EDITORIAL

Migration-led Regeneration: On how cities become more unequal with mixed population flows

Felicitas Hillmann

Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Germany

Technische Universität Berlin, Germany

Ching Lin Pang

Universiteit Antwerpen, Belgium

Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven, Belgium

Corresponding author: Felicitas Hillmann, Georg-Simmel Center for Metropolitan Studies, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin. **Felicitas.Hillmann@hu-berlin.de**

Professor Felicitas Hillmann and Professor Ching Lin Pang are Guest Editors for this Special Issue of *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies; an Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2020, 12, 2.

Abstract

It is timely to reopen the discussion on inequalities in connection with migration-related processes. Our special issue might be a first step in shedding more light on this issue which had all but vanished at the discourse level but that has not ceased to exist. It presents an international and interdisciplinary selection of scholars that are concerned with questions of urban transformation, diversity and inequality.

Keywords

Diversity, Cities, Inequality, Migration

Introduction

We write this editorial in the days of heavy riots that erupted as the 46 year-old black man George Floyd died due to the disproportionate police violence in Minneapolis in the US. The act of the state and the following protests of the civil society reveal the tension built up over time, disclosing deep division, multilayered and multi-directional discontent in society, demonstrating a new quality of confrontations. It is timely to reopen the discussion on inequalities in connection with migration-related processes. Our special issue might be a first step in shedding more light on this issue which had all but vanished at the discourse level but that has not ceased to exist. It presents an international and interdisciplinary selection of scholars that are concerned with questions of urban transformation, diversity and inequality.

Changing cities

Since the 1990s cities all over the world have undergone major transformations as a result of globalisation and neoliberalism – and they have become the main drivers for the transformation itself, increasingly pushing for an active role on the global scale. In a first uncritical phase of 'simple globalisation' (Beck 2000) – spanning the last decade of the last millennium – diversity and cosmopolitanism were embraced by many as 'magic' tools to bring forth economic growth, personal wealth and opulent lifestyles. Within this narrative diversity applies mostly to active internationalisers, a summary concept that includes the skilled transnational workers (Beaverstock & Smith 1996), their children (Pang 2000), international students, tourists and other privileged elites mostly from the Global North but also from the South, opening asymmetric transnational spaces for migrant actors (Hillmann, van Naerssen & Spaan 2019). Not only have migration pattern and mobility flows changed over the past 20 years, but new information technologies and new transport systems translated in what thinkers like Urry (2009) identified as the mobility turn (see also Büscher and Urry 2009) have emerged. The spectrum of mobile people fitting into the new infrastructures of migration and mobility is extreme: it now ranges from cruise-tourists on the one end towards those that flee war and poverty on the other. Authors such as Creswell (2006) and Sheller (2018) observed a new mobility regime, provoking also adjustments in the way cities tried to organise their renewal and their regeneration. Now, cities had to redefine their position in a transforming urban hierarchy worldwide (Sassen 1991). This has led to the rise of the 'city region' model (Rodriguez-Pose & Crescenzi 2008; Herrschel 2014), mostly in Europe. Here, city regions have increasingly become key players beyond their referential nation-states generally with the intent of strengthening the local competitiveness or engaging in community building aimed at greater autonomy from the nation-state (Calzada 2015). While the 1970s economic crisis opened up the city as a laboratory for neoliberal experiments, the global financial crisis in 2008 reinforced "the role of cities as strategic sites for global capital accumulation" and regulation. Fiscal austerity led to an even stronger focus on a few strategic priorities, the strengthening of city partnerships with public and private stakeholders, financial innovation and involving local stakeholders in rethinking problems and solutions (Oosterlynck and Gonzales 2013: 1080).

