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## GENERAL PROGRAMME

### WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-18:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
<td>Official opening of the conference, practical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>Short (coffee) break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:15-11:45         | 1A Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation I – Socio-spatial differentiation  
1B The ‘housing question’ in post-socialist cities: policies, innovations and contestations I  
1C Urban policies and non-policies in post-socialist cities I |
| 11:45-13:15         | Lunch break                                                          |
| 13:15-14:45         | 2A Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation II – Mobility and commuting  
2B The ‘housing question’ in post-socialist cities: policies, innovations and contestations II  
2C Urban policies and non-policies in post-socialist cities II |
| 14:45-15:05         | Coffee break                                                         |
| 15:05-16:35         | 3A Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation III – Ethnicity in the city  
3B Production of public space  
3C Urban tourism development in post-socialist cities |
<p>| 16:35-17:00         | Coffee break                                                         |
| 17:00-18:30         | IJURR Keynote lecture and discussion                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-16:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
<td>4A Theorising urban transitions: urban spatialities in the making (and remaking) I Room 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4B Post-socialist urban infrastructures: socio-material transformation and future paths I Room 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4C Histories and urban identities in the post-socialist cities Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:50</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-12:20</td>
<td>5A Theorising urban transitions: urban spatialities in the making (and remaking) II Room 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5B Post-socialist urban infrastructures: socio-material transformation and future paths II Room 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5C Changing of urban and suburban areas Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td>6A Urban Ukraine: pivotal cities on the geopolitical faultline Room 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6B Urban experience in post-socialist small towns: marginalization or (re)urbanization? Room 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6C Teaching post-socialist urbanisms: potential, strengths, limitations (round table) Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-15:50</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50-???</td>
<td>Prague field trip and conference dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FRIDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
<td>7A Post-political urban landscapes?! Where is the political in urban development and urban theory in Eastern Europe? (panel discussion)</td>
<td>Room 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7C Urban revitalization and new development projects</td>
<td>Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:50</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-12:20</td>
<td>Official closing of the conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Field trip departure (Northern Bohemia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SATURDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Estimated time of return to Prague from field trip (arrival at the conference venue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 IJURR Lecture at the 6th CATference: 25 YEARS OF URBAN CHANGE

“Comparative Urbanism and Post-socialism: experiences and perspectives”

Sponsored by International Journal of Urban and Regional Research

WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015, 17:00-18:30
LECTURE HALL: VELKÁ GEOLOGICKÁ POSLUCHÁRNA (VG)

MODERATOR
Matthias Bernt (Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning, Erkner)

SPEAKERS
Jennifer Robinson (UCL Department of Geography, University College London)
Thinking cities through elsewhere; Starting theoretical conversations from anywhere

Slavomíra Ferenčuhová (Masaryk University, Brno)
Authors and audiences of the writings on post-socialist cities

Michael Gentile (University of Helsinki)
Real, imagined or imposed difference? Post-communist cities vs urban theory
# SESSION PROGRAMME

**WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015, 10:15-11:45**

**SESSION 1A: Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation I – Socio-spatial differentiation**
Organizers: Tiit Tammaru, Martin Ouředníček, Szymon Marcińczak
Chair: Tiit Tammaru
Room 1: Věž

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruta Ubarevičiene</td>
<td>Migration and urbanization in Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra Špačková, Lucie Pospíšilová, Martin Ouředníček</td>
<td>Socialist and Post-socialist Prague and its Socio-spatial Differentiation from the Perspective of 1970–2011 Population Censuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maris Berzins, Zaiga Krisjane</td>
<td>Patterns of socio-economic segregation in Riga two decades after socialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gentile, Szymon Marcińczak, Samuel Rufat</td>
<td>Back on the radar: The evolution of spatial patterns of residential segregation in Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION 1B: The ‘housing question’ in post-socialist cities: policies, innovations and contestations I**
Organizers: Anna Badyina, Carola Neugebauer
Chair: Anna Badyina
Room 2: Levá Rýsovna (LR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna Badyina</td>
<td>The urban conditions of the ‘housing question’ in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Radzimski</td>
<td>Housing shortage in post-socialist countries 25 years after the change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bernt, Laura Colini, Daniel Förste</td>
<td>The interrelation of financialisation, shrinkage and welfare state restructuring and the new “housing question” in an eastgerman neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsuzsanna Pósfai, Vera Horvát</td>
<td>Forty years of financing housing in Hungary – housing as an articulation of global capital flows on the semi-periphery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION 1C: Urban policies and non-policies in post-socialist cities I**
Organizers: Kadri Leetmaa, Johanna Holvandus, Jasna Stefanovska
Discussants: Annegret Haase, Katrin Grossmann
Chair: Kadri Leetmaa
Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Holvandus</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Associations in Spatial Planning: the Case of Tallinn, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavomíra Ferenčuhová</td>
<td>Learning across borders: urban planners in Czechoslovakia and their response to ‘Western’ planning models (1948-1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alena Procházková, Luděk Sýkora</td>
<td>Prague metropolitan region as political and planning construct? Discourse analysis of local and regional development documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirjam Büdenbender, Daniela Zupan</td>
<td>From megalopolis to city comfortable for life – the evolution of neoliberal urbanism in Moscow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015, 13:15-14:45**

**SESSION 2A: Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation II – Mobility and commuting**
Organizers: Tiit Tammaru, Martin Ouředníček, Szymon Marcińczak
Chair: Martin Ouředníček
Room 1: Věž

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szymon Marcinczak, Marcin Stepniak</td>
<td>The impact of regional structure on commuting distance and time in Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Svoboda</td>
<td>Changes of work localization in the Prague metropolitan region 1991-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balázs Szabó</td>
<td>Social change and residential mobility in the downgrading areas of Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiba Svane</td>
<td>Residential mobility in post-soviet City Riga, Latvia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION 2B: The ‘housing question’ in post-socialist cities: policies, innovations and contestations II**
Organizers: Anna Badyina, Carola Neugebauer
Chair: Carola Neugebauer
Room 2: Levá Rýsovna (LR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Trumbull</td>
<td>Restructuring socialist housing estates and its impact on residents’ perceptions: &quot;Renovatsiia&quot; of khrushchevki in St. Petersburg, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinatin Gurgenidze-Schmitt</td>
<td>Living in the post-Soviet microrayons, on the example of Gldani In Tbilisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sichinava, Joseph Salukvadze</td>
<td>Housing inequalities in the South Caucasus – cases of Yerevan and Tbilisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION 2C: Urban policies and non-policies in post-socialist cities II**
Organizers: Kadri Leetmaa, Johanna Holvandus, Jasna Stefanovska
Discussants: Annegret Haase, Katrin Grossmann
Chair: Johanna Holvandus
Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erika Nagy, Gábor Nagy</td>
<td>Local strategies tackling peripherality in ECE frontiers: Revealing the relationships of the political and the economic in cross-border urban spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katalin Fehér, Judit Keller, Zsuzsanna Vidra, Tünde Virág</td>
<td>Local variations of residential integration - Settlement development programs in Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavel Šuška</td>
<td>From Environmental Advocacy to Neighbourhood Communities: Changing Scale and Form of Urban Activism in Post-socialist Bratislava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branislav Machala</td>
<td>Waterfront-fix: A critical perspective of waterfront transformations in postsocialist Bratislava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSION 3A: Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation III – Ethnicity in the city
Organizers: Tiit Tammaru, Martin Ouředníček, Szymon Marcińczak
Chair: Szymon Marcińczak
Room 1: Věž

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kadi Mägi, Kadri Leetmaa, Tiit Tammaru, Maarten van Ham</td>
<td>How does the ethnic component of one's residential context change as a result of immobility and short- or long-distance moves: The case of Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivana Přidalová, Martin Ouředníček</td>
<td>The Role of Foreign Migration in Changing Socio-Spatial Differentiation in Prague Metropolitan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatas Burneika, Ruta Ubarevičiene, Gintare Pociute</td>
<td>Socio-economic aspects of ethnic segregation of major Lithuanian cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SESSION 3B: Production of public space
Chair: Konstantin Axenov
Room 2: Levá Rýsovna (LR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Konstantin Axenov</td>
<td>Dynamics of the Accessibility of Public Space in the Residential Communities of a Post-Soviet Metropolis, case of St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajos Boros, Zoltán Kovács, Szabolcs Fabula, Dániel Horváth</td>
<td>Urban diversity and the production of public spaces in Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carola Neugebauer, Lela Rekvashašvili</td>
<td>Loss and (re)Construction of Public Space in Post-Soviet Cities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronika Kastlová</td>
<td>Scene of public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra Vlachynská</td>
<td>Permanent Public Art in Suburbia of Prague</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SESSION 3C: Urban tourism development in post-socialist cities
Organizer: Veronika Dumbrovská
Chair: Veronika Dumbrovská
Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veronika Dumbrovská</td>
<td>25 years of urban tourism development in Prague: The changing patterns of tourism in the historical center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Stors, Andreas Kagermeier</td>
<td>The post-socialist transformation in East-Berlin as a facilitator and incubator for new ways of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bálint Kádár</td>
<td>Tourism development in post-socialist Budapest: infrastructures in slow regeneration after the fast breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younkyoung Sung</td>
<td>Becoming a tourist city: The story of Gotha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrey Makarychev</td>
<td>Neopatrimonial sovereignty and performative governmentality: the case of FIFA World Cup – 2018 in Nizhny Novgorod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015, 15:05-16:35
**THURSDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2015, 9:00-10:30**

**SESSION 4A: Theorising urban transitions: urban spatialities in the making (and remaking)**

Organizers: Oleg Golubchikov, Luděk Sýkora  
Chair: Luděk Sýkora  
Room 1: Věž

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Golubchikov</td>
<td>The urbanisation of transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gentile, Örjan Sjöberg</td>
<td>Neoliberalism(s) as a guide to post-socialist urban change: (non-)variegated theoretical perspectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kalyukin, Thomas Borén, Andrew Byerley</td>
<td>The Second Generation of Post-Socialist Change: Gorky Park and Public Space in Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadir Kinossian</td>
<td>Soviet, transitional, capitalist? State-led spatial restructuring in Russia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION 4B: Post-socialist urban infrastructures: socio-material transformation and future paths**

Organizers: Wladimir Sgibnev, Tauri Tuvikene  
Chair: Wladimir Sgibnev  
Room 2: Levá Rýsovna (LR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Bouzarovski, Sergio Tirado Herrero, Saska Petrova</td>
<td>Energy poverty in post-communist cities: Landscapes of vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Kukliňa, Irina Koriukhina</td>
<td>Socio-spatial transformation of urban infrastructures of post-soviet Baikals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauri Tuvikene</td>
<td>The neo-liberalisation of infrastructure governing in Soviet housing estates? The case of car parking in Tallinn, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liviu Chelcea</td>
<td>Motorway Construction in Romania: Ruins of Future, Nature and Waiting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SESSION 4C: Histories and urban identities in the post-socialist cities**

Chair: Srdjan Mandić  
Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Šimon, Jana Jíchová</td>
<td>Alternative (hi)story of urban change: reading Prague through crime and homeless?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harutyun Vermishyan, Sona Balasanyan</td>
<td>Local identities and symbolic structures of urban places in post-Soviet Yerevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srdjan Mandić</td>
<td>Beyond People Pasts and City Futures: Politics of Heritage Production in Post-Socialist Serbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THURSDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2015, 10:50-12:20

SESSION 5A: Theorising urban transitions: urban spatialities in the making (and remaking) II
Organizers: Oleg Golubchikov, Luděk Sýkora
Chair: Oleg Golubchikov
Room 1: Věž

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katrin Grossmann, Annegret Haase</td>
<td>Neighbourhood change beyond clear story lines: What can assemblage and complexity thinking contribute to better understanding neighbourhood development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márton Berki</td>
<td>Talking at cross purposes? Linguistic differences as barriers of conceptualising the post-socialist transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luděk Sýkora</td>
<td>One City, More Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondřej Mulíček, Robert Osman</td>
<td>Chronopolis: temporal concept of translocal place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SESSION 5B: Post-socialist urban infrastructures: socio-material transformation and future paths II
Organizers: Wladimir Sgibnev, Tauri Tuvikene
Chair: Tauri Tuvikene
Room 2: Levá Rýsovna (LR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ger Duijzings</td>
<td>Encircling a city in transformation: Bucharest's centura and infrastructural changes at Bucharest's periphery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Plyushteva</td>
<td>Seats, stations, talk and water: Writing the history of the Sofia Metro through its everyday life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wladimir Sgibnev</td>
<td>Post-Soviet biographies of public transport infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Ryder</td>
<td>Urban transport and metros in central-eastern Europe before and after 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SESSION 5C: Changing of urban and suburban areas
Chair: Martin Šveda
Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irina Slepukhina, Isolde Brade</td>
<td>Two decades of transition: towards post-Soviet city systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katarzyna Gorczyca</td>
<td>Do the large housing estates change significantly - examples of the social transformation of selected estates in Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dritan Rustja</td>
<td>Periurbanization proces in post-socialist Albania: with case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Šveda, Michala Madajová, Peter Podolák</td>
<td>Behind the suburban zone in the hinterland of Bratislava: evidence of diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SESSION 6A: Urban Ukraine: pivotal cities on the geopolitical faultline

**Organizers:** Michael Gentile, Kostyantyn Mezentsev  
**Discussant:** Olga Medvedkov  
**Chair:** Michael Gentile  
**Room 1: Věž**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kostyantyn Mezentsev, Grygorii Pidhrushnyi, Nataliya Mezentseva</td>
<td>Suburbanizing Ukraine: from expanding problems to expanding development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katheryna Sehida</td>
<td>The transformation of demographic structures in the post-communist city: an exploration in Ukraine's second metropolis (Kharkiv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gentile</td>
<td>A surprise of diversity wrapped in a blanket of deceitful monotony: the multiple social spaces of Soviet-era blocks of flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasiia Mazurova</td>
<td>Features of the territorial and functional organization of the big post-socialist city (on the example of the city of Kharkiv)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SESSION 6B: Urban experience in post-socialist small towns: marginalization or (re)urbanization?

