MIGRANTS & CITY-MAKING

Dispossession, Displacement, & Urban Regeneration

AYŞE ÇAĞLAR & NINA GLICK SCHILLER

MIGRANTS & CITY-MAKING

MIGRANTS & CITY-MAKING

Dispossession, Displacement, and Urban Regeneration

Ayşe Çağlar and Nina Glick Schiller

Duke University Press • Durham and London • 2018

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Typeset in Minion and Trade Gothic type by BW&A Books, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Çaglar, Ayse, author. | Schiller, Nina Glick, author.
Title: Migrants and city-making : multiscalar perspectives on dispossession / Ayse Çaglar and Nina Glick Schiller.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018004045 (print) | LCCN 2018008084 (ebook) | ISBN 9780822372011 (ebook) | ISBN 9780822370444 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780822370567 (pbk. : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH : Emigration and immigration—Social aspects. | Immigrants—Turkey—Mardin. | Immigrants—New Hampshire—Manchester. | Immigrants—Germany—Halle an der Saale. | City planning—Turkey—Mardin. | City planning—New Hampshire—Manchester. | City planning—Germany—Halle an der Saale.
Classification: LCC JV6225 (ebook) | LCC JV6225 .S564 2018 (print) | DDC 305.9/06912091732—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2018004045

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.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the support of the following institutions that made this book possible through financial assistance, research offices, and facilities: the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology; the Center for the Humanities, University of New Hampshire; the University of Vienna; Central European University, the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity; the University of Manchester; and Malmö University.

We also are grateful for the personal support of Günther Schlee, Bettina Mann, Viktoria Giehler-Zeng, Viola Stanisch, Manuela Pusch, Bert Feintuck, Dudley Dudley, Steven Vertovec, Peter van der Veer, Katif Araz, and Yehuda Elkana. Special thanks to Hubert Weterwami, Helene Simerwayi, and their children, who have been an ongoing inspiration for this book.

This book would not have been possible without the support of our partners and children: Arif Çağlar and Leyla and Sinan Çağlar; Steve Reyna and Rachel Schiller, Devan Aptekar, Naomi Schiller, Noah Biklen, Zander Reyna and Kate Reyna Lalier, Brenda and Damon Reyna, and Bradon Reyna. Our special thanks to Sinan for his continuing support and patience as he grew up in the company of this book.

In addition, we had the assistance of the following research colleagues: Dr. Thad Guldbrandsen, Dr. Seda Yüksel, Dr. Evangelos Karagiannis, and Dr. Minh Nguen. We were assisted in fieldwork and our interviews by a range of outstanding and insightful researchers, including Geraldine Boggs, Peter Buchannan, Faten al Hassun, Molly Messinger, Ronn Mueller, Markus Rau, Martin Sieber, Emila Smallridge, Julia Wenger, and Julia Wenzel. Invaluable technical support was provided by Daniele Karasz, Katrin Kremmel, Alexandra Sindrestean, Karen Alexander (copyediting), Robert Schultze (photography), Dr. Oğuz Tanındı and Jutta Turner (cartography).

We were graciously received by city and political officials in Halle/Saale, Manchester, New Hampshire, and Mardin, and we wish to thank them for their generous assistance. This research was made possible only by multiple residents of each city who welcomed us with sociability, kindness, and wisdom.

Funding was provided by a MacArthur Foundation Human Security grant; by a University of New Hampshire Excellence grant and Faculty Development grants; by the Center for the Humanities, including the James H. Hayes and Claire Short Hayes Chair in the Humanities; by a Central European University research grant; by the University of Vienna, Max Planck Institute for the study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity (Minerva Fellowship); and by the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.

INTRODUCTION

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 ethnoreligious 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, bazars 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

them to turn to other means of accumulation. Whether one accepts this understanding of the dynamics that underlie contemporary dispossessive processes, there is general agreement among observers of diverse political outlooks that massive amounts of wealth are now controlled by a handful of people (Oxfam 2015; Piketty 2015; Milanovic 2016; Sassen 2014; Durand 2017). Those controlling this concentrated wealth are finding other forms of investment more profitable than the production of goods, whether the goods are steel, cell phones, garments, or gizmos. In 2016, the weakness of the world economy appeared in fundamental sectors such as oil, steel, and commodities (World Bank 2016), which reflected reduced production as corporations cut back on goods people couldn't afford to buy. As a result, those holding concentrations of capital sought new and intensified forms of accumulation by dispossession.

