MIGRANTS & CITY-MAKING

Dispossession, Displacement, & Urban Regeneration

AYŞE ÇAĞLAR & NINA GLICK SCHILLER

MIGRANTS & CITY-MAKING

This page intentionally left blank

MIGRANTS & CITY-MAKING

Dispossession, Displacement, and Urban Regeneration

Ayşe Çağlar and Nina Glick Schiller

Cover art: Multimedia Center, Halle Saale. Photo: Alexander
Schieberle, www.alexschieberle.de

To our mothers and fathers,
Sitare and Adnan Şimşek and
Evelyn and Morris Barnett, who
understood the importance of
having daughters who wrote books.

With great appreciation of the
two mothers who so courageously
and patiently waited for this one.

In memoriam, Evelyn Barnett,
1919–2017.

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Multiscalar City-Making and Emplacement

PROCESSES, CONCEPTS, AND METHODS

The world is very different from the year 2000, when we began our long-term research into relationships between migrants and three seemingly disparate cities.[1] Mardin, Turkey, lies on the Turkish-Syrian Border; Manchester, New Hampshire, is in the northeastern United States; and Halle/Saale, Saxony-Anhalt, is part of formerly socialist eastern Germany. Today, the significance of war and crises of capital accumulation and political power are more evident around the world, including in these three cities, although crisis and social and economic transformations have gained visibility in each of the cities in different ways. As the world changed and our research project developed in response to these changes, we came to better understand the multiscalar relationships and the multiple actors, including each city's migrants, that were reconstituting each locality.

By the time we had finished this book, the province of Mardin had become a war zone, with several districts and villages bombed and blockaded by the Turkish army.[2] The devastation of the city-region is a violent reminder of how changing conjectural conditions in a particular place can—within less than a year—transform a center of global urban regeneration into a space of wreckage and devaluation. In the spring of 2015, posh hotels, tourist destinations, and "quaint" Syriac Christian village and religious sites, which were showcased as historic places of multireligious dialogue and openness, were attracting a seemingly ceaseless flow of tourists and international delegations. A short time later, these places stood empty. They not only mocked recent hopes of regional renewal but also embodied future possibilities for new cycles of urban regeneration and capital accumulation. However, at present, the dreams of Mardin's leaders to regenerate their city by globally marketing its vibrant, multireligious past lie in ruins as people flee for their lives.

By 2016 in Manchester, New Hampshire, city leaders had curbed their en-

thusiasm for large-scale regeneration plans and defunded one of the city's major public redevelopment agencies. However, the local economy was experiencing the stimulus of a renewed arms industry to supply the wars in the Middle East, including the fighting in Syria close to the Turkish-Syrian border. In Halle, the general failure of redevelopment plans to attract private capital, despite vast public expenditure, was temporarily superseded by the challenge of resettling new refugees fleeing armed conflicts, especially the war in Syria. Seemingly separated by region, history, and culture, the three cities we studied not only participated in interrelated restructuring processes but also, by the end of our research, had become interconnected by geopolitical events within the current historical moment.

We began our research in a hopeful period. Plans to bring prosperity to cities around the world sought to attract new flows of investment and build "new economy" industries within revitalized urban vistas. The spirit of the times, evident in both public policy and scholarship, emphasized a "metropolitan revolution," with cities serving as engines of development (Katz and Bradley 2013). Cities were portrayed as generating wealth and restructuring forms of governance and power in ways that would benefit the majority of urban residents (Florida 2002). If migrants and minorities[3] were referenced at all, their role was to provide local color as part of the city's diversity or inexpensive labor in service industries. At the same time, many scholars understood that these urban redevelopment narratives masked growing inequalities within and between cities and offered at best only a short-term fix for underlying structural failures (Brenner and Theodore 2002). They demonstrated that panegyrics to the rebirth of rebranded cities, saved from decline by "culture-led regeneration," failed to acknowledge neoliberal fault lines, disparities, displacements, dispossessions, and contestations underlying recent urban restructuring (Miles and Paddison 2005; Yeoh 2005).

