

Footnote urbanism: the missing East in (not so) global urbanism

To appear as:

Müller Martin (2021). **Footnote urbanism: the missing East in (not so) global urbanism**. In: Lancione M and McFarlane C (eds) *Thinking Global Urbanism: Essays on the City and Its Future*.

Martin Müller

ORCID iD <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0734-4311>

Department of Geography and Sustainability
University of Lausanne
1015 Lausanne | SWITZERLAND
martin@martin-muller.net
www.martin-muller.net

and

Center for Global Urbanism
Ural Federal University
51 Prospekt Lenina | 620142 Ekaterinburg | RUSSIA

Word count: 3,177 words (excluding references)

‘All cities are global, but some cities are more global than others.’

Can you locate the city of Vilnius on a map? If your hand just twitched towards your smartphone, take comfort in that you are not alone. Most people can't. The capital city of Lithuania, an EU member state, draws a blank even among most global urbanists. Vilnius wanted to end that dire state of affairs in 2018. It launched a marketing campaign that provided some basic geographical education of its whereabouts to the global public. The tagline read: “Vilnius – the G-Spot of Europe. Nobody knows where it is, but when you find it – it’s amazing.” I will leave to the side a rich feminist reading of the mystification of female sexuality and the presentation of a city as inviting male penetration and will just say this much: If you are still wondering where Vilnius is, just follow the convulsive hand in Figure 1 to where it clutches the bed sheet.



Figure 1: Image campaign of the city of Vilnius in 2018: ‘Nobody knows where it is, but when you find it – it’s amazing.’ #vilniusgspot (source: Go Vilnius, reproduced with kind permission)

But Vilnius is not just a blank space in the mental maps of tourists; it is just as much one in the mental map of global urbanism. This holds true for the history of global urbanism as we know it, from Peter Hall’s (1966) *The World Cities* to the more recent postcolonial critique of urban studies. This critique, emerging in the 2000s, takes issue with a situation where few large cities in wealthy countries are theoretical beacons, but most others, often outside the West, remained shrouded in darkness. Drawing out cities from the shadows and margins of global urban theory-making and putting them centre-stage has been the declared mission of this critique (McFarlane, 2008). Scholars have been vociferous about the need for ‘new geographies of theory’ (Roy, 2009: 819), about making urban studies ‘more cosmopolitan’ (Robinson, 2002: 549) and about not elevating a limited number of places – Paris, London, Chicago, Los Angeles – into the status of paradigmatic cities for urban theory.

Many people doing research on cities outside North America and Western Europe feel the postcolonial insistence on a more global vision of urban studies, and crucially of urban theory, as a great liberation. I certainly do. It has breathed life into research on cities that had been treated as exotic case studies, and it has encouraged theory-making from places that had hitherto been confined to the margins of urban theory. As a consequence, urban studies has seen influential theorisations emerge from cities such as Jakarta and Johannesburg, Kolkata and Cape Town.

Yet, for Vilnius and its brother and sister cities in the Global Easts – from Belgrade to Kyiv, from Istanbul to Teheran, from Almaty to Taipeh and from Moscow to Seoul – the advent and rapid rise of this critique has not much improved the situation. Quite the opposite. If anything, it has made them recede even more deeply into the dark. Global urbanism, then, is much less global than it purports to be: it comes with a particular gaze that makes some cities – in the Global North and, increasingly, in the Global South – more visible and others, in the Global Easts, less so. Or to paraphrase George Orwell: All cities are global, but some cities are more global than others.

When I write of the Global Easts, in the plural, I refer to all those places that do not easily fit into the categories of Global North and Global South. This concerns in particular the Middle East, East Asia and the post-socialist East. Often, these are countries and cities that were outside or at the margins of European colonialism. Either they were empires themselves, but not European (such as the Russian, Ottoman, Persian, Chinese and Japanese empires), or they were colonies of, or occupied by, non-European empires (such as much of Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Korea, Taiwan, and parts of the Middle East). I use the term ‘East’ here, as elsewhere (Müller, 2020a), not so much as a determinate geographical descriptor than as a floating signifier that denotes an epistemological project: that of thinking urban theory with and through the locations outside European empires and their former colonies.

