Chapter 1

Introduction:
The Development of Urban Movements
in Central and Eastern Europe

Kerstin Jacobsson

Grassroots activism in the urban setting is of general interest to social scientists. It is in cities where the most critical social conflicts of today play out and do so in the most visible fashion, whether in the form of riots in the suburbs of metropolitan areas, local protests in defence of the public interest or citizens' struggles related to everyday life. Conflicts in the city are not only a response to processes of urban restructuring and renewal, but also illustrative of larger processes of economic, political and social change. Urban grassroots mobilisations arise in response to the new social cleavages and increased polarisation as a consequence of neoliberalisation and globalisation processes as well as the transformation of state power and authority. Cities are a physical, cultural, political and socio-economic juncture; a microcosm of global economic forces in which different interests intersect, play out and compete. They are also the critical sites of contestation of these processes (e.g. Nicholls 2008; Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans 2013; Nicholls, Miller and Beaumont 2013). Thus citizen reactions in the urban context can serve as detectors of the critical issues and conflicts of our time.

This volume focuses on the recent waves of urban grassroots activism and the development of urban movements in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe and post-Soviet space (henceforth referred to as Central and Eastern Europe), a region which of course encompasses vast diversity.[1] The book responds to two gaps in the international research literature: the neglect of urban movements in this region within urban studies and the limited attention to urban grassroots activism by scholars working on civil society and social movements in these former state socialist – and today hyper-capitalist – societies. Thus, the volume aims to tie together the emerging research on urban grassroots activism with the existing literature on social movements and civil society mobilisation in post-socialist space. It explores what urban activism can tell us about the development of civil society in the region.

---

1   Thus, for the purpose of this volume, we include also Russia, Ukraine, the Baltic states and the ex-Yugoslavian states in 'Central and Eastern Europe', a region which is in itself a social construct with contested boundaries.

Secondly, the volume attempts to bring social movement theorising and urban studies closer together and cross-fertilising each other, as these research fields have tended to develop rather in parallel and with only limited interaction (Pickvance 2003). It aims to bring 'the urban question' closer to social movement studies and illustrate the usefulness of social movement theory in the study of urban movements in post-socialist Europe, Ukraine and Russia. This allows us to offer new perspectives on urban movements in this region. However, it is also argued that scholars on urban movements in other places in the world have much to learn from studying urban activism in this region; it forces us to widen our view of urban movements and acknowledge the variety of forms that contention takes.

Thirdly, the volume explores the extent to which the post-socialist legacy is still relevant and a defining factor (despite EU membership or candidacy, and over two decades of democratic transformation), whether it be in terms of types of activism, the coming together of different aggregations of citizens, or in terms of the particular political contestations and conflicts that reflect over 20 years of rapid economic liberalisation, state reform and transnational integration. Doing so allows us to assess and discuss the possible distinctiveness of urban activism in this social and political context, as well as its particular strengths and limitations in making an impact on people's living conditions or on public policies. Providing empirically detailed and rich case studies and using theories and methods from across the social sciences, the chapters in this volume capture the diversity and complexity of post-socialist urban activism.[2]

Urban Grassroots Activism and the Development of Post-Socialist Civil Societies

Scholars interested in urban movements have good reason to take an interest in what happens in Central and Eastern Europe. For any social scientist interested in social change and the collective action that it spurs, this region provides an excellent opportunity to test and develop social movement theory. In this region, recent decades have been marked by the liberalisation of housing and urban policy, often opening fully to market forces; and followed by problems such as inadequate state policies or urban planning, conflicts related to restitution and privatisation of property, the deterioration of the housing stock, insufficient production of social housing, rising rents and electricity prices, gentrification, the rise of gated communities and the co-existence of 'enclaves' of affluence and deprivation, and the privatisation and commercialisation of public space (e.g. Andrusz, Harloe and Szelényi, 1996; Van Kempen, Vermeulen and Baan 2005; Tsenkova and Nedović-Budić 2006;

Altrock et al. 2006; Stanilov 2007; Czepczynski 2008; Tsenkova 2009; Darieva et al. 2011; Polanska 2011; Hirt 2012). As this volume demonstrates, the laboratory of urban politics is richly illustrative of the complex nexus of state-society-market relations within post-socialism, but also of relevance in understanding the impact of neoliberalism elsewhere in the world. In few regions of the world have marketisation and privatisation been more pervasive than in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Unsurprisingly, this situation has brought about numerous protests among residents demanding urban policy changes, safe living conditions, sustainable housing, as well as citizen protests to protect green areas, mobilising against gentrification or against the privatisation and commodification of public space. The chapters in this volume explore the rich variety of forms of urban protest and the heterogeneous collectives presently engaged in urban activism across a number of the post-socialist countries. Some citizen mobilisations are spontaneous and short-lived while others are better organised and long lasting. Some are more reactive while others more proactive, some more progressive and others more conservative in their claims, some disruptive in their action while others – most in fact – are more moderate in their form of protest. What they have in common is that they challenge the present state of affairs and empower citizens on issues related to their daily lives. Most importantly, however, these types of grassroots mobilisation and activism force us to challenge some of the established knowledge on post-socialist civil societies, such as views of the 'weak' civil societies in the region (e.g. Howard 2003).

Civil society in Central and Eastern Europe has undergone tremendous changes over the past three decades: from the state-controlled associational life that existed to various extents in the countries during the state-socialist era to the Western-sponsored 'liberal' civil society that developed during the early years of political and economic transformation to today's more diverse civic life. It combines features from all these periods; the old associations which have meanwhile been reformed, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) of the Western type, local grassroots activism and wider, more spontaneous mobilisations enabled by social media and Internet calls for action, exist side by side and often in interaction.

Indeed, one of the most notable developments since the turn of the century is the resurgence of grassroots activism in the cities across Central and Eastern Europe. In contrast to the 'NGO-ised' civil society, developed during the first decades of political and economic transformation and supported by Western Europe and the US, this activism is domestically funded and grassroots-driven. It has developed in response to local problems and needs, while often being inspired ideationally by urban movements across the world. The international research literature, however, has paid scant attention to the development of urban movements in these countries (for some exceptions, see Làng-Pickvance, Manning and Pickvance 1997; Pickvance 1996; Pickvance 2000; Rink 2000; Tykanova 2012; Aidukaitė 2013; Ivanou 2013).[3] Thus far, the international

---

3   See also Kleman, Miryasova and Demidov 2010, Gladarev 2011.

research on civil society and social movements in Central and Eastern Europe has tended to focus on issue-based advocacy organisations of the NGO type (e.g. Mendelson and Glenn 2002; Narozhna 2004), mainly related to environmental issues, women's rights and minority rights (e.g. Flam 2001; Fagan 2005, 2006; Císař 2010; Císař and Vráblíková 2010; Torsello 2012; Jacobsson and Saxonberg 2013, 2015). These are the types of organisations that have been supported and sponsored from abroad.

We suggest that there are several reasons for the lack of scholarly attention to urban grassroots movements in the region. First, it is a rather recent development (most initiatives have developed since the turn of the century), thus representing a new phase in the development of post-socialist civil societies. Secondly, however, the lack of attention to grassroots movements in this region paid by urban scholars as well as general social movement scholars stems, at least in part, from methodological and theoretical choices and approaches. These types of local and low-key activism easily escape the researchers' lens when the focus is either on advocacy-organisations capable of lobbying policy-makers or catching media attention or on traditional protest events, such as mass demonstrations. In expecting social movements in the post-socialist context to follow the same repertoire of action and contention as, for instance, in Western Europe or North America, researchers risk missing out on important forms of collective action. Protest-event analysis suggests that local 'self-organised' civic activism, that is collective action mobilised without the involvement of an organisation, is the most frequent kind of civic activism in post-socialist Europe (e.g. Císař 2013a, 2013b, 2013c on the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Bulgaria). This form of activism is based on 'many events, no organizations, and few participants' (Císař 2013b: 143). Many mobilisations around the 'urban question' in the region would be of this kind.

Mass protests certainly happen in the region from time to time, as in the Euro-Maidan protests in Ukraine, the protest for fair elections in Russia, the mobilisations against the ACTA agreement in Poland or the anti-corruption and anti-austerity protests in South Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, as Císař's data indicate, other forms of activism are more prevalent, such as the 'transactional activism' performed by advocacy organisations on the one hand and the 'civic self-organised' activism of local grassroots on the other (e.g. Císař 2013a, 2013b, 2013c). However, even if the repertoire of contention of social movements in the region may partly differ from other parts of Europe (see also Flam 2001; Piotrowski 2013b), it does not mean that contentious action is not taking place or that such action would be ineffectual.

We argue that an overly narrow view of contentious action (defining it in terms of prevalence of traditional protest events, such as demonstrations) risks not capturing all relevant forms of contentious action and excluding much movement-relevant behaviour. An 'either-or view' of social movements – either they are engaged in contentious action or they become service organisations or self-help groups – is not helpful to understand collective action in this social context (if indeed anywhere); in many cases groups are engaged in both in

parallel (Jacobsson and Saxonberg 2013). An 'either-or view' is particularly ill-suited for understanding urban movements, as they typically transgress such dichotomies. Rather than 'either or', urban movements are typically 'both and', being multifunctional in nature, at once practically oriented and oppositional. Also, positioning urban movements as facing the choice of either co-optation or remaining radical and progressive is not helpful either, as also groups seeking collaboration with institutional actors often combine this with claim-making and contestation in different forms.

Consistent with our approach in a previous volume (Jacobsson and Saxonberg 2013), we argue that in order to understand the great variety in the goals, structures and strategies of movements in the post-socialist context, the specificities of this context must be taken into account and a wide view of contentious action be applied in order to do justice to the activism taking place. This resonates as well with Leitner, Peck and Sheppard's (2007) stress on the many forms that contestation of the practices or effects of neoliberalisation of the city can take. Indeed, an important research task is to see how different forms of contestation combine in urban mobilisation and activism.

