

THEORIES ON CAPITALIST URBANIZATION AND THE POSTSOCIALIST CITY

UDC 316.334.56

Josip Kristović

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy*, Serbia

E-mail: josipkristovic@gmail.com

Abstract. *In this paper one will present the most relevant theories considering capitalist urbanization in the last one hundred years, and later on will discuss how those theories may be used in studying and analyzing postsocialist cities. The reason why those theories are chosen can be found in the simple fact that they are broad and well-rounded, and thus hold the central position within urban sociology. More precisely, it is a case of the influence of the capitalist mode of urbanization on cities in postsocialism. Postsocialist societies have undergone changes called "transition" since the 1990's, and these changes have not passed over urban areas and their praxis. One can recognize some important urban changes: centre commercialization, the industrialization of rural and peripheral areas belonging to a city, gentrification of certain "elite" areas etc. However, perhaps the most recognizable mark in contemporary postsocialist cities is how they use and consume their own space.*

Key words: *urban sociology, capitalism, postsocialism, city and space.*

At the very beginning, one should remind the reader of the key theoretical constructions of classic urban sociology, which have been developed during the 1920's and 1930's. Of course, it is the theoretical approach called the "Chicago school" whose most significant representatives are Robert Ezra Park, Ernest Watson Burgess and Louis Wirth. These three scientists are well known for establishing a new sociological discipline, devoted to a new set of problems characteristic of "urban life", that is, of life in urban areas – cities. R.E. Park developed the idea of "human ecology", a term he coined based on the influence of natural ecology, while he borrowed some terms from this scientific discipline which, in his opinion, can also be used in the analyses of social (urban) praxis: symbiosis, invasion, domination, supremacy, subordination etc. Later on, he and Burgess worked on developing the theory of urban ecology. They find that cities are moved by the forces of Darwinian evolution which moves ecosystems, and the most significant force of all is competition. Applied to urban praxis, competition means that groups compete for urban

Received June 11, 2012

* PhD student of sociology

resources, therefore, urban space is divided into certain "ecological niches". They also conceptualized a city on the model of concentric circles: central business, transitional (industrial, deteriorating housing), working class residential, residential and suburban zones (Park, Burgess 1921). One can notice the very powerful biological character of this theory, but that was the main approach in the social sciences at the time (the influence of Herbert Spencer, for example).

As for Louis Wirth, he exposed his ideas mostly in an essay called "Urbanism as a Way of Life", published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1938. His main thought is one of urbanism as a form of social organization, not only opposite human culture, but as a form that violates some or all aspects of this culture, family relations in particular. He used to criticize urban life, but he did point out some positive effects of capitalist urbanization: he thought that metropolitan civilization is the best civilization that human beings have ever, while the city is everywhere the center of freedom, tolerance, progress and invention. It is possible from this temporal distance to address some critiques to this theory, primarily from the standpoint of power and the ideological base of the elemental notion which is used, and it is "urbanism". However, the great worth of this theory lies in introducing a very important component in the study and analysis of social praxis, which is obvious nowadays, when capitalist urbanization has spread throughout the whole planet.

The second important theory that appeared was Neo-Marxism. As it is the case with the previous one, here is a brief reminder of three most significant and influential authors: Lefebvre, Castells and Harvey. Henry Lefebvre was the first representative of the Neo-Marxist approach to the questions of urban sociology. He presented a distinctive theory of (post)modern capitalist urbanization. The main trait of his work is that he gives a whole new dimension of interpretation to the notion of "urbanism". Namely, this notion is regarded, researched and understood as a totality which cannot be explained by partial sciences. In other words, Lefebvre thinks that this notion can be found in the same theoretical and methodological level as the notion "society". Thus he writes that the "urban phenomenon shows its own universality" (Lefebvre 1974:66) and divides the history of all human civilization into three *époques*: agrarian, industrial and urban. Urbanization is, to Lefebvre, the end and the sense of industrialization. This, without a doubt, revolutionary thought gave the motive and created room for certain criticism which came from two other authors of Neo-Marxist provenience, Manuel Castells and David Harvey, who introduced a new principle in urban sociology, thinking by deepening the theory of Lefebvre and finally constructing their own theoretical approaches.

