

The 21st-Century Metropolis: New Geographies of Theory

ANANYA ROY

Department of City and Regional Planning, University of California, 228 Wurster Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-1850, USA.
Email: ananya@berkeley.edu

(Received January 2007; in revised form June 2007)

ROY A. The 21st-century metropolis: new geographies of theory, *Regional Studies*. This paper calls for ‘new geographies’ of imagination and epistemology in the production of urban and regional theory. It argues that the dominant theorizations of global city-regions are rooted in the EuroAmerican experience and are thus unable to analyse multiple forms of metropolitan modernities. By drawing on the urban experience of the global South, the paper presents new conceptual vectors for understanding the worlding of cities, the production of space, and the dynamics of exurbanity. It makes the case that such area-based knowledge deepens recent theoretical attempts to articulate a relational study of space and place.

New geographies Urban futures Urban theory Urbanization Urbanism Third World cities

ROY A. 21 世纪的大都市区：新的地理学理论，区域研究。本文认为在城市区域理论领域需要提出“新地理学”假设及相关认识论。文章指出，目前主导全球城市区域理论的是基于欧美经验的分析，因此无法用于分析大都市区现代化的多元表现形式。随即文章以南部城市实践为例，向读者展示了一种用以理解城市全球化、空间产生以及超城市性 (exurbanity) 活力的新型概念矢量。这一尝试表明，基于地方的知识能够加深和补充目前关于空间与场所关联性研究理论。

新地理学 城市特征 城市理论 城市化 城市主义 第三世界城市

ROY A. Les métropoles du XXI^e siècle: nouvelle géographie de la théorie, *Regional Studies*. Cet article appelle à de nouvelles géographies de l’imagination et de l’épistémologie pour la production de théories urbaines et régionales. Il avance que les théorisations dominantes des villes-régions du monde sont enracinées dans l’expérience euro-américaine et sont donc incapables d’analyser les formes multiples de la modernité des métropoles. En s’appuyant sur l’expérience urbaine du Sud, cet article présente de nouveaux vecteurs conceptuels pour comprendre la mondialisation des villes, la production d’espaces et la dynamique de l’exurbanisation. Il prétend que la connaissance basée sur la région approfondit de récentes tentatives théoriques visant à expliquer une étude relationnelle de l’espace et de la place.

Nouvelle géographie Avenir de l’urbanité Théorie de l’urbanité Urbanisation Urbanisme Villes du tiers-monde

ROY A. Die Metropole im 21. Jahrhundert: neue Geografien der Theorie, *Regional Studies*. In diesem Artikel werden ‘neue Geografien’ der Fantasie und Epistemologie bei der Entwicklung von urbanen und regionalen Theorien gefordert. Es wird argumentiert, dass die dominanten Theoretisierungen der globalen Stadtregionen in der euro-amerikanischen Erfahrung verwurzelt sind, weshalb sie sich nicht zu einer Analyse der multiplen Formen von metropolitanen Modernitäten eignen. Durch eine Nutzung der urbanen Erfahrungen im globalen Süden werden im Artikel neue konzeptuelle Vektoren für das Verständnis der Weltentwicklung von Städten, der Produktion von Raum und der Dynamik der Exurbanität vorgestellt. Es wird argumentiert, dass sich durch ein solches gebietsbasiertes Wissen die jüngsten theoretischen Versuche der Artikulation einer relationalen Studie von Raum und Ort vertiefen lassen.

Neue Geografien Urbane Zukunften Stadttheorie Urbanisierung Stadtplanung Drittweltstädte

ROY A. La metrópolis del siglo XXI: Nuevas geografías de la teoría, *Regional Studies*. En este artículo abogo por unas ‘nuevas geografías’ de la imaginación y la epistemología en la producción de la teoría urbana y regional. Postulo que las teorizaciones dominantes de las regiones ciudades globales tienen sus raíces en la experiencia euroamericana y por tanto no son capaces de analizar las diversas formas de modernidades metropolitanas. Basándome en la experiencia urbana del sur global, en este artículo presento los nuevos vectores conceptuales para comprender el desarrollo mundial de las ciudades, la producción del espacio y las

dinámicas de la exurbanidad. Expongo que tales conocimientos de áreas incrementan los recientes intentos teóricos de articular un estudio relacional del espacio y el lugar.

Nuevas geografías Futuros urbanos Teoría urbana Urbanización Urbanismo Las ciudades del tercer mundo

JEL classifications: N90, O2, P51

DISLOCATING THE CENTRE

The territories of the metropolis, with its social topographies, economic energies, and political machineries, is once again on the theoretical and policy agenda. This time the interest lies in the extended conurbations of the 'city-region', in the fading of city into countryside, in the frontiers that trail into the horizon, and in the vast blotches of sprawl that defy census boundaries and categories. Of course, this is a resurgent rather than wholly new interest. Urban historians have long been interested in precisely such conurbations, be they those of the feudal age where economic and political identities of freedom and serfhood were embedded in the localities of city and countryside; or those of early 20th-century social-democratic capitalism when there was a lively imagination for managing the relationship between city and countryside, an imagination that today would possibly be named 'sustainability'.

The present paper argues that it is time to rethink the geographies of urban and regional theory. Much of the theoretical work on city-regions is firmly located in the urban experience of North America and Western Europe. This is not unusual. It is part of a canonical tradition where theory is produced in the crucible of a few 'great' cities: Chicago, New York, Paris, and Los Angeles – cities inevitably located in EuroAmerica. It is time to rethink the list of 'great' cities. While the 20th century closed with debate and controversy about the shift from a 'Chicago School' of urban sociology to the 'Los Angeles School' of post-modern geography, the urban future already lay elsewhere: in the cities of the global South, in cities such as Shanghai, Cairo, Mumbai, Mexico City, Rio de Janeiro, Dakar, and Johannesburg. Can the experiences of these cities reconfigure the theoretical heartland of urban and metropolitan analysis?

The cities of the global South, when visible in urban theory, are usually assembled under the sign of under-development, that last and compulsory chapter on 'Third World Urbanization' in the urban studies textbook. They are the sites at which capital accumulation and democratic governance happen under 'special circumstances' (STREN, 2001, p. 205). They are the mega-cities, bursting at the seams, overtaken by their own fate of poverty, disease, violence, and toxicity. They constitute the 'planet of slums', with its 'surplus humanity' and 'twilight struggles' (DAVIS, 2004, p. 13). Davis's apocalyptic imagination of the Global Slum is only the newest variant in the high-pitched narration of the crisis of mega-cities. It is thus that

ROBINSON (2002) has launched an unrelenting critique of the geography of urban theory, sharply noting the enduring divide between 'First World' cities (read: global cities) that are seen as models, generating theory and policy, and 'Third World' cities (read: mega-cities) that are seen as problems, requiring diagnosis and reform. Against the 'regulating fiction' of the First World global city, ROBINSON (2003, p. 275) calls for a robust urban theory that can overcome its 'asymmetrical ignorance'.

