

FACTA UNIVERSITATIS

Series: **Architecture and Civil Engineering** Vol. 16, N° 3, 2018, pp. 401-413

<https://doi.org/10.2298/FUACE180524017K>

## GENTRIFICATION, CREATIVE CLASS AND PROBLEMS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN CONTEMPORARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT

UDC 711:316.334.56

711:338.2

711.316.33

Vladimir Kostić<sup>1</sup>, Aleksandar Kostić<sup>1</sup>, Milena Dinić Branković<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Pristina, Faculty of Economics, Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia

<sup>2</sup>University of Niš, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Niš, Serbia

**Abstract.** *This paper considers modern city territories and analyzes neoliberal spatial city planning which is, among other things, mostly realized through gentrification. While explaining the modern transformation tendencies of cities the authors seek to find the link between the gentrification phenomenon and the rise of city inequality. In this context, marginality is not the result of economic underdevelopment but economic progress. The paper explores the reasons why contemporary urban politics leads to class segregation. The authors investigate a genetic connection of the capital and urbanization confirming Harvey's paradigm that „capitalism is forced to urbanize in order to renew itself“. Furthermore, the paper investigates the relationship between creative class-creative city and to what extent it is reality and to what “a utopia for the chosen ones.”*

**Key words:** *urban renewal, neoliberalism, post city, inequality, commercialization*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Social sciences, economy and sociology in the first place, have recognized a challenge in the possibility of exploring city gentrification as an instrument of neoliberal urban politics. Therefore the sociologist Lefebvre (1970) came to the conclusion that capitalism could only survive with the aid of the production of space and was the first to use the term “city substance”. Harvey who applied Lefebvre's idea on urbanism as a social and engineering discipline in the 1980's (1985) was on the same track. Both authors realized that gentrification itself would solve the problem of excess financial capital. They saw the growth of cities as an important factor of economic stabilization of capitalism on a global

---

Received May 24, 2018 / Accepted June 5, 2018

**Corresponding author:** Vladimir Kostić

University of Pristina, Faculty of Economics, Kolašinska 156, 38220 Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia

E-mail: [vladakostic1985@gmail.com](mailto:vladakostic1985@gmail.com)

scale. The definition of the term gentrification is complex. The term gentrification was first introduced in sociology by Ruth Glass with the intention of describing the invasion of middle-class into residential districts of London that were at the time used by the working class people. Tiesdell et al. (1996: 128-129) talk about gentrification as a phenomenon according to which residents of lower income and less profitable entertainment are replaced by wealthier tenants and more profitable uses. The law on Spatial Planning of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 defines gentrification as the improvement of economic standards of a certain district, often by well-planned urban renewal after the megaprojects related to great sport or cultural events. What all of the existing definitions of gentrification have in common is that they define it as the construction of residential areas intended for wealthy people, or in other words, for the population homogenous according to the symbolic and economic status. Capitalism is forced to urbanize in order to renew itself. A great urban structure transformation with a dramatic change of socio-economic picture occurred at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Paris and was led by Baron Haussmann. Thanks to the ideology and governmental support of the public official Robert Moses, in the period 1940-1970 a significant reorganization of New York took place. Its aim was to lead the market out of the crisis through construction and attraction of excess capital. "Spatio-temporal fix" occurred (Harvey, 2005a), and the production of "city substance" acquired greater dimensions and the capital started creating its own reality.

Gentrification of cities with all its vagueness of meaning to this day attracts the attention of researchers. The importance of cities in modern world is constantly growing and their network is building up. Therefore, „in the countries with low income rate economic activity makes up 55% of GDP, in moderately developed countries 73%, and in developed countries up to 85%, which implies that modern economy is not 'tied to' territories but rather cities and their networks. (Vendina, 2012: 812). This indicates that markets have "swollen" the excess capital. Sociologists begin to renew a critical approach towards space. It becomes the "expanding of city substance" (Rex extensa) as a paradigm of given and simple. However, the involvement of social sciences makes the whole process more complex. In fact, "the labyrinth of complications" is created (Harvey, 2005b: 93). The neoliberalization of urban space or in other words urban practice has put the rebellion, that is to say, the understanding of "the right to the city" in the foreground (Harvey, 2008: 88). In this sense, there is no division between the spatial structure and economic paradigm of competitiveness and conjuncture. Consequently, space becomes contradictory - because, apart from being the category of power transition, in the language of Marxism, it is being compressed and at the same time it is a substance of expansion, dynamic, its acceleration becomes faster day by day. Cities become a paradigm of speed at which things happen in urban politics. Consequently, discussions on the construction chaos and corruption become modern urban topics.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the "creative city" as a wide-spread concealment of enormous social costs and neoliberal agenda. The "creative city" concept focuses on the dynamic sources of change, incorporating the youth cohort and popular culture shaped by the digitally literate and entrepreneurial consumer (Hartley et al., 2012), and is driven by the "creative class" (Florida, 2002). Florida's view on economic growth and development of cities and regions is based on the idea of a distinct group of people working in so-called "creative" professions, whose creativity represents a great potential for innovation and urban growth. The "creative city" should not necessarily be considered as an absolute discrepancy of creative urban development and gentrification of urban area. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to investigate the following: (1) the gentrification

