

# GENTRIFYING TECHNO – THE (SUB)CULTURAL COMMODIFICATION OF BERLIN’S CLUB CULTURE

**SCHWARZ, ELLI**

*International Relations & Sociology, College of Social Sciences*

## ABSTRACT

In Berlin, club culture emerged in post-unification Germany of the 1990s as a largely non-commercial subcultural movement with roots in squatting and punk culture, driven by Black and queer communities among others. Nowadays it is world-renowned, earning UNESCO’s intangible cultural heritage status in 2024, and attracting millions of tourists each year. By drawing on Marxist and Bourdieusian approaches to class, I argue that the subculture has been reshaped to become more profit-oriented than community-oriented, through neoliberal governance and gentrification. Through the (re)valorisation of subcultural spaces and exploitative practices that capitalise on authenticity, club culture has been assimilated into neoliberal relations of production. Meanwhile, there is a lack of support from the state to preserve club culture. Therefore, commercialisation becomes a necessity for clubs to survive under the pressures of shrinking urban space. As a result, more affluent, cosmopolitan crowds are being attracted, while clubs become less accessible for intersectionally marginalised people on the basis of class, despite their portrayal as ‘diverse’ and ‘inclusive’. This becomes evident in Berlin’s infamous door policies and in the whitewashing of its historical roots. Combining economic and cultural approaches to class elucidates how the spaces and practices of marginalised subcultural communities become co-opted and exploited *from above* for the benefit of local governments and business-oriented private actors, reproducing intersectional inequalities in club culture. However, significant gaps remain in the literature on how race, gender, disability and other factors intersect with class and space in Berlin. Thus, future research is required.

## INTRODUCTION

Berlin is world-famous for its vibrant nightlife due to the city’s club (sub)culture that has been popularised since the 1990s. Every year, numerous tourists make their way to Berlin to queue up at its world-renowned clubs, such as Berghain, Tresor, or KitKat. Notably, in 2024, Berlin Techno club culture was acknowledged as part of Germany’s national intangible cultural heritage by UNESCO (n.d.). This begs the question: How has club culture come this far, and how has this affected the community?

In this article, I explore this question with a focus on the classed dimensions of this process in the context of neoliberalisation. Utilising Marxist (Harvey, 2002; Gray, 2022) and Bourdieusian (Thornton, 1995, 1997; Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Jensen, 2006) approaches to class, it becomes evident that through the local government’s involvement and gentrification, Berlin’s club culture has been reshaped to become profitable and therefore more in line with dominant structures. However, this has led to club culture’s subcultural capital being (re)configured to be in line with the tastes of white, middle class, cisgender men who dominate the scene. With that, dominant power structures from mainstream society are reproduced within club culture, dictating who can access which clubs, when, and how. First, I explore the concept of subcultural capital in the context of club culture’s roots. Second, I discuss the ways in which club culture has been affected by symbolic and physical gentrification under neoliberal urban governance. Third, I examine how subcultural capital can be used to exhibit power in Berlin’s clubs by assessing strict door policies, racism, and the historical context of the subculture. Using subcultural capital to reconfigure Berlin’s club culture from above leads to increasing exclusion of people who are already marginalised in mainstream society.

## SUBCULTURAL CAPITAL AND THE ROOTS OF BERLIN’S CLUB (SUB)CULTURE

In many accounts, the history of Berlin’s club culture is directly connected to the fall of the Berlin Wall and Germany’s reunification in 1989 and 1990, respectively (Baker, 2019; Ludewig, 2020). In its early years, the subculture’s core values were ‘peace, love, unity and respect’ (Farrugia, 2012: p.31), praising an anti-commercial attitude and equality on the dancefloor and beyond (Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015; Ludewig, 2020). This time period is pivotal for the development of Berlin club culture’s ‘subcultural capital’ (Thornton, 1995, 1997) and its ‘underground heritage and identity’ (Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015: p.111). Based on Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984) concept of cultural capital, Sarah Thornton (1995, 1997) coined subcultural capital as being in the know about what is trendy and hip in a subculture, which often refers to material goods such as clothes or records. Importantly, subcultural capital attributes authenticity to subcultures, outlining aspects that make it unique and desirable. In the case of Berlin’s Techno club (sub)culture, urban spaces are pivotal for organising, developing and living subcultural values as members of a community inscribe them with meaning and tie them to expression of (sub)cultural belonging within their locality (Thornton, 1995, 1997; Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015; Bader and Scharenberg, 2010; Pien, 2015). In line with the values and the perception of Berlin’s club culture as described above, Thornton argues that by partaking

