfdimensionales Modell, das uns einen systematischen Vergleich und Erklärungsansätze für Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede zwischen den beiden Städten ermöglicht.

Keywords: comparative research, local migration regimes, cities, accommodation, refugees, Germany

1 Struggles around the decentralisation of refugee housing

When we started the fieldwork for our PhD research projects on the negotiation of (refugee) migration in the East-German city Leipzig and the West-German city Osnabrück in 2014, the issue of refugee accommodation moved into the focus of public attention, as more refugees arrived not only on European shores, but also in German cities and villages. However, neither we, nor our interlocutors had a premonition of the dynamics that lay ahead in and after the “long summer of migration” (KASPAREK and SPEER 2015) with its multiple crises. Whereas the European leaders sought to close the routes via the Mediterranean and the Balkans as quickly as possible, on the local level, authorities and civil society initiatives negotiated the accommodation of the newcomers. Our main sites of research were the two German

cities, but we also worked and conducted research in other European cities in France and England. Being “here and there” (KNOWLES 2003) in geographical terms, as well as the constant exchange between the two of us allowed us to observe how differently the migration dynamics were perceived and dealt with not only by different European member states but also by different localities – across national borders and within the same state.

We noted, for example, a divergent dynamic in the organisation of housing for refugees in our two German field sites. Prior to the increasing arrivals, at the beginning of the 2010s, the local governments of Leipzig and Osnabrück had adopted concepts to accommodate refugees in a *decentralised way* – that is, not in mass accommodation centres, but in small-scale facilities and private flats in different residential areas of the city (SL 2012; SO 2013). The local authorities wanted to *make a difference* – in contrast

to other city municipalities and the regional authorities, which continued to accommodate refugees for many months or even years in big compounds with little to no privacy and self-determination. While Leipzig and Osnabrück took a similar direction in the organisation of refugee housing in 2012/13, their accommodation plans were challenged and – in different ways – re-negotiated in the following months and years. The arrival of rising numbers of refugees, especially in 2015/16, was framed as a ‘state of emergency’ in Leipzig and was increasingly met with hostile reactions. The crisis discourse in turn served to legitimate a renewed *camp approach* to refugee housing. In Osnabrück, on the other hand, the city authorities were keen to underline that they did not experience the increasing arrival of refugees since 2013 as a ‘crisis’, maintaining and even further developing their decentralisation concept.

In this paper, the negotiation of refugee¹⁾ accommodation practices in Leipzig and Osnabrück will serve as an empirical basis for discussing a broader methodological question: Namely, how to compare the way (refugee) migration is dealt with in different localities? And what insights can we (not) gain through such a comparison? *Making a difference* is thus both a description of our empirical phenomenon and of our analytical endeavour. The merits and methods of comparative research are widely discussed within the social sciences. We base our considerations primarily on literature that argues for a relational and space-sensitive comparative approach. From such a perspective, making a difference means relating cities not as two mutually exclusive contexts, but as interconnected articulations of processes that stretch across space, and that are localised at the same time. In the next section, we will further develop such a relational comparative perspective, drawing on the re-scaling approach of GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR (2009) and the work of the French philosopher LEFEBVRE (1991) on the social production of space. In a third section, we will explain how we have used these theoretical impulses and our empirical material to form five analytical dimensions for the study of

urban practices and spaces of asylum. These will be illustrated in a fifth section, on the basis of empirical spotlights from our two case studies.

2 How to compare local migration regimes

Comparative perspectives have a long tradition in the study of migration. However, due to the interdisciplinary nature of the field of research, such endeavours sometimes differ significantly in what they compare and how they compare. This applies in particular to the study of the structures, processes and institutions through which migration is governed and regulated. For a long time, social scientists have compared different national migration and integration models and policies (BRUBAKER 1992; FAHRMEIR et al. 2003). In recent years, migration scholars have repeatedly called for a *local turn* (GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2011; MARTINIELLO 2013). They emphasise the local scope of action for the inclusion of migrants, especially in urban contexts. The sometimes significant variations between cities regarding the governance of migration and migrants, some authors argue, can be put down to local geographic, social, economic and political-administrative particularities (BLOEMRAAD 2013; BOESE and PHILLIPS 2018). Others point to the effects that diverging national political traditions have on local attempts to integrate migrants (DEKKER et al. 2015); the variance and lack of standardisation of international and federal migration and asylum laws (SCHAMMANN 2015); the decentralisation and uneven distribution of state responsibilities and power resources (SCHMIDTKE 2014; PENNINX and GARCÉS-MASCARENAS 2016); or differing cultural factors that promote or limit the accommodation of migrants in cities (JAWORSKY et al. 2012). In their turn to the local, however, many of these contributions remain attached to a container-like understanding of space that conceptualises locality mainly as an administrative unit. So far, comparative local migration research has paid (too) little attention to space-sensitive perspectives. Rooted in constructivist and mostly praxis-theoretical perspectives, the latter examine the interplay of site-specific and space-producing practices of governing migration and are thus also able to account for political reactions to migration movements beyond state-dominated spatial conceptions (HINGER et al. 2016; DARLING 2017; POTT 2018). In the following, we want to highlight the potential of the migration regime perspective for the spatially sensitive analysis of local practices and policies of governing migration.

¹⁾ We use the term ‘refugee’ not in its legal sense, but in the broad sense of a person seeking asylum or protection. Following this line of thought, we understand the contested attempts to control and regulate asylum and the lives of asylum-seeking persons as part of the multi-scalar project of governing migration. From this perspective, a clear separation between the governance of migration and the governance of flight and refugees – and thus also a clear separation between refugee studies on the one and migration studies on the other hand – appear empirically and conceptually misleading.

2.1 Localising migration regimes

Regime theory, originally coined and used in political sciences (KRASNER 1983), seeks to describe the emergence and dynamics of (international) institutions through which state and non-state actors cooperate and negotiate issues of potential conflict, which cannot be regulated by one state or by the states alone. In recent years, the regime concept has received increased attention in migration research, resulting in various interpretations of what a migration regime is (HORVATH et al. 2017; CVAJNER et al. 2018). Despite the plethora of epistemological foundations, methodological approaches and empirical focuses, the spatial conditions and space-producing effects of migration regimes still need to be further explored both empirically and theoretically. By adopting a spatially sensitive regime perspective, we avoid considering spatial conditions and references such as local, regional, national or transnational as given. Instead, we examine how spatial frameworks and references are created and used and how social differentiations and forms of special treatment are linked to specific places (HINGER et al. 2016). By questioning both the local conditions and the localising effects of the practices and politics of governing migration, the regime concept helps to reconstruct the “significance of spaces, places, and borders for migration processes and their consequences, for the emergence and change of migration regimes, or for the negotiation of specific migration conditions” (POTT 2018, 108).² From such a perspective, the focus of observation shifts towards “scaling as a (often interest-driven) mechanism of production, hierarchisation, and linking of different places and spatial dimensions” (ibid., 125). Thus, social practices are not only differentiated horizontally, according to different places or sites, but also vertically, i.e. on different scales (POTT and TSIANOS 2014, 125). Attempts to control and regulate migration, for example, are produced on and through different scales, while migrants themselves act as scale-makers in a variety of ways (GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2011).

