

Europe's only Megacity

Urban Growth, Migration and Gentrification

in 21st Century Moscow

JULIA RÖTTJER/JAN KUSBER

At the beginning of the 21st century, Moscow is the largest city and the only Megacity in the European context.¹ It is therefore a case study to be considered in the frame of this conference volume about perspectives of cultural sciences on urban slum areas and their inhabitants. The capital of the Russian Federation has been growing constantly over the last 20 years and the city itself is currently home to approx. 12,000,000,² the Moscow agglomeration to more than 17,000,000 inhabitants, in other words 12 % of the Russian population.³ Moscow is the true centre of the Russian Federation, not only as the focus of a centralised political system, but also as the hotbed of Russian economy. It has been a widely accepted saying that the Russian capital is “one of the most expensive cities of the world” – it also seems to stand for gated communities, a concentration of powerful oil companies, Soviet city planning heritage, the menacing collapse of traffic and an extremely uneven distribution of wealth. At the same

-
- 1 One may discuss the case of Istanbul here. Fedor Kudriavcev speaks of European cities in contrast to cities like Istanbul, Cairo and – Moscow. Cf. KUDRIAVCEV, 2012, p. 374. The heritage of the socialist metropolis planning stands against this: LENTZ, 1997, p. 110.
 - 2 Statistical projection on the basis of the last official number in 2010 (11,514,300), the inclusion of new areas into the city, and the development since 2002: VSEROSSIJSKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013.
 - 3 Cf. MAKHROVA, 2006: <http://demoscope.ru/weekly/2006/0247/tema01.php>, 07.05.2013.

time, the Moscow of today does not appear to feature the aforementioned “urban slum areas” in a sense that might be associated with other Megacities.⁴ Nevertheless, processes of social segregation and gentrification as well as urban migration into and within the city are issues which concern the development of this European Mega-Agglomeration and will be considered in this paper. Its aim is to put Moscow into the debate of this collection, because this Megacity is worth to be researched permanently and interdisciplinary. Within its limited space we shall briefly focus on some points of recent developments in Moscow:

- Urban growth: What are the general stages in Moscow’s development until today? What current challenges are there and what is the character of the anticipated future growth?
- Urban migration: Who lives where in this city and what spaces are occupied by different groups of Muscovites? Which groups are migrating into the city? What can be said about the urban poor?
- Gentrification: Who ‘owns’ the city? What groups are migrating within the city and what are the reasons? How are groups of Muscovites expelled from different areas of the city?

Not all points shall be answered fully, but there always is a historical perspective as a relevant context-setting category. As this article is written by two historians, this may be their appeal for a closer collaboration of historical and social sciences dealing with the phenomena in question.

4 During its history, poverty in Russia has been a topic that was investigated on many levels, and poverty in the city of Moscow has naturally been included in this research. However, at the same time it can be witnessed that St. Petersburg seemed to be more in focus concerning the sketching of urban social issues – cf. for a recent example JAHN, 2010.

Urban growth and development of "The best city in the world"⁵

The city of Moscow gradually grew around the Moscow Kremlin, beginning in the 14th century. It was the capital of the Grand Duchy, after 1547 Tsardom of Muscovy up to 1712, when Peter the Great made the newly founded St. Petersburg his capital. Of course, the loss of the function as the political centre of the state led to a decrease of population of approximately 150,000 down to some 120,000, however, with its location in the Russian heartland and still being centre of commerce the city soon recovered. Moscow once again became capital of the Soviet Union from 1922 to 1991, and of the Russian Federation since 1991.⁶

Situated on either bank of the Moskva River, during the 16th to 17th centuries the city grew up in divisions, formerly separated from one another by walls: the Kremlin, Kitaigorod ("walled town", but interpreted as "Chinatown" by folk etymology), Bielyigorod ("white town"), Zemlianoigorod ("earthworks town"), and Meshchanskiigorod ("bourgeois town") outside the city walls. When Catherine II came to power in 1762, the city's filth and smell of waste and the irregularity of the streets were depicted by observers as a symptom of disorderly lifestyles of lower-class Russians, most of them with a peasant background. Elites called for the improvement of sanitation, which became part of Catherine's plans for increasing control over social life. Although her ambitious General plan for Moscow (1775) as a whole failed, the main achievements were the Mytishchinski water-pipe (built 1784-1804) and the street lightening, which made the centre of the city more secure. After the fire of 1812 as a result of Napoleon's campaign, the city ramparts were replaced with the Boulevard Ring and Garden Ring roads, replacing the walls around Bielyigorod and Zemlianoigorod, respectively.⁷ The city's population grew from 250,000 to above 1,000,000 by the end of the 19th century. National political and military successes from 1812 through 1855 calmed the critics and validated efforts to produce a more enlightened and stable society. There was less talk about the smell and the poor hygienic conditions.

-
- 5 In 2013, Moscow is putting on a festival named "The best city in the world" – see the official Moscow website, presentation for the press March 29th, 2013: PRAVITEL'STVO MOSKVY(1): <http://www.mos.ru/press-center/presentations>, 07.05.2013.
- 6 Cf. on the history of the city in general: LUZHKOVA, 1997. On the persistence through the political changes of revolution and the breakdown of communism: SCHLÖGEL, 2011.
- 7 Cf. on the rebuilding of Moscow after 1812: SCHMIDT, 1989, p. 143-202.

However, with Russia's failures in the Crimean War in 1855-56, confidence in the ability of the state to maintain order in the slums eroded and demands for improved public health placed the issue of filth back on the agenda.⁸ In the second half of the 19th century, Moscow was connected by railway: The first line was the one to St. Petersburg, opened in 1852. At the end of the 19th century, Moscow had become the centre of the country's railway network and saw an influx of migrating peasants, who were the needed work force for the industrialisation in fin de siècle Moscow. With no general urban planning and no concept for public transport and housing at hand, factories were built at the embankments of the Moskva River, near to Kremlin, for example the chocolate factory "Einem".⁹

After the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks moved the capital from Petrograd to Moscow in order to evade the wakes of the World War and the raging civil war. Whereas the population in Petrograd declined seriously, Moscow became the world capital of socialism with a further increase in population. The first Five-Year-Plan saw Moscow as a centre of light and heavy industry. At the end of the twenties it became a "peasant metropolis"¹⁰. But the massive influx of peasants was a source of great concern for party officials. In their opinion, peasants, as members of a "petit-bourgeois" class, represented an "uncultured mass" fond of drinking, with no discipline or religious beliefs and a general lack of political consciousness. So, the city with now 2,000,000 inhabitants not only needed outstanding new buildings designed and built by avant-garde architects (Le Corbusier, Mel'nikov, and others) as worker-clubs and houses for leisure entertainment, but a general development plan. This "Master Plan for the Reconstruction of the City of Moscow", devised by a commission under Lazar Kaganovich and co-signed by Stalin and Viacheslav Molotov on July 10th 1935, was intended as an offensive against the old Moscow, which would transform the city as a whole. Four years in the making, the plan called for an expansion of the city's area from 285 to 600 square kilometres that would take in mostly farmland to the south and west beyond the Lenin (nowadays Sparrow) Hills. It involved 16 major highway projects and the construction of sev-

8 Cf. MARTIN, 2008, p. 243-274. This subject was important, though a minor one during the revolution of 1905, cf. THURSTON, 1987.