phenomenon in all its complexity, which includes both positive and negative discourse, and (2) to what extent a neoliberal city represents the fertile ground for entrepreneurs on the one hand and a problem for the majority of citizens on the other hand, as well as, whether a “creative class=creative city” represents a realistic developmental perspective or rather a utopia for the chosen ones.

## 2. GENTRIFICATION AS A MODERN URBAN PHENOMENON

In the last fifty years great deindustrialization of cities has happened. Namely, there is the case of relocation of industrial facilities outside of the city which leads to the changes reflected in the areas ready for the construction of residential and commercial property. Urban renewal of these areas means better housing quality and better communal infrastructure in ruined urban area potentially interesting for investors. This may result in gentrification and leads to socio-economic stratification. This phenomenon is especially associated with cities in Great Britain, South America and Australia (Butler, 1995: 190).

The term gentrification literally denotes refinement, ennoblement, and prestige, making a particular space more attractive for living or renting. This may refer to individual buildings or the whole districts that earned such reputation for objective socio-economic processes such as: lowered standard of living, depopulation, deindustrialization, etc. In European and American cities this process started in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and implied mass migrations of residents from districts that became prestigious all of a sudden. These marginal groups usually moved to the suburbs or even farther (Glass, 2010: 7). Gentrification affected long forgotten and deserted industrial buildings. Researchers in such cases talk about the changed purpose of a parcel of land, city regeneration, urban renewal or reconstruction (Tallon, 2013: 42-66; Helms, 2003: 474-477; Smith, 2010: 93-94, Vaništa-Lazarević, 2003). *The first stage* of gentrification involved depopulation of whole districts which were characterized by the low standard of living and high crime rate (so called ghettos). These were devastated and neglected locations where compact, racial and national minorities used to live, usually in ruined apartment buildings that belonged to factories. This stage is linked to 1960s. The second stage began in 1970s with the emergence of the so called squatters (English verb squat – overtake, conquer cities) and lofters (English loft – a flat in the attic, inaccessible place). The nature of this phenomenon is in the occupation or cheap lease of for various reason empty flats, houses or whole districts. These districts were usually inhabited by bohemians, actors and artists who turned the space into art galleries, art studios, night clubs, etc. These places were characterized by a special “aura” and image which contributed to the rise of prices in the near neighborhoods. Having realized this, the owners changed the terms of the lease and the rent went up or the institutionalization of space was carried out by granting it the official status. These processes happened in Chicago, Amsterdam, New York, Berlin, and Paris. The third stage is connected to the period after the beginning of 1990s. Gentrification started flourishing with the aid of accumulated capital and the support of public sector.

Gentrification does not only represent an important capital investment it also represents the realization of non-economic goals that would contribute to the overall success. Actually, that is a symbolic capitalization of space that enhances some segments of post industrialization. Such developmental strategy is connected to the establishment of national and global market of consumers prepared to pay a lot for the service they get. Similar

strategy is impossible in the cities where there is no good transportation infrastructure, as well as in the cases of undeveloped inner demand, the lack of initial capital, and often the lack of stable institutions. Space as a socio-economic, political and cultural phenomenon poses a number of dilemmas for a term that was considered unambiguous. It was the domination of the given condition of space that long excluded the role of social sciences because it was considered that space was far simpler than society. Things became more complex with the involvement of social sciences.

Therefore, gentrification as a new phenomenon in urban development represents higher standards of living for some people, and for the others, the struggle for survival and migration. It included class dimensions which took place in social geography of working class districts. Those who supported this process used more sophisticated terms: „recycling of districts“, „improvement“, „renaissance“, etc. This was an attempt to blur class, and racial connotations of gentrification (Beauregard, 1993), which indicates that gentrification is a controversial process with the class character. That is the reason why the opposition to gentrification is often seen as the opposition to advancement. It is obvious that disputes related to gentrification do not only represent a struggle for urban space, but also for symbolic political power to determine the future of a city (Smith, 2012: 46). Gentrification is a process which lasts and provokes debates.