2.2 The re-scaling of cities and the three dimensions of space

Building on Neil Smith and Erik A. Swyngedouw’s conceptualisations of social phenomena via different *scales* (SMITH 1992; SWYNGEDOUW

² All quotations from German sources were translated into English by us.

2004), GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR (2009) postulate a connection between the incorporation of migrants in and the scalar repositioning of cities. Global neoliberalisation processes, they argue, have led to a shift of economic competition from the national to the sub-national and city level (see also BRENNER 2004). Politically constructed spatial units such as urban, regional, national or global are blurred against this background and can no longer be understood as a “nested set of territorial relationships” (GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2009, 179). Given the need to compete for (state) investments, cities are striving to position themselves in the global market through city marketing. GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR describe the “repositioning of the status and significance of cities, both in relationship to states and within global hierarchies of urban-based institutional power” (ibid.) as a *rescaling* process.

Highlighting the influence of migration in this process, the authors show, how the conditions and political strategies in and through which urban migration and integration policies are pursued have changed, and they emphasise the role of migrants as *scale makers* in the process. Faced with the challenge of having to reinvent the city as a global brand, the agents of urban neoliberalisation are incentivised to relate positively to migrants and promote their physical presence. In addition, migrants are embedded in transnational networks, “that can link cities to flows of capital, goods, ideas, new ideas and cultural representations.” (ibid., 189). Although all cities “are part and parcel of the same on-going processes of reconstructing and reimagining place” (GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2011, 5), GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR argue that cities are differently scaled and accordingly offer different local opportunity structures for migrants (ibid., 2).

Even though the approach proposed by GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR has some limitations³, their scaling concept and focus on local history, actor constellations and dynamics provide a fruitful analytical perspective for a comparison of urban migration regimes. This is especially the case when it is combined with space-theoretical considerations that allow for a deeper analysis of the urban practices and spaces of

³ The categorisation of cities on the basis of their position in global hierarchies of power and the rather narrow focus on the connection between migration and economic urban development risks reproducing conceptions of a linear urban development and overlooking all those diverse, also non-economic, socio-political processes of change, which cities undergo in a global society on the move.

asylum, which form a specific part of local or urban migration regimes. Asylum-seeking persons, especially when housed in temporary shelters, often experience a state of limbo or in-between (KOBELINSKY 2010; CABOT 2014). Life in a shelter procedurally and temporally succeeds the arrival and precedes incorporation policies and processes (the latter forming the focus in GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR's work). For the comparative analysis of urban spaces of asylum, we propose to additionally draw on the space-theoretical work of HENRI LEFEBVRE.

2.3 The production of spaces of asylum

LEFEBVRE has shown that space is always socially produced (LEFEBVRE 1991). According to LEFEBVRE, changes in social conditions have always been accompanied by changes on a spatial level. Space is made; space is changeable; and these processes are interwoven. This becomes clear from LEFEBVRE's three dimensions (and moments in the social production) of space: 1) a physical dimension (perceived space); 2) a mental dimension (conceived space or representations of space); and 3) a social dimension (lived space) (LEFEBVRE 1991, 11). The fundamental consequence of this perspective is that we do not examine space, but the social production of space, which in turn is to be understood as a spatiotemporal theory of social practice (SCHMID 2010). Any operationalisation of LEFEBVRE's thinking is difficult because of the fragmentary and metaphorical nature of his work (ibid., 14ff). Nevertheless, his oeuvre provides a source of inspiration for both political and academic practice. On the one hand, social movements aiming to bring about changes in (urban) society draw on LEFEBVRE and especially his idea of a "right to the city" (LEFEBVRE 1996). On the other hand, there are a number of empirical studies that have implemented and further developed LEFEBVRE's perspective (VOGELPOHL 2012; RÖSSEL 2014; BERTUZZO 2009). Recent analyses of the production of practices and "spaces of asylum" have also taken a Lefebvrian approach (JAHRE 2014; BLANK forthcoming). With LEFEBVRE, spaces of asylum constitute more than "architecturally conceived spaces that serve the registration, examination, and accommodation of refugees in host states." (DAUSS 2016, 83). For example, in a paper presented at the 11th IMISCOE Conference in Madrid in August 2014, SYLVANA JAHRE used LEFEBVRE's framework to distinguish between the material dimension of refugee housing, its regulation and its representation in her

study of refugee accommodation in Berlin. In a similar vein, a current research project at the University of Frankfurt adopts a Lefebvrian perspective in order to investigate how urban asylum regimes are constituted through (locally) specific constellations and (inter-) relations between actors, discourses and materialities. In conjunction with the comparative rescaling perspective proposed by GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR (2011), LEFEBVRE's three-dimensional spatial theory thus promises to provide us with an appropriate vocabulary to formulate answers to the research problem addressed in this paper.

3 Data and methodology

In light of the literature discussed above, we will now explicate how we compared practices and spaces of asylum in the two German cities we studied. The data on which we build our considerations was generated during several years of research (2014–2017) at both sites, using a range of research methods. These included semi-structured expert interviews, participant observations, informal exchanges and the analysis of written documents (newspaper articles, policy documents, material developed by various NGOs). Even though our research projects were largely developed and carried out independently, we stayed in touch throughout the process regarding our empirical findings and theoretical considerations. This exchange mainly took the form of a relational comparison: We used the cities "to pose questions of one another" (WARD 2010, 480). For this article, we chose the accommodation of refugees as a focus, not only because it marks the beginning of municipal responsibility in the asylum process – and implies room for manoeuvre which is used in different ways – but also because the opening of accommodation centres for asylum-seeking persons repeatedly leads to severe conflicts and thus becomes the focal point of local negotiations of (refugee) migration. We sought to formulate analytical categories that would allow us to systematically compare and relate our sites with regard to refugee housing but that could also be applied to other fields of practice in local migration regimes.

The first dimension, mostly inspired by our reading of GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR's work, is the cities' positioning and (migration) history. According to the authors, the relationship between migrants and cities is "shaped by the positionality of cities within economic, political, and cultural fields of power." (GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2011, 3). While we

do not follow the quite rigid categorisation of cities according to their scalar position, we do think it is necessary to consider local economic, public and cultural factors of the cities, in order to understand how a city accommodates migrants. Like GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR we also deem it necessary to highlight how cities' "complex layers of social history and social structure result in specific local forms of incorporation built on place-specific representations, legacies and expectations" (GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2009, 196). Depending on the local migration history, perceptions of (refugee) migration vary, as do institutional experiences in dealing with (refugee) migration and support infrastructures. For the purpose of this paper, we use official statistics, documents, newspaper articles and interviews to introduce the migration history and economic positioning of both cities.