in trendy consumption, hegemonic, social hierarchies can be transcended within these communities since everyone can buy the necessary goods to embody subcultural capital (Thornton, 1995, 1997). However, subcultural capital can also be used as a powerful tool to reinforce social division from mainstream society, including intersectional oppression and privileges along the lines of, for instance, class, gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality and disability (Jensen, 2006; Binnie and Skeggs, 2004), especially in neoliberal societies (Burchiellaro, 2020). Neoliberalism refers to policies that aim to realise market opportunities in every aspect of our social lives, shifting responsibility from the state to individuals. Disinvestment in social issues, austerity measures, and the privatisation of (local) governments and public services are typical neoliberal policies (Burchiellaro, 2020), leading to intensified social inequalities, while class relations are rendered irrelevant (Tyler, 2015). Thus, dominant orderings of power can be reproduced within subcultures through the use of subcultural capital, especially in the context of neoliberalism. This becomes evident when examining Berlin's club culture and how processes of gentrification have impacted its development and survival.

## SUBCULTURAL GENTRIFICATION

While Germany's new capital was deindustrialised and lacking profit-generating industries in the 1990s, its creative networks and subcultures had been flourishing due to Berlin being accessible with (formerly) cheap rents in historical working-class neighbourhoods (Bader and Scharenberg, 2010; Holm and Kuhn, 2011; Baker, 2019; Lücke, 2020). Especially in its early years, club culture depended on temporary spaces, including many squats; parties were often illegal, and the scene was living an anti-commercial ethos (Colomb, 2012; Baker, 2019). However, in an effort to turn these 'unproductive' spaces and people into profit by attracting cultural economies and more affluent demographics, based on Richard Florida's (2002) book *The Rise of the Creative Class*, in the early 2000s the local government aimed to (re)valorise those spaces based on Berlin's subcultural capital, inherently tied to its club culture (Colomb, 2012; Bader and Scharenberg, 2010). This led to 'symbolic gentrification' by promoting the city's subcultural hubs through tourist agencies, local governments and media discourses (Colomb, 2012). Symbolic gentrification refers to processes where the sense of belonging and cultural aspects of a local community are undermined through (cultural) marketing from above that (re)valorises a place's symbolic value while residents are not necessarily physically displaced (Shaw, 2005; Holm, 2010). For instance, nowadays Berlin's local government advertises club culture as a main drawing point for tourists coming to the city on its website (Berlin, 2025). This strategy heavily contributes to commodifying Berlin's club culture as it becomes a product which is advertised to creative and knowledge-based middle-classes with cosmopolitan attitudes (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004), to generate profit for the city's economy, which opposes the subculture's anti-commercial ethos.

### Exploitation and lacking support from the state

Despite utilising Berlin's club culture to incite economic growth, there has been a 'state subsidy gap' (Gray, 2022: p.74), which has led to many clubs shutting down as they cannot afford the costs to keep their doors open. By capitalising on the authenticity of a locality, its most marketable aspects are extracted and purposefully promoted to increase its popularity. The arrival of cosmopolitan crowds (as residents and tourists) who are attracted by the strategic marketing of countercultural authenticity, is utilised for justifying 'monopoly rents', i.e., extortionately high rents for living, cultural and leisure spaces located in desirable or 'trendy' areas (Harvey, 2002). With that, districts such as Mitte and Prenzlauer Berg, members of the subcultural community, as well as clubs, have been displaced (Drevenstedt, 2020; Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015). As gentrification accelerates across the city, subcultural spaces that can be used for community-focused activities are decreasing and hosting events that cater towards intersectionally marginalised communities, such as queer People of Colour, is becoming less feasible (Ludewig, 2020). As clubs have become businesses, nowadays, going to a club in Berlin is expensive, with 20 Euros or more being the standard pricing for entering a single event (Plett, 2023). Additionally, club visitors spend around 30 Euros on gastronomy per visit (Lücke, 2020). This financial strain bars people with a low income and/or many people who belong to the working classes from regularly attending events and becoming members of a community.