As argued above, the resurgence of urban grassroots activism represents in part a new phase in the development of post-socialist civil societies. This is interesting for several reasons. The mobilisation of urban grassroots challenges the (still dominant) picture of the overly professionalised and advocacy-oriented NGOs as the main civil society actors in the post-socialist context as well as the frequently noted difficulties in mobilising grassroots in this region (cf. e.g. Henderson 2002; Mendelson and Glenn 2002). It supports the argument that assessments of the strength of civil society based on the numerical strength or organisational density of NGOs do not do justice to, or reflect in a fair way, the activity of actually existing post-socialist civil societies (e.g. Kopecký and Mudde 2003; Kleman, Miryasova and Demidov 2010; Ekiert and Kubik 2014).

Secondly, civil society activism in the urban context provides evidence of important institutional developments in civil society in the post-socialist countries, including the strengthening of the institutional structures of civil society and its relationships to public authorities in many countries of the region. For instance, the chapters of this volume illustrate the development of increased collaboration and the development of deliberative structures *within* civil society, such as the forming of umbrella organisations for community organisations in Lithuania (Aidukaitė and Jacobsson, chapter 11) and the informal Congress of urban movements in Poland (Polanska, chapter 9; Kowalewski 2013).

The chapters also reveal changes in the direction of more and structured cooperation between civil society and public authorities, the development of cooperation agreements and partnerships with local authorities in countries like Poland, Slovakia and Lithuania, and more participatory forms of local governance, such as the introduction of participatory budgeting in over 70 cities in Poland (Kraszewski and Mojkowski 2014), a couple of Slovakian cities (Bitušíková, chapter 10) as well as cities in Russia, Ukraine and Albania (Fölscher 2013).

What we see is a gradual increase in citizen participation in urban governance in parts of the region; more so in the countries which are members of or candidates to the European Union than countries like Russia or Ukraine (e.g. Grabkowska, Pancewicz and Sagan 2013).[4] While lessons from other parts of the world warn us that inclusion of urban movements in local governance may also have detrimental side-effects, such as the risk of co-optation and de-radicalisation of movements (e.g. Mayer 1999; Mayer and Künkel 2012), in countries which three decades ago were non-democratic regimes with limited opportunities for political participation available for citizens, the development is nonetheless noteworthy.

This development of civil society is all the more important as civil society in the post-socialist countries has been found to be institutionally underdeveloped, both internally and *vis-à-vis* policy-makers (e.g. Gliński 2006). The field of urban activism consequently allows us to update the views on civil society in the region and to qualify the 'weak civil society' thesis that has been so influential in the literature on civil society in Central and Eastern Europe and Russia (e.g. Howard 2003; Mendelson and Glenn 2002; Narozhna 2004).

The remaining part of the chapter is structured as follows: First we introduce our view on urban movements. Next, we discuss briefly urban transformation in the post-socialist cities and the development of urban movements in the region. Finally, we introduce the chapters' topics, clustered around four themes: 1) The negotiation of 'urban meaning' in the post-socialist context; 2) The 'urban' as a space for agency and basis for citizenship; 3) The role and challenges of alliance-building in urban mobilisation; and 4) The role of urban movements in urban governance in the region.

Studying Urban Movements

Looking back at studies of urban movements, Pickvance (2003) noted a relative isolation of writing on urban movements from writing on other types of social movements and from social movement theory.[5] One reason, he suggested, was that Castells' seminal work on urban movements (1978, 1983) had treated them as

---

4   Indeed, the partnership approach to civil society has been encouraged and supported by external donors, including the European Union (e.g. Fagan 2005 and chapter 11). The detrimental effects of the NGO-model on post-socialist civil societies have been thoroughly discussed in previous research (e.g. Henderson 2002; Mendelson and Glenn 2002; Sampson 2002; Narozhna 2004) as well as the consequences of resource-dependence in relation to either external donors or local policy-makers in terms of the moderation and de-radicalisation of claims (e.g. Fagan 2006).

5   Although there are of course notable exceptions from this, such as Cress and Snow 1996. See also the exploration by urban scholars of the spatialities of contentious politics (e.g. Leitner, Sheppard and Sziarto 2008; Nicholls 2008; Nicholls, Miller and Beaumont 2013).

sui generis and appeared to make a connection to social movement theory unnecessary. Pickvance (2003) identified some advantages with this relative isolation: a focus on effects in much of the writings on urban movements (whether improvement in public services, in people's lives or politically), an interest in political power (which enabled a productive debate about relations between urban protest and state authorities), and a focus on the political context in which urban movements developed. Nevertheless, Pickvance identified some negative consequences as well: it meant being cut off from general social movement theory, the process of mobilisation and identity creation was rarely studied, and a separation was established between studies of voluntary associations and their interaction with authorities and studies of urban movements. In this volume, we share the concern to try to bridge these fields; thus, the chapters draw on social movement theory while also drawing on insights from Castells' legacy.

For the purpose of this volume, we can define social movements as collective action efforts aimed at challenging the present state of affairs by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with the elites, authorities and/or opponents (cf. Tarrow 1998: 4; Jacobsson and Saxonberg 2013), acknowledging that the repertoire of collective action will differ in different contexts and may range from symbolic resistance to overt protest. Also, they do not have to be engaged in constant mobilisation to be considered social movements. We here side with Melucci's (1989) claim that social movements cannot be understood by looking just at their manifest side (protest events); we need to take into account their latent side (the networks in everyday life) too.

Our interest here is limited to urban-oriented movements, concerned with shaping the life in the city. This includes very different collectives and action forms, from countercultural squatters to neighbourhood associations or homeless movements. As Castells (1983) has argued, they share some characteristics in spite of their diversity: 1) They consider themselves urban, in any case related to the city (or the community) in their self-denomination; 2) They are locally based and territorially defined; 3) They mobilise around the three major goals: collective consumption (or public infrastructure), cultural identity, and political self-management (Castells 1983: 328; see also Rabrenovic 2009, Mayer 2006). The first goal is related to a city organised around its use value, as against the notion of urban living and services as a commodity, according to the logic of exchange value, including issues related to quality of life. The second goal refers to cultural identity, including the maintenance or creation of autonomous local cultures. Castells conceived of this as an orientation towards community. The third goal is related to a search for increasing citizen participation in local government and/or achieving urban (territorially based) self-management (Castells 1983). As the chapters in this volume illustrate, these dimensions and goals are still highly relevant in and characteristic of urban activism in the region under study.[6]

---

6   In this volume, we use the term *urban movement* for these types of city-oriented collective action (movements *of* the city rather than movements appearing in the city)

We also follow the tradition of Castells in seeing the city as a social product resulting from conflicting social interests and values. The early, Marxist-inspired studies of urban movements saw them as responses to contradictions and crisis tendencies in capitalism and the logic of capital accumulation on the one hand and the role of the state in reproducing the economic system and social order on the other (e.g. Castells 1978, Finquelievich 1981). Even if the Marxist legacy has remained less strong, urban movement researchers have continued to trace their emergence and nature to contradictions in capitalism and the logic of capital accumulation on the one hand, and the often related changes in urban planning and governance on the other (e.g. Mayer 1999). Thus, the new waves of urban protest over the past decades have been analysed in relation to the neoliberal restructuring of cities (e.g. Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer 2012; Künkel and Mayer 2012). Also the urban movements studied in this volume have in many ways developed in response to neoliberal restructuring of cities, the eroded service-provision and life-quality for large parts of the populations and the free reign of private investors and developers in shaping urban space.

Nevertheless, as Castells emphasised in *The City and the Grassroots*, collective action is not merely a response to systemic contradictions but also stems from people's experiences and meaning-making: 'Cities are living systems, made, transformed and experienced by people' (Castells 1983: xv). For several chapter authors, the experiential dimension is critical to understanding the urban activism developing (see also Hamel 2014), as well as the meaning-making practices in relation to life in the city, what could be conceptualised as the negotiation of urban meaning (cf. Castells 1983, Lefebvre 1996).

Urban movements display some distinctive features which should make them of particular interest to social movement scholars. Urban movements do not fit neatly into the conventional categorisation of 'new' (identity-based) social movements and the 'old' mobilisations around the 'social question'. Authors have pointed to an increasing amalgamation of 'new' social movements with 'old' social issues, such as poverty, social exclusion or homelessness, and where urban movements combine the concerns of old social movements with the utopias and action repertoires of the new social movements (Roth 2000, Pickvance 2003). For instance, urban activism often combines culture (painting, theatre, music) with pursuing material issues and concerns.

A feature related to this hybrid character of urban movements is the existence of cross-class alliances in local mobilisations (e.g. Castells 1983, Mayer 2000, Mayer 2013). Urban problems typically affect – albeit in various degrees – all classes, such as problems with environmental degradation or transportation affecting the

---

and not urban *social* movements, as Castells (1983) had it. For Castells, only movements achieving structural change qualified for being urban social movements (Castells 1983: xviii, 305; see also Finquelievich 1981). We prefer the capacity and outcomes of collective action not to be included in the definition of a social movement but to be open for empirical investigation in each case (cf. Pickvance 2003).

quality of life in the city (e.g. Finquelievich 1981: 242). Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer (2012: 7) speak of alliances currently being created between 'the deprived' (those who are immediately exploited, unemployed, impoverished, discriminated against in job or education, in ill health, etc.) and 'the discontented' (those who are disrespected, treated unequally because of sexual, political, or religious orientation or otherwise constrained in their capacity to explore the possibilities of life). Such new and sometimes unexpected alliances among heterogeneous collectives, such as between direct action activists, tenants' organisations, artists, academics and so on, are arising in Central and Eastern Europe as several of the chapters in this volume illustrate. A research theme to be explored is indeed the 'complications' entailed in the forming of multi-class alliances engaged in urban activism ranging from middle-class radicals and artists to socially marginalised groups. As Mayer has remarked, 'Though all of them are affected by contemporary forms of dispossession and alienation, they occupy very different strategic positions within the post-industrial neoliberal city' (Mayer 2013: 11).