9 Cf. HUBER, 2007, p. 25; DÖNNINGHAUS, 2012. The company became the famous "Red October" in Soviet times. The site was bought by a developer in 2004, the production moved to the rim of Moscow. Since, there have been several fantastical plans for a mix-use project in close proximity to the Kremlin, but nothing could be realised yet. Cf. MAKAROVA, 2010: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2010/2/ma25.html>, 07.05.2013.

10 So the title of a cultural study by HOFFMANN, 1994.

eral monumental buildings of “state-wide significance”, the well-known skyscrapers that were to dominate the boulevards’ perspectives.¹¹ It foresaw 15,000,000 square meters of new housing to accommodate a total population of approximately 5,000,000 within the next decades. Representative streets modelled after Haussmann’s boulevards in Paris were built, most prominent the Gorkii street.¹² The city would be surrounded by a green belt up to a width of ten kilometres.

Even while the master plan was being drawn up, old Moscow was giving way to the new. One of the showpieces of the Soviet capital was to be the Moscow Metro, which broke ground in March 1932, went into service in May 1935 and serves, with its successively built lines, especially the ring line, as the backbone of public transportation until today.¹³ A second project, begun in the early 1930s, was the Moscow-Volga Canal built by an army of 200,000 forced labourers, which opened in July 1937. The hopes to make the system of rivers and waterways the major route for the transport of goods failed. The railway remained and still is the dominant means of transportation. In the year 1939, the population of Moscow rose to over four million and by 1959, with the banned returning because of the dissolution of the GULAG after Stalin’s death in 1953, the number of inhabitants approached the 5,000,000 mark. The General plan of 1935 was superseded ahead of time.

During the Khrushchev-period, entire villages in the Moscow region and farmland that had been cultivated for centuries were ploughed under to make way for new apartment blocks organised in micro-districts.¹⁴ The prototype of such housing developments was Novye Cheremushki, south of the city centre.¹⁵ Later, the neighbourhood of Medvedkovo in the city’s south-west and other outlying areas were subjected to the same process. Nevertheless, the new party programme of 1961, which promised that the housing shortage would be eliminated during the first decade of building communism (1961-70), was far from having been realised in the country and in Moscow.

To bring the blue- and especially the white-collar-workers to their working place in the centre of the Soviet Union’s capital, the MKAD (Moskovskaia kol’tsevaia avtomobil’naia doroga), a ring road used only for military purposes, was opened to the public in 1962.¹⁶ It had four lanes running 109 kilometres along the city borders.

11 Cf. for the Stalinist architecture NOEVER, 1994. The building of the high rises was begun after 1945.

12 Cf. RÜTHERS, 2007, p. 75-152.

13 Cf. NEUTATZ, 2001.

14 Cf. COLTON, 1995, p. 358-381.

15 Cf. RÜTHERS, 2006.

16 Cf. KUDRIAVCEV, 2012, p. 375.

The MKAD marked the administrative boundaries of the city of Moscow until the 1980s, when outlying suburbs beyond the ring road were being incorporated.

Whereas struggling heavily with controlling the migration into Moscow – especially the peasants, who came there just to sell parts of the harvest, melons from Astrakhan and other products to overcome the dysfunctions of planned economy,¹⁷ – the Summer Olympic Games of 1980 presented an unparalleled opportunity to showcase the superiority of Soviet athletes as well as the achievements of Soviet socialism in front of a world-wide audience.¹⁸ Extraordinary measures were taken to prepare for this grand festival. A renaissance of urban planning, typical of host cities, resulted in not only new stadiums, training facilities, and hotels, but also a new airport at Sheremetevo. The city itself was ‘polished up’: Roads were newly paved, trees were planted – dissidents and the poor were banned or otherwise expelled from the city.¹⁹

When the USSR was dissolved in 1991, Moscow became the capital of the Russian Federation. Since then, the emergence of market economy in Moscow has produced an explosion of Western-style retailing, services, architecture, and lifestyles. The city has continued to grow during the 1990s to 2000s, its population rising from less than 9,000,000 to more than 11,000,000. Mason and Nigmatullina argue that Soviet-era urban-growth central planning (before 1991) produced controlled and sustainable metropolitan development, typified by the building of the greenbelt in 1935. However, there has been a dramatic growth of low-density suburban sprawl since then, created by a heavy demand for single-family dwellings as opposed to crowded apartments. In 1995-97 the MKAD ring road was widened from the initial four to ten lanes. In December 2002 Bul’var Dmitriia Donskogo became the first Moscow Metro station to open beyond the limits of MKAD. The Third Ring Road, intermediate between the early 19th-century Garden Ring and the Soviet era outer ring road, was completed in 2005.²⁰ The greenbelt is becoming more and more fragmented and satellite cities are appearing at the fringe. Summer dachas are being converted into year-round residences, and with the proliferation of automobiles there is heavy traffic congestion. These fragmentations of the borders of the megacity and its expansion beyond those rims have to be noted when considering the Moscow agglomeration and its population.²¹

17 Cf. on the migration and mixture of population in the 60s and 70s: GAVRILOVA, 2001, p. 130-171.

18 Cf. KUSBER, 2003, p. 108f.

19 Cf. KUPERMANN, 2007.

20 Cf. KUDRIAVCEV, 2012, p. 375.

21 Cf. MASON/NIGMATULLINA, 2011.



A view at the different historical layers of Moscow housing – from the Khrushchevki of the 1950s to later Soviet complexes and postmodern apartment blocks

Urban migration

Moscow is an independent federation subject of the Russian federation. At the same time, the city is the administrative centre of the federation subject it is surrounded by, the “Moscow region” (Moskovskaia *oblast*). Within the *oblast*, there are many larger cities and smaller towns located within the direct vicinity of Moscow. More than one million commuters are on their way to Moscow and back every day, while three to four million Muscovites spend the summer on dachas outside the city boundaries. Within this agglomeration there exists not only a close interconnection in terms of traffic, but in the labour and housing markets as well. Tendencies that are true of the housing market of Moscow itself quickly spread into the agglomeration, which has seen an unusually high building activity in the last years; it attracts not only Muscovites but also private housing investors from all over Russia.²²

22 ZUBAREVICH, 2012, p. 265.

Table 1: Population of Moscow, Moscow region and Russia, 1989-2010 (in 000)²³

	1989	1995	2000	2005	2008	2009	2010	Development		
								1989-2000	2000-2010	1989-2010
Russia	147,400	148,460	146,890	143,474	142,009	141,904	141,914	-0,35 %	-3,39 %	-3,72 %
Moscow City	8,972	9,085	9,933	10,407	10,470	10,509	10,563	10,71 %	6,34 %	17,73 %
Moscow Region	6,689	6,672	6,628	6,630	6,673	6,713	6,753	-0,91 %	1,89 %	0,96 %

23 Table is based on numbers from DEMOGRAFICHESKII EZHEGODNIK ROSSII, 2001, p. 22 (1989); DEMOGRAFICHESKII EZHEGODNIK ROSSII, 2010, p. 29 (1995-2009) and from the official site of the 2010 census of the Russian Federation (2010): VSEROSSIISKAIJA PEREPIS' NASELENIJA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013.