Although significant contemporary processes of dispossession related to land revaluation and governance are not solely urban phenomena, some of the most useful scholarship on contemporary dispossession have been analyses of urban restructuring processes (Smith 1996; Brenner, Marcuse, and Mayer 2009; Künkel and Mayer 2011). Recent forms of urban dispossession are documented in the literature on slum or favela clearance or "rehabilitation" (Freeman 2012; Banerjee-Guha 2010; Lees, Shin, and Lopez Morales 2015).[7] As has been noted for India, slum designations "function as a central vehicle for facilitating the alienation of public land to private developers" (Ghertner 2014). Approaching accumulation through dispossession in this way challenges urban scholars to cease viewing the urban poor as a marginal, surplus population or outside the processes of capital accumulation. The poor must be understood as contributing to the processes of creating value in city land and property in several interrelated ways. In cases where cities become depopulated or abandoned by wealthier people, some neighborhoods remain viable because they are claimed by the poor. These areas and the property within them are often constituted within multiscalar city-making networks of migrant and non-migrant small businesses and religious, political, social, humanitarian, and charitable institutions that cater to the urban poor (Morell 2015). Within these networks, poor people contribute to processes of accumulation by putting a brake on abandonment, decay, and devaluation as well as through the social relations their activities generate. In many places in the world, squatters develop urban peripheries only to be expelled as this land is claimed by public–private interests for redevelopment.

Focusing on these processes allows us to understand why so much capital

has been invested in urban regeneration schemes around the world. This perspective situates conditions of contemporary city-making within a broader analysis of dispossessive processes that place migrants and non-migrants within the same analytical lens. Confronting processes that underlie displacements requires acknowledging that migrants can no longer be considered a separate category of actors but must be seen, along with everyone else, within their multiple identities/disparate positionalities and within configurations of dispossession and subsequent social and physical dislocations. Moreover, this theorization speaks to possible bases for the emergence of globe-spanning social movements that can counter globally resurgent nationalisms (Glassman 2006).

Processes of dispossession produce a range of physical and social displacements. The term "displacement" has transhistorical connotations and relates to processes of capital accumulation in specific places and times. In its transhistorical sense, "displacement" refers to the city-, state-, and empire-building processes that have stripped people of land, resources, and their means of livelihood and forced them to reposition, reorder, or relocate their lives and relationships. Often violent, these displacements were accompanied by new forms of emplacement, including class formation, slavery, intensified gendered hierarchy, and colonization (Wolf 1982).

However, we highlight a second meaning of displacement that is linked to the accumulation of capital by dispossession. In this second usage, displacement is the outcome of people losing their access to various social means of subsistence. This displacement has taken many forms. Sometimes the dispossession that leads to displacement occurs through neoliberal "austerity" measures and "reforms" and the restructuring and privatization of public land, housing, employment, and benefits. These transformations have led to downward social mobility as large numbers of people lose their social positions. Sometimes the dispossessive processes are violence and warfare linked to broader struggles for land and resources within geopolitical contentions, which cause people to flee their homelands. Because of these processes, the lives of increasing numbers of people around the world are becoming precarious. Precarity is *not* a synonym for poverty (Fassin 2015). In this book, we use it to refer to a state of insecurity and unpredictability brought about by neoliberal restructuring of both the terms and the conditions of working and living. However, we recognize that precariousness is basic to capitalist cycles of accumulation. In cities, the displaced are becoming urban precariats (Standing 2011): people who have never moved but have nonetheless been

socially dispossessed, and displaced and people who have migrated either within or across borders only to face another cycle of displacement and insecurity within urban regeneration.

The people from whom wealth is extracted are increasingly cast out or cast aside as worthless, regardless of legal status within the country where they live. In the past and at present, such appropriations are ultimately maintained by force but simultaneously legitimated culturally by narratives of national, racialized, and gendered difference (Harvey 2005; Quijano 2000). That is to say, accumulation through dispossession is justified by the categorization of those who have generated value as less than human. To highlight this integral aspect of the process of dispossession, Butler (2009) notes that the powerful cast the displaced as the "ungrievable other." In this process, the construction of cultural, religious, or racialized difference, or the judgment that such people are "deplorable" or criminal elements who lack the necessary values or work ethic, may serve to justify displacement. In urban regeneration processes, after inhabitants of poor neighborhoods, whether categorized as "native" or migrant, are stigmatized as violent and dangerous, they are first deprived of urban services and then evicted. Dispossessions following these otherizing processes strip people not only of their housing and businesses but also of their social, political, and economic networks and concomitant social capital, deepening the negative effects on their livelihood of their displacement.

Within our analysis of three disempowered cities, we explore forms and processes of dispossession and displacement, which we understand as aspects of the worldwide neoliberal competition between cities with different degrees of economic, political, and cultural power. We ask how, when, and with what consequences dispossessed and displaced people, both migrants and non-migrants, reconstruct their lives within these urban restructuring processes in these cities. By understanding these processes within the dynamics of multiscalar city-making, we link displacement and dispossession with modes of emplacement, which include claims for social citizenship and the development of sociabilities that can underlie movements for social justice. In chapter 1, we provide a comparative analysis of Manchester, Halle/Saale, and Mardin that establishes the basis for further discussion about the momentary successes and the failures of restructuring projects of other disempowered cities.