The emphasis of many cities worldwide now was even more on chasing highly qualified personnel for the sake of their urban economies and on attracting well-monied

visitors such as international students or tourists. The beautification programs of the cities on the inside foreshadowed the smartening of heritage, while migration infrastructure such as new terminals and ports was renewed and adapted to the needs of accelerated flows of people. Also, in most cities a highly diversified population structure had arisen. While parts of the immigrant population that came in as industrial workers became marginalised, a vibrant, somewhat multicultural local reality became visible, adding to the cosmopolitan appeal of the city (Zukin, Kasinitz & Chen 2016). Immigrants started making claims (Kivisto 2020; Hillmann & Samers forthcoming) and migrant entrepreneurship replaced traditional wage labor opportunities (Rath et al. 2020, p. 460). At the same time, new communication tools allowed for an intensification of transnational contacts and social configuration. It has been since the late 1990s that the municipal managerialist approach to urban planning and social welfare provision tended to be replaced by an increased role of the private sector at the local level, pushing for worldwide entrepreneurial city management (Leary and McCarthy 2013, p. 7). The now pursued promotion of high-profile developments through events and grand projects changed the tenor of public debate around the built form and on regeneration projects (Keith 2013, p. 175), focusing on business improvement strategies, city growth strategies and cultural and creative industries around fashionable business school gurus (Keith 2013, p. 169). The old structural imbalances due to economic restructuring in the cities had not been touched by those newer policies and remained for some time in the shadow of the more compelling promise of diversity and superdiversity (Vertovec 2012) and also multicultural heritage (Karmowska and Shaw 2004). One might think that the intellectual connection between these two poles of urban development was literally missing.

Martin (2020, p. 205) describes this very vividly when comparing demographic and economic inequalities with positive and negative battery poles: 'nothing happens until a connection is made'. This is what we face at the moment, so it seems. There is no universally endorsed definition of what 'inequalities' entail, neither is the term 'migration' sharply delineated. From an urban planning perspective, Fainstein (2010) came up with a vision of the 'just city' by proposing the three criteria of equity, diversity and democracy (cited after Dlabac 2020) to understand inequalities in cities. She refers to the trade-off between growth and equity in favour of social benefits and investment in human capital (Equity/Redistribution); the promotion of reproduction of and respect of group differences without oppression, rather than forcing assimilation (Diversity/Recognition); and citizen participation with fair representation of interest and disadvantaged groups (Democracy) and here points to the shifting principles in terms of housing, land-use/urban renewal and public services over the past 20 years.

The consequences of the invisible choices made in past decades seem to have become all the more visible. We now see more clearly that the upbeat birds' eye -view grand narrative of success and 'creative classes' has conveniently glanced over the inconvenient reality at the quotidian level, where vulnerable groups of workers and migrants have left their families to toil in foreign cities or to do care work for other families. The globalisation from below (Benton-Short et al. 2005; Mathews et al. 2012) or the world's other economy (Mathews et al. 2012, Yuan and Pang 2019) unravel the underbelly of the global cities. Neoliberal

economies have accelerated mobilities both of people and material culture (Pang and Mo 2018; Wang, Pang C.L. & Leutner in press). It might have generated a cosmopolitan momentum, but this does not necessarily translate into a genuine cosmopolitan outcome.

Thus, it should not come as a surprise that in many cities we find mixed neighborhoods of newcomers and even enclaves. In contrast, smaller cities and rural areas lose population and the population shows hostile attitudes towards newcomers. While many cities have to cope with an increasing social and economic polarisation of diversity internally regarding the stock-population, they reach out for such promising flow-populations that come into the city with resources (be it financial capital as in the case of the tourists or professionals skills or cultural capital as in the case of the academic middle classes). They also can build on translocal and national networks, as in the case of refugees, businessmen or civil society. One evolving imaginary frames the stock- and flow-population as the 'somewheres' and the 'anywheres' (Goodhart 2018) as part of this urban transformation that is also accompanied by new dividing lines of open versus closed cities (Sennett 2018) as well as between larger cities and their smaller neighbours. Not only do we observe increasingly internal inequalities in cities and between cities, we also see established inequalities in the way cities share their ways of dealing with migration. In Europe, for example, the capacity of being part of supranational knowledge networks (such as Metropolis, Eurocities, intercultural cities) became a crucial element in finding local ways to deal with migration and integration.

