

European cities



European cities

Modernity, race and colonialism

Edited by Noa K. Ha and Giovanni Picker

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

Copyright © Manchester University Press 2022

While copyright in the volume as a whole is vested in Manchester University Press, copyright in individual chapters belongs to their respective authors, and no chapter may be reproduced wholly or in part without the express permission in writing of both author and publisher.

Published by Manchester University Press
Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL

www.manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the
British Library

The book cover is taken from the painting *Chafariz d'el Rey in the Alfama District (View of a Square with the Kings Fountain in Lisbon)*, ca. 1570–88, Museu Coleção Berardo in Lisbon. The name of the author is unknown. This is one of the first figurative representations of an urban space in Europe where whites and 'non-white Others' are side by side. Distinguishable here are Jewish, white and Black people.

ISBN 978 1 5261 5843 7 hardback

First published 2022

The publisher has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for any external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



Cover design:
Abbey Akanbi, Manchester University Press

Typeset
by New Best-set Typesetters Ltd

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	page ix
<i>List of contributors</i>	x
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiv

Introduction: rethinking the European urban – Noa K. Ha and Giovanni Picker	1
---	---

Part I: Provincialising historicism

1 Parochial imaginations: the ‘European city’ as a territorialised entity – Anke Schwarz	37
2 Countermapping colonial amnesia in Parisian landscapes – Tania Mancheno	56
3 Provincialising industry: hyperreal urban modernity in nineteenth-century Buenos Aires – Antonio Carbone	77

Part II: Provincialising (urban) geography

4 Provincialising conviviality: convivial boundary-making in post-Ottoman, socialist and divided Mitrovica – Pieter Troch	99
5 Urban infrastructures, migration and the reproduction of colonial forms of difference – Aidan Mosselson	120
6 Decolonising Cottbus: unmasking coloniality/modernity and ‘imperial difference’ in post (real)socialist urban sites of remembrance – Miriam Friz Trzeciak and Manuel Peters	143

Part III: Provincialising the (urban) political

7	Decolonial migrant claims to the metropole: views from two Mediterranean cities – Mahdis Azarmandi and Piro Rexhepi	171
8	Portuguese Urban Studies: between race and the absence of racism – Ana Rita Alves	192
9	Between hope and despair: how racism and anti-racism produce Madrid – Stoyanka Eneva	213
10	Theorising Hamburg from the South: racialisation and the development of Wilhelmsburg – Julie Chamberlain	235
	Coda: toward urban provisioning – AbdouMaliq Simone	257
	Index	263

Introduction: rethinking the European urban

Noa K. Ha and Giovanni Picker

The European city is not the prolongation of the native city. The colonisers have not settled in the midst of the natives. They have surrounded the native city; they have laid siege to it.

Frantz Fanon, *A Dying Colonialism* (1965), 51.

... which version of European modernity?

Stuart Hall, 'Culture, community, nation' (1993), 358.

As Paul Gilroy has insisted, racial terror lies at the very heart of innocent modernity. I do not think we have acknowledged this enough in urban studies, steeped as we are in Eurocentrism.

Ananya Roy, 'Urban Studies in the age of Charlottesville' (2018).

Europe is not affirmative. It is always contingent on a negative dialectic, on a negation, on an omission, on lack – Europe is what its others are not.

Hamid Dabashi, *Europe and Its Shadows: Coloniality After Empire* (2019), 49.

This book is a multidisciplinary collection which sets out to contribute to debates on European cities and, more broadly, on global geographies of knowledge production. Two wide-ranging aspects of Social Sciences scholarship on urban Europe appear to us as remarkable limitations: first, the relative lack of a broad focus on the history of colonialism and the centrality of race and, second, the comparative relegation of Central and Eastern European cities to area studies. Analyses that theoretically and historically outline major common properties across European cities seem to gloss over the role played by five centuries of circulation between colonies and metropole of technologies of governance, wealth, knowledge, and affect. Relatedly, yet increasingly less pronounced, state socialism seems to be the only foregrounded feature for placing certain European cities in the Central and Eastern Europe 'area-study box', outside Europe 'proper'. In this Introduction we are going to discuss these two limitations before outlining the ten chapters, with a view to contribute to a renewed understanding of urban Europe.

The multiple biographical, geographical, historical and professional locations from which we as editors inhabit and analyse urban Europe shaped our intention to launch this project. Based in Berlin, Noa K. Ha is an urban scholar and anti-racist activist, whose family history extends to the East Indies (now Indonesia), the Netherlands, Germany and Vietnam, a history which reflects colonial and postcolonial migration between Europe and its colonies; Giovanni Picker is a Glasgow-based urban scholar from Milan, whose several Hungarian-Jewish relatives were deported and exterminated under Nazi rule, a regime which learnt significantly from German colonial ruling.¹ We see our biographical trajectories, in Lisa Lowe's words, as 'intimacies [...] in a residual sense' – 'scenes of close connection in relation to a global geography that one more often conceives in terms of vast spatial distances' (2015: 18). These historical and spatial proximities reach back to the genesis of transatlantic capitalism, which coincided with the birth of what became known as *modernity*, and the beginning of colonialism. We see racial and racist dispositions that drove and variously organised the numerous imperial projects of colonial subjugation as crucial in organising contemporary societies globally, while being contextually diversified. Our biographical trajectories hence continue to reverberate across European urban life and beyond, crystallising in varying formations of racial injustice and anti-racist expressions.

Coming from these residually intimate biographies, when we met in 2015 in Berlin, our common intellectual grounds were laid bare; over the subsequent years, they continued to stimulate our conversations on the multiple, complex and unfinished entanglements of the European urban. The 2019 'Provincializing European Cities' session that we organised at the annual International Sociological Association RC21 conference in New Delhi provided a fertile ground for the germination of critical insights on the European urban. In spring 2020, during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic and against the odds of imposed lockdown, three days of online discussions with the contributors to this volume further expanded those epistemic provocations and empirical clues toward critically (un)learning from and engaging with urban worlds in and beyond Europe. We are all the more grateful to the authors for their multiple efforts and care in making this volume possible.

Inspired by these connections and conversations, we would like to start our discussions here by interrogating the main paradigms within which the Social Sciences have studied European cities.² One of the most classic and influential of those paradigms has been 'developmentalism' (Dussel, 1998), meaning the understanding that European cities are among the most significant expressions and drivers of what is generally intended as 'modern'. From Georg Simmel's (1971 [1903]) study of Berlin to the more comprehensive investigations of Max Weber (1958 [1922]) and Lewis Mumford (1963),

European urban contexts have primarily been depicted as sites of modern structures and lifestyles, politics and social organisation, steered by innovatively reformist agendas.³ In the early 2000s, these influential analyses prompted the formation of a significant body of Social Sciences scholarship, primarily in Sociology, which proposed a renewed ‘European City’ model, or ideal type (Häußermann and Haila, 2005). While acknowledging, and at times foregrounding, the presence of urban poverty and inequalities, this scholarship’s understanding of the modern/European city is primarily associated with accessible prosperity as well as progress, openness, tolerance, growth and democracy.

This dominant narrative of European cities seems to us significantly partial – not only because it discloses a rather hagiographic understanding of modernity whereby ‘progress’ is viewed as largely uncontested, but also and primarily because it reproduces a developmentalist understanding of the world, as differentiated between more and less ‘developed’ cities.⁴ Put otherwise, since ‘modernity’, as any other evaluative concept, can only be defined in relation to its opposite – i.e. that which is considered unmodern – it seems necessary to ask what this ‘unmodern’ is and how it is conceived of in the scholarship of European cities. The answer to this question emerges both explicitly and implicitly, but overall ‘the European City’ scholarship tends to overlook the relations through which the very caesura modern/unmodern is produced. This point relates to Dabashi’s (2019) idea of ‘negative dialectic’, which we offered as an epigraph to this text, and suggests an epistemic concealment of the terms in relation to which the universal of ‘modernity’, including its extensions such as ‘progress’, ‘cohesion’ and ‘development’, is deployed to characterise various urban arrangements across Europe.

This epistemic erasure is part of ‘Eurocentrism’ (Dussel, 1998) – peculiar dispositions to knowledge that we are going to discuss in this Introduction. At the start of our discussion, we find it important to consider that such dispositions to knowledge tend to reproduce a certain hierarchical understanding of the urban by differentiating between two extremes: the allegedly disordered and ‘underdeveloped’, so-called megacities – primarily located in the southern hemisphere – that are described as having defective infrastructures; and the allegedly ordered and ‘developed’ metropolises – mostly cities of the (post-) industrialised West – which by way of opposition come to appear as a sort of normative ontology of the urban (Ong and Roy, 2011; Robinson, 2006). One of the most noteworthy implications of this binary paradigm is that categories of analysis become split in the same way. For instance, while poverty and social exclusion feature as chief problems in analyses of European cities megacities, tend primarily to be seen as suffering from urban informality and a lack of infrastructures, two phenomena which, in turn, tend to be overlooked in studies of urban Europe.

Such a developmentalist paradigm becomes perhaps even more explicit when considering an additional caesura, which that paradigm encourages – that between Western European and Central and Eastern European cities. As we are discussing in this Introduction, Social Sciences scholarship tends to define Europe by reference to Western European cities while classifying Central and Eastern European cities primarily, if not exclusively, as postsocialist. Curiously, then, while the twentieth century is usually taken as the only defining dimension of Central and Eastern European cities, Western European cities seem to find their most significant and enduring historical references in the Weberian High Middle Ages. And for the sake of clarity, we want to stress that we do not question the fact that European cities may be viewed as ‘modern’; what we do, instead, is point at the lack of a reflexive attention to specific aspects of the ‘modernity’ that those cities are deemed to embody. These specific aspects primarily concern the role of race as a quintessentially European modern formation.⁵ Hall’s (1993) question in the epigraph to this text, then, becomes our guide quote.

In our endeavour, we are inspired by Chakrabarty’s *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (2000). The reason why we decided to draw on Chakrabarty’s seminal study is not just because it proved influential in rethinking European global hegemony, but also because it did so during a period of strong enthusiasm for the ‘finally’ reunited Europe. The book’s critique of historicism as a form of teleological constructivism seems particularly well tailored for looking at the post-1989 euphoria, during which many (Western) European cities, for example Berlin and Vienna, regained their 1910s and 1920s aura as epitomes of ‘European modernity’.