However, there is still insufficient research and theory that explores the relationship between projects to rebrand and regenerate cities with different degrees of political, economic, and cultural power, on the one hand, and the everyday sociabilities and social citizenship practices of city residents, on the other. Initially, exploration of cities in the global economy, as well as critiques of urban rebirth through regeneration and rebranding, focused on cities such as London, New York, and Tokyo, which were seen as global centers of economic, political, and cultural power (Keil and Brenner 2006; Massey 2007; Smith 1996; Sassen 2001). Studies of migrant incorporation also have tended to focus on such cities (Cross and Moore 2002), but increasingly urban researchers have expanded the scope of their inquiries into

"midrange cities," (Sassen 2002a; see also Ward and McCann 2011), "gateway cities" (Benton-Short and Price 2008), and "ordinary cities" (Robinson 2006). Meanwhile, ethnographers began to examine the lives and social relations of migrants outside urban centers of global power, although with few exceptions (McEwan, Pollard, and Henry 2008; Barabantseva 2016; Frykman 2015) interdependencies among processes of displacement, urban restructuring, and migrant emplacement have not been sufficiently explored.

Migrants and City-Making: Dispossession, Displacement, and Urban Regeneration addresses how globe-circulating, contemporary urban regeneration agendas were implemented in cities that were clearly not global powerhouses. We focus on the relationships between these cities and their migrants as these relationships became part of projects of urban transformation. When we began our research, city leaders in Manchester had just initiated a new period of city regeneration. In Halle/Saale a decade after German unification, city leaders sought ways to reposition their city within Germany and beyond. Meanwhile in Mardin, leaders were just beginning to address the need to repopulate the city and reposition it within Turkey, in the region, and globally.

Since that time, the leadership in each city has experienced periods of success and failure in their efforts to regenerate urban districts and reposition their cities within multiscalar networks of power. At times, each city seemed to gain prominence and significance, yet, by the end of our research, all three faced further disempowerment. Setting aside dichotomies between agency and structure, mobility and stasis, and migrant and non-migrant, which so often configure urban and migration theory and research, this book offers a comparative multiscalar analysis that explores the interrelated processes of displacement, dispossession, accumulation, and emplacement through which urban life is constituted.

Beyond Methodological Nationalism and the Ethnic Lens

The multiscalar analysis we offer rests on a critique of methodological nationalism and the ethnic lens. Methodological nationalism is an intellectual orientation that approaches the study of social and historical processes as if they were contained within the borders of individual nation-states (Amelina et al. 2012; Beck 2002; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002, 2003). That is, methodological nationalists confine the concept of society within the boundaries of nation-states and assume that the members of these states share a common history and set of values, norms, social customs, and institutions. Viewing migrants as culturally and socially discrete from "national societies," meth-

odological nationalists assume that these populations require social integration into the nation-state where they have settled.

This perspective on culture and membership is a product of nineteenth-, twentieth-, and twenty-first-century nation-state building processes that legitimate a political ideology that portrays individuals as having only one country and one identity. Because of the predominance of methodological nationalism and its ethnic lens, researchers assessing the implications of migration across state borders have tended to see differences in national origin as the most significant social and cultural division within the population of a nation-state. Class, gender, and subnational regional and cultural differences pale in significance. Through a single discursive act—the delineation of those of migrant background from "natives"—those who are designated as native to the territory of a nation-state become participants in a shared and homogenous culture; those departing from one national territory to settle in another are not only differentiated as "foreign" but also understood to share a common homeland identity and culture.

As we previously wrote (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009, 184) "starting with Barth (1969), there is a voluminous historical and ethnographic literature that details the constructed nature of ethnic identities and ethnic group boundaries, and the diversity that lies within a population labeled as an 'ethnic group' (Modood 1997; Sollors 1989). However, despite the scholarship detailing the social construction of difference and the challenge to write 'against culture,' migration studies continue to approach migrants' relationships to economic, social and political forms of urban incorporation through an ethnic lens."

This foundational "binary of difference" (Glick Schiller 2012b) leads many migration scholars to approach all people of the same national or ethno-religious migrant background as homogenous in terms of their values, culture, religion, achievement, leadership, and transnational networks as well as identity, aspirations, and desire to live in tightly knit immigrant communities. As a result, scholars of migration often continue to use the concept of "ethnic community" as both the object of study and the unit of analysis in migration research. When migration researchers adopt a transnational perspective on migration but retain an "ethnic lens," they assume that migrants who share an ethnic identity form a transnational or a diasporic community that links homeland and new lands of settlement (Cohen 1997). The field of diaspora studies has perpetuated the problem by defining the unit of study as people who share an ancestry and a history of dispersal (Soysal 2000). Scholars of new migration and diasporas who use an "ethnic lens" obscure the diversity of migrants' relationships to their place of settlement and to other

localities around the world as well as the commonalities between migrant and non-migrant populations (Glick Schiller, Çağlar, and Guldbrandsen 2006, 613).[4]