Castells' critique is certainly far harsher. He almost completely rejects the notion of "urban" considering it ideologically based and therefore scientifically useless. But one may criticize him because he "names his main work "The Urban Question" without any regard to what connotation this term has, except that he emphasizes "a Marxist approach" in the subtitle (Caldarovic 1987: 205). What is primarily in Castells' thinking is "keeping an accent on the deterministic precedence of the capitalist mode of production" (Petrovic 2004:25). The main theoretical category within his conception is "collective consumption", although one holds against him that he clarifies this notion and its relational meaning only partially (Caldarovic 1987:214), even when he offers some concrete examples of what could present the so-called means of collective consumption. He thinks that the city is a residential unit in which the process of working force reproduction is mediated by goods and collective consumption, while the state apparatus intervenes directly in favor of capitalistic monopoly, by averting the problems of working force reproduction and takes care of this working force by controlling education, health insurance etc.

During the 1990's Castells brought and developed a theory which is widely known as the theory of nets, that is, in his opinion, the contemporary global society is a "network society" which exists and whose praxis takes place in the "age of information" (the age where collecting, managing and manipulating information is of key importance). In some other places, an imagined society like this one is called "knowledge society", which implies the significance of both education and skills in the capitalism of today. In the case of the characteristics of the city in the age of information, Castells writes that a "city of information is an urban expression for an entire pattern of information society determinants, just like an industrial city is a spatial expression of an industrial society." (Castells in: Vujovic, Petrovic 2005:191) He clearly stated his attitude on determinism but also on the specifications of contemporary capitalist mode of production, in some parameters completely different than the one which had existed in nineteenth and first half twentieth century.

David Harvey has developed a concept known in academic circles as regulation theory. This probably most significant representative of contemporary British neo-Marxism first exposed his thoughts at the beginning of the 1980's within the discipline called radical human geography, while he was dealing with the questions of the contemporary model of capitalism from the start of his scientific career. He emphasizes some of the, until then, neglected aspects of studying in the city, precisely on those which connect the city with the functioning of capitalism, without spending too much time solely on the notion of "the urban". The key category is surplus value. In his opinion, a city is the geographical and social center of the concentration of surplus value. He observes the notion "urban" from a wider historical perspective and does not agree with the thought that the dichotomy urban-rural can be identified with the dichotomy modern-traditional.

Harvey introduces the category of monopoly rent in the notional apparatus, more precisely, the ownership of certain location which enables the right to a future income. Monopoly rent represents any possible earnings from a monopoly-formed price, and it is realized when a group or an individual accomplishes increased intake of profit due to exclusive control over some space or mercantile good which is unique and cannot be copied (for example, Wall Street in New York City, the Louvre in Paris etc.). In the times of an industrial crisis the growth of real estate speculation or investment in consumption funds leads to diverting capital into a secondary flow (Petrovic 2004:22). On the other hand, the contemporary "world economic crisis", still ongoing at this very moment, shows the exact opposite process of the financial capital crisis, the breakdown of the real estate market in some countries or even the breakdown of whole monetary system (Greece), and the crisis of entire industrial sectors (the car industry, for example).

Another theoretical notion which this scientist introduced is the notion of flexible accumulation, which is "characterized by direct confrontation with rigidity of Fordism. It resides on flexibility in the sense of labor processes, the labor force market, products and consumption patterns... It also brought a new round of what I will call "space-time curdle" in the capitalist world – the shrinking of time horizons of private and public decision making" (Harvey in: Vuletic 2003:220). According to Harvey's interpretation, urban reality is first and foremost a class reality, while governing a city ranges from management to entrepreneurship, thus he describes four alternative strategies of urban governing (a city as an enterprise): 1. competition inside an international labor division creates or uses certain advantages for the production of goods and services; 2. The city area tends to ameliorate its competitive position in the sense of space consumption; 3. urban entrepreneurship is distinctly tinged with the battle for key managerial functions and for control of

large financial affairs, government or collecting and treating information and 4. a competitive advantage in terms of surpluses apportion via central government (Harvey in: Vujovic, Petrovic 2005:212-215). These strategies, especially the second one, are of great importance in studying and analyzing the processes of transformation of postsocialist cities.

