

Introduction: Redefining Urban Studies: Interdisciplinarity and Synthesis

The New Urban Studies: Possibilities for a Middle Ground between Political Economy and the Cultural Turn

We begin in full agreement with Manuel Castells' statement expressed in *The Urban Question*: "There is no theory of space that is not an integral part of a general social theory." Numerous developments in critical social theory that have unfolded in the past three decades (since the watershed of 1968) have had considerable impact on urban studies. Core Anglo-centric assumptions of urban studies have been questioned, stable categories of structure and identity have been reworked and new processes of subjectivity and hybridity emphasized. In the process a considerable gulf has developed between political economy approaches towards urban structures and processes and the 'new urban studies' shaped by the 'cultural turn'. The differences between the two perspectives have been emphasized as protagonists on both sides sought to establish distinctive schools of thought – an issue which Mark Gottdiener addresses with passion in his chapter within this volume.

Yet the smoke of academic battle concealed a terrain where both sides found themselves close, if uneasy neighbors. The recent efforts at synthesis can be seen, in part, as a reaction against the absolutism of critical reaction (which often calls for a near total abandonment of an existing approach). Furthermore, there is increased willingness to examine intersections, inclusions, interrelationships among various elements of different approaches. The new urban studies is intentionally interdisciplinary, sharing the belief that the complexity of cities and urban social life requires many theoretical and analytical frameworks that blur distinction between the study of politics, economics, society, and culture. There are signs of increasing synthesis which thoughtfully address the concerns over essentialized notions of identity and subjectivity yet retain the important consideration of structural conditions which produce the city.

Given the prevalence of multiple approaches to understanding the city, is it possible or even preferable to attempt a comprehensive overview of urban studies? In this introductory chapter we have chosen to address the present state and future possibilities of urban studies through a discussion of the field's present fragmentation and potential synthesis. Our choice is not intended to fully capture the broad array of theoretical and empirical studies in urban studies nor to make descriptive claims about the current state of the field. Reviews of urban studies routinely survey theoretical developments along disciplinary lines or competing paradigms that have come into play since the field's beginnings in the early twentieth century. Linear reconstructions of the field's past imply a neat theoretical progression from the early Chicago School writings up to the present and tend to emphasize themes pertaining to urban studies in the West (e.g the commercial city, the industrial city, the postindustrial city). Finally, disciplinary surveys often disallow discussions of other aspects of urban studies that are remotely connected or entirely disconnected from a narrative reconstruction of western urban studies.

We will return to the possibilities for a 'middle ground' in urban studies -- defined by a degree of convergence between political economy and other approaches around issues of difference and identity – later. . As we move into a new millennium we also appear to be more aware of this common ground and this volume provides an opportunity to explore

this mutuality. At the same time our contributors will develop their distinctive interests and approaches and, in the process, reveal the lively differences which remain between political economy and cultural turn perspectives.

Having staked our claim we want now to examine how we got to this position. Is there potential for some synthesis or is (continued) fragmentation inevitable (or indeed desirable)? In order to address these issues, we first interrogate many of the theoretical and epistemological assumptions inherent in the western-centered trajectory of urban studies. We engage in an "auto-critique" of the trajectory we outline as a device to introduce and explain the challenges of recent advances in urban studies. We then review these recent advances and suggest points of synthesis.

Toward Fragmentation: From Political Economy to New Critical Urban Studies

We begin with the aftermath of the political and social upheavals of 1968 which prompted a dramatic critique of urban studies in the West and hastened along a Kuhnian paradigmatic shift in the epistemologies, theories, and methods for studying the city. This shift crystallized in a considerable body of scholarship examining the urban in the context of capitalist social organization. Identified as the "new urban sociology" (Gottdiener, Feagin) but also claimed by geographers (Harvey), critical political economy became the dominant approach to the study of the city by the mid-1980s. Mainstream perspectives based on the operations of self-regulating markets and oversimplified notions of space were rejected. Influenced by Marx's writings (and to varying degrees, Weber's) post-1968 urban studies in the US and Western Europe were committed to understanding processes of capital accumulation, including real estate speculation, investment, and disinvestment and the importance of state intervention in urban processes such as private development. The built environment of the city was understood as a social construct subjected to the dominant power relations, exploitation and conflict always in play in capitalist social formations.

Simultaneously, mounting a critique of mainstream urban studies (particularly, human ecology) and addressing social justice concerns, these approaches (WHAT APPROACHES?) sought to disentangle the political and economic processes that produced uneven development within and between cities and, for that reason, the debilitating effects upon the housing conditions, employment opportunities, and overall lifestyles of the urban poor and ethnic and racial minorities. Underlying most writings was a strong normative affirmation of the potential for emancipatory class politics or class-based social movements. (HERE WE COULD REFER TO DAVID SMITH'S CHAPTER AS A CONTINUATION OF THIS APPROACH, ALBEIT IN THE POSTCOLONIAL CONTEXT OF S. AFRICA).

