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When news first broke of the fatal shooting of 28 foreigners at the Splendid Hotel in Quagadougou, Burkina Faso, most reporters had only the remotest idea where the West African city is located. Those who did depicted it as a dreary inland administrative centre – David Tang, the Financial Times of London’s resident cultural sophisticate, includes it on his list of the world’s worst cities, ‘dirty, dusty and rotten’ (Tang, 2016: 1) – popular mainly with a few hundred foreign civilians working for faith-based relief agencies. In fact, Quagadougou is a culturally vibrant city of 1.5 million people, a third larger than Birmingham, England’s second most populous city. Ouagadougou is hardly unique. Recent urbanization along the Gulf of Guinea (West Africa) has been so rapid that the region will soon be comparable to the East Coast of the United States, with five cities over 1 million people, including one hypercity, Lagos Nigeria, with a population of 23 million (Davis, 2006: 5–6). Explosive urban population growth is not restricted to the African continent. In most countries, urbanization levels have reached record levels, with some world regions becoming more than 80 per cent urban (Brenner and Keil, 2006).

This ‘planetary urbanization’ or ‘urban age’ trope has come to dominate how we think of cities. Since the late 1980s, Brenner and Schmid (2014: 312) note, the urban age thesis ‘has been embraced with increasing frequency in international urban scholarship and policy research, often by influential thinkers and practitioners as a convenient metanarrative for framing a wide variety of investigations within or about cities’ (Brenner, 2014). Arboleda (2014: 339) observes that the often heard claim that more than half the world’s population now resides in cities has become a form of ‘doxic common sense’ that determines the way in which questions regarding the urban condition are framed, both at multilateral agencies like the United Nations and the World Bank but also in ‘the conceptual repertoires of political progressive strands of
thought in urban studies’. While not disputing that the percentage of urban dwellers worldwide will soon be reaching epic proportions, Merrifield (2014: x) complains that academic experts and media commentators alike are engaging in ‘Malthusian fear mongering’ which ‘obfuscates the class and power question surrounding our current urban question’.

Whilst urban commentators generally agree that we increasingly live in a ‘world of cities’, there is considerably less agreement on how to interpret and understand the contemporary urban condition. There are three interrelated points of contention.

One major fault line has developed around the degree of importance that should continue to be accorded to physical space as an organizing concept. In the classic human ecological model which dominated urban sociology and geography for its first half-century, the organization and physical layout of the city were treated as having a life of their own. Park and Burgess (Park et al., 1925) asserted that the city could be visualized as a series of concentric circles or zones rippling outwards from the core. As one moves further from the central business district, the land becomes more valuable, the housing more desirable and the population more assimilated.

When a political economy perspective finally mounted a successful paradigmatic challenge in the 1970s, physical space still held centre stage, albeit from a radically different vantage point. David Harvey (1973, 1975) asserted that urban space should be seen as a scarce resource that is distributed not by natural ecological processes, but rather by outcomes based on economic and political conflict rooted in class-based struggles (Hutter, 2007: 123). While agreeing that capital and class are regretfully missing from the human ecology paradigm, urban political economists differ widely on what an alternative treatment of space should look like. Their socio-spatial perspective identifies real estate interests and government intervention as missing elements in explaining how the built environment changes and develops.

Inspired by Lefebvre’s triadic model of the social production of space, other urban analysts adopted a more explicitly constructionist approach. Representational space, the third element of the triad, allows for new forms of understanding in physical environments that otherwise seem to be fixed and controlled by economic and political elites. The possibility exists here for the imaginative re-use and remaking of the city, drawing on a different set of cultural and historical resources (Robinson, 2004: 172–3). In the introduction to their edited collection, Urban Imaginaries: Locating the Modern City, Alev Çinar and Thomas Bender (2007) describe what a new perspective on the city might look like. Rather than focus on a single, defined physical space with fixed boundaries, we are urged to visualize the city as a field of experience that is socially constructed by its inhabitants. Cities are thus the products of a collective imagination, albeit one that is grounded in material space and social practice. Significantly, collective narratives about the city serve to construct, negotiate and contest boundaries, a process that inevitably leads to ethnic, racial and class conflict. Theoretically, the challenge here is to combine political economy, whose emphasis is on conflict and inequality, with more recent cultural and linguistic approaches that interpret the city as ‘a space of performance, theatre and signification’ (Gotham, 2002: 1739). This can potentially lead to a more sophisticated form of urban scholarship which does not lose track of the city as a site of inequality and struggle.