The challenge for researchers who are critical of methodological nationalism is to discard the binary between migrants and non-migrants and yet keep in focus the migration experience, with its multiple forms of displacement as well as barriers to and modes of emplacement. Because discourses about cultural, racial, and religious difference can both legitimate and obscure various forms of displacement and emplacement, there are occasions when an analyst must retain the terms "migrant" and/or "non-migrant." Therefore, we use these terms not to continue a process of categorizing and assuming cultural or religious difference but to counter assumptions of many public policy makers and national politicians that migrant newcomers stand outside the social system, constitute a threat to social cohesion, and require integration. In fact, we use the term "migrant" to challenge the assumption that the lives and practices of people who move to a city from other countries are subject to categorically different dynamics from the "majority" and/or "natives." Instead, we maintain that it is necessary to place migrants and those who see themselves as natives within the same analytical framework.

We argue that because so many researchers, influenced by methodological nationalism and its by-product, the ethnic lens, accept a deeply embedded binary between migrants and the mainstream of society, the crucial role of migrants within the city-making process often has been discounted within public and scholarly narratives (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009; Çağlar and Glick Schiller 2011). Migrants must be approached as social actors who are integral to city-making as they engage in the daily life of cities through different and varied forms.

Of course, the term "migrant" is a fluid signifier. It can apply to persons who move within as well as across international boundaries and whose legal status can vary from unauthorized to citizen. However, for the purposes of this book and the specific historical conjunctures it reflects and reflects upon, we use the term "migrants" to refer to those who have crossed international borders. We join contemporary political debates at a historical moment when too many political leaders cast aspersions specifically on cross-border migration and focus on categories of legal status: undocumented,[5] refugee, legal resident, or "naturalized" citizen (Glick Schiller 2016). In *Migrants and City-Making: Dispossession, Displacement, and Urban Regeneration*, we explore the city-making practices of people with all these legal statuses. While we place migrants and non-migrants in the same analytical framework, we

pay close attention to the racialization and stigmatization of international migrants, which are aspects of dehumanization. Various forms of dehumanization serve to legitimate the processes of dispossession and displacement (defined below) that are at the analytical center of this book.

Building on Critical Policy Studies

In exploring the legitimation of dispossession and displacement by a range of institutional multiscalar actors who have been central to urban restructuring, we build on the work of scholars who have offered a critical policy studies (Shore and Wright 1997, 2011; Kingfisher 2013; Clarke et al. 2015). Several urban researchers have contributed to this field of inquiry by exploring why so many cities adopted similar restructuring strategies (Peck 2005; Peck and Theodore 2015; Gonzalez 2006). These scholars note that restructuring strategies had embedded within them a set of policies that were attractive to city leaders globally. As Jamie Peck's (2005) critical reading of Richard Florida indicates, city leaders striving to adequately compete with other cities for "creative" talent and capital were attracted to a set of creative-cities policies. These policies seemed to provide a guaranteed recipe of urban growth in the context of the implementation of neoliberal agendas globally and the formation of "neoliberal policy regimes" (Kingfisher 2013, 17). Leaders found that they could justify as necessary and urgent a range of bureaucratic and judicial changes in institutions, procedures, and regulatory mechanisms. The policies thus facilitated the allocation of public resources and the reconstitution of governance procedures from previous legislative mechanisms to new decision-making bodies dominated by corporate actors.

Peck (2005) emphasizes that this restructuring of governance and its concomitant growing disparities could be legitimated in relation to external national and global forces. These have compelled each city to compete for capital and urban prosperity in order to be situated higher in various city rankings and their comparative indicators. This competition naturalized the uneven distribution of wealth and power as part and parcel of the functioning and structure of the world order.

As critical policy scholars, such as Peck (2005) and Clarke and his colleagues (2015) have pointed out, actors who implemented neoliberal policies were subject to the discipline of capital mobility. Their research makes visible far-reaching networks of experts, academic institutions, urban development corporations, websites, and speakers developed to "support, sustain and profit from the circulation" of wealth, ideas, and technologies of restructur-

ing in specific localities (Gibson and Klocker 2004, 431). These scholars highlight the significance of tracing networks of power.

Our perspective on multiscalar urban regeneration also is informed by the broader literature on critical policy studies, including the anthropology of policy. This literature connects policy formulation and implementation with networks of power that situate localities to broader processes. As Clark and his colleagues (2015, 6) emphasize, "The social in the making always takes place within a world of preexisting fields of power." These studies stress the multiscalar nature of these fields, which is so crucial to understanding local transformations. For example, Susan Wright (2011, 27) calls attention to how "the small details of social change that are observable in particular locations connect to wider processes of social, economic and political transformation." As Clarke et al. (2015, 23) note, "Transnational policy flows are never linear transfers from one place to another but involve 'multiscalar networks' (Jones, Jones, and Woods, 2004, 104) that organize space in ways that enable—and constrain—the movement of policy."