**Organizers:** Annett Steinführer  
**Chair:** Annett Steinführer  
**Room 2: Levá Rýsovna (LR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sorina Voiculescu, Ioan Sebastian Jucu</td>
<td>Living with/in dereliction: the case of small and medium sized municipalities in Timiş County, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annett Steinführer</td>
<td>Marginalized or particularly resilient (or both)? Paths and current trends of small-town development in post-socialist eastern Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonín Vaishar</td>
<td>Small towns – urban points and/or rural centres?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SESSION 6C: Teaching post-socialist urbanisms: potential, strengths, limitations

**Round table**

**Organizers:** Oleg Pachenkov  
**Moderator:** Oleg Pachenkov  
**Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Pachenkov</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luděk Šýkora</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bernt</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantin Axenov</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadir Kinossian</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRIDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2015, 9:00-10:30

SESSION 7A: Post-political urban landscapes?! Where is the political in urban development and urban theory in Eastern Europe?
*Panel discussion*
Organizers: Christian Smigiel, Katrin Grossmann
Room 1: Věž

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Golubchikov</td>
<td>Post-political or ideological?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Bouzarovski</td>
<td>The depoliticization of poverty: Governing energy vulnerability in post-communist cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Radzimski</td>
<td>Is pavement a political issue? On the understanding of local politics &amp; policies in transition countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Matoušek</td>
<td>Knowledge for policy making? Know how to make a change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadri Leetmaa</td>
<td>What is left from the strategic planning? Some observations from Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annegret Haase</td>
<td>Governance of shrinkage in the postsocialist context: What can we learn for the general scientific and policy discourse?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SESSION 7C: Urban revitalization and new development projects
Chair: Ingmar Pastak
Room 3: Pravá Rýsovna (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingmar Pastak, Anneli Kährik</td>
<td>Socio-spatial dimension of urban renewal in market-led city: the impact of public and private-led projects on neighbourhood's image, social networks, and sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gábor Tolnai</td>
<td>Brownfields of Budapest from a new perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondřej Slach</td>
<td>Reshaping city centre in a shrinking city through flagship projects: Case study of Ostrava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACTS

IJURR Lecture at the 6th CATference: 25 YEARS OF URBAN CHANGE

“Comparative Urbanism and Post-socialism: experiences and perspectives”

Jennifer Robinson (Department of Geography, University College London)

Abstract: Inspired by post-colonial critiques, urban studies today is characterised by conceptual and methodological experimentation in pursuit of a more global approach to understanding cities. The challenge is to develop methods and theoretical practices which allow conceptual innovation to emerge from any urban situation or urbanisation process, sustaining wider conversations while insisting that concepts are open to revision. This maps well on to the core methodological problematic of comparison. Mindful of the strong limits to comparison presented by conventional quasi-scientific methods, a new grounding for comparison is proposed, specific to the field of the urban, and a new typology of tactics for undertaking urban comparative research is suggested. The paper will discuss how this new vocabulary of comparative method can be put to work through considering some recent experiments in the field of global urban studies. This includes launching theoretical concepts from distinctive locations, to be put to work in new situations (for example, the concept of informality); and tracing connections to arrive at perhaps unexpected comparisons (perhaps, from post-socialist to post-apartheid cities).

Author Bio: Jennifer Robinson is Professor of Human Geography at University College London; she has also worked at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (South Africa), LSE and the Open University. Her book, Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development (Routledge, 2006) developed a post-colonial critique of urban studies. Her new book, Comparative Urbanism: tactics for a more global urban studies, is in progress. Earlier writings explored the history of apartheid cities, the politics of post-apartheid city-visioning, feminist theory and space, and post-colonialism. Current research focuses on strategic policy and large scale urban developments in Johannesburg and London.

Slavomíra Ferenčuhová (Masaryk University, Brno)

Abstract: The idea to develop ‘cosmopolitan’ and truly ‘post-colonial urban studies’ (Robinson 2006) has provoked a number of responses, most of which have attempted to join the project. The debate continues today in critical rethinking of urban theory or research methodologies, and in promoting urban studies that would include knowledge on and from various cities across
the globe, that would challenge normative concepts that have dominated urban theory in the 20th century, that would be more ‘democratic’, i.e. ‘characterized by diverse urban epistemes and imaginaries’ (McFarlane 2010: 727), and that would better include researchers from around the world.

Departing from this debate, I would like to engage with the question addressed to the panel – that is “How can urban studies in general profit from a better integration of research on post-socialist cities? (and the other way round)” – and to propose two points for further discussion. First, I would argue (in agreement with other authors) that encouraging more intense dialogue between scholars studying cities in former socialist countries and scholars studying cities in various other contexts can be indeed – and in general – very beneficial. This will be illustrated by referring to recent critical contributions to studies on postsocialist cities that have appeared in direct response to the debate on cosmopolitan approach to urban studies, or, in some cases, in parallel to it. They bring important insights from a perspective informed by research on (post)socialist cities to the critical discussion of urban theories and concepts, or to mapping the specific geographies of urban theory, while creatively using stimuli provided by the debate.

Then, in the second part of my contribution, I would like to reflect on what we actually mean by – and expect from – ‘integration’ of the research on post-socialist cities to ‘urban studies’. I will argue that it is important to consider various meanings or aspects of such integration – first, integration on the level of themes, research problems or theoretical approaches, second, integration on the level of academic knowledge production, and third, integration in terms of circulation of ideas within urban studies. I will focus on this third aspect in greater detail.

**Author Bio** Slavomíra Ferenčuhová works as assistant professor and teaches urban studies at the Department of Sociology, Masaryk University. She has published a book (2011) based on her doctoral theses that analyses transformations and continuities of urban planning practices in the Czech Republic between 1950s and 2007 and currently awaits publication of her second book on history of urban sociology, both international and in Czechoslovakia. Her research interests also include everyday life in housing estates in (former) socialist countries and history of socialist times’ architecture and urbanism in Central and Eastern Europe.

**Michael Gentile (University of Helsinki)**

*Real, imagined or imposed difference? Post-communist cities vs urban theory*

**Abstract** Much of the theoretical debate within the “socialist” and “post-socialist” cities research community over the past 30-35 years has focused on the degree to which these cities depart from the assumed normality of the “Western” city. This normality transpires from the discursive framing of “post-socialist” cities and societies, and of their ongoing transformations, as a “Return to Europe”, “convergence”, “lagging behind” and, perhaps most vaguely, as the effects of “transition” (I am certainly no less guilty than anyone else, probably even more). The problem is that while we are busy looking for such expressions of convergence, development and Europeanization, what we do when we refer to these cities as post-whatever-we-think-there-used-to-be-before-1989, is that we set limits to our theoretical imaginations about them, ascribing them a difference that is not necessarily real or meaningful, and stifling communication with the urban research community at large. Certainly, there are many things that set Moscow apart from London, or Leipzig from Nuremberg, but I would argue that our current conceptualizations of the “post-Communist” city are based on differences that are either imagined, exaggerated, misrepresented, outdated or imposed. Imposed differences may stem
from hegemonic discourses originating from outside the research community, but they may also reflect a form of self-censorship, based on the implicit assumption that imported theories are more valuable and carry greater prestige than local produce. These aspects refer to what Jennifer Robinson has termed "the geopolitics of the production of urban knowledge". Dropping the implicit assumption of Western normality, and thus of the normality and applicability of Western-made (or rather NY, LA, London and Chicago-made) theories, carries the potential to free vast untapped intellectual resources. In this, I side with Robinson's and implicitly also Ferenčuhová's argument that we need to view CEE cities as ordinary, and that we need to resist the temptation of resorting to the ready-made toolbox of the student of the world city. A focus on the "dual optic of networks and territories" (Robinson 2005, p. 763), on flows, relations and circulations as well as on city space, might be a good way to boost the export potential of locally produced urban theory. In my talk, I will develop my thoughts about how this may be achieved.

**Author Bio** Michael Gentile teaches urban geography and research methods at the University of Helsinki. His main research interests include "post-communist" cities, migration, urban poverty and, most recently, geopolitical identities. Most of his recent publications are related to developments in Ukraine and particularly in the Donbas region.
SESSION 1A: Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation I – Socio-spatial differentiation

Organizers: Tiit Tammaru, Martin Ouředníček, Szymon Marcińczak
Chair: Tiit Tammaru
Room: Room 1 - Věž

The aim of the session is to bring together quantitative research on post-socialist cities, making use of the recently released data from the 2011 census round, as well as registers, surveys, mobile phone data etc. Theoretically informed, analytically rigorous and politically relevant research based on solid empirical material that illustrates varied forms of socio-spatial and socio-housing changes in post-socialist cities are included in the sessions. The research of the papers is based on ecological data as well as micro data.

The topics of the session include:
- New evidence of segregation patterns along socio-economic, ethnic and demographic lines
- New evidence of neighbourhood change in the post-socialist cities
- New evidence of mobility patterns in post-socialist cities

Ruta Ubareviciene (Delft University of Technology & Lithuanian social research centre)

Migration and urbanization in Lithuania

Despite the general population decline in many Central and Eastern European countries, there is a trend of increasing concentration of population in the major cities since the 1990s. This study aims to get more insight into the recent processes of internal migration in Lithuania. The aim of this paper is to examine the characteristics of those who moved to the three largest Lithuanian cities 10 and 20 years after transition. During the Soviet-time, the communist planning doctrine aimed at a more even spread of population by controlling the size and hierarchy of the cities in Lithuania. After the 1990s the distribution of the population was no longer regulated, and as a result, the patterns of residential mobility have changed. However, little is known about the spatial and social dimension of internal migration in post-communist Lithuania. This study uses individual-level Lithuanian census data from the year 2001 and 2011.

Petra Špačková, Lucie Pospíšilová, Martin Ouředníček (Charles University in Prague)

Socialist and Post-socialist Prague and its Socio-spatial Differentiation from the Perspective of 1970–2011 Population Censuses

In the last 40 years, the socio-spatial structure of Prague has been influenced by two different regimes which have left very different imprints in the city’s fabric. The egalitarian politics of state socialism led to the huge housing construction at the outskirts of the city (panel housing estates). Post-socialist period carried the market mechanisms and developed conditions for "new" processes like suburbanization and gentrification. All these changes manifest themselves in the transforming of Prague’s neighbourhoods. The impact of the socialist attempt to reshape the city were assessed by Matějů (1980) who compared factors differentiating the urban...
environment in 1930 and 1970. He showed that while under capitalism the social economic status clearly dominated as the main differentiating factor, it was the family status which lied behind the diversity of urban neighbourhoods forty years later. The ambition of this paper is to extend Matějů's work and provide knowledge about the city's development in the following forty years. Moreover, we want to contribute to the discussion about the specificity of post-socialist city. Firstly, we investigate whether the return of capitalist regime turns back to the higher dominance of the social economic status or there are other factors which gain in importance (e.g. ethnicity). Secondly, we analyse the inertia of spatial patterns with the special attention to the housing of the rich and the poor. And finally, we focus on the changing geographical variability on various spatial levels (basic settlement units, cadastral units, city districts, and zones). In the analysis, we employ the detailed statistical data from Censuses held in 1970, 1991 and 2011.