The cities of these Global Easts have become mere footnotes to contemporary global urbanism. I mean this metaphorically, although it is often true in a literal sense: cities of the Easts are frequently relegated to the footnotes of books and articles, reduced to mere afterthoughts for the sake of completeness. The footnote, of course, is not where the exciting action happens. It is for tucking away things you think you should mention but deem not important enough to put them in the running text. English playwright Noël Coward put it quite memorably: ‘Having to read a footnote resembles having to go downstairs to answer the door while in the midst of making love’ (quoted in Grafton, 1999: 70). The Easts are thus the unwelcome disruption when you are busy with more exciting things in global urbanism. And let’s face it: for the most part, global urbanism has chosen not to go downstairs.

The goal of this contribution is to rummage through the footnotes of global urbanism in order reconstruct the gaze of global urbanism and its blind spots with regard to the Global Easts. For only if one is aware of that gaze – and its silences – can one direct it elsewhere. The analysis in the rest of this piece focuses on one of those multiple Easts: those 30 countries, and their cities, that emerged from the fall of state socialism between 1989 and 1992 to form the post-socialist East. This East includes cities from Wrocław to Vladivostok, from Sarajevo to Samarkand, from Tirana to Tartu, as well as the largest city in Europe, Moscow.

Rummaging through the footnotes of global urbanism

Literature on global urbanism has one particular place reserved for cities of the post-socialist East: the footnote. This is often enough true in quite a literal sense. When in the 1980s Austro-American urban theorist John Friedmann started to think urbanisation in relation to global economic processes with his world city hypothesis, this marked an important opening up of urban studies to cities around the world. The world cities approach explicitly cast its gaze beyond the narrow confines of large metropolises to a world of interlinked cities. Friedmann, however, framed the cities of the (then still socialist) East as a problem in this approach and confined them to the footnotes: ‘A *problem* is posed by cities in the actually existing socialist countries, particularly China and the Soviet Union. The question is an empirical one: how and to what extent are their major cities tied into the international capitalist economy and therefore subject to its influence?’ (Friedmann and Wolff, 1982, footnote on page 310, emphasis added). The only time the East occurs in Friedmann’s influential paper on the world city hypothesis is, again, in a footnote to Table 1 (Friedmann, 1986: 72). This table, entitled ‘The World City Hierarchy’, lists world cities in core and semi-peripheral countries. Its footnote reads: ‘Also *eliminated* from consideration were all centrally planned economies which are integrated into the Soviet block’ (emphasis added). No mention thus of Moscow or Warsaw, and their control functions in the world economy – a *problem eliminated* by definitional fiat in one fell swoop.

In the early 2000s, a critique of the specific geography of the notion of ‘world cities’ emerged – a geography that favours rich and powerful cities over others, less rich and less powerful, notably those in the Global South (Robinson, 2006). The clarion call was not to privilege certain cities on the basis of their economic power, but to widen the empirical embrace of urban studies to work towards creating a more global discipline. This opening would have come at the right time for cities of the post-socialist East. Socialism had dissolved a decade earlier and cities from Wrocław to Vladivostok were integrating, and being integrated with force, into the global (capitalist) economy and flows of investment, capital, migration and expertise (Poiani and Stead, 2019). More and more local researchers started to publish in English, and Western researchers had much easier access to Eastern cities as field sites than during socialist times. ‘The situation appears more propitious than ever, then,’ Jennifer Robinson (2006: 93) remarked, ‘for an integration of urban studies across long-standing divisions of scholarship, especially between Western and other cities, including “Third World” and former socialist cities’. In theory.

In practice, however, cities of the post-socialist East continued to be consigned to the footnotes. Let us look at how this is the case in three of the most formative interventions for global urbanism: Robinson’s (2002) *Global and world cities: a view from off the map*, Roy’s (2009) *The 21st century metropolis: new geographies of theory* and Sheppard, Leitner and Maringanti’s (2013) *Provincializing global urbanism: a manifesto*.

Jennifer Robinson’s paper is an early critique of the division between urban theory, associated with cities of the West, and development studies, associated with cities in the Third World. Post-socialist cities make a tentative appearance in a footnote (!) on the first page: ‘This argument [of the division between Western and Third World cities] would seem to hold also for other cities ‘beyond the West’, such as post-Socialist [sic] cities’ (Robinson, 2002: 531).