Earlier anthropologists of legal policies, such as Merry (2006), documented the ways in which policies become vernacularized when they travel. Critical policy scholars such as Kingfisher (2013) and Clarke et al. (2015), among others, extend this analysis by noting that globally circulating policies are translated and locally assembled to reflect the conjunctural intertwining of the differential power of local forces and broader national and international actors. They approach translation "as an intrinsically political and contentious process in which forms and relationships of power are always at stake, even if processes and technicalisation try to make them invisible" (Clarke et al. 2015, 189). The interplay of each of these forces within changing local configurations and contentions must be part of the analysis.

Multiscalar: Not Multileveled, Multisited, or Merely Everyday

With rare exceptions (Gardiner Barber and Lem 2012b; Sum and Jessop 2013), most social scientists speak of analytical levels in which the macrolevel of the world system, or globalization, stands above and beyond the microlevel of daily life (Marcus 1986; Neal 2013). In contrast, building on critical policy scholars, geographers, historians, and others who have worked to theorize multiscalar processes (Jones et al. 2004; Clarke et al. 2015; Braudel 1974), we utilize methods of multiscalar research and analysis that discard the notion of levels. We also discard a nested concept of scale as encompassing a fixed hierarchy of bounded territorial units such as neighborhood, city, province,

and nation-state. Instead we trace social processes as they are constituted, noting their interconnections through both institutionalized and informal networks of differential economic, political, and cultural power (Glick Schiller 2012a, 2015b; Çağlar and Glick Schiller 2011). We use the term "multiscalar" as shorthand to speak of sociospatial spheres of practice that are constituted in relationship to each other and within various hierarchies of networks of power.

Although we build on several decades of debate about the concept of "scale" (Smith 1995; Swyngedouw 1997; Brenner 1999, 2001, 2009, 2011; Marston 2000; Marston, Jones, and Woodward 2005; Hoefle 2006), when we use the concept of scale in the term "multiscalar," our concern is somewhat different from those of urban geographers (Jessop, Brenner, and Jones 2008; Brenner 1999, 2011; Swyngedouw 2004). They have often preferred to differentiate scale, territory, place, and network and then discuss the relationship between these concepts. We share with those critical geographers an understanding of scales as locally, regionally, nationally, and globally mutually constituted, relational, and interpenetrating entry points for an analysis of globe-spanning interconnected processes. However, we work in dialogue with an understanding of multiscalar that is highlighted by Sassen (2013). She finds the term useful in recalibrating approaches to the study of cities and urban spaces by rearticulating their multiple, spatially articulated forms of power. Similarly, our approach to scale is a relational one that recognizes that structures of unequal power exist within multiple, but not nested, networked hierarchies.

What happens in a locality is constituted in relation to actors' reach and/or connection to multiple actors possessing different amounts of power, including the control of capital. For example, in a local project to redevelop urban housing, city authorities may act in relationship to national agencies with the power to provide grants and loans, but they may also be directly constrained by global financial markets and credit ratings, which positively or negatively evaluate the city's credit worthiness. This directly affects not only the housing project but also the economic prospects and well-being of city residents. Or local authorities might acquire some control over federal agencies through direct relationships with supranational institutions, such as the European Union (EU), by means of a different set of political agendas. This, in turn, has an impact on the scope and nature of a seemingly local housing project.

In our approach to networked processes, we define social fields as networks of networks, emphasizing that social fields entail multiple and intersecting networks in which actors, as individuals, institutions, or corporate

entities, hold uneven power (Glick Schiller 2003; Kingfisher 2013). Networks and the social fields they constitute may be locally or regionally situated, or they may extend nationally, transnationally, or supranationally, as in the case of the EU, or may span the globe. In their daily reach, all interpersonal networks may not be transnational in the sense of cross-border connections or be multiscalar, that is, linked to actors based in multiple distinct domains of power. However, in our daily lives we all participate in social fields that extend beyond the local.