The historian starts by considering that ‘[i]n Europe itself, [historicism] made possible completely internalist histories of Europe in which Europe was described as the site of the first occurrence of capitalism, modernity, or Enlightenment’ (Chakrabarty, 2000: 7), and sets out to ‘rethink two conceptual gifts of nineteenth-century Europe that are integral to the idea of modernity. One is historicism – the idea that to understand anything it has to be seen as both a unity and in its historical development – and the other is the very idea of the political’ (2000: 6). In addition to following this twofold line of enquiry – by centring a critique of both ‘historicism’ and ‘the political’ – we welcome Keith’s (2005: 193, n.60) on-point invitation to add the spatial dimension to Chakrabarty’s (2000) analytic of the historical one: ‘the contextualising of a language of urbanism, a making problematic the street, the tower block, the neighbourhood, the ghetto, the cultural quarter and the whole city identifies a problematic that is spatial in precisely the sense that Chakrabarty’s project is historical’.

Hence, we decided to organise this volume in three sections – ‘Provincialising historicism’, ‘Provincialising (urban) geography’ and ‘Provincialising the

(urban) political'. Our attention to the temporal (urban-historical), the spatial (urban-geographical) and the urban-political reflects a long intellectual tradition of reflexivity that interrogates the analytical categories with which Western Social Sciences operate. It does so in order to encourage the study of largely overlooked processes, silences and subjectivities that have more or less direct connections to the various European colonial projects. In doing that, our aim is 'not to reject social science categories', such as those typically used to look at European cities (for example 'cohesion', 'inclusion' and 'equality'), but rather 'to release into the space occupied by particular Euro histories sedimented in them, other normative and theoretical thought enshrined in other existing life practices and their archives' (Chakrabarty, 2000: 13).

We are aware of the immensity of this task. Our effort here, we want to stress, is not intended to be a definitive critique of European urban formations as we know them today, nor a univocal theorisation of them. Rather, we offer points of departure, angles and opportunities for identifying generative venues of critical thought about past and contemporary European urbanities. Such sought-after plurality emerges also from the multiplicity of the chapters' theoretical references – from postcolonial perspectives, to decolonial approaches, to more comprehensive race critical theories – and triggers our ultimate hope of achieving 'decentred poetics that may help us imagine geohistorical categories for a non-imperial world' (Coronil, 1996: 52).

Provincialising the European City

When Chakrabarty's *Provincializing Europe* was published in 2000, scholarly conversations on various aspects of European societies were burgeoning. After the Maastricht (1992) and Lisbon (2000) treaties, there were debates on the EU enlargement; debates on the increasing global migration flows; on changing labour markets; and debates on rights and liberties in the context of emerging virtual connectivities. Despite their global breadth, these debates tended to ignore what Chakrabarty (2000) vividly analysed at the dawn of a new global world order after the end of the Cold War: the very making and legacies of Europe's global hegemony, that is, the almost five centuries of imperial colonial projects.

Along with debates on European societies, conversations on 'The European City', also emerging in the early 2000s, inaugurated significantly influential ways of looking at European urbanities by centring the model of 'The European City' as a peculiar ideal type and an ontological plausibility. On the wave of 1990s planning debates on Berlin's post-1989 reconstruction (Molnar, 2013), and substantially drawing on the Weberian (1958 [1922])

historical sociology of medieval European urban formations, these conversations posited that ‘the diminishing significance of nation-states (as a consequence of globalisation) in Europe (and promoted by the European Union) has created a “power vacuum” that has provided new opportunities for local and regional action’ (Häußermann and Haila, 2005: 52). In contrast to the recent Global City and ‘urban sprawl’ scholarships, as well as to the model of ‘the American city’, these emerging ideas were largely based on the perceived ‘preponderance of medium-large cities’, a characteristic ‘intended to exemplify [...] Europeaness’ (Bagnasco and Le Galès, 2000: 15). Four features were seen as constitutive of this urban Europeaness, namely (a) public land ownership, (b) the legacies of the burghers, (c) relative autonomy and (d) the prominence of public, welfare-state services. This model, it was argued, presented outstanding similarities with the Weberian (1958 [1922]) model of ‘the Occidental city’ – the medieval Western European city as a specific kind of political collective, the very first democratic one (see also Grainger and Cutler, 2000; Häußermann, 2004; Kazepov, 2005; Le Galès, 2000; Siebel, 2006).

At the junction of these two events – the publication of *Provincializing Europe* and the invention of the European City model (hereafter ECM) – we identify a significant tension between voices and sensibilities addressing Europe at the dawn of a new millennium: on one side, a postcolonial critique of European knowledge production and global cultural hegemony; on the other, solidly Eurocentric conversations about European urban formations, stretching back to the High Middle Ages, and void of any reference to global history. In light of this, while ECM was built on a series of empirically meticulous analyses of late twentieth-century local powers (included, for instance, in Bagnasco and Le Galès, 2000), both the analytical construction of the model and some of its implications appear as problematically partial. Chamberlain, in Chapter 10 of this volume, sharply articulates some of these critical aspects. Here we would like to focus on some of the key empirical observations, methodological choices and practical implications of that model. In doing so, we obviously do not engage with all the empirical and theoretical streams of research which orbit around ECM. We nonetheless offer a hopefully useful critique of ECM’s historical and epistemic grounds.

One of ECM’s foundations is the Weberian observation that the central and northern medieval Occidental City was clearly separated from the countryside, and one of the determinants of this separation was the presence of city-farmers. Recent historical and archaeological research on this point, however, has shown that ‘[Weber] may be right, if by Medieval city we are thinking of north Italian city states where there was a sharp division between city (*città*) and hinterland (*contado*). But north of the Alps there were many cities like those of ancient Greece, which had city-farmers as a group

connecting city and hinterlands' (Hansen, 2006: 93).⁶ This seems to diverge from Weber's analysis, especially from his idea of freedom in Central and Northern European cities that was, for him, 'the *revolutionary* innovation which differentiated the medieval occidental cities from all others' (Weber, 1958 [1922]: 1239) and which 'gave European cities the honour of symbolizing modernization and civilization' (Häußermann and Haila, 2005: 51). Famously, Weber (1958 [1922]: 94) hagiographically mentions the medieval slogan *Stadtluft macht frei* ('City air makes man free').

While not surprising in itself, this hagiographic tone becomes noteworthy if one asks for whom freedom was available in the European cities of the High Middle Ages and – indeed – for whom it is available in the twenty-first century. What Weber, let alone the ECM scholarship's analyses of Weber's work, either overlooks or discounts as marginal is the presence in medieval European cities of enslaved people (Bartlett, 1993: 167–191; Heng, 2018: 151–155) as well as the recurrent persecutions – including exterminations – of Jews, who were largely regarded as strange figures (Heng, 2012: S57; 2018: 15). The appearance of guilds, confraternities and political associations indeed marked a significant change from previous feudal social orders. What is often overlooked, however, is that what Weber calls freedom seems primarily if not exclusively the freedom of the emerging urban ruling class of able-bodied men – the merchants, the bankers, the traders and anyone else who was not sold, banished, enslaved or reduced to the role of servant, many of whom were Muslim women and women from the eastern parts of Europe (Heng, 2018: 143–144; Robinson, 1983: 112–133).⁷

This point not only serves to contextualise, and thus better understand, Weber's emphasis on freedom in the European medieval city; it also allows one to appreciate a very influential way in which urban Europe was imagined and represented in the Middle Ages. Through a series of meticulous discussions, the historian and literary scholar Heng (2003; 2018) has uncovered the various and complex ways in which race appeared in the European Middle Ages. The author names one of these ways 'cartographic', referring to the production of the first world maps; one of those maps, the Hereford Mappa Mundi, dated 1300, could be viewed as one of the first projects of crafting a European identity – the map represents Europe as a 'civilized territory of urban life – a web of cities' (Heng, 2018: 35). This representation of Europe was sharply contrasted by a depiction of other parts of the world as containing monstrous figures, 'global races swarm[ing] in other vectors of the world', which served as a comparator for constructing, through that representation, 'European self-identity and civilization' (Heng, 2018: 35). The fact that one of the most authoritative ways in which race was invented in the European Middle Ages was a representational alignment of Europe with urbanity and humanity, in direct opposition to rurality as the

typical domain of bestiality, coinciding with non-Europe, gives a sense of the powerful medieval imaginaries surrounding European cities. Therefore, the ‘urban air’ which ‘sets you free’ might in actuality refer to a specific, racially exclusive ‘air’, deemed lacking outside European cities.⁸ As Isin (2002a: 15–22; 2002b: 119–120) repeatedly showed, Weber’s understanding of the medieval European city is highly orientalist, hence Eurocentric.⁹

Eurocentrism, urbanity and colonial epistemes

The example of the Hereford Mappa Mundi illustrates a key aspect of European knowledge production in the Middle Ages, specifically knowledge of Europe, including its cities: the construction of a hierarchical caesura between European urbanity and the deemed less-urban rest of the world. From this perspective, the ECM narrative about modernity constitutes a similar hierarchical caesura – a narrative that deceives a markedly Eurocentric standpoint. In use since the 1920s, the concept of Eurocentrism was made popular by the political theorist Amin (1989) and comprehensively theorised a decade later by the philosopher Dussel (1998).¹⁰ The latter argued that ‘modernity’ is not European, but was constructed as such, not least through the European production and imposition of specific world maps. According to Dussel (1998), Eurocentrism is the product of both European colonialism and the various celebratory narratives that went along it, including the ‘Enlightenment’, ‘Renaissance’, ‘Reformation’ and indeed ‘Modernity’. The author locates some of the conditions for these ‘universals’ to appear in the production of evaluative categories such as ‘the West’, ‘the East’, ‘the first world’ and so on. These everyday categories, ubiquitous in standard knowledge production, far from being naturally given, are flexible and emerged through Europeans’ colonial expansion since the fifteenth century, building on their material and symbolic power.

Key implications of these historical processes are palpable in twenty-first-century Europe. The Eurocentric constitution of ‘Europe’ reflects the becoming of a supranational entity – and identity. The articulation of a shared European identity relates to two important historical events as a moral conclusion of history: on one hand the experience of National Socialism and the Holocaust, and on the other hand the end of the Cold War with its breakdown of former socialist and communist states (Böröcz and Kovács, 2001; Melegh, 2006). When a shared European identity was being formulated after 1989, the postcolonial historicity, in itself historicist, of European inception largely omitted to consider colonial violence as a feature of contemporary societies in urban Europe and normalised a nostalgic perspective on the European colonial past (Hansen and Jonsson, 2017; Boatcă, 2010). Despite that shared European history, the various national colonial histories unfold very differently

– with different colonial practices and relations. Nevertheless, one continues to see – as, for instance, in the current European debates on migration, refugees, national identity and urban living that Mosselson discusses in Chapter 5 of this volume – colonial differentiation through the construction of the European Other, the fortification of European borders and the crafting of the figure of the refugee as a threat to European identity (Bhagat, 2019; De Genova, 2018; El-Tayeb, 2011; Schierup et al., 2006).