Our second analytical dimension, which also ties in with a (local) migration regimes perspective, refers to the local actors and the (power) relations among them. Like GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR (2009, 189), we see migrants and non-migrants alike as scale- and place-makers. Hence, we place urbanites with different legal statuses, newcomers as well as long established residents, in the same analytical framework. LEFEBVRE was also interested in the way different actors engaged in (the production of) space, and especially in all heterodox spatial practices (1991, 419-22). In the empirical spotlights that we have selected for this article, we do not focus so much on the everyday construction of 'counter-spaces' by individuals (e.g. the residents of an accommodation centre). Still, our discussion of the de- and re-centralization of refugee housing alludes to LEFEBVRE's idea that change "can only spring from interaction and counter-plans, projects and counter-projects" (ibid., 419). In other words, we see the (regulation of) refugee accommodation as a negotiated or contested practice, which is also co-produced by refugees themselves. We identified and analysed the local actor constellations at both research sites during ethnographic field trips and through the reconstructive analysis of interviews with (street level) bureaucrats, refugees and activists, among others. In our field notes and observation protocols on the everyday-life in mass accommodation centres, from committee meetings or public information events, as well as in our interview transcripts, a specific network of actors with contentious and/or cooperative relationships became visible.

Doing Asylum Regulation, our third comparative dimension, describes a space of social practices inhabited and produced by the residents of the municipal accommodation centres, administrative and other

city employees, volunteers, activists and anti-migrant initiatives. Our considerations are informed on the one hand by practice-theoretical and constructivist migration regime approaches, and on the other hand by HENRI LEFEBVRE's reflections on spaces of representation, i.e. *lived space*. This space is charged with meaningful everyday practices, and yet it is a controlled space (LEFEBVRE 1991, 39). Those investigating lived spaces, Lefebvre criticises, often forget to "set them alongside those representations of space which coexist, concord or interfere with them; they even more frequently ignore social practice." (ibid., 41) From this perspective, *Doing Asylum Regulation* is not merely a description of migrant and non-migrant everyday practices, but describes a space governed by state and non-state actors, institutions and processes alike.

Spatial representations, our fourth dimension, form the „dominant space in any society (or mode of production)“ (ibid., 39) according to LEFEBVRE. The space we describe here is the space of urban planners, administrative staff, politicians and marketers. The space they produce in numerous documents, strategy papers and concepts is a conceived space "shot through with a knowledge (*savoir*) – i.e. a mixture of understanding (*connaissance*) and ideology – which is always relative and in the process of change." (Ibid., 41; italic in the original). We extracted this spatial, more or less ideologised knowledge from the municipal accommodation concepts, press releases, transcripts of city committee meetings, local party programmes and strategy papers, as well as local newspaper articles.

Our fifth and final analytical dimension, the material component of urban asylum regimes, refers to what is usually understood as space, that is, for example, buildings, streets, ensembles of places. LEFEBVRE also referred to this dimension as "perceived space" and underlined the importance of the body in its production (ibid., 40). LEFEBVRE as well as GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR are, as Marxian thinkers, not interested in the physical or built world *as such*, but in the way people interact with it and what this tells us about a specific (urban) society and its mode of production (LEFEBVRE 1991, 172-174; GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR 2011, 14-16). In a similar vein, we examine the physical dimension of refugee accommodation as part of the social interrelations in the city. We detected the physical dimension of the social production of spaces of asylum through numerous visits in accommodation centres, participant observation and exchanges with the people living and working in these centres.

4 Comparing refugee housing in Osnabrück and Leipzig

Building on the literature discussed in the previous sections, we re-evaluated our empirical material on the practices and politics of governing migration in Leipzig and Osnabrück through the five analytical dimensions operationalised above: 1) (Economic) positioning and (migration) history; 2) Local actor constellation; 3) Regulative accommodation practices 4) Representations of refugee accommodation; 5) Materiality of Spaces of Asylum.

4.1 (Economic) positioning and migration history

A few structural and historical similarities and differences between Leipzig and Osnabrück make a multifaceted and deep comparison possible. Although today Leipzig is considered the fastest growing metropolis in Germany, the city has a long history of shrinking and out-migration (RINK et al. 2012). Between 1933 and 1998, Leipzig's population decreased from about 713,000 to about 437,000 inhabitants. The German Democratic Republic had made little effort to open the country to immigration. Only few immigrants came as guest workers, students and apprentices from socialist 'brother states'. In the turbulent post-reunification years, 100,000 persons left the city. Against the background of high unemployment and widespread xenophobia, the migrant population remained permanently low and limited to three groups: Jewish contingent refugees, so-called 'late repatriates'⁴⁾ and refugees (WEISS 2009). At the end of the 1990s, however, re-urbanisation processes began. Numerous private and public – national and European – investments enabled the city to reinvent itself as a booming tourism and service location. Unemployment in the city has fallen significantly in recent years (SL 2017b), as have vacancy rates (SL 2017a). These recent urban developments have had an impact especially on the Leipzig housing market. People with low incomes have particular difficulties in finding suitable housing. In addition to this difficulty, refugees are exposed to numerous forms

⁴⁾ Individuals considered to be ethnic Germans, living in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc have been granted permission to settle in German since the Second World War. Their migration has been framed as 'repatriation'. Until the end of the 1980s, the so-called 'repatriates' came mostly from Poland and Romania and settled in West Germany. Since the early 1990s, the (late) repatriates who settle in the reunified Germany mostly come from the former Soviet Union.

of discrimination (HUMMEL et al. 2017). At the end of 2017, the city was home to over 590,000 people (SL 2017b). In recent years, city officials have made increasing efforts to attract and politically represent migrants, as evidenced, among other things, by the constitution of a 'Migrants' Council' in 2009 and the establishment of a Welcome Centre in 2018. With over 14 per cent, migrants now form a growing part of Leipzig's urban population (SL 2018a).

Osnabrück's population has slowly, but steadily grown since the post-war years. Around the turn of the millennium, the number of inhabitants decreased slightly because of low birth and immigration rates, but it has climbed back up to over 168,000 residents since 2016 (SO 2018). The population has grown above all thanks to (mainly student) immigration from the surrounding rural areas and international immigration. As the city administration proudly notes in its statistics, one in three residents has a 'migration background'⁵⁾ (SO 2016a). Between the late 1950s and 1970s, so-called 'guest-workers' came to work in Osnabrück. Moreover, the city accommodated many 'repatriates' in the post-war years as well as after the fall of the Berlin Wall. While the West German government did not consider integration policies necessary, because it did not recognise Germany as an 'immigration country', the municipality of Osnabrück developed integration policies early on and established a municipal 'Foreigners Council' as early as 1972 (SO n.d.). While some of the 'foreign workers' and repatriates returned to their countries of origin or moved on to other places, many stayed on and shaped the city. Concurrent with the arrival of significant numbers of repatriates in the late 1980s/early 1990s, the city also saw a peak in the number of individuals seeking asylum (Interview with Social Welfare Officer, 14.1.2016). Even though asylum-seeking persons were not explicitly targeted by integration measures before 2013, already in the 1980s, an infrastructure was developed for their support, mostly consisting of non-governmental, partly religious initiatives. Today, as in the past, newcomers – especially if they are identified as foreigners, have a low income, and an insecure residence permit – face great difficulties in finding adequate housing (ibid.). Affordable housing is scarce and the city has little ability to influence the housing market as the municipal housing society was sold in 2002.