Maris Berzins (University of Tartu), Zaiga Krisjane (University of Latvia)

*Patterns of socio-economic segregation in Riga two decades after socialism*

The fundamental political, economic and social transformations that have been unfolding since the collapse of state socialism in the Central Eastern Europe (CEE) drew scholarly and public attention to increasing socio-economic inequalities and socio-spatial differentiation in post-socialist cities. This study discusses the patterns of socio-economic segregation in Riga, the capital of Latvia. In our study, we draw our empirical evidence from the capital city, because it is widely acknowledge that the most notable social change and the fastest economic grow has tended to be concentrated and much more advanced in capital cities. Moreover, little is known about the ethnic dimension of occupational segregation, despite the existence of sizeable minority populations. The focus on ethnicity in our study is important, since Riga is the only capital in the Baltic States where the ethnic majority in absolute numbers is less than non-Latvian minority. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to analyse post-Soviet social inequalities in urban space, with a specific focus on ethnicity. In our research, most importantly, we need to clarify how growing socio-economic inequality in a light of systemic changes and economic restructuring relates to patterns of occupational and ethnic segregation. The analysis captures the situation at the time of the two Latvian censuses of 2000 and 2011. The results reveal that the levels of occupational and ethnic segregation calculated according to global indices of residential segregation are generally low. The geography of occupational structure in Riga reveals that selected socio-occupational groups are widely dispersed across the city. The conclusion is that Riga at the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century is relatively socio-spatially mixed.

Michael Gentile (University of Helsinki), Szymon Marciańczak (University of Lodz), Samuel Rufat (University of Cergy-Pontoise)

*Back on the radar: The evolution of spatial patterns of residential segregation in Bucharest, Romania*

Bucharest, the near two-million strong capital of Romania and a major metropolis of the Balkans, appears to be the most overlooked capital city of socio-spatial change in CEE cities studies. This leftover might distort the overall picture because the socialist regime had produced an actual social segregation in the capital; also because of the peculiarities of Romanian path, generally characterized by a communist 'hardline' experience and then a gradualist or 'hesitant'
transition; and finally because the vast majority of Bucharest's residents are still housed in socialist-era structures. Applying a range of segregation measures to 1992, 2002 and 2011 census data in Bucharest, this paper studies twenty years of socio-demographic and occupational residential segregation. In Bucharest, increasing income inequalities and significant changes in the social and occupational composition have not translated into socio-spatial polarization, despite concerns about the social costs of transition.

**SESSION 1B: The ‘housing question’ in post-socialist cities: policies, innovations and contestations I**

Organizers: Anna Badyina, Carola Neugebauer  
Chair: Anna Badyina  
Room: Room 2 – Levá Rýsovna

Almost 25 years passed since the start of the re-marketization of the housing systems in post-socialist societies. The reformed housing was to more effectively address the housing needs and achieve better living standards for the populations. However, while the housing quality has noticeably improved for certain groups, the housing conditions have generally become fragmented, uneven and polarised. This tendency is reinforced by selective housing policies aiming to bolster the private markets – although there have also emerged various interesting innovations for a socially-inclusive housing sector.

This session aims at exploring the evolving politico-institutional and urban space of housing. It will discuss: what is actually happening to the post-socialist housing systems (including urban form); what forces govern the change; what impacts these housing and urban processes have on the living conditions of the populations; what conflicts and struggles they generate; what innovations and best practices emerge. The session offers critical interdisciplinary perspectives on housing in post-socialist contexts with an attempt to understand these processes within the wider international debates on evolution of capitalism, urban development and spatial injustice.

Anna Badyina (University of Southampton)  
*The urban conditions of the ‘housing question’ in Russia*

Russia's housing situation was once approached within the framework of Soviet urbanisation aiming to provide equal socio-economic and collective welfare infrastructure across the national space. The living conditions of the majority of the population were substantially improved through the Soviet era. Contrary to the past, housing today is shaped by pro-growth urbanisation and speculative urban practices as well as by selective policies and institutions that govern these processes. Drawing on urban and housing research in Russia, this paper demonstrates how housing problems and solutions emerge in the dialectical relationship with the urban processes.
Adam Radzimski (Gran Sasso Science Institute & Adam Mickiewicz University)

Housing shortage in post-socialist countries 25 years after the change

One of the issues that most frequently appeared in discussions in the early years after the great systemic transformation in Central and Eastern Europe was the shortage of housing. With this contribution we would like to ask to what extent the housing shortage remains an issue in the present time. Firstly, a using a review of literature we would like to assess the role that the concept of housing shortage plays in current discussions regarding the post-socialist transition. Secondly, with respect to the empirical aspect we will ask to what extent the housing needs are met in different post-socialist countries, which indicators are mostly suited to describe the problem, and what improvements in statistics could be suggested. Finally, looking into the policy dimension, our objective is to compare policy settings in different countries that led to various outcomes in terms of housing quantity and quality. Using the cases of Eastern Germany and Poland, we would like to demonstrate how, as a result of specific constellation of factors, including demographics, welfare, but also to large extent policies, the housing situation could evolve in very different ways starting from quite similar initial conditions.

Matthias Bernt, Laura Colini, Daniel Förste (Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and structural Planning)

The interrelation of financialisation, shrinkage and welfare state restructuring and the new “housing question” in an eastgerman neighbourhood

Using a mix of survey data, results from a study on local planning politics and fieldwork, the paper discusses the interplay of planning and welfare policies with global financial markets in the impoverishment of a neighbourhood in Halle-Neustadt, a shrinking New Town in Eastern Germany.

Here, different developments come together. First, Neustadt has experienced dramatic population loss in the last two decades. These brought about large-scale demolition programmes, as well as planning policies which aim to transform parts of the neighbourhood into green space. Second, Neustadt has experienced two waves of privatisation in the last two decades, leading to a complete change of ownership structures. Municipal and cooperative owners have been largely displaced by national and international financial investors which hold their stock as an asset and aim for short-term gains, rather than long-term development. Third, cuts regarding the “reimbursement of housing costs” (“Kosten der Unterkunft”) have put more pressure on welfare recipients to live in the cheapest housing available on the local market and have led to a "business-model" based on low, but state-subsidized, rents in peripheral estates. The paper discusses how these developments work together to produce new concentrations of poverty in a prototypical shrinking city.
In our paper we analyze the mechanisms of financing housing in Hungary from the 1970s to date, with the aim to understand the political economy of housing, and to explore the role of various actors and institutions (both public and private) in influencing access to housing. The main turning points we identify are housing credit expansion from the 1970s; mass privatization in the 1990s; the credit boom starting in 2000; and the outburst of the crisis in 2008. Our key argument is that mechanisms of financing housing are crucial to translating global economic dependency and capital flows to a local or household scale, in a broader context of the financialization of housing. However, the way these global flows are articulated in a given context is largely determined by historical and institutional arrangements. We will also present comparative elements with the housing markets of Eastern Germany as part of a PhD research, the first empirical findings of which will also be presented.

SESSION 1C: Urban policies and non-policies in post-socialist cities I
Organizers: Kadri Leetmaa, Johanna Holvandus, Jasna Stefanovska
Discussants: Annegret Haase, Katrin Grossmann
Chair: Kadri Leetmaa
Room: Room 3 – Pravá Rýsovna

When comparative observations about urban planning and urban governance are being made across European countries the researchers fairly often admit the lack of institutionalized urban policy in the Central and Eastern European countries. Although the formal policy principles are rather vague, a variety of planning solutions, policy initiatives on different governmental levels, the ways how large European, governmental and private investments are managed, and other actual governance practices occur. Cumulatively these practices form a de facto urban policy, with variations in different post-socialist countries/cities. In fact, also the absence of policies is a sort of policy approach, creating a neoliberal planning atmosphere and giving proportionally more influence to private investors.

There are numerous studies on post-socialist urban change. Yet, only few contributions consciously target to understand what are the main features of urban policies in post-socialist cities and how the interventions direct the fortune of cities, urban districts, neighborhoods. This will be the main discussion topic of our session. Our cities are exposed to normative planning and policy approaches formulated at the European level. It is increasingly relevant not to be only a concepts’ adjuster, but to ensure that the knowledge of good urban governance and planning is also partly based on the experiences of post-socialist Europe.
The keyword for cities is without a doubt diversity. To comprehend this mixture of differences new practices are opted to reduce disadvantage and inequality, create places of encounter, and recognise possible stakeholders. During the last two decades certain restructuring of boundaries between the government, the market and civil society can be detected resulting in growing cooperation between the mentioned sectors.

This article analyses the contribution of neighbourhood associations to spatial planning providing insight to current collaborative planning situation in Tallinn. The empirical data implies to certain aspects or even gaps in collaboration suggesting a need for overall shift towards more open and inclusive planning practice. Also, the obstacles for collaboration lie in the bureaucratic structures as well as in lack of competence to carry constructive discussion.

The paper is based on ongoing work under the EU-funded FP7 project DIVERCITIES (2013–2017).

Urban planning in socialist countries in the second half of the 20th century has been often analysed as specific and different from planning in other countries. Yet, recently, several works have pointed out that exchanges existed between planners in the UK and the Soviet Union (Cook et al 2014; Ward et al 2012; Ward 2012), or that exports of ideas and work occurred between socialist countries and the Middle East (Stanek 2012). This paper aims to join these works and focuses on how, why and what kind of information on planning in the 'West' was searched and used by Czechoslovak planners between 1948 and 1989. Based on analysis of professional publications and planning documents, this paper uncovers that socialist planners and theorists of planning were continually learning from their colleagues in the 'West'. At the same time, it points out the disconnections between the ideas that appeared in the periodicals and publications and the actual practice of planning in Czechoslovakia.

Using discourse analysis, this paper investigates relations between the city of Prague, Central Bohemian region and municipalities in Prague metropolitan area as reflected, represented and conceptualized in local, regional and national development and planning documents. The primary questions concern whether and how the other municipalities and regions are reflected in strategic development and spatial planning priorities, whether they are seen as competitors and/or potential synergies from cooperation are considered, and whether there are instances that emphasize and promote common interests within and for the metropolitan area. The paper illustrates the relations focusing on two cases. Firstly, it discusses the application of Integrated Territorial Investments for the allocation of Structural Funds in the new programming period,
and secondly, it investigates planning discourses related to the location of new research centres within the Prague metropolitan area.

Mirjam Büdenbender, Daniela Zupan (Universität Stuttgart)

*From megalopolis to city comfortable for life – the evolution of neoliberal urbanism in Moscow*

This article examines the evolution of neoliberal urbanism in Moscow. It shows that the global financial crisis was one of several multi-scalar processes that led to the restructuring of the city’s system of urban governance, its dynamics of space making and creation of public discourse. Whilst Moscow developed chaotically as hyper-capitalist investment hub in the years preceding the global financial crisis, the emphasis in discourse and policy shifted towards a new transparent, participatory and sustainable urbanism as of 2010/11. Yet, rather than constituting a qualitative break with Moscow’s pre-crisis development agenda, the city’s new development trajectory is part of a strategy by the federal elite to consolidate its power and contain the contradictions that had emerged out of the previous urban development model. The article therefore argues that the transformation of neoliberal urbanism in Moscow has been part of a wider political strategy directed at maintaining the status quo.
SESSION 2A: Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, neighbourhood change and segregation II – Mobility and commuting

Organizers: Tiit Tammaru, Martin Ouředníček, Szymon Marcińczak
Chair: Martin Ouředníček
Room: Room 1 - Věž

For session abstract see session 1A.

Szymon Marcinczak (University of Lodz), Marcin Stepniak (Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization Polish Academy of Sciences)
The impact of regional structure on commuting distance and time in Poland

Urban regions consist of clusters of residence and work. The literature on the relationship between places of residence and work concentrates on distance and time traveled. Using data from Polish Labor Force Surveys 2009-2011, we address the following questions: What is the effect of socio-material status, demographic features and workplace characteristics on commuting distance and time? What is the effect of regional structure and residential milieu on commuting patterns? The analysis suggests that socioeconomic status is more significantly related with commuting time than with commuting distance. Women tend to commute shorter distances, but we do not find any effect of depending children on work-related travel distance and time. As expected, commuting distance and time are the longest in monocentric regions with centralized commute flows. Residents of small towns travel greater distances and times than those who live either in rural areas or larger cities.

Peter Svoboda (Charles University in Prague)
Changes of work localization in the Prague metropolitan region 1991-2011

The contribution deals with evaluation of spatial aspects of labor flexibility in Prague's metropolitan region during 1991–2011. Main focus is placed on identification of spatial changes of work in post-socialistic metropolis in relatively new settings of flexible post-industrial global production game which influences traditional understanding of job locations within metropolitan areas. Consequences of increasing time and spatial flexibility of labor, represented among others by establishment of new types of jobs, heterogeneity of working opportunities, reduction of spatial ties and delocalization of many new professions to suburban areas, have impact on commuting and other regional processes. The aim of the contribution is mostly focused on explanation of changes inducted by flexible work organization of labor in Prague's metropolitan region. Paper is based on analysis of statistical census data on commuting and industrial classification of economic activities of the labor.
Balázs Szabó (RCAES Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

*Social change and residential mobility in the downgrading areas of Budapest*

The housing market of the post-socialist cities, which had been formed by the housing privatization in the 1990s, underwent major changes in the 2000s. First the real estate boom, then the economic crisis increased the differences between the up- and downgrading city quarters. These latter, namely the brownfields, the large housing estates and the old working class outskirts will be examined and compared with other parts of the city in the proposed paper focusing on Budapest as case study for the changes of social composition. Based on census data, the author will explore whether neighborhood deterioration is an outcome of aging and depopulation, or the inflow of members of lower social strata also play a role in it. Another topic to be addressed is the mobility behavior in downgrading urban zones. Using the results of a recent sample survey, the paper will analyze the dwellers’ opinion about their position in the housing market and their intention and ability to move.