More recently, the politics and use of urban space have been reconfigured by a global trend towards greater entrepreneurialism, more intense inter-urban competition and the promotion of place-specific development strategies (Ooi, 2004: 11). As Greg Richards points out in Chapter 4, the increasingly competitive global environment of cities ‘has
forced them to adopt different strategies to distinguish themselves and create competitive advantage in order to attract resources, talent and attention’.

One intriguing new treatment of urban space is captured by the concept of ‘gray space’. According to the Israeli political geographer Oren Yiftachel, in the early stages of the twenty-first century the structural dynamics of cities have pushed massive numbers of residents into gray space – political spaces characterized by mobility, informality, temporariness, marginality and extreme status and power disparities. This produces a structure that resembles ‘creeping urban apartheid’ (Yiftachel, 2009: 92), wherein many urban residents ‘are regarded as unrecognized, illegal, temporary or severely marginalized in urban regions in which they live and work’ (Yiftachel, 2015: 730).

A second polarity within the urban literature aligns along the treatment of diversity and difference. Hannigan (2013) identifies and contrasts two opposing approaches here. The first, the economic and prosperity model, privileges economic productivity and competitiveness, cosmopolitan urbanity, cultural consumption, governance through private-public collaboration, creativity and innovation as growth drivers. By contrast, the rights, justice and emancipation model favours the informal economy, everyday urban practices, public infrastructures and spaces, citizenship rights, social equity and redistribution, social justice and democratic hope. Whereas the former treats diversity as a ‘lure’ with which to attract tourists, investors and ‘creative people’, the latter values urban difference in its own right as the portal to a liveable and just city. Merrifield (2014) situates this chronologically in a shift that occurred in the latter decades of the twentieth century. In the 1960s and 1970s the state primarily engaged in policies that promoted collective consumption items (housing, health, social welfare) vital for social reproduction. Under pressure from the fiscal crises and economic downturn during the 1980s, this changed. With ideological and material support from the state, financial and merchant capital actively dispossessed collective consumption budgets. Rather, it now engaged in ‘valorizing urban space as a commodity, as a pure financial asset, exploiting it as well as displacing people’ (Merrifield, 2014: xii). After a brief interregnum, this spawned neo-liberalism.

In a pair of recent papers (Scott and Storper, 2015; Storper and Scott, 2016) Allen Scott and Michael Storper have identified a third theoretical fault line that is deepening within urban theory and studies. On one side of this debate, Storper and Scott situate three influential versions of urban analysis: postcolonial urban theory, assemblage theory and planetary urbanism, each of which they find ‘seriously wanting as statements about urban realities’. On the other side, they offer up their own analytical understanding of the city, an approach which pivots on a logic conditioned by an urban land nexus. This features five crucial processes that shape the specifics of urbanization in different times and places: level of development; resource allocation rules; forms and levels of stratification; cultural norms and traditions; authority and power.

Of the three ‘fashionable theories of urbanization’ critiqued by Scott and Storper, postcolonial urban theory has made the biggest splash. A seminal work here is Jennifer Robinson’s book *Ordinary Cities* (2006), in which she argues that we need to break free from a theoretical agenda dominated by North American and European traditions and consider a diversity of urban practices, identities and processes. Borrowing the notion of the ‘ordinary city’ from Amin and Graham (1997), Robinson asserts that it is wrong to rank urban centres according to ‘tiers’; all cities are distinctive, unique and equally of value. As Tim Edensor and Mark Jayne (both contributors to this volume) point out in the Introduction to their edited book, *Urban Theory Beyond the West* (2012: 1), ‘urban theorists have tended to remain entrenched in conceptual and empirical approaches that have barely moved beyond the study of a
small number of Western cities which act as the template against which all other cities are judged’. It has become almost common sense, Hentschel (2014: 79) observes, to criticize the division of urban studies into ‘cities of the West and cities of the South’. Roy (2009: 820) insists that ‘the center of (urban) theory-making must move to the Global South’.