⁵⁾ This refers to individuals who are not born with German citizenship or who have at least one parent who is not born German.

Both cities thus have a history of accommodating (international) migrants, even though these histories differ and obviously reflect the long-standing divide between the two German states. What is important to note is that migration to Leipzig and Osnabrück is not so much characterised by the international migration of highly skilled professionals looking for an attractive place to live and work, but rather is a product of dispersal.

While Leipzig has been celebrated as the ‘new Berlin’ (BISCHOF 2015), that is, a cultural hotspot that attracts visitors from everywhere, and although unemployment rates in the city have also fallen significantly (SL 2018b), Leipzig lacks the differentiated job market of many major West German cities. Osnabrück has a low unemployment rate thanks to a flourishing local economy, but many students leave the city after finishing their studies for more varied employment opportunities and a more cosmopolitan lifestyle in bigger cities (SO 2016b).

4.2 Actors in local migration regimes

Tying in with the first attempt to position the two cities in the last section, this section will explore the dynamic actor constellations, which shape local migration regimes. These constellations involve state, semi-state and non-state actors, who pursue different interests and dispose of different resources to enforce their interests. While there are many similarities between the two German cities concerning the actors involved in negotiating refugee accommodation, there are also several differences, which help us to understand the diverging dynamics in the two cities since 2015.

In both Leipzig and Osnabrück, the administrative responsibility for the organisation of refugee housing lies with the municipal Social Welfare Departments.⁶ In the years preceding the adoption of the decentralisation plans, they accommodated the few individuals allocated to the cities without political controversy. This is not to say that there were no initiatives demanding better accommodation conditions for refugees – in Osnabrück the association *Exil* and others had been demanding the decentralisation of refugee housing since the mid-1980s (Interview with a founding member of *Exil*, January 24, 2017), as had the Leipzig Refugee Council since the mid-1990s.

⁶ In some German municipalities, Public Orders Offices and Foreigners’ Authorities are in charge, which arguably has an impact of how the issue is treated.

However, the appeals of refugee rights activists “did not have much public resonance. That is, you basically had to fight alone”, as a founding member of the Leipzig Refugee Council remembered (Interview November 1, 2016). This changed when more refugees were allocated to the municipalities in the 2010s.

The development of the decentralisation plans and the accommodation of thousands of asylum-seeking persons throughout the long summer of migration led to a multiplication and diversification of the actors involved in negotiating refugee housing. The Osnabrück concept, for example, introduced proactive social work in the accommodation centres in collaboration with the Catholic charity organisation Caritas and the children and youth welfare organisation *Outlaw*. In Leipzig, especially over the course of 2015, numerous non-state actors were entrusted with the opening and daily operation of shelters; these included charity organisations like the Red Cross, the *Johanniter*, and the *Malteser* but also the army and private companies, especially for security services. In addition to the state and non-state actors officially organising or operating refugee accommodation, volunteer initiatives have increasingly shaped the everyday life in the accommodation centres. In both cities, volunteers had served as guides or support for newcomers well before the long summer of migration. However, the number of people volunteering in 2015/16 and the scope of their engagement was unprecedented. Many volunteers got involved in the framework of neighbourhood-associations, which emerged with the opening of accommodation centres in different residential areas of the cities. Moreover, throughout 2015, volunteers stepped in because of the deteriorating living conditions in some of the accommodation centres, an increasing hostility against refugees, especially in Leipzig, and increasing difficulties of the institutional actors to provide the newcomers with decent housing, basic guidance and information. Some of the new volunteers joined the long-established migrant support organisations and antiracist initiatives in their protests against the tightening of asylum laws on the regional and (supra-) national level and for the improvement of living conditions for refugees in the city, whereas others defined the motivation for their intervention as mainly humanitarian. In both cities, but especially in Osnabrück, Protestant and Catholic parishes as well as Muslim congregations were highly engaged in supporting the newcomers, including through the provision of living spaces (NIEHAUS 2016). Unlike Leipzig, where Christian-motivated refugee support depends above all on individual initiatives and actors, Osnabrück is strongly characterised by the influ-

ence of the Christian churches. As the deacon of a Catholic church who was also part of a local ‘Alliance against deportations’ told us, Christian groups in Osnabrück have often cooperated with left-wing non-religious groups, because they share an “indignation” over the way refugees are treated and a desire to help (Interview 22.7.2015). For those living in the accommodation centres, the volunteers represented additional contacts and the chance to acquire information about their own living situation, the asylum procedure and life in Germany, which was otherwise not accessible to them. Partly in alliance with activists and volunteers, refugees increasingly participated in negotiating the conditions of their housing. For example, in an open letter to the mayor of Leipzig, they sought to draw attention to their living conditions and demanded a right to “learn German, work and get out of this prison” (OL 2015). In both cities, grassroots movements have formed based on alliances between residents, with and without a secure residence status, struggling for a ‘solidarity city’, that is “a city, where no one is deported, everyone can move freely and without fear, no one is asked for papers, and no one is illegal.” (SOLIDARITY CITY n.d.)

Whereas in Osnabrück, civil society initiatives were exclusively focused on supporting newcomers, in Leipzig, there were also negative reactions. In Leipzig, as in many other places in Germany, citizens’ initiatives have mobilised – on the streets, at the numerous information events and on the net – to prevent the accommodation of refugees in their neighbourhoods. For example, the brochure of an initiative against the opening of a regional centre for the initial reception of refugees (*Erstaufnahmeeinrichtung*) in a former hospital states that the arrival of numerous refugees traumatised by wars and unfamiliar with local legal and cultural habits would threaten the local idyll, making families and children insecure and lowering local property prices (WAGNER 2014). Against the backdrop of weekly demonstrations by the extremist LEGIDA-movement in Leipzig, an offshoot of the Dresden-based Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamisation of the West (PEGIDA), attacks against refugees and their accommodations and homes rose drastically (RAA 2015, 2016; AAS 2018). In Osnabrück, right wing extremist groups are not a part of the local political scenery and, unlike in most other municipalities in Germany, the new extremist right-wing party Alternative für Deutschland (AFD) has managed to gain only very little voter support. There were also no demonstrations against refugee accommodation and no known incident of xenophobic violence against refugees or refugee housing.