With the gradual fading of the alter-globalisation movement, activist groups belonging to radical environments in many countries have turned to local, urban activism in defence of 'urban commons', with inspiration from Harvey (2012) and others (see Portaliou 2007, Mayer 2013, Jacobsson and Sörbom 2015). Also in Central and Eastern Europe, there has been a shift from transnational mobilisation to local, urban issues, along with mobilisations against fascism and racism (e.g. Navrátil and Císař forthcoming). Here, as elsewhere, anti-capitalist critique is pursued through the 'right to the city' activism, or inspired by Occupy, and deliberately in alliance with other citizen groups. This shift to the local – or rather glocal – has meant a targeting of power from below, in the micro-political processes in everyday life. This reorientation of radical activists towards issues related to everyday life and the urban environment has been a way to rethink and regain collective agency (Portaliou 2007, Jacobsson and Sörbom 2015). The notion of 'urban commons' has been instrumental in legitimising the shift in focus and action repertoire, and it has enabled more radical activists to connect both a wide variety of mobilisations and to relate to external others, such as ordinary local residents.

Recent studies of urban movements in Western Europe and North America have tended to focus on Reclaim/The Right to the City (e.g. Smith and McQuarrie 2012; Mayer 2009, 2012), the alter-globalisation movement, and Occupy or anti-austerity protest (e.g. Mayer 2013, Miller and Nicholls 2013). However, these types of protests – high-visibility direct action along with transnational collective action on a mass scale – should not divert our attention from the continued importance of local struggles related to everyday life. As also argued by Leitner, Peck and Sheppard, contestation can take many forms and the actual practices depend on the context in which contestants find themselves. While some types of action aim to explicitly challenge neoliberal institutions and ideology, other actions serve more to combat the negative local effects of privatisation and marketisation processes and moreover, neoliberalisation may be contested when it is not seen as

the main culprit but where other forms of injustices or oppression are seen as the main target (Leitner, Peck and Sheppard 2008: 13–14).

Devoting attention to activism taking place in less spectacular forms and more related to collective problem-solving in everyday life is also necessary to avoid a middle-class bias in the study of urban movements. To do justice to mobilisations by other classes or social groups, we have to acknowledge that these actors might not conceptualise their activism in the same ways as middle-class radicals and may display other emic understandings of their activism, such as in the case of the collective action performed by elderly people in Leipnik's case studies from Ukraine (chapter 4).

Activism taking place in relation to everyday life is arguably of particular importance in the post-socialist context. If we take seriously the claim that places are locations where identities are shaped and form a basis for collective agency (e.g. Nicholls, Miller and Beaumont 2012), the transformative potential of urban activism goes beyond the specific struggles. The local urban context provides an arena for the shaping of political subjectivities, and provides a path to gaining a sense of agency. This is particularly critical in the post-Soviet context, where the Soviet legacy has meant an atomisation of individuals and/or a strengthening of household or friendship ties rather than wider social relationships. Moreover, in countries like Russia and Belarus, overt political contestation and collective action are still a highly risky business. As argued by Clément (chapter 8), here urban space provides the most important arena for ordinary people to take the step into activism and for localised grassroots initiatives to gain in generality, solidarity and scale (see also Gladarev 2011).

Thus, this volume aims to disentangle the complexity of urban activism, covering a wide range of dimensions of action and contestation. But first we will describe briefly the context in which the urban movements develop and unfold.

Urban Transformation and Urban Movements in Central and Eastern Europe

Treating the countries of Central and Eastern as one region risks leading to an overly 'homogenised' view given their huge differences in political openness and institutions, reform trajectories and civil societies. Some authors even argue that the very labeling of these societies as 'post-socialist' or 'post-communist' several decades after the political and economic transformation represents a way of 'Othering' them, implicitly conveying assumptions about 'backwardness' and processes of 'catching-up' with the West (e.g. Buyandelgeriyn 2008, Mizielinska and Kulpa 2011).

At the same time, the radical transformations of these societies – socio-economically, politically and in terms of urban development – give rise to some distinctive features – if not so much in the direction of change as in its pace and scale. The political change from state socialism to market liberalism was

implemented in a few months, even if institutional adaptation took some more years (e.g. Kornai 2008). Even if the built environment is changing more slowly, both the rate and the scale of change have meant a radical transformation of post-socialist cities (e.g. Andrusz, Harloe and Szelényi 1996; Tsenkova and Nedović-Budić 2006; Altrock et al. 2006; Stanilov 2007; Czepczyński 2008; Borén and Gentile 2007; Darieva, Kaschuba and Krebs 2011; Grubbauer and Kusiak 2012).

The main direction of urban restructuring has been a transfer of assets, resources and opportunities from the public to the private sector on the one hand, and the decentralisation of political responsibility to the local level on the other. The decentralisation relieved state budgets of the costs for housing, services, etc., tasks for which municipalities were ill-equipped financially and which led local authorities to sell out real estate to private interests on a massive scale (e.g. Harloe 1996, Pickvance 1996, Stanilov 2007b). Such privatisation has in turn exacerbated differences in terms of ability to pay among groups of citizens. Moreover, municipalities initially imposed few restrictions on private investors and developers. The policy of privatisation through restitution of urban land and dwelling units to their former owners is distinctive to post-socialist privatisation (albeit not in all countries), and has strongly impacted on the reduction of public space in the post-socialist city (Harloe 1996, Stanilov 2007). As put by Stanilov:

> From high-density, monocentric settlements, dominated by high-rise public housing and communal modes of transportation, the CEE cities are being transformed into sprawling, multi-nodal metropolitan areas reaching extreme levels of privatization of housing, services, transportation, and public space. Privatization has become 'the leitmotiv of post-socialist urban change'. (Stanilov 2007b: 7, quoting Bodnar 2001: 7)

While processes of privatisation have of course taken place in the West as well, these adjustments in the urban patterns have been taking place much more gradually. Moreover, urban development in the West has been more strongly guided by public planning and negative effects mitigated by public policies. The post-socialist countries, on the other hand, moved from central planning to a haphazard and chaotic urban development following a permissive 'laissez faire' during the first 15 years of economic transformation (e.g. Harloe 1996, Stanilov 2007c). It was not until around the turn of the millennium that new master plans were developed for most capitals and major cities (Stanilov 2007c: 416), and citizen voices began to be heard in urban development and governance in the region (e.g. Van Kempen, Vermeulen and Baan 2005; Swianiewicz 2007; Sagan and Grabkowska 2013; Bitušíková, chapter 10).

Post-socialist transformation has meant a considerable migration from small de-industrialised towns to urban centres (or abroad), which has led problems of 'shrinking cities' (Kaase, Grossmann and Rink 2013). Most importantly, it has meant a significant socio-spatial restructuring of cities; a sub-urbanisation where

investments have been concentrated to the suburban outskirts, where new shopping centres, office parks and new residential areas for the emerging upper and middle class – often behind gates – have been produced, along with the revitalisation of city centres and accompanied by gentrification processes. The inhabitants of other areas of the cities have instead experienced a deterioration of the housing stock, rent increases and thus problems with the affordability of housing, inadequate service-provision, environmental degradation, etc. The intensification of inequalities in the post-socialist city is reflected in its spatial forms. Gated housing – and what Hirt (2012: 50) speaks of as escalation of 'enclosure'– has in a short period of time become one of the hallmarks of the region (e.g. Bodnar 2001, Blinnikov et al. 2006, Polanska 2011, Hirt 2012) along with speculative investments and commercialisation of city centres.

The capitals and larger cities in the region are actively participating in the game of city branding (e.g. Czepczynki 2008, Lisiak 2010) as a way of attracting investments, positioning themselves as creative cities in the global economy and the inter-urban competition. Just like cities of Western Europe or the US, the larger cities of the region are engaged in promoting mega events, festivalisation, exploitation of cultural capital for economic ends, 'all of which require a sanitation of urban space for the purposes of consumerism, tourism and "work-play" environments for the desired clienteles' (Mayer 2013: 9).

However, as Stanilov (2007c: 8) has remarked, the two patterns – the socialist and the post-socialist – coexist, as layers of new development are superimposed on the old urban fabric. This leads him to conclude that the post-socialist cities of Central and Eastern Europe:

> have the urban vitality of the Western European inner city neighborhoods; the degree of privatization of urban resources typical of North American cities (not to mention the fascination with the lifestyle culture of malls, suburban houses, and private automobiles); an eroded level of public service provision characteristic of Third World countries; and the booming economy of the East Asian cities from the 1970s and 1980s. (Stanilov 2007b: 12)[7]

Thus, while the cities in the region display common patterns of neoliberal urbanisation (consumerism, gentrification, gating, privatisation of public space), the changes they have experienced have been sharper and more abrupt: The development has taken place 'more coincidentally than sequentially – "everything at once"' (Mizielinska and Kulpa (2011: 15). Thus, to borrow Koselleck's expression (1985: 94), the 'contemporaneity of the uncontemporaneous' is manifested in the urban environment, reflecting the post-socialist complexity.

Another aspect of the complexity of post-socialist societies is the co-existence of rapid change with the salience of 'old' practices and informality, including

---

7   Since then some countries of the region have been severely hit by the economic crisis while others are still prospering.

what Smith has called the co-existence of commodified and non-commodified practices and reciprocity; along with markets, the informal economy continues to be of critical importance for survival and everyday life, building on individual and household resourcefulness and exchanges of goods and services within alternative economic practices (Smith 2007: 217; see also Hirt 2011, Stenning et al. 2010).[8] These practices have served as coping strategies during as well as after state-socialism (Mazurek 2012). (See, for instance, Leipnik's analysis of the dacha mutual self-help communities, chapter 4). Thus, the unevenness of marketisation and neoliberalisation in the region needs to be stressed (e.g. Grubbauer and Kusiak 2012b).