Does this mean that cities become more standardised in their approaches towards migration or what are the consequences of those supranational policies? Very often there is a spatial dimension to this. As Hall and Rath (2007) have shown, cities have to deal with many various forms of migration and mobility at the same time if they want to be successful. We might think of processes of migration-led urban transformation (Hillmann 2019), meaning that we find all over the world similar moments of the interaction between the mainstream societies and differentiated flows of people in the cities. And we can observe, that the degree of action that cities are willing to take is profoundly changing – as if we were seeing a dysfunctional nation-state level that is increasingly fading and losing its power to act in the face of the concrete actions of cities (Barber 2014). In this way, the glocalisation long announced by theoreticians may be taking shape. In dealing with the refugee crisis in Europe, for example, local authorities are making great strides in initiating supranational policies through local policies, provoking new inequalities (Bendel et al. 2019).

This special issue focusses on the various ways inequalities are (re)produced through the variations of migration that is proceeded in the cities. As we noted above, there is not *one* definition of 'inequality' and a plethora of forms of migration and mobility exists, the focus of research represented in the different articles is heterogeneous by nature. This was an editorial decision on purpose, as it contradicts the tendency to reduce complexity for the sake of theory. The editors believe that there is no such a thing as the one single one-size-fits-all approach to understanding the current changes in urban settings, but that heuristic instruments are needed and that the formulation of research questions is the best way to generate new knowledge in the field. It is far from clear what outcomes are developing from the current 'cosmopolitan momentum', what they entail and how they will further develop in

the near and not so near future. (Beck 2010). Some of the papers compare different struggles in different urban settings of the world – even comparing the Global South with the Global North, making use of what Robinson defined as the 'comparative gesture, and thereby seeking to overcome methodological nationalism (Robinson 2011), while others concentrate on the neighborhood level within cities. Comparisons of immigrant cities in the Global North are already an exception (Rath et al. 2014), comparisons between cities between the Global North and the Global South have yet to become a common topic of research.

It has long been known that the places in which migrants live are also the most unequal, the most marginalised places in town. The Jewish ghetto in the medieval town reminds us of this constant of urban development, as do the Huguenot colonies all over Western Europe which were expressions of social innovations. Regulating the 'outsiders' in many cases meant appeasement policies to calm the majority population. Economic regulations on who is allowed to run which business at which time and with which resources are an asset of all urban policies aiming at regulating the contact between the newcomers and the established ones, and certainly part of the social capital embedded in a web of power and inequality in cities (Blokland & Savage 2016). Often, the context of the neighbourhood is the frame of reference (Yuan & Pang 2018), rather than the city level, because migrants tend to settle in certain places in town. The 'city' as such is nothing other than a labyrinth of many different, smaller places that are populated by different milieus and provided with different resources, forming volatile alliances and coalitions of interest for some time. Still, the cities have to react to the outside, the municipalities have to come up with policies that respond to the diversity within the cities and that, for example, mediate between and among state institutions and the resident population when processing migration. The ongoing challenges in the city are being exacerbated and accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic and thus providing opportunities for more and deeper observation, reflection and analysis. This journal issue is just one step in this process. Based on the above-mentioned considerations, the city is brought into focus as the central unit of analysis, because it is here that the global processes processed locally can be understood most adequately.

We'd better think of: Migration-led regeneration

Urban development policy, a volatile alliance of the most varied actors with different powers of action, is increasingly faced with the dilemma described above between, on the one hand, integration efforts and, on the other, the exploitation of the diversity which may only have arisen as a result of former migration episodes (Hillmann 2019). For in many cities the migrant population already resident (the stock population) is now attracting new immigrants (the flow population). Neighbourhoods that are home to international residents and thus a multitude of interesting restaurants, shops, services and networks become magnets for further immigration and are interesting for all kinds of visitors. As a result, productive places of migration-related diversity can also be read as a major visible spatial manifestation of inequalities. Many of the policies that Western-European cities use for example to *react* to inequalities act inwards, i.e. in the existing neighbourhoods, to counteract the still existing marginalisation of the migrant population and to try to prevent social exclusion processes of particularly vulnerable groups through social programmes. These policies differ from