As we have shown, the degree to which everyday life in local migration regimes is defined by conflict varies. While antagonistic positions concerning refugee housing also came to the fore in Osnabrück, these mostly consisted in demands to ameliorate the reception and accommodation conditions. Compared to this, the struggles in Leipzig have been more violent, due largely to the strong position of right wing groups and opinions in the city. This supports the argument that the local actor constellations and dynamics matter when it comes to how migration in general, and asylum in particular, is handled.

4.3 Doing asylum regulation

The previous explanations have shown that a changing set of actors influences how refugees are treated in local migration regimes. We will now focus on the role of interactive dynamics and negotiation practices for the production of specific local spaces of asylum. In both Leipzig and Osnabrück, the decisions taken in 2012/13 to decentralise the accommodation of refugees were not only preceded by sometimes-heated debates; they also initiated further discussions on where and how to accommodate refugees in the city. These negotiation processes, we argue, can be seen as ordering attempts both influenced by specific spaces and contributing to the production of these spaces, in turn.

Contradicting the principle of limiting refugees with insecure residence statuses to accommodation centres, the Saxon city Leipzig and the lower-Saxon Osnabrück decided at the beginning of the 2010s to make official what was already common practice: namely, decentralised refugee housing. At that time, more than 60 per cent of refugees in Leipzig and 47 per cent of refugees in Osnabrück already lived in apartments, which were either rented by the city or by the refugees directly (SL 2012, 11; SO 2013, 9). In 2012 and 2013 respectively, Leipzig and Osnabrück adopted decentralisation plans promoting the accommodation of asylum-seeking persons in private flats.

Up to the 2000s, refugees in the Free State of Saxony were mainly housed in mass accommodations, isolated from everyday life in the cities and villages and often dependent on supplied food and coupons. Under increasing public pressure from anti-racist groups and refugee organisations, the leading heads of the Leipzig Social Administration decided to “enable all asylum seekers assigned to and living in Leipzig, as well as foreigners with an absence to leave (*Duldung*), to live in dignity, taking into ac-

count their special situation and needs” (SL 2012, 4). Willing to make a difference, they found inspiration in some West German cities such as Nuremberg and Stuttgart and their efforts to include migrants in city social life. After a two-year long ‘decentralisation debate’, the City Council adopted a new accommodation concept in 2012. Taking advantage of a statutory provision that allowed refugees to be accommodated in private living space during asylum proceedings under certain – primarily humanitarian – circumstances, the newly adopted concept emphasised the self-determination of refugees and established criteria for decent housing in the city (ibid.).

In Osnabrück, a first resolution by the City Council against the long-term housing of refugees in mass accommodation centres was passed in 2007, following protests of civil society initiatives and residents of the regional ‘reception centre’ in the nearby town of Bramsche. In 2013, when the numbers of refugees allocated to the city slowly started to rise, the City Council adopted a two-stage model of refugee housing. This concept was also the result of negotiations between municipal actors and civil society groups, and it was inspired by decentralisation plans of other cities, like Leverkusen, Cologne and also Leipzig (SO 2013). Although the social welfare office had to provide accommodation for more than 4,000 refugees in the following years, Osnabrück never had a crisis debate (SO 2018). Even the opening of several large and medium-sized interim accommodation centres over the course of 2015/16 did not draw any visible negative reactions. On the contrary: in 2015, local authorities decided that all refugees, regardless of their status and supposed vulnerability, could move directly into a flat. In December 2014, the local community even welcomed the opening of a federal initial reception centre in a former hospital.⁷⁾ In addition to humanitarian reasons motivating it, this decision was advantageous for the continuation of the decentralisation plan, because fewer asylum-seeking persons were allocated to municipalities with reception centres.

In contrast to Osnabrück, the practices and discourses of housing refugees in Leipzig shifted away from consensus over time. In the face of accelerating migration dynamics and increasingly hostile reactions, the city officials had difficulties in finding suitable accommodation. Only one year after the adoption of the decentralisation plan, the City Council

passed a reformulated three-stage housing model, which is still officially in force. But given that the number of asylum-seeking persons living in the city increased fivefold between 2011 and 2015 (SL 2016), this plan also proved difficult to implement. At the beginning, the adherence to mass housing was justified by the fact that it was the only way to prevent the opening of emergency shelters in urban sports halls, as the Mayor of Leipzig put it in an interview with the local newspaper (MEINE and STAEUBERT 2018). But over the course of 2015, the way the reception and accommodation of refugees in the city were negotiated and practised changed quite drastically. The revival of mass accommodation and emergency shelters for temporarily housing the many newcomers presented a de facto interruption of the city’s decentralisation policy.

4.4 The conception and representation of (refugee) migration and the city

Local migration regimes, as we have shown, are constantly negotiated. In this section we will turn to the categories, constructions and perceptions of (refugee) migration and urban society that are voiced and compete with each other in such negotiation processes. The dominant representations of migrants in the city are affected by and affect the way migrants are accommodated. This interrelation between discourses or representations and practices of asylum also helps us to understand the diverging developments in Leipzig and Osnabrück.

In Leipzig, the official conception and representation of refugee migration changed with the debates around the ‘refugee crisis’. The city had previously welcomed refugees as a potentially beneficial part of an increasingly diverse and cosmopolitan urban society and had made their empowerment and integration through decentralised housing an official aim of local policy (SL 2012). However, this conception was increasingly replaced by a crisis discourse in 2015/16, which was accompanied by representations of the newcomers as a threat and/or as victims. This double-edged representation was closely related to the reactions to the (planned) arrival of refugees – with support initiatives on the one hand and anti-refugee protests on the other. The online platform of the main local newspaper, as well as the information events organised to inform residents about the openings of accommodation centres, were increasingly turned into stages dominated by right-wing groups and citizens voicing their hostility towards the cos-

⁷⁾ In these centres refugees are registered, await the start of their asylum procedure, the allocation to a municipality, or their deportation.

mopolitan society and their new neighbours to be. These actors painted a vision of a city threatened by increasing migration, in which traditional values such as family, neighbourliness and security were eroding. The hostile agitation of some citizens also left its mark on the official treatment of the newcomers. While city officials still publicly highlighted the ethical obligation to help refugees as people in need, the coordinates of what was meant by humanitarian assistance changed. While in 2012 ‘decentralised’ had meant respecting the privacy of the refugees and promoting their self-determination, in the turbulent times of 2014/15 this turned into “warm, safe, and well-fed” (MEINE and STAEUBERT 2018).

In Osnabrück, the representation of refugees in the city was rather stable throughout the long summer of migration. Local officials highlighted that Osnabrück had not experienced the arrival of refugees since 2014/15 as a ‘refugee crisis’, thanks in part to the 2013 concept for the [decentralised] accommodation and integration of refugees (SO 2018, 6). At least since the 2013 concept, the city authorities had recognised refugees as an integral part of urban society and framed their accommodation and integration as a humanitarian obligation and as a chance for the growing and dynamic urban society. The framing of refugees as victims in need of help clearly dominated public debates in Osnabrück. Unlike in Leipzig, voices against the accommodation of refugees in the city remained confined to the online platform of the local newspaper. Citizens wanting to support the newcomers and to ensure their decent accommodation dominated the information events.