The table shows the rate of the growth of the Moscow population in comparison to that of the entire country; however, it also demonstrates that the fastest expansion of Moscow population happened between 1995 and 2000 and that it is currently slowing down. While in 1989, the combined population of Moscow city and region made up 10,6 % of the Russian population, in 2010 this rate rose to 12,2 %. According to the census of 2010, Moscow has 11,503,501 inhabitants and the Moscow region 7,095,120, which mostly live in urban-type settlements.²⁴

Table 2: Population of Moscow agglomeration in 2002 and 2010; division into Moscow city counties (okrugi) and urban/rural population of Moscow region²⁵

	Overall 2002	Overall 2010	Percentage of Population in relation to Moscow city and Region in 2010	Percentage Growth/ Decrease in 2010 in relation to 2002
Moscow City and Region	17,001,292	18,598,621	100,0 %	+9,4 %
Moscow City	10,382,754	11,503,501	61,9 %	+10,8 %
Moscow Region	6,618,538	7,095,120	38,1 %	+7,2 %

24 Cf. VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013.

25 The data was taken from the official web sites of the 2002 census: VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2002 GODA: <http://www.perepis2002.ru/index.html?id=42>, 07.05.2013, and from VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013. For the values of 2002, the city of Zelenograd, counted separately in the census, was taken as the city okrug Zelenogradskii. Also, three in 2002 still independent smaller settlements were included in this table in the values of the South-Eastern, Western and Eastern okrugi, of which they became a part later on, in order for comparison with 2010.

	Overall 2002	Overall 2010	Percentage of Population in relation to Moscow city and Region in 2010	Percentage Growth/ Decrease in 2010 in relation to 2002
City okrug Eastern (Vostochnyi)	1,394,497	1,452,759	7,8 %	+4,2 %
City okrug Western (Zapadnyi)	1,049,104	1,285,914	6,9 %	+22,6 %
City okrug Zelenogradskii	215,727	221,712	1,2 %	+2,8 %
City okrug Northern (Severnyi)	1,112,846	1,100,974	5,9 %	-1,1 %
City okrug North-Eastern (Severo-Vostochnyi)	1,240,062	1,359,508	7,3 %	+9,6 %
City okrug North-Western (Severo-Zapadnyi)	779,965	942,223	5,1 %	+20,8 %
City okrug Central (Tsentralnyi)	701,353	741,967	4,0 %	+5,8 %
City okrug South-Eastern (Iugo-Vostochnyi)	1,116,924	1,318,885	7,1 %	+18,1 %
City okrug South-Western (Iugo-Zapadnyi)	1,179,211	1,362,751	7,3 %	+15,6 %
City okrug Southern (Iuzhnyi)	1,593,065	1,716,808	9,2 %	+7,8 %
Moscow Region: urban Population	5,248,534	5,683,710	30,6 %	+8,3 %
Moscow Region: rural Population	1,370,004	1,411,410	7,6 %	+3,0 %

The city itself takes up 2,510 km² and is divided into twelve counties (*okrugi*) which, since the last city extension on July 1st 2012, consist of 146 administrative sub-structures.²⁶

In comparison to other big Russian cities, Moscow, as the centre of a centralistic and authoritative state, features many advantages for big companies including the energy sector. Thus, despite the fact that Moscow has a general post-industrial economy with more than 80 % of the gross regional product due to services, it is important that the large producing companies have their headquarters mostly in Moscow. The corporate tax principles in this centralised economic system provided for the payment of taxes at headquarters, at least until the issuing of a new regulation in 2012, which still excludes Gazprom. These taxes, paid to the capital by companies that produce goods elsewhere and offer their services all over the country, make up 43-45 % of the huge Moscow budget which comprised 38 billion Euros in 2011. Not only a high percentage of the Russian population is living in and around Moscow; also, compared to all of Russia, there is an even higher proportional amount of investment, housing construction and retail. The concentration of investment and financial resources is the motor of change to urban society. The share of Muscovites that can be defined as middle class doubles the overall Russian rate – it is about 40 %. The average income in Moscow is comparatively high – in other large Russian cities it is 35-60 % lower than in the capital.²⁷ In Moscow, the nominal average monthly employment income in 2010 was 908 Euros, and the average pension was 192 Euros, the average living space was 18,7 square metres per person.²⁸

Moscow has always featured a low birth rate in comparison to the death rate, not unlike other very large cities. Especially in the 1990s, the birth rate sank to a very low level: While there were 120,000 children born in 1985, the number was only 68,500 in the year 1995. Still, during these years the population of the city

26 There were 10 counties (*okrugi*) with 125 districts (*raiony*). In July 2012, with Novomoskovskii and Troitskii two more okrugi were added, consisting of 21 administrative sub-structures, which are called “settlement” (*poselenie*). Cf. the official Moscow city site: PRAVITEL'STVO MOSKVY(2): <http://www.mos.ru/authority/structure>, 07.05.2013.

27 Cf. ZUBAREVICH, 2012, p. 265-267, based on information by the Moscow Independent Institute for Social Policy. As middle class indicators, Zubarevich uses two out of three of the following: income, education level and self-conception.

28 Cf. Federal agency of state statistics: REGIONY ROSSII. OSNOVNYE SOTSIALNO-ECONOMICHESKIE POKAZATELI GRODOV 2011: http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b11_14t/IssWWW.exe/Stg/centr/moskv-g2011_1.htm, 07.05.2013.

rose. Concerning the average life expectancy, the capital has a lot to offer to its inhabitants and even leaves St. Petersburg far behind: For males the life expectancy is 67 years (for Russia in general: 60), for females it is 77 years (for Russia in general: 73). These facts contribute to the phenomenon that the population of Moscow is increasing while the overall Russian population is declining. But the decisive factor is the migration into the city, which has always been playing an important role in Moscow until today.²⁹

Table 3: Migration in Moscow City and Region compared to Russia, in 2009³⁰

	Moscow City and Region	Russia	Moscow City and Region	Russia
Arrivals				
	Total Number of Arrivals		Arrivals, Rate per 1000 Population	
Total Number of Arrivals	191,709	1,987,598	11,1	14,0
Arrivals from Other Regions of Russia	155,805	766,436	9,0	5,4
Arrivals from Foreign Countries	35,904	279,907	2,1	2,0
Departures				
	Total Number of Departures		Departures, Rate per 1000 Population	
Total Number of Departures	68,156	1,740,149	4,0	12,3
Departures to Other Regions of Russia	64,117	766,436	3,7	5,4
Departures to Foreign Countries	4,039	32,458	0,2	0,2

29 Cf. ZAIONCHKOVSKAYA/MKRTCHYAN, 2009: <http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2009/0389/tema02.php>, 07.05.2013.