### **2.1. Neoliberal city, gentrification and the problem of conflicts**

Starting with the 80s the production of “city substance” becomes unlimited and it is not only focused on cities, which was common in the past. Neoliberal logic turns everything into resources, whether it is the case of brands, processes, ruins or people. Since the only true measure of neoliberalism is efficiency, everything comes down to interchangeable monetary resources, from oil to spiritual values. The question arises as to whether or not the neoliberal cities are a prey of entrepreneurs or truly at the service of citizens? It is obvious that a large financial surplus is absorbed by space and in return increased through urbanization, in other words strategies for faster city development at all costs. In this sense the existing, but insufficiently efficient city substance, is restructured through gentrification. Therefore it is forced by the capital, or better say, a new possibility for the rent income through realty arises (Rent-gap theory). In other words, gentrification represents the struggle of opposing poles which takes place within neoliberal cities (Smith, 1996). So called chaotic concepts which are the result of the low quality criterion represent negative implications of gentrification. It often happens that “Districts populated by middle and upper class strive to achieve exclusiveness, namely to impose various measures of restricted trespass for nonresidents, such as placing some physical barriers or inhumane security systems, or discouraging passersby to find themselves in such areas by some symbolic means. In both cases boundaries are set, although of different level of restriction between the private and public space, which has great political implications” (Krstic, 2015: 88). It is obvious that residents of gentrified city areas are not interested in social life and interaction with their neighbors. Such people are only mobile within their own groups, especially when residential and spatial mobility is concerned, which only explains self-sufficiency of new middle class people and their lack of desire to keep in touch or develop any kind of a relationship with the neighbors. (Goodlad and Meegan, 2005: 198).

Gentrification is an ongoing process and it does not imply that the neighborhood dimensions are not susceptible to change. The atmosphere is created through interaction. If

there is a “shell” in “gentrified” neighborhood, social life becomes impossible. The best example of this is Belleville, a district in eastern Paris where besides autochthonous French people lives a great number of immigrants. However, its location and traffic infrastructure was noticed by middle and high class people, so they started inhabiting Belleville in 1980s. In that part of the city residents formed two groups. The first autochthonous group does not look upon social and ethnic diversity with hostility, whereas the second group is reserved because the type of life led in the neighborhood does not suit it, it keeps itself at a distance from the local residents and does not interact with the first group. The immigrant group does everything to make native residents leave the neighborhood. It is obvious that gentrification of Belleville brought to a conflict, and given the economic and social power of new residents it is inevitable that the old residents who nourish community spirit and solidarity cannot survive in the district, in other words they will start moving out (Simon, 2005: 218-228). In that sense, the space itself is formed as a network of mutually “blind” places that negate each other (Замятин, 2013). However, gentrification does not necessarily has to bring troubles because the middle class sometimes develops social relationships which include different spheres such as work, church, various associations, which enable it to transfer social capital from one discourse to another (Coleman, 1988: 109). Even though the relationships are developed between different social strata, and different social groups intertwine, there is a potential for making contacts that would help the social capital bridge the divide and create the setting for the improvement of the social status of marginalized groups.

Gentrification has an element of reurbanisation and revitalization in itself which comes from disputable necessity, even though everything rests on urbanism as the product of neoliberal ideology. It is precisely the conjunction of ideology and the market characterized by the urbanistic strategies that enables “the real estate market to mediate space in the same way in which financial market mediates time” (Sheppard, 2006: 125). Gentrification is always in the sphere of social relations and class power because without excess capital there is no urbanization. It sometimes has devastating consequences since the whole families have to move out. Sometimes integrated communities characterized by solidarity and companionship are scattered on the periphery of the city, which consequently makes them lose their sense of rebellion. These people think that the right to the city has been taken from them. This only illustrates the power of capital in the process of urbanization - “a fundamental and radical aspect of neoliberal gentrification” (Harvey, 2013: 27).