Seminal attempts to redress this shortcoming can be found in Robinson’s (1997, 2008) research on South African cities; Abdou Maliq Simone’s (2007, 2014) ethnographic meditations on everyday life in West African urban settlements; and Ananya Roy’s (2011) discussion of ‘slumdog cities’ in India. One thread that runs through the work of all three authors is the strong sense of adaptability, originality and resilience that is said to characterize the urban in non-Western cities. As Robinson (2006: 4) observes, without taking into account this strong sense of creativity, ‘the potential for imagining city futures is truncated’. Still, the future does not appear to be uniformly bright. Simone (2016) has recently concluded that the space for autoconstruction in middle-latitude cities is shrinking. By autoconstruction he means those aspects of urban life where residents build their homes and workplaces from scratch or public housing is taken over by the residents. As such, these constitute a reaction to the severe repression and domestication that accompany the rise of the private city. A more optimistic view on this can be found in Chapter 30 of the Handbook, wherein Kim Dovey employs assemblage theory to visualize how formal and informal elements in low income housing areas might be usefully reconciled.

Citing Peck (2015), Storper and Scott (2016) claim that postcolonial urban scholars have failed to satisfactorily resolve a fundamental tension between constant calls for a ‘worlding’ of urban analysis on the one hand, and the equally constant affirmation of a ‘North/South binary’ on the other. Worlding refers to the practices engaged in by cities outside the global North that indicate new directions for theorizing the urban in the twenty-first century. This is most obvious in the case of Asian cities. In their edited book, Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global, Roy and her colleague Aihwa Ong (2011) offer three modes for being global: modelling (for city futures), inter-referencing (bits and pieces of one place can be found, seen, imagined and transplanted in or to another place [Ren and Luger, 2015: 6]), and new solidarities (the creation of new ‘aesthetic regimes’ beyond class, city and national divisions). Storper and Scott (2016) argue that some postcolonial urbanists attempt to sidestep the contradiction between the idiosyncratic exceptionalism of cities of the Global South and their potential utility as the building blocks of a new paradigm for urban studies by embracing a ‘comparative gesture’ whereby it is possible to ‘think across differences’ as long as this avoids comparison between the North and the South.

These conflicting viewpoints notwithstanding, a strong case can nevertheless be made for treating the city as a distinctive object of scholarly analysis. Both Storper and Scott (2016) and Walker (2016) have vigorously defended the integrity of the city against suggestions by some proponents of ‘planetary urbanism’ (see Brenner and Schmid, 2015) that the city has faded away as an identifiable geographic entity, necessitating the abandonment of the distinction between the urban and the rural. Despite the fact that ‘cities are notoriously fuzzy at the edges, variegated within and differentiated from place to place’, Walker (2016: 14) insists that this does not mean that ‘we can’t reasonably distinguish them from their “other” in the countryside or find deep commonalities across cities in time and space’. Storper and Scott (2016) agree, calling the city ‘an irreducible collectivity’ whose unique character derives from its properties as a locus of agglomeration and from ‘its specific daily and weekly rhythms of life’. Farias and Bender (2010: 109) offer three reasons for continuing to regard cities as a legitimate object of study and analysis despite ‘urban
sprawl, urban divides, distantiated communities and the multiplicity of sociotechnical networks proliferating in urban spaces’. First, a sufficient number of cities are distinctive, in that you know you are in one place as compared to another. Second, follow networks such as those found in the financial sector or in creative industries and you still end up in the city. Third, cities can be powerful actors in terms of producing small changes that can move on to become big changes.

Continuing debates about the nature of cities and the urban are putting current ‘urban concepts under stress’ (Rickards et al., 2016). In the search for new concepts, models and theories, it is likely that fruitful avenues will be found along the intersections and fracture zones between established and emerging fields of enquiry. This Handbook will hopefully contribute to mapping some of these shifts and transitions.

THE HANDBOOK

From this brief overview of the current state of urban studies it should be evident that the field is at one and the same time rapidly expanding and undergoing a period of intense self-examination. Once situated largely within the traditional disciplines of economics, geography, political science and sociology, the field has now ‘widened’ (Miles and Hall, 2003: 4) to include anthropology, architecture, communications, creative industries, cultural criticism design and innovation, leisure studies, organization studies and tourism. Richard Florida, arguably the most widely recognized urbanist today outside the academy, operates his ‘Prosperity Institute’ from within the Rotman School of Business at the University of Toronto. David Harvey, the most cited urban geographer in the English-speaking world, is Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the City University of New York. Interesting new work on the former fringes of urban studies is testing the boundaries of the field. Traditional tools of urban representation – such as maps, models and statistics – have given way to new forms of representation such as street poetry, art and performance that ‘speak to the experiences of different urban dwellers’ (Hall et al., 2008: 5). While this proliferating presence of urban studies is a positive development, it can easily take the form of multiple nuclei, rather than a single dominant paradigm or paradigm shift.