30 Data was taken from DEMOGRAFICHESKII EZHEGODNIK ROSSII, 2010, p. 29 (table 1.7), p. 408, 411, 414 (table 7.2.).

	Moscow City and Region	Russia	Moscow City and Region	Russia
	Net Migration			
	Total Number of Net Migration		Net Migration, Rate per 1000 Population	
Total Number of Net Migration	123,553	247,449	7,2	1,7
Net Migration from Other Regions of Russia	91,688	0	5,3	0
Net Migration from Foreign Countries	31,865	247,449	1,9	1,7

The aforementioned influx of migrants into the city during the 1920s brought both men and women into the city. They were in search of work, and not intent on founding large families, so a relatively low birth rate and small number of children became a consistent feature of the Moscow population. However, in the 1960s until 1980s the progressing urbanisation in Russia spread this trend and led to an approximation of the overall Russian population age pyramid to that of the capital. Similar features were characteristic of the age pyramid of Moscow in 1989, but at the beginning of the new millennium the migration surge not only balanced the natural decline, it also rejuvenated the city's population.³¹ Like in other large cities, the educational level in Moscow is rather high compared to the rest of the country. Being asked about their sources of income in the census of 2010, 57 % of the Muscovites named employment income, including self-employment and family business, as a source, 27 % pensions (including invalidity pensions) and only 3,5 % (other) social benefits or governmental support. One quarter of the respondents stated that their income was dependent on other individuals. Thus, the rate of pensioners, the vast majority of them in the age groups 60 years and older is about the same level in Moscow as it is in all of Russia.³² It is a phenomenon uncharacteristic for megacities with such high living expenses

31 Cf. ZAIONCHKOVSKAYA/MKRTCHYAN, 2009.

32 Respondents were all individuals 15 years or older. Multiple answers were possible, but app. 86 % gave only one and app. 14 % two sources; three answers or more were seldom. Analysed data was taken from 2010 census: VSEROSSIJSKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIJA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013.

that the group of pensioners and the ratio of older population is so strong, fostered by city government, which subsidises the pensions out of its own budget.³³

The migration history and the present situation which have been forming Moscow's population make it a multi-ethnic and multi-religious city. The strongest groups in the Russian capital who perceive themselves as non-Russian, are inhabitants of former Soviet republics, mainly Ukrainians, Tatars, Armenians, Azerbaijani and Belo-Russians, but there are also other large groups, such as of Mordovians, Jews and Uzbeks:

Table 4: Overall population of Moscow City and Region, according to Nationality³⁴

	Population, according to Nationality					
Moscow City and Region	1989	%	2002	%	2010	%
Overall Population			17,001,292	100,0 %	18,598,621	100,0 %
Russians	14,047,917	89,7 %	14,830,772	87,2 %	16,133,082	86,7 %
Ukrainians	438,508	2,8 %	401,452	2,4 %	273,578	1,5 %
Tatars	281,898	1,8 %	218,934	1,3 %	205,245	1,1 %
Armenians	78,305	0,5 %	164,085	1,0 %	169,772	0,9 %
Azerbaijani	31,322	0,2 %	110,214	0,6 %	76,184	0,4 %
Belo-Russians	125,288	0,8 %	101,565	0,6 %	70,890	0,4 %
Jews	313,220	2,0 %	89,258	0,5 %	53,145	0,3 %
Mordovians	46,983	0,3 %	45,243	0,3 %		
Chuvash	31,322	0,2 %	28,541	0,2 %		
Uzbeks	15,661	0,1 %	24,312	0,1 %	61,368	0,3 %
Chechens (city only)			14,465	0,1 %		
Ossetians (city only)			10,561	0,1 %		
Moldavians (region only)			10,418	0,1 %		
Koreans (city only)			8,630	0,1 %		
Kazakhs (city only)			7,997	0,1 %		
Bashkir (city only)			5,941	0,1 %		

33 ZUBAREVICH, 2012, p. 268.

34 The data analysed was taken from the census of 2002: VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2002 GODA: <http://www.perepis2002.ru/index.html?id=42>, 07.05.2013, and from the census of 2010: VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013. Cf. for 1989: GAVRILOVA, 2001, p. 420 (table 7).

Official data cannot provide any information about the significant number of nonregistered migrants from Russia and outside Russia living in the capital (table 3 and 4).

Gentrification and segregation in inner Moscow

Prior to 1992, almost all houses in Moscow were state owned, municipal or corporate. There were practically no private houses in Moscow during Soviet times. In the first years following the perestroika period the resources for municipal housing programmes in Moscow were scarce, while new forms of investment and public private partnerships had yet to evolve. The last census of the Soviet Union in 1989 had shown that the housing situation and its problems were an important issue for the Muscovites, but in 1995 there were still about 650,000 households waiting in line for the opportunity to new living quarters and many Muscovites were living in a shared apartment (*kommunalka*).³⁵ In order to effectively reduce this waiting line, the municipal building company DSK (the former Building Combine No. 1), which had survived the perestroika, continued in the construction of prefabricated housing.³⁶ But the city was not only short of living quarters, but also of territory. The authorities thus turned to the five-story-buildings with a programme to relocate the dwellers in order to gain area for high rise living quarters. During the first years of the new millennium, the inhabitants in need to be relocated represented competition for those already waiting – so, people from the waiting list who had filed their respective applications in 1987, were able to gain access to new living quarters in 2006.³⁷

The capital could not provide nearly enough living quarters to its population and suffered an overall lack of investment into housing and city planning. At the point of dissolution of the Soviet Union, an intense era of construction began

35 Cf. KULAKOVA, 2006, p. 238-241. The estimate percentage of *kommunalka* dwellers reaches from 9 % (KULAKOVA, 2006, p. 238) up to 45 % (BADYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 118).

36 The house type P-44/17, first built in 1979, was continued until the year 2000; the 17-story panelled building can boast a total area of 18,814 m² in Moscow. Since 1998, new prefabricated types were introduced, as the P-44T, P44-TM, and the model *Jubilee*, advertised as “the first and only prefabricated house of a new generation with winter gardens (porches) and free layout.” Cf. DOMOSTROITEL’NYI KOMBINAT No. 1: <http://www.dsk1.ru/Houses/History>, 07.05.2013.