The present paper seeks to articulate new geographies of urban theory. Doing so requires 'dislocating' the EuroAmerican centre of theoretical production; for it is not enough simply to study the cities of the global South as interesting, anomalous, different, and esoteric empirical cases. Such forms of benign difference-making keep alive the neo-orientalist tendencies that interpret Third World cities as the heart of darkness, the Other. It is argued that the centre of theory-making must move to the global South; that there has to be a recalibration of the geographies of authoritative knowledge. As the parochial experience of EuroAmerican cities has been found to be a useful theoretical model for *all* cities, so perhaps the distinctive experiences of the cities of the global South can generate productive and provocative theoretical frameworks for *all* cities. The critique of the EuroAmerican hegemony of urban theory is thus not an argument about the inapplicability of the EuroAmerican ideas to the cities of the global South. It is not worthwhile to police the borders across which ideas, policies, and practices flow and mutate. The concern is with the limited sites at which theoretical production is currently theorized and with the failure of imagination and epistemology that is thus engendered. It is time to blast open theoretical geographies, to produce a new set of concepts in the crucible of a new repertoire of cities. In putting forward such an argument, the paper suggests a rather paradoxical combination of specificity and generalizability: that theories have to be produced *in place* (and it matters *where* they are produced), but that they can then be appropriated, borrowed, and remapped. In this sense, the sort of theory being urged is simultaneously located and dis-located.

The theoretical agenda that can be engendered by such new geographies of theory will now be briefly outlined. As perceptively noted by JONAS and WARD (2007, p. 170), the city-region is often conceptualized as a building block of the global economy. In the work of SCOTT (2001), for example, the city-region heralds a new phase of capitalist territorial development

and is thus the key space of accumulation, competition, and governance. Such a framework links up in important ways with the dominant narrative of global/world cities. Pioneered by SASSEN (1991) and KNOX and TAYLOR (1995), but partly derivative of CASTELL'S (1996) theories of 'spaces of flows', this narrative maps a hierarchy of city-regions. This is agglomeration economics writ large. But it is also a Darwinian ecology of cities: the survival of the fittest in the keen competition of network capitalism. In the alpha-beta-gamma worldwide rankings, 'mega-cities' are usually off the map, seen as 'big but powerless' entities, while global/world cities are presented as nodes of a globalization that is unidimensionally driven by finance capital.

Such a conceptualization falls short in several ways. First, as JONAS and WARD (2007, p. 170) note, the city-region literature is silent on 'how new territorial forms are constructed politically and reproduced through everyday acts and struggles around consumption and social reproduction'. It is thus that JARVIS (2007) calls for closer attention to the practices and politics of 'care' that make possible the economic production of city-regions. Second, as PURCELL (2007) argues, the research on city-regions is thin in its engagement with issues of democracy. The focus on economic competitiveness tends to elide the terrain of political struggle and subject-making through which space is lived and negotiated. For this reason, the only two essays under the heading 'Questions of Citizenship' in SCOTT'S (2001) edited volume, *Global City-Regions* – one by HOLSTON (2001) and the other by ISIN (2001) – tell an unusual story of informality, populism, social movements, and Islamicist politics. The story is unusual not because these phenomena are unusual, but rather because they have thus been rendered in the normalized narrative of global city-regions. Central to such shortcomings then is what AMIN (2004, p. 35) calls a 'territorial' reading of regions, one that is premised on the assumption that there is a well-defined territory that can be controlled and managed and that thus reduces politics to 'managerial localism'. Building on the work of Massey, AMIN (2004, pp. 38–39) calls for a 'relational' or 'topological' reading of regions, such that the local is viewed as a 'field of agonistic engagement' with 'different scales of politics/social action'.

In the present paper, Amin's call for a topological reading of regions is linked with Robinson's call for an end to the asymmetrical ignorance of urban and regional theory. It is argued that while it is necessary to articulate a 'relational' theory of place, such an articulation is well served by the production of theory in the context of the global South. Such an enterprise does not entail 'adding' the experience of the global South to already existing frameworks of the city-region. For example, there is new work that seeks to illuminate the city-regions of the developing world (SEGBERS, 2007) but which strives to fit these spaces into the

predictable forms and hierarchical rankings of the global/world city theory of Sassen and Taylor. The paper is less interested in the additive or predictive assimilation of the Southern experience into the theory of city-regions. Instead, it aims to convince that a serious study of the global South can dislodge what AMIN (2004, pp. 33–34) terms the 'hegemonic territorial imaginary of the world' and instead reveals 'an excess of spatial composition'. The present paper thus moves away from the term 'city-region' and instead seeks to create an agenda for the study of the 21st-century metropolis that is focused on a variety of dynamic topologies and deep relationalities: the worlding of cities, the production and politics of space, and exurbanity and extraterritoriality. What is at stake here is not the mapping of bounded and located city-regions but rather an analysis of the heterogeneity and multiplicity of metropolitan modernities.

NEW GEOGRAPHIES OF THEORY: STRATEGIC ESSENTIALISMS

The EuroAmerican academy has a rather unique institution called 'area studies'. Formulated in a Cold War era, 'area studies' signifies the geopolitics of knowledge. Intending to produce 'area studies specialists', this field of training grounds disciplinary identities in the deep understanding of world-regions. More recently, there has been a rethinking of area studies such that the emphasis is no longer on 'trait geographies' but rather on 'process geographies' (APPADURAI, 2000a): in other words, on the forms of movement, encounter, and exchange that confound the idea of bounded world-regions with immutable traits.

It is proposed that 'area studies', especially when understood through the lens of 'process geographies', can help forge new geographies of urban theory. At the very least it makes possible an understanding of the area-based production of knowledge – how and why particular concepts are produced in particular world-areas. Such a venture makes possible an understanding of the diverse specificity of urbanism and metropolitanism and also facilitates useful comparative inquiries. It is in this spirit that the present author and Nezar AlSayyad, under the auspices of a Ford Foundation 'Crossing Borders' project, brought together scholars of urban informality who work in Latin America, South Asia, and the Middle East (ROY and ALSAYYAD, 2003). It was demonstrated that the conceptualization of urban informality had emerged in the Latin American context, such that it was not possible to separate this theoretical framework from its area studies origins. But it was possible to recognize the distinctive types of theorization that were being enabled by the study of urban informality in other world-regions, such as the Middle East and South Asia, and it was possible for scholars and practitioners working in each area context to learn from the other.

In this paper the agenda is more ambitious. On the one hand, an 'area studies' framework yields a *located* urban theory, rich in the grounded realities of world-areas. This is necessary and imperative. On the other hand, when the 'area studies' framework is itself complicated as 'process geographies', then it is possible to think about a *dis-located* urban theory that far exceeds its geographic origins. OLDS (2001b) thus rightly notes that:

the large regions which dominate the current maps for area studies are not permanent geographical facts. They are problematic heuristic devices for the study of global geographic and cultural processes.