It is obvious that „liberal urbanism leaves citizens in a vicious circle of poverty without finding other solution for them but make them move somewhere else“ (Đorđević, 2016: 261). Marginalized groups have neither strength nor power to resist such processes. After leaving gentrified areas the state sees them as an additional cost, and they find themselves in more hopeless situation. It is in government’s interest to, for example, make profit out of construction not realizing that the problem becomes bigger because of the growing number of aggravated city inhabitants (Levine, 2004: 89). A way out of this situation lies in the fact that the complexity of gentrification must be realized. Namely, in the process of urbanization, urbanistic aspects, architectural solutions, ecological, social and legal norms must be taken into consideration. It is a fact that in the process of gentrification different interests are intertwined and the power struggle is usually at the expense of citizens. The first negative result is socio-spatial stratification and the rise of inequality. The decision making should be transparent and citizens and community should participate in the creation of politics.

### 3. CREATIVE CITY AND IMMATERIAL FACTORS OF DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN SPACE

National and global market as well as globally integrated organizations cannot function properly without central places in which globalization finds its embodiment. Such places are cities, since innovation, science and international trade are concentrated there. Creative class is described as the most active subject in the construction of urban space because it possesses human and social capital. Creative man has the knowledge that dominates the society which is also called the intellectual capital (Gorz, 2010: 209). The description that the Frankfurt school gave in order to explain the transformation of culture into business and deceit, or in other words the birth of chimera whose name is “creative city” is in fact the attempt to use the mask of culture as a camouflage of real estate speculations. The creative city bares the template of the ideological construct (Pasquinelli, 2012: 141-142). That is how Florida (2002) promotes the concept of creative city as the construction of an appealing urban identity and symbolic branding of small territories. According to the above mentioned, one can notice the tendency of the agenda and social expenses concealment. On the other hand, Pasquinelli approaches this problem from an alternative perspective “the creativity of a city is simply a biomorphic extension of its social composition and competence” (Pasquinelli, 2012: 142).

The complexity of “the creative city” lies in the fact that it does not succumb to the canons of classics, nor the measures of high culture. That is the reason why it is hard to select a consistent and comprehensive definition of “the creative city”. From the standpoint of this research the closest definition is the one that says that it is “a biopolitical machinery which integrates all the aspects of life that are included in the process of work, in which new lifestyles become goods, in which culture is considered to be material movement as any other and specific, in which collective image production is recaptured in order to increase private profit – ‘creative city’ appears as a closed circle” (Pasquinelli, 2012: 143). From the sociological standpoint, creative identity of views is typical of small creative groups and in that sense their particular interests are not visible enough. Creative urban environment should function as a catalyst for creative activities of the citizens. However, such activity can appear only where the basic traditional components of the open city economy exist. Even when the global cities fulfil the requirements of labor the creative industries employ 3-5% of people (Лэндри, 2011: 33). Even though according to the conception of Florida (2002) creative class is characterized by multiculturalism, tolerance and diversity, in reality creative city space often provokes quite the opposite – a decrease in ethnic diversity and an increase in the economic threshold access to central gentrified areas (Мартьянов, 2016: 43). Gentrification is a popular neoliberal cure for the places where devastated city areas and deserted factories with apartments are renewed. However, this happens under the pressure of the growing creative class. It helps in breathing a new life into the cities which survived deindustrialization and were deserted by a great number of workers and experts, and were populated by the members of marginalized groups who usually subsist on grey economy. In such circumstances a true motive for gentrification is the capitalization of urban city space. The interest of city community is offered as a sacrifice to the neoliberal city politics which inevitably leads to the segregation of city space where private profit is in the foreground. Even Florida (2013) admits that the growing creative class does not create a multiplier effect which would empower a wide range of social groups. Creative city by the nature of things has its postmodern dimension which implies urban changes that have not happened beforehand. That is how postmodern

urbanism generates the picture in which there is no place for the working class anymore. This is the case of “one special opportunistic vision of postmodernism, and not the so called cultural turnover per se” (Smith, 2012: 52).

Smit has not anticipated the problem of collective imagination in the process of gentrification even though he stresses out that dealing with culture and capital is vital (Smith, 1979; 1982). Unlike the traditional form of gentrification, the one that promotes artificial cultural capital and marketing of the “creative city” is becoming more and more popular. The process started in New York on Lower East Side at the end of the 20th century when the owners who could not rent their houses at a commercial price, rented them to the artists for the next five years at a lower price. However, when the process of gentrification in the neighborhood started the owners raised the prices enormously. The artists “built” their art into gentrification, however they were relocated. Nevertheless, the artistic production model turned into immaterial factories across Europe, and Berlin and Barcelona are typical examples of this. The real estate market established a depraved coalition with the world of art and cultural tradition in the majority of European cities which are produced by counterculture.