Harvey implies the presence of a so-called "creative class" which is connected to the idea of popular culture and the determination of urban life, because "commercialized culture is sold more effectively when it gets the special character of the local context." (Petrovic 2004:24) This commercialized culture has the character of profitability but also of interurban competitiveness for a better place at the global level in the sense of "best places to live" (McCann 2004). Furthermore, Harvey presented the standpoint of unequal geographic development of the global society and global capitalism and of the existence of a "neoliberal state" (Harvey 2005), and investigates this problem on the example of New York City bankruptcy in 1975 (Harvey 2007) Also, in one of his recent papers he states the opinion that the urbanization of China is the main stabilizer of world capitalism these days (Harvey 2008). It is necessary to emphasize that he never swayed from essential Marxist ideas, of course adapted to the contemporary social praxis.

The theory of network (the information) society and regulation theory are both due to a completely new approach in the sociology of the city, which is primarily characterized by abandoning (in their opinion "ideological") notions of "urban" and "urbanism". Beside certain weaknesses and deficiencies, which is, anyway, the case with any other theory in the domain of social sciences, these two concepts offer a great possibility for serious critical analyses of social relations, processes and appearances which characterize a spatial unit called the "city". The central point is the decisive deterministic character of the capitalist mode of production, allocation and concentration of surplus value and accumulation and fertilization of capital. In the meantime Castells has partially abandoned structural-Marxist orientation with which he started, but never does so completely. Harvey, on the other hand, stays one of, if not the most, significant representatives of British neo-Marxism. His idea of an entrepreneurial city implies the existence of tension between economic competitiveness and democracy as a political system, that is, between the freedom of profit and the freedom of an individual.

In addition to these scientists, one must mention a few others who are also very significant in the field we are discussing here. Two of them belong to the Neo-Weberian thought, Peter Saunders and Ray Pahl. The main category with which they operate is the distribution of social power. Saunders singles out the importance of divisions in the sector of consumption. His main hypothesis is that the role of state in British society after World War II required a new social division into actors who rely on the public sector and those who rely on the market. Therefore he emphasizes the strained relation between the public and private. City space is, in his opinion, a contextual variable which influences social processes. Ray Pahl starts from the notions of power and bureaucracy.

Saskia Sassen developed the thesis of forming a transnational global urban system, where the key role is reserved for those spatial units which she calls "global cities" (for example, three of them were considered the most important of all: New York, London and Tokyo). To a certain extent she accepts Castells' interpretation of contemporary capitalism and the role of cities in it. Global cities are centers of economic power and major points of capitalism, whose connection is enabled by the compression of time and space, raised and developed by the information revolution. However, a possible objection is "the absence of an explanation of theoretical standpoints", which therefore "leaves a space for

critical remarks of technical determinism" (Petrovic 2004:26). On the other hand, Michel Bassand (Bassand 2001) starts from Lefebvre's understanding that the urban phenomenon is the imprint of a global society transformation in space and accepts the differentiation of three types of human civilization patterns (agrarian, industrial and urban). Bassand suggests that, in the frame of theoretical constructions and explications, the notion of function should be substituted with the notion of process, thus he names, in his opinion, the main processes of contemporary urban praxis and functioning.

There are a few mostly British authors whose work is dedicated to the issues urban sociology. At this point one should mention two of them: Bob Jessop and Gary Stoker. Jessop discusses Harvey's idea of an entrepreneurial city and "points out that the notion of an entrepreneurial city includes more and more factors which have earlier been considered "non-economic", which challenges the primary influence of capital accumulation in relation to values, interests and other subsystems (such as education, science, health care). Thereby the battle of hegemony and/or dominant principles of socialization on a greater scale is more intense." (Petrovic 2004:35-36) Although he emphasizes non-economic factors and processes, and therefore, the sphere of individual and group interests as well, which is of course exceptionally important, it appears that something that presents "the core" of capitalism, and that is exactly its economic base (the accumulation of capital and maximization of profit), still has a crucial role. It is especially distinctive in the crisis of capitalism, as it is the case nowadays. How else can we explain the trend of privatization (therefore of economization) of exactly those "non-economic" factors (what has been the dominant ideology and praxis in the past thirty years)? Even if one avoids economizing in answering this question, it is quite obvious that the values and interests of individuals and social groups are predominantly formed and realized under the dominance of capital-relation. In other words, the process of socializing capitalism introduces the situation where capital-relation becomes a social relation, the relation to which all other relations, no matter whether they are personal or group ones, are formed and guided (see more in: Lazic 1988 and Shaikh 1990).