Culture Enters Critical Political Economy

In this section we first survey the capacity of critical political economy perspectives to integrate analyses of cultural production and consumption into urban theories. One area firmly rooted in critical political economy emphasizes the importance of signs, symbols, and imagery to urban development. These approaches note significant changes in capitalist accumulation -- namely the shift toward the production of services and

spectacles -- that have placed symbols and imagery in the fore of place development (Harvey). New "cultural" fields that have been instituted in the academy include "tourism/leisure studies" and "consumption studies"; their parameters remain largely defined by economic considerations. Hence, cultural processes are worth studying as long as it is made clear that their significance is tied to an acknowledgement of the capitalist processes which produced them. Zukin's work on the "symbolic economy" examines the increasing utilization of cultural forms as an economic base in urban development (tourism, arts, sports stadia, etc.). Gottdiener's work on "theming" addresses the deployment of cultural forms as place themes places as a strategy in increasing economic competition between cities (Gottdiener 1997; Hall 1997). Prevailing discourses and representations about the city are shown to be intrinsic to political economic processes of sociospatial change, such as community abandonment and redevelopment (Mele 2000). Kian Tajikbaksh (2001): "...moves the Marxist theory of culture a significant step beyond orthodox-Marxist cultural and aesthetic theory, arguing that historical materialists now need to consider the relative autonomy of symbolic and cultural systems without giving up the traditional political-economic focus of Marxism."

Identity, Subjectivity and the Limits of Critical Political Economy

Following the lead of Harvey in *The Condition of Postmodernity*, urban theory in the critical political economy tradition absorbed an analysis of cultural forms into a theory of social production of space. While clearly these approaches were concerned with the city as a force which shaped the everyday lives of urban dwellers, their main intent was to comprehend the structural forces that produced the city itself. An expansive notion of cultural processes -- one that includes a broad range of identities and subjectivities in addition to class -- was not the epistemological concern but were viewed as an historical condition, itself emanating from materialist conditions.

There were important and early efforts among urban theorists to account for new forms of social difference and identity within the political economic paradigm. Castells, in particular, in *City and the Grass Roots*, sought to incorporate new forms of social identities (other than class) into the Marxist framework, namely by emphasizing consumption processes and their role in the reproduction of labor. Non-class oriented social movements were organized around issues of collective consumption, which are integral to late capitalism. Katznelson, too, in *Marxism and the City*, sought to explain the emergence of new forms of group identities (ethnicity, race, territory) not by moving beyond Marxism but pushing and stretching the theoretical framework to include these new realities.

The limitations of the structuralist tendencies within political economic approaches were laid bare in feminist theoretical advances which questioned the emphasis placed on economic factors, especially among class-based theories. Among other things, feminist theories of difference have questioned the normative assumptions implicit within political economy analysis and critiqued essentialised conceptions of class, race, gender and sexuality. Their attention to the multiple and complex constitution of subjectivities seeks to challenge more conventional analyses of urban enclaves, 'ghettoes', local communities and the First World/Third World dichotomy. They draw our attention to the ways in which knowledge and scholarship on the city is created by discourses that reflect

gendered power relations. The privileged representation of the city as site of and for capitalist reproduction is criticized as both narrow and excluding (see Deutsche 1991). Feminist critiques of the political economy of gentrification, for example, challenged the exclusive focus on the class relations in urban restructuring, arguing it renders silent (and therefore insignificant) the powerful gender dimension inherent in the production and consumption of the city.

Work in this vein has called attention to the connections between social difference (defined both in its representational forms and in terms of subjectivity formation) and spatial practices. Social differences are materialized in spatial forms, such as inner city gentrification (see Bondi 1998 on gender). While retaining interest in the material consequences of these practices, these works tend to focus on revealing the larger power dynamics that the deployment of representations tap into, such as marginalization and exploitation. Cities, then, may be seen as the materialization of not simply political economic but cultural practices. Likewise, specific forms of urban spaces construct social identities and subjectivities (city as productive). Spatial form and design also has considerable influence upon the constitution of social identities and subjectivities (Massey 1994).

The more recent emphasis in critical social theory on identities and difference have problematized the traditional domain of urban studies as formulated in the 'West' by the political economy perspectives of the 1970s and 1980s. Influenced by poststructuralist theories, newer approaches reject simplified, essentialized notions of difference as pre-given and natural. The focus upon the construction of social difference requires an examination of the social world from varied perspectives of race, class, gender, sexuality, and other identifying social attachments in which social positions do not reflect a stable range of interests. As Michael Peter Smith has argued, "the accumulation strategies of capitalist logics, structures, and actors, to which many urban analysts devote so much attention, are not the sole, or at times, even the most important, agencies in the constitution of urban life. As important, if not more so, has been the impact of ordinary women and men -- their consciousness, intentionality, everyday practices, and collective action -- on the social construction of urban life" (Michael Peter Smith 2000: 6). There are always practices and related identities that exist outside the gaze of social structure, that exist "in the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of proprietary powers" (DeCerteau (1984: 37).