There is an interesting relationship between the local culture and gentrification where each of the cities has developed its unique style. Thus, the futuristic museum of modern art MACBA in Barcelona was built in the center of old part of the city in Raval quarter (Fig. 1). The gentrification effect of MACBA was successful, especially thanks to the cultural surroundings of the museum which consisted of a globalized middle class in Catalonia. Certainly, the gentrification of Raval had its controversy and obscurity such as the allegations against local residents for spreading homosexual orientation and concealment of various unethical interests related to real estate trading (Ribalta, 2004).



**Fig. 1** MACBA Museum of Contemporary Art Barcelona in El Raval quarter.

Source: <http://www.rafaelvargas.com/project/aerial-shooting-barcelona>

Gentrification did not skip Russia. The best example for this is the neoliberal reconstruction of the capital city Anadyr (Fig. 2). In 2000 the team of Roman Abramovic brought a group of artists and architects from Moscow to design a series of unusual

buildings. A lot of people looked at them as Anadyr wonder. The buildings were built in the spirit of postmodernism. The gentrified city could boast about picturesque brands such as: Artica (new monumental art), amusement center Baklan, the radio Purga. Big Large parking lots for bicycles appeared on the streets, the Soviet panel houses were painted in bright colors, and the Moscow Center of Contemporary Culture Garage became the venue for artistic events. According to neoliberal logic anything goes; the most important thing is to be successful and efficient (Смирнов, 2016: 79-80). However, gentrification always happens in the same way, at least when the esthetic supervision is concerned. Newly arrived rich residents redecorate the whole districts, or better say renovate, taking care not to undermine the historical value of the building they are moving into. This is good since the architectural ambient stays the same. On the other hand, some care more for the luxury and location and the individual taste prevails there (Bridge, 2007: 41-43).



**Fig. 2** Anadir, Russia panoramic view.

Source: <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/279786195574099527/>

There is an interesting urban enterprise in Serbia called Belgrade Waterfront on the location known as Savamala (Fig. 3). Following the example of respected cities in Western Europe and Northern America, the realization of the project according to which 6200 luxuries apartments, average size of 140m<sup>2</sup> intended for rich citizens and transnational elite has already started on the right bank of the river Sava (Крстић, 2015: 97). So far the workers of Serbian Railways have lived there, the majority of them has lost their jobs, and therefore the obvious intention of the project is to relocate the poor citizens. It will certainly be a challenge for the artists who transpose artistic content and who see gentrification as a collaboration between them and the investors in order to bring gain for the city. Gentrification of this part of Belgrade has aroused controversy and provoked intensive debates which never stop. „Commercialization of the right to have public debates and bringing the whole spectrum of aspects (social, cultural, political) down to arguments of short-term financial gain reveals that Belgrade Waterfront is primarily in the realm of financial market, and secondly in the tridimensional reality of the citizens of Belgrade (Крстић, 2015: 99).





**Fig. 3** View of Belgrade Waterfront project from the bridge "Gazela" (photo montage).  
Source: [http://www.politika.rs/old/uploads/editor/1\(30\).jpg](http://www.politika.rs/old/uploads/editor/1(30).jpg)

The autonomy of creative class is another problem. The question arises as to what extent it is able to support uneconomic factors of the city space development. Everything indicates that sooner or later it will succumb to the logic of the market, in other words, creative industry as one of the branches of capitalistic economy. The realization of creative concepts is determined by economic concept to a large extent (Крстич, 2015: 99). The concept of creative city subordinates the strategy of its development to interests and prospects of a small social group instead of trying to always find the balance and compromise of different collective interests (Мартьянов, 2016: 45). The creative concept of urban development implies the global context no matter how paradoxical it may seem. Namely, the concept of creative city, creative class and creative industry tend to promote the popularity of activities focused on the effects of local growth. Creative city makes the brand out of gentrification itself. That is precisely the reason why the corporate capital is becoming more and more interested in monopolizing creative industry on a global scale and in this way takes the central position in strategic planning of urban development.

### **3.1. Conflicts of interest which determine the concept of creative class and creative city**

The question arises as to whether or not the creative class and creative city are able to create and support non-economic factors of urban space development. It is more likely that sooner or later it would come to terms with the logic of the market, or creative industry that represents one of the branches of capitalist economy. In fact, creative concepts and their realization are determined by the economic concept. The processes that have taken place in the past ten years confirm the thesis on segmentation, localization and commodification of creative utopias in the global space of creative cities (Мартьянов, 2016: 45). In megalopolises we can talk about topological unity, but we can also talk about the fact that they represent heterogeneous space in which different social groups try to protect their contradictory interests. It is precisely the power of the most influential group that determines the concept of creative city.