Our concern is with emplacement as well as displacement within neoliberal restructuring. We define emplacement as the relationship between, on the one hand, the continuing restructuring of place within multiscalar net-

works of power and, on the other, a person's efforts, within the barriers and opportunities that contingencies of local place-making offer, to build a life within networks of local, national, supranational, and global interconnections. The concept of "emplacement" serves as both a useful analytical tool with which to understand city-making in diverse urban settings and as an evidence-based concept. Central to our analysis, the concept of emplacement allows us to situate all residents of a city within transformations of space over time. Restructuring, as it continually changes over time, reconfigures and re-represents social and political spaces and the social forces that produce them (King 1996). As a processual concept that links space, place, and power (Smith 2002; Massey 2005; Harvey 2006), emplacement must be understood within specific geographic and temporal spaces and power fields.

We use the term "emplacement" because, unlike the terms "integration" or "assimilation" or the discourse that targets migrants as threats to social cohesion,[8] the concept of emplacement both invokes a sense of place-making and allows us to focus on a set of experiences shared by people who are generally differentiated by scholars and policy makers as either migrant or native. By speaking of emplacement, we can situate migrant and non-migrant displacements within globe-spanning, but locally and temporally situated, neoliberal processes of the destruction and reconstitution of capital. In the framework we present, non-migrants as well as migrants must seek emplacement.

Chapters 2 through 5 examine several different processes of emplacement, all of which we found salient within the disempowered cities we studied. Those include entrepreneurship, sociability within shared spaces of residence, work and institutional settings, and social citizenship facilitated by religion, or supranationally facilitated place-making. Highlighting intersecting pathways of migrant and non-migrant displacement, emplacement, and city-making represents a much needed direction in comparative urban and migration studies and argues for an emerging displacement studies (Feldman Biano nd).

CONTEMPORANEITY AND CONJUNCTURE

Temporality as it relates to concepts of contemporaneity and conjuncture is an important but insufficiently discussed topic in urban and migration studies. By using the term "contemporaneity," we emphasize the need to conceptualize that those seen as migrants and those categorized as natives are coeval. These actors must be understood as sharing the same time/space, although with unequal access to resources and power. Too often the dynam-

ics of migrant practices, whether glossed as traditional or transnational, are thought of as situated within other places and at other times. Migrant practices and their dynamics are often approached through "typological time" (Fabian 1983) and therefore conceived of as categorically different from the practices and dynamics of non-migrants (Çağlar 2013, 2016). By situating migrants as contemporaries of all other urban residents and by analyzing their practices as coeval, it becomes clear that all city inhabitants (migrant or not) build their lives within processes of displacement and emplacement.

To address the changing trajectories of forces within which city-making, displacement, and emplacement occur, it also helps to conceptualize time in relation to changing configurations of intersecting multiscalar networks of disparate power. To do this, we speak of historical conjunctures, a concept once used broadly and taken for granted among Marxist-influenced scholars. Over the past few decades, some authors writing about displacement, globalization, and crisis have made passing reference to "the current historical conjuncture" (Malkki 1995), or the "current conjuncture" (Lee 1998; see also Gill 1992; Susser 2002; and Castells 1977). But with a few important exceptions, mainly concentrated in a cultural studies project that builds on Gramsci's use of the term (Denning 1996) and Hall's subsequent writings (Hall et al. 1978), little effort has been made to define the term or systematically deploy the concept.[9]

However, John Clarke (2010, 6) has recently argued for "thinking conjuncturally." He writes that conjunctural analysis is not a theory but an orientation that offers "a way of focusing analytical attention on the multiplicity of forces, accumulated antagonism and possible lines of emergence from particular" intertwinings of relations of power and contradictions (Clarke 2014, 115). To make a conjunctural analysis is to assess "the forces, tendencies, forms of power, and relations of domination" that at any moment in history can lead to regional and local political, economic, and social arrangements that differ from each other yet are interdependent (Clarke 2014, 115). By making a conjunctural analysis, we can situate the significance of different modes of capital accumulation in relationship to different forms of governance, discourse, kinship, identity, belonging, policing, mobility, and activism over time and in particular places. Hence, an analysis of each unfolding conjuncture denaturalizes views of social order and challenges the hegemonic, common sense of a point in time.

The concept of the historical conjuncture challenges the widespread methodological nationalist tendency to discuss migration and urban dynamics within separate national institutional histories. This orientation provides so-

cial analysts with a means of examining transformations across places and times and the interrelations of these changes. A conjunctural analysis examines the multiscalar, globally extending relationships of places to processes of accumulating wealth and power, to constructions of meaning and affect, and to the ways in which modes of social, political, and economic life are organized and reproduced. Such an analysis brings together intersecting global transformations that condition the growth of different organizational forms of industry and agriculture; the growth of nation-states and national movements; the content, meaning, and role of religion; the nature and articulation of crises; the dynamics and success of movements for social justice; and the efficacy and forms of capital accumulation. Differing specific iterations of institutional structures and policies in specific states and regions reflect as well as contribute to transnational or global transformations and affect modes of life, production and social reproduction, and ideologies of self and society everywhere.

