

## CHAPTER 1

### **Introduction: 'gentrification' a global urban process?**

*Loretta Lees, Hyun Bang Shin and Ernesto López-Morales*

To what extent is gentrification a global phenomenon, with diverse causes and characteristics, or a phenomenon of globalisation, conceived as a process of capital expansion, uneven urban development and neighbourhood changes in 'new' cities? (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005, p 2).

#### **Introduction: moving beyond the usual gentrification suspects**

Gentrification has been a major focus of several (inter)disciplinary literatures for many years, including but not limited to geography, sociology, urban studies, urban planning, anthropology, political science and economics, but its theoretical and conceptual framing has, to date, been constrained by an Anglo-American lens. This collection responds directly and forcefully to address the limitations of this gentrification lens in ways that have not been attempted before. In so doing it critically assesses the meaning and significance of gentrification in cities outside of the usual suspects: a large number of the book's chapters are located outside of the Global North in post-colonial and in some cases non-white urban contexts which are increasingly confronted by global as well as local (re)development pressures. In addition some of the chapters focus on cities that sit awkwardly between the so-called global north and south (eg Lisbon in Portugal) and the global west and east (eg Istanbul in Turkey). The collection delivers on promises made by other gentrification scholars, for example Atkinson and Bridge (2005), who outlined the need for a truly cosmopolitan, global, view of gentrification, even if we recognise that such a cosmopolitan view is not easy to obtain. A cosmopolitan view is worldly-wise, well-travelled, urbane, refined and aware, but in this collection we aspire to a 'cosmopolitan prospect' rather than 'view', for 'prospect' conjures up a more forward looking cosmopolitanism, one with aspect, perspective, and outlook at its heart. In this book we seek to move the gentrification literature in the direction of a properly global urban studies, we discuss the extent to which 'gentrification' is a global process, and in so doing highlight the injustices, the uneven developments and displacements, that this process is yielding globally.

For decades, authors and experts on gentrification have espoused the global nature of gentrification, at the same time asking for a more global investigation into the process. Many of these references to the globalization of gentrification were in nations and cities linked to the Global North (eg Badcock, 1989, on the Australian rent gap; Sykora, 1993, on the functional gap in Prague), but some began to emerge from the Global South itself (eg Jones and Varley, 1999 on Puebla, Mexico). Then as the process moved into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the late Neil Smith (2002; also Smith and Derksen, 2002) talked about 'gentrification going global', 'gentrification generalized', and gentrification as a 'global urban strategy', connecting with debates on globalism, neoliberalism and the changing role of the state. Sometime earlier Smith (1996) had looked for gentrification battlefields around the world, but Clark (2005) warned that some places experiencing gentrification did so differently, the dealings with gentrification in Sweden, for example, were less violent. Kovacs and Wiessner (1999) also argued in sharp contrast to Smith (1996), who used Budapest to demonstrate gentrification in post-communist Europe, that gentrification was not occurring in Budapest in the West European and North American sense of the word. Whilst there have been a few academic journal articles that have attempted a more cosmopolitan view of gentrification (eg Harris, 2008) there has not been a sustained engagement with serious conversations across different contexts. Porter and Shaw's (2008) edited book features great case studies from Europe, North and South America, Asia, South Africa, the Middle East and Australia, it develops a comparative analysis of regeneration/gentrification strategies, their effects, and efforts to resist them, but it doesn't pay enough attention to the issues of developmentalism, universalism and categorisation in comparative urbanism (Lees, 2012,2014).

This book provides exactly that kind of dialogue and theoretical/empirical learning from/with the Global South and the Global North. Such an endeavour necessitates hard empirical and conceptual work and a lot of collaboration with specialist authors working in/on cities across the globe. To that end we have assembled a team of collaborators who for the most part are beyond the usual suspects in gentrification authorship, a number of these are young scholars who have entered gentrification studies asking many of the same questions that we ask in this book, others are more mature scholars who are reflecting back

on, and beyond, their previous writings on gentrification. Some of the contributors were selected from a group of invited researchers who took part in the international seminar series we co-organised entitled 'Towards an Emerging Geography of Gentrification in the Global South' held in London and Santiago de Chile; others were approached separately in the knowledge that they had written on, or were researching, gentrification or related urban processes in diverse parts of the globe. The contributors were encouraged to challenge theoretical and epistemological perspectives that have been based on the Northern/Western experiences of gentrification, perspectives that have become hegemonic in the international gentrification literature.

We have worked to formulate a genuinely collaborative project enabling learning about gentrification from outside the comfort zone of the Global North. Given the differences between the various authors in terms of languages spoken, stage of career, academic discipline, educational training, etc, we do not apologise for the fact that the individual chapters are quite mixed -- some of them theoretically and conceptually dense, others fairly accessible, some very versed in the gentrification literature, others less so. Some actively engage their academic work with anti-gentrification activism or support grassroots movements (for whom there seem to be little doubt gentrification is actually taking place in their cities), whilst others reflect from purely scholarly analysis. Of course as Robinson (2011, p 2) has pointed out collections of case studies from different places do not simply constitute a comparative analysis. She is right and during the editing process for this book we have taken a more interventionist role, we have pushed authors to 'unlearn' how we/they think about gentrification, its practices and ideologies, even to abandon or parochialise the term 'gentrification' itself; we have gone back and forth with authors pushing them to directly address a series of questions (see Figure 1.1).

---

**Figure 1.1 The questions asked of the contributors and ourselves**

What is the complex geographical contingency to gentrification?  
How is gentrification framed and defined in their context?  
What are its causes and consequences?  
Is the concept of 'gentrification' really suitable for denoting processes of restructuring being experienced in inner city or peripheral areas in the cities outside the Global North?