As Wekker (2016) argues in her work *White Innocence*, Europe imagines itself as an ‘innocent’ project, and – as El-Tayeb (2011) argues in her book *European Others* – Europe locates racism and colonialism somewhere else and far away from its own borders. It may be that non-European territories have been colonised and even violently conquered – this is the general narrative – but this all took place outside Europe. More generally, the impact of colonial violence is not regarded as key for European societies or for the case here: metropolitan societies. European imagination establishes a narrative of the enlightened, democratic and equal Europe, while so-called ethnic inequalities within European nations are analysed in the framework of ‘migration’ and (national) ‘integration’, considering neither race nor the European postcolonial condition (Lentin, 2014; Schierup et al., 2006).

This suggests that while Europe has a long history of producing postcolonial Others in a variety of subjectivities to maintain ‘the coloniality of power’ (Quijano, 2000) within the colonial metropolises, it is conventionally regarded as the birthplace of humanity which is founded on the history of enlightenment as a universal value. The becoming of modern colonial Europe is often traced back to the late fifteenth century, and most notably to Christopher Columbus’s voyages. The ‘Berlin Conference’, or ‘Congo Conference’, which took place in 1884–85 when European nations were hosted by Otto von Bismarck in Berlin to partition the African continent in accordance with European national interests – and the borders here established still define contemporary African nations decades after their independence – marks another fundamental moment. Europe’s self-esteem, by which it persuades itself that it is ‘raceless’, hampers a theoretical reflection on how racism and white supremacy are constitutive to and implicit in European urban epistemologies (Goldberg, 2000; Ha, 2017; Kipfer, 2007; Picker, 2017; Simone, 2010). Eneva in Chapter 9 of this volume provides such a theoretical, critical reflection by ethnographically illustrating how pervasive Eurocentric notions of activism are, including anti-racist activism, in organising urban social movements in Madrid.

Given that these historical and contemporary processes shape the ECM, it seems important to discuss the conditions and limits of the model’s Eurocentrism. As Robinson (2006: 21–40) seminally exposed, the genesis of Urban Studies on both shores of the Atlantic was already highly Eurocentric,

or ‘developmentalist’. From Georg Simmel’s ‘primitive figures’ to Robert Park’s ‘freedom of cities’ as substitution ‘for the local loyalties’, as well as ‘the rational organization which we call civilization’ for ‘the sacred order of tribal custom’ (quoted in Robinson, 2006: 21), the so-called ‘forefathers’ of Urban Studies – unanimously considered as such after removing W. E. B. Dubois from the scene (Morris, 2015: 45–54) – follow a decisively Eurocentric paradigm. Alves in Chapter 8 of this volume proposes an in-depth examination of these points with reference to urban knowledge production in the Portuguese academy.

The production of a developmentalist and Eurocentric urban order, according to which Europe is viewed as superior and by extension as the reference to which those who supposedly are less developed must adapt, establishes binaries such as developed/underdeveloped and modern/unmodern. The (re)production of these binaries seems to happen due to a lack of reflexivity in producing knowledge from the European ‘centre’. An example of this is the Weber-inspired contrast between the slave-ridden, ancient city and the freedom-based medieval city: ‘The classic city was governed by a sharp division between a citizenry of free men [...] and on the other hand the slaves and the foreigners. The medieval city thrived on another distinction, between town and country, between the burghers on one side and the peasants – servile or not – and the landowners on the other’ (Le Galès and Therborn, 2009: 2). Such a contrasting (comparative) method leads to a developmentalist reading of the past that owes much to a Eurocentric methodological essentialism for which Weber provided an authoritative legitimation.¹¹ In this regard, Zimmerman’s point that in Weber’s Sociology ‘race is superfluous: culture functions just as effectively to *reduce history to an elaboration of stereotyped identities*’ resonates quite pertinently (2006: 68; our italics).¹²

Developmentalist and Eurocentric readings of European cities are pervasive. Another usually accepted binary is between megacities in the Southern hemisphere and European cities:

Those writing on megacities, gigacities, or the rise of global urban regions [...] point to the rise of networks and governance failures related to obsolete governmental boundaries. Another way to think along the same lines relates to the idea of the end of cities and the triumph of the urban sprawl [...]. A classic argument dismisses this view, because the relatively stable core of Europe’s urban system is made up of medium-sized and reasonably large cities, which are fairly close to one another, and a few metropolises. (Le Galès, 2011: 1577)

Here the author refers to European cities in order to dismiss the claim that cities are allegedly becoming ‘ungovernable’. What we would like to stress here is that the rhetorical contrast between ‘megacities’ and European cities

produces a hierarchy of governability in which European cities rank higher. The reproduction of a century-old celebratory representation of Europeanness seems particularly effective in this context because it conceals the fact that many ‘megacities, gigacities’ happen to be former European colonised cities, including for example Manila, New Delhi, Mumbai, Jakarta and Mexico City; unreflexively contrasting these cities with European cities is Eurocentric, and cannot but end up reproducing notions of European superiority. Indeed, one page later this appraisal emerges clearly: ‘European cities make a fairly general category of urban space, relatively original forms of compromise, aggregation of interest and culture, which bring together local social groups, associations, organized interests, private firms, and urban governments’.

Overlooking the historicity of both precolonial urban orders beyond Europe and current global inequalities may affect depictions not only of the allegedly faulty postcolonial urban world but also of Europe.¹³ In one of the most seminal contributions to the ECM scholarship, Le Galès (2000: 125) focused on migrants’ presence in European cities by noticing that ‘The decline in city-centre districts since the 1970s [...] was all the more visible because immigrants from outside these communities had settled in them during the 1960s and later [...] This concentration of vulnerable, deprived populations produces self-reinforcing effects because the immobility of such population intensifies the districts’ separate cultures’. While not the only discussion on ‘immigrants’ in the book, this passage conveys the idea that ‘immigrants’ are the reason for the visibility of ‘the decline in city-centre districts’; failing to acknowledge that many members of ‘such population’ are in Europe because of the colonial past seems to be premised on a quite fixed approach, which leads such scholarship to view ‘immigrants’ as the reason for urban decline. And the use of notions such as ‘ethnification’ (Le Galès and Therborn, 2009: 19) to refer to immigration in European cities signals a widespread assumption according to which the default, self-ascribed European condition is non-ethnic, implicitly meaning white, requiring in this way that black and brown people be positioned as exogenous to an imagined white European self (Boulila, 2019; Essed et al., 2018; Goldberg, 2006; Lentin, 2008; Wekker, 2016). This unchecked racial conception of (white) European urbanity persists by virtue of its concealment. Put differently, Eurocentrism contributes to, and is predicated on, overlooking the key global and historical connections, which are constitutive of the contemporary European urban, in both the past *and* the present.

Another example refers to racial segregation in Western continental European cities, a phenomenon largely deemed either relatively limited or non-existent (e.g. Musterd, 2005; Préteceille, 2009; Tammaru et al., 2014; van Kempen and Murie, 2009). A first seminal work in this literature mentions ‘caste systems, slave-owning societies, repressed religious minorities’ as cases

of politically imposed segregation, brings up South African apartheid and Jim Crow USA, and contrasts them to ‘most developed states’, implying (Western) European states, which ‘have taken an unequivocal stand against segregation’ (Préteceille, 2000: 84). This premise establishes an epistemic contrast between Europe and the USA that unreflexively overlooks the spatial and temporal contextuality of race, its variable articulations and modalities of concealment according to place-related, global-historical connections (Murji and Picker, 2019: 915–918; Kipfer, 2007; Martina and Schor, 2015).

Such a contrasting strategy almost inevitably results in suggesting that in Europe residential segregation displays dimensions other than race, such as ethnicity and nationality. This move, which seems to have become a kind of conventional wisdom, leads to casually erasing the possibility of adopting race as analytical category in studies of residential segregation in Europe:¹⁴ ‘ethnicity and race are socially constructed concepts and quite contentious; the former is more predominant in Europe, while the latter is preferred in North America (and Anglo-Saxon world), South Africa, and Latin America’ (Arbaci, 2019: 59).¹⁵

Coterminous to this contrasting approach is the peculiar role reserved to the urban East. Since Eastern Europe has historically been represented as the ‘dark other’ of ‘European civilisation’ (Todorova, 2009 [1997]), Central and Eastern European cities seem to remain cast in a separate and mono-dimensional analytical camp. Indeed, Weber (1958 [1922]) never referred to them when constructing his ideal-type. When Eastern European cities are mentioned in the ECM scholarship (typically in passing and at the end of an essay on ‘proper’ European cities), they seem to permanently need to catch up to some kind of supposedly acceptable level of development after the transition from socialism to postsocialism that fatally produced, according to this view, ‘losers and winners’ (e.g. Le Galès and Therborn, 2009: 42; Mingione, 2005: 82).

Deep-rooted, orientalist narratives on Eastern Europe echo in Urban Studies particularly through the notion of the ‘postsocialist city’, which suggests that only in the East is the past haunting cities. As Bodnár (2018) persuasively suggested, ‘State socialism ended long ago but its importance has lingered uncannily in “postsocialist” urbanism [...]. Fascism was defeated in 1945, and by the sixties hardly anyone talked about postfascist Germany or Europe’. And even in studies that purposely focus on Central and Eastern European cities, as Ferenčuhová and Gentile (2016: 484) point out, ‘a resilient assumption [...] is that these cities are anomalous, subject to gradual correction [...] and lagging behind’. By contrast, Troch in Chapter 4 of this volume sharply shows how the scholarship on urban Europe typically overlooks the rich history of multireligious and multicultural urbanism in South-Eastern Europe as territories connected to the Middle East and Asia.

What we would like to stress here is the unfortunate implication of creating a hierarchical model in which European cities viewed as ‘proper’ – those in the Western part of the continent – are seen as better or more ‘developed’ than ‘other’ European cities in the East. As a matter of fact, a burgeoning scholarship, primarily in urban geography, critically reviews the dominant orientalist conceptions of theories of Eastern European cities and engages key urban theorisations from the East (e.g. Ferencuhová and Gentile, 2016; Gentile, 2018; Tuvikene, 2016). Trzeciak and Peters in Chapter 6 of the present volume, critically unearth the colonial vestiges of Cottbus, in East Germany, indicating how Europeanness emerges also in relation to the collective amnesia of colonialism across the West–East divide.