Although they generally did not use the term "conjuncture," those who wrote about globalization in the 1990s were attempting to analyze a global historical conjuncture as its transformative dynamics became apparent (Mittelman 1996). The transnational migration paradigm of the 1990s that made transnational lives visible was the product of that historical conjuncture (Glick Schiller 1999; Kearney 1995). By the 1990s, transformations begun two decades earlier in response to crises of previous arrangements of capital formation had made visible the high degree of global interconnectivity, the transnationality of migrants' lives, emerging forms of flexible accumulation, new urban dispossessions, and gentrification, as part of the intensifying implementation of neoliberal agendas for economic and political restructuring (Sassen 1998). Crises took different forms and intersected in different and nonlinear ways with various national and local histories from the 1970s to 2008. Within that conjunctural moment, cities became recognized as convergences of new arrangements of governance involving corporate, educational, and public actors.

Implementations of neoliberal agendas and the struggles against it, including anti-globalization and right to the city movements, are producing a world that is becoming increasingly different from that of the period between the 1970s and 2008. Of course, there is uneven development, and conjunctural forces play out differently in different places. Nevertheless, these forces extend around the world, and when a new reconfiguration of multiscalar networks and their imbricated processes of capital formation emerge somewhere in the world, there are ramifications elsewhere. The global economic crisis of

2008 both echoed and magnified cracks in the system of accumulation that had prompted an Asian debt crisis in 1997 and the dot-com crash at the turn of the millennium. It also marked the emergence of a new conjunctural configuration. We are just beginning to assess the implications of these further transformations for the multiple forces of dispossession, including war, the intensification of racism, deportations, restrictions on migration and resulting displacements, disempowerment, city-making, and struggles for social justice. Our data traced the situation until 2016, but each of our chapters ends by noting the implications of our observations for future developments. In our conclusion, we address the changing historical conjuncture and the politics of transformation.

COMPARISON AS A MULTISCALAR METHOD

We work within a renewed dialogue among urban scholars, primarily geographers, about the merits and methods of comparing cities (see, for example, Nijman 2007, 2012; McFarlane and Robinson 2012; see also Robinson 2004; Dear 2005; Ward 2008, 2010; Ward and McCann 2011). Until recently, many urban scholars had abandoned their earlier interest in comparative perspectives, and those remaining failed to delineate the variables being compared (Cross and Moore 2002). Distrust of comparison has been particularly potent among urban anthropologists, who tend to see each city as displaying its own logic and unique differences (Berking 2008; Löw 2012). We argue that despite their varying historical legacies, it is possible and useful to compare those cities that participate in ongoing struggles for positioning within multiscalar networked hierarchies of economic, political, and social power. Locality and local history matter but only in relation to the dynamic multiscalar reconstitution of place within which the sense of the local is constituted.

One reason urban scholars had abandoned comparative studies was that they distrusted any methodology that entailed "by necessity some degree of reductionism as a step in preparing empirical observations for comparative assessment" (Pierre 2005, 447). Scholars in many disciplines adopted postmodernist narrative strategies that emphasized the uniqueness and path-determined nature of each place, a perspective that negated the possibility of comparison. Others, influenced by Deleuze and Guattari's (1988) theorization of decentered rhizomic networks and Latour's (2005) actor-network theory, focused on the dynamics of interconnectivity. However, as John Law notes (2009, 141), "the actor network approach is not a theory. Theories usually try to explain why something happens, but actor network theory is descriptive

rather than foundational in explanatory terms. . . . Instead it tells stories about 'how' relations assemble or don't." Influenced by this kind of postmodernist approach to globalization, some urban scholars have described multiple spatialities of place-making, networking, and urban social movements without paying sufficient attention to the questions of unequal power that shape the nature of networking and sociospatial positioning (Smith 2001; Leitner et al. 2007).

We maintain that a focus on interconnectivities without a comparative theoretical framework with which to identify hierarchies of institutionally based power at given conjunctural moments leaves analysts with no conceptual space to address important questions about dispossession, displacement, and emplacement in various cities. Hence, those concerned with horizontal networks of interconnection are ill-equipped to explore why cities differ in their reach to networked institutions of power at particular times and in their relationship to migrants, situating them differently within narratives and policies of regeneration.