As for Stoker, he has offered a theory of regime in explaining the functioning and practice of urban politics. The regime theory was designed as an answer to the theory of elite, that is "it enables new manners in discussing the questions of power. It directs attention from a limited focus on power as a problem of social control to the understanding of power expressed by social production" (Stoker in: Vujovic, Petrovic 2005:219). In the quoted text he deals the work of Clarence Stone, for whom he claims is most successfully applying the theory of regime to studying city managing. Stoker also pays attention to the critiques of this theory, thus he describes the ways how it can be upgraded and developed.

How can a city be sociologically defined? According to the classic understanding, a city is any urban area (as the complete opposite of any kind of rural area), a settlement constituting those contents which determine it as urbanized: asphalt streets, squares and city parts, parks, government and utility, as well as educational and health institutions buildings, banks, media, religious objects, malls, theatres, museums etc. The absence of rural, that is, agricultural production is an essential characteristic of this kind of settlement, counter to the presence of objects and institutions of the industrial and financial capital. However, it is well noticed that the dichotomy urban-rural is not quite unquestionable and certainly not sufficient for a scientific inquiry into the notion "city", moreover one objects to theories which are based on this dichotomy since they are idealized, and that all of their relevance lies, more or less, directly or indirectly, in justifying the

present state of capitalism. It is possible, for example, to observe some villages in the Alps as a urbanized settlement, because a great amount of the aforementioned contents that determine an urban area can be found in them, while on the other hand, there are some settlements officially named cities or parts of cities (suburbs etc.), which even have a number of those contents, but cannot be considered urbanized in full sense, because some part (or even most) of their inhabitants deal with agriculture. Those are precisely the rural areas and settlements in the scope of some city territory, some kind of suburbs which can be found especially in postsocialist countries.

It is possible to show many examples that "a city" does not have to and sometimes is not solely a settlement understood in the classical sense (an urban/urbanized place), for the reason that it can and to some extent does include rural areas within its territory. Medieval cities, which were built on the locations of fortresses used for the protection of people from the attacks of robbers and raiders, did become "cities" precisely because of the distinguished urban way of life which fundamentally differentiates them from other (rural) settlements, but even this particular way of life has come into being through the accumulation of wealth and a concentration of surplus value, using the resources and labor from the "non-city", just as Harvey showed. It is possible to say that a concrete social-historical form of mode of production determines the creation of the "urban". The urban way of life is created and developed as a specific ideology of the ruling class (or should it be said power elite, but this is not the place for discussing the class-elite dichotomy), which tries in that manner to distinguish itself from the rest of the society. Following Castells' explanation that every époque of human civilization is characterized by an urban expression which derives from the particular mode of production of a particular époque, one can say that a mercantile city has been developed with the appearance and domination of mercantilism and financial capital, as well as that the industrial city has been developed as a consequence of the industrial revolution and the domination of industrial capital. Every ruling class/elite creates cities based on its own interests and preferences. The examples which can be used as a confirmation of this opinion are Renaissance European cities, especially in modern Italy (the decisive role of the patrons like the Medici family), and creating a population and area growth of cities in the west of United States (Los Angeles, Las Vegas...), as well as some other contemporary capitalist cities: Dubai was a fishing village until the 1960's, Brazilia was founded at the same time and so on. From the second half of twentieth century we have witnessed the creation of "planned cities", mostly in India, Pakistan and Iran (Navi Mumbai, Putrajaya etc.), or the "King Abdullah Economic City" in Saudi Arabia.

Contemporary urban sociology (or sociology of the city) is partially becoming the sociology of space, that is, one can say, the sociology of capitalism in the sense of a critical approach to social reality and its shaping, more precisely the topic of interest of this special sociology is, more and more, the accumulation, flow and fertilization of industrial and financial capital in a certain spatial unit called the "city", in other words, it is about the spatial expression of the capitalist mode of production. The sociology of the city, in its essence, is mesosociology, it stands "between the micro-level of an individual and small groups and the macro-level of global society" (Vujovic in: Turza 1996:103). As Saunders notices, there is an ongoing "quest for the "urban" topic of analysis. All other sociological sub disciplines have followed their own topic: family, crime, organization, religion or something else" (Saunders in: Vujovic, Petrovic 2005:173). Thus all other special sociologies have clearly defined the area of study; however, without a multidisciplinary ap-

proach to sociological thought they remain at the level of a partialized relation towards society as a dynamic totality. Maybe it is precisely this "elusiveness" and the difficulty of defining the subject of urban sociology that has fostered the trend of its transformation towards an entirety scientific discipline which studies the contemporary state of the capitalist mode of production and its spatial manifestation.