However, instead of making more funding available to protect urban spaces for subcultural uses, and to allow access to these venues for 'diverse' crowds, especially for marginalised communities, the city government invests little to no money into club culture (Hergeth, 2025). Although the 'Clubcommission' (a Berlin-based regional network and political group that is active around policies regarding club culture) has been advocating for more funding, the city does not fund many club cultural activities besides most prominently its *Schallschutzfonds* (noise abatement fund; no author, 2025), which is a symptom of gentrification as clubs are being forced to control their noise levels by new affluent demographics that have moved into gentrified neighbourhoods with clubs, and complain about the noise (Pien, 2015). Every year, clubs close because they cannot afford monopoly rents (Harvey, 2002) and other high maintenance costs. For example, the club Griessmühle had to close its doors in 2020 after a lengthy battle against gentrification (Haarbach, 2020). Although the city has been capitalising on club culture's subcultural capital, there has been a historical lack of funding and recognition of the culture as being worthy of perseverance and cultural value for the city, which continues until today. This has led to Berlin's club culture becoming dominated by a need to generate high economic turnovers to survive, reconfiguring what kind of events take place and what audiences can access club culture.

## DIVERSITY AND EXCLUSION

As new buildings, especially luxury apartments (Marquardt et al., 2012) and office buildings, are built in the city and investors fight for the best deals in the once derelict Berlin, middle-class cosmopolitan groups are attracted by the aesthetic of the 'Berlin Style' (Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015). As (parts of) the middle class increasingly participate in underground subcultures, they are reshaped into something less radical and more tolerable for mainstream crowds, taking away their oppositional cultural aspects (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Burchiellaro, 2020). This can de-politicise and erode a subculture's 'authenticity' (Pien, 2015). Co-opted by neoliberal-cosmopolitan logics, subcultural capital becomes more about representing aesthetic elements, rather than exonerating values, and living alternative lifestyles that are in opposition to dominant norms and ideologies as they become niche markets within the neoliberal system (Burchiellaro, 2020; Bader and Scharenberg, 2010). Thus, popularising and commodifying a subculture can lead it to assimilate more into mainstream consumer preferences of cosmopolitan middle-class groups. As a result, subcultural spaces and practices become more difficult to access for marginalised people and communities. Assessing Berlin's infamous door policies from an intersectional, class-based angle shows how this affects club culture.

### 'Heute Nicht': Berlin's Infamous Door Policies

Berlin's club culture is generally presented as diverse and inclusive (Lücke, 2020; Drevenstedt, 2020; Berlin, 2025). Yet, in the context of neoliberalisation, the realities within Berlin's club culture contradict these cosmopolitan claims. Strict door policies can be used to enable marginalised communities to access countercultural spaces such as nightclubs and hence create safe spaces away from mainstream cultures (Drevenstedt, 2020). However, in the context of Berlin's club culture, strict door policies have become a marketing tool as the concept has been co-opted by the cosmopolitan preferences of middle-class crowds, being reconfigured as contributing to authenticity, by creating myths around the necessary subcultural capital to be let into venues (Drevenstedt, 2020). Most prominently, Berghain's door policies are strict; therefore, thousands of people (locals and tourists alike) queue up every weekend, informed by endless online guides on how to dress and perform to increase their chance of entering (Wünsch, 2021). In its early years as 'Ostgut', the club focused on creating a safe space for gay men and kinky or BDSM communities; however, as it was forced to relocate due to gentrification and the club rebranded as Berghain, the crowds changed (Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015). Status and accumulating subcultural capital in the form of material goods becomes more important than creating (safe) spaces for (marginalised) communities. People who are regarded as not knowing how to behave within Berlin's club culture, for example, 'Prols and Touris' (the working-class and tourists) (Rapp, 2009: p.49), are kept out through these policies. Working-class people are stigmatised and perceived as a threat since, according to Binnie and Skeggs (2004: p.46), they are 'associated with the reactionary politics of nationalism rather than the multicultural politics of cosmopolitanism.' It does not matter if they possess the 'correct' subcultural capital in the form of clothes, such as wearing black, or knowing about the event and line-up (Wünsch, 2021); based on their social habitus, working-class people are deemed as not being able to understand or exhibit cosmopolitan values, and thus unable to navigate Berlin's 'diverse' clubs. Hence, strict door policies can be used as a tool for exclusion. As D. Strauss (2013: p.208) put it: 'Class is the unspoken root of all German nightlife activity', which becomes evident when assessing door policies. Together with the increased prices for going to a nightclub (Lücke, 2020; Plett, 2023), it appears that working class people with a low(er) or no income are restricted from accessing clubs in Berlin either due to an apparent missing subcultural and/or economic capital.