The 'time-compressed manner' in which the post-socialist city has developed (Hirt 2011: 72) also means that the trajectory of urban movements is partly different in the region as compared to Western Europe and the US, where much of the theorisation of urban movements has taken place.[9] Urban movements do not have a long history in the region but in a few decades have developed into the liveliest field of civic activism. Activism in cities during especially the latter years of state-socialism was rather related to environmental issues (e.g. Deelstra and Yanitsky 1991; Làng-Pickvance, Manning and Pickvance 1997). Although organs of public self-management and housing cooperatives existed in the Soviet Union from the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Andrusz 1992, Shomina 1999), it was not until after regime change that organisations independent of the state developed. Housing movements developed in the late 1980s and 1990s as a response to new stakes in the post-socialist city, such as housing privatisation and homelessness, as emphasised by Pickvance (1996: 265, 1994). Likewise the many community organisations in post-Soviet space (Shomina 1999, Aidukaitė 2013) have been formed in response to the poor infrastructure and the reduction of common space (green areas, playgrounds, sports facilities) in many residential areas. Moreover, neighbourhood mobilisations against new construction, infill development and 'compaction' practices (e.g. Ivanou 2013, Sovsun 2013) have developed in response to haphazard city development. Mobilisations in defence of cultural heritage and against large spectacular urban development projects, such as entertainment complexes and mega-events are also frequent (e.g. Dixon 2010) as well as anti-gentrification activism but also such activism that tends to spur gentrification, such as artist collectives and architect-led cultural activism (Jonson 2015).

---

8   Moreover, in some countries more than others, the new formal democratic and market institutions established in the 1990s became 'enveloped in informal practices', as Ledeneva has put it in her work on Russia (2014: 16, 2006), including the formally independent judiciary and private property rights.

9   For instance, as compared to the phase model developed by scholars working on urban policy and urban movements in Western Europe and the US, which has emphasised the move from fordist to post-fordist economies and the accompanying changes in city policies, urban governance and the relationship between city authorities and urban movements (e.g. Mayer 2012, 2013).

Squatting in the region has developed since the mid-1990s, both in response to the supply of empty houses (due to unclear ownership rules or decaying city centres) and demand (for housing needs or countercultural activity). In the Visegrad countries, squatting has been closely connected to the anarchistic environments and the hardcore and punk rock scenes (e.g. Císař and Koubek 2012, Piotrowski 2014). In some countries, such as Lithuania, massive housing privatisation has caused squatting to almost disappear, while it is still rather prevalent in, for instance, Poland: the country hosts one of the most long-lived squats in Europe (Rozbrat in Poznań, started in 1994), functioning also as a centre of resistance to neoliberal city policies. New leftist and anarchist groups pursuing anti-capitalist activism are currently visible in countries like Russia, Poland, Ukraine, Czech Republic and the Balkan states. Another popular form of action in the region is Critical Mass biking (see Kopf, chapter 5) and urban (sometimes guerilla) gardening.

A challenge for the new left in the region has been the strong anti-communist frames and discredit of the 'old left' in public discourses (e.g. Piotrowski 2013b). Radical activists have been more inclined to identify with anarchist than leftist ideologies, embracing an anti-hierarchical and participatory culture. This sub-cultural basis has enabled them to pursue a critique of elites and NGOs alike (e.g. Piotrowski 2013a). Nevertheless, in Poland, squatters have become major players in housing and urban activism, joining hands with tenants' organisations in pressuring local authorities (see Polanska, chapter 9, Polanska and Piotrowski 2015).

Overall urban activism in the region tends to be small-scale and either related to everyday life in the neighbourhoods or connected to the sub-cultures. Action repertoires, also of the radical activists, tend to be peaceful, in the form of Do-It-Yourself (DIY) activism, culture jamming and challenging dominant discourses in consumer society in playful and in-offensive ways (see Lindqvist, chapter 2). Protest in the carnival form, using humour, draws on a tradition from the situationist-inspired Orange Alternative (Piotrowski 2013a, Kenney 2002) while also being inspired by adbusting and similar actions elsewhere. The general pacifism of new social movements, especially in Central Europe, is also a legacy of Solidarity as well as influential 'dissident' thinkers such as Adam Michnik, Václav Havel and György Konrád. These authors were also influential in promoting the stance of 'anti-political politics', favouring an ethical rather than political understanding of civil society, the pursuit of political ends by non-political means and the shunning away from all institutional politics (e.g. Celichowski 2004). Nevertheless, the anti-political sentiments among activists in the region also stem from experiences of corrupt and repressive authorities.

While increasingly many groups across the region question and mobilise against the neoliberal policies and practices, drawing inspiration from struggles across the world, urban mobilisation and activism – reaching beyond the countercultural activist groups – face a number of challenges in the post-socialist context.

It can be argued that if most countries of the region today represent hyper-versions of global trends such as neoliberal urbanisation, this is not so much

despite as *because* of post-socialist legacies, which rather tend to reinforce these processes. Neoliberal, individualist subjectivity, for instance, goes very well with the anti-collectivism that followed from the state-socialist experience. As Hirt has argued: 'socialism did not obliterate the private; it obliterated the public – not as an institution but as an *ideal* … In inflating but debilitating the public, besieging the private, and erecting a firm, cruel border between them', socialism paved the ground for what she calls the post-1989 privatism (Hirt 2012: 22). While sharing many features of 'privatism' in North America or Western Europe, including a weakened state, a transfer of assets and responsibilities from the public to the private sector, and a declining appeal of collectivist narratives, Hirt argues that 'post-socialist privatism' also has its own, locally embedded dynamics: its rootedness in the state socialist attempts to subdue the private realm and the failure to establish a viable non-corrupt public realm after 1989 (Hirt 2012: 27). Somewhat paradoxically, post-socialist legacies 'hook' into, reinforce and amplify individualism and facilitate the pervasive expansion of market rationality in post-socialist Europe and Russia.

Other challenges that collective action in this social and political context needs to overcome include:

- A remaining public–private divide, with a marked border between the private/domestic sphere (family and friendship networks) and the institutional-official sphere, developed during the state socialist time (e.g. Howard 2003);
- The fact that citizens have historically been detached from decisions that affect them and tend to be disillusioned about policy-makers and authorities' capacity or interest in solving their problems;
- A mistrust also of collective action, and the preference for individual coping strategies or reliance on families and personal networks (Gliński 2004, cf. Pickvance 2001), also related to low levels of generalised trust in society;
- The fact that expenditure responsibilities of local governments greatly exceed their revenue capacity, and the lack of transparency, for instance regarding decisions about urban development (e.g. Fölscher 2013);
- The unresponsiveness or resistance of local (and national) authorities and officials to listening to the voices of citizens; and
- The recent growth of the policing and repressive apparatus (in some countries more than others), from private security companies patrolling the urban public spaces (contracted by the local authorities) and the proliferation of video surveillance, to the establishing of riot police forces and the growing numbers of gendarmerie officers (e.g. Juska and Woolfson 2012).
-

In addition, the multiple social cleavages (class, generational, rural–urban, secular–religious, ethnic – in some countries more than others) and the intensified social polarisation in the formerly relatively equal societies compound the

challenge of collective action. Social polarisation is reflected in stigmatising public discourses on the losers of the transformation as 'post-communist leftovers' failing to profit from the new opportunities and adapting to the new times (e.g. Buchowski 2006, Hryciuk and Korolczuk 2013, Polanska 2014). A challenge then is to develop positive identities conducive to mobilising collective action rather than responding with individualisation and internalisation of responsibility or shame. Place-based identities and politicisation of everyday life realities prove conducive to doing precisely this, as the contributions to this volume show.

Introduction to the Volume

The case studies in this volume cover a wide range of urban activisms, from groups engaged in housing and neighbourhood-based activism, to cultural heritage defence movements, the 'right to the city' activism and countercultural, autonomous activists. They illustrate the complexity and multiple roles and functions of urban activism: engagement in practical, collective problem-solving, empowering individuals in relation to their everyday life concerns *and* challenging societal consensus and dominant codes at the most fundamental level, the symbolic one (cf. Melucci 1985). Representing urban grassroots movements, they provide a much-needed corrective to the (still) predominant picture of a weak, passive and NGO-ised civil society in the region. Moreover, the volume includes studies from severely under-studied places and countries, such as Kaliningrad, Ukraine, Lithuania, Slovakia, Romania and Serbia. Below we identify a number of common themes across the chapters, as a way of introducing the chapter topics and perspectives.

The Negotiation of Urban Meaning

Rather than asking what tangible outcomes urban activism may achieve, a number of chapters set out to explore the social meaning of urban activism in the post-socialist context. As Czepczynski has argued, the cultural landscapes of Central and Eastern Europe are liminal in Victor Turner's sense of the word: not socialist any more but not liberated from the burdens of the past either, 'sandwiched in between things they want to remember and things they would be happy to forget' (Czepczynski 2008: 182).

Restoring and re-negotiating urban identity and meaning always implies memory practices of commemorating and rejecting; it means a selective appropriation of local heritage and history, and placing the historical elements in a current narrative and projection of the future (e.g. Czepczynski 2008; Czaplicka, Gelazis and Ruble 2009; Lisiak 2010). For most of the urban activists studied for this volume, this means both a rejection of the state-socialist past and the old socialist iconographic landscape features *and* a rejection of the neoliberal city and of neoliberal individuality and symbolism. While activists can unite in rejection,

uniting behind a positive model and narrative of the city turns out to be more complicated, however.