proactive diversity strategies, which aim to build up collective identity and are often commercialised, betting on the benefits of the "look and feel" of a mixed neighbourhood and promising leisure time and cultural events. At the same time, cities are acting externally – nationally and internationally – by means of attempts by actors such as universities and business associations to control their activities, for example by providing special housing or by making them more attractive to short-term visitors, especially tourists. Thus, we observe an emerging dilemma between integration efforts on the one hand and the exploitation of diversity on the other. In recent years, these institutional sponsors have increasingly organised themselves through transnational city networks (Oomen et al. 2018) and have selectively implemented international best practices through the exchange of experience – as we stated above. A very good example for this shift in the way cities deal with the issue of migration towards the outside is the Marrakesh Mayors' Declaration[1] 'Cities working together for migrants and refugees' that was presented at the intergovernmental Conference to adopt the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and the United National General Assembly to adopt the Global compact on refugees in December 2018. The mayors and city leaders claim and declare, that migration remains primarily an urban and local phenomenon. They ask for urban diplomacy and joint advocacy and they even speak of migrant-led advisory bodies to be integrated into local policies. Cities, so the declaration says, should work with international city networks to improve multilateral cooperation and should become integrated into decision-making processes much more. Increasingly, research challenges the question of how the position of the mayor influences migration-led regeneration (Dlabac et al. 2020)

In many of the western countries top-down approaches that focused on migration issues have been developed, and they have worked out differently locally. However, there is a growing number of bottom-up practices in urban renewal processes initiated by immigrants and civil society itself. Often it is particularly migration-influenced places, for example arrival quarters, which develop above-average dynamics through the production of their everyday living environments. Depending on the neighbourhood, a certain mix of instruments is therefore relevant in dealing with migration-related issues on site. What can be learned from these locations with regard to migration-related regulation?

As briefly outlined above, the regeneration practices of the cities *cum grano salis* refer to three dimensions: the physical and building structure, the socio-economic texture and the symbols and models used. It is now possible to analyse at which points urban development policies aimed at immigration meet migrant practices, migrant agencies. At first glance, it seems as if the boundaries between what the cities wish and are happy to take up and what they also have to cope with in terms of integration problems are blurring and merging into an arbitrary diversity. However, a detailed analysis of migration-related regeneration practices shows that the non-simultaneity in the degree of participation and involvement of the different groups persists. Figure 1 shows that many existing migration-related activities can

---

[1]The Mayors' Declaration can be found at:
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5df133ed5c523d063ce20693/t/5ea5fe595aaf842048077e95/15879368575 84/Marrakech+Mayors+Declaration.pdf).

be initiated top-down, but are then adopted bottom-up, for example, through intercultural associations or initiatives against discrimination. But often it is the other way round: a folkloric initiative can be turned into a carnival of cultures. In the following we will therefore discuss the significance of such overlaps between top-down and bottom-up initiatives.

Figure 1 Heuristic Framework of Migration-Led Regeneration

Regeneration	Dimensions of the urban	Physical structure	Socio-economic texture, policies	Symbolics and representation
	Regeneration starts with	Built environment	Socio-cultural fabric	Culture and images
Expressions Of Migration-led Regeneration	Top-down policies	-Setting-up of migration architecture (arrival architecture) -Icon buildings -Refugee centres	-Sectoral initiatives (housing, work, education, health, ICT & Technology) for disadvantaged strata of the population -Welcome-Centre -Migration officer -Integration concepts - Intercultural weeks and similar	- Vision of diversity -welcome brochure -Urban citizenship activities -Competitions and tenders on diversity
	Migrant practices and bottom-up agency		-Migrant economies -Intercultural associations, festivals, sport events, -Theatre and arts Migrant-tours Creative industries	-Festivals and parades -Open prayers and interreligious discourse -Campaigns for diversity, Hybridisation of food culture Migrant use of social media like bloggers, -

Hillmann 2020[2]

The heuristic framework of migration-led regeneration presented here gives us a possibility to move away from stereotypes on the interplay of migration with urban regeneration strategies as it asks at which points migration and mobility step up as change agents within urban transformation. It allows for international comparison as it includes re-active and pro-active action in regard to migration and includes top-down and bottom-up initiatives into the focus of research. We assume that cities that are able to offer a wide array of instruments to organise the fluid population in their cities are best prepared to master future challenges. The better top-down and bottom-up approaches intertwine and allow for exchange, the higher is the probability of social innovation and urban regeneration for the inhabitants and the cities (Hillmann 2019, Pang & Li in preparation; Gielen 2018).