37 Cf. KULAKOVA, 2006, p. 242f.

in Moscow almost immediately. The historic city centre attracted most of the activity, driven by the needs of the emerging market economy with all the new financial and business services and municipal policy alike. The concentration of wealthy companies or financial services and their headquarters in the city centre was followed by a concentration of wealthy inhabitants. So already in the early 1990s, individuals and businesses started to purchase apartments in top quality locations in order to renovate them luxuriously. Badyina and Golubchikov, who analyse these processes, especially in the inner micro-district Ostozhenka, summarise this phenomenon: “However, a central location and an expensive renovation [...] turned out to be not quite enough. [...] The evolution from apartment-by-apartment to house-by-house and then to block-by-block elite housing (re)construction signified the emergence of systematic gentrification in inner Moscow.”³⁸

The micro-district of Ostozhenka is located south-west to the Kremlin in an area that was used as meadowland until the middle of the 19th century. At the end of the 19th century, the majority of tenants were small-scale retailers, craftsmen, state servants of low ranks, students and impoverished members of the intelligentsia; landlords were mostly merchants. In the case of Ostozhenka, the extreme neglect of building stock in the late Soviet Moscow was even more evident: The general plan of 1935 had designated a site nearby to the megalomaniac – yet never realised – project of the “Palace of Soviets”. Thus, there were long existing plans to comprehensively redevelop the entire quarter with the palace, which prevented building or renovation on a smaller scale.³⁹

At the beginning of the 1990s, the rate of Ostozhenka inhabitants living in a *kommunalka* was between 60 % and 70 %, ⁴⁰ and thus significantly higher than the average in central Moscow. With the introduction of housing privatisation in 1991, inhabitants gained the right to privatise their own living quarters free of charge; two years later one third of all flats in Moscow were in private hands. With the developing market economy this served as a basis for the mechanism of well-off private persons and agencies buying the separate *kommunalka* rooms from their inhabitants and combining them into apartments or office floors. The social structure of the micro-district started to change, the overall population declined, and the proportion of wealthier people started to rise, while the for-

38 Badyina/Golubchikov, 2005, p. 115.

39 Cf. Gdaniec, 2005, p. 145; Badyina/Golubchikov, 2005, p. 115-117. The 1883 cathedral Christ the Saviour that occupied the lot foreseen for the palace, was demolished in 1931.

40 Cf. Gdaniec, 2005, p. 173 and Badyina/Golubchikov, 2005, p. 118, respectively.

mer *kommunalka* inhabitants left, supported by the city rehousing programmes. After the 1998 Rouble crash and the following economic pause, large development started to invest in the real estate sector. Ostozhenka, where the cathedral “Christ the Saviour” overshadowing the micro-district was being rebuilt on its former site long dedicated to the “Palace of Soviets”-project, was being marketed as an elite location in close proximity to the Kremlin. The new developments did not consist of the mere merging of single rooms into apartments, but of comprehensive building projects and the more there were the more intensive the elite status perception became.⁴¹

In Moscow, land ownership is separate from building ownership, so the land owner is the municipality, while developers can lease parcels to build on.⁴² The city administration took an active part in promoting the physical and social change in areas such as Ostozhenka by resettlement mechanisms that required inhabitants to leave if their building had been marked by the city as in urgent need of repair. The administration had – and still has – to provide the expelled with an alternative housing or, in case of ownership, to compensate them. Often, these terms have been less favourable for the residents than direct negotiations with the investors. The vacated buildings could then be demolished, often ignoring the regulations of the sophisticated Russian monument preservation law, and give way to the new elite projects. Of the 3,725 officially registered tenants in 1992 in Ostozhenka, 1,263 persons were forced to rehouse during this compulsory programme until 2004, while 1,584 persons had been relocated after private negotiations with developers. Additionally, there is a large number of Ostozhenka residents who sold their privatised rooms and flats or rented them

41 Cf. BADYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 118-120.

42 In 2007 and 2008 Moscow legislation has been altered in order to assimilate it to the federal laws: new possibilities of land ownership or long-term land lease are being introduced. Also, the Moscow mechanism of planning the project in detail beforehand, and only then letting the parcel of land designated to that project, has changed: it is the objective to achieve more competitive and transparent forms of land lease. A row of projects begun in Moscow before the introduction of this legislation which were suspended, have since been revised or cancelled. Supposedly, an emphasis was put on some projects that had been planned in an especially semi-legal or extra-legal relationship between city administration and investor; cf. NOBIS, 2012, p. 130-135. On the network of authorities and developers and its personal, “intimate character” see also BADYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 121f.; GDANIEC, 2005, p. 170f.

out and went to live elsewhere. So, the structure of the area's population has undergone a thorough change.⁴³

Today, real estate agencies claim that "Ostozhenka Street, 'the Golden Mile', is the most prestigious residential area not only in Moscow, but in entire Russia."⁴⁴ According to a ranking by "Financial News", Ostozhenka street made it into the top ten of the "most expensive and desirable streets in the world."⁴⁵ In 2010 the average price to buy a flat in one of the developments in Ostozhenka was 19,000 Euros per square metre. In one of the old buildings, depending on the status of renovation, the square metre costs from 5,500 up to 14,000 Euros (the lower end of the range being in proximity to the average price in Moscow city). The "Moscow Times" summarises the new character of this central area:

"Just next door from the multi-cultural, cross-class and eclectic Arbat, Ostozhenka could be a world away, or anywhere in the world, for that matter. [...] These top-end buildings remain worlds in themselves, with neither obvious links to the city neighbourhood that surrounds them at a distance, nor direct access to immediate infrastructure — although one elite supermarket has finally opened on Korobeinikov lane this year. It has been alleged that most of the apartments here were bought during the gold rush by those who never actually intended to live in them, making the whole place the world's fanciest ghost-town."⁴⁶

This perception of a separate world in itself and the elite concept is fostered by another phenomenon not alien to other Megacities: In order to protect the property of the new owners, concierges and door codes are not enough, but extra security guards and fences have started to arise and produce small islands of gated communities. Up until now, despite discussions about it, not the whole area of Ostozhenka has been fenced off. But elsewhere in and especially around Moscow, larger stretches of settlement have become gated quarters, public space

43 Cf. BADIYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 120-123.

44 AGENCY KNIGHT FRANK; <http://www.knightfrank.ru/eng/residential/homes/show/t6UJ9A0052FN/>, 07.05.2013.

45 NEWS AGENCY RIANOVOSTI, 09.03.2011: <http://en.rian.ru/business/20110309/162926700.html>, 07.05.2013.

46 Introduction to interview with three real estate agents in THE MOSCOW TIMES, 13.10.2010: <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/realestate/residential/analysis/article/ostozhenka-unusual-in-every-way/418724.html#no>, 07.05.2013. For average price see also ZUBAREVICH, 2012, p. 265.

has become private in the fenced areas of postmodern cities.⁴⁷ The two phases that Badyina and Golubchikov observed in Ostozhenka – “the spontaneous individual-driven process of housing rehabilitation before 1998, and the ‘systematic’ property-led gentrification thereafter”⁴⁸ – can also be paralleled with other global Megacities. However, other phenomena cannot, such as the relatively substantial living space that still remains in Moscow’s city centre or the absence of an intermediate phase with artists and creative professionals in the role of “gentrifiers” that later on have to leave themselves after a new wave of reconstruction.⁴⁹ Of course, the specific historical circumstances of the Soviet period, such as property legislation, city planning, housing shortage, *kommunalkas* and deteriorated buildings, has had an impact. So had the experience of Soviet society and its collapse, with the subsequent crisis. Some of Moscow’s urbanisation features can be compared to other post-socialist capitals such as Budapest, Warsaw or Prague. But the individual historical, cultural and global context points to the unique features of every case study.⁵⁰

As has been shown, the transition from state owned to personal property housing took place especially during the first ten years after the fall of the USSR: two thirds of housing stock became private through privatisation and new construction. The less well-off population generally stayed in state-owned flats they rented or leased. This was the basis for the UN-Habitat-Report human settlements in 2003⁵¹ which aimed at a definition of the term “slum” under such circumstances. It is true that there are no big slum areas in Moscow like the Banlieues in France⁵² or the favelas of South-American cities. Slums are intermixed

47 Cf. GDANIEC, 2005, p. 182, 193; BADIYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 120-123; SHEVCHENKO, 2009, p. 167, points out the similarities between erecting fences around luxury buildings and fortifying the doors of quite ordinary apartments with the aim of “warding off outsiders”. Her interpretation is that the fencing phenomenon has an identical appearance to that in other globalized cities, but also reacts to a specific post-Soviet utopia aspiration (p. 175).