A last point concerns the role and functions of ECM, as a reference for urban policy makers and planners. As Molnar’s (2013: 136–166) seminal analysis of post-World War II European architecture shows, the ‘European city’ ideal goes back to the early 1980s; the author specifically discusses the ways in which that idea, grounded in nineteenth-century planning principles and promoting a notion of the city as a repository of collective memory, functioned as the pivotal reference for rebuilding Berlin’s Potsdamer Platz in the early 1990s. Architects, mostly from West Germany, opted to follow this model ‘as a starting point of future plans and chased an idealized picture of a European city that may have never existed’ (Molnar, 2013: 145), instead of starting from the ruins and fragments left by almost three decades of urban splitting.

Schwarz in Chapter 1 of the present volume articulates the implications of such an ‘idealised picture’ in twenty-first-century urban projects, including the Humboldt Forum in Berlin and the category of ‘decorum’ in Italian cities. Lawton (2017) scales up the critical analysis to the European Union’s urban policy framework, in which ‘The “European city” has come to be seen as representing the virtues of the “good city” [...] deeply embedded within processes of a highly neoliberalized economic terrain’ (Lawton, 2017: 80–81). The author makes clear that, as a reference for urban policy makers, ECM may well encourage ‘an ideal where social inclusion and all other elements of an idealized city will be led through innovative practices. [...] Embedded within such an approach is a tightly manicured urban imaginary which rolls out mantras of “innovation”, “smartness” and “creativity” in an unproblematic manner as saviours of the urban future’ (Lawton, 2017: 83; see also Lawton and Punch, 2014). In a similar yet more theoretical take, Novy and Mayer (2009: 108) criticise ECM as a ‘blueprint to guide future urban development’, especially because of its allegedly good and ‘just’ qualities. And stretching these processes both historically and geographically, Carbone in Chapter 3 of this volume demonstrates the global reach of the European city ideal, by discussing its impact on urbanisation debates in nineteenth-century Argentina.

So far, we have stressed some of ECM's limitations according to its historical grounding, its methodological underpinnings and some of its implications as a reference for urban practitioners. Our invitation here remains 'not to reject social science categories' (Chakrabarty, 2000: 13) but rather to identify possible venues for alternative, non-Eurocentric analyses. We are aware that Eurocentrism is not a prerogative of ECM, and features in urban scholarship which is inspired, for example, by Marxist rather than by Weberian theories.¹⁶ It is also important to stress that our critical engagement with the ECM scholarship does not result in constructing an alternative model, but in contributing to open up a multiplicity of venues for reflexive, critical and global perspectives on urban Europe. Equally, we want to make clear that our critique does not only pertain to specific scholarship debates, be they on so-called 'urban diversity', 'urban culture' or 'residential segregation' in Europe. Rather, our approach – owing much to Dipesh Chakrabarty – is in line with Stuart Hall's, in that: 'I have never worked on race and ethnicity as a kind of subcategory. I have always worked on the whole social formation which is racialized' (1995: 53–54). With this in mind, the remainder of this Introduction will discuss the rationale for non-Eurocentric theorisations of urban Europe, before outlining the various contributions to such theorisations that are offered by the chapters included in this volume.

Introducing the racial European urban

We would like to consider three fundamental missing connections between the various scholarly literatures on the European urban. First, there seems to be no conversation between, on one side, historical and anthropological studies of the relevance of colonial urbanism for contemporary European cities and, on the other, the Sociology of European cities.¹⁷ Various streams of anthropological and historical studies uncovered the contribution of colonial trade to the development of European port and other cities, and the various circulations between metropole and colony of forms of urban knowledge such as planning and governance (e.g. Abu-Lughod, 1980; Bigon and Ross, 2020; Bruns and Gerend, 2018; Driver and Gilbert, 1999; Fuller, 2007; King, 1990; 1992; Nightingale, 2012; Njoh, 2007; Pula, 2013; Rabinow, 1989; Wright, 1991). And yet this scholarship is largely absent from the (Historical) Sociology of urban Europe; equally, contemporary asymmetrical relations of economic dependency between cities in the postcolonial South and European cities remain out of focus. This series of missing connections signals the importance of recontextualising histories and sociologies of European cities and emphasises the hegemonic power of these cities over formerly colonised contexts. All chapters in this volume are contributions

to this end – while the first three chapters take history as their object, not only their perspective, in Chapter 7 Azarmandi and Rexhepi show the dialectical plurality of historical reconstructions through migrant and queer of colour politics of reimagining the urban space de-linked from hegemonic historical/historicist narratives of Europe.

The second missing connection relates to the discrepancy between, on one side, the mounting scholarly evidence of the relevance of race and racism in contemporary European urban processes and, on the other, the relative lack of attention to critical race in theories of European urbanism. A fairly large body of scholarship has uncovered the fundamental ordering function that race plays in a number of urban processes across Europe, including, but not limited to, urban governance (e.g. Bhagat, 2019; Bruce-Jones, 2015; Fassin, 2013; Fassin et al., 2014; Gonick, 2015; Gressgård, 2019; Ha, 2016; Ivasiuc, 2021; Keaton, 2006; Kipfer, 2007; 2016; Modest and de Koning, 2016; Picker, 2016), spatial dynamics of containment, gentrification and segregation (e.g. Filčák and Škobla, 2013; Gruner, 2010; Haritaworn, 2015; Kipfer and Goonewardena, 2013; McCombs, 2018; Picker et al., 2015; Picker, 2017; Rogozen-Soltar, 2017; Schierup et al., 2018; Tissot, 2007; Vincze et al., 2018; Vincze and Zamfir, 2019), and urban cultural production and collective memory (e.g. Aldrich, 2005; El-Tayeb, 2012; Fleming, 2017; Kopp and Krohn, 2013; MacFarlane and Mitchell, 2019; Nasiali, 2016; Peralta and Domingos, 2019; Silverstein, 2018; Simone, 2010; Zwischenraum Kollektiv, 2017). These studies empirically document contextually varied and variable urban phenomena, including the racial oppression and dehumanisation recurrently experienced by Romani people, Migrant, Black and People of Colour, together with their related political and cultural responses; also addressed by these studies are urban governance logics and mechanisms, as well as identity and memory politics that are promoted by urban authorities, mediating state agencies and grassroots collectives.

These processes, scattered across the European urban, directly relate to global dynamics of racial injustice, strongly marked by the colour line, contributing to their perpetuation. One key illustration of this is the disproportionately higher rates of police stop-and-search of People of Colour, Travellers and Roma than of the majority, across all EU Member States (FRA, 2021). Systemic racial profiling in European cities emerges as indisputable by looking at the same data disaggregated in ‘Stopped in a vehicle’ and ‘Stopped while on foot’ – the latter figures ranking consistently higher than the former. For example, in France, while 18 per cent of the general population is being stopped while on foot, this figure swells to 43 per cent in the case of people with biographical connections to South Saharan African countries; in Hungary, walking while being Roma makes you almost three times more likely to be stopped and searched by the police than the

average population (40 per cent v. 15 per cent); and in Germany, if you have biographical connections to South Saharan Africa, you are over three times more likely to be stopped and searched by the police while walking in the street (40 per cent v. 13 per cent) than the general population (FRA, 2021). Collected mostly in cities, these data show that racial oppression does not routinely occur only at Europe's borders (De Genova, 2018), but in its urban centres too. We think the time has come for Urban Studies to acknowledge these processes as constitutive of European urban formations.

The third and final missing connection is between two scholarly literatures – the one on theorising so-called 'postsocialist cities' and the one on the so-called 'East–West slope' (Melegh, 2006), the latter denoting how the developmentalist media and political discourses in the West, prominent since the late 1980s, construct a 'slope' in civilisational, moral terms between the allegedly superior West and the allegedly inferior East (Böröcz and Kovács, 2001). The deeply rooted tradition, widespread among European cultural elites and institutions, of analysing Eastern Europe as the dark side of its enlightened counterpart is part of Eurocentric knowledge production, which was and is primarily generated in former imperial capitals such as Paris, London and Berlin. The hierarchical order that Eurocentric representations construct, contributes to the reproduction of a 'debilitating diachronic and spatial ghettoization' (Todorova, 2009 [1997]: 202) of Eastern Europe; it furthers structural inequalities between the many 'Europes' (Boacă, 2010) and overlooks the intensive East–West mutual exchanges and interdependencies. For example, in Berlin, the second largest nationality of foreign residents after Turkey is Poland, which is twice as large as the third largest nationality, Syria; in Rome, the most common foreign nationality is Romania, accounting for a quarter of the total number of foreign residents; in Madrid, while the sum of all former colonised Latin American nationalities make up half of the total number of foreign residents, Romanians make up the relative majority, even more numerous than any single Latin American country; and in London, while eight out of the ten most numerous nationalities are from former colonies, Poland ranks second just after India.¹⁸

The present volume contributes to establishing these three major connections, and offers a repertoire of empirical and theoretical interventions, merging critical urban and critical race studies. By referring to Chakrabarty's provincialising work, we want to expose the 'developmentalism' as dominant understanding of European urbanities, and simultaneously centre what that dominant understanding typically silences, namely both the various colonial projects and the racialised subjects whose biographies and voices continue to be shaped by that silencing. Since that dominant understanding primarily emerged in relation to the crafting of a 'new Europe' after 1989, the urban practices, urban space-making and urban epistemologies analysed in the

chapters of this volume refer to a post-1989 Europe. As colonial epistemes and epistemologies have prospered for centuries, we see the urgency, thirty years after the establishment of Europe as a unified neoliberal capitalist system, of emphasising the conjunction of a normalisation of colonial nostalgic systems of representation and the growing research on race/racism in Social Sciences (see Ha, 2022).

By increasing and refining knowledge on European cities, we contribute to global conversations on post/colonial urban knowledge production. When Said (1993: 19) asked ‘who in Britain or France can draw a clear circle around British London or French Paris that would exclude the impact of India and Algeria upon these two imperial cities?’, he was referring not only to racial and ethnic traces in late twentieth-century urban Europe, but also to the active erasure of those traces and archives – many people today would probably be ready to draw that circle. The point here, as we have discussed, is not only that the colonial *past* is largely erased across analyses of European (urban) societies, but that its present *and presence* are. That is not to suggest that colonialism haunts contemporary Europe from an imagined outside – such a view would simply obliterate the historicist understanding that colonialism is ultimately an exogenous and ancient nightmare whose shadow hangs over the present. Instead, the colonial past is, as we discussed at length, constitutive to Europe as a social, political, economic and cultural formation. As Mancheno in Chapter 2 of this volume discusses with reference to the Parisian banlieues, colonial continuities are crucial aspects of European cities. To paraphrase Roy’s (2018) point which we quoted in the epigraph, it is time for Urban Studies to acknowledge such continuities.