Recently, several edited volumes have begun to make comparative claims. Books have categorized cities as "port," "secondary," or "gateway" (Kokot et al. 2008; Price and Benton-Short 2008; Chen and Kanna 2012). However, these books offer few actual comparisons beyond introductory remarks by the editors, which focus on categorizing types of cities. Urban anthropologist Setha Löw (1999, 8) provided an overview of typological thinking as a mode of comparison by identifying twelve different "images and metaphors" used by researchers to characterize cities, including "divided," "contested," "ethnic," "sacred," "traditional," "global," "informational," and "postmodern." Such representations fail to articulate underlying dynamics that make cities similar at particular conjunctural moments.

However, building on new work in comparative urbanism as well as debates about scale, some scholars have called for a "relative comparative approach" to urban studies (Ward 2008; Glick Schiller 2012a) that incorporates transnational studies and understands cities as "strategic nodes of financial flows, migration, policy formation, [and] the practice of state power" (Ward 2008, 408; see also Schneider and Susser 2009). Efforts to develop a new, comparative urban research agenda involve rethinking our assumptions of causality and questioning our units of analysis (Robinson 2011, 2).

Of course, the interest in causation as well as in locating instances of similar cases in which one can explore variation is several centuries old in western social thought (Mills 1882 [1843]). In our comparative study, we continue this dialogue by engaging in a critical reading of Charles Tilly's method of

"variation" finding. According to Tilly, "variation-finding" strategies "establish a principle of variation in the character or intensity of a phenomenon by examining systematic difference amongst instances" (Tilly 1984, 83). It is important to note that, despite its emphasis on differences, this approach first identifies similarities. Comparative urban analysis begins by questioning "why separate places can be very similar in certain respects" (Nijman 2007, 1) and then studies variations within characteristics defined as similar.

Rather than inscribing the cities we have been studying—Halle/Saale, Manchester, and Mardin—into the global South or the global North, we present five parameters through which the similarities of these cities can be analyzed, despite their different national histories and geographies. We utilized a set of variables that occurs in each of the cities: disempowered positioning, plans and projects for urban restructuring, references to migrants within rebranding narratives, the degree of investment in services for migrants, and opportunities for migrant emplacement within multiscalar regeneration processes. Within this comparative framework, we examined variations in migrant and non-migrant processes of displacement and emplacement.

A Word on Methodology: Toward an Ethnographically Informed Analysis of Multiscalar City-Making

Our research combines ethnographic participant observation; in-depth interviews with people differentially positioned in the social, cultural, and political life of the city; and the collection and analysis of urban economic, political, and cultural development documents, initiatives, and regeneration programs.[10] In Halle and Manchester, we worked with teams of students; attended public meetings, religious services, and events that concerned migrants; and shopped in businesses owned or run by migrants. We also visited informally with local non-migrant residents and with some of the migrants, including their family and friends whom we had interviewed, and joined them in various festive occasions. In Mardin, we attended official meetings related to urban regeneration; participated in cultural events; and talked to Syriac Christian returnees as well as to those who had never emigrated, to religious leaders, to shop keepers, to cultural operators, to nongovernmental organization (NGO) workers, to directors of cultural institutions and industrial zones, and to entrepreneurs whose businesses range from small to large and powerful.

In all cities, we interviewed municipal officials, urban developers, and political leaders involved with urban regeneration as well as officials and leaders

of civil society organizations, who were particularly concerned with the presence of minorities and new migrants. We drew from the local, regional, and supranational websites connected to each city and from institutional offices, civil society organizations, and newspapers. From these multiple sources, we collected relevant statistical information about trade, unemployment, labor, investment, institutional structures and profiles, budgets, development plans, allocations, population composition and change, and local narratives about each city and its migrants.

We note that in considering trajectories of urban restructuring, it is important to neither overestimate nor underestimate city narratives. We demonstrate that these narratives can neither be taken as a description of actual policies and practices nor be discarded as inconsequential. Narratives facilitate or impede action, even as they are affected by the changes a city experiences. They reflect and contribute to changing understandings of urban development and branding. Our analysis underlines the importance of using a variety of sources and not simply relying on city narratives to assess the outcomes of urban restructuring. We highlight the discrepancies between the urban narratives about successful regeneration and the data on growing debt, inequality, and displacement that the various planning documents of each city, as well as our observations and interviews, made apparent.

We also explored how migrants or minorities sought to settle in the city, built transnational connections and relationships with non-migrants, and, in building networks, became entangled with and participated in the construction of specific urban narratives and policies about migrants, belonging, and urban generation. When we began our research, migrants, including legal immigrants, people without legal papers, refugees, and international students, made up 8 percent of the population of Manchester (US Census 2000b) and 3.1 percent of the population of Halle (City of Halle 2016). Syriac Christian returnees to the city of Mardin and surrounding villages were a tiny fraction of the population of Mardin province. Though the size of the migrant/minority population is important for different aspects of displacement and emplacement, our research demonstrated that, within urban regeneration projects and narratives, the presence of migrants and their capacity to access networks of power do not necessarily correlate with the size of their population.