At this point one should move onto the study of the characteristics of contemporary postsocialist cities and how some of these theories can be used and applied in studying social relations and processes in this specific spatial unit. After the implosion of real-socialism and planned economy in Central and Eastern Europe, symbolically marked by the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, all of countries have gone through a "transition period", a transition from planned to market economy and from a single-party to a multi-party political system. What has exactly happened is a kind of "primary" accumulation of capital, because ownership of production means in most cases passes from state and social into the private sector, while the state, more or less, retains ownership of some crucial sectors. The former SFRJ republics have had a transition marked by wars in the 1990's, precisely Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As for Serbia, it is necessary to indicate that this country has passed through two types of social transformations: blocked and deblocked. "Blocked transformation represents a process in which a totalized monopoly of a collective-owner class of all of social reproduction, characteristic of socialism, is replaced by the economic and political dominance of the same group, which uses this dominance to slow down as much as possible the development of market economy and political competition." (Lazic 2000:33) Deblocked transformation is the notion which describes the period after the fall of Slobodan Milosevic's regime in 2000, when some sort of neoliberal model of social transformation was applied, in a specific form characteristic for this country. The main goal was to create total domination of foreign huge capital, which was only partially successful, because of strong state interventionism in economy (public enterprises) and the power of local tycoons. Lazic and some other authors (Slobodan Antonic for example) call this kind of newly formed capitalism in Serbia "political capitalism", because of the strong influence of politicians on every aspect of social reproduction and the key role of political praxis in the creation and shaping of this "post-Milosevic" society. It is perhaps justified to call this form "crony capitalism", because of the real power of "hidden structures", interests groups and familiar connections in shaping social reproduction. Best men, relatives, nephews, as well as organized crime strongly influence political praxis, and even if the decisions of what will be privatized and who is allowed to make a profit are made exclusively by politicians, "crony deals" precede every such decision.

Changes which have arisen from this transition certainly have reflected on postsocialist cities. For sociological study, the following are especially important: the commercialization of city centre, the industrialization of the periphery and rural or semi-urbanized areas belonging to the city territory, the gentrification of certain city parts and strengthening of the role, power and influence of local elites, with a weakening of the role, power and influence of citizens at the same time. All of these changes happened mostly because of the application of a neoliberal social model, where the freedom of profit has an advantage in relation to the freedom of an individual. One aspires to a certain social consensus (for example, the Republic of Serbia Expropriation Law is called "public interest") on the necessity and inevitability of a postsocialist cities transforming into Harvey's "urban machine" (a city as an enterprise), where privatization, deregulation and huge capital interests have a decisive role.

The main question which is imposed here is whether and how it is possible to apply the theoretical conceptions of Manuel Castells and David Harvey to the study of contemporary postsocialist cities. Certainly, the possibilities would vary from case to case; however, it is sure that a certain common denominator which will generalize that analysis can be found. As for Serbia, and in view of the comparison with other postsocialist countries, one has to bear in mind the late and almost perpetually obstructed modernization and the fact that just approximately twenty years ago, the city population surpassed the rural population, and even this fact can be problematized. Unlike the European tradition of maintaining a relatively continuous development of medieval fortified cities and their transformation first into industrial and then into contemporary information cities-enterprises, the cities in Serbia were originally oriental casabas from the times of the Ottoman Empire. The exception are cities in Vojvodina, which were under the rule of the Habsburg Monarchy, and therefore had completely different development. It is important to point out that three of the cities in Vojvodina (Novi Sad, Sombor and Subotica) were given the status of free royal cities in the second half of the eighteenth century. Western and central European cities were the keepers of the tradition of social liberty and at least formal equality of the citizens in feudalism and partially in absolutism, a tradition manifested by the famous motto "city air makes men free". Oriental ottoman casabas, on the other hand, did not have this kind of tradition. Furthermore after the final liberation of Serbia in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Serbian rural population expelled the Turkish population from the cities, thus modern Serbian citizenship started to form just about 150 years ago.