To unravel the complex dynamics which connect the colonial past to the present, the chapters in this book follow Chakrabarty’s twofold line of enquiry: first, provincialising historicism by ‘unlearn[ing] to think of history as a developmental process’ (2000: 249) and by centring the relevance of the colonial and its contemporary racial structures; second, provincialising the political by documenting and learning from contemporary anti-racist, postcolonial and decolonial views and expressions (in both physical-political action and writing). In addition to these two lines of inquiry, and in view of our specific attention to urban space, we propose to provincialise (urban) geography by examining various instances of race–space articulations.

Provincialising historicism

European cities: Modernity, race and colonialism intends to shift the conversation on European cities toward a non-Eurocentric paradigm, away from colonial epistemes. The category of race, racism and racialised societies

are produced and maintained through the urban and the understanding of the European urban, because race is not only inscribed into what is called modernity, but is constitutive of it, and by extension of urbanity. Acquiring different forms and functions across the centuries, race has remained one of the most pervasive and decisive phenomena across European knowledge production and related social structuring during the various stages into which European history is traditionally divided (Araujo and Maeso, 2015; Goldberg, 1993; Hondius, 2014). Colonies were crucial settings in which Europe experimented with many of the institutional and cultural arrangements which characterise contemporary cities – as Wright (1997) seminally and concisely put it, colonial urban and architectural praxes and forms of knowledge were ‘laboratories of modernity’. It should be stressed that the category of race – which was rendered through European monarchies at the beginning of colonialism and, from the eighteenth century on, through their nation states – does not operate everywhere in the same way. As was already the case during colonialism, it has been translated and rearticulated, framing different hierarchies of embodiment (Stam and Shohat, 2012; Stoler, 1989).

In Chapter 1, Schwarz’s theoretical insights on the notion of ‘the European city’ show that, if approached from a socio-territorial perspective, this idealised notion shows its appeal to conservative, even reactionary, sensibilities through a common reaction to global interconnections, understood as threats to established and deep-rooted identities. The author’s line of argument persuasively indicates that some of the anxieties behind the ideal of the ‘European city’, which originated in the context of Germany’s 1990 reconstruction, resonate with racist and white supremacist sensibilities. Schwarz meticulously reviews the theoretical concept of territory/*territorio* to highlight the privileged perspective it provides to detect racialising notions that are implicit within multiple instances of urban policies across Europe. Urban ‘decorum’ resonates particularly with the very dimension of the ideal, and acquires a criminalising and securitising function with very concrete consequences in terms of banishment and repression across Italian cities. The author’s preoccupation with the European city ideal does not stop at a deconstructing analysis, but envisages possibilities of reframing, resistance and retheorising, across disciplines and actions towards strategising emancipated modalities of urban existence.

Focusing on the politics of heritage as it plays out in the UNESCO programmes in Paris, Mancheno shows, in Chapter 2, that the banlieues (Parisian peripheries), first celebrated as an architectural innovation during the Paris world fair in 1889, acquired a quite different aura once they became the residence of postcolonial subjects. The author ‘countermaps’ the narrative and policy on the Parisian banlieues by engaging a decolonial

analysis of public memory. Building primarily on Frantz Fanon's work and the historiography of colonial urbanism, the author traces some of the most significant connections between colonial and metropolitan France. Mancheno shows that the banlieues are actually crucial sites for understanding French history, yet are totally erased from UNESCO heritage politics. The analysis of the colonial continuities embedded in the very project and function of the banlieues until the twenty-first century – as securitised urban spaces for lower-class, postcolonial urbanites – allows the author to argue that the selective nature of UNESCO heritage politics serves to deepen the urban colour line in Paris. In this light, Mancheno's analysis also calls for a rethinking of the notions of race and ethnicity that often fail to circulate among urban scholars working on Europe: a strong historical consciousness and interpretation would allow scholars to see race as firmly grounded in colonial continuities, refracted in, among other dimensions, various instantiations of the European urban, including the Parisian banlieues.

The historical contribution that Carbone provides journeys through the *longue durée* of the European city ideal and shows how the ideal functioned in structuring moral and racial hierarchies. In Chapter 3, the author discusses a very specific debate in nineteenth-century Argentina, from which the nexus of urbanisation and industrialisation emerges, and shows how European cities were considered highly positive and idealised symbols of progress to the extent that they were considered 'hyperreal', hence self-evidently positive, not even requiring any specification. Squarely and invariably embedded in these hyperrealities were the racial markers of whiteness defined as quintessentially European and superior. Carbone's analysis of the racial semantics of modernity and industry provides invaluable clues about the extent to which, in the nineteenth century, European cities' images shaped representation of humanity, morality and worth, well beyond Europe; it demonstrates not only how pervasive historicism was back then, but also how European cities were constitutive parts of European historicism.

Provincialising (urban) geography

If in Berlin you take the northern entrance to Großer Tiergarten across from the Brandenburg Gate, you bump into the Memorial to the Sinti and Roma Victims of National Socialism. Walk five minutes southbound and you arrive at the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. If you then continue eastbound on Hannah-Arendt-Straße, at the corner with Wilhelmstraße, you see the building where, during a meeting in 1884–85, European empires partitioned and appropriated the African continent for the sake of exploitative domination – with only a little information about this history at the spot. Take Wilhelmstraße southbound for ten minutes, and on your right-hand

side is Topographies of Terror, the former Gestapo Headquarters, now a museum of Nazi terror.

Cast in European cities' space are countless traces of an embalmed European racial past. Other examples of these urban traces include the Warsaw ghetto; Rome's Cinema Impero (Bianchi and Scego, 2014); Amsterdam's Royal Palace and Jodenbuurt (Hondius et al., 2018); Paris's Jardin des plantes and Vélodrome (Aldrich, 2005); and the many neighbourhoods in other cities with various colonial links.¹⁹ While these urban historical sites assemble a narrative about the past, they simultaneously intervene in the present by educating about the importance of remembering and honouring the victims of variously expressed racial rulings.²⁰ As emerges throughout this volume, these urban sites signal a 'post-' condition 'that is temporally *after* but not *over* that to which it is affixed' (Brown, 2010: 21). At the same time, they are reminders of outbursts of racist politics that, as such, lend themselves to being precisely pinned in time; they say something, but certainly not everything about the pervasive ways in which race routinely and variably contributes to organising urban life across the continent.

In Chapter 4, Troch looks at one of these ways, by deciphering everyday dynamics of conviviality in the divided city of Mitrovica, Kosovo. In doing this, the author critically reviews the scholarship on urban conviviality that emerged in the West and underlines its Eurocentric modalities, often mingled in scholarly literature on super-diversity, and contributes in this way to a provincialising reflection on urban theory. The Ottoman and socialist histories of the city provide a historical canvas for deconstructing what Todorova (2009 [1997]) calls 'balkanism', namely the racist view of the Balkans as morally inferior to the rest of the European peninsula, especially its Western lands. By showing how racial and ethnic boundary-making have been constitutive to convivial social relations across the two empires and until today, the chapter argues that urban forms of conviviality, rather than an antidote to exclusion, may just be its integral part. This serves as a stringent critique of the conviviality literature, which might be relevant just in Western metropolises, where analyses of existing racial divisions typically situate conviviality in opposition to structures of exclusion.

In Chapter 5 Mosselson sheds light on urban phenomena that, while often hinted at or implicitly assumed, are not often discussed as everyday realities. By discussing Sheffield's reconfiguration of urban space in relation to the UK's 'hostile environment' (i.e. the anti-migrant national policy in force since 2012), the author analyses three urban infrastructures: monuments as sites of memorialisation across the city; spatial segregation along racial lines; and asylum seekers' housing conditions. These three types of infrastructure tell stories of continuities of colonialism and racial oppression, and allow Mosselson to bring to the fore a perpetually neglected issue in

debates on urban infrastructures across Europe – the imperial and colonial constitution of European urbanism, substantially built on colonial wealth, hence on the transatlantic enslavement of people from the African continent, whose nationalities correspond to very many of today’s asylum seekers in the city. By looking at their urban experiences, struggles and desires for decent living conditions amidst hostile infrastructures, windows are opened into urban possibilities of alternative existence.

Trzeciak and Peters, in Chapter 6 on Cottbus, Germany, discuss a second example of the European socialist state’s organisation of the urban space. The authors expose from a decolonial perspective the entangled histories of colonialism and socialism as they emerge from three urban sites – the aesthetic and architecture of a socialist cafe, the housing conditions of a group of migrant workers during socialism and the postsocialist renaming of one street. The analysis of these urban sites shows the ways in which socialist ideals and the racial underpinning of German colonialism unfolded hand in hand, and crystallised in specific urban locations whose histories are today largely forgotten. The authors contextualise their analysis within a contemporary postcolonial city tour they offer on a regular basis and discuss the ways in which these entangled histories of socialism and colonialism reverberate also in contemporary Germany through two main phenomena – the stigma placed on East Germany as the less civilised, backward part of the country, and the related steep rise of racist incidents in this part of the country. The authors’ city tour aims precisely to raise awareness of racial and colonial continuities; the ultimate aim of such awareness is to provide inventive venues for countering contemporary racist manifestations and dispositions.

Provincialising the (urban) political

Urban space in postcolonial Europe is not only a space in which metropolitan society establishes a difference between itself and ‘Others’; urban space is not only a space or representation of European history and national museums, not only a commodified infrastructure for globalised financial and tourist industries. It is also a space of self-organisation, of self-determination and of resistance against institutional discrimination, state violence and capitalist exploitation – seeking to disrupt colonial practices in urban Europe (Ha, 2017). The following contributions centre the political subjects seemingly not registered as European bodies but proving their being on a daily basis in urban Europe.