This assumed parallelism is not explored further, although post-socialist cities are mentioned several times later in the paper. While Robinson devotes a later paper entirely to the question of cities of the post-socialist East in global urbanism (Robinson, 2016), this early intervention, together with her book *Ordinary cities* (Robinson, 2006), mentions the post-socialist East for completeness, but does not engage with cities there, and their empirical realities, in any depth, beyond postulating an analogy.

The other two pieces (Roy, 2009; Sheppard et al., 2013) pass over the post-socialist East in silence. Ananya Roy argues for the need to multiply the locations from which urban theory is produced and highlights the potential of different world regions to that effect. She comes out in favour of enlisting area studies for forging new geographies of urban theory. Yet, in her otherwise comprehensive consideration of different areas – Latin America, South Asia, East Asia, the Middle East, Africa – one area is conspicuously absent: the post-socialist East. That is all the more curious as it was precisely the confrontation between the West and the then socialist East that led to the ascendance of area studies during the Cold War (Engerman, 2010; Sidaway, 2013: 986). Yes, Roy (2009: 821) does mention that her ‘coverage of world-areas is thus highly selective and strategic rather than comprehensive’. But it is hard to see what other non-Northern areas have been left out, apart from Southeast Asia and non-white Oceania.

Finally, the manifesto for provincializing global urbanism (Sheppard et al., 2013) performs an interesting manoeuvre, where it theoretically leaves the door open for cities of the post-socialist East, while practically closing it. It does so by calling for challenging mainstream urbanism from the South, which, in a footnote (!), they define as ‘those, *everywhere*, whose livelihoods have been made precarious by geohistorical processes of colonialism and globalizing capitalism’ (p. 898, emphasis added). This could include the post-socialist East, at least where ‘globalizing capitalism’ is concerned (where the East stands in the forcefield of colonialism is more complicated, see Müller 2020a). Yet, when it comes to putting names and locations to this all-encompassing South, one quickly realizes that the manifesto is articulated around the conventional notion of the South as ‘the post-colonial societies of Latin America, Asia and more recently Africa and non-white Oceania’ (p. 894). This is even more curious knowing Eric Sheppard’s earlier interest in socialist cities (Sheppard, 2000). Thus, the cities cited in the manifesto are Jakarta, Lagos, Calcutta [sic], São Paulo, Mumbai, Hongkong, Singapore and Shanghai – all with a history of European colonialism. Cities in the Easts, post-socialist or otherwise, are passed in silence.

The position of the post-socialist East is not much different in the major textbooks of urban geography. Textbooks are central sources of representing urban studies and a world of cities in all its diversity, both to students and to instructors. The global urban critique notably pointed out that Third World cities had been relegated to the obligatory last chapter of textbooks, as special or exotic cases (Roy, 2009). In general, English-language urban geography textbooks exhibit a strong bias towards AngloAmerica, as a recent analysis demonstrated (Lawhon and Roux, 2019). Let us take a closer look at the two most international textbooks according to that analysis: Jonas et al.’s (2015) *Urban Geography: a critical introduction* and Pacione’s (2009) *Urban Geography: a global perspective*. What is the position and role of cities in the post-socialist East in them?

Sadly, the tally is quickly made. *Urban Geography: a critical introduction* does not mention the cities of the post-socialist East even once. There is one mention of ‘socialist cities’, but only to argue that this label is becoming obsolete with the spread of the term ‘global South’ (p. 75). *Urban Geography: a global perspective* has a few pages devoted to the urban form and urban planning in the socialist city. But these cities disappear from view with the collapse of socialism. A mere two paragraphs (p. 185) explain how the post-socialist transition process has turned those cities really into their Western counterparts: the free market has replaced central planning, and suburbanisation, private home ownership and gentrification have taken hold. Post-socialist cities undertake large redevelopment of the downtown with private capital, ‘like many entrepreneurial cities in the US’ (p. 185), and there is a trend towards a “‘European” urban residential structure characterised by an affluent inner core and a poor periphery’ (p. 185). The post-socialist city seems to return, in this account, to Western capitalist normality, with all difference effaced – an account not shared by many of the researchers working on those cities.