(p. 129)

This type of an 'area studies' framework can be seen as producing 'strategic essentialisms': authoritative knowledge that is fine-grained and nuanced but exceeds its empiricism through theoretical generalization. Such forms of essentialism and dislocation, it is argued, are needed to dismantle the dualisms that have been maintained between global cities and mega-cities, between theory and fieldwork, and between models and applications. It is not enough for one's understanding of the 21st-century metropolis simply to make visible the cities of the global South. It is not even enough to exceed the visibility of crisis and catastrophe. It is instead necessary to view *all* cities from *this* particular place on the map.

These places on the map and the views they afford will now be briefly discussed. This discussion is broached with the explicit recognition that each world-area is a heuristic device rather than a permanent geographical fact. The present coverage of different world-areas is thus highly selective and strategic rather than comprehensive. It is also particularly concerned with theoretical work that not only is area based, but also is focused on the urban and metropolitan experience. In other words, this brief overview is a glimpse of how the 'urban question' is broached in distinctive ways in and across different world-areas. It will become quickly evident that such urban questions are simultaneously located and dislocated, affording both a view of a place on the map as well as of a topology and relationality that redraws the map itself.

Latin America

The empirical and theoretical structure that emerges from Latin America is one concerned with the conditions of urban citizenship. Most recently, there has been considerable scholarship on forms of marginality and inequality in cities such as Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro (AUYERO, 2000; PERLMAN, 2003). Such patterns of impoverishment and deprivation are seen to be produced by geographies of separation, by the Latin American 'city of walls' (CALDEIRA, 2001). At the same time, Latin Americanists are intrigued by the possibilities of 'insurgent citizenship' (HOLSTON, 1999).

What are the ways in which the urban poor claim and appropriate space and livelihood, thus challenging the unequal terms of citizenship that have been laid down in Latin American city-regions? Such questions are of particular relevance and urgency in Latin America today, with the popularity of leftist political regimes and with reinvented forms of populism. Will Chavez's Caracas be a just city? Can Morales live up to his promise of a remedy for the enduring poverty of the Bolivian countryside? Can Brazil transform its socio-spatial hierarchies through the institutionalization of participatory democracy? But such questions also speak to a longer tradition of Latin American theory: the work of the *dependistas*. Articulated as a counterpoint to modernization theory and its claims of growth poles, spatial equilibrium, and trickle-down growth, dependency theory asserts the persistence of core-periphery geographies, including parasitic primate cities and involuntarily informal economies. For dependency theorists this underdevelopment is actively produced by the modes of dependency through which Latin America is inserted into the world economy (FRANK, 1967; CARDOSO and FALETTO, 1979). In the 1970s, an urban dimension was added to dependency theory. Most notably, CASTELLS (1983) put forward the idea of the 'dependent' city as a space of social mobilizations but one where these energies were often co-opted by the populist politics of patronage. While the potential of social movements was there, insurgency and radical social change were rarely realized. Dependency then was not simply an external condition, perpetuated through neocolonial forms of development and globalization, but it was also an internal condition, the reproduction of inequality in the struggle for the Latin American city.

South Asia

The corpus of work on South Asian cities is more limited. In this 'area studies' terrain the exposition of the 'agrarian question' has been much more thorough than that of the 'urban question'. More recently, there has been what RAO (2006) calls an 'urban turn' in South Asianist scholarship. Theorists of the post-colonial nation are increasingly concerned with the forms of 'political society' (CHATTERJEE, 2006) that find expression in the city. As in the case of Latin American urbanism, there is a sustained engagement with the violences, marginalities, and erasures of the South Asian city (APPADURAI, 2000b). But there is also an interest, even optimism, about the possibilities of urban citizenship, what APPADURAI (2002) calls 'deep democracy'. It is worth noting that the South Asian debates about urban politics and citizenship have a unique theoretical signature. If Latin American urban analysis is steeped in the legacies of dependency theory, then the South Asian scholarship is shaped by the traditions of postcolonial theory, and particularly that South Asian variant of postcolonial analysis: subaltern

studies. Postcolonialism, of course, is more than the study of colonial and after-colonial societies. It is above all a critical theory of subjectivity and power. South Asia thus yields a window on forms of agency and subjectivity that go well beyond theories of populism and patronage and democracy. Whether located in the colonial city or the contemporary city, the South Asian debates are fundamentally concerned with the hegemonic production of urban subjects and subjecthood. Studies of the South Asian colonial city are thus as concerned with the aesthetic registers of beauty and hybridity as they are occupation and destruction (DUTTA, 2006). Studies of the contemporary South Asian city are thus concerned with the ways in which subaltern subjects consent to and participate in projects of urban redevelopment and urban inequality (ROY, 2003). An inevitable theoretical companion to such work is a radical reflection on the conditions under which scholarship can or cannot represent such subjects: can the subaltern speak?

East Asia

Postcolonial theory produced in the context of East Asia is substantially different than that produced in Latin America or South Asia. So are the implications for urban theory. While Latin American theory has been focused on dependency and South Asian theory on subaltern identities, the scholarship of East Asia has instead been concerned with 'arbitrage': the negotiation and mediation of economic globalization and cultural cosmopolitanism. Provocatively argued by ABBAS (2000, p. 783), arbitrage is the East Asian variant of the term 'glocalization', and indicates strategies that capitalize on differences in scales, spaces, and zones: 'everyday strategies for negotiating the disequilibria and dislocations that globalism has created' (ABBAS, 2000, p. 786). It is in this sense that Abbas reads Hong Kong as a 'para-site', shaped by its geographies of dependency, colonialism, and para-colonialism, but also wielding the capacity to mediate global flows of capital, bodies, ideas, desires, and aspirations. East Asian urban theory thus draws attention to the polytemporal and polyvalent productions of global modernity, as in the conceptualization of 'modern' (1920s) and newly 'modern' (1990s) Shanghai. The idea of a 'Shanghai modern' (LEE, 2001), inevitably colonial but ineluctably cosmopolitan, is a powerful theoretical claim. It creates a framework of globalized urbanism that is more differentiated and nuanced than both *dependista* mappings and global city ecologies.

Africa

For a while, the Africanist literature on cities echoed the themes of Latin American urbanism: peasants in the city, world-systems structures of dependency and underdevelopment, informalization under conditions of neoliberal globalization. Or, the scholarship tackled particular geopolitical conditions, such as the apartheid

and post-apartheid city. More recently, a more ambitious project of theorizing African urban spaces and subjects has emerged. The first mandate is to understand capitalism in African cities not simply as social relations of production but as forms-in-circulation (NUTTALL and MBEMBE, 2005, p. 2000). This study of circulations – the circulation of racialized bodies, of migrant bodies, of value, of commodities, of superstitions, of rumours, of bribes, of used goods – creates a dizzying sense of the urban economy. It is thus that SIMONE (2004a) reframes urban infrastructure as 'people as infrastructure', indicating the contingent and fleeting circulations and transactions through which African cities are reproduced. The second mandate is to link such forms-in-circulation to African modernities. What are the ways in which African cities can be understood not as 'failed' cities but rather as cities of aspirations and expectations, the 'city yet to come' (SIMONE, 2004b)? What are the ways in which the 'figure of the subject in the time of crisis' can be understood as the arbiter of metropolitan modernities (MBEMBE and ROITMAN, 2003)?