Chapter 7, by Azarmandi and Rexhepi, points at some of these disruptions in both Barcelona and Salonika, and engages a decolonial analysis of these two cities, viewed as ‘migrant metropolises’. Barcelona’s 1992 Olympics

are examined as an instantiation of both whitewashing state and market narratives of Europeanisation and Catalanisation, taking the shape of massive displacements of racialised communities, as well as successful anti-racist urban struggles. Salonika is scrutinised through a similar lens, via a genealogy of its cultural policies which branded the city a European Capital of Culture in 1997. While newly arrived refugees can only find an abode in a former-toilet-factory-turned-camp, urban development aspirations refer to European multiculturalism and progress, by way of forcibly displacing Roma and Albanian migrant families while sidelining the Ottoman past via the art-industry repurposing of Islamic urban spaces such as mosques. Racialised and migrant urbanites' multiple forms of resistance and re-existence emerge as central forces of inventive politics, primarily memory politics, in both cities, counter-mapping in this way the Mediterranean city and thus showing venues for its decolonial reimagining. By reconstructing the ways in which dominant narratives of Europeanisation and 'European culture' materialise and are contested in the two Mediterranean cities, the authors propose a decolonial rethinking of Europe and its cities as allegories, myths whose power emerges in all its fragility if seen from the point of view of the racialised's dissent.

Alves in Chapter 8 enacts a kind of academic-epistemic disruption in the form of an unconventional literature review. The author takes the reader on a journey across Portuguese Urban Anthropology, to show the ways in which race and institutional racism have been silenced throughout that scholarly literature. Across libraries and texts in the UK, Brazil and Portugal, the author engages in a quasi-autoethnography of awareness of epistemic silences. In the process, various literatures are critically reviewed, precisely through the lens of race critical theories, to reveal how epistemic silences are part of institutional racism, insofar as they reinforce hierarchies of legitimacy within the politics of knowledge production. The notion of 'epistemic apartheid' is then discussed as an intellectual refraction, which translates into an elicitation, of really existing racial segregation dynamics happening across Portugal's cities.

In Chapter 9, Eneva investigates the ways in which racism and anti-racism are reshaping twenty-first-century Madrid's urban space. As the author shows, the urban map of social vulnerability indicators directly correlates with the map of density of foreigners' residence, within the context of changing labour relations through migration policies and high levels of discrimination in accessing housing. The chapter empirically focuses on two neighbourhoods, Lavapiés and Usera, where low-income and migrant households feature significantly, and develops a critique of *barrionalismo* (the feeling of belonging to a *barrio*, meaning neighbourhood), arguing that the concept has failed to consider racialised and migrant voices and experiences as central. By focusing on the various alliances between racialised

newcomers and local, white anti-racists, the chapter provides a sharp and convincing contribution to the overwhelmingly raceless urban scholarship on Europe. These themes resonate vividly across all chapters, but perhaps mostly with Schwarz's attention to the ways in which forms of 'territory' and territorial belonging are able to both assemble different kinds of voices and elicit tensions and disruptions between those very voices.

The point of 'amnesia of spatial disciplines', referring to the widespread erasure of the colonial past in urban scholarship, does not only resonate with Alves' discussion on Portugal but is also thoroughly analysed in Chapter 10. Chamberlain ethnographically and historically dissects the constitutive matrix of the racial stigma that dominates narratives on the district of Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg. It does so by contextualising Hamburg as a port city within global power structures which reach back to colonialism and its social and economic aftermath, and argues that without a race-conscious analysis, it would hardly be possible to understand both the material and the representational making of the district. The voices of racialised non-German workers emerge as the first and most important sources for theorising 'from the South', following anti-racist methodologies of social enquiry, prior to engaging with the 'Northern', dominant planning narratives. This analytical structure allows Chamberlain to offer a rare and disruptive understanding of the city, able to question not only the 'amnesia' of the scholarship but also some of the most conventional modalities of knowledge production.

AbdouMaliq Simone closes our collection by addressing its topic from the epistemological territory where the last section resides. In a propositional move, Simone invites us to critically reflect on European urbanities as nodes of urban *provisioning* yet beyond the loci of deemed race-neutral welfare *provisions*, and as combinations of social relations that converge in making racialised lives more viable emotionally, economically and socially. Ultimately, these provisionings are there, proliferating in their genericity, along with and in parallel to designs of economic calculi of extraction. These forms of provisioning invite us to contribute to an archive of encounters of care, health and schooling in which institutions and people share the urban, its spaces and opportunities. A race-conscious, reflexive archive of urban provisioning, then, is what we hope this book will encourage, because such an archive would ultimately help us – to go back to where we started – 'imagine geohistorical categories for a non-imperial world' (Coronil, 1996: 52).

Notes

- 1 On the German colonial lessons for Nazi racial rule, see Césaire (1972 [1955]), Baranowski (2011) and Olusoga and Erichsen (2010).

- 2 By Social Sciences, we primarily refer to Sociology, Political Science, Economics and Social Anthropology.
- 3 An exception to this influential scholarship is Walter Benjamin, whose critique of colonialism, especially in his *Arcades* project, is part of his holistic critique of modernity (see Bjelić, 2016: 247–267; Keith, 2005; Robinson, 2006: 28–36; Vandertop, 2016). The significance and limitations of Benjamin’s work for the study of race in European cities have yet to be fully unearthed.
- 4 The ‘European city’ scholarship foregrounds the notion of ‘moderated modernity’ to establish a contrasting difference with the model of the US city, which is widely considered, from an equally Eurocentric angle, the epitome of urban modernity (Häußermann and Haila, 2005: 53 *et passim*).
- 5 Lack of space here prevents us from offering a theoretical discussion of the racial in its peculiar, variable articulations across Europe. See on this Wekker (2016); Essed et al. (2018); Boulila (2019). On modalities of silencing race in post-WWII Europe, see Goldberg (2006), Lentin (2008) and Nimako and Small (2009).
- 6 Hansen (2006: 94) finds that Weber (1958 [1922]) is ‘unclear’ about city-farmers as a crucial factor for differentiating between the ancient and the medieval city.
- 7 Weber (1958 [1922]: 200) argues that ‘in the typical city of the medieval Occident the economics of slavery declined until it lost all importance. The powerful guilds could not tolerate the work of slaves, paying personal tribute to a master in competition with free crafts’. Phillips (1985: 99–106), in partial disagreement with Weber, shows the fundamental importance of slave labour and the slave economy in Italian cities in the early Middle Ages. On ‘freedom’, Stasavage (2014) argues that medieval European cities were able to sustain their political autonomy largely because they were imposing barriers to entry into markets and professions; hence, ‘freedom’ was a kind of exclusive freedom. On the oppression of disabled people in medieval European cities, see Gilchrist (1994).
- 8 The scholarly literature on race in medieval Europe is extensive. See, for example, the 2001 *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* Special Issue on ‘Race and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages’. Bartlett’s (2001) article in that special issue is particularly important for a comprehensive overview of the complex interrelations of ethnicity, nationhood and race.
- 9 Vlassopoulos’ (2007) conclusion on Weber’s (1958 [1922]) work aligns with Isin’s (2002a; 2002b) analyses: ‘The comparison [...] between the ancient and the medieval/modern economy [...] makes sense only from a certain European perspective. It reifies complex processes with different levels and temporal and spatial frameworks, in order to render them as part of the genealogy of Europe’ (2007: 127).
- 10 The literature on Eurocentrism has since burgeoned. For comprehensively theoretical overviews, see the Duke University Press ‘On Decoloniality’ book series, edited by Catherine E. Walsh and Walter D. Mignolo, and launched in 2018.
- 11 Said’s (1978: 259) comment on Weber’s method of ‘ideal types’ in relation to studies of the Orient is to the point here: ‘[Weber’s] notions of type were simply an “outside” confirmation of many of the canonical theses held by Orientalists,

whose economic ideas never extended beyond asserting Orientals' fundamental incapacity for trade, commerce and economic rationality'.

- 12 On Weber's racism, imperialism and nationalism, see also Hund (2014).
- 13 On the importance of precolonial urban arrangements to understand cities of the Global South, see Bigon and Ross (2020) and Hull (1976).
- 14 Arbaci (2019: 309) importantly acknowledges the significance of colonial legacies in contemporary Southern European cities for understanding segregation in those cities yet, equally importantly, omits to view those legacies in terms of race as the foundational logic of spatial organisation of colonial rule (see on this point Nightingale, 2012: 1–18; the historian (2012, 390–393), however, fails to acknowledge works which centre race in segregation dynamics in contemporary European cities).
- 15 For example, see Andersen (2019) and Musterd (2020). A partial exception to this comparative conventional wisdom is Wacquant's (2008) sociology of urban marginality of Chicago and Paris, where 'ethno-racial' is one of the categories used, at times, to explain the condition of social marginality in the Parisian banlieues. The author, however, omits to theoretically clarify what that category indexes and entails, and still deploys it within the USA–Western Europe contrast, ending up foregrounding it only in the USA.
- 16 See, for instance, Harvey's (2004) work on Paris and Cox's (2016) USA–Western Europe comparison. More generally, one of the most important features of Eurocentrism is the silence on black and people of colour's lives. On this point, Goldberg made an incisive observation, with a focus on Britain and the Netherlands: 'It is significant then, both as a mark of urban life and of historical scholarship, that accounts of blacks in Britain and the Netherlands [...] are (regarded as) outside of – not properly belonging to – standard historical accounts of those societies, and take this exclusion as their almost exclusive motivating or inspirational focus. This exceptionalism, it should be clear, is not a product principally of self-determining "minority" separation, an infantilising celebration of ethnic self-identification. Rather, *it is a product primarily of that initial ignoring, the rendering invisible, of peoples designated black so that representational exceptionalism, an emphatic foregrounding focus, becomes the only possibility for writing Strangers and Outsiders, black people in particular, back into the historical record*' (2000: 77; our italics). Goldberg's point on exceptionalism lies at the core of our choice of the present volume's title, which reflects our invitation to attend to the constitutive contributions of blacks, people of colour and other racialised groups to European urban formations. The last section of this edited volume particularly addresses this point.
- 17 As we make clear above, we are not suggesting that the Urban Sociology of Europe never considers colonial urbanism, but that, when it does, it largely considers it as a thing of the past, which occurred far away from the European core, and with important legacies only in former colonial cities. See e.g. May et al., 2005; Crenshaw, 2014.
- 18 Data Sources. Berlin: 'Number of foreigners in Berlin in 2019, by nationality', available at <https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1094889/umfrage/anzahl-der-auslaender-in-berlin-nach-staatsangehoerigkeit/> [accessed 17 December 2021];

- Rome: ‘La popolazione straniera a Roma, 2018’, available at www.comune.roma.it/web-resources/cms/documents/Popolazione_straniera_di_Roma_2018_DEF.pdf [accessed 17 December 2021]; Madrid: ‘Población extranjera en la ciudad de Madrid: Población según Nacionalidad en la ciudad de Madrid’, available at www.madrid.es/portales/munimadrid/es/Inicio/El-Ayuntamiento/Estadistica/Areas-de-informacion-estadistica/Demografia-y-poblacion/Poblacion-extranjera/Poblacion-extranjera-en-la-ciudad-de-Madrid/?vgnnextfmt=default&vgnnexto id=c289d54944580510VgnVCM2000000c205a0aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=9ce23636b44b4210VgnVCM2000000c205a0aRCRD [accessed 17 December, 2021]; London: ‘2011 Census Ethnic Group Fact Sheets’, available at <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/2011-census-ethnic-group-fact-sheets> [accessed 17 December 2021].
- 19 Fundamental for this awareness and understandings are the several city tours of postcolonial Europe, organised by grassroots groups and supported at times by academics. See, for example, Trzeciak and Peters in Chapter 6 of this volume; Bianchi and Scego (2014) about Rome, and Hondius and colleagues (2018) about Amsterdam.
 - 20 The location of the 1884–85 Berlin Conference was not publicly marked as an urban site until 2005; since then, a minimal stele provides some information about German and European colonial history and that specific location. Since 2019 the project ‘DEKOLONIALE’ has its office at this address and centering the presence of colonial history in Berlin.