What this Special Issue offers to the reader

For this special issue, that is conceived as going a first mile to understand better the nexus between migration, diversity and urban development with special emphasis on the dimensions of inequality, we invited authors with an interdisciplinary background, mostly positioned within urban studies. This special issue does not neatly align with the framework proposed above and is in a sense biased as the contributions reflect the state of the art of western academia. We chose to integrate authors that look at different aspects of this nexus and that make use of different methodological approaches.

Two papers take a closer look at structural inequalities by considering immigration politics and policies. Ron Hayduk's contribution asks what shapes immigrant integration and what could produce greater equity? He suggests defining immigrant incorporation as successful when immigrants achieve a status of well-being on par with each other and similarly situated to the native-born members of the population in the US. Foreshadowing the protest after the murdering of George Floyd in Minneapolis in May 2020, he assumes that still today ethnic and racial minorities, many of whom immigrants, make up the majority of the working class and that there is an ethnic make-up of the US by new immigrants creating opportunities for overcoming structural racism and economic exploitation. Actually, in the US foreign-born Afro-Americans are doing better economically and socially than US-born Afro-Americans as in the case of George Floyd. Kingsley Madueke and Floris Vermeulen also start with observations on the macro-level. They elaborate on how immigrant politics play out in two cities – one in an advanced democracy in the Global North (Amsterdam) and one in an emergent democracy in the Global South (Jos, Nigeria) – by taking into account the forms and parameters of diversity, urban inequalities, group politics and conflict across advanced and emergent democracies. By comparing the 'global' and maximally diverse city of Amsterdam with the secondary city Jos, they identify that similar processes in each context lead to dissimilar outcomes. In the case of Amsterdam group inequality in itself did not directly lead to a stronger link between identity and politics. By comparing the policies directed to the Turks in Amsterdam and the Hausa in Jos they state that the parameters and pattern are different in the two contexts. They concentrate on the role of group-identities, ascribed or self-given. While in the well-regulated political space of Amsterdam resistance

against stigmatisation was expressed and debated, in Jos within the setting of weak institutions violent strategies in addition to political action were taken by political parties. Many of the tensions are still rooted in the colonial history, they conclude. Here migration-led regeneration results in being entangled with the possibility of negotiating group identities in democratic contexts.

Two of the articles in this special issue point to the importance of institutions to govern immigration. The article of Mike Raco and Tuna Taşan-Kok highlights how city governments more consciously aim to make use of diversity management to fulfil their expectations of regeneration. By comparing migration-led policies in super-diverse London and Toronto, they observe a shift from local 'diversity management' towards global management practices which lead to new forms of curation. In the two cities ethnic diversity is associated with various forms of inequalities, whose narration by the city governments changes over time. They show how public bodies try to use their powers to provide role models for the public sector, producing selective image-building and representations of diversity, that can lead to simplifications that produce further marginalisation for some groups. They pronounce that diversity politics in cosmopolitan societies are under constant pressure for reform and direction. Similarly, the contribution of Caio Teixeira focuses on the changing policy responses cities give to address migration-related diversity. He questions if there is such thing as a "template model" for immigrant incorporation which travels among cities via international city networks. He emphasises the EUROCITIES Integrating Cities Charter, that was designed to build an institutional frame of policy learning for policies on the city level and to develop practices to integrate newcomers. He speaks of soft policies that increasingly merged with tactics of city branding. Again, learning from and among the city governments, networked governance, takes place as a political regulation strategy and aims at providing a roadmap for policy makers, but with the consequence that regulatory practices can result in the othering of migrant groups.

Two contributions in this special issue deal with the way diversity is lived in mixed neighborhoods and both reflect the situation in neighborhoods in Berlin (Germany). The paper of Anna Steigemann reflects on how streets businesses in Neukölln work as sites for the practices of local communities and inclusion and at the same time reflect larger trends of urban renewal. Her empirical research shows that the perception of trust is high among the shop-owners with 'cosmopolitan experience', but there is stark mistrust against more formalised players such as chain stores. Steigemann points to the disconnectedness of the visions of the planners and urban renewal agents on the future of the 'ethnic' streets and the newcomers in search of niches of survival. The contribution of Ceren Kulkul takes a very different angle of migration-led regeneration by focussing on the exclusion of newly arrived well-educated young Turks in Neukölln and Kreuzberg, fleeing the political consequences of the Gezi-protest in Turkey since 2013. Even situated in these extremely diversified places in town, the highly-qualified migrants interviewed by the author faced social exclusion and translocal experiences – but at least had the possibility of fostering a sense of belonging in the new town. Kulkul reminds us that the daily experiences are trans-local experiences, that are based on the capacity of building bonds in at least two urban realities. The migration paradox,

that each migrant compares his or her actual situation with what might be his or her socio-political situation in the country of origin, fully applies in this case of the highly skilled Turks. They rather learn to cope with exclusionary practices than thinking to turn back to their place of origin.