Many researchers, particularly in anthropology, use "transnational" or "translocal" to follow personal networks across borders but decline to connect the personal to the institutionalized power embedded in scalar relations. The field of transnational families is marked by these limitations (Olwig 2007; Mazzucato and Kabki 2009). In contrast, we stress that we are all part of social fields that are multiscalar. In short, the social fields in which we are embedded link in some way to institutions of differential power based in many places. The concept of multiscalar social fields enables us to address and capture aspects of social relations through which broader social forces enable, shape, constrain, and are acted upon by individuals. By using the term "social," we specify our interest in links between people without neglecting the fact that these links are mediated through a growing range of technologies.

The migrants whose lives we follow in this book form multiple new social relations and maintain others as they settle in specific places. The networks in which they live contribute to the remaking of the institutional nexus of city-level, regional, national, supranational, and globe-spanning actors. These processes cannot be reduced to various modes of capital accumulation that interact within specific places and times, but they also cannot be understood without understanding the dynamics of these modes. A multiscalar global perspective provides a reading of capitalism that does not reduce it to anonymous economic forces but rather approaches relations of capital as multiple unequal social relations constituted within social fields of power (Kalb and Tak 2005; Clarke 2014; Hart 2001).

Our multiscalar global perspective allows us to approach cities not as units of analysis or as bounded territorial units but as institutional political, economic, and cultural actors positioned within multiple institutionally structured scales of differentiated but connected domains of power. Cities are useful entry points because they generally have their own governance regimes, economic and spatial development plans, and powers (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009). Each city's institutional structure shapes variations within its different local territorial districts and economic sectors. Enmeshed in

globally articulated restructuring strategies, all cities are players in emerging public–private forms of governance (Brenner 2004; Syrett and Sepulveda 2012).

Multisighted, not Multisited

This methodology and mode of analysis deploys alternative "ways of seeing" (Berger 1972); research is multisighted rather than multisited. The relational and processual concept of rescaling challenges the concept of "multisited" analysis, which many anthropologists believe is the best, if not the only, way to study transnational migration and globalization ethnographically (Coleman and Hellermann 2011; Falzon 2009). Many anthropologists embrace multisited analysis because, despite their broad acknowledgment that the world is interconnected, they still claim an intensive study of a discrete "community," "neighborhood," or locality as their terrain (Ortner 1984). At the same time, many assert that such ethnographic study of a single site necessarily obscures "the ways in which closely observed cultural worlds are imbedded in larger more impersonal systems" (Marcus 1986, 166). If "up close and personal" ethnography can only describe bounded units of analysis, then it follows that ethnographers can only study interconnections by moving between sites and following flows of people, goods, and ideas. Researchers champion multisited ethnography because of their limited view of the local, maintaining that only by heeding George Marcus's (1995, 106–7) call to "follow the people" and "follow the thing" can they trace the ways in which people and places interconnect.

Our view builds upon a different lineage of scholarship. We agree that, with its attention to personal narrative and to the contextualized enactments of everyday life, ethnography offers an irreplaceable entry into the analysis of social practices and sociabilities and their shifting meanings. Yet, informed by the various strands of multiscalar scholarship, we hold that it is not only possible but also necessary for an ethnographer to observe in each location that "seemingly independent processes and locations are interconnected with each other" (Miraftab 2014). That is to say, no site can be understood apart from its interconnections through time and space, and these interconnections can be studied in a single site (Feldman 2011). The logic that Hannerz (2003, 206) describes as part of multisited research, namely, that "the sites are connected with one another" and "one must establish the translocal linkages, and the interconnections," holds true for the study of single sites as well.

Each research site is always multiscalar because all places are constituted

in relationship to elsewhere as parts of intersecting networks linking multiple forms of disparate institutionalized power. Ethnographers past and present have been able to study these networks without moving (Gluckman 1940; Susser 2012a, 2012b; Müller 2016). For a single site, ethnographers can and must trace interconnections of unequal power to analyze processes and relationships and make visible the multiscalar power structures connecting different places (Feldman 2011). An urban space, whether a building, religious congregation, neighborhood, or city, is always multisited because it is simultaneously positioned in multiple interconnecting trajectories of power (Massey 2005). To speak about the multiple ongoing connected processes and relationships of urban restructuring, regeneration, and rebranding as they develop through space and over time, we use the term "city-making." Our approach challenges ethnographers of "everyday" life to situate their research within a framework of multiscalar city-making.