All of this presents both a compelling reason to compile a *Handbook of New Urban Studies* and a rigorous challenge in so doing. We realized early on that any attempt to follow a linear narrative – from human ecology to urban political economy to postmodernism to postcolonial studies – was unlikely to succeed. Nor would it be helpful to follow the lead of past volumes and organize the material according to policy sector (environment, housing, health, transportation, social welfare), geographic region (Africa, Asia, Latin America) or type of city (economic city, rational city, gendered city, ludic city, global city, etc.).

What we decided to do was bring together a multi-disciplinary group of scholars, each of whom has been working at the leading edge of urban studies, and ask them to produce an original paper. In so doing, four broad types of Handbook chapters emerged. Some of our authors produced an overview and update of current concepts, topics, debates and policies. Thus, Tom Slater reviews and extends the concept of ‘territorial stigmatization’; Mark Jayne and his co-authors explain the practice of ‘town twinning’ in the context of inter-urban competition; and Kevin Gotham and Brad Powers critically assess the seemingly ubiquitous notion of ‘resilience’ in post-disaster communities, showing how it is constructed and contested. Other contributors reprise and elaborate on an intriguing concept or idea that they themselves have previously introduced, demonstrating its potential efficacy. Accordingly, Adam Dixon expands on his typology of ‘frontier cities’ and Dan Silver
riffs on the cultural meanings embedded in urban ‘scenes’. Third, several contributors apply cutting-edge methodologies or theoretical notions to new contexts. Kim Dovey, for example, draws upon assemblage theory, which Scott and Storper cite as one of the three ‘fashionable theories of urbanization’ (see above). Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt demonstrates how Actor-Network Theory (ANT), an approach developed in the field of science and technology studies (STS) and often linked to urban assemblages (Farías and Bender, 2010), can be used to analyse what ‘makes things happen’. Fourth, we commissioned several contributors to write about cities, urbanization and academic analysis in regions outside of Europe and North America. Thus, Shenjing He and Junxi Qian describe the footprint and challenges created by rapid urbanization in China and point to new frontiers in researching Chinese cities and urbanism; while Garth Myers explores ‘African ideas of the urban’, and considers how these might be brought back into urban theorizing about the divided city in America.

Given the diversity of perspectives and approaches adopted by our contributors, we resisted the temptation to impose a single, overarching theoretical framework. We did, however, choose to devote the largest single block of chapters in the Handbook to topics and issues related to the ‘culturalization’ of the city. In this we follow the example of Malcolm Miles and Tim Hall (2003: 4) who right from the start inform their readers, ‘Culture then, as a shaping force, is a recurring interest in this book’. The rationale for employing a cultural lens is convincingly stated by Rossi and Vanolo in their excellent text Urban Political Geographies: A Global Perspective (2012). Rossi and Vanolo describe the public discourse, emphasizing the role of culture and creativity (the latter representing a more energetic and growth-led variant of the former) as urban growth drivers constituting ‘one of the most influential urban narratives of the last decade’ (p. 19). It has been embraced by growth machines in both the affluent North and the emerging global South.

One indicator of the rapidly proliferating importance of this cultural turn is its emerging role in Asian economies. In Chapter 20 of the Handbook, Graeme Evans foresees a time soon when China and other Asian economies (Singapore, India, South Korea) will compete directly with the creative economies of the West – which have left manufacturing (including cultural goods) largely behind. Already, Evans says, the global economic crisis and China’s slowdown has moved state policy towards higher value-added production and shifted attention to creative content and the creative industries. In their review of recent research on Chinese cities and urbanism (Chapter 29), Shenjing He and Junxi Qian confirm this. In the last decade, they observe, culture-led regeneration and the cultural/creative industry have become new catchphrases in China’s urban policies, and a national cultural economy is in the making. He and Qian warn us, however, that this is a top-down initiative. In most cases, culture is exploited as a value-added asset to bolster economic growth and deal with the consequences of de-industrialization.