Are there endogenous processes that would be better captured by concepts other than gentrification?

How useful is the literature on gentrification from the Global North in theorizing or conceptualizing what is going on in the countries and cities they write about?

What does the (Western) gentrification concept do analytically that other concepts cannot do better?

---

In doing this a number of the chapters achieve a real critical edge, albeit to a varying degree. Getting the authors and their chapters to speak to each other as Robinson (2011) suggests is much more difficult when nearly all of these authors have a language other than English as their first language and when they are already pushing themselves to think beyond the confines of the gentrification literature to date. As such in the conclusion to this book (see Chapter 22) we do the work of speaking across and through all the chapters ourselves (the fact that we three editors have expertise from/on different parts of the globe has helped this process) pulling together what we (and the contributors) have learned. Juxtaposing diverse cases of urban development outside the Global North and beyond the usual suspects has both moved us beyond over-generalizing on gentrification processes (which hide other processes at work) but also it has enabled us to (re)discover the important generalities and specificities associated with the process of gentrification globally.

### **Gentrification in comparative perspective**

In the 1980s, 1990s and indeed into the 2000s the internationally comparative work that was being undertaken on gentrification predominantly compared Western cities<sup>1</sup>. Research in gentrification outside of the usual suspects also viewed gentrification through an Anglo-American gentrification lens, eg Badcock's (1989) emulation of Marxist rent gap theory in Adelaide, and Cybriwsky's (1998) account of gentrification in Tokyo; even if some offered much more critical and contextual accounts, eg Sykora's (1993) 'functional gap' in post-socialist Prague. New work on gentrification informed by postcolonial writings also tended to view the process through an Anglo-American lens, eg Shaw's (2000) 'Harleminizing' aborigines in Sydney's Redfern neighbourhood. Atkinson and Bridge's (2005) collection

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example, Smith and Williams, 1986; Ley, 1986, across Canadian inner cities; Lees, 1994, on London and New York City; Carpenter and Lees, 1995, on London, Paris and New York City; Slater, 2002, on New York City and Toronto; van Criekingen and Decroly, 2003, on Brussels and Montreal; etc.

'Gentrification in a global context' offered a much wider view of gentrification around the globe, which it evoked well through the phase 'new urban colonialism', but it failed to undertake a thorough comparative urbanism. However, if one delves deeply into the chapters in that book from outside of the usual suspects one can find comparative grievances, comparative urbanisms, and concerns that their cases do not quite fit with the Anglo-American norm. Petsimeris (2005), for example, wonders why southern European cities have been all but ignored in the gentrification literature, and points readers towards a significant literature on the structure and evolution of the southern European city as different to northern European cities. He argues: 'Southern European cities are highly heterogeneous and complex, and the processes of gentrification are for this reason very different in terms of its temporality and spatiality' (Petsimeris, 2005, p 242). He concludes that the root causes and intensity of gentrification in Southern European cities are not the same as in Britain and North America, but his comparator remains the Global North. Rubino (2005) questions if there might be a specifically Latin American gentrification by revisiting the Chicago School. Krase (2005) compares a Polish-American neighbourhood in New York with one in Krakow, he attempts an interesting comparison across time, space and transnational ethnic connections using image based research. He argues that although the causes of gentrification are different in the two neighbourhoods the aesthetic practice (style, taste) of gentrification is similar. He states: 'If we were to suspend our ideological beliefs for a moment we might find some gross historical similarities between Greenpoint, Brooklyn, United States and post-socialist Krakow, Poland. For one they are both places that have suffered extensive physical deterioration in the 1970s and 1980s only to find themselves desirable destinations for higher status migrants at the turn of the century' (Krase, 2005, p 205).

However, should we really ignore contextual, ideological differences? Sykora (2005, p 90, emphases added) is uncomfortable in his assertions of gentrification in post-communist cities: '...it is increasingly clear that the implementation of market reforms in Eastern European 'post-communist' cities has often led to pronounced urban restructuring and neighbourhood changes that are, *to some extent*, similar to transformations mapped out for cities in the west'; and 'In conclusion we point to the specificities of gentrification in post-communist cities that *might* have some relevance for the general discussion of the process

and its trajectories under differing systemic conditions'. He concludes that 'Gentrification is not generally a major factor in the transformations of post-communist cities' (Sykora, 2005, p 104). He continues (p 105) that there has been no pioneer phase for post-communist gentrification with a *desire* for inner city living, the process instead is more utilitarian, driven by demand for housing in pleasant locations near to the places of work of the professional classes. However Sykora does not go so far as to state that the processes at work in post-communist cities are not gentrification, but something else.

### **Debating the epistemological limits of 'gentrification'**

Over the years there has been anxiety on and off about the term 'gentrification' being stretched beyond its limits. Bondi (1999, p 255) warned researchers not to overload the concept of gentrification with reconceptualisations: 'the more researchers have attempted to pin it down the more burdens the concept has had to carry'; nevertheless she also argued that 'creative approaches to the production of academic knowledge entail cyclical processes of conceptualisation and reconceptualisation'. This book attempts that creative approach, by way of contrast not only did Bondi (1999) want gentrification research to be allowed to 'disintegrate under the weight of these burdens', she disintegrated under the weight of these burdens and withdrew from researching gentrification itself. A couple of years later Lambert and Boddy (2002) argued quite forcefully that new-build developments in British city centres should not be categorised as 'gentrification' but rather as 're-urbanisation' (see Davidson and Lees, 2005; Lees et al, 2008, pp 138-141). In contrast Cybriwsky (2011, p 243) argues: 'Yes, of course it is gentrification, without a doubt!', in his discussion of aggressive new build redevelopments in central Tokyo under the Japanese *dokken kokka* (construction state), where office buildings, high-rise luxury apartments, up-market retailing, and arts facilities, were being built for the wealthy. The key to this process is the unevenness in the ways in which Tokyo was seeing the rise of such new investments. Butler (2007, p 167) has also mulled over the epistemology of gentrification but expressed concern 'not that [the gentrification] concept has become 'diluted' but rather that there is now an expectation of what we should expect to find which blinds us to the continued diversity of consequences'. He makes a good point, although there is hardly a single 'we' given an increasingly diversified global academia facing the diverse emergences and consequences of