Baiba Svane (University of Latvia)

*Residential mobility in post-soviet City Riga, Latvia*

In post-Socialist cities residential mobility has been considered as a major process of adjustment to the economic and social restructuring after collapse of state socialism (Ruoppila, 2006). Since 1990s almost 50% of residents of Riga have moved (Krišjāne, Bērziņš, Bauls, 2014). This paper investigates residential mobility among neighborhoods using an empirical evidence. Residential mobility were analyzed through a household surveys carried out in 2012, 2013 and 2014, and Population Census Data carried out in 2000 and 2011. Empirical data shows that share of residents living in large housing estate neighborhoods have increased between years 2000 and 2011 (72%;75%) also in outer city (6%; 8%), while share of residents living in inner-city neighborhoods have decreased (22%;17%). Besides 72% of residents of Riga live in soviet built housing (2011). The author concludes that neighborhoods of Soviet time built panel housing in Riga have maintain a relatively good image to residents.
Nathaniel Trumbull (University of Connecticut)

Restructuring socialist housing estates and its impact on residents' perceptions: "Renovatsiia" of khrushchevki in St. Petersburg, Russia

This paper explores the issue of restructuring socialist housing estates in St. Petersburg, Russia, with an emphasis on residents' perceptions of the wide range of economic, social, and environmental impacts of that restructuring. A new housing renewal program, "renovatsiia" (renovation) of khrushchevki, has been controversial from the very beginning and involves the demolition of existing khrushchevki and the construction of new housing on the same sites. By examining the issue within the framework of housing regeneration in the post-socialist context, the paper aims to provide insights into some of the challenges of urban renewal in the housing sector in the second largest Russian city. The paper at the same time investigates the viability of the collaborative planning model in the context of the post-socialist city.

Tinatin Gurgenidze-Schmitt (Technische Universität Berlin)

Living in the post-Soviet microrayons, on the example of Gldani In Tbilisi

We can observe that different cultures in various situations tend to adapt to their living area and conditions. Each individual generates the space according to the place where he or she lives. As Henri Lefebvre describes “Every social space is the outcome of a process with many aspects and many contributing currents, signifying and non-signifying perceived and directly experienced, practical and theoretical. In short, every social space has a history, one invariably grounded in nature, in natural conditions that are at once primordial and unique in the sense that they are always and everywhere endowed with specific characteristics”.

This paper explores the adaptation and appropriation strategies of inhabitants living in Soviet blocks in Gldani - a mass dormitory suburb situated in the periphery of Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia. Gldani consists of eight 'microrayons' designed in the late 1970s and provides a home for approximately 140,000 inhabitants. The paper discusses the processes of change affecting these Soviet living environs; to what extend the everyday life of the inhabitants is standardized and their lifestyle controlled by being embedded in these spaces.

David Sichinava, Joseph Salukvadze (Tbilisi State University)

Housing inequalities in the South Caucasus – cases of Yerevan and Tbilisi

Yerevan and Tbilisi underwent a spectacular economic and sociocultural shift since transition from command to market economy. Privatization of formerly state-owned housing stock and
transferring building activities to the hands of the private business has been key features of this process. As it is documented in the literature, despite drastic changes in every aspect of life, at the first stage of the post-Communist transition housing inequalities were not dramatically affected, contrary to the expected. However, nowadays the situation has been altering and the gap is gradually widening.

This paper seeks to unveil the main factors influencing housing inequalities in contemporary Yerevan and Tbilisi. Based on the pooled survey data from the Integrated Household Surveys of Armenia and Georgia, the analysis checks whether the effect of socio-demographic and economic variables on per capita living space in the dwelling has been altered during the first decades of the 21st century.

**SESSION 2C: Urban policies and non-policies in post-socialist cities II**

Organizers: Kadri Leetmaa, Johanna Holvandus, Jasna Stefanovska  
Discussants: Annegret Haase, Katrin Grossmann  
Chair: Johanna Holvandus  
Room: Room 3 – Pravá Rýsovna  

*For session abstract see session 1C.*

Erika Nagy, Gábor Nagy (Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Science)  
*Local strategies tackling peripherality in ECE frontiers: Revealing the relationships of the political and the economic in cross-border urban spaces*  

ECE transition and inequalities emanating from the operation of liberalized markets and neoliberal state practices have been interpreted as ‘inevitable’ consequences of global capitalism in public discourses across Europe. Interpreting these processes in the context of ‘aspatial’ (depoliticized) globalization contributed to the naturalization of capitalist social relations and the separation of the ‘economic’ from the ‘political’. Our paper gives a critical political economic account of how the economic and the political are interwoven in local strategies and daily practices in cross-border urban regions. We argue for that local agents react to their ‘peripheral’ position in hierarchies and capital flows by employing multiple political strategies going beyond the boundaries of the urban region to revalorize local assets. Such strategies raise conflicts that are explicitly political as they challenge power relations in existing hierarchies, urban spaces and in urban-rural relations.

Katalin Fehér, Judit Keller, Zsuzsanna Vidra, Tünde Virág (Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Science)  
*Local variations of residential integration - Settlement development programs in Hungary*  

Settlements are applying for a limited number of nationally announced EU funds for the development of poor and segregated neighbourhoods and the integration of their population. Programs mostly apply a settlement type community work which develops the local services and keep the population in their residence. However local governments can interpret the
principles and conditions of the programs, the areas to be developed variously. Relations between local actors and the leadership are rooted in the historical background of former integrational tendencies, and they are determining the outcome of these projects. Based on qualitative research of three Hungarian middle sized towns, our presentation analyzes various strategies of settlements which are shaping developmental programs as part of their general inclusionary and exclusionary practices as well as looks at how and why the same project constructions have different outcomes in different local contexts.

Pavel Šuška (Institute of Geography SAS)
*From Environmental Advocacy to Neighbourhood Communities: Changing Scale and Form of Urban Activism in Post-socialist Bratislava*

In the last 25 years, urban activism in Bratislava underwent its own post-socialist transformation. The development of civic initiatives seeking to influence urban development was shaped by changing structures of opportunities, threats and constraints, which led to the re-scaling of spaces of engagement and to new forms of activism. Specific features of the early years of the transition in Slovakia meant primary orientation on the nation-state level and taking up a defensive position for the civil society as a whole. Opening political opportunities at the local level and growing dissatisfaction with the trends in urban development (e.g. land-use conflicts) brought re-localization of engagement and strengthening of urban environmental advocacy. In new dynamics of contention, the developed local „place frames” endured and they are being used in current depoliticised forms of community activism.

Branislav Machala (Charles University in Prague)
*Waterfront-fix: A critical perspective of waterfront transformations in postsocialist Bratislava*

Transition of postsocialist cities in Central and Eastern Europe is, even 25 years since the end of communism, still apparent in their dynamic adaptation to capitalist conditions. Their rapid systemic reconfiguration accompanied by delayed industrial decentralization, economic integration into global economy and increasing interurban competition among cities for scarce resources, is especially visible on waterfronts. Waterfronts as ‘glocal’ spaces marked by ‘the annihilation of space by time’ reflect interests, ideas and power relations between networks of actors of various scales. Continuous debate on theoretical framing of waterfront transformation has been evolving among urban geographers for more than half a century. However, the nature of waterfront transformation in the late capitalist, postsocialist context is still unexplored. Closer theoretical attention to critical interplay between key driving forces of the transformation like capital, institutions and politics is missing. This presentation frames the ongoing inner city transformation in Bratislava by addressing debates on postsocialist transition, waterfront transformation, scale and uneven geographical development. In particular, attention is being paid to unravel the role of scale and uneven spatial logic of capital which are fixed on transforming waterfronts. Thus, I use political economy approach in order to explore and critically evaluate the nature, effects and overall impacts of the ongoing waterfront transformation on wider socio-economic environment in Bratislava.
SESSION 3A: Census geographies and beyond: New patterns of housing segmentation, 
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For session abstract see session 1A.

Kadi Mägi, Kadri Leetmaa, Tiit Tammaru, Maarten van Ham (University of Tartu)
*How does the ethnic component of one’s residential context change as a result of immobility and short- or long-distance moves: The case of Estonia*

This paper studies the effects of immobility, short-distance moves (intra-urban mobility and suburbanisation), and long-distance migration on the ethnic residential context of ethnic groups. The study region is Estonia, a country that has experienced an intensive immigration from other former Soviet republics after the WWII. Two major ethnic groups in the country – Estonians and Russian-speakers – have different residential patterns and the levels of ethnic segregation have remained high since their arrival to the country. The main research question is whether different forms of mobility lead to different levels of spatial integration for the Russian-speaking minority in Estonia. Using unique linked census data from the 2000 and 2011 Estonian censuses, we observe individuals in 2000 who lived in the bilingual capital city Tallinn, and who have stayed in their original neighbourhood, moved within the city, within the Tallinn metropolitan area or left to other regions of the country.

Ivana Přidalová, Martin Ouředníček (Charles University in Prague)
*The Role of Foreign Migration in Changing Socio-Spatial Differentiation in Prague Metropolitan Area*

The main aim of the paper is to evaluate key processes of socio-spatial differentiation in Prague metropolitan area during the transformation period 1991-2013 using the evidence of residential migration data. Special attention is paid to migration of foreigners, which is the dominant factor of population balance in Prague today. Migration of foreigners is perceived as a new phenomenon after the Velvet revolution, which has been considerably changing the socio-spatial differentiation of Prague metropolitan area especially during the last 15 years. We argue that foreigners represent quite differentiated group of migrants with rather specific housing preferences and strategies which differ considerably from those of the Czech population. We suppose that increasing role of international migration has led to growing ethnic differentiation of Prague’s society and to creation of the first spatially concentrated areas within the city. The paper is based on analysis of individual data from registers of migration (1992-2013) which are confronted with results of the 1991, 2001 and 2011 population censuses and analysed in seven types of residential areas.
Donatas Burneika (Lithuanian social research centre), Ruta Ubareviciene (Delft University of Technology & Lithuanian social research centre), Gintare Pociute (Lithuanian social research centre)

Socio-economic aspects of ethnic segregation of major Lithuanian cities

One of the specific features of the most post Soviet cities is their multi-ethnic structure, which was strongly influenced by interior migrations within Soviet Union. The particular ethnic structure of the major cities in Lithuania is well known but their spatial dimensions still were hidden. The paper analyses spatial differences of distribution of the main ethnic minorities in 3 major city regions. The changes of spatial differentiation of Russian and Polish speaking residents taking place in recent period will be analysed according the data of recent population censuses. The associated spatial socio-economic dimensions will be analysed too. Initial findings suppose that socio-economic and ethnic structures of these cities are closely related, therefore ethnic segregation processes are closely related to general social segregation trends. The degree of correlation of ethnic and social structures should vary substantially depending on proportion of these groups in a city.

SESSION 3B: Production of public space

Chair: Konstantin Axenov
Room: Room 2 – Levá Rýsovna

Konstantin Axenov (St.Petersburg State University)

Dynamics of the Accessibility of Public Space in the Residential Communities of a Post-Soviet Metropolis, case of St. Petersburg

Results of our previous research on the topic, based on the field surveys held in different types of residential communities of St. Petersburg in 2008, revealed that post-socialist privatization both of housing and commercial real estate has led to dramatic changes in the accessibility of public space. Some types of new urban property owners were interested in providing the maximum access to the territory that they control, whereas others prefer isolation from outsiders. Our field measurements showed the unconditional victory of the latter. That study has revealed significant differences in the rate of denial of access to different types of residential areas of the city and has determined the participants in this process and their motives. There is some evidence that the market appeal of accommodation types is directly correlated with the degree of publicly accessible space shrinkage. In 2015 we held a new survey and present the paths and dynamics of the described shifts.

Lajos Boros (University of Szeged), Zoltán Kovács, Szabolcs Fabula, Dániel Horváth

Urban diversity and the production of public spaces in Budapest

Public spaces are important spaces for representation of different social groups. Therefore, their production is characterised by constant social struggles and is connected to power relations, dominant set of values etc. In capitalism, public spaces are more and more commodified and
homogenised, thus obstructing the representation of certain groups, values, ideologies. This process can cause social conflicts in heterogeneous neighbourhoods where only some "approved" elements of local cultural diversity are visible in public spaces, making them spaces of homogeneity and heterogeneity at the same time.