Middle East

The Middle East is a complex epistemological terrain. It is perhaps the only 'area' in 'area studies' that is not a geographical territory but rather a social construct. Middle of what and east of where (ALSAYYAD and ROY, 2003, p. 2)? In this sense, the idea of the Middle East makes evident the social (read: orientalist) construction that underlies all geographies and geographical facts. It is the ultimate heuristic device, one that calls into question the ways in which one's theories are 'world'. The boundaries of the Middle East are constantly reworked – spilling over into North Africa, extended in the public imagination to sites of conflict, and often conflated with the contours of predominantly Muslim societies, even those as far-flung as Afghanistan. Within these ambiguous and expanding borders there are also emerging and significant traditions of urban and metropolitan theory. As in the case of South Asia, the violences of Middle East nationalisms have led to a careful analysis of how the city can embody the cruelties, separations, and erasures of nation-making: from the ethnocracy of Zionist settlements (YIFTACHEL, 2006), to the politically sanctioned fiefdoms of multicultural Beirut, and to the 'urbicide' that is at work in various occupied territories (GRAHAM, 2004). Most recently, a bolder effort has been afoot. The self-styled 'Cairo School' has launched a study of cosmopolitanisms and modernities located in the globalized Middle East, examining the heteronomous landscapes of malls, gated communities, Islamicized public spaces, and informal settlements (SINGERMAN and AMAR, 2006).

Here, then, is a rich and complex landscape of concepts and theoretical traditions. But the aim of this paper is something more than the documentation of

empirical richness and regional diversities. How can regionally produced concepts be deployed as 'strategic essentialisms', simultaneously located and dislocated? How can the theories embedded in 'area studies' retain their geographic coordinates but also cross borders and travel as dynamic vectors of new theoretical conversations and exchanges?

CONCEPTS FOR THE 21ST-CENTURY METROPOLIS

It was noted above that the dominant narrative shaping the study of global city-regions is the global/world city theory of Sassen and Taylor. This section revisits this framework, but through the conceptual vectors that have emerged from 'area studies'. It is shown that there are other ways of 'worlding' cities and that these geographies of connections give a more relevant and dynamic theory of the 21st-century metropolis. Two other strands of theorization that are often mobilized are also engaged to make sense of the contemporary urban experience. The first, led by HARVEY (1989) and SMITH (1996), presents a Marxist analysis of urban accumulation and regulation. Particularly beholden to Lefebvre, it seeks to explain the production of space through forms of urban redevelopment and gentrification. The concern here is not only with uneven spatial development, but also with modes of regulation that manage and displace the crises of capitalism, as in the work of BRENNER (2004), BRENNER and THEODORE (2002), and JESSOP (1994). The second strand, often dubbed the 'Los Angeles school', traces the explosion and implosion of the metropolis: the exurban landscapes of the exopolis (SOJA, 1992), the enclaves of the fortress city (DAVIS, 1990), and the border geographies of the 'postborder' city (DEAR and LECLERC, 2003). In a Debordian analysis of late capitalism, this framework draws attention to the symbolic economies of the city-region: the alienation of production, reproduction, and regulation in the spectacle that is the postmodern metropolis (SORKIN, 1992). Through an engagement with new geographies of theory, it is sought to update and rework these theorizations.

Worlding of cities

In urban theory, the analytical practice of 'worlding' is dominated by the framework of global cities and world cities. This ecology of globalization pays attention to the circuits of finance capital and informational capital but ignores other circuitries of the world economy. It is not surprising then that global/world cities mapping drops all other cities from the map, arguing that they are structurally irrelevant to the functioning of economic globalization (ROBINSON, 2002). But the immense body of work

being done in various world-regions indicates that there are many other ways of 'worlding' cities and that these are of crucial significance in the world economy. For example, theorists of 'transnational urbanism' are examining the ways in which gentrification and urban redevelopment are embedded in global property markets, the globalization of Lefebvre's 'production of space' (OLDS, 2001a). Others are studying 'transnationalism from below', the practices and strategies of migrants as they cross borders and produce space (SMITH, 2001). Particularly significant is the work of JACOBS (1996) on post-colonial urbanism. Jacobs interprets global cities such as London as 'postcolonial' cities and shows how London's colonial past shapes its contemporary spaces – in 'ethnic enclaves', in struggles over urban redevelopment, and in negotiations over cultural identity. This is the unstable and profound 'edge of empire', one that exists not at the margins, but rather at the heart of the global city. Similarly, MITCHELL'S (2004) study of globalized Vancouver reveals contestations over urban space that are also contestations around nation and homeland. Vancouver's Pacific Rim urbanism, driven by wealthy and middle-class Chinese transnational entrepreneurs, disrupts the models/myths of assimilation and interculturalism that constitute Canadian citizenship.

Such forms of 'worlding' are crucial because they move urban theory from the mapping of 'world cities' to the historicized analysis of 'world systems'. The global/world cities framework asserts a hierarchy of cities but is unable to account fully for the materialization of such a hierarchy, and even less so in relation to the long histories of colonialism and imperialism. Space is a 'container' in these theoretical reports; its 'production' remains unexplained (SMITH, 2002). For example, TAYLOR (2000), following Braudel, rightly notes that capitalism is a world of multiple monopolies and that global/world cities represent a 'monopoly of place'. This is a refreshing recalibration of the rather simplistic narrative of 'agglomeration economies'. Yet, Taylor is unable to explain the formation of such power configurations and monopolistic complexes. The frameworks of transnational urbanism and post-colonial urbanism ply precisely such explanatory power. Through a study of imperial geographies, Jacobs can explain the production of London as a global city. Through an analysis of Pacific Rim elites, Olds can account for the global accumulation that is taking place in Vancouver. But it is interesting to note that even this work remains centred in 'First World' cities, though they represent an important effort to transnationalize and globalize the study of these cities. While such efforts at 'worlding' cities are of considerable significance, a second type of 'worlding' is being proposed that is less conventional.

The 'worlding' of cities has typically adopted a core-periphery model of globalization. This is the case with

neo/liberal frameworks and this is the case with post/colonial frameworks. However, 'area studies' research indicates an urgent need to rethink the model of core and periphery. APPADURAI (1996) suggests a theory of 'scapes': overlapping, disjunctive orders (mediascapes, ethnoscapas, financescapes) as an analytics of globalization and as an alternative to core-periphery mappings. However, his theme of 'scapes' narrates globalization as a process of deterritorialization without taking into account the rather obvious forms of *reterritorialization* that are at work in the world system. A 'worlding' of cities has now to take account of multiple cores and peripheries, and more provocatively has to note the emergence of core-periphery structures *within* the global South. Two examples of such 'worlding' will be cited.