48 Cf. BADIYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 127.

49 The latter example refers to the Paris quarter of Roquette. Cf. GDANIEC, 2005, p. 194f. Cf. for the current state of research on gentrification in general LEES, 2010, and for the German debate HOLM, 2010, and TWICKEL, 2010.

50 Cf. BADIYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 127.

51 Cf. UN-HABITAT, Global Report on Human Settlements 2003, The Challenge of Slums, Earthscan, London; Part IV: ‘Summary of City Case Studies’, p. 195-228: <http://www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/GRHS.2003.0.pdf>, 07.05.2013.

52 Cf. WEBER et al., 2012, p. 50-56.

into parts of Moscow, as well in Ostozhenka⁵³, where gentrification has now been underway for almost 20 years, as in other areas. The report's listing for the nuclei of slums names *kommunalkas*, which are used by two or more families who share the kitchen and other facilities (including hostels, dormitories and hotels) and outdated and dilapidated buildings, typically the first generation of mass housing with low quality construction and facilities. They are shabby, consist of so called squatter flats or even look abandoned from the outside. Residents there are entitled to housing improvement or free alternative accommodation, but queues are long and move slowly according to availability of municipal housing stock. The most obvious category in 2003 was deteriorated houses, primarily post-World War II structures that are recognised as damaged or otherwise unsuitable for constant habitation. All these types are sometimes in the periphery but quite often, because of the urban growth, in central areas of the city.⁵⁴ The people living there are pensioners, invalids, single parents, student families, refugees, run-away-children, orphans, people of no fixed abode ("BOMji") and other kinds of nonregistered people.

The Putin-government and local administrations tried hard and with some success to alter the situation of the pensioners, who live in Moscow probably better than in many parts of Russia, but the other groups, especially nonregistered migrant workers (from the former USSR) do not find a place in the housing and social policy of state nor city. They are needed for the growing wealth of Moscow, but are the social losers of the situation because of difficult access to adequate housing, medical care and education.⁵⁵ The role of supporting NGOs is tolerated in this context, but unsecure under contemporary political contexts in Russia.

Current growth and future development

The Russian capital is growing at breath-taking speed. Traffic jams, noise and smog are just a few of the negative side effects. Neither the city's infrastructure, nor housing and traffic planning, nor parks and recreational areas can currently meet the demands of the inhabitants. The city's General plan up to 2020 has

53 In 2004 there were still 77 shared apartments for 440 people (199 families) in Ostozhenka. Cf. BADIYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV 2005, p. 123.

54 Cf. KRASHENINNOV, 2003: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu-projects/Global_Report/cities/moscow.htm, 07.05.2013.

55 Cf. NAZAROVA, 2007, p. 364.

already been rendered obsolete.⁵⁶ Another aspect of the housing problem is the fact that apartments and houses have become objects of speculation, meaning that speculative vacancies exacerbate the housing shortage. It makes sense to buy apartments as investment and it does not matter much whether or not they are occupied. Of course, this is not true of the majority of flats, but there is still no equilibrium between demand for housing and occupation rates of existing housing.

In 2007, 33 million cars were registered in Moscow, but only 1.6 million parking spaces. Every year sees 200,000 additional cars hit Moscow's streets, 800,000 cars are on the street at any one time. Moscow has 1,300 km of streets, 40 % less than the required road network compared to other major European cities. Moscow's spider-web street grid has not been upgraded, purely because the city planners could not anticipate such explosive urban growth.⁵⁷ Michael Blinkin on the other hand argues that these are also the results of socialist planning heritage that conceived the net of streets as a fishbone system and not as a system of urban highways on which the individual transport can flow.⁵⁸ In April 2012 the new mayor of Moscow, Sergei Sobianin confirmed the ambitious expansion plan for the Moscow Metro: By 2020, a second Circle line shall help to relieve the city's traffic situation. The costs will be enormous:⁵⁹ Over the next eight years, the backbone of the public transport system in the Russian capital will be dramatically strengthened. The expansion plans until 2016 see the construction of 75,6 km of new routes and 37 new stations – at a cost of 460 billion Roubles (11,5 billion Euros). The mayor has recently confirmed the next five-year-plan for the development of the metro: from 2016 to 2020 an additional 75 km and 33 new stations are to be added – 100 billion Roubles (2,5 billion Euros) have to be set aside for this each year. This will bring a change in the architecture of the Metro network – the so-called “third interchange”: The first is, in metro-language, the group of interchange stations in the city centre, the second is the current circle line. These are to be relieved through a significantly

56 Cf. the official plans: INTEGRATED BODY FOR URBAN DESIGN POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT OF MOSCOW; <http://stroi.mos.ru/eng/default.aspx?m=31&d=31,07.05.2013>.

57 Cf. RUSSIA-NOW(1): http://www.russia-now.info/russia/moscow/news/moscow_s_growth_is_causing_headaches_for_planners_31.html, 07.05.2013.

58 Cf. BLINKIN, 2012.

59 Cf. INTEGRATED BODY FOR URBAN DESIGN POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT OF MOSCOW; <http://stroi.mos.ru/eng/default.aspx?m=31&d=31,07.05.2013>.

further reaching second circle line.⁶⁰ In comparison to other Megacities, the public transport, although very efficient, is at times beyond its capacities and needs to be adapted to the mass of commuters on their way to work and home again.⁶¹

During the last months of Dmitri Medvedev's presidency, a new plan was announced that will eventually strongly influence the further development of Moscow: the incorporation of vast territories (1,480 additional [!] to the existing 1,070 square kilometres in 2012) in the South of the city centre. This announcement, as so often, came first – and only then began serious planning and talks with the mayor of Moscow and the governor of the surrounding Moscow region, Sergei Shoigu. The intention of Medvedev was obviously to create new administrative quarters for the government and thus to alter the traffic from centre to the periphery. But will this work, as Fedor Kudriavcev remarked, with some ten thousand government clerks dispatched from the centre?⁶²

Last but not least: The brief sketch on urban growth always connected with the problems of expansion, transport and housing, needs one last comment on migration within the context of changing political and ideological times. It poses the question, of whose city one wants to talk. It was the city of the Moscow bourgeois in the 19th century⁶³, of the nationalities of the Tsarist Empire and of the peasants and workers of the Soviet Empire who were attracted by a socialist metropolis – which despite all problems of housing and urban development offered them far more opportunities than other socialist cities in most of the Republics of the USSR. This was especially true for migrants from Central Asia and the Caucasus. They were, not only after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, perceived as unloved guests at the very least and necessary work force at the same time and have been and sometimes still are facing open hatred, as a series of incidents shows.⁶⁴

Conclusion

In 2008 Monica Rùthers stated that megalopolis Moscow will stay a fancy and glamorous city where the rich and the middle class try at any cost to stay as near to the city centre as they can. On the other hand, the gap between the rich and

60 Cf. RUSSIA-NOW(2): http://www.russia-now.info/russia/russia_news/moscow_to_build_second_metro_circle_line_cost_22_billion_euro_96.html, 07.05.2013.

