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*Migrants and city-making: dispossession, displacement, and urban regeneration* offers carefully theorised ethnographic account of three cities—Manchester, New Hampshire; Halle/Saale, Germany; and Mardin, Turkey—between 2000 and 2016. This book opens up avenues for reviewing methodological and analytical approaches to capture complex socio-spatial and temporal processes underlying urban regeneration globally. As Çaglar and Glick Schiller usefully engage with urban processes such as sociabilities, power relations, and citizenship in varying capacity throughout the book, they define and systematically operationalise ‘multi-scalar approach’ to examine migrants’ role in city-making. Through this approach, the authors maintain that the ‘structures of unequal power exist within multiple, but not nested, networked hierarchies’ (p.8). The following three points capture what I deem are the most significant contributions of the book and outline the ways in which the authors meaningfully advance the discussion about migrants and cities in their constant making and constructing within and beyond the select cities.

First, the book makes a compelling case for using multi-scalar perspective in migration research by critically evaluating and engaging with other predominant approaches to studying cities. The authors critique the methodological approach that treats cities as nationally bounded entities with shared cultural distinctiveness where migrants ought to be ‘socially integrated’ as well as problematise the assumption of the binary of differences between migrants and non-migrants because such an assumption fails to recognise migrants as active and influential social actors that are integral to city-making processes. Throughout their analyses, the authors show how to treat cities ‘as institutional political, economic, and cultural actors positioned within multiple institutionally structured scales of differentiated but connected domains of power’ (p.9). The usefulness of this perspective for appraising city-making emerges in authors’ careful exploration of various modes of migrant dispossession, displacement and emplacement in the processes of urban regeneration. Analyses across chapters showcase intricately interconnected and varied levels of situatedness of transnational social actors in dynamic urban spaces.

 Second, the book exemplifies a comparative ethnographic project on city-making and urban regeneration. It does so by narrating the story of the selected ‘disempowered cities’—defined by authors as, ‘those that once boasted greater economic, cultural, or political significance, upon which these cities now strive to build’ (p.92)—through the lens of technologies of urban repositioning. Authors organise their account of processual changes in urban reconfiguring and their interactions with the practices of transnational social actors in response to specific parameters. Such an approach is used for comparing the nature of socio-spatial transformation across three seemingly disparate cities that inhabit relatively distinctive economic, social, and political landscapes. The multi-scalar global interconnections are made visible through the description of processes of capital accumulation and experiences of dispossession, displacement, and emplacement that are consequential to the project of urban restructuring across empirical cases.

 Third, the authors explore aspects such as—everyday construction of migrant entrepreneurs, urban sociabilities and power relations, processual and performative social citizenship of migrants, and emplacement practices of returnee migrants—in their ethnographic material, and synthesize these intriguing discussions to engage with concepts of temporality, spatiality, and power relations in transnational urban contexts. Here, authors highlight the criticality of conjunctures to understand transnational actors’ contribution to city-making and urban restructuring processes. By contemporaneously understanding the lives of migrants and non-migrants who are subjected to multi-scalar forces, the authors show deeply entwined ‘sociabilities of emplacement’ in urban spaces. Emplacement—another recurring term in the book—has been captured in its variegated forms within transforming fields of power relations in city-space. In the powerful conclusion of the book, the authors problematise the differentiating, hierarchical, and non-agentic ways of reading, observing, and analysing migrants experience, migration processes and practices. Here, the authors push for using the analytical framing that overcomes the politics of difference between migrants and non-migrants, possibly, by crafting the narrative of shared situatedness of social actors in interconnected urban spaces.

The three points mentioned above illustrate authors’ effort to explain and operationalise useful analytical tools, such as accumulation by dispossession, displacement, and emplacement. By analysing practices that are responsive to structural transformations in the social field, the authors capture dynamism and complexity underlying the ways in which migrants contribute to the processes of the making and regeneration of cities. Beyond academic engagement, the authors’ political statement, i.e. to discard socially differentiating narratives of migrants in the city, is a much-needed input today for comprehending social processes and practices in increasingly divisive societies globally. Moreover, this book calls for embracing the imperative for pursuing an ethnographically informed comparative inquiry to describe and interpret city-shaping practices—this, indeed, is a useful way, if possible, to study places and people in the era of enhanced mobility worldwide. *Migrants and city-making*, therefore, is a vital read for scholars of migration and cities as well as an excellent tool for students to reflect on the urban projects in their neighbourhoods.
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