The first is the case of global circuits of domestic work that link 'peripheries' such as the Philippines to 'cores' such as Hong Kong and Singapore. It is a well-established fact that there is a gender order to the geographies of late capitalism. EHRENREICH and HOCHSCHILD (2003) bestow the term 'Global Woman' on the labouring bodies (maids, nannies, sex workers, assembly line workers) through which global accumulation is facilitated and reproduced. The valuation and exchange of these bodies takes place not only in South-North flows, but also in South-South flows. The work of CONSTABLE (1997) and YEOH *et al.* (2000) details the feminization and racialization of domestic service in Hong Kong and Singapore, such that maidhood becomes synonymous with national and gender typifications (in these cases, usually with the type 'Filipina'). The Philippines, on the one hand, facilitates the 'export' of its women and relies heavily on their remittances, but on the other hand, gingerly negotiates wages and working conditions with Hong Kong and Singapore, and is often threatened with the spectre of 'returned' Filipinas.

The second is the case of the routes of migration, lines of evacuation, and exchanges of commodities that connect the cities of sub-Saharan Africa to cities such as Mumbai, Dubai, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, and Jeddah, elaborated by SIMONE (2001) in an illuminating article titled 'On the worlding of African cities'. Africans deploy 'the city as a resource for reaching and operating at the level of the world' (p. 22), thereby creating everyday strategies of 'worlding', a 'worlding from below'. Some of these circuits 'spin out and link themselves to the more conventional migratory paths' of Europe and North America' (p. 22), but many of them remain connected primarily to other sites in the global South. These networks are facilitated not by the usual agents and firms of finance capital and informational capital, but by other equally relevant economic and social agents, in this case, the '*zawiyyah*' or Sufi brotherhood. It is worth reading the following passage from SIMONE (2001, p. 28) as a counterpoint to the Darwinian mappings produced by the global/world cities framework:

Thus in Treichville, where I visited a Tidiane *zawiyyah* in 1993, a large world map was placed on a wall in one of the common rooms. On the map, hundreds of cities were circled with magic markers and 'tagged' with numbers. On a table below the map were heavily worn and numbered cardboard files corresponding to the numbers on the map. In these files were various lists of names of followers living in these cities with brief profiles of each one.

Such forms of 'worlding' move one away from simple core-periphery models of globalized urbanization. Instead, one is left with what ONG (1999) terms 'differentiated zones of sovereignty'. The 21st-century metropolis arbitrates this geography of multiplicity and differentiation. And in doing so it is, as Abbas would have one imagine, a 'para-site'. It is dependent on the circuits of global capital and yet it also produces and mediates these circuits.

Production of space

There is a sophisticated body of theory on the 'production of space', Lefebvre's shorthand for the ways in which surplus value is produced through the commodification and exchange of space. Of course, for Lefebvre, the production of space also takes place through representations of space (the abstract spatial conceptions of experts and planners), through the everyday, lived experience of space, and through the collective meanings of representational spaces. However, the primary appropriation of his work has centred on how property capital, once deemed to be a 'secondary' circuit, is today a 'primary' circuit, notable not simply for its role in expanded reproduction, but rather for its central role in the production of value (SMITH, 2002) and in the ever-expanding frontier of primitive accumulation (HARVEY, 2005). From such a conceptualization follows a host of corollary concepts about forms of regulation and formations of space. SMITH (1996) characterizes the contemporary city as 'revanchist', with zero tolerance for the urban poor. HARVEY (1990) charts the shift from 'urban managerialism' to 'urban entrepreneurialism', noting that the state is now an agent, rather than regulator, of the market. GRAHAM and MARVIN (2001) demonstrate that such productions of space yield a highly uneven metropolitan landscape, a 'splintering urbanism' of 'secessionary networked spaces' and 'black holes'. But of course it is this unevenness that makes possible new rounds of gentrification and urban redevelopment, with the revalorization of devalorized property (SMITH, 1996). The 'regulation' theorists (BRENNER and THEODORE, 2002) designate such practices as a 'spatial fix', whereby the crisis of over-accumulation is remedied through investments in new sites of value.

These theoretical positions have been produced in the context of the EuroAmerican urban experience. This is not to say that this analysis is not applicable to the cities of the global South. Indeed, it is highly relevant. The argument is less about transnational relevance and more

about the scope and range of analysis. By being embedded in the EuroAmerican urban experience, this theoretical work bypasses some of the key ways in which the production of space takes place in other urban and metropolitan contexts. Further, this 'other' experience has considerable relevance for EuroAmerican city-regions and can provide insights into hitherto unexplained processes in these cities. One such mode of the production of space is highlighted: informality. 'First World' urban and metropolitan theory is curiously silent on the issue of informality. Or there is a tendency to imagine the 'informal' as a sphere of unregulated, even illegal, activity, outside the scope of the state, a domain of survival by the poor and marginalized, often wiped out by gentrification and redevelopment. But a large body of 'Third World' literature provides a sophisticated and rather different understanding of informality. It is worth highlighting three contributions of this analytical framework.

First, informality lies within the scope of the state rather than outside it. It is often the power of the state that determines what is informal and what is not (PORTES *et al.*, 1989). And in many instances the state itself operates in informalized ways, thereby gaining a territorialized flexibility that it does not fully have with merely formal mechanisms of accumulation and legitimation. These too are, to borrow a term from BRENNER (2004), 'state spaces'. For example, the rapid peri-urbanization that is unfolding at the edges of the world's largest cities is an informalized process, often in violation of master plans and state norms but often informally sanctioned by the state (ROY, 2003). This means that informality is not an unregulated domain but rather is structured through various forms of extra-legal, social, and discursive regulation. Second, informality is much more than an economic sector; it is a 'mode' of the production of space (ROY and ALSAYYAD, 2003). Informality produces an uneven geography of spatial value thereby facilitating the urban logic of creative destruction. The differential value attached to what is 'formal' and what is 'informal' creates the patchwork of valorized and devalorized spaces that is in turn the frontier of primitive accumulation and gentrification. In other words, informality is a fully capitalized domain of property and is often a highly effective 'spatial fix' in the production of value and profits. Third, informality is internally differentiated. The splintering of urbanism does not take place at the fissure between formality and informality but rather, in fractal fashion, within the informalized production of space. With the consolidation of neoliberalism, there has also been a 'privatization of informality'. While informality was once primarily located on public land and practised in public space, it is today a crucial mechanism in wholly privatized and marketized urban formations, as in the informal subdivisions that constitute the peri-urbanization of so many cities (ALSAYYAD and ROY, 2003, p. 4). These forms of

informality are no more legal than squatter settlements and shantytowns. But they are expressions of class power and can thus command infrastructure, services, and legitimacy in a way that marks them as substantially different than the landscape of slums.

Such issues are obviously of pressing concern for the cities of the global South where informality is often the primary mode of the production of 21st-century metropolitan space. But they are also of relevance to *all* cities because they draw attention to some key features of urbanism: the extralegal territoriality and flexibility of the state; modes of social and discursive regulation; and the production of differentiated spatial value. In this sense, informality is not a pre-capitalist relic or an icon of 'backward' economies. Rather, it is a capitalist mode of production, par excellence.