gentrification and other processes in different, complex urban systems around the world. More than preserving and 'patrolling' the use of the 'gentrification' concept (to quote Ananya Roy's, 2009, call for a truly postcolonial theorization) what is needed now is proper global debate among scholars from the South, North, West and East, as is the main goal of this book.

More recently, Maloutas (2012) has asked whether the use of the Anglo-American term 'gentrification' facilitates or impedes understanding of processes of urban restructuring in different contexts. Like in this book he invites scholars to discuss some of the epistemological limits of current urban theorizations on gentrification. However, his arguments are somewhat confused and based on a rather circumscribed review of the gentrification literature<sup>2</sup>. For one, he ignores the fact that there was significant debate in the 1990s about the contextual nature of gentrification, when a number of authors claimed terminological diversity for the same process, eg embourgeoisement, aburguesamiento, elitización, urban reconquest, and so on (this debate was especially strong in Spain, see for instance García-Herrera, 2001). Indeed, this terminological debate led to the withdrawal of some scholars from gentrification studies altogether. Maloutas (2012) argues that we need to pay more attention to context in gentrification studies, that gentrification research needs to be brought into new contexts in an attempt to explain specific processes that may look dissimilar, that we need stronger and deeper evidence on the causal mechanisms of gentrification. Yet, confusingly he also argues that 'looking for gentrification in increasingly varied contexts displaces emphasis from causal mechanisms and processes to similarities in outcomes across contexts, and leads to a loss of analytical rigour' (Maloutas, 2012, p 34). Like Atkinson (2008), he argues that gentrification researchers have tended to label too many kinds of neighbourhood change as gentrification and this elasticity has reduced the bite of critical studies of its localized appearance and has, as a result, diminished policy-maker interest. We agree that a poor theorization of gentrification may lead to faulty accounts of cases of urban change labelled incorrectly as gentrification, but on the other

---

<sup>2</sup> Maloutas' scepticism about the applicability of gentrification theory outside the north/west is not based on enough evidence. His paper itself is confined to the northern/western literature, it presents 101 references only 11 of which come from contexts outside of the north Atlantic, and seven of those are chapters from the same book (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005). Only four of his references are accounts outside of Europe or North America, he has missed a number of significant papers on gentrification in Latin America, Africa and East Asia.

hand, we believe that a large number of well-analysed cases help extract the global regularities of the causes of gentrification. Maloutas (2012) is in fact recalling an epistemological problem that has been around since Popper (1998) about the empirical nature of theorization and the extent to which a theory can inductively emerge from certain empirical evidence. The whole debate about case-oriented analysis has been drawn on the assumption that it is possible to induce regularities from a distinct number of different cases and this is in fact a good way to create knowledge (see Flyvbjerg, 2006; Ragin, 1987). To consider gentrification as 'a mid-range theory' (see Butler, 2010) is not necessarily wrong, if it is accepted that this mid-range theory will help consolidate and articulate empirical regularities which would otherwise appear disarticulated. Without a gentrification theory that serves as an 'umbrella' (see Davidson and Lees, 2005), the debate we are holding now in this book would probably not exist, neither would most of the gentrification debates held hitherto by scholars in different contexts, nor would urban activists around the world be able to identify the different types of redevelopment-led displacement that are in many ways part of the same repertoire of class restructuring in global capitalism.

Maloutas (2012) argues that three key reference points are necessary conditions for gentrification: gentrification aesthetics, the presence of a middle-class (as a particularly well defined social segment), and post-industrialization. He argues that through these we can assess whether gentrification is really a different or only vaguely related phenomenon in different places. This is too-simplistic an idea about gentrification, or worse, a reification of contextual epiphenomena, such as the way gentrification has looked, smelled or tasted in some specific (North American and West European) contexts at very specific times. Maloutas (2012) seems to be trapped in a 'dilution' (see Butler, 2007), as he never defines gentrification but nevertheless makes claims about what gentrification should *not* be based on three necessary conditions for the process. But gentrification aesthetics are just an effect of gentrification, the middle-classes depend on historical socio-cultural particularities<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, Lemanski and Lama-Rewal (2010) have critiqued and deconstructed Indian class categorizations with respect to urban governance issues in Delhi, arguing that the new middle class is a small elite and that numerically the large lower middle class is much more significant in urban populations. In Latin America, the ascending urban middle-classes of the 1930s to 1960s were hinges for the modernization of Latin American states and pushed for more redistributive policies (Hardoy, 1975), differing from middle-class constructions in North Atlantic cases. Wang and Lau (2009) have written about gentrification and Shanghai's new middle class

which do not exist in many cases where gentrification is 'allowed' to exist, and finally there are post-industrial cities that do not have gentrification and likewise cities that have gentrification but have not experienced deindustrialization and a move to post-industrialization (see Lees, 2014a).