The Multiscalar Connection of Everyday Life

Many ethnographers of migrant settlement responded to reminders that "geography matters fundamentally" and that attention must be paid to "different conditions, at different scales, in particular places" (Berg, Gridley, and Sigona 2013, 352) by offering studies of "everyday life" that ignore the locality's multiscalar connectivities. Instead, they offered delimited ethnographies of neighborhoods, bazaars and markets, public squares, or buildings (Vaiou and Lykogianni 2006; Watson 2009; Vertovec 2015; Eriksen 2010). Their research fails to explore how these sites are constituted by multiscalar networks of differential power. Because these ethnographers approach their research sites as not only units of study but also units of analysis, these spaces appear as self-constituting places. Many authors highlight the uniqueness of each city's everyday life and the historical specificity of its neighborhoods to counter what they see as an overly structural analysis of globalization and neoliberalism (Löw 2009, 2012; Berking 2008; Leitner, Peck, and Sheppard 2007). In so doing, they erode the theoretical basis for comparative urban and globalization research.

The result is that the literature on migrants' everyday life is confined to description and haunted by binaries of difference. Without fully assimilating critiques of the ethnic lens or adopting a multiscalar analysis that situates urban actors within various networks of power, this research continues to reflect national categories of difference. Much of this research remains focussed on the "ethos of mixing" in multiethnic neighborhoods (Berg, Gridley, and Sigona 2013, 355; see also Vertovec 2015). The penchant of many scholars to

frame "'everyday' sociabilities" (Wessendorf 2013) or convivialities through a language of difference is shaped by the "double polarization" (Friedman 2004, 26) that has accompanied the implementation of neoliberal agendas. Political leaders, policy makers, prominent researchers, and funders in countries around the world have focused on the supposed threat foreigners pose to social cohesion. This threat is linked to the "lack of trust" foreigners are said to evoke wherever they settle (Putnam 2007). The scholarship of the everyday can be read as an effort by some scholars to respond to anti-immigrant narratives by stressing that people can and do form social ties across differences and that certain urban spaces present examples of "living with difference" (Nowicka and Vertovec 2014, 341). However, even as they work to combat contemporary anti-immigrant politics, these scholars unwittingly lay the groundwork for viewing migrants as dangerous strangers.

This book offers another response. We argue that, to address sociabilities forged on the basis of spaces and domains of commonality between migrants and non-migrants, researchers and policy makers need a global multiscalar analytical framework that can address common conditions of precarity and displacement that mark the lives of many urban residents. The challenge for researchers of urban sociabilities is to develop an analytical framework that traces connections between how city residents respond to their differential access to power, to their city's position in regional and global playing fields, and to their relationships to the ongoing restructuring and repositioning of the neighborhood places where they build their lives. Thus, to construct a multiscalar analysis of daily sociabilities is to place them within the specific conjunctural configuration of multiple institutional social fields of uneven power of globe-spanning, national, regional, urban, and local institutions. These social fields intersect and shape the possibilities of emergent sociabilities. In this way, we can understand the multiscalar constitution of localities as the ongoing production of all places and social relations that constitute them.

Migrants and City-Making explores several modes of migrant emplacement that contribute to city-making as a multiscalar process: nonethnic entrepreneurial activities; everyday life sociabilities and social citizenship through Christian claim making; and supranationally mediated processes of emplacement. We emphasize that processes of capital restructuring and competitive urban regeneration lead to similarities between cities that occupy comparable positions of power at conjunctural moments, despite different legacies and even as, within these similarities, domains of differentiation emerge. Yet in our emphasis on the active agency of migrants, the analysis we present differs

from critiques of neoliberal restructuring in cities that have ignored the historical and continuing role of migrants in city-making.

We maintain that it is unsatisfactory to provide a structural analysis of neoliberal urbanism without attention to migrants' agency. Nor is it sufficient to offer ethnographic descriptions of everyday life in migrant neighborhoods, ethnic organizations, or other urban settings without considering the reconfiguration of multiple institutions and networks of power at each historical conjuncture. By tracing migrants' processes of emplacement and displacement in cities sharing similar positions within global fields of power, scholars and policy makers can see contradictions and tensions actuated by these dynamics. Our choice of cities and focus on migrant emplacement allow us to highlight claim-making practices, situations, sites, institutions, and social relations in which displaced people, migrant and non-migrant, build sociabilities that can form the basis for new kinds of political action. Therefore, our book responds both to the emerging social citizenship practices that underlie urban social movements and to a desire for and current interest in new approaches to sites and acts of being political (Isin 2002).

Placing Disempowered Cities

The studies of multiscalar processes in cities that lack adequate economic, political, and cultural power but are nonetheless shaped over time by regional, national, supranational, and global dynamics and forces can contribute much to our understanding of the relations between migrants and cities. As are more powerful cities, these cities are also caught up in globally competitive interconnected restructuring processes but experience them within positions more structurally disadvantaged than do global centers of power.