In the case of the territorial organization of postsocialist countries, one can notice that almost every one of them underwent certain changes in the administrative divisions in last twenty years, while the level and type of the local autonomy differed from one another. A few examples will be provided: first of all Poland, which is a country with the largest territory of all the postsocialist countries, except Russia, and based on the reform from 1999, it was divided into 16 dukedoms, replacing 49 of them which had existed until then. They include within themselves cities and towns, while neither the capital nor any other city has any specific definition as a special territorial unit. Based on the reform of 2000 in the Czech Republic, the state was divided into 13 regions divided into districts (replacing the former 73 districts). The capital, Prague, is defined as one of the districts. As for Slovakia, from 2002 it was divided into 8 regions ("krajevi") each one named after its administrative centre, and they have a certain level of autonomy. These 8 regions are divided into 79 districts, and the two biggest cities, Bratislava and Kosice, are divided into 5, that is 4, districts. Hungary, from 2011, has been constituted of 20 regions (divided into 174 sub-regions): 19 areas and the capital Budapest, which has a specific local government. In Hungary 23 cities with areal legislative are recognized as "urban areas".

In Romania (1995), the capital Bucharest and its dependant county Ilyfov (the suburbs of Bucharest) have redefined their relations, and therefore the capital city has become the only spatial unit different from the other counties (41 in total). Bulgaria has from 1999 been divided into 28 provinces, two of them are the Sofia area and the City of Sofia, while the local government is organized into 264 municipalities. Two former SFRJ republics have also changed their territorial organization. Croatia is divided into 21 district offices ("zupanije"), two of which are the District Office Zagreb and City of Zagreb. Bosnia and Herzegovina, after the war, was organized into a very complicated administrative system of two entities. One of them was divided into 10 cantons, while the District of Brcko has special status. Also, in this country there are four official cities (Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Mostar and East Sarajevo).

The Republic of Serbia, according to the Law on Territorial Organization from 28.12.2007, is structured in the following way: 23 cities and the City of Belgrade (a special territorial unit) and 150 municipalities, which make up a total number of 174 units of local government. The decentralization of Serbia is a question which has presented a serious problem for a long time, considering the modernizing of the country as it has been imagined by the administrative division of contemporary western type. Any attempt of decentralization and dismantling of central government monopoly is construed as country fragmentation, certainly under the influence of the SFRJ break-up and the problem of Kosovo and Metohija. Municipalities and cities in Serbia had noticeably far greater jurisdictions before the 1990's; the situation was changed by the Law on Local Government from 1999 and by the aforementioned law from 2007. It is important to notice that before 2007 only three settlements had the status of a city (Belgrade, Nis and Novi Sad), while right now there are 24 of them, some paradox ally consisting of just one municipality.

All of these examples of postsocialist countries' territorial organizations clearly prove the appropriateness of considering a city as a special distinctive territorial unit with its own political power and economic activity. In most cases, what happened was a certain copying of the structure of the developed western capitalist countries, where the application of the neoliberal model of social praxis has an important role. The transition from the socialist to the capitalist society has inevitably brought the transformation of an administrative division and reconfiguration of the relations among different levels of political power. The complexity of those territorial changes, the particularity of each of them, but also the similarities or even some regularities in this process present an interesting database for interpretation and analysis. The question is based on the possibilities of maintaining these complex systems based on the dominance of the biggest cities (including the capitals), which are considered the centers of the concentration of surplus value.

By taking into consideration all the aforementioned, the main question which is imposed is whether, if, and how and to what extent is it possible to apply some of mentioned theories, especially the one of David Harvey, in the study of postsocialist city characteristics and their transformations over the last twenty years (that is, after "the break" of socialism and "the triumph" of neoliberalism), as well as social processes, relations and the entire praxis within them? It is this author's belief that this particular theory is not only possible, but plausible if one is to reveal the real character of those cities and their place and role in the contemporary capitalist mode of production and its specific social-historical form, "postsocialist capitalism". One especially has to pay attention on the process of developing city territory and the use and consumption of space. In Serbia, but in other countries of this type, numerous cities, that is local governments, tends to "attract" (mostly foreign) investments, so they offer some parts of the city territory to capitalists to use them and create factories and open newly created workplaces. The local governments often change the urban and spatial planning to create such a possibility for capitalists (the aforementioned Republic of Serbia Expropriation Law and the "public interest" within it).