Furthermore, there is a lack of research regarding the intersectional and racialised aspects of accessing Berlin's club culture; incidents of racism being the reason for being rejected at 'the door' have been reported anecdotally (Thaddeus-johns, 2019). In 2021, Nicholas Rose, a ballet dancer and activist, accused security personnel at the club RSO of racism and homophobia as he was attacked during an event (Resident Advisor, 2021a). RSO 'solved' the issue by apologising, closing the club for a few weeks and changing policies (Resident Advisor, 2021b). Yet it is unclear if those measures suffice to eradicate racism at the club since, according to a Resident Advisor article (2021b), more people share Nicholas' experiences as they 'experienced discriminatory and aggressive behaviour at RSO and Griessmühle' between 2019 and 2021, which points towards racism and discrimination being a fundamental issue rather than pertaining to individual members of staff.

### Historical erasure

Racism and exclusion within Berlin's club culture do not only pertain to door policies; they are also evident in its historical roots. While both Berlin's club culture and techno more generally are rooted in music made by Black communities (Drevenstedt, 2020), the field has become imbued with the tastes of a white, cis-heteronormative, middle-class through gentrification. This is reflected in a whitewashed retelling of Berlin club culture history being solely rooted in reunification as the sound of 'the new Berlin', while Black communities outside of Detroit have contributed to the emergence of the culture through creating the electronic sounds so integral to it (Ludewig, 2020). Club culture would not exist without queer party scenes, the influences of Black music, Caribbean sound system cultures, as well as West Berlin's GI discos and US-American influences due to many soldiers being stationed there during the allied forces' occupation (Weheliye in Ludewig, 2020). Yet, apart from recognising Detroit's Techno cultures, it is mostly portrayed as a white, German phenomenon from Kraftwerk's and Tangerine Dream's sounds from the 1960s/1970s to a revolutionary reunification in 1989/90 (e.g. Baker, 2019; Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015; Berlin, 2025). Despite calling for preserving the subculture, recognising Berlin's club culture as UNESCO (n.d.) national tangible cultural heritage of Germany contributes to this. Additionally, Ludewig (2020) points out that during reunification, German nationalism, as well as racist violence against non-white bodies, were on the rise. Furthermore, the historical erasure of marginalised perspectives continues: in 2018, the party Room 4 Resistance was cancelled at *://about blank* due to DJs supporting the campaign *#DJsforPalestine* (Resident Advisor, 2018). Similarly, the DJ Arabian Panther, who wears a black keffiyeh at shows in support of Palestinians, was not allowed to play at Berghain after being booked for an event in late 2023, allegedly due to him wearing this symbol and being vocal about his support of Palestine (DJ Mag, 2024). Structural issues that persist despite reunification, as well as the exclusion of voices from People of Colour, queer people, and the

working classes are largely ignored within club culture. This leads to a whitewashed, and ultimately inaccurate, representation of club culture's subcultural capital and history.

Taking into account door policies, racism, and whitewashing of history, presenting diversity as one of the subculture's strong suits appears to be used as a strategy to cover up for structural discrimination by celebrating and appropriating positive differences. With that, marginalisation is individualised rather than being recognised based on social inequalities, and how they are structurally (re)produced through cultural domination (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Tyler, 2015). This proliferates the reproduction of structural, hegemonic social hierarchies through cultural domination of a white, cis heteronormative and male-dominated middle-class habitus within club culture.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, through neoliberalisation, Berlin's club culture has been forced to assimilate to the status quo and has thus become more congruent with the system rather than being antagonistic to it. Combining economic and cultural approaches to class when assessing Berlin's club culture elucidates how spaces and practices of marginalised communities become co-opted and exploited for capitalist interests, subsequently reproducing intersectional inequalities. Capitalising on the authenticity of clubs, private actors (including local governments) have symbolically gentrified areas to restructure urban landscapes by attracting cosmopolitan crowds. This is being done to justify levying high rents, while withholding state subsidies for maintaining clubs. This class-based strategy of subcultural exploitation from above only allows for the survival of clubs that become entrepreneurial, transforming these spaces into business avenues. Those clubs that can survive have been commercialised, and thus the price to participate is high. Conjointly, since those who are attracted to 'authentic' neighbourhoods with a 'Berlin Style' (Schofield and Rellensmann, 2015) are more likely to be part of the knowledge-based and creative middle classes, subcultural capital is transformed in favour of cosmopolitan consumer preferences. Thus, aesthetics and status, rather than community and solidarity, become essential to (sub)cultural belonging. Strict door policies have become part of the culture's 'authenticity', yet it can be used as a marketing tool, as well as for exclusion and justifying racism, reproducing intersectional social inequalities. Meanwhile, marginalised voices (especially those of queer people, women, and People of Colour) have been erased to proliferate a narrative that configures club culture's subcultural capital as inherently German, limiting who can express themselves freely within the subculture. In the future, there needs to be more research focused on the perspectives of people who are part of the club culture, especially with a focus on structural, as well as intersectional, marginalisation and exclusion within the community. This requires focusing on non-white, queer, trans/non-binary\*, female-identifying, working class participants to reduce risks of reproducing status quo perspectives based on the accounts of white, cisgender, middle-class men that are widespread in research.