The creative class is a specific social group. It flourishes only when the social connections are not that strong, and the relations are established through the market with no strings

attached. It is composed of people without families and non-market mechanisms of support who find pleasure in constant work and individualistic competitiveness. It has been observed that such creative class is being reproduced by the external influence, affirmation of sexual minorities and those young people who are not in a hurry to create a family. As it cannot reproduce by its own power, the creative class is transformed into the desired subculture. Regardless of the creative class significance the question arises as to whether or not these groups can be considered within the context of an informative model which presupposes wide social regularities and a healthy society.

Recently, the nominal boundaries of megalopolis do not coincide with life boundaries. Namely, it does not make much sense to “reveal” resources of city development within itself. Postindustrial cities presuppose the existence of a greater material base which is situated outside the nominal boundaries of megalopolis, and even regions. There are a lot of factors which determine this sequence of events. First of all, there are people, or the personnel, capital technology, transport infrastructure, etc. There are also demographic problems that cannot be solved within the cities. Essentially, megalopolises as economic centers of creative industries cannot survive without external markets in modern conditions. However, this does not mean that global cities are available for the whole humanity. Such an idea shows the signs of utopia, even today. Immobile urban population will increasingly depend on deceptive plans of city administration for the attraction of the creative class of modern nomads. Lonely urban life, fear of commitment, the escape from a marriage, an apologia of an individual, body, independence, will make the ego/self an absolute value (Atali, 2010: 110). The creative class as any other speculative resource, in case there is a problem leaves the city without the means spent on suspicious creative investments, which easily leads to a problem. Unrealistic plans are often the consequence of neoliberal greed.

In a sense the creative concept of urban development all of a sudden becomes a sign of weakness of the global context. On the other hand, creativity which depends on the investors makes the architecture of large cities look alike. It is not an accident that some say that Belgrade Waterfall will resemble Dubai. Evidently, there are a lot of examples of unjustified attempts of certain cities, and with them certain states, to monopolize creative industry on a global scale. Obviously, the polarization of city space is, among other things, a product of aspirations for domination and profit. In such circumstances, creativity acquires a frivolous dimension.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In the developed world the problem of excess capital often appears, and gentrification is one of the best ways to absorb it. Therefore, in big cities, residential areas are built for middle class people who are representatives of the population homogenous according to the symbolic and economic status.

Not only urbanists, architects and economists deal with space but also sociologists who develop a critical approach to it. Namely, from the very moment the social sciences got involved in the problem of space the “labyrinth of complications” was created. The expansion of city substance is an efficient mechanism with which capitalism solves the problem of excess financial capital. This does not mean that gentrification is not followed by chaos, polarization of interests and ambivalent coexistence of different areas. The existing but insufficiently efficient city substance is being restructured with the aid of

capital, however, chaotic concepts appear during the process as a result of poor criteria. Consequently, the middle and upper class people who move to those areas do not want to have any contact with the neighbors who already live there, so they introduce some measures of denied access and create a hostile environment by some other safety measures. However, gentrification can sometimes have positive implications if it enables the social capital to expand beyond the boundaries of a limited social group.

One of the most severe consequences of gentrification and the creation of the so called post city is the displacement of entire families. Marginalized groups consider the displacement as the deprivation of the right to the city. That is the kind of attack of neoliberalism on the family through urbanization and gentrification. Neoliberal urban practice of gentrification directly creates geography of renewed class power. In that sense, creative city, creative class and a mantra of immaterial gentrification are at the service of making the middle class homogenous. This is a cover for enormous expenses and the lack of empathy for the marginalized groups and their destiny. The euphemism „concentration of immaterial“ is basically the transformation of the spiritual into the discourse of market. Thus the syntagmatic terms “creative class” and “creative city” become a utopia for the chosen ones. In everyday life, gentrification is fundamentally between the inconsistent neoliberal theory and variable neoliberal practice. Such a process involves a variable introduction of theoretical concepts of classical neoliberalism, or intensifying the strictness of processes in practice. This would not only create the conditions for a renewal of class power but also for the future class conflicts in the cities. In such neoliberal commonplace of the city, gentrification represents a strategic, urban-economic practice. A way-out of this situation is to include the citizens in the process of decision making, in other words make the process transparent.