An equally significant contribution of the 'informality' framework to one's understanding of the 21st-century metropolis is the insight into forms of mobilization, agency, and resistance. Urban theory has long been concerned with the ways in which the poor and marginalized act in the face of power. However, it has been better able to explain acts of power than acts of resistance, as in concepts of growth machines, political regimes of redevelopment, modes of regulation, and urban entrepreneurialism. The 'Third World' literature on informality is a treasure-trove of conceptual work on the 'grassroots' of the city, and is thus able to expand considerably the analysis of 'urban politics' or 'metropolitics'. For example, BAYAT (2000) working in the context of Middle East cities, delineates the repertoire of tactics through which urban 'informals' appropriate and claim space (the influence of DE CERTEAU, 1984, is obvious). This 'quiet encroachment of the ordinary' by subaltern groups, according to him, creates a 'street politics' that shapes the city in fundamental ways. Similarly, CHATTERJEE (2006), writing about Indian cities, makes a distinction between 'civil' and 'political' societies. For him, civil society groups make claims as fully enfranchised citizens, a 'bourgeois governmentality' if you will. Political society on the other hand are the claims of the disenfranchised and marginalized, what APPADURAI (2002) has termed 'governmentality from below'.

Perhaps the most complex articulations of agency and subaltern subjecthood come from a growing body of work on African cities. On the one hand, this literature is concerned with the 'figures of the subject in the time of crisis', with 'registers of improvisation' where 'every law enacted is submerged by an ensemble of techniques of avoidance, circumvention, and envelopment' (MBEMBE and ROITMAN, 2003, p. 114). Here informality becomes a mode of subjectivity, a way of 'operating more resourcefully in underresourced cities'; cities thereby become 'pirate towns' (SIMONE, 2006, p. 357); and infrastructure must be understood not as steel and concrete but rather as fields of action and social networks (SIMONE, 2004a). On the other

hand, this framework is more than an analysis of poverty and necessity. MBEMBE (2004, p. 378) thus designates it as an analytics of 'superfluity'. It is an analysis of the very material basis of the 'social' – of the ways in which the 'social' must be understood as 'the locus of experiment and artifice' rather than 'a matter of order and contract' (MBEMBE and NUTTALL, 2004, p. 349). How else can one understand situations where order is an artifice and the contract is an experiment, where contract is an artifice and order is an experiment? In his critique of this work, WATTS (2005) despairs:

Is this 'really about a "collective system" or a desperate search for human agency (improvisation, incessant convertibility) in the face of a neoliberal grand slam? Open and flexible, if provisional, is what used to be called self-exploitation'.

(p. 184)

But this is perhaps the point. The Africanist debates about agency, subjectivity, and politics defy the easy categorizations of power and resistance. Under conditions of crisis, the subaltern subject is simultaneously strategic and self-exploitative, simultaneously a political agent and a subject of the neoliberal grand slam.

Exurbanity and extraterritoriality

The 21st-century metropolis is a chameleon. It shifts shape and size; margins become centres; centres become frontiers; regions become cities. BAUDRILLARD (1986) writes of this process: 'They have not destroyed space; they have simply rendered it infinite by the destruction of its centre' (p. 99). The 21st-century metropolis makes a fool of census jurisdictions, of the mappings of city and suburbs, and confounds the easy narratives of regional change, including those that emphasize agglomeration and innovation. For the last two decades, the 'Los Angeles school' of urban theory has been tracing this explosion and implosion of metropolitan formations, a geography that is more appropriately imagined as 'exopolis' (SOJA, 1992) or as the 'postborder city' (DEAR and LECLERC, 2003). While the 'Los Angeles school' has been effective in analysing the symbolic economies of the postmodern metropolis, the concern here is with a very specific dimension of exurbanity: the relationship of city and nation. Drawing on the experiences of cities of the global South, it is argued that exurban geographies are deeply implicated in the making of the nation and, therefore, exceed the scale of city-regions. In this sense, they are 'extraterritorial' spaces.

The 'extraterritorial' metropolis is evident in various contexts. For DEAR and LECLERC (2003), the 'postborder city' is a 'transnational megalopolis' that exceeds not only metropolitan jurisdictions, but also national borders. The 'postborder city' is something more than a vast metropolis and something more than cross-border exchanges. It is an 'integrated city-region, or

regional city, that just happens to be bisected by an international border' (p. xii). At the same time, this city-region is not contiguous territory; the suburbs of its inner cities lie across national borders, in the villages of Latin America (DAVIS, 1999). In other words, the 'postborder city' subsumes national space-making within the territory of the metropolis. It thus transcends the border and yet it also recreates multiple borders at multiple, scattered sites. The 'postborder city' is after all also a 'fortress city' (DAVIS, 1990). When Baudrillard writes that exurbanity is American and America is exurban, he does not mean that this is uniquely American territory. Instead, he is suggesting that it is in the space of exurbanity that the 'utopia' of the American nation is achieved and that it is here that the violences accompanying such a utopia are most clearly traced.

There are other manifestations of the 'transnational megalopolis'. The extended metropolitan forms that are emerging in Southeast Asia, what LAQUIAN (2005) calls 'mega urban regions', are not only conurbations of city and countryside, but also spaces of transnational accumulation and development. Kuala Lumpur's Multimedia Super Corridor, created by Mahathir's Vision 2020, stretches 38 miles from Kuala Lumpur International Airport to the Petronas Towers and city centre. This spatial plan is a shorthand for transnational ambitions, a 'Cyberjaya' metropolis that can harness the benefits of informational capitalism and stretch the Kuala Lumpur metropolitan region to meet up with the development boom in neighbouring Singapore. But it is also anchored by a deeply nationalistic set of aspirations, including the new town capital 'Putrajaya' complete with an architectural aesthetics that conveys the image of a globalized, and yet distinctively Malaysian, modernity. Malaysia's cultural slogan after all is 'Malaysia, Truly Asia', a modernity of multicultural intermingling and a postcolonial harmony of colonial landmarks and hypermodern spatialities.

This dialectic of nationalism and transnationalism, of territoriality and extraterritoriality, is also sharply obvious in Shanghai. ABBAS (2000, p. 778) interprets early 20th-century Shanghai as the 'cosmopolitanism of extraterritoriality'. Indeed, *fin-de-siècle* Shanghai was a city of international interests and settlements, an ensemble of French, American, and British territories. The metropolis was thus simultaneously territorial and extraterritorial, with different (national) rules and norms shaping each swath of settlement. *Fin-de-millénaire* Shanghai is similarly cosmopolitan. The question is whether its extraterritoriality is similarly pronounced. Is the speed and intensity of transnational investments, including those by the overseas Chinese, creating an extraterritorial metropolis? Is Shanghai located in place and time, or is it a city of elsewhere, the city that is yet to come? Is it possible to interpret Shanghai as an expression of Chinese modernity if the very category of 'Chinese-ness' is bound up with flexible citizenship, diasporic identity,

and transnational accumulation (ONG, 1999)? And yet is not Shanghai a distinctive project of a distinctive sort of national/nationalistic state anchored by the same types of colonial nostalgia and postcolonial hyperboles as Kuala Lumpur?