## REFERENCES

- Bader, I. and Scharenberg, A. 2010. The sound of Berlin: Subculture and the global music industry. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. [Online]. **34**(1), pp.76–91. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00927.x.
- Baker, A. 2019. *The Great Music City: Exploring music, space and identity*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Berlin. 2025. *Berlin club culture*. [Online]. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://www.berlin.de/en/tourism/insider-tips/8100644-5766508-berlin-club-culture.en.html>.
- Binnie, J. and Skeggs, B. 2004. Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and consumption of sexualized space: Manchester's Gay Village. *The Sociological Review*. [Online]. **52**(1), pp.39–61. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1111/j.1467-954x.2004.00441.x.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burchiellaro, O. 2020. "There's nowhere wonky left to go": Gentrification, queerness and class politics of inclusion in (East) London. *Gender, Work & Organization*. [Online]. **28**(1), pp. 24–38. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1111/gwao.12495.
- Colomb, C. 2012. Pushing the Urban Frontier: Temporary uses of space, City Marketing, and the Creative City Discourse in 2000s Berlin. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. [Online]. **34**(2), pp.131–152. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1111/j.1467-9906.2012.00607.x.
- DJ Mag. 2024. Berghain accused of cancelling Arabian panther gig due to Palestine support. *DJ Mag*. [Online]. 17 January. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://djmag.com/news/berghain-accused-cancelling-arabian-panther-gig-due-palestine-support>.
- Drevenstedt, L. 2020. Dimensions of Club Culture: Learning from Berlin. In Jóri, A. and Lücke, M. eds. *The New Age of Electronic Dance Music and Club Culture*. Cham: Springer. pp.9–20.
- Farrugia, R. 2012. *Beyond the dance floor: Female djs, technology and electronic dance music culture*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Florida, R. 2002. *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gray, N. 2022. Correcting market failure? stalled regeneration and the State Subsidy Gap". [Online]. **26**(1), pp.74–95. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi: 10.1080/13604813.2021.2017193.
- Haarbach, M. 2022. Berliner Club Griessmühle Muss Schließen: Techno-Club Hofft auf Gespräch mit Eigentümern. *Tagesspiegel*. [Online]. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/berlin/techno-club-hofft-auf-gesprach-mit-eigentumern-4680550.html>.
- Harvey, D. 2002. The art of rent: Globalization, monopoly and the commodification of culture. In Panitch, L. and Leys, C. eds. *A world of contradictions: Socialist Register 2002*. New York: Monthly Review Press. pp. 93–110.
- Hergeth, A. 2025. Emiko Gejic über die Clubkrise in Berlin: "Flexibel bleiben für neue Formate". *taz*. [Online]. 15 July. [Accessed: 27 November 2025]. Available from: <https://taz.de/Emiko-Gejic-ueber-die-Clubkrise-in-Berlin/!6100028/>.
- Holm, A. 2010. *Wir bleiben alle! Gentrifizierung – Städtische Konflikte um Aufwertung und Verdrängung*. Münster: Unrast.
- Holm, A., & Kuhn, A. 2011. Squatting and urban renewal: The interaction of squatter movements and strategies of urban restructuring in Berlin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. [Online]. **35**(3), pp.644–658. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.001009.x.
- Jensen, S.Q. 2006. Rethinking subcultural capital. *YOUNG*. [Online]. **14**(3), pp.257–276. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1177/1103308806065820.
- Ludewig, B. 2020. The Berlin Techno Myth and Issues of Diversity. In Jóri, A. and Lücke, M. eds. *The New Age of Electronic Dance Music and Club Culture*. Cham: Springer. pp.29–53.
- Lücke, M. 2020. Club Culture and Electronic Dance Music in Berlin: An Economic, Social, and Aesthetical Perspective. In Jóri, A. and Lücke, M. eds. *The New Age of Electronic Dance Music and Club Culture*. Cham: Springer. pp.55–62.
- Marquardt, N. et al. 2012. Shaping the urban renaissance: New-build luxury developments in Berlin. *Urban Studies*. [Online]. **50**(8), pp.1540–1556. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1177/0042098012465905.
- Pien, J.-C. 2015. Zwischen Subkultur und Post- Subkultur: Über Authentizität und Diffusion in der Berliner Club(sub)kultur. [Online]. [Accessed 28 October 2025]. Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/19701513/Zwischen\\_Subkultur\\_und\\_Post\\_Subkultur\\_%C3%9Cber\\_Authentizit%C3%A4t\\_und\\_Diffusion\\_in\\_der\\_Berliner\\_Club\\_sub\\_kultur](https://www.academia.edu/19701513/Zwischen_Subkultur_und_Post_Subkultur_%C3%9Cber_Authentizit%C3%A4t_und_Diffusion_in_der_Berliner_Club_sub_kultur).
- Plett, C. 2023. Clubs in Berlin: Billig und viel feiern war einmal! Warum Party Machen Jetzt so teuer ist. *Berliner Zeitung*. [Online]. 15 August. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/kultur-vergnuegen/musik/billig-und-viel-feiern-das-war-einmal-warum-sind-die-berliner-clubs-jetzt-so-teuer-li.367946>.