REFERENCES

1. Bassand, Michel (2001) *Za obnovu urbane sociologije: jedanaest teza*. Sociologija Vol.XLIII, No.4, pp.345-352. Beograd:ISIFF
2. Čaldarović, Ognjen (1987) Urbana sociologija: socijalna teorija i urbano pitanje. Zagreb:Globus
3. Castells, Manuel (2005) *Evropski gradovi, informaciono društvo i globalna ekonomija* in: *Urbana sociologija*, Vujović, S. and Petrović M. (eds.), pp.181-195. Beograd:Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva
4. Harvey, David (2003) *Od fordizma do fleksibilne akumulacije* in: *Globalizacija – mit ili stvarnost*, Vuletić V. (ed.), pp.214-248. Beograd:Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva
5. Harvey, David (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press
6. Harvey, David (2005) *Od menadžerstva ka preduzetništvu: transformacija gradske uprave u poznom kapitalizmu* in: *Urbana sociologija*, Vujović, S. and Petrović M. (eds.), pp.208-217. Beograd:Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva
7. Harvey, David (2007) *Neoliberalism and the City*, Transcript of a lecture given at the University of Windsor on September 25,2006. Studies in Social Justice, Vol.1, No.1
8. Harvey, David (2008) *Right to the City*. New Left Review No.53
9. Lazić, Mladen (1988) *Kapitalizam u evoluciji*. Novi Beograd:IIC SSO Srbije, IDI Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
10. Lazić, Mladen (2000) Elite u postsocijalističkoj transformaciji srpskog društva in: Račji hod, Lazić, M. (ed.). Beograd:Filip Višnjić
11. Lefebvre, Henri (1974) *Urbana revolucija* (La révolution urbaine). Beograd:Nolit
12. McCann, Eugene J. (2004) *"Best Places": Interurban Competition, Quality of Life and Popular Media Discourse*. Urban Studies Vol.41, No.10, pp.1909-1929. SAGE Publications
13. Park, Robert Ezra and Burgess, Ernest Watson (1921) *Intoduction to the Science of Sociology*. The University of Chicago Press
14. Petrović, Mina (2004) *Globalizacija i gradovi*. Sociologija Vol.XLVI, No.1, pp.19-44. Beograd:ISIFF
15. Saunders, Piter (2005) *Neprostorna urbana sociologija?* in: *Urbana sociologija*, Vujović, S. and Petrović M. (eds.), pp.171-180. Beograd:Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva
16. Shaikh, Anwar (1990) *Capital as a Social Relation* in: *Marxian Economics: The New Palgrave*, Eatwell and Milgate (eds.), pp.72-78. Norton
17. Stoker, Gary (2005) *Teorija režima i urbana politika* in: *Urbana sociologija*, Vujović, S. and Petrović M. (eds.), pp.218-228. Beograd:Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva
18. Vujović, Sreten (1996) in: *Čemu još sociologija?* Turza, K. (ed.), pp.93-118. Beograd:Gutenbergova galaksija

TEORIJE O KAPITALISTIČKOJ URBANIZACIJI I POSTSOCIJALISTIČKI GRAD

Josip Kristović

U ovom radu biće predstavljene najrelevantnije teorije koje se tiču kapitalističke urbanizacije u poslednjih stotinu godina, a zatim će se preći na razmatranje kako ove teorije mogu biti primenjene u propitivanju i analiziranju postsocijalističkih gradova. Razlog zbog koga su ove teorije odabrane leži u njihovoj širini i celovitosti, te se zbog toga postavljaju na centralnu poziciju u okviru urbane sociologije. Tačnije rečeno, radi se o uticaju kapitalističkog načina urbanizacije na gradove u postsocijalizmu. Postsocijalistička društva su, počev od 1990-ih, prošla kroz promene nazvane "tranzicija" i te promene nisu zaobišle urbane prostore i njihovu praksu. Mogu biti prepoznate neke važne urbane promene: komercijalizacija centra, industrijalizacija ruralnih i perifernih područja koja pripadaju gradu, džentrifikacija određenih "elitnih" naselja itd. Ipak, verovatno najprepoznatljivije obeležje savremenih postsocijalističkih gradova jeste kako oni koriste i troše sopstveni prostor.

Ključne reči: *urbana sociologija, kapitalizam, postsocijalizam, grad i prostor.*