Despite small numbers, the significance of migrants in city-making in Manchester and in Halle became clearer to us after we considered the case of Mardin. Syriac Christians had fled the area in the 1990s to live in different parts of Europe. Only in 2002 did very small numbers of Syriac Christians begin to reconnect and return to the city and its surrounding villages.

These numbers were contested, but the proportion of Syriac Christians in all of Mardin province was not more than 0.06 percent of the total population. However, new returnees, together with the Syriac Christians who had never left, acquired a special significance in Mardin's city-making process at the conjuncture under consideration. As we show in chapters 1 and 5, they became very important to the city's access to various supranational multinational institutions such as the EU, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Bank, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which in turn played an important role in efforts by Mardin's leaders to restructure, rebrand, and re-empower their city.

We began intensive research in Halle and Manchester in 2000 and continued until 2007, making periodic updates until 2016. In Halle, our exploration of the possibilities of migrant emplacement led us to interview several snowball samples totaling eighty-one migrants of all legal statuses. Most interviews were with respondents from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Nigeria, Russia, Bosnia, Vietnam, Iraq, Turkey (Kurdish), and Syria. Intensive participant observation was conducted in two born-again Christian congregations, and ties with one of these congregations continued until 2015.

In Manchester, an initial series of snowball samplings also connected us to migrants of diverse backgrounds and all legal statuses. A subsequent focused sample concentrated our interviews with respondents from the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Nigeria, Russia, Bosnia, Vietnam, and two Latin American countries (Colombia and Mexico). In total, we interviewed 115 migrants not only from those countries but also from Sudan, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Rwanda, Uruguay, Romania, Taiwan, China, Iraq, and Greece.

In Mardin, research began with a focus on hometown associations in Europe in 2007 and continued through ethnography in Mardin in 2014–15. However, our collection of secondary material extends our data to 2000, the beginning of our research period. In Mardin, our research became multilocal and transnational in that we followed network ties to Istanbul and Vienna. In all, we conducted twenty-nine interviews with city officials, project leaders, and businessmen of various backgrounds and with Syriac Christians from Mardin who were businessmen and religious leaders and members of hometown associations.

Introducing the Chapters

Our exploration of the relationships between migrants and city-making begins in chapter 1. This chapter establishes the comparative framework through

which we approach the three disempowered cities we researched. The following similarities emerged among the seemingly disparate cities of Manchester, New Hampshire; Halle/Saale, Germany; and Mardin, Turkey. City leaders initiated urban regeneration hoping that through neoliberal restructuring their city could regain some of its past significance and power. Redevelopment strategies, rebranding, and urban marketing sought to use public funding to attract private investment that would transform each city in a center of knowledge, tourism, and high-tech industries. Economic and social disparities increased; public coffers suffered. Migrants and minorities were welcomed in narratives that identified each city as diverse and welcoming. However, almost no city resources were invested in migrant-specific services or ethnic organizations. Nonetheless, in the context of welcoming narratives, migrants and minorities entered the economic, social, religious, and political processes of the city and became city-makers.

Four ethnographically informed chapters follow, chapters 2 through 5. Building on our comparative approach to multiscalar urban regeneration in all three cities, we reexamine a series of questions about the relationship between migrants and cities that not only have been prominent in the academic literature over the past few decades but also have been the focus of public policy. Each chapter highlights the dynamics, tensions, and dialectics of different forms of emplacement at changing conjunctural moments.

Using Halle as a case in point, chapter 2 explores the emplacement and displacement of small migrant businesses as part of city-making processes in disempowered cities. The chapter critiques literature that reduces migrant businesspeople to "ethnic entrepreneurs," focuses on neighborhoods with high densities of an immigrant population, and accords explanatory power to the cultural repertoires of certain ethnic groups. Instead, we build on the work of those who have approached migrant businesses as business, tracing the growth and decline of small migrant businesses according to changing conjectural configurations of networked urban, regional, national, European, and global institutionalized power. Migrants, we emphasize, participated in building and reconstituting these networks. Central to the chapter's analysis are the urban redevelopment programs and actors that transformed Halle's economy, population, and the city districts where migrants' businesses were located or where they moved after being displaced. Chapter 2 links the emplacement, dispossession, and displacement of migrants' businesses to the multiscalar restructuring processes that reconfigured the lives of all residents and small retail businesses.

Chapter 3 builds upon Simmel's understanding of "sociabilities," which

emphasizes domains of commonality rather than difference in social relations. We explore the daily sociabilities through which migrants or nonmigrants sought their place in the cities in which they resided. Drawing from our Manchester data, we focus mainly on different types of sites (i.e., proximal, workplace, and institutional) through which newcomers and nonmigrants in Manchester established sociabilities. We link the emergence of these sociabilities to conditions that all residents confronted within the ongoing multiscalar processes of capital accumulation and to the precarities and impoverishment resulting from the dispossessive processes of urban restructuring and regeneration.