The aim of the study is to present how urban social diversity is manifested in the production of public spaces in Budapest, Hungary. The case study area is the 8th District of Budapest which is a diverse neighbourhood with several ethnic and social groups living together. The research is based on the analysis of policy documents and interviews conducted with the residents of the district.

Carola Neugebauer, Lela Rekviashvili (RWTH Aachen University)

*Loss and (re)Construction of Public Space in Post-Soviet Cities?*

The importance of public space as a site for power and resistance, facilitator of social exchange or a stage for art and performance has been long acknowledged in the academic literature. It hosts and reflects social and political cleavages. Thus, observing transformation of public spaces can be helpful for understanding multiple and protracted transformation processes in post-Soviet societies and cities. So far, however, changes in the meaning, design, use and negotiation of public space in post-Soviet cities remains to be terra incognita (except Darieva et al. 2011). Against this backdrop, we initiated a peer-reviewed theme issue to explore the tension between the loss and (re)construction of urban public space in post-Soviet cities, focusing on the agents of change, their practices and institutional settings that shaped loss and (re)construction of public space. Reflecting the pooled papers, we draw conclusions about the topics addressed and aim to open up a fertile debate.

Veronika Kastlová (Czech Technical University in Prague)

*Scene of public space*

Public space could be symbolically understood as a scene where a number of interactions – social rituals take place. The key question is to define architectural and urbanistic procedures used for urban scene design of public spaces in the cities during problematic situation today. What kind of role can theatre (which is based on social rituals) play in vitalization of public spaces? Present disappearing of image of the cities and effort to find a solution for this unpleasant state lead to various considerations. For public space, consisting of substantial part (material and spatial part) and non-substantial part (scenic or ephemeral part), the latter mentioned seems to be more important one.

If ephemeral part is considered essential for public space design, it is possible to define for this part of public space design principles used in theatre production. It seems that it is possible to design public space as a scenic space. So let us design enjoyment and catharsis of public spaces.
The theme of presentation is practice of permanent public art in Prague after 1989. It focuses on suburban areas. In the 70s and 80s approximately 400 new sculptures were installed in the city of Prague. In the last two decades the number is about 70. The majority of sculptures and objects are located in the historical centre of Prague. There is only 8 pieces found in suburbia. These pieces were initiated by various institutions, associations and companies. It indicates expanding spectrum of subjects entering this cultural layer of the city and alternative approach in the area where no policy and strategies have not yet been created. Public art on the outskirts are set in the urban context that is not compact, car transportation is preferred and identity is poorly articulated. Sculptures and objects in these places are analysed in the relation to the urban context which is considered as a key part of the meaning of sculpture.

**SESSION 3C: Urban tourism development in post-socialist cities**

Organizer: Veronika Dumbrovská  
Chair: Veronika Dumbrovská  
Room: Room 3 – Pravá Rýsovna

Tourism plays an important role in urban economy, social life and planning. The importance of tourism became to be evident mainly in connection with transition of cities from the industrial one (as a place of production) to post-industrial (as a place of consumption). “In 1980s some cities managed to make a smooth transition from industrial wasteland to tourist mecca” (Fainstein, Judd 1999, s. 12).

Cities of former “Eastern Block”, which re-entered the global market economy in early 1990s, faced challenges resulting from the transformation of economy, society and political structures, as well as from an increasingly competitive environment. As well as the transformation differed in particular cities, so was the development of tourism in these cities.

The session focuses on five case studies analyzing the development of tourism in post-socialist cities, in particular in capital cities Berlin, Prague and Budapest, and one smaller city Gotha (Germany, Thuringia).

Veronika Dumbrovská (Charles University in Prague)  
*25 years of urban tourism development in Prague: The changing patterns of tourism in the historical center*

During the last 25 years Prague has become a significant tourist destination in Europe. This development however was rapid and unbalanced. Whereas in the early 1990s the tourism in Prague contributed to the smooth transition of workforce to the service sector, today Prague's historical center suffers from touristification, overcrowding, commodification and alienation (Hoffman & Musil 2009). This contribution will deal with the changing socio-spatial patterns of tourism in historical center of Prague with the greater focus on the “Royal Way”. Based on the combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods (in-depth interviews with local residents, analysis of retail outlets and its development on the “Royal Way”, analysis of the
secondary statistical data about tourism and economy development in Prague etc.) changing business activities in the historical center of Prague and its impact on the local community and tourism itself will be analyzed. The findings will show that privatization, restitution and the absence of tourism management have a profound impact on tourism in Prague and have contributed to the creation of a tourist ghetto on the "Royal Way".

Natalie Stors, Andreas Kagermeier (University of Trier)

*The post-socialist transformation in East-Berlin as a facilitator and incubator for new ways of tourism*

With the fall of the Berlin Wall, the former capital of the GDR has undergone a dramatic change. What makes the situation of Berlin specific is the influence from former West-Berlin, which has been quite strong in the gentrification of the 19th century quarters as well as the development of a subcultural clubbing scene in abandoned former industrial precincts. The purchasing power of the West-Berlin demand worked as a booster for the development. The gentrification and the clubbing scene soon attracted visitors from outside Berlin as well. The Eastern part of Berlin became the incubator for new ways off tourism “off the beaten track” and attracting new (mainly younger) target groups. As the touristification process took place mainly in the Eastern part of the town it is no wonder that innovative offers included those of the Share Economy are concentrated there.

In the presentation the transformation process will be characterised and the role of new ways of tourism will be analysed.

Bálint Kádár (Budapest University of Technology and Economics)

*Tourism development in post-socialist Budapest: infrastructures in slow regeneration after the fast breakdown*

Budapest was the most visited Central-European destination in the 1980s. In 1990 it suddenly lose its attractiveness as the most accessible eastern city from the west, and the most western destination accessible form the east. Infrastructures of mass tourism became outdated in a new era of selforganized postmodern tourism. Lack of infrastructural development, the unique model of microprivatisation of the property market, or the cancellation of the World Exposition of 1996 all contributed to stagnation. But after this era a slower, but deeper planning renewed the inner city, and the growth of many interesting bottom-up initiatives made Budapest a vibrant urban destination, with a well connected network of quite unique attractions. Today the growth of tourism is fuelled by those arriving with low-cost airlines, searching for good price/quality ratio, but many of these young people become repeat visitors in the future, creating a sustainable basis for tourism in the Hungarian capital.

Younkyoung Sung (Bauhaus University Weimar)

*Becoming a tourist city: The story of Gotha*

The case of cities with less than 60,000 inhabitants and great historic artifacts, suffering from population decline and ailing industry structure, is general phenomenon in East Germany. One
of them, Gotha, a city located in the middle of Thuringia, has been through different hardships while developing the city as tourist destination. This presentation attempts to analyze how a former socialist city deals with its destination development during the last 25 years. While looking at the case of Gotha, we can trace the transformation of the economy system, decision making of the politics, communication development in tourism sector as well as the critical problems in the present tourism management. This process involves not only the physical urban transformation but also socio-cultural transitions such as life style change, gentrification, and urban identity change. Tourism development has brought visitors, infrastructure and new events. However, residents’ attitude and the communal infrastructure still lack market orientation. The tourism planning and communal policies seem to be unaligned and residents are unaware of their own city’s legacy. By analyzing expert interviews and local residents’ interviews, we can follow the gap between the subjective ideals and its limitations for the future tourism.

Andrey Makarychev (University of Tartu)

Neopatrimonial sovereignty and performative governmentality: the case of FIFA World Cup – 2018 in Nizhny Novgorod

The paper claims that sports in Russia is a social milieu susceptible to political impositions and often generative of sovereignty-centric discourses that are articulated through interrelated concepts of exceptionality, nationalism and security. I specifically focus on the preparatory stage of the FIFA 2018 Cup in Russia, which takes place in the conditions of declining economy and the fall of national currency, which makes it much less celebratory than the Sochi Olympics. Based on the case study of Nizhny Novgorod, I argue that the World Cup project is basically treated as a liability and a burden, rather than as an asset or a source of national inspiration.
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SESSION 4A: Theorising urban transitions: urban spatialities in the making (and remaking) I

Organizers: Oleg Golubchikov, Luděk Sýkora
Chair: Luděk Sýkora
Room: Room 1 - Věž

In 1998, Pickles and Smith brought together an edited volume on Theorising Transition which emphasized a variegated, path-dependent and yet open-ended terrain of post-socialist transition. While many of the propositions raised by that contribution continue to resonate today, 25+ years since the start of transition, the community of post-socialist urban scholars must be in position to make its own and further theoretical statements grounded in the reflections on the continuing evolution of the post-socialist city. And yet Örjan Sjöberg, in his address to the 5th CATference in Tbilisi, pointed out that despite the growing empirical contribution of post-socialist scholarship to urban studies, its impact on urban theory remains limited.

Against this context, this session seeks to engage in a debate on variegated theoretical interrogations stemming from research on post-socialist cities. Its contributions showcase theoretical innovations inspired by the post-socialist contexts but which could also reverberate
more broadly in the studies of global urban transitions. Such theoretical innovations (which can relate to any urban practice or spatiality) would necessarily be informed by the wider development of thought, but go beyond merely accommodating well-rehearsed concepts into the post-socialist context. Furthermore, the session’s philosophy is not to constrain its contributions by any particular political, ontological or epistemological standing.

Oleg Golubchikov (Cardiff University)

*The urbanisation of transition*

Cities play a crucial role in the establishment of capitalism over ex-communist societies. While cities are often portrayed as merely a projection of larger societal changes, they are actually an important social and material framework for the production and reproduction of the new social relationships, including class (trans)formation. Transition is conditioned by urban experiences, through which it has taken its specific narrative and disciplining power and by which it produces new social structures and relationships. This paper articulates the notion of “urbanisation of transition” to capture this role of cities in the production of new society. It argues that urbanisation of transition has effects far beyond the local city scale in articulating the new modalities of state, space, scale, class and capital accumulation.

Michael Gentile (University of Helsinki), Örjan Sjöberg (Stockholm School of Economics)

*Neoliberalism(s) as a guide to post-socialist urban change: (non-)variegated theoretical perspectives?*

During the first decade of post-socialist urban change, as was indeed the case in almost any discourse on transition, a widely held view amongst those taking an interest in the emerging post-socialist world was that there was more than just one way forward. In fact, a major point of critique was precisely that the prescriptions issued were oblivious of any other worthwhile or relevant goals and trajectories. The very nature of “the real transformations in post-communism” required, or so critics suggested, “an opening of our conceptual maps of transition to counter the closure of dominant discourses and the power of these ideas in shaping the policy agendas of transition” (Smith & Pickles 1998, pp. 5, 7).

Somewhat ironic then that neoliberalism seems to have become the favourite catch-all term to explain what has happened in the urban realms since. Has the underlying rationale for Smith and Pickles’ original argument, based on the heterogeneity of starting points and goals, been proven wrong? Or have neoliberal prescriptions truly carried the day? Could it be that neoliberalism is an extraordinarily flexible recipe and that, as a mobile technology, it is likely to find use everywhere? If not, how come judging by the post-socialist urban studies literature that it appears to have permeated just about every polity to have emerged following the demise of Soviet type socialism?

Alexander Kalyukin (Uppsala University), Thomas Borén (Stockholm University), Andrew Byerley (Göteborg University)

*The Second Generation of Post-Socialist Change: Gorky Park and Public Space in Moscow*
After the fall of communism, public spaces in Moscow and in other CEE cities underwent dramatic changes in line with the wider adaptation to the market economy, epitomized in processes of privatization and commercialization. Most recently, we argue, these processes are overshadowed by the ‘second generation’ of post-socialist change that entails the recasting of the very conception of the public and public space, and the purpose here is to further discuss the general validity and possible generalizations of this conceptual result. We argue that neoliberal capitalism in Moscow is becoming even more pervasive under the framework of civility, livability and Europeanization discourses entailing the production of socially divisive urban space. In regards to post-socialist urban studies (and beyond) thinking in terms of different generations, or periodization, of change helps to critically dissect urban processes in order to prompt comparative inquiries between Eastern and Western urbanisms.

Nadir Kinossian (The Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)
Soviet, transitional, capitalist? State-led spatial restructuring in Russia

Once again, the central state in Russia acts as the main force behind economic development. Far from being "hollowed out", the Russian state and its developmental ambitions call into question some of the key concepts of Western geography, particularly, ‘state rescaling’. Russia's new centralisation is not a resurrection of the Soviet model with its emphasis on spatial equalisation. In contrast, the modern Russian state selects certain territories, geographical scales, and locations as strategic 'spaces of priority'. It is up to the regional and local actors to implement visions of the centre, which places spatial development at the conjuncture of the top-down initiatives and local responses.

This research focuses on state-led spatial restructuring that form Russia's new space comprised of prioritised and non-prioritised territories, different scales and locations, specifically by addressing the following questions: 1) what are the 'spaces of priority'? 2) what are the actors involved? 3) how do spaces of priority relate to traditional spaces?