Big cities are the focus point where the effects of gentrification are most evident. The creative class is the most active participant in the construction of urban space, and cultural economics reveals its affinity towards the concrete. Essentially, the creative class and creative city are the templates of the ideological construct. The promotion of the “creative city” concept as the construction of the appealing city identity and branding of theories is nothing but the desire for the concealment of neoliberal agenda of social costs.

Postmodern urbanism creates a picture in which there is no place for the working class. In cities such as Barcelona and Anadyr, businesses have established an alliance with the world of art, but in a questionable manner. The creative concept of urban development, or the creative city, has its global context: corporate capital is interested in monopolizing gentrified cities and creative industries, which is only a confirmation of profitable neoliberal resource logic of the space perception.

#### REFERENCES

1. Atali, Ž. (2010). *Kratka istorija budućnosti*. Beograd: Arhipelag.
2. Beauregard, R. (1993). *Voices of Decline: The Postwar Fate of US Cities*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
3. Bridge, G. A. (2007). Global Gentrifier Class? *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 39(1):32-46.
4. Butler, T. (1995). Gentrification and the Urban Middle Classes, In: T. Butler and M. Savage (eds) *Social Change and the Middle Classes* (pp. 188-204). London: UCL Press.
5. Coleman, J. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, Supplement: *Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure* (1988), pp. S95-S120 Available at <https://faculty.washington.edu/matsueda/courses/587/readings/Coleman%201988.pdf> Accessed 19.02.2018.

6. Đorđević, S. (2016). Džentrifikacija kao nova urbana strategija i oblik krize liberalne demokratije u globalizovanom svetu. U: *Zbornik radova sa međunarodne konferencije „Urušavanje ili slom demokratije“?* Beograd 24-25. septembar 2016. (str. 257-277). Beograd: Čigoja štampa.
7. Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
8. Florida, R. *More Losers than Winners in America's New Economic Geography*. (2013) Available at: <https://www.citylab.com/life/2013/01/more-losers-winners-americas-new-economic-geography/4465/> accessed 10.02.2018.
9. Glass, R. (2010). London: Aspect of change. In Less L., Slater T. and Wyly E. K. (eds) *The Gentrification Reader* (pp.7-8). London: Routledge.
10. Goodlad, R. and Meegan, R. (2005). Governance, Social Cohesion and Neighbourhood Participation. In *Changing Cities: Rethinking Urban. Competitiveness, Cohesion and Governance*. Edited by Nick Buck, Ian Gordon, Alan Harding, and Ivan Turok. (pp. 188-203). Basingstoke U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
11. Gorz, A. (2010). *The Immaterial: Knowledge, Value and Capital*. London; New York : Seagull Books.
12. Hartley, J., Potts, J., MacDonald, T., Erkunt, C. and Kufleitner, C. (2012). CCI Creative City Index. Available at <http://cultural-science.org/journal/index.php/culturalscience/article/view/49/79> accessed 15.04.2018.
13. Harvey, D. (1985). *The Urbanization of Capital. Studies in the history and theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
14. Harvey, D. (2005a). 'Space as a key word'. In D. Harvey (ed.) *Spaces of Neoliberalization: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development* (pp. 93-115). Heidelberg, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag.
15. Harvey, D. (2005b). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
16. Harvi, D. (2013). Pobunjeni gradovi od Prava na grad do Urbane revolucije. Novi Sad: Mediterran
17. Helms, A. C. (2003). Understanding Gentrification: *An Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Urban Housing Renovation*. *Journal of Urban Economics* 54:474-498.
18. Lefebvre, H. (1970). *La révolution urbaine*. Paris: Gallimard.
19. Levine, M. (2004). Government Policy, the Local State, and Gentrification: The Case of Prenzlauer Berg (Berlin), Germany, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(1), 89-108.
20. Pasquinelli, M. (2012). Kreativna sabotaža u fabrici kulture: Umetnost, džentrifikacija i metropola. U: *Na ruševinama kreativnog grada* ( Ured. Ana Vilenica & Centar\_kuda.org ) (str. 140-178). Novi Sad: Centar za nove medije\_kuda.org
21. Republička agencija za prostorno planiranje (2010). Zakon o Prostornom planu Republike Srbije od 2010. do 2020. godine. "Sl. glasnik RS, br. 88/2010.
22. Ribalta, J. (2004). *Mediation and Construction of Publics: The MACBA Experience*. Available at [http://republicart.net/disc/institution/ribalta01\\_en.htm](http://republicart.net/disc/institution/ribalta01_en.htm) accessed 07.02.2018.
23. Sheppard, E. (2006). David Harvey and Dialectical space-time. In N. Castree, D. Gregory [ed.] *David Harvey: A critical reader*, (pp. 121-141). Oxford: Blackwell.
24. Simon, P. (2005). Gentrification of old neighbourhoods and social integration in Europe. In Y. Kazepov (Ed.), *Cities of Europe. Changing contexts, local arrangements, and the challenge to urban cohesion*. (pp. 210-232). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
25. Smith, N. (1982). Gentrification and uneven development. *Economic Geography*, 58:139-155.
26. Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and Revanchist City*. London; New York: Routledge.
27. Smith, N. (2010). Toward a theory of gentrification: A back to the city movement by capital, not people. In L. Lees, T. Slater, & E. Wyly (Eds.), *The gentrification*. (pp. 85-98). New York: Routledge (First published: Smith, N. (1979). Toward a theory of gentrification: a back to the city movement by capital not people. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45: 538-548.)
28. Smith, N. (2012). Da li je džentrifikacija prljava reč? U: *Na ruševinama kreativnog grada* (Ured. Ana Vilenica & Centar\_kuda.org ) (str. 26-64). Novi Sad: Centar za nove medije\_kuda.org.
29. Tallon, A. (2013). *Urban regeneration in the UK: 2nd edition*. London: Routledge.
30. Tiesdell, S., Oc, T. and Heath, T. (1996). Revitalizing historic urban quarters, Architectural Press, Oxford.
31. Vaništa-Lazarević, E. (2013): *Obnova gradova u novom milenijumu*, Beograd: Classic map studio.
32. Вендина, О. И. (2012). *Невидимые сдвиги в развитии городов. Географическое положение и территориальные структуры*. Москва: Новый хронограф.
33. Замятин, Д. (2013). *Постгеография города: стратегии пространственного воображения* Available at: <http://www.russ.ru/pole/Postgeografiya-goroda-strategii-prostranstvennogo-voobrazheniya> accessed 07.03.2018.
34. Крстић, И. (2015). Центрификација Београда, Будимпеште и Прага. *Култура*, бр. 146/2015, стр. 86-103.
35. Лэндри, Ч. (2011). *Креативный город*. Москва: Издательский дом „Классика - XXI“.