Cultural policies and initiatives as urban growth drivers in emerging economies are anything but benign. In Chinese cities, He and Qian report, culture and creativity are more often than not deployed as hegemonic rhetorics to whitewash the capital accumulation process, inducing social displacement and exacerbating inequality and segregation. In their discussion of mega-events such as the Olympics and the football (soccer) World Cup (Chapter 18), Christoph Haferburg and Malte Steinbrink point out that these events follow different paths in emerging nations than in the urban North. In the latter, the hosting of events is often carried out in connection with brown field development of old ports, railway infrastructure or production sites. In the former, they occur at the inner peripheries of the city, notably within and adjacent to informal settlements. Drawing
on examples from Brazil and South Africa, Haferburg and Steinbrink show how the state solves the ‘image problem’ posed by low income housing located in zones earmarked for event-related development by implementing ‘invisibilization’ measures ranging from the forced removal of inhabitants to the erection of ‘visual protection screens’. Ironically, an ongoing state-directed ‘pacification’ initiative in Rio’s favelas is designed not only to make these neighbourhoods safer and more liveable for its residents, but also to open them up to tourists seeking experiences of ‘controlled edge’ (Hannigan, 2006).

One of the overarching effects of the culturalization of urban systems has been a more holistic consideration of the different aspects of Lefebvre’s spatial triad, with the analysis of lived and representational dimensions of the urban particularly coming to the fore. The greater attention being paid to issues of ‘placemaking’ (Dovey, 2010) is redolent of this shift. Cities competing to put themselves on the global map and attract attention and mobilize resources need to orchestrate an increasingly complex range of stakeholders to ensure they become or remain attractive as places to live in, work in, invest in and visit. Culture becomes not just an output of the urban system that increases the attractiveness of places (Florida, 2002), but culture also becomes an input to the system, addressing the need to find new ways of living in the city and developing new ways of living, working and governing together.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE TEXT**

The *Handbook of New Urban Studies* is structured around nine Parts, slightly more than the seven sections in the original *Handbook of Urban Studies* (2001). As the first draft of the current Handbook was nearing completion, one of the co-editors (JH) had occasion to present a preview of the chapter line-up to a seminar organized by the Urban Cluster at the National University of Singapore. Why, one of the participants wondered, did we eschew the usual convention in such volumes of starting with the classic theoretical pieces on cities by Benjamin, Harvey, Lefebvre, Park and Simmel in favour of a lead Part on ‘The Globalized City’? The answer, as Tim Bunnell points out in Chapter 2 of the Handbook, is that a twenty-first-century globalized world is increasingly formed in terms of transnationally-interconnected cities.

In the mainstream vision of contemporary globalization, advanced producer and financial services cluster in a handful of first tier urban centres at the apex of a worldwide urban hierarchy, in and through which transnational corporations coordinate their production and investment activities (Brenner and Keil, 2006: 75–6). Bunnell argues that the dominance of the world/global cities paradigm as elucidated by Saskia Sassen, Peter Taylor and others, has obscured the importance of other transnational urban connections, especially for those cities that never appear on world city maps. Among these are global immigrant or immigrant gateway cities with dense transnational migrant connections such as Dubai; urban policy networks that diffuse policies and best practices globally; and cities with a sizable population of ‘student sojourners’. Indeed, this is compatible with the ‘worlding’ approach of postcolonial scholars such as Ong and Roy discussed in the previous section.

In Chapter 3, Adam Dixon approaches this from a different vantage point. In describing and explaining the global geography of finance, one needs to look beyond the established centres of global finance to other types of financial centres, notably frontier cities, on the periphery of or distant from the epicentre of global finance. These frontier cities, which do not rank highly on the usual hierarchies of financial centres, are nonetheless important because they function in social and institutional proximity to financial capitals such as London, New York and Hong Kong. In
the third article in this set (Chapter 4), Greg Richards profiles 'eventful cities', which represent another dimension in the global transformation of cities. As Short (2014: 245) has noted, the hosting of spotlight events such as film festivals, Expos and Olympic Games provides opportunities for city elites to stage a widely accessible and globally pervasive marketing campaign. Richards writes that such major events become a tool for cities to raise their global profile, attract media attention, stimulate tourism and generate economic growth.