SESSION 4B: Post-socialist urban infrastructures: socio-material transformation and future paths I
Organizers: Wladimir Sgibnev, Tauri Tuvikene
Chair: Wladimir Sgibnev
Room: Room 2 – Levá Rýsovna

The fall of socialism also meant transformations in material forms, management and perception of urban infrastructures (Bouzarovski 2010, Collier 2011, Dalakoglou 2012). Since 1991, the state provision of heat, water, electricity and transport has increasingly been replaced with user-pays schemes and a privatisation of service provision. With diminishing financing and complicated economic conditions, maintenance has been inadequate and infrastructures have often deteriorated. Yet hope in the future relies a lot on infrastructural development, with additional support from EU funding not only helping to improve existing infrastructures but also opening up new dimensions unimagined before in formerly socialist countries. Bridges, tunnels, railway lines, highways, new heating provision schemes and systems, power plants are constructed or in plan to be built. As it is now 25 years of urban change in post-socialist cities, it is an apt time to reflect on the ways in which post-socialist transformation as well as new utopias of future are intermingled with infrastructures.
One of the consequences of the post-socialist transformation of Eastern and Central Europe is the expansion of energy poverty – a condition where households are unable to access adequate energy services in the home. This paper examines the institutional and infrastructural underpinnings of this condition in post-communist cities, with the aid of analyses undertaken as part of the EVALUATE project (urban-energy.org/evaluate). Taking into account advances in research on urban social resilience (Bouzarovski et al 2011) and procedural environmental justice (Bickerstaff et al 2013) we use a vulnerability framework to explore the emergence of domestic energy deprivation in the given empirical context. Our findings point to the presence of energy poverty across a specific set of demographic and spatial settings in ECE cities. These results connect the rise of the phenomenon to the poor co-ordination of energy, welfare, and housing policies in the relevant government departments. One of the main challenges stems from the policy makers’ failure to perceive issues of social welfare reform, energy efficiency, housing policy and price affordability in an integrated manner. Further contributing to the invisibility of energy poverty has been the private character of domestic energy deprivation, as well as its non-conformity with conventional poverty-amelioration methods. Infrastructural path-dependencies have played a major role in shaping the resulting landscapes of vulnerability – both in terms of the agency played by socio-technical networks inherited from the past, and the emergence of material and behavioural lock-ins specific to the post-communist period.
inherited from the Soviet time. In the paper we will discuss the changes in spatial organization of
the city as a result of efforts of local authorities and individuals to adapt existing facilities to the
market economy. The interviews and observations gathered in 2009-2011, as well as secondary
sources serve as a base for analysis.

Tauri Tuvikene (Tallinn University)

The neo-liberalisation of infrastructure governing in Soviet housing estates? The case of car
parking in Tallinn, Estonia

This paper discusses the governing of infrastructures in post-Soviet housing estates of Tallinn,
Estonia. There is an increasing shift towards individual responsibility in the use of
infrastructures in post-socialist cities. For instance, as various studies have already discussed,
water and progressively more also heat consumption are largely measured based on individual
household consumption. This paper, however, looks at the ways in which neo-liberal forms of
governing are applied in the case of car parking infrastructures in housing estates. In Tallinn, the
municipality has decided to allocate parcels of its land for long-term rent as parking lots to flat-
owners’ associations formed based on single apartment buildings. On the one hand, this marks a
departure from the idea of sustainability which has led to neo-liberal measuring devices for
water and heat: in relation to the transport management in housing estates, the city merely
accommodates individual cars. On the other hand, the responsibility of the city is also
diminishing and that of lower level governing actors increasing. Thus, there is an increase of
neo-liberal forms of governing in housing estates but in terms of car parking, the promotion of
user-pays schemes (e.g., by Shoup, 2005 “High Cost of Free Parking”) have not been taken as far
as for heat and water.

Liviu Chelcea (University of Bucharest)

Motorway Construction in Romania: Ruins of Future, Nature and Waiting

Infrastructures most often take longer time to complete and cost more than initially planned.
This is an especially salient issue in Romania, a country with a limited number of kilometers of
motorways relative to other countries in the EU (652 km as of 2014) and where car owners and
transportation companies desperately wait for their construction. Building on Akhil Gupta’s idea
that infrastructures are “ruins of the future”, I analyze the materiality and imaginary created at
the intersection of proposed/under construction motorways and their hyper-presence in mass
media. In particular, I focus on visual economy of motorway ruination and on the political
technologies that it creates. The visual economy of current motorway ruination is populated by
aerial footage of the proposed pathways of the motorways under construction (a joint project of
the Ministry of Transportation and amateur aero-clubs), ground level photos of segments of the
motorways under construction, drone imagery, future-oriented maps of Romania with proposed
motorways or motorways under construction and quantitative visual data rendered through
colors about the progress for each segment. Televisions and news websites often carry such
content. The subjectification and visualization of the increments in the progress in construction
work, transform waiting for highway completion into what Michel Callon has called ‘spaces of
calculability’. Ruination and waiting create new opportunities for the domination of nature, non-
human animals and class politics.
**SESSION 4C: Histories and urban identities in the post-socialist cities**

Chair: Srdjan Mandić  
Room: Room 3 – Pravá Rýsovna

Martin Šimon, Jana Jíchová (Charles University in Prague)  
*Alternative (hi)story of urban change: reading Prague through crime and homeless?*

Socio-spatial development of post-socialist cities has been mainly analysed via conventional approaches and methodologies utilising population and housing data or policy analysis and case studies. Many studies focused on commercialisation and gentrification of core city, the future of housing estates, or a flight of middle-class to suburbs and beyond. In geography circles a relatively minor attention has been devoted to alternative data sources and to marginalised populations. In our paper we re-read history of urban development of Prague in last 25 years through prism of alternative perspectives: penal and poorest class research. Overall societal changes after 1989 introduced not just free market and elections. The development of less repressive and more competitive society resulted into social polarisation and emergence of ‘losers from transition’. New opportunities were acquired also for crime and new types of crime. All these changes have been markedly substantiate in urban spaces.

Harutyun Vermishyan, Sona Balasanyan (Yerevan State University)  
*Local identities and symbolic structures of urban places in post-Soviet Yerevan*

The urban space of modern Yerevan mainly resulted throughout the Soviet period and, basically, reflected the impact of Soviet architecture and industry. Nonetheless, the symbolic distribution of physical/geographical space of the city has also changed in result of post-Soviet transformations. Symbolic structures have been both conditioned and caused by changed urban local identities. Based on Pierre Bourdieu’s constructivist structuralism, this paper will analyze local distribution of symbolic features of post-Soviet Yerevan. Presented approach and findings have resulted from mixed methods sociological research (including public survey, biographical interviews and observations) conducted in Yerevan between 2013 and 2015. The research is pioneering in regards to application of urban sociology to Yerevan city. Visual methods of data collection have been used throughout observations providing factual evidences of theoretically justified transitions, reconstructions and shifts.

Srdjan Mandić (Bauhaus University Weimar)  
*Beyond People Pasts and City Futures: Politics of Heritage Production in Post-Socialist Serbia*

The recent turbulent change or regimes in Serbia in year 2000 has resulted in change of paradigms from industrial to service based economy. In fact, the number of people employed in industry has dropped more than 60%. Departed from once future-oriented industrial society, Serbian institutions, financially supported by the European Union, are introducing past-oriented heritage projects to revive current urban situations.
This paper will present the findings from the field work I conducted in the town of Senjski Rudnik, where I observed the project of transformation from once a mining town into a town museum. Further, I will focus on an important case of struggle over urban space between local actors and centralized power, which outlined a new form of production of the urban in the post-socialist Serbia. The paper will, nevertheless, conclude by indicating the potential in the project of transformation as a platform for dealing with the traumatic experience of deindustrialization.
Katrin Grossmann (University of Applied Sciences Erfurt), Annegret Haase (Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ)

*Neighbourhood change beyond clear story lines: What can assemblage and complexity thinking contribute to better understanding neighbourhood development?*

Neighbourhood research today is concerned with exploring and understanding two grand story lines of neighbourhood development: gentrification and decline. Coming from a post-socialist background, it has been our experience that many neighbourhoods have taken surprising and unpredictable shifts and turns. The prominent story lines of neighbourhood research, gentrification and neighbourhood decline seem tempting but too selective when making sense of these experiences. Given this context, this paper sets out to enrich the discourse on neighbourhood change, especially the strands concerned with so-called declining neighbourhoods, by starting from assemblage and complexity theories, which share an emphasis on processes, interdependencies, uncertainties, surprising shifts, and feedback loops in the production of specific spatial formations. We want to test whether such a focus is helpful for neighbourhood development research by examining the development of an inner-city district and a large housing estate in Leipzig as a postsocialist city. From a theoretical perspective, we will discuss what we can learn from the postsocialist context for the general thinking about neighbourhood change and its interpretation with help of conceptual approaches, e.g. through the use of assemblage thinking in addition to existing approaches.

Márton Berki (Eötvös Loránd University)

*Talking at cross purposes? Linguistic differences as barriers of conceptualising the post-socialist transition*

The linguistic turn of the social sciences, as well as its subsequent intellectual currents rooted in post-structuralism, found very limited resonance within post-socialist urban research, leaving the entire field almost untouched. Yet, linguistic differences might serve as barriers in the search for common grounds when conceptualising the complex spatialities and temporalities of the politico-economic transition. Contested terminologies including “transition”, “transformation”, “restructuring”, “regime change” etc. may differ from context to context, with their underlying notions rarely being questioned or deconstructed. Furthermore, mutual understanding is made even more complicated by English gradually becoming the academic lingua franca in Central and Eastern European capitalist semi-peripheries as well. Identifying these linguistic differences as
epistemological differences, I argue, should have been started much earlier – however, in order to gain a greater understanding of post-1990 processes, it is still not too late to begin.

Luděk Sýkora (Charles University in Prague)
One City, More Cities

I focus on three areas of inquiry. First, I deal with the exceptionality and universality of postsocialist cities within planetary urbanization. Are postsocialist cities exceptional or are their just bare instances of worldwide urbanization logic? These questions are at the start of dispute about the inputs of postsocialist urban studies to urban theory. Second, I discuss whether postsocialist cities are on one trajectory of urban change and development or whether we rather tend to observe multiple different trajectories. In other words, are postsocialist urban studies just a bare patchwork of variegated cases on a canvas of socialist past or is there something more between us to share in a common agenda? Finally, I move the scale of my focus on the internal life within postsocialist cities and ask how far postsocialist cities develop as integrated urban socio-spatial formations or whether they rather exhibit and are represented as discrete worlds of various phenomena.

Ondřej Mulíček, Robert Osman (Masaryk University)
Chronopolis: temporal concept of translocal place

The paper reflects the issues of place-based rhythmicity, urban temporality and more general relations between time and space. The research focus is linked to the work of Yi-Fu Tuan, Edward Relph and David Seamon, as well as to the studies of Mikhail Bakhtin, Henri Lefebvre and Mike Crang dealing with (urban) temporality.
We do not apply purely spatial conceptualization of place as many geographical concepts do. Place has been conceptualized here as a locality related to many other places through time or rhythm. The nature of place is defined not only by its physical settings. It is synchronized with other places through superlocal urban rhythms, defined by the contents, functions and meanings of other distant localities. The empirical part of the paper stems from the observation of numerous localities in Brno (Czech Republic) drawing the attention to the timespace concept of translocal place called chronopolis.
Ger Duijzings (University of Regensburg and LMU Munich)

Encircling a city in transformation: Bucharest’s centura and infrastructural changes at Bucharest’s periphery

This paper describes and analyses contemporary transformations of infrastructure at Bucharest’s periphery, focusing on the centura, the more than 70 km long belt around the city. The centura was created before socialism as a military defense ring, consisting of fortifications connected by a railway, later supplemented by a ring road. Maintaining its role as a defensive ring and symbolic boundary of the Romanian capital under socialism, some parts were upgraded in recent years in order to facilitate increased circulation, especially to the north where economic activity is concentrated. However, the ring mirrors the multiple contradictions of a post-socialist city, which are often stark at a city’s periphery. It is home to simultaneous and contrasting developments and newly emerging functionalities, all of which happens without much coordination and in ‘frictional’ interaction and juxtaposition, such as the privatization of land and assets, suburbanization, and the rise of gated communities, China markets, garbage belts, cemeteries, and related forms of securitization. The paper will provide an ethnographic portrait of the ring, and is based on empirical fieldwork research carried out intermittently around the ring over the last four years.

Anna Plyushteva (University College London)

Seats, stations, talk and water: Writing the history of the Sofia Metro through its everyday life

This paper originates in a research project focused on everyday practices of infrastructure use. In this paper, I would like to consider these practices in their broader spatial and temporal setting, by situating everyday urban travel in Sofia within the 45-year history of its (ongoing) Metro construction project.