36. Мартянов, В. С. (2016). Креативный класс – креативный город: реальная перспектива или утопия для избранных? *МЭиМО.Т.* 60 (10), 41–51
37. Смирнов, Н. (2016). Зомби-манифест нелиберального урбанизма. *Журнал общественной и художественной критики „Разногласия“ No9 Октябрь 2016*, 69-87. Available at: [http://www.colta.ru/storage/rubric/70/raznoglasiya\\_link\\_1.pdf](http://www.colta.ru/storage/rubric/70/raznoglasiya_link_1.pdf) accessed 06.03.2018.
38. Харви, Д. (2008). Право на город. *Логос* 3 (66), 80-94. Available at: [http://www.intelros.ru/pdf/logos\\_03\\_2008/04.pdf](http://www.intelros.ru/pdf/logos_03_2008/04.pdf) accessed 05.03.2018.

## **GENTRIFIKACIJA, KREATIVNA KLASA I PROBLEMI SUKOBA INTERESA U SAVREMENOM URBANOM RAZVOJU**

*Ovaj rad razmatra procese savremene gradske teritorije i analizira neoliberalnu prostornu strategiju grada koja se, između ostalog, najviše ispoljava preko gentrifikacije. Objasnjavajući savremene tendencije transformacije gradova autori traže vezu između fenomena gentrifikacije i rasta gradske nejednakosti. Marginalnost u tom kontekstu nije rezultat ekonomske zaostalosti, već ekonomskog progressa. Rad istražuje zašto današnja urbana politika dovodi do klasne segregacije. Autori ispituju genetsku vezu kapitala i urbanizacije potvrđujući Harvijevu paradigmu da je „kapitalizam prinuđen da urbanizuje kako bi se obnovio“. Takođe, u radu se istražuje odnos kreativna klasa-kreativan grad i koliko je to realnost a koliko „utopija za izabrane“.*

Ključne reči: *urbana obnova, neoliberalizam, postgrad, nejednakost, komercijalizacija*