Central to this increased emphasis on marketing cities is the process of branding and image manipulation. In Part II, we offer up three articles that address the topic of ‘Urban Entrepreneurialism, Branding and Governance’. Responses to growing inter-urban competition are discussed by Mark Jayne, Phil Hubbard and David Bell in terms of the practice of town twinning. The idea of town twinning originally emerged in post-World War Two Europe as a means of re-establishing economic, social and cultural links severed by conflict. But in recent years the twinning of cities has been reconfigured through the growth of ‘new localism’ tied to the emergence of neo-liberal governance. It is now a device for linking places that are spatially distant but economically proximate, creating new glocalized circuits of resources and knowledge. Looking at the UK city of Manchester, this shows that cities are now the object of what González (2011) has termed ‘policy tourism’, which supports the reproduction of urban models through policy networks strung between cities. In Chapter 6 Philip Lawton examines how many of these models have become solidified into the ‘Barcelona Model’ or the ‘Nordic Model’, which have changed our ideas about how a ‘European City’ should function. The idea of European cities as high-quality places with a human scale was promoted through the work of planners such as Jan Gehl (who worked in Copenhagen, later touted as the ‘world’s most liveable city’). But Lawton shows that an aggressive approach to urban transformation has co-opted the liberal view of the European city and adapted it to the needs of a neo-liberal age. Jasper Eshuis and Erik-Hans Klijn carry on this debate in Chapter 7, examining how city branding has become the intangible form of urban development in the new Millennium. City branding targets the key segments of the neo-liberal marketplace, and tries to influence their actions in a new form of governance strategy. The emotional content of the brand is used to change perceptions and activate urban stakeholders through the way they feel about the city. This is replacing governance strategies supposedly based on rational evidence and analysis.

The corollary of neo-liberal growth strategies is the increasing marginalization of certain groups and places in the contemporary city and the growing risk attached to many urban lives. Many cities are embodying the new fractures of Ulrich Beck’s (1992) ‘risk society’. The chapters analysing this shift in Part III (‘Marginality, Risk and Resilience’) begin with Tom Slater’s examination of ‘territorial stigmatization’ in Chapter 8. The ‘Create Streets’ concept in the UK was specifically designed to eradicate the stigmatized enclaves of high-rise social housing in favour of state-sponsored gentrification. This exemplifies the way in which neighbourhoods have become the problem in urban development, solutions for which are invariably sought in external intervention rather than grass-roots approaches. In an African context, Caroline Wanjiku Kihato examines the relationship between mobility and gender through the lens of cross-border women living in Johannesburg. She argues that the informal, ‘liminal city’ is not a ghetto, but ‘a gateway where many are trapped’, and suspended in a limbo between formality and informality, legality and illegality. These forces also shape the resilience of communities to external shocks, as Kevin Fox Gotham and Bradford Powers show in the case of post-Katrina New Orleans in Chapter 10. Disasters can wreak havoc with cities and
their inhabitants, but they can also create the potential for developing new urban realities, as recent work on the New Zealand city of Christchurch has shown (Swaffield, 2013). As Gotham and Powers argue, global disaster risk is increasing, intensively concentrated, and unevenly distributed, often as a result of rapid and poorly planned urban development. Confronting these risks, particularly for vulnerable communities, also means increasing the resilience of cities such as New Orleans.

In Part IV attention turns to the sprawling suburbs and processes of suburbanization. Bill Randolph shows how the physical risks discussed in the previous part are mirrored by uneven distribution of the risks of disadvantage. He notes an inversion of urban social structure with the recent resurgence of the inner city, powered by corporate investment, gentrification and the attraction of affluent mobile groups. The rise of the inner city has however been matched by a growing crisis of suburbia, which is becoming ‘unjoined’ from the rest of the city, subject to ‘transport poverty’. Suburbs are also seen as being at risk from climate change, as Ian Smith points out in Chapter 12. Smith examines different perspectives on the ability of suburban communities to respond to climate change, including systems theory, socio-technical transition, social practices and urban politics. He underlines the current lack of theorizing about the position of the suburban within the general urban context, particularly as ‘sites of rampant individualization within a notion of suburban cohesion’. John Hannigan then examines the social construction of smart growth policies, a hotly debated new policy arena. Smart growth was originally seen as an American variant of sustainable growth, although the idea is rapidly being embraced by policymakers in Europe and other world regions as well (Krueger, 2010). Originally coined as a political marketing tool, smart growth has now become a broad movement that frames the concept in many ways, including as a tool for urban improvement, as a solution for environmental problems, as a form of environmental justice, and as a support for public health.

Part V of the Handbook deals with a pressing issue for all cities – the need to become visible and ‘distinctive’ (Turok, 2009) in a competitive urban field. As the range of contributions to this part suggests, the strategies for achieving visibility are numerous and diverse. Can Seng Ooi analyses how cities have used art as a means of putting themselves on the map and mooring mobile tastemakers. ‘Art cities’ such as New York and Paris have long attracted artists, but now policies designed to attract art dealers, investors and critics are being pursued by emerging cities such as Singapore and Dubai, changing the global geography of art markets and the position and branding of these cities. Tim Edensor looks at the way cities have positioned themselves through the use of light, transforming the night into a visual spectacle with light installations and festivals. The colonization of the night is no longer restricted to the fringes of society, but is now the realm of corporate investment and neo-liberal policymaking as well. However, more engaging forms of lighting design can also be used to re-enchant places and produce new forms of nocturnal conviviality.