To read the extraterritorial in the territories of the metropolis is crucial. Equally crucial is the reading of the national in the transnational megalopolis. Such readings make visible formations of power and governance and forms of accumulation and dispossession. The most obvious example is the extra/territoriality and trans/nationalism of the Israeli settlements in the West Bank. Designated by NEWMAN (1996) as instances of suburban and exurban 'colonization', these settlements (which are in effect 'informal subdivisions') manifest the extraterritorial power of the state of Israel. Each time a settlement is established, Israeli infrastructure and law extends to this site, thus creating a metropolitan form that is not only ethnocratic (YIFTACHEL, 2006), but also one of splintered sovereignty (SEGAL and WEIZMAN, 2003). There is perhaps only one other contemporary example of such intense forms of extraterritoriality: the territorial formations of American military bases that now puncture the national territories of American allies and occupied countries – the 'America towns' of Iraq, Afghanistan, Okinawa, South Korea, Italy, and the Philippines (GILLEM, 2004). To keep pace with such geographies, one needs an urban and metropolitan theory that is simultaneously located and dis-located.

METROPOLITAN MODERNITIES

The study of the 21st-century metropolis is inevitably a study of modernity (ROBINSON, 2006). In urban and metropolitan theory, modernity has been firmly located in the EuroAmerican city. It is the experience of Paris, London, Vienna, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles that defines the contours of the modern and postmodern. The cities of the global South are for the most part seen to be inheritors of a backward modernity, the 'modernism of underdevelopment' (BERMAN, 1982), or aspiring to mimic and copy EuroAmerican modernities. In recent years a strikingly different analysis of urban modernities has emerged. There are at least three variations in this emerging framework.

The first is the argument that modernity (and its violences) is everywhere. Writing against the efforts to frame 'Third World' cities through the master tropes of slums and disorder, NUTTALL and MBEMBE (2005) boldly assert that African cities and their residents are 'full participants in metropolitan modernity'. In a 'sameliness as worldliness' argument, they note that lavish urbanism is everywhere, including in Africa; and slum life is everywhere; including in America. The second is an imagination about 'alternative' modernities (GAONKAR, 2001), the sense that while modernity is everywhere, distinctive sorts of 'native' modernities are produced under

conditions of 'alterity' and difference. There is thus a Shanghai modern, a Bengali modern, a Cairo cosmopolitan. The third is a bolder argument, for it 'dislocates' the very production of modernity. In particular, it calls into question the Western origins of modernity, arguing instead that it is important to take seriously the emergence of the modern outside the geography of the West and in the circuits of production and exchange that encircle the world (MITCHELL, 2000). It is in this sense that CHAKRABARTY (2000) 'provincializes Europe' and ROBINSON (2003) calls for the application of such 'postcolonial' perspectives to the study of cities and territories.

The present paper has sought to sketch the first outlines of a more worldly theory of the 21st-century metropolis. In doing so, it has drawn heavily upon the third strand of modern imaginings: a 'worlding' of cities such that the standard geographies of core and periphery are disrupted and dislocated. In such a world, Vancouver and San Francisco are the peripheral outposts of a dynamic Pacific Rim urbanism centred in the para-site, Hong Kong, and extending to Beijing and Shanghai with labour and outsourcing hinterlands in the Philippines, Cambodia, Chinese economic zones, and Vietnam. In such a world, Dubai is the lodestone of desires and aspirations, the icon of supermodernity in the backbreaking trudge of transnational migration from the villages of Egypt, Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Pakistan. It is surely an 'evil paradise' of 'fear and money', a 'dreamworld of neoliberalism' (DAVIS, 2006; DAVIS and MORK, 2007), but it is also an articulation of an Arab modernity where more is at stake than what DAVIS (2006, p. 53) designates as the 'monstrous caricature of futurism'. It is the place at which the distinctions between the black economy and global finance capital are erased, where city and nature are violently fused, and where the feudalism of an emirate meets up with an open cosmopolitanism.

This paper has also inscribed the 'worlding' of cities with the arguments of 'worldliness' – that while distinctive and alternative modernities are produced in multiple urban sites, such experiences can speak to and inform one's analysis of other places. While much of urban theory has managed a traffic of ideas that routes concepts from EuroAmerica to the global South, there is an urgency and necessity to chart more intricate roots and routes. It is in this sense that the study of informality in Latin America can tell something profound about political regimes and politics in *all* cities. It is in this sense that the registers of metropolitan wealth, transience, and disposability in African cities can tell something profound about agency and subjectivity in *all* cities. The extraterritoriality of the 21st-century metropolis demands such analytical work, a theory that is simultaneously located and dislocated.

There are, of course, limitations to such an approach. Placing the 21st-century metropolis in its different world-areas runs the risk of reifying territorial

jurisdictions and geopolitical stereotypes, of producing a classificatory scheme that can obscure topologies and relationalities. However, when such world-areas are approached as 'process' rather than 'trait' geographies, and when the knowledge produced about these areas is seen as a 'strategic essentialism' rather than as a generalization, a more dynamic imagination and epistemology is possible. At the very least, such an approach can dramatically reconfigure the signifier, 'global', that seems to have become an ubiquitous presence in the theorization of city-regions. It is known how to map the 'global' through Darwinian hierarchies of city-regions; much

less is known about the complex connections, exchanges, and references through which cities (everywhere) are worlded. The world is not flat, and it is time to produce a more contoured knowledge of its cities.

Acknowledgements – The author wishes to thank Angela Hull, Michael Neuman, and two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments. The author is particularly grateful to Ryan Centner, PhD candidate in Sociology, and Sylvia Nam, PhD student in City & Regional Planning, at the University of California–Berkeley. Their research assistance was invaluable in shaping this paper and its arguments.