We begin chapter 4 by addressing the issues the concept of social citizenship raises and the theoretical space it offers to approach citizenship as both performative act and social process. We then examine the claims born-again Christians organizing in both Halle and Manchester made to their city. This chapter demonstrates that the theology, practices, and identities deployed by born-again Christian migrants constituted a form of social citizenship that challenged the established notions of rights to territory and belonging articulated within state-centric concepts of citizenship. Our analysis critiques debates about rights to the city that neglect a multiscalar analysis.[11] In the course of our comparison of the born-again practices and beliefs in the two cities, we demonstrate that forms of social citizenship are shaped by, as well as made more visible by, the structural disempowerment of these cities within conjunctural changes.

In chapter 5 we examine how in Mardin Syriac Christians and the places associated with them acquired value within the multiscalar urban restructuring processes precipitated by the Turkish government's efforts to both join the EU and reposition itself within the reconfiguring Middle East. Local leaders' efforts to rebrand and present Mardin as safe and friendly to business and investment and to obtain EU funding for urban regeneration depended on the visible presence of Syriac Christians, especially return migrants from Europe. The presence of Syriac Christians validated Mardin's self-presentation, to global investors and funding institutions, as a city with a peaceful multifaith heritage. The data in this chapter refutes those studies of hometown and migration and development that ignore the significance of structurally linked conjunctural factors. We maintain that researchers must assess such factors to understand when and how migrant transnational actors join development projects. We link returnees' emplacement in Mardin to the reconfiguring global networks of power, including global warring at a historical conjuncture.

In our conclusion, we combine our multiscalar analysis of the mutual constitution of the local, national, regional, supranational, and global not as different dimensions of experience but as interpenetrated domains of power and agency. The conclusion links our data and analysis to emerging intellectual and political debates. We include a cautionary proviso to those who, rather than providing a global perspective on uneven power within which urban contestations and migrant sociabilities arise, argue either that mobilities spark cosmopolitan openness (Hannerz 1990) or that they inevitably provoke conflict, nationalism, and anti-immigrant racist movements (Kymlicka 2015). Our conclusions neither celebrate nor deprecate mobilities. We highlight the growing threat posed to all struggles for social justice by the expansive powers of national security states and supranational institutions of border control.

NOTES

Introduction

Some of the arguments in this chapter draw on Nina Glick Schiller, Ayşe Çağlar, and Thaddeus Guldbrandsen (2006), "Beyond the Ethnic Lens: Locality, Globality, and Born-Again Incorporation." *American Ethnologist* 33, no. 4: 612–33; Ayşe Çağlar (2016b), "Still 'Migrants' after All Those Years: Foundational Mobilities, Temporal Frames and Emplacement of Migrants," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42, no. 6: 952–69; Nina Glick Schiller and Ayşe Çağlar (2009), "Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35, no. 2: 177–202; Ayşe Çağlar and Nina Glick Schiller (2011), "Introduction: Migrants and Cities," in *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*, edited by Nina Glick Schiller and Ayşe Çağlar, 1–22 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

1. The conventions of publishing make it difficult to indicate that this book is a product of ongoing coauthorship. It could not have happened without our equal collaboration in developing and refining our theoretical and methodological framework and our ability to draw from our different linguistic skills.
2. As in most cities in Turkey, in Mardin the name of the city and the province are identical. Thus, Mardin refers to both the city and the province. The city is the district where the provincial administrative seat is located. The province is composed of several districts, with their own municipalities and villages. In Turkey's administrative structure, provinces are different from territorial divisions designated as provinces in other countries, such as Canada. While Canadian provinces contain more than one city, in Turkey, there is only one city in each province. Each province therefore is a city-region.
3. The terms "minority" and "migrant" or "migrant background" are defined differently in different countries, regions, and periods. "Minority" is a particularly contested and contextually defined term (Council of Europe 1995). In this book, we focus on people residing in cities who migrated across international borders, but we do not situate cross-border and internal migrants within different analytical frameworks, as do methodological nationalists. In two of the cities we studied, Halle/Saale, Germany, and Manchester, New Hampshire in the United States,

people with a cross-border migration history are generally assigned to a migration category (refugee, legal immigrant, failed asylum seeker, international student, etc.). Historically, in Mardin, besides categories of migrants, various populations such as Armenian and Syriac Christians have been seen as minorities. When Syriac Christian émigrés returned from Europe to Mardin, they were generally positioned in regeneration narratives as a "minority," rather than as migrants. In Mardin, we identify internally displaced people in our analysis to highlight the violent displacement and dispossession dynamics that they experienced and that played a role in their emplacement processes.