In this footnote urbanism, the post-socialist East is therefore either completely absent in attempts to present a more global picture of urban studies or is confined, often quite literally, to the footnotes. These footnotes come in two kinds. The first could be called the ‘idem’ footnote, conveying a message akin to ‘the same goes for the post-socialist East’, without presenting much evidence for this thesis. This idem footnote aligns the East either with the West, assuming a neat transition from socialism to Western-style capitalism (as in Pacione, 2009), or with the South, assuming a similar trope of marginalisation (as in Robinson, 2002). The second type of footnote is the elimination footnote. It mentions cities of the post-socialist East for completeness, but then goes on to disregard, or eliminate, them from further consideration (as in Friedmann, 1986 and Friedmann and Wolff, 1982).

From the footnotes to the main act: ‘Nobody knows where it is, but when you find – it’s amazing.’

Footnotes are the places where we put information that is too important to leave out, but too trivial to discuss in a meaningful way, lest it disrupt the main argument. The footnote is a side show or afterthought tacked on, sometimes awkwardly, to the lead narrative. It is where we find the cities of the post-socialist East in contemporary global urbanism: their existence is sometimes acknowledged (and sometimes not), but its implications are ignored.

This ignorance has problematic consequences. It creates a blind spot in the endeavour of global urbanism to work towards a more global urban studies. What is more, this is a blind spot that global urbanism is currently only dimly aware of, enthralled as it is by theorising from the South and the hemispheric fallacy that North plus South equals the globe (Müller, 2020b). This footnote urbanism puts all those interested in cities of the Easts, whether students, scholars or policymakers, in an awkward position: How shall one articulate one’s thoughts if speaking from what is essentially terra incognita in global urbanism? Who shall one speak to and with what concepts? And who will listen?

For global urbanism to become truly global, it must embrace the Easts. Two things follow. First, global urbanism must come to terms with its Eastern blind spot and move towards an active engagement with the wealth of literature that is out there, whether on the postsocialist

or on other Easts. The large and growing body of writing, almost all in English, now comprises several edited volumes, some of them dating back to the 2000s, when the first interventions of the postcolonial critique of global urbanism appeared (in addition to the early classic of Andrusz et al., 1996 there are ; Brade and Neugebauer, 2017; Grubbauer and Kusiak, 2012; Kliems and Dmitrieva, 2010; Stanilov, 2007; Stanilov and Sýkora, 2014; Tsenkova and Nedović-Budić, 2006; Tuvikene et al., 2019). Several excellent monographs present a nuanced picture of post-socialist urbanism, avoiding the twin dangers of assuming full assimilation to the West on the one hand and exotic difference on the other (Czepczyński, 2008; Fehérvári, 2013; Hirt, 2012). There is a biannual conference on the international urban geographies of post-communist states, colloquially known as the CATference, which draws about 200 participants. Perhaps most importantly in this age of social media, there is a lively facebook group (Cities after Transition, 2020) and twitter account (@AfterCities).

A second step ensues. It is about listening and entering into a dialogue. Post-socialist urban research has sought to converse with research on cities in other parts of the globe and contribute to global urban theory. Debates have circled around the practice of comparison (Tuvikene, 2016; Tuvikene et al., 2017; Wiest, 2012), the need to produce and ‘export’ theory (Gentile, 2018b; Ouředníček, 2016; Sjöberg, 2014), the obstacles to engaging with global urban studies (Ferenčuhová, 2016a, 2016b) and the position of the East in global urban studies (Müller and Trubina, 2020b; Pobłocki, 2020). Authors have shown chutzpah in proposing ways of speaking back to global urban theory through revising existing (Western) concepts such as gentrification, neoliberalism, urban geopolitics, urban informality and improvisation, mobility and shrinking cities (Gentile, 2018a, 2019; Gentile and Sjöberg, 2019; Haase et al., 2016; Kubeš and Kovács, 2020; Kusiak, 2019; Müller and Trubina, 2020a; Tuvikene, 2018; Tuvikene et al., 2019).