Maloutas (2012) claims that there is an 'attachment' of gentrification to the Anglo-American metropolis. We agree, but his argument is epistemologically blurry. First, does that 'attachment' come from the fact that those metropolises were the places where gentrification was first studied scientifically? If so, why? Or is this an attachment that responds to certain conditions that only Anglo-American cities have in common or that only Maloutas sees? In fact, the gentrification literature has been clear that Western European and North American cities are different from each other (see the section on gentrification in comparative perspective above; and Lees, 2012). As a good example of this, the different nature of gentrification experienced in the US compared with that in Canada made the early 1980s dispute between Neil Smith and David Ley something much more interesting than the ideological quarrel that it has long been reported as (on the quarrel see Lees et al, 2008) because this dispute was also fundamentally about the very different nature of the cases they were researching (see Lees, 2000). But at that time no-one dared to deny that both were cases of gentrification. As such, Maloutas' (2012) argument about the contextual-attachment of gentrification seems as problematic as arguing that Marx's notion of the working-class equals only the physical and psychological attributes that Engels described for the British and German proletariat in the mid-1800s. What Maloutas (2012) has contributed is a fossilization, rather than contextualization, of the concepts, by confining them to the particular geographical and historical specificities that generated them.

We claim (of course the elephant in the room is who should define where the limits of a concept should be), like most of the authors in this book, that there are more relevant and necessary conditions for gentrification to exist: the class polarization that lies beneath the appearances of gentrifying urban areas across the globe, the noticeable increase in investment put into the economic circuits of urban 'regeneration' (or the secondary circuit

---

concluding that '[t]he seemingly familiar (with Western conceptualizations) outputs are actually the result of different mechanisms occurring through different historical pathways' (Wang and Lau, 2009, p 65).

of the built environment, as David Harvey or Henri Lefebvre would call it), and different forms of displacement - direct displacement, indirect displacement, exclusionary displacement, displacement pressure, social exclusion, and so on (see also Davidson and Lees, 2005; Aalbers, 2011; Marcuse, 2010; Slater, 2009). On the contrary, there seems to be an 'epistemological' temptation to see gentrification as deeply context-dependent because the particularities observed in a specific number of gentrification cases in the Global North are apparently hard to replicate elsewhere. We think it is time to reconsider the regularities that lie behind those processes, and consider what is central to the process of gentrification itself insofar as a large number of cases can illuminate this reflection.

More recently, Ley and Teo (2014) have explored the epistemological argument raised by Maloutas (2012) in considering the identification and naming (or absence of naming) of gentrification in Hong Kong. They too are concerned about the 'conceptual overreach' of 'gentrification' from the Anglo-American heartland to the cities of Asia Pacific and specifically Hong Kong. However they conclude that just because the word 'gentrification' is missing from public and academic discourse in Hong Kong it does not mean that gentrification is not happening: 'It is only the critical view of gentrification in Euro-America compared with the neutral or even affirmative view of urban redevelopment in Hong Kong that confounds the global symmetry' (Ley and Teo, 2014). They argue that the ideological consensus about the role of property in upward social mobility, a set of values that have been hitherto unquestioned, is becoming seen as socially unjust.

These fears that 'gentrification' has become a 'regulating fiction', 'a self-fulfilling prophecy', deserve our attention. We must consider, as do Ley and Teo (2014), if use of the term/concept 'gentrification' outside of Euro-America represents a 'false rupture (a severing from its source region) and false universalisation (uncritically universalizing it)' (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1999, p 43). This is something that this book seeks to do.

## **Questioning a global gentrification**

The overall aim of this book is to put the concept of gentrification into question globally, recognising that this might contribute to dislocating existing conceptualisations of

gentrification and could potentially allow for the development of new lines of analysis of urban change. To that end we draw *conceptually* on the 'new' literatures on comparative urbanism and policy mobilities and *practically* on the knowledge of gentrification researchers working on/in the Global South and in other atypical contexts. We do not seek to be 'comparative' in a structured or traditional fashion (ie. flattening cases through a limited number of factors or categories) but rather 'exploratory' and in many ways unstructured (following McFarlane and Robinson, 2012). As such the book offers a much needed 'deep' and case-oriented empirical lens into the comparative urbanism of gentrification in the Global South and beyond the usual suspects, revealing multiple translations throughout the world. The 'new' comparative urbanism (see Robinson, 2006) asserts that urban theory as it has developed is colonial, hegemonic, and based on a selective number of cities, a situation that has been fuelled by the global and world cities debates. As McFarlane (2010) argues, claims about the city (and here we could insert 'gentrification') as a category are too often made with implicitly the Global North in mind. As such we have made significant strides to bring into the debate a large number of cases from the Global South and East. But as this book shows it is very difficult to break this hegemony and in fact the comparison remains an important one, we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater. Robinson (2006; 2011) argues that contemporary urban theory has pushed to the side some cities, especially those deemed to be non-modern, even primitive. The result is different literatures – urban geography tends to focus on wealthier cities which have become universalised and development geographers on poorer cities contributing to the development geography literature. Following Robinson's (2006) plea for a postcolonial urban theory that acknowledges the potential of learning from the experiences and accounts of urban life in different cities, we have tried hard in this book to look beyond the usual suspects. We offer here a 'comparative gesture' (see Robinson, 2011), as a first step towards a properly comparative global gentrification studies that can lead the way in undermining the hegemony of gentrification as a model for the development of cities everywhere. But in so doing we stand aside from other comparative urbanists in our belief that to flatten the globe and its multiple urban hierarchies so as to appreciate difference hides social injustices and neglects important power relations.