Therefore, we suggest the term "disempowered cities" to reference cities that responded to the pressures of neoliberal urban restructuring but entered the competition with a given configuration of limited assets. These are cities where leaders and residents can recall the loss of power while confronting the challenges to restructure and once again successfully compete. Acting within a revived historical memory of their city's past importance in their nation-state and beyond, city leaders demonstrate an explicit consciousness of the loss of power. They refer in their urban narratives to times in which their city and its residents shared greater prosperity and significance. Hence, when we speak of "disempowerment," we intend to highlight the entanglement of memories of the loss of power with neoliberal processes that underlie the regeneration of urban spaces and the restructuring of governance.

This past often remains inscribed in the material infrastructure. Such resources and the city's institutional repertoire, as well as references to its past glories, become the basis of urban developers' plans and aspirations for an urban regeneration that can restore general prosperity. However, the legacy of the past does not determine the choices city leaders take or the degree to which residents support urban regeneration; rather, it constitutes only one resource upon which restructuring efforts can draw. Thus, we are not talking about path dependency (Woodlief 1988), although a city's past enters our analysis. In the relational and historical perspective of this book, cities that do not have the reference point of past glories and previously greater relative empowerment have not, then, been disempowered. Thus, a disempowered designation entails both the objective loss of power and city leaders' subjective awareness of this loss. Cities that are simply down and out and whose leaders have not aspired to regeneration require further research and theorizing.

We note that our definition is not transhistorical but refers to the neoliberal competitive positioning of cities within recent historical conjunctures. The rise and fall of cities over the centuries and their histories of interconnections and competitions within changing historical conjunctures is a much broader topic and has been explored within several different analytic frameworks (Weber 1958 [1921]; Mumford 1961; Braudel 1974; Tilly 1990). Our comparative analysis of three disempowered cities within recent neoliberal restructuring and our historically specific approach to disempowerment certainly contribute to this broader discussion. Our comparison of three disempowered cities opens a dialogue about the relative outcomes of restructuring in cities that have sought to regain their lost power.

At the end of the twentieth century, disempowered cities around the world engaged with varying outcomes in urban renewal to generate wealth. Some cities such as Bilbao (Masboungi 2001) and Bogotá (Fonseca and Pinilla 2008; Venice Bienniale 2006) were celebrated as exemplary cases of successful urban regeneration. The regeneration of other cities such as Detroit (Akers 2013; Smith and Kirkpatrick 2015) remained more problematic despite massive city center investment. We hope that the parameters we delineate, which we discuss below in the methodology section of this chapter and develop in chapter 1, will contribute to further and comparative discussion of a broad range of cases. We examine who benefits and who pays for redevelopment, document short-term successes and long-term further disempowerment and dispossession of different social groups, and trace that channeling of capital and resources mobilized for local redevelopment to various national and transnational centers of power. As critics of the celebratory narratives that

surround certain urban regeneration projects stress (Ponzini 2010; Cifuentes and Tixlier 2012), it is important to move beyond a snapshot and a generalized view of success. Our comparison contributes to this dialogue and the emerging data on regeneration in such cities.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the leaderships of many disempowered cities, like those of more powerful cities, sought to regain their past stronger positions by generating wealth through urban regeneration and branding within globe-spanning efforts to attract capital, "creative classes," and supranational institutions. Migrants in a wide range of class positions have contributed to these efforts. Consequently, disempowered cities with often surprisingly migrant/minority-friendly narratives and policies have been featured in news coverage, as captured by this *New York Times* headline: "Ailing Midwestern Cities Extend a Welcoming Hand to Immigrants" (Preston 2013).[6] In Europe, with support from the Council of European Municipalities and Regions and the Committee of the Regions of the European Union, a network of cities, including some we designate as disempowered, recognized the role of immigrant entrepreneurs in the "economic growth of their local area" by offering services, products, and employment to "immigrants and the host population, and creat[ing] in many cities an important bridge to global markets" (Rath and Swagerman 2011). However, few scholars of either urban restructuring and or migration have acknowledged the multiscalar relationship between migrants and urban restructuring processes in such cities.