There is no excuse for ignoring cities in the East: literature is out there, it is plentiful, it is in English, and it has something to say to global urban theory. Entering into a dialogue with the East will add some nuance, some shades of grey (Pobłocki, 2013; Yiftachel, 2009), to the sometimes overwrought debates that emerge from a global urbanism divided into hemispheric binaries of North and South.

Noël Coward may have remarked that engaging with a footnote was akin to having to go downstairs to answer the door whilst in the midst of making love. Cities from the East are banging on that door, loud and clear. If global urbanism chose to go downstairs and answer, it might be surprised to discover yet unknown pleasures. *The Global East: nobody knows where it is, but when you find – it’s amazing.*

References

- Andrusz G, Harloe M and Szelenyi I (eds) (1996) *Cities After Socialism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brade I and Neugebauer C (2017) *Urban Eurasia: Cities in Transformation*. Berlin: DOM.
- Cities after Transition (2020) Cities after Transition (CAT). Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/274911812535400/>.

- Czepczyński M (2008) *Cultural Landscapes of Post-Socialist Cities: Representation of Powers and Needs*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Engerman DC (2010) Social Science in the Cold War. *Isis* 101(2): 393–400. DOI: 10.1086/653106.
- Fehérvári K (2013) *Politics in Color and Concrete: Socialist Materialities and the Middle Class in Hungary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ferenčuhová S (2016a) Accounts from behind the Curtain: History and Geography in the Critical Analysis of Urban Theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(1): 113–131. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12332.
- Ferenčuhová S (2016b) Explicit Definitions and Implicit Assumptions about Post-Socialist Cities in Academic Writings. *Geography Compass* 10(12): 514–524. DOI: 10.1111/gec3.12282.
- Friedmann J (1986) The world city hypothesis. *Development and Change* 17: 69–83.
- Friedmann J and Wolff G (1982) World city formation: an agenda for research and action. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6(3): 309–344. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.1982.tb00384.x.
- Gentile M (2018a) Gentrifications in the Planetary Elsewhere: tele-urbanization, Schengtrification, colour-splashing, and the mirage of “more-than-adequate” critical theory. *Urban Geography* 39(10): 1455–1464. DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2018.1500248.
- Gentile M (2018b) Three metals and the ‘post-socialist city’: reclaiming the peripheries of urban knowledge. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* online. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12552.
- Gentile M (2019) Geopolitical fault-line cities in the world of divided cities. *Political Geography* 71: 126–138. DOI: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.03.002.
- Gentile M and Sjöberg Ö (2019) Neoliberalism(s) as a Guide to Post-Wall Urban Change: Explanation Out of the Blue? *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 0(0). DOI: 10.1111/tesg.12374.
- Grafton A (1999) *The Footnote: A Curious History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grubbauer M and Kusiak J (eds) (2012) *Chasing Warsaw: Socio-Material Dynamics of Urban Change Since 1990*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Haase A, Rink D and Grossmann K (2016) Shrinking Cities in Post-Socialist Europe: What Can We Learn from Their Analysis for Theory Building Today? *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 98(4): 305–319. DOI: 10.1111/geob.12106.
- Hall P (1966) *The World Cities*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Hirt S (2012) *Iron Curtains: Gates, Suburbs and Privatization of Space in the Post-Socialist City*. Oxford: Wiley.