4. In other writing, we have developed this concept further, using the term "methodological ethnicity" (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2008). With the rise of diaspora studies, long-standing minorities, such as the Chinese in regions of Asia, were increasingly approached as diasporic populations. Although scholars of these populations rightly emphasized their diversity of class and history and the role of these populations within state and class formation, many of these scholars continued to operate within an ethnic category and/or ended up contributing to the reproduction of an ethnic category, such as Chinese (Nonini 2015; Hearn 2016).
5. In Europe the terms "undocumented" or *sans papier* are used by political activists and scholars to defy the aspiration of "illegality." In the United States, the term "undocumented" has increasingly been used as a pejorative, casting these migrants as illegal and criminal, although border crossing is not a criminal act. Some scholars in the United States refer to this status as "unauthorized," but since this term is not widely known, we use the term "undocumented" but reject the binary between legality and illegality established on the basis of documents.
6. Citing further examples in the United States, the *Atlantic* magazine ran an article under the headline, "Why American Cities Are Fighting to Attract Immigrants" (Hesson 2015b). The article notes that "many metro areas with large foreign-born populations have thriving local economies. And now local governments all over the U.S. are trying to replicate their successes." James Brasuell (2015) argues that "new immigrants revitalized Main Street" in Nashville, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis–Saint Paul.
7. Urban anthropologists and sociologists previously called attention to the stigmatization processes that accompanied the dispossession of the urban poor in urban renewal programs in the post–World War II era (Safa 1974; Gans 1962; see also Harvey 2012).
8. In earlier writings, we have used the term "incorporation" in an effort to theorize settlement outside the expectations of assimilation and the political values embedded in integration discourses. We find the term "emplacement" more useful because it emphasizes the ongoing processes of establishing social relationships within space and time and situates both migrants and non-migrants within these processes.
9. For a different conceptualization, see Kalb's exploration of critical junctions (2005).
10. In keeping with the Institutional Review Board protocols of the University of New Hampshire, in the United States, and the University of Manchester, in the United Kingdom, we have anonymized all interviews with migrants and with all actors other than public officials, with the exception of those migrants who became public figures in the course of our research and who gave us permission to use their

names. In Halle, Nina Glick Schiller initially worked with Julia Wenzel, Marcus Rau, Martin Sieber, and a handful of student volunteers. Between 2003 and 2005, Halle's ethnographic team of student researchers was managed by Evangelos Karagiannis and co-led by Nina Glick Schiller and Ayşe Çağlar. Julia Wenger contributed to updating research material and additional interviews beginning in 2013. Ronn Müller also provided data and advice. From 2003 to 2005, another ethnographic team, led by Nina Glick Schiller and Thaddeus Guldbrandsen, included Peter Buchannan and built on the previous and continuing work of numerous student assistants. Further assistance was provided by Molly Messinger and Geraldine Boggs, who focused on the study of refugee resettlement in New Hampshire. In Manchester, Hubert Weterwami, Helene Simerwayi, and Faten al Hassun contributed additional interviews, updated research material, and provided analytical perspectives. In Mardin, the research team was composed of Ayşe Seda Yüksel and Ayşe Çağlar.

11. Our approach resonates with the work of scholars who have examined postsocialist transformations as part of global neoliberal restructuring of capital. Our framework also speaks to the recent Marxist critique of new social movements. However, our focus in this book is on migration and urban studies.

Chapter 1

1. Apparently, all these wonders have been located by archeologists, except for the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, which are now thought to have existed in the capital of its rival Assyrian empire, Nineveh (Dalley 2013).
2. Hillsborough County also contains the smaller city of Nashua, with a population of 86,788 in 2000 (NH Employment Security 2017). In contrast, Boston was a city of 667,137 in 2016 (US Census 2017a).
3. The funds came in large part from the Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority (MHRA), which sold 50 million dollars' worth of bonds to finance the arena and then leased the arena to the city. As redevelopment continued, this public housing authority channeled public funds into private investment projects while serving as a conduit for massive amounts of federal money from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This money also supported private real estate development and construction, although applications to HUD for public funding claimed that funded programs provided housing and services for the impoverished local population and for refugees who had been concentrated in the downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.
4. The volatility of defense industry funding is apparent in the contracts awarded each year. In 2003, the percent of contracts awarded increased 50.3 percent from the previous year. Between 2004 and 2006, there were annual increases (2004: 7.5 percent; 2005: 24.5 percent; 2006: 11.1 percent.) Then 2007 and 2008 were years of declining contracts (2007: –3.5 percent; 2008: –33.8 percent). The years since the 2008 recession were marked by both sharp growth (2010: 32.3 percent) and decline (2011: –6.6 percent) (Donahue Institute 2015). In 2011, there were 560 "New Hampshire firms and institutions tied to DOD and DHS [Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security] contracts" (Anderson 2012), while in 2013 there were only 470 such contractors (Donahue Institute 2015).