The countercultural and autonomous activists in Vilnius studied by Lindqvist (chapter 2) refuse any 'fixation' of identity; they practice place making in ways which allow for multiple identity formations without demanding ideological unity, and deliberately attempt to make the boundary between participants and spectators in their public actions become fluid. Their playful street performances entail re-interpreting and appropriating a heritage of folk forms, figures and practices and loading them with new meaning to raise critical consciousness, mobilise people and form oppositional identities, rejecting – and opening up alternatives to – neoliberal individuality. Rather than trying to recruit members or making direct claims to the authorities, their aim is to disrupt the discourse of neoliberal policies in Vilnius in playful and non-violent ways. In doing so, they re-appropriate and re-create the city (cf. Lefebvre 1996).

The cities in the region and their inhabitants negotiate the present in relation to the past as well as the future. This includes a striving to find their unique place in the centre of Europe. As argued by Gelazis, Ruble and Czaplicka, 'Preservation, restoration, reconstruction, and new construction are all means of reorienting the postcommunist city and lending it an image or character linking it with either historical or modern concepts of "Europe"' (Gelazis, Ruble and Czaplicka 2009: 342). In distancing themselves not only from the state socialist past but also from the market hegemony entailed in economic transformation process, some urban movements draw on their pre-socialist cultural heritage as symbolic resources through which critique of the present can be pursued. The architectural heritage protection movement in Bucharest, studied by Florea (chapter 3), came to choose the image of Bucharest as 'little Paris' as the main symbol and future-oriented narrative of the city. This choice of framing, however, made the initial cross-class alliances increasingly complicated and meant a gradual boundary-drawing where the Roma and other marginalised groups came to be seen as 'unfit' in this urban vision. A similar development has been described by Sovsun (2013) in her study of the 'anti-construction' movement in Ukraine, which initially united 'right to the city' activists, neighbourhood organisations and architects, but which ended up being increasingly 'taken over' by right-wing and nationalist groups, attracted by the defence of national heritage.

As Tykanova and Khokhlova's analysis shows (chapter 7), some activist groups in St. Petersburg have chosen to appeal to the historical significance of their neighbourhood as a symbolic resource in their struggle, while other groups have rejected such framing as irrelevant and sentimental and instead opted for more 'rationalist' frames. That the urban symbolism is highly contested is illustrated by Leipnik's case study of a recent installation of a monument of Joseph Stalin and its defence by war veterans in the city of Zaporizhia, Ukraine, revealing generational cleavages and, arguably, mutual misunderstandings of the social motives of different generations of citizens (chapter 4). Leipnik's analysis of a number of types of urban activism performed by elderly in Ukraine seeks to disentangle not

only the social meaning but also the social role of the elderly's activism, showing their contribution to the public good and to social solidarity and cohesion, but easily mistaken for self-interest or backwardness due to their choice of ideological framing (old leftist) and the different life experiences and interpretations of history across generations in post-socialist Ukraine.

Heritage preservation and 'progressive modernism' are thus both seen as cultivating a modern identity (cf. Gelazis, Czaplicka and Ruble 2009: 10), rejecting some parts of the past, reclaiming others. Several of the chapters reflect the post-socialist contradictions – marked by the nostalgia for an idealised historical era before socialism combined with an idealised vision of the Western cities and societies on the one hand – and between negotiating a place in Europe and the world and yet with a distinct national and local identity, on the other. Finding one's place within a European 'normality' paradoxically implies a movement both 'back to normal' and 'onwards to normal' (cf. Lindström 2012). For instance, Kopf (chapter 5) shows that biking activism in Belgrade takes place against the background of a sense of societal crisis in Serbia and the longing for 'modernity'. Their activism illustrates the ambivalence of wanting simultaneously to nourish a 'different' identity, contesting the meaning of European modernity (including automobile culture and consumerism), and yet becoming 'more like' Western Europe. Furthermore, biking activism provides a form for pursuing a social critique and articulating the 'right to the city' without being associated to 'dirty politics'. This reflects the 'politics of anti-politics' as a common feature of urban activism in the post-socialist context. The Belgrade biking activists make clear demarcations not just *vis-à-vis* institutional politics and the NGO sector but also in the relation to other forms of – what they perceive as – 'political' activism such as LGBT activism.

Also the 'right to the city' and other new left activists in Croatia and Serbia that Bilić and Stubbs study (chapter 6), see the NGO form as irrelevant and often antithetical to their *modus operandi*, and express profound distrust of 'dirty politics'. This wave of grassroots mobilisation represents a local expression of wider global movements, including the World Social Forum and the Occupy movements. While not necessarily framing their activism in urban terms, but rather in terms of class divisions and solidarity, they still draw on an urban–rural distinction prevalent in the ex-Yugoslavian, post-war context. The 'urban habitus' is seen as synonymous with humanistic and cosmopolitan ideals in contrast to the 'peasant mentality' of patriotism and national pride. Nationalism – whether contested, embraced, or present as a 'structuring absence'[10] – is a marked feature of urban activism in the region.

---

10   That is, not talked of but always present and consequential (cf. Skeggs 1997: 74 on class).

The 'Urban' as a Space for Agency and Basis for Citizenship

Czepczynski (2008: 182) has argued that: 'The reconstruction of the civic significance of urban space is among the most important tasks in front of post socialist societies'. The civic activism and urban movements represented in this volume are as good signs as any of such a reconstruction going on across the region. In fact, the urban context proves to be highly conducive to the fostering of civic outlooks and identities and claiming the right to influence public policy, thus serving as a renewed basis for citizenship in this social context. As Kopf as well as Bilić and Stubbs shows, the positive self-definition of the urban, educated, civilised citizen (*građanin*/*građanka*), literally 'of the city', serves as a basis for raising demands and claiming rights in the post-Yugoslav context – without having to be associated with the 'corrupt' sphere of institutionalised politics.

Clément, in her analysis of a city-wide protest movement in Kaliningrad (chapter 8), starts off from a life-world perspective of the post-Soviet citizen. She investigates the process by which 'ordinary people' (*obyvateli*) with no prior experience of activism take the step into protest. In a social and political context as unconducive to protest as Russia currently, such steps into collective action are not something that follows readily from grievances but something that needs to be explained. Clément's analysis points to social-cultural mechanisms occurring in everyday life as well as the relational mechanisms at work in network-building and the up-scaling of contention. Clément also takes issue with the frequent association of ordinary people's practical concerns with particularistic claims or NIMBY (Not in My Backyard) reactions. Practical concerns are often a natural and appropriate starting point for protest but, as her analysis shows, during the course of protest in Kaliningrad, a generalisation of claims took place as well as a process of enlargement of scale from small scale protest to a city wide mass mobilisation. Individuals with no previous experience of activism even became protest leaders.

Taking practical action thus means a regaining of individual and collective agency, serving as a future basis for citizenship, which is of particular importance in post-authoritarian, low-trust societies. Such processes are more empowering and transformative than immediately evident and thus their importance goes beyond the concrete mobilisation and its tangible outcomes. We could conceptualise this as a process of 'political becoming' (cf. Gunnarsson Payne and Korolczuk 2014), of democratic subject-formation and the gaining of a sense of agency and political efficacy. This includes acquiring a different way of looking and seeing (cf. Norval 2006) and of relating to others, grounded in (embodied) experiences of activism, collaboration, victories and losses. Having acquired such as sense of self and of being agents of change, citizens turn into *potential* future activists, opening up new horizons of expectation and thus potential future action space (cf. Koselleck 1985); in other words, also seemingly small steps may be loaded with potentiality and force.

That politicisation of the practical issues related to everyday life and mobilisations at the neighbourhood level seem particularly appropriate for these types of process, opening up new spaces for collective agency, is also illustrated in Aidukaitė and Jacobsson's study of community organisations in Lithuania (chapter 11). Especially in a post-Soviet context, such mobilisations are critical to the building of community relationships and – gradually – more generalised social trust (Kleman, Miryasova, Demidov 2010), and to escape the low trust 'trap' of post-socialist civil societies (cf. Sztompka 1993).

The Role and Challenges of Alliance-Building in Urban Mobilisations

In Central and Eastern Europe, as elsewhere, increasingly many and diverse groups can unite under the banner 'Cities for people, not for profit (cf. Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer 2012). Polanska studies how tenants' organisations and squatters in Warsaw have joined forces in defending tenants' rights and in placing demands for voice and participation on urban matters on local authorities (chapter 9). Thus, while previous studies of urban movements in Eastern Europe in the 1990s (e.g. Rink 2000) have pointed to the relatively few connections between initiatives of different kinds – such as tenants' mobilisations, artists and urban culture activists, ecological and social development initiatives and squatters and countercultural scenes – explicit attempts to link these are ongoing in the region. The most notable initiative is the congress of urban movements in Poland, held annually since 2011, an informal coalition of activists and associations in an explicit attempt to coordinate collective action, overcome the fragmentation of urban movements and effectively pressuring policy-makers for change in urban policies (e.g. Kowalewski 2013; Grabkowska, Pancewicz and Sagan 2013).[11] Here, as elsewhere, this assemblage of local struggles has been inspired and enabled by notions of 'urban commons' (Harvey 2003, 2012) and the 'right to the city' (cf. Lefebvre 1996).

The non-violent repertoire of contention characteristic of new social movements in Central and Eastern Europe (see also e.g. Kenney 2002, Jacobsson 2012, Piotrowski 2013a), including the anarchist activist-milieus, is an enabling factor in the forming of such diverse 'rainbow' alliances. The autonomous activists studied by Lindqvist are rather typical in believing that pacifism is the only viable way of struggle in a society with populations that are sceptical of participating in protests and consider violent behaviour to be 'uncivil'. Their protests are contentious and transgressive, yet strictly pacifist.

Authors have pointed out that uniting around demands rather than interests may be a way to achieve multi-class alliances (Jezierska 2011, drawing on Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Similarly, Jessop and Sum (2012) argue that focus on class relevance of social identities rather than class interests assists alliance politics.