61 Cf. BLINKIN, 2012, p. 282.

62 Cf. KUDRIAVCEV, 2012, p. 377 f.

63 Cf. RUCKMANN, 1984.

64 Cf. ZUBAREVICH, 2012, p. 268.

the poor widens.⁶⁵ This is also the tenor in blogs on gentrification.⁶⁶ The gentrification processes were already reflected in public art exhibitions: The project Auditorium Moscow, shown in the White palace (*Belaia palata*) in the heart of old Moscow, was for example initiated by the Museum of Modern Art in Warsaw in cooperation with curators Ekaterina Degot and David Riff.⁶⁷ It also reflected on the changes that have been taking place in Ostozhenka. The fact that this criticism takes an artistic form is notable in itself, such as the dislocation of population cannot happen entirely without upheaval. However, while the more resistant tenants sooner or later had to face violent methods used to expel them from their quarters, very little concerted protest on their side has taken place. This perceived absence of public protest, also against the demolition of historic sites, has been assigned to the fact that during the high tide of new development in the inner city, the list of severe and of everyday problems for the population in this time of crisis was extensive: simply too much to deal with them all, the problem of a sound city planning was easily outranked, if one was not the particular person to be expelled from one's neighbourhood in the city centre.⁶⁸

Indeed, the nearer to the centre, the more coveted the living space. The middle class has been and still is looking for property in the micro-districts or lives in a rented apartment and seeks a dacha. Rütters has described that there was in fact no suburbia outside of Moscow in 2008, just the province. It remains to be seen whether the plans for a new administrative centre in the South of big Moscow alter the situation. There are slight evidences that suburbs and closely connected cities such as Khimki on the way from the airport Sheremetev to downtown, with a shorter way to work, shopping malls and Ikea, will bring some change. Here, the daily migration does not rise. But it is still an example of neoliberal growth and the absence of comprehensive urban planning that sees city, suburbia and region in a context.⁶⁹

65 Cf. RÜTTERS, 2008, p. 505.

66 Cf. GENTRIFICATION BLOG: <http://gentrificationblog.wordpress.com/2008/09/30/moskau-stadtumbau-fur-neue-reiche/>, 07.05.2013; CHTODELAT NEWS: <https://chtodelat.wordpress.com/tag/gentrification/>, 07.05.2013.

67 Cf. AUDITORIUM MOSCOW: <http://auditorium-moscow.org/en/about.html>, 07.05.2013. While some enterprises and the Polish government supported the project, no participation of the Russian government or the city of Moscow was to be seen.

68 Cf. BADIYINA/GOLUBCHIKOV, 2005, p. 123-126. For the prolonged, even "total crisis" and its handling by the Muscovites see SHEVCHENKO, 2009.

69 Cf. GOLUBCHIKOV, 2011.

Literature

- BADYINA, ANNA/GOLUBCHIKOV, OLEG, Gentrification in Central Moscow – a Market Process or a Deliberate Policy? Money, Power and People in Housing Regeneration in Ostozhenka, in: *Geografiska Annaler* 87 B, 2 (2005), p. 113-129.
- BLINKIN, MICHAEL, Festgefahren. Moskaus Verkehr – ein Spiegelbild der Gesellschaft, in: *Osteuropa* 62, 6-8 (2012), p. 279-292.
- COLTON, TIMOTHY, *Moscow. Governing the socialist metropolis*, Cambridge 1995.
- DÖNNINGHAUS, VICTOR/NUMEROVA, LJUDMILA, Mehr als ein Lebenswerk. Die Moskauer Schokoladen- und Feingebäckfabrik Einem & Co., in: *Russen und Deutsche. 1000 Jahre Kunst, Geschichte und Kultur. Essayband zur Ausstellung*. Berlin 2012, p. 294-301.
- DEMOGRAFICHESKII EZHEGODNIK ROSSII. STATISTICHESKII SBORNIK, 2001. ID., 2010.
- GAVRILOVA, IRINA N., *Naselenie Moskvyy. Istoricheskii rakurs*, Moscow 2001.
- GDANIEC, CORDULA, *Kommunalka und Penthouse. Stadt und Stadtgesellschaft im postsowjetischen Moskau*, Münster 2005.
- GOLUBCHIKOV, OLEG/PHELPS, NICHOLAS A., Post-socialist post-suburbia? Growth machine and the emergence of ‘edge city’ in the metropolitan context of Moscow, in: *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 36 (2011), p. 425-440.
- HOFFMANN, DAVID L., *Peasant Metropolis: Social Identities in Moscow, 1929-1941*. Ithaca, New York 1994.
- HOLM, ANDREJ, *Wir bleiben alle! Gentrifizierung – Städtische Konflikte um Aufwertung und Verdrängung*, Münster 2010.
- HUBER, WERNER, *Moskau – Metropole im Wandel. Ein architektonischer Stadtführer*, Köln et al. 2007.
- JAHN, HUBERTUS F., *Armes Russland. Bettler und Notleidende in der russischen Geschichte vom Mittelalter bis in die Gegenwart*, Paderborn et al. 2010.
- KUDRIAVCEV, FEDOR, Plan ohne Plan. Das Projekt “Groß-Moskau”, in: *Osteuropa* 62, 6-8 (2012), p. 371-382.
- KULAKOVA, IRINA, *Istoriia moskovskogo zhil’ia*, Moscow 2006.
- KUPERMANN, ALEXANDER, *Die Olympischen Spiele 1980 in Moskau*. Unpublished Masterthesis, Mainz 2007.
- KUSBER, JAN, “Heiliges Russland” und “Sowjetmacht”. Moskau als Ensemble von Gedächtnisorten. In: *Gedächtnisorte in Osteuropa. Vergangenheiten auf*