The relationship between urban visibilities and invisibilities is examined by Ricardo Campos in Chapter 16. He views cities as a communicational environment, in which power can be wielded to make elements of the city and social groups visible or invisible, even though these forms of power can be countered through various tactics. Struggles around the production and eradication of graffiti (or street art, depending your position) are redolent of these arenas of (in)visibilization. Similar arguments are made by Christoph Haferburg and Malte Steinbrink (Chapter 18) in relation to the staging of mega-events in developing countries, where the undesirable elements of the urban landscape, such as shanty towns or favelas are made invisible or ‘cleaned up’ for events such as the World Cup or the Olympic Games. Pier-Luigi Sacco
(Chapter 17) also analyses the power of large-scale events to remodel the city, this time in relation the European Capital of Culture. He argues that such events can increase the visibility of cities, but that they can also form the basis for new ‘creative districts’ in the city, which is one of the reasons why issues of event ‘legacy’ are becoming more important for cities (Smith and Fox, 2007).

The turn toward the concept of the ‘creative city’ (Hubbard, 2006: 206–46) is examined in Part VI. Robert Hollands, Marie-Avril Berthet, Eva Nada and Virginia Bjertnes look at the way in which social movements eager to retain their ‘right to party’ have countered neo-liberal creative city policies. The example of ‘first world urban activism’ in Geneva, Switzerland is used to address wider debates about culture, creativity and politics in the neo-liberal city. The collision between alternative culture and creative city cool hunting has been extended internationally, as Graeme Evans shows in Chapter 20. Cities increasingly vie to position themselves on the kind of rankings that made Florida’s (2003) analysis of the creative class so attractive for policymakers. As he notes, the failure of many ‘creative city’ strategies to deliver tangible benefits is one of the reasons why such policies are now being subsumed into wider ‘smart city’ policies. Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt (Chapter 21) also makes the point that long-term actions often work better than short-term creative branding strategies. Using the case study of Roskilde in Denmark, he argues that it is important to understand how resources such as cultural production can be used to ‘make things happen’ in cities. He argues that Actor-Network Theory (ANT) and new approaches to mobilities and cultural production (Urry, 2007; Edensor et al., 2010) can be useful tools in this regard.

In Chapter 22 Lénia Marques illustrates how creative clusters have been having concrete effects in cities for over 500 years. She argues that while much attention has been focused on the development of creative clusters and districts in recent years, this has often failed to address their relationship to urban dynamics and their consequences for urban planning and policy. Each cluster needs to be considered in its particular urban context, in order to understand what makes them tick—and this situated understanding is particularly important as creative development policies are exported to new contexts in emerging economies and in the Global South. Nienke van Boom analyses the development of the creative city in Chapter 23, showing how the concept has evolved from creative planning approaches to the rise of the creative industries to strategies based on attracting the creative class. She rounds off with a situated case study of creative development in Eindhoven in the Netherlands, a post-industrial city that has employed a range of different creative strategies in search of visibility and growth.

Part VII examines the relationships between urbanization, urbanity and urban lifestyles. We start in Africa, where Paul Collier and Anthony J. Venables examine the relationship between housing and urbanization. They show that the sequence of investment in housing has been inefficient, with people arriving ahead of infrastructure provision, leading to the creation of slums. Low-density housing development, low home ownership and lack of infrastructure inhibits development, and although the situation could be ameliorated by government intervention, this has been slow to develop. In the case of a developed city—Amsterdam—Willem Boterman and Sako Musterd show in Chapter 25 that residential preferences are related to class factions. They find that social positions corresponding with specific residential orientations and, particularly, class fractions connected to creative and cultural professional spheres, are found in the most urban milieus of central Amsterdam. These data seem to confirm the link between urbanity and the creative class posited by Florida (2002) and the preference for inner city locations among certain segments of the middle classes.