REFERENCES

- ABBAS A. (2000) Cosmopolitan de-descriptions: Shanghai and Hong Kong, *Public Culture* **12**, 769–786.
- ALSAYYAD N. and ROY A. (2003) Prologue/dialogue, in ROY A. and ALSAYYAD N. (Eds) *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, South Asia, and Latin America*. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.
- AMIN A. (2004) Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* **86**, 33–44.
- APPADURAI A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- APPADURAI A. (2000a) Grassroots globalization and research imagination, *Public Culture* **12**, 1–19.
- APPADURAI A. (2000b) Spectral housing and urban cleansing: notes on millennial Mumbai, *Public Culture* **12**, 627–651.
- APPADURAI A. (2002) Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics, *Public Culture* **14**, 21–47.
- AUYERO J. (2000) The hyper-shantytown: neoliberal violence(s) in the Argentine slum, *Ethnography* **1**, 93–116.
- BAUDRILLARD J. (1986) *America*. Verso, New York, NY.
- BAYAT A. (2000) From 'dangerous classes' to 'quiet rebels': the politics of the urban subaltern in the global south, *International Sociology* **15**, 533–557.
- BERMAN M. (1982) *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air*. Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.
- BRENNER N. (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- BRENNER N. and THEODORE N. (2002) Cities and the geographies of 'actually existing neoliberalism', *Antipode* **34**, 349–379.
- CALDEIRA T. (2001) *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in Sao Paulo*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- CARDOSO F. H. and FALETO E. (1979) *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- CASTELLS M. (1983) *The City and the Grassroots*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- CASTELLS M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- CHAKRABARTY D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- CHATTERJEE P. (2006) *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- CONSTABLE N. (1997) *Maid to Order in Hong Kong: An Ethnography of Filipina Workers*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- DAVIS M. (1990) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. Vintage, New York, NY.
- DAVIS M. (1999) Magical urbanism: how Latinos reinvent the big city, *New Left Review* **234**, 3–43.
- DAVIS M. (2004) Planet of slums: urban involution and the informal proletariat, *New Left Review* **26**, 5–34.
- DAVIS M. (2006) Fear and money in Dubai, *New Left Review* **41**, 47–68.
- DAVIS M. and MORK D. B. (Eds) (2007) *Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism*. New Press, New York, NY.
- DE CERTEAU M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- DEAR M. and LECLERC G. (Eds) (2003) *Postborder City: Cultural Spaces of Baja California*. Routledge, New York, NY.
- DUTTA A. (2006) *The Bureaucracy of Beauty*. Routledge, New York, NY.
- EHRENREICH B. and HOCHSCHILD A. (Eds) (2003) *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. Metropolitan Books, New York, NY.
- FRANK A. G. (1967) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press, New York, NY.
- GAONKAR D. P. (Ed.) (2001) *Alternative Modernities*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- GILLEM M. (2004) America town: building the outposts of empire. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Architecture, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.
- GRAHAM S. (Ed.) (2004) *Cities, War, and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- GRAHAM S. and MARVIN S. (2001) *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities, and the Urban Condition*. Routledge, London.
- HARVEY D. (1989) *The Urban Experience*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- HARVEY D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- HARVEY D. (2005) *The New Imperialism*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- HOLSTON J. (Ed.) (1999) *Cities and Citizenship*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- HOLSTON J. (2001) Urban citizenship and globalization, in SCOTT A. J. (Ed.) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 325–347. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

- ISIN E. F. (2001) Istanbul's conflicting paths to citizenship: Islamization and globalization, in SCOTT A. J. (Ed.) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 349–370. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- JACOBS J. (1996) *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. Routledge, New York, NY.
- JARVIS H. (2007) Home truths about care-less competitiveness, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **31**, 207–214.
- JESSOP B. (1994) Post-Fordism and the state, in AMIN A. (Ed.) *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, pp. 251–279. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- JONAS A. and WARD K. (2007) Introduction to a debate on city-regions: new geographies of governance, democracy and social reproduction, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **31**, 169–178.
- KNOX P. and TAYLOR P. (1995) *World Cities in a World-System*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- LAQUIAN A. (2005) *Beyond Metropolis: The Planning and Governance of Asia's Mega Urban Regions*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- LEE L. (2001) Shanghai modern: reflections on urban culture in China in the 1930s, in GAONKAR D. P. (Ed.) *Alternative Modernities*, pp. 86–122. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- MBEMBE A. (2004) Aesthetics of superfluity, *Public Culture* **16**, 373–405.
- MBEMBE A. and NUTTALL S. (2004) Writing the world from an African metropolis, *Public Culture* **16**, 347–372.
- MBEMBE A. and ROITMAN J. (2003) The figure of the subject in the time of crisis, in ABDOUL M. (Ed.) *Under Siege: Four African Cities*, pp. 99–126. Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern.
- MITCHELL K. (2004) *Crossing the Neoliberal Line: Pacific Rim Migration and the Metropolis*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.
- MITCHELL T. (Ed.) (2000) *Questions of Modernity*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- NEWMAN D. (1996) The territorial politics of exurbanization, *Israeli Affairs* **3**, 61–85.
- NUTTALL S. and MBEMBE A. (2005) A blasé attitude: a response to Michael Watts, *Public Culture* **17**, 193–201.
- OLDS K. (2001a) *Globalization and Urban Change: Capital, Culture and Pacific Rim Mega-Projects*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- OLDS K. (2001b) Practices for 'process geographies': a view from within and outside the periphery, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **19**, 127–136.
- ONG A. (1999) *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- PERLMAN J. (2003) The reality of marginality, in ROY A. and ALSAYYAD N. (Eds) *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, South Asia, and Latin America*, pp. 105–146. Lexington Press, Lanham, MD.
- PORTES A., CASTELLS M. and BENTON L. (1989) *The Informal Economy*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- PURCELL M. (2007) City-regions, neoliberal globalization and democracy: a research agenda, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **31**, 197–206.
- RAO V. (2006) Slum as theory: the South/Asian city and globalization, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **30**, 225–232.
- ROBINSON J. (2002) Global and world cities: a view from off the map, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **26**, 531–554.
- ROBINSON J. (2003) Postcolonialising geography: tactics and pitfalls, *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* **24**, 273–289.
- ROBINSON J. (2006) *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development*. Routledge, London.
- ROY A. (2003) *City Requiem, Calcutta: Gender and the Politics of Poverty*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- ROY A. and ALSAYYAD N. (Eds) (2003) *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America, and South Asia*. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.
- SASSEN S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- SCOTT A. J. (Ed.) (2001) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- SEGAL R. and WEIZMAN E. (Eds) (2003) *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture*. Verso, New York, NY.
- SEGBERS K. (2007) *The Making of Global City Regions: Johannesburg, Mumbai/Bombay, São Paulo, and Shanghai*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- SIMONE A. (2001) On the worlding of African cities, *African Studies Review* **44**, 15–41.
- SIMONE A. (2004a) People as infrastructure: intersecting fragments in Johannesburg, *Public Culture* **16**, 407–429.
- SIMONE A. (2004b) *For the City Yet to Come: Changing Life in Four African Cities*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- SIMONE A. (2006) Pirate towns: reworking social and symbolic infrastructures in Johannesburg and Douala, *Urban Studies* **43**, 357–370.
- SINGERMAN D. and AMAR P. (Eds) (2006) *Cairo Cosmopolitan: Politics, Culture, and Urban Space in the New Middle East*. AUC Press, Cairo.
- SMITH M. P. (2001) *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- SMITH N. (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. Routledge, New York, NY.
- SMITH N. (2002) New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as global urban strategy, *Antipode* **34**, 427–450.
- SOJA E. (1992) Inside exopolis: scenes from Orange County, in SORKIN M. (Ed.) *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. Hill & Wang, New York, NY.
- SORKIN M. (Ed.) (1992) *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. Hill & Wang, New York, NY.
- STREN R. (2001) Local governance and social diversity in the developing world: new challenges for globalizing city-regions, in SCOTT A. J. (Ed.) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- TAYLOR P. (2000) World cities and territorial states under conditions of contemporary globalization, *Political Geography* **19**, 5–32.
- WATTS M. (2005) Baudelaire over Berea, Simmel over Sandton?, *Public Culture* **17**, 181–192.
- YEOH B., HUANG S. and WILLIS K. (2000) Global cities, transnational flows, and gender dimensions, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Social Geografie* **2**, 147–158.
- YIFTACHEL O. (2006) *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.