As delineated above, this special issue is conceived as a first step to re-opening the discussion on the relationship between migration and urban development as we feel that inequalities have become part of the new urban mix in the shadows of the diversity-debate. We hope that the reader will find inspiration and food for thought. At no time did we expect to capture the full picture, however. We thank the authors for their work and their patience in the COVID-19 situation, which unexpectedly caught us all in the middle of the development process of this Special Issue. We thank the anonymous reviewers for their time and effort and their altruistic work.

<div align="right">

Felicitas Hillmann
Ching Lin Pang
Berlin and Brussels
June 2020

</div>

References

Barber, B. 2014, 'If Mayors Ruled the World', Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Beaverstock, J.& Smith, J. 1996, 'Lending jobs to global cities: skilled international migration investment banking and the City of London', *Urban Studies* vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 1377-1394.

Beck, U. 2000, 'The cosmopolitan perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 79-105.

Beck, U. (2010) Remapping Social Inequalities in the Age of Climate Change: For a Cosmopolitan Renewal of Sociology, Global Networks, vol. 10, no. 2: 165-181. https://doi.org/10/111/j.1471-0374.2010.00281.x

Bendel, P. et al, 2019, Der Weg über die Kommunen. Empfehlungen für eine neue Schlüsselrolle der Kommunen in der Flüchtlings- und Asylpolitik der EU, Policy Paper, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Berlin. https://www.boell.de/de/2019/02/11/der-weg-ueber-die-kommunen

Blokland, T. & Savage, M. 2016, *Networked Urbanism; Social Capital in the City*, Routledge, London. https://doi/org/10.4324/9781315597805

Blokland, T., Hentschel, C., Holm, A., Lebuhn, H. & Margalit, T. 2015, 'Urban citizenship and right to the city; The fragmentation of claims', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 655–665.

Brenton-Short, L., Price, M. & Friedman, S. 2005, 'Globalization from below: The ranking of global immigrant cities, *International Journal Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 29, no.4, pp. 945-959. https://doi.org/10.1111.j.1468.2427.2005.00630.x

Büscher, M. & Urry, J. 2009, 'Mobile methods and the empirical', *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 99-116. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431008099642

Calzada, I. 2015, 'Benchmarking future city-regions beyond nation-states', *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 351-362.

Cresswell, T. 2006, *On the Move. Mobility in the Modern Western World*, Routledge, New York.

Dlabac, O., Zwicky, R., Carpenter, J. & Pereira, P. 2020, 'Towards the 'just city'? Exploring the attitudes of European city mayors', *Urban Research and Practice*, https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2020.1739323

Fainstein, S. 2010, *The Just City*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Gielen, P. 2018, 'Common aesthetics. The shape of a new meta-ideology', in Dockx, N. & Gielen, P. (eds.) *Commonism. A New Aesthetics of the Real*, Valiz, Amsterdam, p.75-87.

Goodhart, D. 2017, *The Road to Somewhere. The Populist Revolt and the Future of Politics*, Hurst & Company, London.

Hall, C.M. & Rath, J. 2007, 'Tourism, migration and place advantage in the global cultural economy', in Rath, J. (ed.), *Tourism, Ethnic Diversity and the City*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 1-24.

Herrschel, T. 2014, *Cities, State and Globalisation; City-Regional Governance in Europe and North-America*, Routledge, London.

Hillmann, F. & Samers, M. (forthcoming): 'Trans-Atlantic urban responses to migrant lives – Editorial' Special Issue, *Geographical Review*.

Hillmann, F. 2019, 'Instigating integration', *Topos – European Landscape Magazine*, vol. 108, pp. 84-89.