Interestingly, time and again, local authorities and citizens alike employed Osnabrück’s official city brand as the *city of peace* in the debates. Solidarity initiatives and refugee activists have used the city brand to put pressure on local decision-makers to accommodate more refugees and to ensure decent living conditions in the city (e.g. EAI 2017). In turn, the local authorities have referred to the solidarity initiatives as a proof of the lived culture of peace and tolerance in the city (e.g. Interview with the Director of the Municipal Peace Culture Office, 21.6.2015). Underlining that Osnabrück presented a ‘safe haven’ for thousands of protection-seeking persons (SO 2018, 6) was also a way to cast a positive light on the city (administration). This proves the point that cities increasingly (attempt to) use migration, migration-based diversity and its handling as locational factors in the inter-communal competition for financial and human resources (SCHMIZ

2017; PÜTZ and RODATZ 2013). In Leipzig, the accommodation of refugees has similarly served to reinforce the city’s image as the cosmopolitan *trade fair city*, as a cultural centre with international reputation and as one of the main sites of the *peaceful revolution*. Many residents and local authorities are proud to set Leipzig apart from the rest of Saxony, which is infamous for its right-wing and xenophobic political landscape. The fact that right-wing protest groups also explicitly refer to the German Democratic Republic’s civil rights movement and use its slogans – „We are the people“ („Wir sind das Volk“) being the most well-known – makes it increasingly difficult for the Leipzig city administration to refer positively to the city’s history as a place of resistance.

In both cities, different representations of city space and the arrival of refugees thus coexist and compete with each other. On the one hand, refugees are represented as an integral and valuable part of a heterogeneous urban society, as illustrated by the use of this topic for city-marketing purposes. On the other hand, refugees are conceived as a threat to a city space that is imagined as a homogenous unit. The latter representation became especially dominant in Leipzig following the increased arrival of refugees in 2015, which in turn had an impact on how and where the newcomers were accommodated, as we will further explore in the next section.

4.5 The built world of urban asylum

Local migration regimes can also be distinguished through their material dimension. (Refugee) migration and the way it is dealt with depend on the local built infrastructure and are, in turn, inscribed in it. Where and how refugees are accommodated depends not only on the available housing stock but also influences whether and how buildings are constructed, renovated and used. What is more, the place refugees occupy in the city – in spatial terms – often also reflects the opportunities they have in urban society. In this final section, we will compare the changing built world of refugee accommodation in Osnabrück and Leipzig.

Working from the idea that the social position of refugees in the city can be ameliorated through a change and upgrading of the physical environment, in 2012/13, the local authorities of Leipzig and Osnabrück decided to promote the accommodation of refugees in private flats. At that time, the

cities' existing accommodation centres had a capacity of about 550 in Leipzig (SL 2012), and approximately 200 in Osnabrück (SO 2013). Still in use today, these sites are located at the cities' peripheries – one in a pre-fab housing estate, the other in an industrial area. The refugee accommodation centre in Leipzig was originally designed for and used by Russian soldiers. In Leipzig, these old sites and all other new accommodation centres are fenced and controlled by private security services. Visitors have to present their IDs, and the residents have to report regularly if they do not want to be considered 'missing' and consequently lose their right to social benefits, including the right to accommodation. With a few exceptions, the Osnabrück accommodation centres are neither fenced, nor controlled by a security guard -a couple of caretakers and, since 2013, the municipal social workers are the only official contact people for refugees within the accommodation centres. Like in Leipzig, some of the sites used for the accommodation of refugees have a history of accommodating foreigners – soldiers or the so-called guest workers. In fact, this continuity of accommodating foreigners in camps is at least partly legitimated through the existence of buildings that were designed for this very purpose. With the adoption of the decentralisation plans, the municipalities sought to break with this practice, but over the course of 2015, the local authorities in Leipzig argued that the emergency situation forced them to continue to use camps and later to construct new mass accommodation centres.

The local authorities in Leipzig argued that the opening or renovation of mass accommodation centres was necessary to avoid emergency shelters (see section 3.3.). A similar argument was brought forward by the local authorities in Osnabrück, who argued that the opening of a reception facility in the city, with a planned capacity of 300 places, would help ensure that the city did not have to accommodate newcomers in tents and containers, as the opening of the reception centre would lower the number of people allocated to the city (Author's Protocol of citizens' forum, 3.12.2014). While the local authorities in Osnabrück could indeed avoid the opening of emergency shelters (with the exception of an emergency shelter opened in February 2016 for a year in the framework of administrative assistance to the regional authorities), in Leipzig the asylum landscape soon changed fundamentally. As more and more people reached Germany via the Balkan route, regional and local authorities started to compete in their search for potential accommo-

modation sites. In Leipzig, congress centres, former hardware markets, gymnastic halls and eventually campsites were repurposed throughout 2015/16 in order to accommodate the asylum-seeking persons. While the living conditions in these provisional shelters were often terrible, the central location of the centres proved to be an advantage, as they were easily accessible for the numerous volunteers who supported those living there with donations, language courses and leisure activities. Last but not least, this case underlines the close connection between the perception of and reaction to migration and migrants and the concrete localities and materialities of refugee accommodation.

5 Still making a difference?

Comparisons contribute decisively to our understanding of the uneven topographies of local migration regimes. Taking our research of refugee accommodation in Leipzig and Osnabrück as an exemplary case, we have discussed how to compare local migration regimes. We proposed a comparative model with five dimensions, based on the work of GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR on the one, and LEFEBVRE on the other hand. The five dimensions – (economic) positioning and (migration) history, local actor constellation, regulative accommodation practices, representations of refugee accommodation, materiality of spaces of asylum – have helped us to structure our observations for a systematic comparison and to develop explanatory approaches to similarities and differences between the two cities. In this paper, *making a difference* was thus not only an emic category, but also our analytical aim. Striving to make a difference, both Leipzig and Osnabrück adopted decentralisation plans in the early 2010s, but during the long summer of migration these plans were re-negotiated in significantly different ways. While the decentralisation plan was de facto discontinued in Leipzig, it has been largely upheld in Osnabrück. We have argued that these divergent developments were not so much due to a different economic or scalar positioning, but rather to the cities' respective (migration) histories, local actor constellations, dynamics, and representations. We have highlighted, for example, the presence of right-wing groups and xenophobic sentiments in Leipzig and their absence or invisibility in Osnabrück as a decisive difference. Moreover, we have pointed out how the diverging accommodation practices in the two cities were linked to differ-

ent conceptions of urban society as places of arrival. While both cities have used (refugee) migration and integration as a way to promote their city, this representation was much more contested in Leipzig and eventually overtaken by a ‘crisis discourse’ in 2015/16, which legitimated the revival of centralised mass accommodation for refugees.