Using a much wider range of data Daniel Silver argues that urban life revolves around a
series of ‘scenes’ or experiential settings, each one of which has multiple dimensions. Scenes have cultural meanings that can be quantified and compared across and within cities, even though this requires fine-grained data. Silver argues that locational decisions are not just related to objective factors such as cost or distance, but also to the extent to which people can see themselves fitting into a particular scene. A renewed concern with the role of culture as a driver of neighbourhood effects is signalled, following the lead of Sampson’s (2012) analysis of community in Chicago. Christiana Miewald, Eugene McCann and Daniela Aiello explore a more specific type of scene in Chapter 27, with an analysis of urban foodscapes in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside neighbourhood. They examine the incursions of middle- and upper-class ‘foodie culture’ into a predominantly low income area. High-end restaurants and cafés have sprung up to serve the needs of the adventurous food tourists, jostling with the food banks and low-cost stores catering to local residents. Their analysis highlights the stark contrasts between food as a vehicle of gentrification and as an essential resource for survival.

Part VIII focuses on new directions in urban theory, in particular examining how new ideas can be derived from rapidly urbanizing areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Cities here can provide relevant lessons for cities elsewhere, even though usually the flow of ideas is structured in the reverse direction (e.g. OECD, 2010). Garth Myers poses the question of whether there is a particularly African idea of the urban in Chapter 28. In an interesting experiment in comparative urbanism he contrasts Zanzibar in Tanzania, which he has studied for the past quarter century, with his home city of Hartford, Connecticut. He finds that the spatially grounded spirituality of Zanzibar provides many lessons for developing policies that are relevant to the ‘shadow worlds’ inhabited by black and Latino citizens in Hartford. In Chapter 29 Shenjing He and Junxi Qian examine the vast scale of urbanization in China, where it is expected that 60 per cent of China’s population will live in cities by 2020, compared with 53 per cent in 2012. They show that rapid urbanization has also been linked to burgeoning academic analysis of cities. This has generated debates about issues such as the attempts by Chinese cities to establish themselves on the global stage (which Can Seng Ooi also notes in his analysis of global art cities in Chapter 14), which at the same time contrast with urban poverty and growing inequality. China’s cities are also being marked by processes of commodification and ‘enclave urbanism’, while the expanding middle classes have helped to support the development of culture-led regeneration. These trends have in turn developed new debates about the ‘right to the city’ in China. In the following chapter Kim Dovey utilizes assemblage theory as a means of tracing the relationship of formal to informal practices in the city, and to provide a link to complex adaptive systems and urban resilience. These issues are important in analysing the development of informal settlements, which have been subject to the ‘invisibilization strategies’ described by Campos in Chapter 16, at the same time as they have been utilized to attract tourists. The upgrading of these areas requires an understanding of their urban processes and the very nature of ‘informality’ itself.

The final Part (IX) of the book looks towards the future, tracing different future imaginaries of the urban as well as future cityscapes and policy imperatives. In Chapter 31 Clovis Ultramari and Fábio Duarte analyse the ways in which the future of cities has been imagined through history. Using press and academic databases they show that although the future of cities is becoming relatively less popular as a research topic among academics, it is still popular with the media. They tie this popularity to the potential for transformation, which is also a reason that cities vie to attract mega events such as the Olympic Games. In Chapter 32 John Gold and Margaret Gold outline how future transformation has become an important part
of the Olympic imaginary, with increasing effort being made to secure a ‘legacy’ from staging the event. Even though the imagined future of Olympic cities has often been much more positive than the eventual outcome (as Kissoudi [2008] illustrates in the case of the Athens Olympics), the visioning of the future provided by events continues to provide a powerful tool for urban change (as Sacco also notes in the case of the European Capital of Culture in Chapter 17).

Anna Luusua, Johanna Ylipulli, Hannu Kukka and Timo Ojala then explore the development of the ‘hybrid city’ made possible by the application of digital technology in public urban places. Digital technologies have long been seen as having the potential to transform cities and our notions of community and public space (Aurigi, 2005). Using the example of the northern Finnish city of Oulu, Luusua and her colleagues contemplate the new geographies stemming from new technologies, and the possibility that high-speed Internet access will have the power to affect urban hierarchies in future.

In the concluding chapter, Sujata Shetty and Neil Reid examine the obverse of the rapidly expanding cities in emerging economies – the shrinking cities of North America. Looking at Cleveland Ohio, Buffalo, New York and Youngstown, Ohio, they illustrate how cities have tried to manage shrinkage and its consequences. This is challenging, because policymakers are oriented towards growth, and ill-equipped to cope with decline. Shetty and Reid suggest that adaptive resilience may be a useful future coping strategy, involving collaborative networks of stakeholders, information systems and data-driven interventions, and an ability to address multiple policy goals.
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