---

11   Another attempt to 'gather' diverse local struggles and bring groups together is the Congress of Women in Poland.

However, as several studies in this volume show, while radically diverse groups can unite against the favouring of exploitation interests in neoliberal city policies, the positive and future-oriented visions prove to be more divisive, raising the issue of who fits in the urban vision and who does not. The vision of preserving the city heritage may come into conflict with defending the 'right to the city' for all citizens and solidarity with the poor, as in Florea's study of Bucharest, where the poor Roma families inhabiting a squat in the attractive city centre came into conflict with the cultural capital and visions of the artists, architects and academics concerned with cultural heritage and the cultural identity of the city. This illustrates well Mayer's (2012, 2013) argument that the new 'creative city' policies, which see (sub)cultural milieus as assets and make use of them in their branding strategies, readily introduce tensions and may cause splits among urban movements. Parts of the movement risk being co-opted or partly integrated into this neoliberal urban model while other segments risk to be marginalised or even criminalised (e.g. Mayer 2012).

In societies as marked by urban-rural cleavage as those of Central and Eastern Europe, the 'urban habitus' also becomes a demarcation device and claim to superiority in relation to the uneducated, primitive habitus of the rural dweller or other 'backward' groups (see for instance Bilić and Stubbs' chapter; cf. Buchowski 2006). The urban identity can thus serve as a marker of class distinctions, complicating the formation of cross-class alliances. The social distance between the new middle-classes and 'ordinary people' in the increasingly stratified and polarised post-socialist societies tends to compound this challenge.

The heterogeneous networks presently engaged in urban activism accentuate the role of brokers and mediators (often of middle-class background) in enabling such diverse alliances, a theme explored by Polanska (chapter 9). Her analysis highlights the role of reflexivity in brokerage, in order to deal with the different groups and overcome mutual suspicion, both among the activist groups of different class-background and between activists and public authorities. The latter is arguably even more important in the post-socialist setting with the deep mistrust of authorities and disillusion with everything political but also the low levels of generalised trust.

Reflexivity is also characteristic of the countercultural activists in Vilnius studied by Lindqvist (chapter 2), aiming to open up discursive space for questioning and resistance but refusing to make 'final' statements that would in any way close the discursive terrain. While drawing on established cultural repertoires, such as the display of irony together with song and music performance which have been part of a historical Baltic tradition of popular resistance, the activists find ways to articulate protests against the hegemony of neoliberal values without falling into ethno-nationalism. However, as mentioned, other urban movements in the region, in drawing on and defending cultural heritage, have found themselves gradually ending up in the 'uncomfortable' company of nationalist and right-wing groups, with whom they share the critique of the neoliberal city, and have led movements to split (Florea, chapter 3; Sovsun 2013).

Urban Movements and Urban Governance

The inability of local (or central) government to meet the needs of large proportion of the inhabitants have led to a wave of small-scale urban grassroots mobilisation in the region. The chapters in this volume also provide evidence of a gradual institutionalisation of urban movements. However, while some groups have formalised into associations with legal status, often for funding reasons, others have resisted formalisation. Nevertheless, we see an increase in informal collaboration across civil society groups, reflecting what Domaradzka and Wijkström (2014) speak of as a 'maturing field' of urban movements. This is an important institutional development within civil society – to overcome the 'fragmentation of the collective action space' so characteristic of post-socialist civil societies (Jacobsson 2012). Bitušíková's analysis of urban activism in a middle-sized Slovakian city (chapter 10) reveals the dense social relationships developing in local civil society, the efforts at community building and the relatively extensive engagement of the inhabitants in urban matters. Likewise, Domaradzka and Wijkström (2014) quote World Value Study data from 2012 showing that over 25 per cent of the Poles had been engaged in discussions about their local area during the two last years and over 20 per cent had attended meetings of local residents. This illustrates the mobilising capacity of issues related to everyday life in the region.

Thus far, however, there are few (if any) signs of professionalisation and NGO-isation of urban movements, in contrast to the general pattern of other social movements in the region, such as environmental or women's movements. Urban activism is based on voluntary work and not paid employees, and to the extent they have funding, it is mainly from domestic sources. Moreover, most of the activities are based on grassroots initiatives and bottom-up processes rather than organised from the top (e.g. Zgiep 2013).

The other notable development is the increasing participation of urban movements in local governance arrangements. The degree to which local authorities are interested in dialogue with civil society of course differs across the region, especially between the members of, or candidates to, the European Union as compared to non-members. The European Union has diffused, and arguably imposed, partnership models on civil society and local authorities, by tying partnership requirements to financial support. As shown by Aidukaitė and Jacobsson (chapter 11), the incentive structure provided by the EU has been instrumental in spurring the formation of community organisations in Lithuania.

Poland seems outstanding in the region in terms of participatory, deliberative governance arrangements, developed both within civil society and between civil society and public authorities (e.g. Prykowski 2011, Zgiep 2013, Domaradzka and Wijkström 2014), including local and central consultation structures, a Public Debate Forum in the President's Office, the institution of citizen's initiative (to submit civic law proposals if supported by 100,000 signatures), participatory budgeting processes in a large number of Polish cities, citizen panels/juries, not to speak of all the deliberative processes ongoing on blogs and social media.

Dialogue arrangements have developed also in the housing sphere, such as Warsaw Housing Meetings and Tenants' Round Tables, analysed by Polanska (chapter 9). In 2014, an 'Urban movement coalition' was formed to support urban activists to run as candidates in the November election for city councils in cities all over Poland (Domaradzka and Wijkström 2014), and eventually candidates representing urban movements got seat in six city councils as well as the Central District Council in Warsaw. Also Bitušíková's case study of urban activism and urban governance arrangements in a Slovak city, provides evidence of increased and institutionalised dialogue between local authorities and activist groups, including the establishment of the 'Committee for non-governmental non-profit organisations' as an advisory body to the Mayor and participatory budgeting for a share of the municipal budget (20,000 Euro).

While urban movements in Poland opted for an informal coalition (the Congress of urban movements), the community organisations in Lithuania (analysed in chapter 11) have formed formal umbrella organisations to facilitate dialogue with, and gain leverage *vis-à-vis*, public authorities. It is well-known that federal or 'meta-organisational' structures tend to introduce self-moderation, and risk leading to marginalisation of radical claims, thus initiating a process of 'survival of those who fit the system' among civil society organisations (Karlberg and Jacobsson forthcoming). Research from other places in the world provides ample evidence of the trends towards local governance based on public-private partnerships, including more participatory and inclusive forms of governance and the enrolment of community organisations as service-providers, carrying the risk of co-optation and goal displacement with 'goals channeled into feasible program activities' (Mayer 2006: 205, Mayer 1999). This is an obvious risk in the post-socialist context with the underfunding of local authorities, and a task for future research to assess.

The more radical factions of urban movements risk being co-opted too, as a consequence of the new 'creative city' policies which make use of (sub)cultural milieus in their branding strategies (e.g. Mayer 2012, 2013). This risk of instrumentalisation of sub-cultures is obvious too in relation to the revitalisation of city centres and the role of artist collectives in urban activism in the region. Nevertheless, this development is also actively resisted, especially by the countercultural and/or new left activists who do their best to stay away from involvement with policy-makers or NGOs alike (as, for instance, the case studies from the ex-Yugoslavian context illustrate).

At the same time, it is not evident what criteria for success to apply in assessing the achievements of urban movements, such as the emancipatory potential and capacity to challenge the neoliberal consensus on the one hand versus gaining political leverage on the other (cf. Mayer 2013). The study by Aidukaitė and Jacobsson shows that community organisations in Lithuania have been rather successful in achieving their concrete goals, such as stopping threats to their local environment or getting improvements in infrastructure and services in their neighbourhoods. In fact, they have been more successful in Kaunas,

where the relationship between local authorities and community organisations is characterised by cooperation, than in Vilnius, where mutual antagonism prevails.

Nevertheless, much more research is needed to assess the gains and losses for urban movements in the region of inclusion in terms of urban governance arrangements, in a short-term as well as longer-term perspective. While short-term gains may indeed come at expense of long-term losses, Keynes (1923) also warned us against underplaying short-term improvements in living conditions in the assessment of economic and social change in making his famous remark that 'In the long run we are all dead'. This, again, calls for a 'both and' view in our assessment of social movements.

References

Aidukaitė, J. 2013. Community Mobilizations around Housing and Local Environment: Insights into the Case of Vilnius. *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, 1(32), 136–51.

Altrock, U., Güntner, S., Huning, S. and Peters, D. (eds). 2006. *Spatial Planning and Urban Development in the New EU Member States*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Andrusz, G. 1992. Housing co-operatives in the Soviet Union. *Housing Studies*, 7(2), 138–53.

Andrusz, G.D., Harloe, M., and Szelényi, I. (eds). 1996. *Cities after Socialism. Urban and Regional Change and Conflict in Post-Socialist Societies*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Blinnikov, M., Shanin, A., Sobolev, N. and Volkova, L. 2006. Gated communities in the Moscow greenbelt: Newly segregated landscapes and the suburban Russian environment. *GeoJournal*, 66(1–2), 65–81.

Bodnar, J. 2001. *Fin De Millenaire Budapest: Metamorphoses of Urban Life*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Borén, T. and Gentile, M. 2007. Metropolitan processes in post-communist states: An introduction. *Geografiska Annaler Series B*, 89(2): 95–110.

Brenner, N., Marcuse, P., and Mayer, M. (eds). 2012. *Cities for People, Not for Profit. Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge.

Buchowski, M. 2006. The specter of orientalism in Europe: From exotic other to stigmatized brother. *Anthropology Quarterly*, 79(3), 463–82.

Buyandelgeriyn, M. 2008. Post-post-transition theories: Walking on multiple paths. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 37, 235–50.

Castells, M. 1978. *City, Class and Power*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

———. 1983. *The City and the Grassroots*. London: Edward Arnold.