Hillmann, F., van Naerssen, T. & Spaan, E. (eds) 2019, *Trajectories and Imaginaries in Migration. The Migrant Actor in Transnational Space*, Routledge, New York.

Karmowska J. & Shaw S. 2004, 'The multicultural heritage of European Cities and its re-presentation through regeneration programmes', *Ethnologia Europaea*, vol. 34, no. 2. https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.959

Keith, M. 2013, 'Urban regeneration and the city of experts', in Leary, M. & McCarthy, J. (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Urban Regeneration*, Routledge, London, p. 168-178.

Kivisto, P. 2020, 'Multiculturalism and immigration', in Inglis, C., Li, W. & Khadria, B. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of International Migration*, Sage, London, p. 418-432.

Leary, M. & McCarthy, J. 2013, 'Introduction: Urban regeneration, a global phenomenon', in Leary, M. & McCarthy, J. (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Urban Regeneration*, Routledge, London, pp. 1-6.

Martin, P. 2020, 'Rethinking global migration flows', in Inglis, C., Li, W. & Khadria, B. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of International Migration*, Sage, London, p. 200-215.

Mathews, G., Ribeiro, G. & Vega, C. (eds.) 2012, *Globalization from Below: The World's Other Economy*, Routledge, London.

Oomen, B., Bamgärtel, M. & Durmus, E. 2018, Transnational City Networks and Migration Policy. Cities of Refuge Policy Brief, 5 December 2018. https://citiesofrefuge.eu/publications/transnational-city-networks-and-migration-policy

Osterlynck, S. & Gonzàlez, S. 2013, '"Don't waste a crisis": Opening up the city yet again for neoliberal experimentation', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 37, no.:3, pp. 1075-82.

Pang, C.L. & J. Li (in preparation), 'Co-creating urban authenticity in an urban borderland. The case of Recyclart, Brussels', *Urban Studies*.

Pang, C.L. & Mo, L. 2018, 'Mapping Chinese coffee culture in the land of tea. The case of Yunnan province', *Journal of International Economic Studies* vol. 32, pp. 103-115.

Pang, C.L. 2000, *Negotiating Identity in Contemporary Japan. The Case of Kikokushijo*, Kegan Paul, London.

Rath, J., Foner, N., Duyvendak, J. & van Reekum, R. 2014, 'Introduction: New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape', in Foner, N. Rath, J., Duyvendak, J. & van Reekum, R. (eds.), *New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape*, New York University Press, New York, pp. 1-22.

Rath, J., Solano, G. & Schutjens, V. 2020, 'Migrant entrepreneurship and transnational links', in Inglis, C., Li, W. & Khadria, B. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of International Migration*, Sage, London, p. 450 – 465.

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00982

Rodríguez-Pose, A. & Crescenzi, R. 2008, 'Research and development, spillovers, innovation systems, and the genesis of regional growth in Europe', *Regional Studies*, vol. 42, no.1, pp. 51-67. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400701654186

Sassen, S. 1991, *The Global City*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Sennett, R. 2018, *Building and Dwelling. Ethics for the City*, Allen Lane, London.

Sheller, M. 2018, *Mobility Justice. The Politics of Movements in an Age of Extremes*, Verso, London.

Urry, J. 2009, 'Mobilities and social theory, in Turner, B. (ed.), *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, pp. 477-495. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444304992.ch24

Vertovec, S. 2012, '"Diversity" and the social imaginary', *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes De Sociologie / Europäisches Archiv Für Soziologie*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 287–312.

Wang, J., Pang, C.L. & Leutner, P. (eds) (in press) *Contemporary Aesthetics, Cultural Anthropology and Fashion Studies*, Renmin University Press, Beijing in collaboration with Royal Collins, Montreal.

Yuan, D. & Pang, C.L. 2019, 'South-South Migrant Trajectories: African Traders in China as *guoke*', in Hillmann, F., van Naerssen, T. & Spaan, E. (eds) 2019, *Trajectories and Imaginaries in Migration. The Migrant Actor in Transnational Space*, Routledge, New York.

Zukin, S., Kasinitz, P. & Chen, X, 2016, *Global Cities, Local Streets: Everyday Diversity from New York to Shanghai*, Routledge, New York.