The Sofia Metro was a major ambition of the local and national governments between 1970 and 2000 – and thus on either side of the ‘watershed’ of 1989. However, the Metro’s construction only made very slow progress until access to EU structural funds was eventually secured in the 2000s. In this paper, I discuss the role of the Metro in the everyday life of the Bulgarian capital, by examining how its pre- and post-1989 histories can be traced through its artefacts and technologies, and the mundane micro-practices of using them. Through this socio-technical perspective, I seek to attend to the way contemporary urban infrastructure in Sofia is impregnated with long-standing, non-linear, and contingent negotiations involving both human and non-humans.

The discussion is based on archival material from the Central State Archive and the Sofia City Archive, placed alongside qualitative data from expert interviews and participant observation, collected between 2012 and 2014.
Wladimir Sgibnev (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)

Post-Soviet biographies of public transportinfrastructures

The article analyses development trajectories of urban public transport systems in the former Soviet Union and discusses patterns and causes of success and decline of particular transport modes. Paradoxically, the so-called “electric” modes (that is, trams and trolleybuses – gorodskoj elektrotransport in Russian) were often the only ones to survive, in spite of costly infrastructures, an ailing energy supply and a rather bad image. At the same time, comparatively flexible and inexpensive publicly run bus systems almost completely disappeared in favour of privately run marshrutka minibuses. The reasons might lie in ideological, material and bureaucratic inertia, and particular local actor constellations, such as coalitions between public administrations and vulnerable strata of the populations. Following John Law, the article conceptualises transport systems as contingent yet fluid complex societal mobility phenomena. The concept of resilience serves as a framework for understanding the systems’ success and decline, which allows inserting this analysis of biographies of public transport infrastructures into a broader discussion on the role of infrastructures in socioeconomic transformation processes. Data is drawn from an online database on post-Soviet public transport systems, complemented by ethnographic research and expert interviews.

Andrew Ryder

Urban transport and metros in central-eastern Europe before and after 1989

Before 1989, a metro was viewed as a mark of successful urbanisation. In the socialist world, cities with over one million residents were thought to be metro-ready. Plans were drawn up for cities throughout central Europe, including Riga, Warsaw, Lodz, Krakow, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, Sofia, and East Berlin. Plans were also made for underground systems in Dresden and Bratislava, among other places. At the time, the main reason for travel was the journey to work, and most travel was by public transport. Since 1989, car ownership has exploded throughout the region, and concentrations of employment in a few large enterprises no longer exist. Bus services have become more important, and public transport more expensive. Despite this, underground rail systems have not only continued to grow in size, but they have also grown in number. Metros are currently being expanded in Sofia, Prague, Warsaw, Berlin, and Bucharest. New underground lines are being built of have been built in Budapest, Leipzig, Krakow, Berlin, and Lodz. Part of the reason is European Union funding. But, is this the best use of funds, or could transport investments take other forms? Several years ago, John Kain wrote about alternatives to the Atlanta metro, arguing that it was a wasteful investment which did little to increase transport use. Why is this not true today in central Europe? Could investment be spent elsewhere?
Irina Slepukhina, Isolde Brade (Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde)

*Two decades of transition: towards post-Soviet city systems*

The past two decades have seen the prominent reconfigurations of city systems in FSU countries. After the USSR dissolution the city system, which has been developed under conditions of a strict central planning system, was disintegrated into fifteen independent parts with dramatic consequences.

Recently, the urban systems of the post-soviet countries have slowly began adaptations to the conditions of new nationhood and globalization. However, there has been only a little discussion about the process of adaptation of the FSU city systems into new political and market conditions. The objective of the research is to explore transformations of the city systems in Russia, Belarus and Ukraine from a comparative perspective. On one hand, the study aims to understand to what extent and under what conditions various urban settlements have got development impulses. On the other hand, the research seeks to address how urban development paths differ between urban systems in selected countries.

Katarzyna Gorczyca (Jagiellonian University)

*Do the large housing estates change significantly - examples of the social transformation of selected estates in Poland*

It is estimated that large housing estates constitute about 35% of the housing stock in Poland. The problems associated with the changes in the demographic and social structure and stock ageing may cause the multiplication of social and spatial problems in such neighborhoods. The main aim of the study is to focus on the social structure of the residents of LHE indicating the main trends of change. The subject of the study are estates built from 1945 to 1990. The timeframe analyzed transformation defines turn of the century, focusing on the analysis of statistical data from 1988, 2002, 2007 and 2011, and questionnaires carried out in 2010-2012. Detailed studies have been carried out in 7 LHE in Poland in 5 cities (Poznań, Kraków, Tarnów, Dzierżoniów, Żyrardów). In the context of the neighborhood change the heterogeneity structure of the estates have been analyzed. The size and type of households, education, economic as well as employment structure of the inhabitants has been studied.

Dritan Rustja (University of Shkoder "Luigi Gurakuqi")

*Periurbanization proces in post-socialist Albania: with case studies*

This paper takes into consideration the process of peri-urbanization and peri-urban development in Albania, during the post-socialist period. It deals with a specific type of territory: the peri-urban areas, which are regarded as zones of transition between urban and rural settlements. Created primarily as a result of the recent wave of urbanization after 1990, peri-urban areas are a novel issue in Albania and little studied.
At first a general introduction of these areas is given, alongside the process of peri-urbanization in Albania in the historical context, comparing it with the other post-socialist countries. Also, in the analytical and comparative context, are treated the development patterns of the peri-urban area of Shkodra and Tirana after 1990. The paper concludes on giving some useful recommendations about the possible future of these areas in Albania.

Martin Šveda, Michala Madajová, Peter Podolák (Institute of Geography SAS)

Behind the suburban zone in the hinterland of Bratislava: evidence of diversity

The paper analyses the hinterland of Bratislava from the perspective of migrant structure and housing construction with the objective of identifying the basic dimensions of socio-spatial differentiation of suburban localities. Our analysis is based on unique individual migrant records, which have never been used before in the Slovak context. The processing of data is based on the approach of factorial ecology, which tries to discover the basic dimensions of socio-spatial structure and cluster analysis by means of which we are trying to identify similar clusters and categorise individual municipalities into relatively homogeneous units – suburban types. Results lead to some very interesting findings. Our paper tries to identify key factors that affect the formation of individual suburban zones and thus contribute towards a better understanding of processes that decisively form the socio-spatial organization of hinterlands in post-socialist cities today.
Kostyantyn Mezentsev (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv), Grygorii Pidhrushnyi (Ukrainian Academy of Sciences), Nataliya Mezentseva (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Suburbanizing Ukraine: from expanding problems to expanding development

This presentation discusses the diverse expressions of suburbanization that have emerged in the environs of Ukraine’s metropolitan regions. Based on a comparative analysis of existing and potential trajectories of suburbanization, we discuss suburban trends in the light of the literature on the transformation of the post-Communist hinterland, proposing a typology that captures the commonalities and diversities of the process in Ukraine. This typology includes (a) suburban-absorbed rural settlements, (b) “cottage” villages (some gated), (c) residentialized dacha settlements, (d) “internal” suburbanization, and (e) amplified Soviet-era satellite towns.

Katheryna Sehida (V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University)

The transformation of demographic structures in the post-communist city: an exploration in Ukraine’s second metropolis (Kharkiv)

The demise of the Soviet Union has been followed by a dramatic transformation of demographic patterns across the region. The changes have occurred on two levels: on the one hand, replacement-level fertility has fallen to low or “lowest low” levels, while adult mortality has risen, and on the other, the structure of households has started to change, echoing the tendency of a “Second Demographic Transition” that has been noted elsewhere in the post-socialist realm, most notably in Central Europe. As Ukraine’s second largest city, and as major post-socialist metropolitan area with a large and diverse labour market, Kharkiv offers a valuable laboratory to inform the literature on changing post-socialist urban demographies, representing an important example from beyond the horizon of the “usual” Central European cities. Accordingly, using a combination of descriptive and inferential methods applied on existing official statistical data, this presentation will critically evaluate the state of both demographic transitions in this city. Finally, during the past year, Kharkiv has emerged as a key city on the Ukrainian geopolitical faultline. One of the effects of this is that significant volumes of internally displaced persons from the Donbas conflict region have made their way to the city, introducing a new “transitory”(?) population segment. The latter will be discussed in short.
Michael Gentile (University of Helsinki)

A surprise of diversity wrapped in a blanket of deceitful monotony: the multiple social spaces of Soviet-era blocks of flats

A recent trend in the literature on post-socialist cities has involved the recognition of the socio-spatial differentiation present within the vast expanses of socialist-era blocks of flats. Far from being socially mixed mass housing, important differences in social structure appear to have developed over the course of the past few decades, and it may be surmised that these differences are powered by differences in relative location, transformed by market forces into different prices and rent levels. Accordingly, it makes sense to assume that inter- (and intra-)housing estate differentiation is most likely a product of Capitalism.

With almost 25 years gone since the demise of the USSR, challenging such an assumption is not an empirically straightforward task, but there are good reasons to revisit the role played by the socialist system, which is known to have created inequalities of its own. Using “immobile resident” subsamples (the majority of the population) extracted from survey data from Stakhanov (2009, n=3000) and Luhansk (2013, n=4000) – cities where residential mobility remained low until the very recent Donbas conflict – this paper runs three sets of comparisons of the social structures of Soviet-era housing estates: (a) of the full set of block-of-flats style mikrorayony within each city, (b) of identical blocks located in different parts of each city, and (c) of identical blocks located within specific mikrorayony. The results will show that, in a low mobility context, housing estate differentiation was inherited from the socialist period. Presumably, if the findings are to be applied to cities with greater residential mobility, “Capitalist” differentiation should be interpreted as a replacement of one form of difference by a new one rather than as the imposition of difference on a previously undifferentiated setting.

Anastasiia Mazurova (V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University)

Features of the territorial and functional organization of the big post-socialist city (on the example of the city of Kharkiv)

The city of Kharkiv is one of the largest economic, scientific and cultural centres of Ukraine. The modern urban territorial and functional organization of Kharkiv has difficult structure and demands research in aspect of public geography. The purpose of this scientific work is the social and geographical analysis of the territorial and functional organization of the big post-socialist city on the example of the city of Kharkiv.

The general characteristic of administrative-territorial division, population distribution in the city of Kharkiv, functional territory urban zoning was presented in this research. The most functional directions of urban development are revealed.

The result of research is detection of development features of an industrial, dwelling, landscape and recreational zone of the city of Kharkiv, as main components of the urban organization, and also creation recommendations for optimization territorial and functional organizations of the post-socialist cities.
Urban studies are almost exclusively dedicated to big cities – metropolises, agglomerations, first- and second order cities. But urban life expresses itself also beyond these types of settlements. For centuries, small towns have been the centres of rural areas, with economic, administrative and cultural functions for their surroundings and with a strong self-esteem of being urban. When rapid urbanization brought about a new quantity and quality of “the urban” in the 19th century, the city was increasingly considered as its normal expression. The small town, then, was needed to contrast the extraordinary speed, density and disruptions of the rapidly growing cities. In its famous essay “The metropolis and mental life”, Georg Simmel in 1903 referred to the small town and rural life in the same breath. On the other pole of the research continuum, rural studies always focused and still focus on the village as the seemingly “one and only” type of settlement in rural areas. Small towns are thus systematically excluded from research interests. Also in post-socialist studies, small towns are lacking research attention. The 6th CATference reflecting 25 years of urban change therefore offers an opportunity to shed light on fortunes and experiences of small towns in post-socialist countries.

Sorina Voiculescu, Ioan Sebastian Jucu (West University of Timisoara)

Living with/in dereliction: the case of small and medium sized municipalities in Timiş County, Romania

The process of redefining post-socialist urbanities raises fertile dialogues between scientists of different backgrounds. If transition is over, then urban capitalism doesn't look promising to populations with increased income disparities and poverty. Nor does it bring justice to increasingly disenfranchised urban communities. Those urban areas defined as small, were very often overlooked by funding agencies and the national government, resulting in the benefit of only very small interventions. This lack of attention from governments and disinterest on the part of researchers has created big opportunities for controversial actions. Such is the case of urban dereliction and the narratives of the ruins. This paper focuses on the dereliction of small and medium sized towns in Timiş County. It analyzes: Why and how did the urban ruins appear? How do the ruins intersect with local cultures and local ways of life? What are the tensions between dereliction and the agendas of local governments?

This contribution uses evidence from the Postdoctoral project, Neoliberalism and the Romanian post-socialist cities responses to the current urban development policies.

Project code: POSDRU/159/1.5/S/133391.