- Rapp, T. 2009. *Lost and sound: Berlin, Techno und der Easyjetset*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Resident Advisor. 2018. [://about blank cancels room 4 resistance event over #djsforpalestine](https://aboutblankcancelsroom4resistanceeventoverdjsforpalestine). *Resident Advisor*. [Online]. 14 September. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://ra.co/news/42509>.
- Resident Advisor. 2021a. Berlin Club Revier Südost to shut temporarily after staff accused of racism and homophobia. *Resident Advisor*. [Online]. 20 August. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://ra.co/news/75883>.
- Resident Advisor. 2021b. More allegations of racism and maltreatment emerge against staff at Berlin venue Revier Südost. *Resident Advisor*. [Online]. 28 September. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://ra.co/news/75897>.
- Schofield, J. and Rellensmann, L. 2015. Underground heritage: Berlin techno and the changing city. *Heritage & Society*. [Online]. 8(2), pp.111–138. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: 10.1080/2159032X.2015.1126132.
- Shaw, K. 2005. The place of alternative culture and the politics of its protection in Berlin, Amsterdam and Melbourne. *Planning Theory & Practice* [Online]. 6. pp.149–169. [Accessed: 26 November 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1080/14649350500136830.
- Strauss, D. 2013. Berlin Falling. In Farkas, W., Seidl, S. and Zwirner, H. eds. *Nachtleben Berlin 1974 bis Heute*. Berlin: Metrolit, p.208.
- Thaddeus-johns, J. 2019. Anything goes in Berlin's clubs. but are bouncers killing the vibe?. *The New York Times*. [Online]. 14 November. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/14/arts/music/berlin-club-bouncers.html>.
- Thornton, S. 1995. *Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Thornton, S. 1997. The social logic of subcultural capital. In Gelder, K. and Thornton, S. eds. *The subcultures reader*. London: Routledge. pp.184-192.
- Tyler, I. 2015. Classificatory struggles: Class, culture and inequality in neoliberal times. *The Sociological Review*. [Online]. 63(2), pp. 493–511. [Accessed: 28 October 2025]. Available from: doi:10.1111/1467-954x.12296.
- UNESCO. (n.d.) *Technokultur in Berlin*. [Online]. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://www.unesco.de/staette/technokultur-in-berlin>.
- Wünsch, S. 2021. What makes Berlin's Berghain Club special. *Deutsche Welle*. [Online]. 10 February. [Accessed: 20 October 2025]. Available from: <https://www.dw.com/en/what-makes-berlins-berghain-club-special/a-59365039>.