Celichowski, J. 2004. Civil society in Eastern Europe. Growth without engagement, in *Exploring Civil Society. Political and Cultural Contexts*, edited by M. Glasius, D. Lewis and H. Seckinelgin. London: Routledge, 71–9.

Císař, O. 2010. Externally sponsored contention: The channelling of environmental movement organisations in the Czech Republic after the fall of communism. *Environmental Politics*, 19(5), 736–55.

———. 2013a. The diffusion of public interest mobilisation: A historical sociology perspective on advocates without members in the post-communist Czech Republic. *East European Politics*, 29(1), 69–82.

———. 2013b. A typology of extra-parliamentary political activism in post-communist settings: The case of the Czech Republic, in *Beyond NGO-ization. The Development of Social Movements in Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by K. Jacobsson and S. Saxonberg. Farnham: Ashgate, 139–68.

———. 2013c. Post-communism and social movements, in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, edited by D. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans and D. McAdam. London: Blackwell, 994–9.

———. and Koubek, M. 2012. Include 'em all? Culture, politics and a local hardcore/punk scene in the Czech Republic. *Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Culture, the Media and the Arts*, 40, 1–21.

———. and Vráblíková, K. 2010. The europeanization of social movements in the Czech Republic: The EU and local women's Groups. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 43, 209–19.

Cress, D.M. and Snow, D.A. 1996. Mobilisation at the margins of society: Resources, benefactors and the viability of homeless SMOs. *American Sociological Review*, 61(6), 1089–1109.

Czaplicka, J., Gelazis, N. and Ruble, B.A. (eds). 2009. *Cities after the Fall of Communism: Reshaping Cultural Landscapes and European Identity*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Czepczynski, M. 2008. *Cultural Landscapes of Post-Socialist Cities*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Darieva, T., Kaschuba, W. and Krebs, M. (eds). 2011. *Urban Spaces after Socialism. Ethnographies of Public Places in Eurasian Cities*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Deelstra, T. and Yanitsky, O. (eds). 1991. *Cities of Europe: The Public's Role in Shaping the Urban Environment*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenia Publis.

Dixon, M. 2010. Gazprom versus the skyline: spatial displacement and social contention in St. Petersburg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(1), 35–54.

Domaradzka, A. and Wijkström, F. 2014. New urban movement entrepreneurs re-negotiating the public-private borderland: The case of Polish urban politics. Paper presented at the 11th ISTR conference, Münster, 22–5 July 2014.

Ekiert, G. and Kubik, J. 2014. Myths and realities of civil society. *Journal of Democracy*, 25(1), 46–58.

Fagan, A. 2005. Taking stock of civil society development in post-communist Europe: Evidence from the Czech Republic. *Democratisation*, 12(4), 528–47.

Fagan, A. 2006. Neither 'north' nor 'south': The environment and civil society in post-conflict Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Environmental Politics*, 15(5), 787–802.

Finquelievich, S. 1981. Urban social movements and the production of urban space. *Acta Sociologica*, 24(4), 239–49.

Flam, H. (ed.). 2001. *Pink, Purple, Green: Women's, Religious, Environmental and Gay/Lesbian Movements in Central Europe Today*. Boulder: East European Monographs.

Fölscher, A. 2013. Participatory budgeting in Central and Eastern Europe, in *Participatory Budgeting*, edited by A. Shah. The World Bank, 127–56. Available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ParticipatoryBudgeting.pdf [Accessed 18 September 2014].

Gelazis, N., Czaplicka, J. and Ruble, B.A. 2009. Introduction: What time is this place? Locating the postsocialist city, in *Cities After the Fall of Communism. Reshaping Cultural Landscapes and European Identity*, edited by J. Czaplicka, N. Gelazis and B.A. Ruble. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1–13.

———, Ruble, B.A. and Czaplicka, J. 2009. Conclusion: Cities after the fall, in *Cities After the Fall of Communism. Reshaping Cultural Landscapes and European Identity*, edited by J. Czaplicka, N. Gelazis and B.A. Ruble. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 335–46.

Gladarev B., 2011. Istoriko-kul'turnoe nasledie Peterburga: roždenie obŝestvennosti iz duha goroda [Historical and cultural heritage of St. Petersburg: the birth of the public from the city spirit]. In *Ot obŝestvennogo k publičnosti*, edited by O. Kharhordin. St. Petersburg: European University Press, 70–304.

Gliński, P. 2004. How active are the social actors? *Polish Sociological Review*, 4(148), 429–50.

———. 2006. The third sector in Poland: Dilemmas of development, in *Civil Society in the Making*, edited by D. Gawin and P. Gliński. Warsaw: IfiS Publishers, 265–91.

Grabkowska, M., Pancewicz, L. and Sagan, I. 2013. The impact of web-based media on evolution of participatory urban planning and e-democracy in Poland. *International Journal of E-Planning Research*, 2(3).

Grubbauer, M. and Kusiak, J. (eds). 2012. *Chasing Warsaw: Socio-Material Dynamics of Urban Change Since 1990*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

———. 2012b. Introduction, in *Chasing Warsaw: Socio-Material Dynamics of Urban Change Since 1990*, edited by M. Grubbauer and J. Kusiak. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 9–24.

Gunnarsson Payne, J. and Korolczuk, E. 2014. Lost in translation? Political grammars in patients' activism around ART in Poland and Sweden. Draft paper.

Hamel, P. 2014. Urban social movements, in *Handbook of Political Citizenship and Social Movements*, edited by H.A. van der Heijden. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 464–92.

———, Lustiger-Thaler, H. and Mayer, M. (eds). 2000. *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*. London: Routledge.

Harvey, D. 2003. The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939–41.

———. 2012. *Rebel Cities. From The Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.

Henderson, S.L. 2002. Selling civil society: Western aid and the nongovernmental organization sector in Russia. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35, 139–67.

Hirt, S. 2012. *Iron Curtains. Gates, Suburbs and Privatization of Space in the Post-socialist City*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Howard, M.M. 2003. *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hryciuk, R.E. and Korolczuk, E. 2013. At the intersection of gender and class: Social mobilization around mothers' rights in Poland, in *Beyond NGO-ization: The Development of Social Movements in Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by K. Jacobsson and S. Saxonberg. Farnham: Ashgate, 49–70.

Ivanou, A. 2013. Taganka 3 group: An instance of local urban activism in Moscow, in *Beyond NGO-ization. The Development of Social Movements in Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by K. Jacobsson and S. Saxonberg. Farnham: Ashgate, 191–211.

Jacobsson, K. 2012. Fragmentation of the collective action space: The animal rights movement in Poland. *East European Politics*, 28(4), 353–70.

——— and Saxonberg, S. (eds). 2013. *Beyond NGO-ization. The Development of Social Movements in Central and Eastern Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.

——— and Saxonberg, S. (eds). 2015. *Social Movements in Post-communist Europe and Russia*. London: Routledge.

——— and Sörbom, A. 2015. After a cycle of contention: Post-Gothenburg strategies of left-libertarian activists in Sweden. *Social Movement Studies*. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2015.1027763.

Jessop, B. and Sum, N.L. 2012. Cultural political economy, strategic essentialism, and neoliberalism, in *Neoliberal Urbanism and its Contestations: Crossing Theoretical Boundaries*, edited by J. Künkel and M. Mayer. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 80–96.

Jezierska, K. 2011. *Radical Democracy Redux. Politics and Subjectivity beyond Habermas and Mouffe*. Örebro University: Örebro Studies in Political Science 29.

Jonson, L. 2015. *Art and Protest in Putin's Russia*. London: Routledge.

Juska, A. and Woolfson, C. 2012. Policing political protest in Lithuania. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, (57)4, 403–24.

Kaase, A., Grossmann, K. and Rink, D. 2013. Shrinking cities in postsocialist Europe – what can we learn from their analysis for urban theory-making? Conference paper available at: http://www.rc21.org/conferences/berlin2013/RC21-Berlin-Papers/3-Haase-et-al.pdf [Accessed 12 November 2014].

Karlberg, E. and Jacobsson, K. Forthcoming. A meta-organizational perspective on the Europeanization of civil society: The case of the Swedish Women's Lobby. *Voluntas. International Journal of Nonprofit or Voluntary Organizations*. Pre-published at: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11266–014–9463–0.

Kenney, P. 2002. *A Carnival of Revolution. Central Europe 1989*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Keynes, J.M. 1923. *A Tract on Monetary Reform*. London: Macmillan.

Kleman K., Miryasova, O. and Demidov, A. 2010. Ot obyvatelej k aktivistam: zaroždaûŝiesâ social'nye dviženiâ v nynešnej Rossii [From ordinary people to activists: arising social movements in contemporary Russia]. Moscow: Tri kvadrata.

Kopecký, P. and Mudde, C. 2003. *Uncivil Society. Contentious Politics in Post-Communist Europe*. London: Routledge.

Kornai, J. 2008. *From Socialism to Capitalism. Eight Essays*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Koselleck, R. 1985. *Futures Past. On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Kowalewski, M. 2013. Organizowanie miejskiego aktywizmu w Polsce: Kongres Ruchów Miejskich [Organizing urban activism in Poland. Congress of Urban Movements]. *Social Space Journal*. Available at: http://socialspacejournal.eu [Accessed 30 September 2014].

Kraszewski, D. and Mojkowski, K. 2014. *Budzet obywatelski w Polsce* [Participatory budget in Poland]. Warsawa: Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego. Available at: http://www.maszglos.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Budzet-obywatelski-w-Polsce-D.-Kraszewski-K.-Mojkowski.pdf [Accessed 19 November 2014].

Künkel, K. and Mayer, M. (eds). 2012. *Neoliberal Urbanism and its Contestations: Crossing Theoretical Boundaries*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso.

Láng-Pickvance, K., Manning, N. and Pickvance, C. (eds). 1997. *Environmental and Housing Movements: Grassroots Experience in Hungary, Russia and Estonia*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Ledeneva, A. 2006. *How Russia Really Works: The Informal Practices That Shaped Post-Soviet Politics and Business*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. 2014. Economies of favors or corrupt societies? Exploring the boundaries between informality and corruption, *Baltic Worlds*, 1, 13–21.