Ward (2010) discusses how the 1970s and 1980s did produce a comparative urban studies, mainly inspired by a Marxist perspective that sought regularities and patterns through a grand and overarching theoretical lens that provided a cross-national comparative perspective. Nevertheless he argues that these studies were hampered by an understanding of cities as bounded and discrete units, and of geographical scales as fixed and pre-given. These of course are shortcomings which both postcolonial and poststructuralist theory have identified, the question of course becomes whether a truly comparative urban studies can be undertaken. According to Ward, the answer is 'Yes', as long as we are informed by past work and theorize back from empirical accounts of various cities. Ward (like Robinson) provides no methodological framework for how this might be done. 'Doing' comparative urbanism scientifically remains a rather open question, it remains a field of inquiry which aims to develop 'knowledge, understanding and generalization at a level between what is true for all cities and what is true for one city at a given point in time' (Nijman, 2007, p 1).

The 'new' comparative urbanism's goal to decentre urban studies from the Global North implies that social scientific research methods, especially those usually associated with positivism, should be replaced by 'academic impressionism'. There are of course lots of problems with this. Various issues emerge, for example, if we are not to classify cities, to compare differences in performance between cities because that would always imply a hierarchy, and if we are to stick to the idea that they are all a category of one, then what can we actually do? It is not surprising that scholars who have argued for a 'new' approach to comparative urban studies concern themselves with city government, governance and the travelling of policies<sup>4</sup>. After all, the themes and research questions that can be formulated around these do not need to reflect very much on the ideas that cities are not bounded, self-enclosed objects and that scales are not self-evident; and their plea for relational understandings is easy to live up to because such topics are primarily about how cities are actors that communicate and connect to other places. It is however a little more complicated, when, for example, one has to engage with questions that constitute what we still consider to be the core of urban studies, eg the understanding of processes and

---

<sup>4</sup> This critique developed out of a 2011 DAAD funded workshop in London and Berlin on comparative urbanism co-organised by Tim Butler, Loretta Lees, Talja Blokland and Isle Helbrecht. Thanks to all who attended for their input which is summarised here.

mechanisms that produce durable urban inequalities and their spatial expressions. All in all, it is important to bear in mind Ananya Roy's (2009) call to reinforce 'the distinctive experiences of the cities of the global South [to] generate productive and provocative theoretical frameworks for all cities. [However, on the other hand, t]he critique of the EuroAmerican hegemony of urban theory is thus not an argument about the inapplicability of the EuroAmerican ideas to the cities of the global South. It is not worthwhile to police the borders across which ideas, policies, and practices flow and mutate. The concern is the limited sites at which theoretical production is currently theorized and with the failure of imagination and epistemology that is thus engendered. It is time to blast open theoretical geographies, to produce a new set of concepts, in the crucible of a new repertoire of cities' (Roy, 2009, p 820).

### **Overview of the book**

We have organised the book chapters into alphabetical order of author surname. We have done this deliberately to mix up the chapters randomly, in part to play to the comparative urbanism agenda and to flatten any regional or city hierarchies that might emerge, but more so to allow us to pull out emerging themes and lessons that are not then forced to conform to a synthetic structure. Some readers might have liked us to have organised the chapters loosely by region, but it is not easy to fit these cases into regions, for example, Cairo long theorised as a Middle Eastern City and the intellectual capital of the Islamic world is in Africa; Istanbul tends to be theorised as a Middle Eastern City, yet it is straddles East (Asia) and West (Europe); Lisbon is in Europe (the Global North) but shares a lot in common with the Global South; and South and East Asian cities, like those in Pakistan, India, China and Taiwan are very different. A number of Latin American researchers have asserted a specifically 'Latin American gentrification' (see Janoschka, Sequera and Salinas (2013), but we believe that theoretical or conceptual insight does not always follow regional lines, even if we recognise that there are Latin American urbanisms that might be linked with urbanisms in Spain and Portugal; Middle Eastern gentrifications in for example Israel, Syria and Lebanon that might be related to conflicts and population migrations as a result of conflicts in that region; and East Asian gentrifications where the role of the state is more prominent than elsewhere in facilitating real estate development.

We have designed the book to speak to different levels of readership. For more advanced readers, the book demonstrates both the complexities and difficulties of undertaking comparative urban analysis, but also the fruitions. For more junior readers (undergraduates and masters students for example) the range of empirical case studies provides them with a good grasp of the theoretical debates but also useful case studies to flesh out these academic debates. Following on from this introduction, in **Chapter Two** Georgia Alexandri shows how gentrification is rising like a phoenix from the ashes of inner city 'crisis' in Athens like in New York City in the 1970s and 1980s. Gentrification dynamics in Athens are seen to operate for now at the micro-scale and enmesh in a complex way with urban fears about illegal immigrants, drug users, and the homeless.

In **Chapter Three** Eduardo Ascensão discusses slum gentrification in Lisbon, Portugal, focusing in particular on Quinta da Serra. His detailed ethnographic work reveals the injustices in this process, the reality of displacement, and attempts to resist. He reveals the institutional imaginings and governmentalities that are part of 'gentrification' as the building of a modern, European, and multicultural Portugal over the past 35 years.

In **Chapter Four** Surajit Chakravarty and Abdellatif Qamhaieh examine the policies causing the gentrification of Abu Dhabi's city centre which are displacing segments of the population. They argue that although there are stark differences between the planning cultures of Abu Dhabi and those of cities in Western Europe or North America, there are similarities in how the 'spatial fix' is administered.

In **Chapter Five** Jake Cummings focuses on the development of 'favela chic' and 'favela gentrification' in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, related to aggressive state-led securitization policies and housing relocation programmes, plus local and global real estate powers campaigning for favela renovation. Favela residents' and gentrifying newcomers' discourses are compared showing 'sub-gentrification' trends (fostered by thriving informal property markets and indigenous land owners consolidating their wealth by capitalizing on their properties) and a second trend of hyper-mobile international newcomers that lie at the vanguard of the gentrification of favelas in touristic areas.