References

- Abu-Lughod, J. L. (1980), *Rabat: Urban Apartheid in Morocco*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Aldrich, R. (2005), *Vestiges of the Colonial Empire in France: Monuments, Museums and Colonial Memories* (London and New York: Palgrave-Macmillan).
- Amin, S. (1989), *Eurocentrism* (New York: Monthly Review).
- Andersen, H. S. (2019), *Ethnic Spatial Segregation in European Cities* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge).
- Araujo, M. and S. Maeso (eds) (2015), *Eurocentrism, Racism and Knowledge: Debates on History and Power in Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Arbaci, S. (2019), *Paradoxes of Segregation: Housing Systems, Welfare Regimes and Ethnic Residential Change in Southern European Cities* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell).
- Bagnasco, A. and P. Le Galès (eds) (2000), *Cities in Contemporary Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Baranowski, S. (2011), *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bartlett, R. (1993), *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Bartlett, R. (2001), Medieval and modern concepts of race and ethnicity. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31(1): 39–56.

- Bhagat, A. (2019), Displacement in ‘actually existing’ racial neoliberalism: refugee governance in Paris. *Urban Geography* 42(5): 634–653.
- Bianchi, R. and I. Scego (2014), *Roma negata. Percorsi postcoloniali nella città* (Rome: Ediesse).
- Bigon, L. and E. Ross (2020), *Grid Planning in the Urban Design Practices of Senegal* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Bjelić, D. I. (2016), *Intoxication, Modernity, and Colonialism: Freud’s Industrial Unconscious, Benjamin’s Hashish Mimesis* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Boatcă, M. (2010), Multiple Europes and the politics of difference within. In Brunkhorst, H. and G. Grözinger (eds) *The Study of Europe* (Baden Baden: Nomos Verlag), pp. 55–66.
- Bodnár, J. (2018), Lay methodological regionalism to rest: posting ‘postsocialism’ in Urban Studies. In *Urban Studies at IJURR’s 40th Anniversary*. Available at www.ijurr.org/spotlight-on/urban-studies-at-ijurrs-40th-anniversary/judit-bodnar/ [accessed 17 December 2021].
- Böröcz, J. and M. Kovács (eds) (2001), *Empire’s New Clothes: Unveiling EU Enlargement* (Telford: Central European Review).
- Boulila, S. C. (2019), *Race in Postracial Europe: An Intersectional Analysis* (London: Rowman and Littlefield).
- Brown, W. (2010), *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty* (New York: Zone Books).
- Bruce-Jones, E. (2015), *Race in the Shadow of Law: State Violence in Contemporary Europe* (London: Routledge).
- Bruns, A. and J. Gerend (2018), In search of a decolonial urban transformation. *GAIA-Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society* 27: 293–297.
- Césaire, A. (1972 [1955]), Discourse on colonialism. In *Discourse on Colonialism* (New York: New Monthly Press), pp. 29–79.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000), *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Coronil, F. (1996), Beyond occidentalism: toward nonimperial geohistorical categories. *Cultural Anthropology* 11(1): 51–87.
- Cox, K. R. (2016), *The Politics of Urban and Regional Development and the American Exception* (New York: Syracuse University Press).
- Crenshaw, E. (2014), New directions in urban sociology. *International Journal of Sociology* 44(4): 3–6.
- Dabashi, H. (2019), *Europe and Its Shadows: Coloniality After Empire* (London: Pluto Press).
- De Genova, N. (2018), The ‘migrant crisis’ as racial crisis: do *Black Lives Matter* in Europe? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41(10): 1765–1782.
- Driver, F. and D. Gilbert (eds) (1999), *Imperial Cities. Landscape, Display and Identity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Dussel, E. (1998), Beyond Eurocentrism: the world-system and the limits of modernity. In Jameson, F. and Miyoshi, M. (eds) *The Cultures of Globalization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press), pp. 3–31.
- El-Tayeb, F. (2011), *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).

- El-Tayeb, F. (2012), 'Gays who cannot properly be gay': queer Muslims in the neoliberal European city. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 19(1): 79–95.
- Essed, P., K. Farquharson, K. Pillay and E. J. White (2018), *Relating Worlds of Racism: Dehumanisation, Belonging, and the Normativity of European Whiteness* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Fassin, D. (2013), *Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Fassin, É., C. Fouteau, S. Guichard and A. Windels (2014), *Roms & Riverains. Une politique municipale de la race* (Paris: La Fabrique).
- Ferenčuhová, S. and M. Gentile (2016), Introduction: post-socialist cities and urban theory. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 57(4–5): 483–496.
- Filčák, R. and D. Škobla (2013), Another brick in the wall: ghettos, spatial segregation and the Roma ethnic minority in Central and Eastern Europe. In Duxbury, N. (ed.) *Rethinking Urban Inclusion: Spaces, Mobilizations, Interventions* (Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Sociais, Universidade de Coimbra), pp. 413–428.
- Fleming, C. M. (2017), *Resurrecting Slavery: Racial Legacies and White Supremacy in France* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press).
- Fuller, M. (2007), *Moderns Abroad: Architecture, Cities, and Italian Imperialism* (London: Routledge).
- Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) (2021), *Your Rights Matter: Police Stops* (Vienna: Fundamental Rights Agency). Available at https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2021-fundamental-rights-survey-police-stops_en.pdf [accessed 19 July 2021].
- Gentile, M. (2018), Three metals and the 'post-socialist city': reclaiming the peripheries of urban knowledge. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42: 1140–1151.
- Gilchrist, R. (1994), Medieval bodies in the material world. In Kay, S. and M. Rubin (eds) *Framing Medieval Bodies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), pp. 43–61.
- Goldberg, D. T. (1993), *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Goldberg, D. T. (2000), Heterogeneity and hybridity: colonial legacy, postcolonial heresy. In Schwarz, H. and S. Ray (eds) *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (Malden, MA: Blackwell), pp. 410–427.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2006), Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(2): 331–364.
- Gonick, S. (2015), Interrogating Madrid's 'slum of shame': urban expansion, race and place-based activism in the Cañada Real Galiana. *Antipode* 47(5): 1224–1242.
- Grainger, H. and R. Cutler (2000), The European city: a space for post-national citizenship. In Harmsen, R. and T. M. Wilson (eds) *Europeanization: Institution, Identities and Citizenship* (Amsterdam: Rodopi), pp. 239–260.
- Gressgård, R. (2019), The racialized death-politics of urban resilience governance. *Social Identities* 25(1): 11–26.
- Gruner, M. (2010), 'The others don't want ...'. Small-scale segregation: hegemonic public discourses and racial boundaries in German neighbourhoods. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(2): 275–292.

- Ha, N. K. (2016), *Straßenhandel in Berlin: Öffentlicher Raum, Informalität und Rassismus in der neoliberalen Stadt* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag).
- Ha, N. K. (2017), Zur Kolonialität des Städtischen. In Zwischenraum Kollektiv (eds) *Decolonize the City! Zur Kolonialität der Stadt: Gespräche | Aushandlungen | Perspektiven* (Münster: Unrast), pp. 73–85.
- Ha, N. K. (2022), Städtische Episteme dekolonisieren: die Europäische Stadt nach 1989 als neokoloniale Ordnung. In Bauriedl, S. and I. Carstensen-Egwuom (eds) *Geographien der Kolonialität. Geschichten globaler Ungleichheitsverhältnisse der Gegenwart* (Frankfurt: Transcript Verlag).
- Hall, S. (1993), Culture, community, nation. *Cultural Studies* 7(3): 349–363.
- Hall, S. (1995), Not a postmodern nomad [interviewed by Les Terry]. *Arena Journal* 5: 51–77.
- Hansen, P. (2006), *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hansen, P. and S. Jonsson (2017), Eurafica Incognita: the colonial origins of the European Union. *History of the Present* 7(1): 1–32.
- Haritaworn, J. (2015), *Queer Lovers and Hateful Others: Regenerating Violent Times and Places* (Chicago, IL: Pluto Press).
- Harvey, D. (2004), *Paris: Capital of Modernity* (London: Routledge).
- Häußermann, H. (ed.) (2004), *An den Rändern der Städte: Armut und Ausgrenzung* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp).
- Häußermann, H. and A. Haila (2005), The European city: a conceptual framework and normative project. In Kazepov, Y. (ed.) *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion* (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 43–64.
- Heng, G. (2003), *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Heng, G. (2012), England's dead boys: telling tales of Christian-Jewish relations before and after the first European expulsion of the Jews. *MLN – Modern Language Notes* 127(5): S54–S85.
- Heng, G. (2018), *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Hondius, D. G. (2014), *Blackness in Western Europe: Racial Patterns of Paternalism and Exclusion* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers).
- Hondius, D. G., N. Jouwe, D. Stam, J. Tosch and A. de Wildt (2018), *Amsterdam Slavery Heritage Guide* (Volendam: LM Publishers).
- Hull, R. W. (1976), Urban design and architecture in precolonial Africa. *Journal of Urban History* 2(4): 387–414.
- Hund, W. D. (2014), White sociology: from Adam Smith to Max Weber. In Hund, W. D. and A. Lentin (eds) *Racism and Sociology* (Vienna and Berlin: Lit Verlag), pp. 23–67.
- Insin, E. (2002a), *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Insin, E. (2002b), Citizenship after Orientalism. In Insin, E. and B. S. Turner (eds) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (London, Thousands Oaks, CA and New Delhi: Sage), pp. 117–128.