- Jonas AEG, McCann E and Thomas M (2015) *Urban Geography: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Kliems A and Dmitrieva M (eds) (2010) *The Post Socialist City: Continuity and Change in Urban Space and Imagery*. Berlin: Jovis.
- Kubeš J and Kovács Z (2020) The kaleidoscope of gentrification in post-socialist cities. *Urban Studies* early online. DOI: 10.1177/0042098019889257.
- Kusiak J (2019) Rule of Law and Rules-Lawyering: Legal Corruption and ‘Reprivatization Business’ in Warsaw. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43(3): 589–596. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12702.
- Lawhon M and Roux LL (2019) Southern urbanism or a world of cities? Modes of enacting more global urban geographical textbooks, teaching and research. *Urban Geography* 40(9): 1251–1269. DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2019.1575153.
- McFarlane C (2008) Urban Shadows: Materiality, the ‘Southern City’ and Urban Theory. *Geography Compass* 2(2): 340–358. DOI: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2007.00073.x.
- Müller M (2020a) In Search of the Global East: Thinking between North and South. *Geopolitics* early online: 1–22. DOI: 10.1080/14650045.2018.1477757.
- Müller M (2020b) The hemispheric fallacy: how we theorised cities from the North and South but forgot about the East. *Working Paper*.
- Müller M and Trubina E (2020a) Improvising ambiguous urban spaces, inhabiting the in-between. *Environment and Planning D: Society & Space*. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3353751.
- Müller M and Trubina E (2020b) The East in global urbanism: views from beyond North and South. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* forthcoming.
- Ouředníček M (2016) The relevance of “Western” theoretical concepts for investigations of the margins of post-socialist cities: the case of Prague. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 57(4–5): 545–564. DOI: 10.1080/15387216.2016.1256786.
- Pacione M (2009) *Urban Geography: A Global Perspective*. 3rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pobłocki K (2013) Neither West nor South: Colour and Vernacular Cosmopolitanism in Urban Poland. *Przegląd Kulturoznawczy* 17(3): 205–215. DOI: 10.4467/20843860PK.13.020.2072.
- Pobłocki K (2020) Over/under-urbanization revisited: comparing ‘instant cities’ in the Global South and Global East. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* forthcoming.
- Pojani D and Stead D (2019) When West–East planning policy advice fails to gain traction. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 62(8). Routledge: 1402–1419. DOI: 10.1080/09640568.2018.1497586.
- Robinson J (2002) Global and world cities: a view from off the map. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26(3): 531–554.

- Robinson J (2006) *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Robinson J (2016) Starting from anywhere, making connections: globalizing urban theory. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 57(4–5): 643–657. DOI: 10.1080/15387216.2016.1271617.
- Roy A (2009) The 21st-Century Metropolis: New Geographies of Theory. *Regional Studies* 43(6): 819–830. DOI: 10.1080/00343400701809665.
- Sheppard E (2000) Socialist cities? *Urban Geography* 21(8): 758–763. DOI: 10.2747/0272-3638.21.8.758.
- Sheppard E, Leitner H and Maringanti A (2013) Provincializing Global Urbanism: A Manifesto. *Urban Geography* 34(7): 893–900. DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2013.807977.
- Sidaway JD (2013) Geography, Globalization, and the Problematic of Area Studies. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103(4): 984–1002. DOI: 10.1080/00045608.2012.660397.
- Sjöberg Ö (2014) Cases onto themselves? Theory and research on ex-socialist urban environments. *Geografie* 119(4): 299–319.
- Stanilov K (2007) *The Post-Socialist City: Urban Form and Space Transformations in Central and Eastern Europe after Socialism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Stanilov K and Sýkora L (eds) (2014) *Confronting Suburbanization: Urban Decentralization in Postsocialist Central and Eastern Europe*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Tsenkova S and Nedović-Budić Z (2006) *The Urban Mosaic of Post-Socialist Europe: Space, Institutions and Policy*. Physica: Heidelberg.
- Tuvikene T (2016) Strategies for Comparative Urbanism: Post-socialism as a De-territorialized Concept. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(1): 132–146. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12333.
- Tuvikene T (2018) Post-socialist (auto)mobilities: Modernity, freedom and citizenship. *Geography Compass* 12(3): e12362. DOI: 10.1111/gec3.12362.
- Tuvikene T, Neves Alves S and Hilbrandt H (2017) Strategies for relating diverse cities: A multi-sited individualising comparison of informality in Bafatá, Berlin and Tallinn. *Current Sociology* 65(2). SAGE Publications Ltd: 276–288. DOI: 10.1177/0011392116657298.
- Tuvikene T, Sgibnev W and Neugebauer CS (eds) (2019) *Post-Socialist Urban Infrastructures*. London: Routledge.
- Wiest K (2012) Comparative debates in post-socialist urban studies. *Urban Geography* 33(6): 829–849.
- Yiftachel O (2009) Theoretical Notes On ‘Gray Cities’: the Coming of Urban Apartheid? *Planning Theory* 8(1): 88–100. DOI: 10.1177/1473095208099300.