In **Chapter Six** Sapana Doshi critically engages with theories of gentrification through the prism of Indian cities and highlights four key factors shaping Indian urban transformation: 1) informal regimes of urban development, settlement and governance; 2) new state formations consolidating urban elite and middle class power; 3) contradictory desires and fragmented subjectivities shaping subaltern mobilizations; and 4) the role of identity-based violence and exclusion in displacement politics. Significantly she argues against staging an Indian ideal type of gentrification and calls for more attention to the diverse extra-economic processes that produce Indian cities. She also claims that in the context of elite world-class making and the prevalence of identity politics, the anti-capitalist 'right to the city' may not be the best rallying cry for anti-gentrification activities in Indian cities.

In **Chapter Seven** Mohamed Elshahed discusses gentrification in Cairo in the context of a city where the wealthy are opting for new gated developments. He argues that the recent interest in investing in downtown is akin to more conventional processes of gentrification, however the conditions in Cairo make these prospects for gentrification difficult to realise - gentrification limited.

In **Chapter Eight** Amiram Gonen, following Atkinson (2003), discusses gentrification in Israel as middle-class resettlement amenable to a range of locational and social qualities, inner city, suburban and rural. He asserts the diversity and widespread nature of gentrification in Israel. The factors behind gentrification are different to in Anglo-American cities, for like in Paris the middle classes opted predominantly for inner-urban living and lower-class populations lived on the fringes of cities, hence his attempt to introduce the Hebrew term *hitbargenoot* following the French term *embourgeoisement*.

In **Chapter Nine** Seong-Kyu Ha discusses the endogenous dynamics of urban renewal in Seoul, South Korea, as what he terms 'renewal-induced gentrification'. He asserts that Seoul has been witnessing one of the world's most aggressive residential renewal programmes, for large scale redevelopment programmes, such as 'joint redevelopment' and 'new town in town' have focused on maximizing landlord profits rather than on improving the housing welfare of low-income residents who have been displaced from their neighbourhoods. He

also discusses the likelihood of anti-gentrification struggles in South Korea in reference to a community-based co-operative approach in Seoul.

In **Chapter Ten** Arif Hasan demonstrates how processes of gentrification in Karachi, Pakistan, are linked to networks with differing spatial reaches. Not only are those behind an emerging historic preservation movement in Karachi trained in the West, the money and design ideas behind the proposed large scale developments on Karachi's coast are from Dubai based companies. Perhaps most importantly, however, most of these redevelopment plans were shelved due in no large part to civil society resistance to gentrification, demonstrating that anti-gentrification resistance can be successful in the Global South.

In **Chapter Eleven** Hilda Herzer, María Mercedes Di Virgilio and María Carla Rodríguez seek to increase the 'evidence base' on gentrification in Latin American cities through a longitudinal study of the La Boca, San Telmo and Barracas quarters in Buenos Aires. Interestingly, gentrification in Buenos Aires is first and foremost about providing cultural, touristic, educational, and commercial, etc. services for high income groups; and only after that about housing for higher income groups.

In **Chapter Twelve** Liling Huang stresses the role of the high percentage of public lands located in the city center and in strategic areas and their influence on gentrification in Taipei, Taiwan. She discusses how due to de-regulation a large number of public housing units became up-scale commodities on the real estate market, as the state sold them into gentrification, tuned them into enclaves for the wealthy and elite professionals, and also pushed up housing prices in the surrounding areas.

In **Chapter Thirteen** Tolga İslam and Bahar Sakızlıoğlu argue for a grounded approach for researching different geographies of gentrification that understands local political contexts and actually existing neoliberalisms in different cities/regions/countries, including the role and power of the state and elite coalitions, etc., that give rise to urban policies promoting gentrification. Comparing Sulukule and Tarlabasi in central Istanbul, neighbourhoods that have been transformed based on the same renewal law, they show how even in two

seemingly similar cases within the same city, the making of, and resistance to, gentrification can take quite different forms.

In **Chapter Fourteen** Gareth Jones revisits the city of Puebla in Mexico which he wrote about in the 1990s with Ann Varley, looking again at gentrification but in the new context of Mexico having fully embraced neo-liberalism. He looks at representations of culture and especially ethnicity in the Paseo project which set out to establish a cultural, tourist and business district across 27 city blocks in the historic centre and covering a number of 'barrios'. Here the Mexican state has underwritten real estate speculation, facilitating a bolder intervention to promote the interests of corporate capital in urban centres.

In **Chapter Fifteen** Marieke Krijnen and Christiaan De Beukelaer show how much processes of gentrification diverge in a single city - Beirut - with different networks of capital formation and visions of the urban future reflecting Lebanon's history of conflict and the various ways in which neighborhoods and social groups are linked to regional and global circuits of capital.

In **Chapter Sixteen** Chinwe Nwanna looks at two cases of gentrification in Lagos Mega City, one an example of slum gentrification, the other the gentrification of government owned housing, both seeing the forcible eviction of tenants. She also discusses the revanchist acts of Governor Fashola who moved the destitute and mentally ill off the streets of Lagos with a view to world city status.

In **Chapter Seventeen** Julie Ren examines whether gentrification is an effective means to describe the changes urban China is undergoing showing the descriptive limits of the gentrification lens. She discusses both the strategic reasons for studying 'gentrification' in China and the potential shortcomings. She is especially concerned that 'gentrification' research in China may obscure a more contextually relevant understanding of urban inequality and that rebalancing the equation towards 'the particular' might isolate Chinese urbanism in its own parochial frame.