- dem Prüfstand, ed. by RUDOLF JAWORSKI et al., Frankfurt/Main et al. 2003, p. 97-115.
- LEES, LORETTA et al. (eds.), *The Gentrification Reader*, London, New York 2010.
- LENTZ, SEBASTIAN, Cityentwicklung in Moskau. Zwischen Transformation und Globalisierung, in: *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie* 41, 2-3 (1997), p. 110-122.
- LUZHKOV, IU. A. (Red.), *Istoriiia Moskvyy s drevneishich vremen do nashikh dnei*, 3 volumes, Moscow 1997.
- MARTIN, ALEXANDER M., Sewage and the City: Filth, Smell, and Representations of Urban Life in Moscow, 1770–1880, in: *Russian Review* 67, 2 (2008), p. 243-274.
- MASON, ROBERT J./NIGMATULLINA, LILIIA, Suburbanization and Sustainability in Metropolitan Moscow, in: *Geographical Review* 101, 3 (2011), p. 316-333.
- NAZAROVA, E. A., Nachalo XXI veka – novyi etap formirovaniia natsional'nogo sostava Moskvyy, in: *Moskva mnogonatsional'naia. Istoki, evoliutsiia, problemy, sovremennosti*, ed. by A. N. SACHAROV, Moscow 2007, p. 325-367.
- NEUTATZ, DIETMAR, *Die Moskauer Metro. Von den ersten Plänen bis zur Großbaustelle des Stalinismus (1897-1935)*, Köln et al. 2001.
- NOBIS, VICTORIA, *Rechtliche Rahmenbedingungen für die Abwicklung von Bauvorhaben in der Russischen Föderation*, Berlin 2012.
- NOEVER, PETER, *Tyrannie des Schönen. Architektur der Stalin-Zeit. Ausstellungskatalog*. München, New York 1994.
- RUCKMANN, JO ANN, *The Moscow Business Elite: A Social and Cultural Portrait of Two Generations, 1840-1905*. Illinois 1984.
- RÜTHERS, MONICA, Schneller wohnen in Moskau: Novye Čeremuški Nr. 9, das erste Viertel in industrieller Massenbauweise, 1956-1970. In: *Städteplanung – Planungsstädte*, ed. by BRUNO FRITZSCHE et al., Zürich 2006, p. 157-180.
- ID., *Moskau bauen von Lenin bis Chruščev. Öffentliche Räume zwischen Utopie, Terror und Alltag*. Köln et al. 2007.
- ID., *Moskau als imperiale Stadt. Sowjetische Hauptstadtarchitektur als Medium imperialer Selbstbeschreibung in vergleichender Perspektive*, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas N.F.* 56 (2008), S. 481-506.
- SCHLÖGEL, KARL, *Moskau lesen. Verwandlungen einer Metropole*, 3rd ed., München 2011.
- SCHMIDT, ALBERT J., *The Architecture and Planning of Classical Moscow: A Cultural History*. Philadelphia 1989.
- SHEVCHENKO, OLGA, *Crisis and the Everyday in Postsocialist Moscow*, Bloomington 2009.

- THURSTON, ROBERT W., *Liberal City, Conservative State: Moscow and Russia's Urban Crisis, 1906-1914*, Oxford 1987.
- TWICKEL, CHRISTOPH, *Gentrifidingsbums oder Eine Stadt für alle*, Hamburg 2010.
- WEBER, FLORIAN et al., *Krise der Banlieues und die politique de la ville in Frankreich*, in: *Geographische Rundschau* 64, 6 (2012), p. 50-56.
- ZUBAREVICH, NATAL'YA, *Russlands Parallelwelten. Dynamische Zentren, stagnierende Peripherie*, in: *Osteuropa* 62, 6-8 (2012), p. 263-278.
- AGENCY KNIGHT FRANK: <http://www.knightfrank.ru/eng/residential/homes/show/t6UJ9A0052FN/>, 07.05.2013.
- AUDITORIUM MOSCOW: <http://auditorium-moscow.org/en/about.html>, 07.05.2013.
- INTEGRATED BODY FOR URBAN DESIGN POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT OF MOSCOW: <http://stroj.mos.ru/eng/default.aspx?m=31&d=31>, 07.05.2013.
- CHTODELAT NEWS: <https://chtodelat.wordpress.com/tag/gentrification/>, 07.05.2013.
- DOMOSTROITEL'NYI KOMBINAT No. 1: <http://www.dsk1.ru/Houses/History>, 07.05.2013.
- GENTRIFICATION BLOG: <http://gentrificationblog.wordpress.com/2008/09/30/moskau-stadtumbau-fur-neue-reiche/>, 07.05.2013.
- KRASHENINNOV, ALEXEY, *Moscow, Russia*, in: *Understanding Slums: Case Studies for the Global report 2003*, ed. by UN-Habitat: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu-projects/Global_Report/cities/moscow.htm, 07.05.2013.
- MAKAROVA, KATIA, *Postindustrializm, dzhentrifikatsiia i transformatsiia gorodskogo prostranstva v sovremennoi Moskve*, in: *Neprikosnovennyi Zapas: Debaty o Politike i Kul'ture*, 70, 2 (2010), p. 35-53: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2010/2/ma25.html>, 07.05.2013.
- MAKHROVA, ALLA, *Dorogaia moia Moskva: tsena prestizha*, in: *Demoskop weekly* (electronic version of the bulletin "Naselenie i obshchestvo"), No. 247-248, May/June 2006: <http://demoscope.ru/weekly/2006/0247/tema01.php>, 07.05.2013.
- THE MOSCOW TIMES, 13.10.2010: <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/realestate/residential/analysis/article/ostozhenka-unusual-in-every-way/418724.html#no>, 07.05.2013.
- NEWS AGENCY RIANOVOSTI, 9.03.2011: <http://en.rian.ru/business/20110309/162926700.html>, 07.05.2013.
- VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2002 GODA: <http://www.perepis2002.ru/index.html?id=42>, 07.05.2013.
- VSEROSSIISKAIA PEREPIS' NASELENIIA 2010 GODA: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm, 07.05.2013.

- PRAVITEL'STVO MOSKVY(1): <http://www.mos.ru/press-center/presentations>, 07.05.2013.
- ID.(2): <http://www.mos.ru/authority/structure>, 07.05.2013.
- REGIONY ROSSII. OSNOVNYE SOTSIALNO-ECONOMICHESKIE POKAZATELI GORODOV 2011: http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b11_14t/IssWWW.exe/Stg/centr/moskv-g2011_1.htm, 07.05.2013.
- RUSSIA-NOW(1): http://www.russia-now.info/russia/moscow/news/moscow_s_growth_is_causing_headaches_for_planners_31.html, 07.05.2013.
- ID.(2), http://www.russia-now.info/russia/russia_news/moscow_to_build_second_metro-circle_line_cost_22_billion_euro_96.html, 07.05.2013.
- UN-HABITAT, Global Report on Human Settlements 2003, The Challenge of Slums, Earthscan, London; Part IV: "Summary of City Case Studies", London, Sterling 2003: <http://www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/GRHS.2003.0.pdf>, 07.05.2013.
- ZAIONCHKOVSKAIA, ZHANNA/MKRTCHIAN, NIKITA, Moskva i migratsiia, in: Demoskop weekly, No. 389-390 (September 2009): <http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2009/0389/tema02.php>, 07.05.2013.