- Ivasiuc, A. (2021), Race matters: the materiality of domopolitics in the peripheries of Rome. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 45, 6(21): 1047–1055.
- Kazepov, Y. (ed.) (2005), *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Keaton, T. D. (2006), *Muslim Girls and the Other France: Race, Identity Politics and Social Exclusion* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press).
- Keith, M. (2005), *After the Cosmopolitan? Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism* (London: Routledge).
- King, A. D. (1990), *Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World Economy: Cultural and Spatial Foundations of the World Urban System* (London: Routledge).
- King, A. D. (1992), Rethinking colonialism: an epilogue. In ALSayyad, N. (ed.) *Forms of Dominance* (Aldershot: Avebury), pp. 339–355.
- Kipfer, S. (2007), Fanon and space: colonization, urbanization, and liberation from the colonial to the global city. *Environment and Planning D* 25(4): 701–726.
- Kipfer, S. (2016), Neocolonial urbanism? La Rénovation Urbaine in Paris. *Antipode* 48(3): 603–625.
- Kipfer, S. and K. Goonewardena (2013), Henri Lefebvre and ‘colonization’: from reinterpretation to research. In Moravánsky, A., C. Schmid and L. Stanek (eds) *Urban Research and Architecture: Beyond Henri Lefebvre* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate), pp. 93–109.
- Kopp, C. and M. Krohn (2013), Blues in Schwarz-Weiß. Berlins Black Community im Widerstand gegen kolonialrassistische Straßennamen. In Diallo, O. and J. Zeller (eds) *Black Berlin. Die deutsche Metropole und ihre afrikanische Diaspora in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin: Metropol), pp. 219–231.
- Lawton, P. (2017), Idealizing the European city in a neoliberal age. In *The Sage Handbook of New Urban Studies* (London: Sage), pp. 78–91.
- Lawton, P. and M. Punch (2014), Urban governance and the ‘European city’: ideals and realities in Dublin, Ireland. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23(2): 136–148.
- Le Galès, P. (2000), *European Cities: Social Conflicts and Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Le Galès, P. (2011), Urban governance in Europe: what is governed? In Bridge G. and S. Watson (eds) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City* (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 747–758.
- Le Galès, P. and Therborn, G. (2009), Cities in Europe. From city-states to state cities, and into union and globalization. *Working papers du Programme Villes & territoires*, 2009/4, Paris, Sciences Po.
- Lentin, A. (2008), Europe and the silence about race. *European Journal of Social Theory* 11(4): 487–503.
- Lentin, A. (2014), Postracial silences: the Othering of race in Europe. In Hund, W. D. and A. Lentin (eds) *Racism and Sociology* (Vienna and Berlin: Lit Verlag), pp. 69–106.
- Lowe, L. (2015), *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).

- McCombs, J. (2018), The class-to-race cascade: interrogating racial neoliberalism in Romani studies and urban policy in Budapest's Eighth District. *Critical Romani Studies* 1(2): 24–39.
- MacFarlane, K. and K. Mitchell (2019), Hamburg's spaces of danger: race, violence and memory in a contemporary global city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43: 816–832.
- May, T., B. Perry, P. Le Galès, S. Sassen and M. Savage (2005), The future of urban sociology. *Sociology* 39(2): 343–370.
- Martina, E. A. and P. Shor (2015), *White Order: Racialization of Public Space in the Netherlands*. *DEDALUS: Revista Portuguesa de Literatura Comparada* (19): 161–188.
- Melegh, A. (2006), *On the East–West Slope: Globalization, Nationalism, Racism and Discourses on Central and Eastern Europe* (Budapest: Central European University Press).
- Mingione, E. (2005), Urban social change: a socio-historical framework of analysis. In Kazepov, Y. (ed.) *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell), pp. 67–89.
- Modest, W. and A. de Koning (2016), Anxious politics in the European city: an introduction. *Patterns of Prejudice* 50(2): 97–108.
- Molnar, V. (2013), *Building the State: Architecture, Politics, and State Formation in Postwar Central Europe* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge).
- Morris, A. (2015), *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Mumford, L. (1963), *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformation and Its Prospects* (London: Secker and Warburg).
- Murji, K. and G. Picker (2019), Race and place. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 39(11/12): 913–922.
- Musterd, S. (2005), Social and ethnic segregation in Europe: levels, causes, and effects. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 27(3): 331–348.
- Musterd, S. (2020), Urban segregation: contexts, domains, dimensions and approaches. In *Handbook of Urban Segregation* (Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar), pp. 2–17.
- Nasiali, M. (2016), *Native to the Republic. Empire, Social Citizenship, and Everyday Life in Marseille since 1945* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Nightingale, C. H. (2012), *Segregation: A Global History of Divided Cities* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Nimako, K. and S. Small (2009), Theorizing Black Europe and African diaspora: implications for citizenship, nativism and xenophobia. In Hine, D. C., T. D. Keaton and S. Small (eds) *Black Europe and the African Diaspora* (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press), pp. 212–237.
- Njoh, A. J. (2007), *Planning Power: Town Planning and Social Control in Colonial Africa* (London: UCL Press).
- Novy, J. and M. Mayer (2009), As 'just' as it gets? The European city in the 'just city' discourse. In Marcuse, P., J. Connolly, J. Novy, I. Olivo, C. Potter and J. Steil, *Searching for the Just City* (London: Routledge), pp. 103–119.

- Olusoga, D. and C. W. Erichsen (2010), *The Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism* (London: Faber and Faber).
- Ong, A. and A. Roy (2011), *Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global* (Oxford: Wiley).
- Peralta, E. and N. Domingos (2019), Lisbon: reading the (post-)colonial city from the nineteenth to the twenty-first century. *Urban History* 46(2): 246–265.
- Phillips, W. (1985), *Slavery from Roman Times to the Early Transatlantic Trade* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Picker, G. (2016), 'That neighbourhood is an ethnic bomb!' The emergence of an urban governance apparatus in Western Europe. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 38(3): 864–885.
- Picker, G. (2017), *Racial Cities: Governance and the Segregation of Romani People in Urban Europe* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge).
- Picker, G., M. Greenfields and D. Smith (2015), Colonial refractions: the 'Gypsy camp' as a spatio-racial political technology. *City* 19(5): 741–752.
- Préteceille, E. (2000), Segregation, class and politics in large cities. In Bagnasco, A and P. Le Galès (eds) *Cities in Contemporary Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 74–97.
- Préteceille, E. (2009), Has ethno-racial segregation increased in the Greater Paris metropolitan area? *Revue française de sociologie* 3(50): 489–520.
- Pula, B. (2013), Building the cities of empire: urban planning in the colonial cities of Italy's fascist empire. In Steinmetz, G. (ed.) *Sociology and Empire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press), pp. 366–395.
- Rabinow, Paul (1989), *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Robinson, C. (1983), *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (London: Zed Books).
- Robinson, J. (2006), *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development* (London: Routledge).
- Rogozen-Soltar, M. H. (2017), Muslim Disneyland and Moroccan danger zones: Islam, race, and space. In *Spain Unmoored: Migration, Conversion, and the Politics of Islam* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press), pp. 115–157.
- Roy, A. (2018), Urban Studies in the age of Charlottesville. In *Urban Studies at IJURR's 40th Anniversary*. Available at www.ijurr.org/spotlight-on/urban-studies-at-ijurrs-40th-anniversary/ananya-roy/ [accessed 7 December 2021].
- Said, E. W. (1978), *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books).
- Said, E. W. (1993), *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Chatto & Windus).
- Schierup, C., A. Ålund and A. Neergaard (2018), Race and the upsurge of antagonistic popular movements in Sweden. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41(10): 1837–1854.
- Schierup, C.-U., P. Hansen and S. Castles (2006), *Migration, Citizenship, and the European Welfare State: A European Dilemma*. Illustrated edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Siebel, W. (2006), *Die europäische Stadt* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp).
- Silverstein, P. (2018), *Postcolonial France: Race, Islam, and the Future of the Republic* (London: Pluto Press).

- Simmel, G. (1971 [1903]), The metropolis and mental life. In *On Individuality and Social Forms* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press), pp. 324–339.
- Simone, A. (2010), Reclaiming Black urbanism. In *City Life from Jakarta to Dakar: Movements at the Crossroads* (London: Routledge), pp. 263–333.
- Stam, R. and E. Shohat (2012), *Race in Translation: Culture Wars Around the Postcolonial Atlantic* (New York: New York University Press).
- Stasavage, D. (2014), Was Weber right? The role of urban autonomy in Europe's rise. *The American Political Science Review* 108(2): 337–354.
- Stoler, A. L. (1989), Rethinking colonial categories: European communities and the boundaries of rule. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31(1): 134–161.
- Tammaru, T., M. van Ham, M. Szymon and S. Musterd (eds) (2014), *Socio-Economic Segregation in European Capital Cities* (Abingdon: Routledge).
- Tissot, S. (2007), *L'Etat et les quartiers. Genèse d'une catégorie d'action publique* (Paris: Le Seuil).
- Todorova, M. (2009 [1997]), *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Tuvikene, T. (2016), Strategies for comparative urbanism: post-socialism as a de-territorialized concept. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40: 132–146.
- Vandertop, C. (2016), The colonies in concrete: Walter Benjamin, urban form and the dreamworlds of empire. *Interventions* 18(5): 709–729.
- van Kempen, R. and A. Murie (2009), The new divided city: changing patterns in European cities. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 100(4): 377–398.
- Vincze, E., N. Petrovici, C. Raț and G. Picker (eds) (2018), *Racialized Labour in Romania: Spaces of Marginality at the Periphery of Global Capitalism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Vincze, E. and G. I. Zamfir (2019), Racialized housing unevenness in Cluj-Napoca under capitalist redevelopment. *City* 23(4–5): 439–460.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2007), *Unthinking the Greek Polis. Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Wacquant, L. (2008), *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Urban Marginality* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Weber, M. (1958 [1922]), *The City*, trans. and ed. D. Martindale and G. Neuwirth (New York and London: The Free Press).
- Wekker, G. (2016), *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).
- Wright, G. (1991), *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Wright, G. (1997), Tradition in the service of modernity: architecture and urbanism in French colonial policy, 1900–1930. In Cooper, F. and A. L. Stoler (eds) *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press), pp. 322–345.
- Zimmerman, A. (2006), Decolonizing Weber. *Postcolonial Studies* 9(1): 53–79.
- Zwischenraum Kollektiv (eds) (2017), *Decolonize the City! Zur Kolonialität der Stadt: Gespräche | Aushandlungen | Perspektiven* (Münster: Unrast).