In **Chapter Eighteen** Elke Schlack and Neil Turnbull review the 'Latin American gentrification' literature, which in the 1990s was interested in the consequences of gentrification for low income populations in traditional historical centres, but moved on in the 2000s to look at the production of gentrification rooted in land policies and housing markets in neoliberalized contexts. They step aside from the bulk of the work on gentrification in Chile which has focused to date on the latter, eg. new-build gentrification (see López-Morales, 2010, 2011), and look instead at the rehabilitation of existing structures in inner city Santiago. In so doing they look at commercial gentrifications that are putting pressure on residential neighbourhoods and making profit through the exploitation of distinctive neighbourhood cultural attributes.

In **Chapter Nineteen** Jorge Sequera and Michael Janoschka deliberately step aside from the iconic examples of Barcelona and Bilbao in Spain and discuss Madrid. They compare two different neighbourhoods in the historic core - Lavapiés and Triball - and show how different dispositifs are used in the production of gentrification, and also how gentrification is limited not just by the Spanish housing crisis, but also by non-European immigrants, a counterculture, escalating struggles for the right to housing as a response to the social and economic crisis, and new residents that do not fit the profile of the desired neighbourhood.

In **Chapter Twenty** Yannick Suderman demonstrates the relationship between Syrian middle-class professionals, regime cronies and their changing consumer preferences, and the process of gentrification. He argues that the production of gentrification in the Syrian capital followed the logics of the market but also depended on an authoritarian state that used gentrification in order to secure its power at the local scale.

In **Chapter Twenty-one** Annika Teppo and Marianne Millstein discuss the place that the notion of gentrification occupies in the South African context, using examples from Cape Town. They argue that the public justifications of, discussions and disputes about, and the material and social conditions related to, gentrification processes differ in South Africa from those in the Global North. They show why those defending gentrification appeal to a moral postcolonial racial discourse.

In **Chapter Twenty-two**, the conclusion, we pull out the main lessons that we have learned from reading these chapters altogether. Here we begin the 'comparative urbanism' that gentrification studies now demands, but this is but a first step, a foray, for that project needs to be longer, deeper, and more sustained, than can be achieved here.

Finally, at the end of the book, Eric Clark, an American who lives and writes about gentrification in Sweden but who has begun to look at gentrification in East Asia, has been invited to write an **Afterword**.

## References

- Aalbers, M. (2011) *Place, Exclusion and Mortgage Markets*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Atkinson, R. (2008) 'Gentrification, segregation and the vocabulary of affluent residential choice', *Urban Studies*, vol 45, no 12, pp 2626-2636.
- Atkinson, R., 2003. Introduction: Misunderstood saviour or vengeful wrecker? The many meanings and problems of gentrification. *Urban Studies*, vol 20, no 12, pp. 2343-2350.
- Atkinson, R. and G. Bridge (eds) (2005) *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, London: Routledge.
- Badcock, B. (1989) 'An Australian view of the rent gap hypothesis', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol 79, no 1, pp 125-145.
- Bondi, L. (1999) 'Between the woof and the weft: a response to Loretta Lees', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol 17, no 3, pp 253-255.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1999) 'On the cunning of imperialist reason', *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol 16, no 1, pp 41-58.
- Butler, T. (2007) 'For gentrification?', *Environment and Planning A*, vol 39, pp 162-181.
- Butler, T. (2010) 'Gentrification and Globalization: the emergence of a middle range theory?', Available at: [http://blogs.sciences-po.fr/recherche-villes/files/2010/01/cahier\\_ville\\_0514.pdf](http://blogs.sciences-po.fr/recherche-villes/files/2010/01/cahier_ville_0514.pdf).

- Carpenter, J. and Lees, L. (1995) 'Gentrification in New York, London and Paris: An International Comparison', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 19, no 2, pp 286-303.
- Clark, E. (2005) 'The order and simplicity of gentrification - a political challenge', in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge (eds) *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, London: Routledge, pp.256-264.
- Cybrivsky, R. (1998) *Tokyo: the Shogun's city at the twenty-first century*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Cybrivsky, R. (2011) *Roppongi Crossing: the demise of a Tokyo nightclub district and the reshaping of a global city*, Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
- Davidson, M. and Lees, L. (2005) 'New Build 'Gentrification' and London's Riverside Renaissance', *Environment and Planning A*, vol 37, no 7, pp 1165-1190.
- Flyvberg, B. (2006) 'Five misunderstandings about case study research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol 12, no 2, pp 219-245.
- García-Herrera, L. M. (2001) 'Elitización: propuesta en español para el término Gentrificación, Biblio 3W', *Revista Bibliográfica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, vol 6, p 332).
- Hardoy, J. E. (1975) 'Two thousand years of Latin American urbanization', in J. E. Hardoy (ed) *Urbanization in Latin America: approaches and issues*, New York: Anchor Books, pp 3-56.
- Harris, A. (2008) 'From London to Mumbai and back again: gentrification and public policy in comparative perspective', *Urban Studies*, vol 45, no 12, pp 2407-2428.
- Janoschka, M., Sequera, J., and Salinas, L. (2013) Gentrification in Spain and Latin America – a critical dialogue, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, doi/10.1111/1468-2427.12030
- Jones, G. and Varley, A. (1999) 'The reconquest of the historic center: urban conservation and gentrification in Puebla, Mexico', *Environment and Planning A*, vol 31, pp 1547-1566.
- Kovacs, Z. and Wiessner, R. (1999) 'Stadt- und Wohnungsmarketentwicklung in Budapest. Zur Entwicklung der inner städtischen Wohnquartiere im Transformationsprozess', *Beitrage zur Regionalen Geographie 48*, Leipzig: Institut für Länderkunde.
- Krase, J. (2005) 'Poland and Polonia: migration, and the re-incorporation of ethnic aesthetic practice in the taste of luxury', in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge (eds) *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, London: Routledge, pp 185-208.