Annett Steinführer (Thünen Institute Braunschweig)

Marginalized or particularly resilient (or both)? Paths and current trends of small-town development in post-socialist eastern Germany

Almost all small towns in post-socialist Eastern Germany were characterized by strong economic decline, population losses and ageing in the post-socialist period. These socio-
economic trends are discussed as ‘small-town marginalization’ (Hannemann 2004) or ‘peripheralization’ (Bürk 2013), and they strongly contrast with the infrastructural and physical renewal, which is certainly a specific feature of the East German transition path in comparison with all other post-socialist countries. These decoupled developments led to a small-town landscape with a homogenized socio-demographic structure on the one hand and physical potentials due to structural vacancies on the other. In the recent past, these functional and physical vacancies were partly occupied by urban ‘pioneers’ and secondary residents. At present, it is increasingly the ageing of the rural areas surrounding small towns that leads to a selective reurbanization accelerating the decline of villages but strengthening the ‘excess importance’ (Christaller 1933) of rural small towns. The paper wants to give an overview of the distinct processes and discuss their outcomes in the light of the conceptual debates on marginalization/peripheralization, reurbanization and urban resilience.

Antonín Vaishar (Institute of Geonics, Czech Academy of Sciences)

Small towns – urban points and/or rural centres?

The paper analyses the position of small towns in the Czech settlement system. It deals with the definition of small towns, their geographical positions, demographic characteristics and function in the national settlement system. A typology of small towns is one of the results of the paper. The article discusses the position of small towns as part of the urban world and their position as a part of the countryside. It concluded that small towns are functionally important as rural centres. However, differences between urban and rural seem to be less important than differences among individual types of the Czech countryside (suburban, intermediate, inner periphery, borderland).

SESSION 6C: Teaching post-socialist urbanisms: potential, strengths, limitations

Round table
Organizer: Oleg Pachenkov
Moderator: Oleg Pachenkov
Room: Room 3 – Pravá Rýsovna

CAT as a network, its regular conferences, research and theoretical papers presented at it, and our routine daily research activity allows claiming the existence of “post-socialist urbanism” as a subject of research and theoretical activity for dozens of professionals. Therefore I would like to raise the question as follows: after “25 years of urban change”, can post-socialist urbanism be also a subject of teaching activity? What is needed for a subject to be taught? Empirical data? Theory? History and “school”, i.e. tradition? Institutional infrastructure, i.e. universities and faculty? It seems we have it all. But still hardly any university has a single course in “post-socialist urbanism”. If we produce knowledge, empirical data and results of its analysis, produce theoretical concepts and publish scientific texts based on these all – what prevents us from teaching this subject? When we have a series of books, papers and collections of papers on this subject – why a university course or even graduate or master or post-graduate program can/does not exist?

Speakers and audience will discuss the issues as follows:
- Shall we speak of “post-socialist urbanisms” in plural? Why yes/not?
- Are “post-socialist urbanisms” particular enough - among other types of “urbanisms” - to be taught?

- Can it be a sort of “regional urbanism”? Or be a part of - or an alternative to - the “north/south” division? Or shall “post-socialist urbanisms” be taught as a part of a wider subject of “post-totalitarian urbanisms”?

- The problem of the use of „western“ concepts in post-socialist urban studies.

- The challenge of use of critical thinking in teaching post-socialist urban studies, in particular in concern to the relations between academic research, public activism and involvement into politics

- What format can such educational program(s) have? What institutional structure can it rely on? Can we build cross-university programs (i.e. institutional collaboration) around this subject?

- More issues can be raised during discussion.

**MODERATOR**
Oleg Pachenkov (European University at St.-Petersburg)

**SPEAKERS**
Luděk Sýkora (Charles University in Prague)

Matthias Bernt (Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning)

Konstantin Axenov (St.Petersburg State University)

Nadir Kinossian (The Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)
In the debate on post-politics, the post-political city is part of a new phase in societal development characterized by politics of consensus and a loss of the political moment. The capitalist organisation of society is no longer questioned, governmental techniques privilege elites, experts assessments replace political debate, managerial and technocratic approaches to societal development come to the fore.

The impact of this debate on urban research has a focus on the western European experience questioning welfare state restructuring and neoliberal agendas. Eastern European urban societies, which experienced sometimes even stronger neoliberal agendas than their western European counterparts, are barely considered.

On the other hand, urban research and urban theory in Eastern Europe has rather neglected the analysis of "the political". In fact, policy analysis has played only a minor role within the search for conceptual positions. Most studies tend to view policies and politics from a local perspective by describing local features of urban policy making. Theoretical and in particular multi-scalar considerations about the role and the making of urban policy and policy in general are still missing.

Therefore we would like to invite discussants to a plenary session that seeks to extend the reasoning about the role of (urban) policy adressing the following questions/issues:

- If the end of state-socialism in the Eastern Bloc was a catalyst for this post-political condition, what is its impact on the post-socialist experiences?
- What kind of particular features, policy models and strategies determine post-political urban landscapes in Eastern Europe?
- What is the role of experts, consultants and their techniques in EE urban development?
- What characterises processes and techniques of policy making in eastern European cities? How do urban policy makers in Eastern European cities themselves perceive the political in their professional self-concept?
- What is the impact of supranational funding frames, e.g. EU funds, on urban policies?
- Which questions does urban research ask? Which questions are not adressed?
- Do we need to re-politicize urban theory in Eastern Europe?

Oleg Golubchikov (Cardiff University)

*Post-political or ideological?*

My contribution seeks to raise several arguments. For a start, it questions the merits of any gross conceptualisations around the “post-political” as too naïve to universally describe the conditions of post-socialist urbanism in all its manifestations. The highly politicised processes are often evident in the post-socialist urban landscape and indeed in the analysis of post-socialist urban experiences. However, the ideas around the post-political city, if applied in a nuanced and
particularized way, can be helpful in identifying particular conditions that have become ideologically engrained in (urban) policy and analysis. I will want to give two examples of these at two distinctive scales. The first, pertaining to the global scale, is the totalitarian function of the post-socialist project with respect to the intellectual closure of practical alternatives to neoliberal capitalism. Part of that is the debilitating ideological mist surrounding socialist legacies and taboos to depict state socialism favourably. The second, and pertaining to the urban scale, is the “naturalisation" of spatial segregation and gentrification in post-socialist discourses. In dominant research and practice, these conditions are taken for granted and seen as law-like processes – worthy of analysis, but void of ethical questioning, normative reasoning, and workable alternative strategy. Linked to that is my final argument that the community of post-socialist urban scholarship needs to cultivate a culture of critical peers that do not shy away from challenging each other's work and indeed the wider scholarship.

Stefan Bouzarovski (University of Manchester)
*The depoliticization of poverty: Governing energy vulnerability in post-communist cities*

In this presentation, I explore the relationship between dynamics of (de)politicization and the infrastructural and spatial assemblage of energy. I highlight the actors, interests and power relations discourses implicated in the entrance and proliferation of energy poverty concerns within the political and policy-making agendas of several ECE cities, currently encompassed by the EVALUATE project. Energy poverty can be seen as a situation where a household is unable to access a socially- and materially-necessitated level of energy services in the home. The presentation highlights the emergence of depoliticizing tendencies within urban initiatives at a multiplicity of scales – including the emergence of the ‘vulnerable subject’ and the technocratic mantra of energy efficiency policies. These are opposed to politicizing efforts within advocacy groups and transnational organizations alike.

Adam Radzimski (Gran Sasso Science Institute & Adam Mickiewicz University)
*Is pavement a political issue? On the understanding of local politics & policies in transition countries*

A pavement is not a political issue – similar statements can be heard often from the proponents of a non-political local government. Indeed, in the last years we observe a clear trend towards post-politics, particularly at the local level. However, it is very doubtful whether the local government can be purely non-political. In this discussion input I would like to reflect on the understanding of local politics and policies in the context of post-socialist transition, taking as example Poland, which I know best from my own experience. In Poland, a post-political perspective has been very widespread in the last years, not only at the local level, but also at the national one. However, some recent evidence seems to speak against this view. In particular, I would like to refer to local and regional elections that were held in Poland in the last year. In my opinion, after these elections the urban landscape appears to be somewhat more political and somewhat less managerial. Of course, it is too early to speak about that how long-term trend it would be, but in my input I would like to discuss the possible implications of that shift.
The aim of the talk is to overcome the (constructed) labels of “academia as Ivory tower” and “policy makers ignoring research” and to offer some ideas on how to make bridges between these two spheres. In this talk, I will reflect on my (i) academic education and research and (ii) recent experience as housing expert in the Agency for Social Inclusion, Office of the Government of the Czech Republic. Academic research on post-socialist cities is often focused on analysis of current state of cities, recent trends and causes of such changes, using a wide range of methods. Explanatory frameworks include seemingly non-political positivist approaches as well as more radical or critical concepts. Many challenges of recent urban change have been identified and explored. Beside this, policy making requires different kind of knowledge as well – knowledge on how to respond to identified challenges and achieve change. Issues of policy practice and policy making are overlooked in academic research. Better understanding of issues like multi-level governance, sectorial or area-based policy design or the role of leadership would improve communication between academic research and policy practice.

I will look back into the 1990s when the first efforts towards a democratic strategic urban planning were made. What is left from these initial enthusiastic ideas? I will reflect the experiences of Tartu, where I have participated in the strategy process both as a researcher as well as an elected member of the city council. It is increasingly complicated to perceive how, where and by whom the urban strategies are created. I will build my discussion on a few real-life examples. (1) I will explain how the process of absorbing EU-funding imposes hybrid forms of policy documents that do not always mesh with the regular planning process of the city. (2) I will explain how state and EU investments ensure unexpected but huge co-investment obligations for local budgets. (3) Based on some innovative governance initiatives I will illustrate where the “participative” today locates in the local planning. Is it possible (and needed) to (re)create some clarity in today's multi-scalar urban planning and policy formation process?

Urban shrinkage represents one of the major challenges across postsocialist Europe. Many cities are faced with massive population losses, the decline of their economic (industrial) base as well as the imprints of shrinkage in urban space (abandonment, decline in infrastructures) and society (selective outmigration, poverty, ageing). The analysis of how postsocialist cities respond to shrinkage, however, shows that here neoliberal and pragmatic strategies are followed in most cases. Shrinkage is poorly discussed as a problem of structural unevenness, a priority for national urban policymaking or a challenge that demands the involvement of many different voices but primarily as a local and temporal (economic) problem that has to be overcome by attracting new business and jobs.
Given this context, the statement takes the coping with urban shrinkage as an example to ask in a wider sense how in the postsocialist context the urban discourse can go beyond predominating neoliberal, pragmatic and locally-focused solutions and how the role of different actors participating in this discourse (at different scales) has to be re- or newly framed. The statement will also expand shortly on the role of the science/scientists for a reshaping of the urban policy discourse. The statement draws on research on postsocialist shrinking cities that has been undertaken since 2009.

SESSION 7C: Urban revitalization and new development projects
Chair: Ingmar Pastak
Room: Room 3 – Pravá Rýsovna

Ingmar Pastak, Anneli Kährik (University of Tartu)
Socio-spatial dimension of urban renewal in market-led city: the impact of public and private-led projects on neighbourhood's image, social networks, and sense of community

Urban renewal goes hand in hand with urban governance: the intertwined combination of public policies, local participation, and private sector initiatives help to force local development in a favourable direction. But what may be the outcomes when public authorities implement a weak role, there are no considerable strategic plans for urban renewal, or civil society has not yet been properly empowered? The current article analyses local socio-spatial impact of market-led flagship urban renewal in post-socialist context. The outcomes of studied urban renewal projects, besides place-marketing and improving neighbourhood’s image, are creating public and semi-public urban space, which has also socio-spatial impact on local neighbourhood – it encourages social life, brings more different groups to certain activities, strengthens social bonds, but also may lead to commercialization of urban social fabric. The paper is based on ongoing work under the EU-funded project DIVERCITIES (2013-2017).

Gábor Tolnai (Eötvös Loránd University)
Brownfields of Budapest from a new perspective

Similarly to many other post-socialist cities in CEE countries, numerous brownfield zones remained in the urban fabric of Budapest due to the decrease of industrial production during the transition. Market-based development has granted uneven possibilities of renewal for these zones.

The proposed paper examines the visible changes in the urban structure, by GIS- & Photogrammetry-based analysis. As specific resources, aerial photos let us explore the static morphological and environmental condition of the sites, while GIS gives the opportunity to analyse the dynamics of conversion. The second purpose of the paper is to search for the causes in urban planning documents and in published / implemented aims of investors. The common feature of the studied areas is their proximity to river Danube. The availability of waterfront is a well-known urban environmental amenity, nevertheless the degree of its exploitation is significantly diverse.
The objective of the paper is to identify and assess through analysis the role and position of the principal actors (coalitions) during the transformation of the Ostrava's broader city centre. Two flagship projects - Nová Karolina and the Lower Vítkovice Area - will be surveyed in depth. In the theoretical part will be discussed concepts of growth and grant coalitions, which will be further applied in the context of the Ostrava's broader city centre. As a concluding part will be discussed the possible effects of such projects, and the associated coalitions, for the future development of the city.