We emphasize the utility of studying migrants' relationships to disempowered cities because we believe that, in such cities, migrants' displacement and emplacement contribute to multifaceted aspects of city-making in ways that can be more readily studied and theorized. In addition, we argue that local leaders and policy makers in disempowered cities often become more aware of the importance of migrants and minorities than do similar actors in more powerful cities. This understanding emerges through their efforts within historical conjunctures to sustain and reconstitute their city. We realized the significance of studying displacement and emplacement in disempowered cities as we struggled to understand relationships between migrants and the three cities in which we worked. We wondered why our observations did not match claims from studies of cities that were powerhouses of corporate, financial, political, and cultural interconnection. In our search for answers, we began to examine the scalar repositioning of cities. This led to defining, identifying, and researching disempowered cities and to rethinking the role of migrants within the multiscalar processes that constitute cities with different configurations of economic, political, and cultural power.

The multiscalar theoretical framework of analysis of *Migrants and City-Making* highlights earlier work in urban history, historical sociology, geography, and anthropology that explored the generative role of city-making in broader social processes (Weber 1958 [1921]; Tilly 1990; Braudel 1974). It also underscores the significance of approaching city-making "within different conjunctions of the capitalist process" (Susser 2002, 3). Historical literature on relationships between cities, states, and empires makes clear that cities have played different roles based on their positioning within networks of power and that this differential embedding affected class composition and ways of life for all the city's residents.

In *Territory, Authority, and Rights* (2008), Sassen notes ways in which cities that are linked to a territorial base but look outward have in the past formed base areas for local people striving to forge new concepts of citizenships and rights. She also suggests that, within contemporary globalization, this process has begun again. But her theory building has generally been concerned with what she designates as global cities. *Migrants and City-Making* deepens Sassen's insights into contemporary processes by exploring how people live within and contribute to globe-spanning processes, even within disempowered cities. This book also counters disciplinary divisions between migration studies and urban studies that continue to obscure global processes of city-making.

Analytical Framework: Key Concepts

Having introduced what we mean by multiscalar analysis, we move on to define the key concepts that underlie and illuminate the multiscalar analysis of relations between migrants and the three disempowered cities that are explored in following chapters. These key concepts are: *accumulation by dispossession* as it relates to *displacement* and *emplacement*, *contemporaneity*, *historical conjuncture*, and *comparison*.

ACCUMULATION BY DISPOSSESSION, DISPLACEMENT, AND EMPLACEMENT

For us, displacement is not just another word for mobility, and emplacement is not just another way of saying integration. Displacement and emplacement are interrelated processes of the restructuring of space and social relations at given points in time. In the analytical framework of this book, displacement and emplacement take place as part of the accumulation of capital by mul-

tiple forms of dispossession. Capital is approached here in its Marxist sense as a set of unequal social relations organized within a range of cultural understandings for the appropriation of surplus value. As Thomas Piketty notes (2014, 20). "The history of the distribution of wealth has always been deeply political, and it cannot be reduced to purely economic mechanisms. . . . The history of inequality is shaped by the way economic, social, and political actors view what is just and what is not, as well as by the relative power of those actors and the collective choices that result. It is the joint product of all relevant actors combined."

Marx (1967) used the term "primitive accumulation" for the dispossessive processes through which capital was initially accrued to fuel the development of industrial capitalism in Europe. Through dispossession, the "social means of substance and of production" were transformed into capital (Marx 1967, 714). This form of dispossession took multiple forms, ranging from the violent seizure of land and resources during conquest and colonization to the "parliamentary form of robbery," such as the enclosure of the commons in England (Marx 1967, 724). Critical development studies and geographers (Glassman 2006; Hart 2006) and anthropologists (Kasmir and Carbonella 2008) have recently taken up the debate about the historicity and scope of the process, reassessing issues initially raised by Rosa Luxemburg (1951) and revisited in the 1960s within debates about dependency theory.

Renaming these processes of accruing capital by appropriating the social means of subsistence as "accumulation by dispossession," David Harvey (2003, 2004) has argued that while always present after the initial expansion of Europe, dispossessions and their resulting displacements have become central to capital accumulation in the current conjuncture. Harvey (2004) includes among contemporary forms of accumulation by dispossession not only older practices such as the seizure of communal land, precious resources, and public spaces but also capital acquired through neoliberal "reforms" such as the privatization of public utilities, schools, housing, and hospitals. Also integral to contemporary accumulation through dispossession are new and revitalized instruments that financialize risk and debt based on markets in mortgages, student debt, and car loans. Harvey's concerns mesh with popular accounts of contemporary capitalism, including capital accumulation via "the shock doctrine" (Klein 2007), "disaster capitalism" (Klein 2007), and the struggle for the "commons" (Susser and Tonnelat 2013).

We agree with Harvey (2004, 2012) that contemporary efforts by capitalists throughout the world to deploy new forms of accumulation have been precipitated by capitalists facing a crisis of overaccumulation, which leads