- Lambert, C. and Boddy, M. (2002) 'Transforming the city: post-recession gentrification and re-urbanisation', Paper presented at 'Upward neighbourhood trajectories: gentrification in the new century', 26-27 September, University of Glasgow.
- Lees, L. (1994) 'Gentrification in London and New York: An Atlantic Gap?' *Housing Studies*, vol 9, no 2, pp 199-217.
- Lees, L. (2000) 'A Re-appraisal of Gentrification: towards a 'geography of gentrification'', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 24, no 3, pp 389-408.
- Lees, L. (2012) 'The geography of gentrification: thinking through comparative urbanism', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 36, no 2, pp 155-171.
- Lees, L. (2014) 'Gentrification in the Global South?', in Parnell, S. and Oldfield, S. (eds) *From the South: A Cities handbook*.
- Lees, L., Slater, T. and Wylie, E. (2008) *Gentrification*, New York: Routledge.
- Lemanski, C. and Lama-Rewal, S.T. (2010) 'The 'missing middle': participatory urban governance in Delhi's unauthorized colonies', Available at: [www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/projects/orthodoxies/conference2010/papers/101202\\_lemanski\\_c.pdf](http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/projects/orthodoxies/conference2010/papers/101202_lemanski_c.pdf).
- Ley, D. (1986) 'Alternative explanations for inner-city gentrification: a Canadian assessment', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol 76, no 4, pp 521-535.
- Ley, D. and Teo, S-Y. (2014) 'Gentrification in Hong Kong? Epistemology vs. Ontology', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, DOI:10.1111/1468-2427.12109.
- López-Morales, E. (2010) 'Real estate market, urban policy and entrepreneurial ideology in the 'gentrification by ground rent dispossession' of Santiago de Chile', *Journal of Latin American Geography*, vol 9, no 1, pp 145-173.
- López-Morales, E. (2011) 'Gentrification by Ground Rent Dispossession: the Shadows Cast by Large Scale Urban Renewal in Santiago de Chile', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 35, no 2, pp 1-28.
- Maloutas, T. (2012) 'Contextual diversity in gentrification research', *Critical Sociology*, vol 38, no 1, pp 33-48.
- Marcuse, P. (2010) 'A note from Peter Marcuse', *City*, vol 14, no 1, pp 187-188.
- McFarlane, C. (2010) 'The Comparative City: Knowledge, Learning, Urbanism'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 34, pp 725-742.

- McFarlane, C. and Robinson, J. (2012) 'Experiments in Comparative Urbanism', *Urban Geography*, vol 33, no 6, pp 765-773.
- Nijman, J. (2007) 'Introduction – Comparative urbanism', *Urban Geography*, vol 28, pp 1–6.
- Petsimeris, P. (2005) 'Out of squalor and towards another urban renaissance? Gentrification and neighbourhood transformations in southern Europe', in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge (eds) *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, London: Routledge, pp 240-255.
- Popper, K. (1998) 'The Problem of Induction', in M. Curd and J. A. Cover (eds) *Philosophy of Science: The Central Issues*, New York and London: W.W. Norton, pp 426-431.
- Porter, L. and Shaw, K. (2008) (eds) *Whose Urban Renaissance? An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies*, London: Routledge.
- Ragin, C. (1987) *The Comparative Method*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Robinson, J. (2006) *Ordinary Cities: between modernity and development*, London: Routledge.
- Robinson, J. (2011) 'Cities in a world of cities: the comparative gesture', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 35, no 1, pp 1-23.
- Roy, A. (2009) 'The 21st Century Metropolis: New Geographies of Theory', *Regional Studies*, vol 43, no 6, pp 819-830.
- Rubino, S. (2005) 'A curious blend? City revitalization, gentrification and commodification in Brazil', in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge (eds) *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, London: Routledge, pp 225-239.
- Shaw, W. (2000) 'Ways of whiteness: Harlemising Sydney's aboriginal Redfern', *Australian Geographical Studies*, vol 38, no 3, pp 291-305.
- Slater, T. (2002) 'Looking at the 'North American City' through the lens of gentrification discourse', *Urban Geography*, vol 23, no 2, pp 131-153.
- Slater, T. (2009) 'Missing Marcuse: on gentrification and displacement', *City*, vol 13, no 2, pp 292-311.
- Smith, N. (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, N. (2002) 'New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as global urban strategy', *Antipode*, vol 34, no 3, pp 427-450.

- Smith, N. and Derksen, J. (2002) 'Urban regeneration: gentrification as global urban strategy', in R. Shier (ed) *Stan Douglas: Every block on 100 West Hastings*, Vancouver Contemporary Art Gallery, pp.62-95.
- Smith, N., and P. Williams (1986) (eds) *Gentrification of the City*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Sykora, L. (1993) 'City in transition: the role of the rent gap in Prague's revitalization', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, vol 84, no 4, pp 281-293.
- Sykora, L. (2005) 'Gentrification in post-communist cities', in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge (eds) *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*, London: Routledge, pp 90-105.
- van Criekingen, M. and Decroly, J. (2003) 'Revisiting the diversity of gentrification: neighbourhood renewal processes in Brussels and Montreal', *Urban Studies*, vol 40, no 12, pp 2451-2468.
- Wang, J. and Lau, S.S.Y. (2009) 'Gentrification and Shanghai's new middle class: another reflection on the cultural consumption thesis', *Cities*, vol 26, no 2, pp 57-66.
- Ward, K. (2010) 'Towards a relational comparative approach to the study of cities', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 34, pp 471-487.