Lefebvre, H. 1996 [1968]. The right to the city, in *Writings on Cities*, by H. Lefebvre, selected, translated and introduced by E. Kofman and E. Lebas. Cambridge: Blackwell, 63–184.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E. and Sziarto, K.M. 2008. The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 33, 157–72.

———, Peck, J. and Sheppard, E.S. (eds). 2007. *Contesting Neoliberalism. Urban Frontiers*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Lindström, J. 2012. *Drömmen om den nya staden: Stadsförnyelse i det postsovjetiska Riga* [The dream about the new city. City renewal in post-Soviet Riga]. Lund: Arkiv.

Lisiak, A. 2010. *Urban Cultures in (Post)Colonial Central Europe*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.

Mayer, M. 1999. Urban movements and urban theory in the late-20th-century city, in *The Urban Moment. Cosmopolitan Essays on the Late-20th-Century City*, edited by R.A. Beauregard and S. Body-Gendrot. London: Sage, 209–38.

———. 2006. Manuel Castells' *The City and The Grassroots*. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(1), 202–6.

———. 2007. Contesting the neoliberalization of urban governance, in *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*, edited by H. Leitner, J. Peck and E.S. Sheppard. New York and London: The Guilford Press, 90–115.

———. 2009. The 'Right to the City' in the context of shifting mottos of urban social movements. *City*, 13(2), 362–74.

———. 2012. 'The "Right to the City" in urban social movements', in *Cities for People, Not for Profit. Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, edited by N. Brenner, P. Marcuse and M. Mayer. London: Routledge, 63–85.

———. 2013. First World Urban Activism. *City*, 17(1), 5–19.

——— and Künkel, J. 2012. Conclusion: Implications of urban theory for social movements, in *Neoliberal Urbanism and its Contestations: Crossing Theoretical Boundaries*, edited by K. Künkel and M. Mayer. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 208–22.

Mazurek, M. 2012. Keeping it close to home. Resourcefulness and scarcity in late socialist Poland, in *Communism Unwrapped*, edited by P. Bren and M. Neuburger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 298–320.

Melucci, A. 1985. The symbolic challenge of contemporary movements. *Social Research*, 52(4), 789–816.

———. 1989. *Nomads of the Present*. London: Hutchinson Raduis.

Mendelson, S.E. and Glenn, J.K. (eds). 2002. *The Power and Limits of NGOs. A Critical Look at Building Democracy in Eastern Europe and Eurasia*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Miller, B. and Nicholls, W. 2013. Social movements in urban society: The city as a space for politicization. *Urban Geography*, 34(3), 452–73.

Mizielinska, J. and Kulpa, R. 2011. Contemporary peripheries: queer studies, circulation of knowledge and East/West divide, in *De-Centring Western Sexualities: Central and East European Perspectives*, edited by R. Kulpa and J. Mizielinska. Farnham: Ashgate, 11–26.

Narozhna, T. 2004. Foreign aid for a post-euphoric Eastern Europe: The limitations of Western assistance in developing civil society. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 7, 243–66.

Navrátil, J. and Císař, O. Forthcoming. Towards a 'non-global justice movement'? Two paths to re-scaling the left contention in the Czech Republic, in *Spreading Protest. Social Movements in Times of Crisis*, edited by D. della Porta and A. Mattoni. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Nicholls, W. 2008. The urban question revisited: The importance of cities for social movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(4), 841–59.

———, Miller, B. and Beaumont, J. (eds). 2013. *Spaces of Contention: Spatialities and Social Movements*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Norval, A.J. 2006. Democratic identification: A Wittgensteinian approach. *Political Theory*, 34(2), 229–55.

Pickvance, C. 1994. Housing privatization and housing protest in the transition from state socialism: A comparative study of Budapest and Moscow. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 18(3), 433–50.

———. 1996. Environmental and housing movements in cities after socialism: The cases of Budapest and Moscow, in *Cities After Socialism. Urban and Regional Conflict in Post-Socialist Cities*, edited by G. Andrusz, M. Harloe and I. Szelényi. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 232–67.

———. 2001. Inaction, individual action and collective action as responses to housing dissatisfaction: a comparative study of Budapest and Moscow. *Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, 23, 179–206.

———. 2003. From urban social movements to urban movements. A review and introduction to a symposium on urban movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(1), 102–9.

Pickvance, K. 2000. The diversity of Eastern European social movements: Urban movements, new social movements and nationalist movements in post-socialist societies, in *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*, edited by P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler and M. Mayer. London: Routledge, 192–212.

Piotrowski, G. 2013a. Social movement or subculture? Alterglobalists in Central and Eastern Europe. *Interface*, 5(2), 399–421.

———. 2013b. Eastern European social movements, in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, edited by D. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans and D. McAdam. London: Blackwell, 383–8.

———. 2014. Squatting in the East – Rozbrat in Poland, in *Squatting and Autonomous Action in Europe, 1980–present*, edited by L. van Hoogenhuijze, A. Katzeff and B. Van Der Steen. Oakland: PM Press, 233–53.

Polanska, D. 2011. *The Emergence of Enclaves of Wealth and Poverty. A Sociological Study of Residential Differentiation in Post-communist Poland*. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis.

———. 2014. Marginalizing discourses and activists' strategies in collective identity formation: The case of Polish tenants' movement, in *The Challenge of Collective Action. New Perspectives on Civil Society and Social Activism in Contemporary Poland*, edited by K. Jacobsson and E. Korolzcuk. Book manuscript.

Polanska, D. and Piotrowski, G. 2015. The transformative power of cooperation between social movements. Squatting and tenants' movements in Poland, *City*, 19(2-3), 274–96.

Prykowski, Ł. 2011. Public Consultations and Participatory Budgeting in Local Policy-Making in Poland, in *Learning for Local Democracy. A Study of Local Citizen Participation in Europe*, edited by J. Forbrig. Central and

Eastern European Citizens Network, 89–106. Available at: http://ceecn.net/storage/2011/CALLDE/complete%20study.pdf [Accessed 26 November 2014].

Rabrenovic, G. 2009. Urban social movements, in *Theories of Urban Politics*, second edition, edited by J.S. Davies and D.L. Imbroscio. London: Sage, 239–54.

Rink, D. 2000. Local citizens' initiatives during (East) German transformation, in *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*, edited by P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler and M. Mayer. London: Routledge, 177–91.

Roth, R. 2000. New social movements, poor people's movements and the struggle for social citizenship, in *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*, edited by P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler and M. Mayer. London: Routledge, 25–44.

Sagan, I. and Grabkowska, M. 2013. Negotiating participatory regeneration in the post-socialist inner city, in *The Routledge Companion to Urban Regeneration*, edited by M.E. Leary and J. McCarthy. London: Routledge, 433–42.

Sampson, S. 2002. Beyond Transition: Rethinking elite configurations in the Balkans, in *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies and Practices in Eurasia*, edited by C. Hann. London: Routledge, 297–316.

Shomina, E. 1999. *Zhiteli i doma* [Residents and Houses]. Moskva: Munitsipal´naja vlast.

Skeggs, B. 1997. *Formations of Class and Gender. Becoming Respectable*. London: Sage.

Smith, A. 2007. Articulating neoliberalism. Diverse economies and everyday life in 'postsocialist' cities, in *Contesting Neoliberalism. Urban Frontiers*, edited by H. Leitner, J. Peck and E.S Sheppard. New York: Guilford Publications, 204–22.

Sovsun, I. 2013. Ideology and framing in the Kyiv urban movement, paper presented at the conference 'Grassroots in the city: Urban movements and activism in Central and Eastern Europe', Södertörn University, 24–5 May 2013.

Stanilov, K. (ed.). 2007. *The Post-Socialist City. Urban Form and Space Transformations in Central and Eastern Europe after Socialism*. Dordrecht: Springer.

——— (ed.). 2007b. Taking stock of post-socialist urban development: A recapitulation, in *The Post-Socialist City*, edited by K. Stanilov. Dordrecht: Springer, 3–17.

——— (ed.). 2007c. Urban planning and the challenges of post-socialist transformation, in *The Post-Socialist City*, edited by K. Stanilov. Dordrecht: Springer, 413–25.

Stenning, A., Smith, A., Rochovská, E. and Świątek, D. 2010. *Domesticating Neoliberalism: Spaces of Economic Practice and Social Reproduction in Post-Socialist Cities*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Swianiewicz, P. 2007. Changing forms of urban government in Central and Eastern Europe, in *Governing Cities in a Global Era. Urban Innovation, Competition, and Democratic Reform*, edited by R. Hambleton and J. Gross. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 93–112.

Sztompka, P. 1993. Civilizational incompetence: The trap of post-communist societies. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 22(2), 85–95.

Torsello, D. 2012. The 'revival' of civil society in Central and Eastern Europe: New environmental and political movements. *Human Affairs*, 22, 178–95.

Tsenhova, S. 2009. *Housing Policy Reforms in Post Socialist Europe. Lost in Transition*. Heidelberg: Physica.

——— and Nedović-Budić, Z. (eds). 2006. *The Urban Mosaic of Post-Socialist Europe. Space, Institutions and Policy*. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.

Uitermark, J., Nicholls, W. and Loopmans, M. 2012. Cities and social movements. Theorizing beyond the Right to the City. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(1), 2546–54.

Van Kempen, R., Vermeulen, M. and Baan, A. (eds). 2005. *Urban Issues and Urban Policies in the New EU Countries*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Zgiep, M. 2013. The emergence of deliberative politics. Social movements and democratic innovations in contemporary Poland. Paper presented at the conference 'The challenge of collective action: New perspectives on civil society and social activism in contemporary Poland', Warsaw University, 18 October 2013.