Our comparative endeavour was not to distinguish between different types of cities and to put them into some sort of urban hierarchy. Rather, we have aimed at drawing connections between our two field sites. The comparative dimensions were not only derived from an engagement with the literature cited above; they also correspond to the questions and categories that emerged from our empirical observations. A relational comparative approach helped us to draw our attention to aspects that we might have overlooked otherwise. For example, the observation that refugee reception has been linked to furthering Osnabrück’s city brand raised the question to what extent such linking is attempted in Leipzig and other cities. And, to cite another example, the fact that accommodation centres are usually guarded by security firms in Leipzig but not in Osnabrück prompted us to think about the reasons for this difference and what this means for everyday life in accommodation centres and the perception of refugees.

A relational comparative approach can thus, above all, generate new questions and ways to comprehend what we observe. It can provide clues as to why refugee migration is dealt with in a certain way at one site and how this relates to other urban asylum or migration regimes. The spatially-sensitive regime perspective sketched in this paper can thus reveal things that remain hidden in studies with a state or policy-focused perspective: First, by taking into account both state and non-state actors and the dynamics between them; second, by focusing not only on outcomes, but on negotiation processes; and third, by shedding light on the role that space plays in the constitution of local migration regimes. While in this paper, we were mostly concerned with the accommodation of asylum-seeking people, we believe that the dimensions distinguished above can also be used for comparative studies of other aspects of local migration regimes. This said, we do not think that the study of a single site obscures any of these things. As GLICK SCHILLER and ÇAĞLAR (2018, 10f.) argue, “each research site is always multi-scalar because all places are constituted in relationship to elsewhere as parts of intersecting networks linking multiple forms of disparate institutionalized power.”

References

- AAS (Amadeu Antonio Stiftung) (2017): Gewalt gegen Flüchtlinge 2017: Von Entwarnung kann keine Rede sein. <https://www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- BERTUZZO, E. (2009): Fragmented Dhaka. Analysing everyday life with Lefebvre’s theory of production of space. Stuttgart.
- BISCHOF, A. (2015): #Hypezig – Die Verkleinbürgerlichung des Alternativen. In: ECKARDT, F.; SEYFARTH, R. and WERNER, F. (eds.): Leipzig. Die neue urbane Ordnung der unsichtbaren Stadt. Münster, 72–87.
- BLANK, M. (forthcoming): Räume des Asyls: Deutschlernen und die Rolle von Raum für die lokale Aushandlung von Asylregimen. In: JOHLER, R. and LANGE, J. (eds.): Fluchtreflexionen. Perspektiven der Migrationsforschung auf gesellschaftliche Aushandlungen. Bielefeld.
- BLOEMRAAD, I. (2013): The promise and pitfalls of comparative research design in the study of migration. In: *Migration Studies* 1 (1), 27–46. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mns035>
- BOESE, M. and PHILLIPS, M. (2018): The role of local government in migrant and refugee settlement in regional and rural Australia. In: *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 52 (4), 388–404. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.26>
- BRENNER, N. (2004): New state spaces urban governance and the rescaling of statehood. Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199270057.001.0001>
- BRUBAKER, R. (1992): Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany. Cambridge/London.
- CABOT, H. (2014): On the doorstep of Europe. Asylum and Citizenship in Greece. Philadelphia. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812209808>
- CVAJNER, M.; ECHEVERRÍA, G. and SCIORTINO, G. (2018): What do we talk when we talk about migration regimes? The diverse theoretical roots of an increasingly popular concept. In: POTT, A.; RASS, C. and WOLFF, F. (eds.): Was ist ein Migrationsregime? What Is a Migration Regime? Wiesbaden, 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-20532-4_3
- DARLING, J. (2017): Forced migration and the city: irregularity, informality, and the politics of presence. In: *Progress in Human Geography* 41, 178–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516629004>
- DAUSS, M. (2016): Fluchtraum. Architektur und raumtheoretische Überlegungen zu Flüchtlingsräumen. In: BARBOZA, A.; EBERDING, S.; PANTLE, U. and WINTER, G. (eds.): Räume des Ankommens: Topographische Perspektiven auf Migration und Flucht. Bielefeld. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839434482-006>
- DEKKER, R.; EMILSSON, H.; KRIEGER, B. and SCHOLTEN, P. (2015): A local dimension of integration policies? A

- comparative study of Berlin, Malmö, and Rotterdam. In: *International Migration Review* 49 (3), 633–658. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12133>
- EAI (Exekutiv Ausschuss der Geflüchteten in der Unterkunft im Ickerweg 120 in Osnabrück) (2017): Petition an den Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Osnabrück und andere Entscheidungsträger. https://www.noz-cdn.de/media/documents/offener_brief_an_die_stadt_osnabr%C3%BCck_1498559385.pdf (Date 13.02.2019)
- FAHRMEIR, A.; FARON, O. and WEIL, P. (eds.) (2003): *Migration control in the North Atlantic world*. New York/Oxford.
- GLICK SCHILLER, N. and ÇAĞLAR, A. (2009): Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: migrant incorporation and city scale. In: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (2), 177–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830802586179>
- (eds.) (2011): *Locating migration: rescaling cities and migrants*. Ithaca/London.
- (2018) *Migrants and city-making: dispossession, displacement, and urban regeneration*. Durham.
- HINGER, S.; SCHÄFER, P. and POTT, A. (2016): The local production of asylum. In: *Journal of Refugee Studies* 29 (4), 440–463. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/few029>
- HORVATH, K.; AMELINA, A., and PETERS, K. (2017): Re-thinking the politics of migration. On the uses and challenges of regime perspectives for migration research. In: *Migration Studies* 5 (3), 301–314. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnx055>
- HUMMEL, S.; KRASOWSKI, B.; MIDELLA, S. and WETENDORF, J. (2017): Rassistische Diskriminierung auf dem sächsischen Wohnungsmarkt. Situationsbeschreibung & Handlungsempfehlungen. Leipzig. <http://adb-sachsen.de> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- JAWORSKY, B.; LEVITT, P.; CADGE, W.; HEJTMANEK, J. and CURRAN, S. (2012): New perspectives on immigrant contexts of reception. The cultural armature of cities. In: *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 2 (1), 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10202-011-0029-6>
- KASPAREK, B. and SPEER, M. (2015): Of Hope. Ungarn und der lange Sommer der Migration. <http://bordermonitoring.eu> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- KNOWLES, C. (2003): Here and there: doing transnational fieldwork. In: AMIT, V. (ed.): *Constructing the field: ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world*. London, 62–78.
- KOBELINSKY, C. (2010): *L'accueil des demandeurs d'asile. Une ethnographie de l'attente*. Paris.
- KRASNER, S. D. (1983): *International Regimes*. Ithaca
- LEFEBVRE, H. (1991): *The Production of Space*. Malden/Oxford/Carlton.
- (1996) *The right to the City* [1968], reprinted In: KOFMAN, E. and LEBAS, E. (eds): *Writings on Cities: Henri Lefebvre*, 147–159.
- MARTINIELLO, M. (2013): Comparisons in migration studies. In: *Comparative Migration Studies* 1 (1), 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.5117/CMS2013.1.MART>
- MEINE, B. and STAEUBERT, K. (2018). OBM-Wahl 2020 in Leipzig: Jung will wieder antreten. In: *Leipziger Volkszeitung Online*. <http://www.lvz.de> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- NIEHAUS, I. (2016): Wie Gemeinden sich für Flüchtlinge engagieren. In: *Deutschlandfunk Kultur*. <https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- OL (Open Letter from residents of a municipal accommodation centre to the Mayor of Leipzig) (2015). <https://www.l-iz.de/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/open-letter.pdf> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- PENNINX, R. and GARCÉS-MASCARENAS, B. (2016): Integration policies of European cities in comparative perspective: structural convergence and substantial differentiation. In: *Migracijske i etničke teme* 32 (2), 155–189. <https://doi.org/10.11567/met.32.2.1>
- POTT, A. (2018): Migrationsregime und ihre Räume. In: POTT, A.; RASS, C. and WOLFF, F. (eds.): (2018): *Was ist ein Migrationsregime? What is a Migration Regime?* Wiesbaden, 107–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-20532-4_5
- POTT, A. and TSIANOS, V. (2014): Verhandlungszonen des Lokalen. Potentiale der Regimeperspektive für die Erforschung der städtischen Migrationsgesellschaft. In: OSSENBRÜGGE, J. and VOGELPOHL, A. (eds.): *Theorien in der Raum- und Stadtforschung*. Einführungen. Münster, 116–135.
- PÜTZ, R. and RODATZ, M. (2013): Kommunale Integrations- und Vielfaltskonzepte im Neoliberalismus. Zur strategischen Steuerung von Migration in deutschen Großstädten. In: *Geographische Zeitschrift* 101 (3/4), 166–183.
- RAA (Regionale Arbeitsstelle für Bildung, Integration und Demokratie Sachsen) (2015): *Rechtsmotivierte und rassistische Gewalt in Sachsen 2015*. <https://raa-sachsen.de>
- (2016): *Rechtsmotivierte und rassistische Gewalt in Sachsen 2016*. <https://raa-sachsen.de> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- RINK, D.; HAASE, A.; GROSSMANN, K.; COUCH, C. and COCKS, M. (2012): From long-term shrinkage to re-growth? A comparative study of urban development trajectories of Liverpool and Leipzig. In: *Built Environment* 38 (2), 162–178. <https://doi.org/10.2148/benv.38.2.162>
- RÖSSEL, J. (2014) *Unterwegs zum guten Leben? Raumproduktionen durch Zugezogene in der Uckermark*. Bielefeld.
- SCHAMMANN, H. (2015): Wenn Variationen den Alltag bestimmen: Unterschiede lokaler Politikgestaltung in der Leistungsgewährung für Asylsuchende. In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft* 9 (3), 161–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12286-015-0267-4>
- SCHMID, C. (2010): *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft: Henri Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes*. Stuttgart.

- SCHMIDTKE, O. (2014): Beyond national Models? Governing migration and integration at the regional and local levels in Canada and Germany. In: *Comparative Migration Studies* 2 (1), 77–99. <https://doi.org/10.5117/CMS2014.1.SCHM>
- SCHMIZ, A. (2017): Staging a ‘Chinatown’ in Berlin: The role of city branding in the urban governance of ethnic diversity. In: *European Urban and Regional Studies* 24 (3), 290–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776416637208>
- SL (Stadt Leipzig) (2012): Konzept “Wohnen für Berechtigte nach dem Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz in Leipzig”. Teil 1 und 2.
- (2016): Migrantinnen und Migranten in Leipzig 2015. Indikatorenbericht.
- (2017a): Monitoringbericht Wohnen 2016/17. Kleinräumiges Monitoring der Stadtentwicklung.
- (2017b): Statistischer Quartalsbericht IV/2017.
- (2018a): Migrantinnen und Migranten in Leipzig 2018.
- (2018b): Wirtschaftsbericht 2018.
- SMITH, N. (1992): Geography, Difference and the Politics of Scale. In: DOHENY, J.; GRAHAM, E. and MDLEK, M. (eds.): *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences*. London, 57–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22183-7_4
- SO (Stadt Osnabrück) (2013): Konzept zur Integration und Unterbringung von Flüchtlingen.
- (2016a): Tätigkeitsbericht 2015.
- (2016b) Bevölkerungsprognose 2017-2030 Band 1 – Gesamtstadt Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Stadtforschung
- (2018): Von der Erstaufnahme zur Überleitung in die Regelsysteme – Integration von Geflüchteten in der Stadt Osnabrück.
- (n.d.): Zur Entwicklung des Gremiums Migrationsbeirat der Stadt Osnabrück https://www.osnabrueck.de/fileadmin/eigene_Dateien/Zur_Entwicklung_des_migrationsbeirats.pdf (Date: 11.2.2019)
- SOLIDARITY CITY (n.d.): Selbstverständnis. <https://solidarity-city.eu/de/> (Date: 11.2.2019)
- SWYNGEDOUW, E. (2004): Scaled geographies: nature, place, and the politics of scale. In: MCMASTER, R. and SHEPARD, E. (eds.): *Scale and geographic inquiry: nature, society and method*. Oxford/Cambridge, 129–153. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470999141.ch7>
- VOGELPOHL, A. (2012): Urbanes Alltagsleben. Zum Paradox von Differenzierung und Homogenisierung in Stadtquartieren. Wiesbaden. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-19473-8>
- WAGNER, T. (2014): Fragenkatalog zur Erstaufnahmeeinrichtung (EAE) und aktueller Flyer der IG Wiederitzsch. In: *Wiederitzsch im Blick*. <https://www.wiederitzsch-im-blick.de> (Date 04.03.2019)
- WARD, K. (2010): Towards a relational comparative approach to the study of cities. In: *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(4), 471–487. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132509350239>
- WEISS, K. (2009): Zuwanderung und Integration in den neuen Bundesländern. In: GESEMANN, F. and ROTH, R. (eds.): *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Migration und Integration als Herausforderung von Kommunen*. Wiesbaden, 131–150.

Authors

Sophie Hinger
 University of Osnabrück
 Institute for Migration Research
 and Intercultural Studies (IMIS)
 - Social Geography
 49069 Osnabrück
 Germany
sophie.hinger@uni-osnabrueck.de

Philipp Schäfer
 University of Konstanz
 Department of History and Sociology
 - Social and Cultural Anthropology
 78457 Konstanz
 Germany
p.schaefer@uni-konstanz.de