The formation of the subject is problematized; identities are constituted and mediated through a multiplicity of representations and discourses. Social groups' different subject positions can never be bundled together as singular, all-inclusive (consuming) categories that operate simply in relation to social structures. Following, it becomes necessary to map the subject. The formation of identity is a process of becoming in which multiple social dimensions (in addition to class) intersect and overlap. These approaches suggest identities are terrains in which various social processes (in addition to economics) are imprinted (if temporarily) in complex, overlapping patterns (Fincher and Jacobs 1998; Featherstone and Lash 1999; Yon 2000). In the problematizing of the constitution of subjectivity, the city -- as site of multiple differences -- becomes pivotal as the location where identities are constituted: the city transforms and is transformed by these processes. This in turn, has led to newer and different meanings of the object of urban studies, the city itself.

The Influence of Postcolonialist and Transnationalist Theories

Analytical interests in heterogeneity and social difference has intensified as scholars whose work intersects or overlaps with postcolonial and transnational studies have turned their gaze to the study of the city. Postcolonial and transnational studies have had profound influence upon contemporary urban studies, prompting a critical interrogation of many of the field's theoretical assumptions. Postcolonialism and transnationalism represent a multiplicity of disciplinary focuses and related epistemologies and methodologies. Nonetheless, there are certain premises which the distinctive approaches share and that have a direct bearing on the study of the city. Both perspectives point toward the narrative of a privileged center infused in representations of the West and its relations to the "other" and the system of binaries which have historically categorized and essentialized subjects. Bhabha's *Nation and Narration* (1990), for example, dismantles and unmask the constitution of the colonized world by the West -- conceptions which define the Third World as unidimensional and naturally subordinate.

Such unmasking is part of a larger project of recognizing how given truths (nations, authorities, etc.) have been produced historically and how categories of social difference and identity have been accorded the appearance of stability and permanence. Both postcolonial and transnational studies call for analyses which destabilize (oversimplified) binaries and examine interstitial, in-between (borders) and overlapping (hybrid) spaces where subjectivities and identities are negotiated. Race, gender, sexuality, and class do not exist as discrete categories in isolation but come into being through conflict and negotiation with each other. Arjun Appadurai's ethnoscapas, mediascapas, technoscapas, finascapes and ideoscapas are non-hierarchical realms of experience which reflect the complex everyday realities of tourists, refugees, exiles and immigrants, among others (Appadurai...).

This focus on the terrain of intersubjectivity and experience has direct implications for urban analysis outside the political economy tradition. There has been considerable recent interest in the stranger as a primary feature of urban society, prompting scholars to return to the works of Georg Simmel. Simmel's work on the stranger is relevant to the analysis of diaspora and other indeterminacies of the global migrant experience -- of mobility, shifting frames of reference, and not belonging. "Walter Benjamin's sociospatial readings have recently been taken up with much interest by critical urbanists. Benjamin's work converges with the central concerns of urban theory to unmask and rearticulate the meaning and experience of everyday life --in the streets, in the arcades, and in the parks - - within the dynamics of capitalist modernity" (Kian Tajbakhsh 2001: 12).

Recent discussions of postcolonialism raise the issue of the relevance of 1970s and 1980s Weberian analyses of British urban conflicts in the context of both race and ethnicity, for example, as well as non-Marxist empirical analyses of urban politics and policy. The 'cultural turn' has also encouraged anthropologists to reassess their approach towards urban 'ethnic minorities' in the UK and the continuing relevance of models of ethnic groups and boundaries developed during the 1970s and 1980s.

GLOBALIZATION here?

Identity and subjectivity: the redefinition of city and urban

One of the earliest criticisms of conventional formulations of the city was the tendency toward reification of the city as an object. Recent work influenced by poststructural and postcolonial theories, has conceptualized the city as a process, as something made -- through representation and discourse -- rather than something found or simply "out there". These approaches conceptualize the city as a site of interlocking and conflicting meanings of cultural, political, and economic relations. The wholeness of the city (often presented uncomplicatedly in conventional urban studies, using geographic boundaries to demarcate and define) is viewed as a narrative device rather than an objective, verifiable "thing." The city is to be understood as a plethora of signs and symbols infused with power relations. These newer approaches are less a critique of political economic modes of urban studies than a plea to move beyond them, to disentangle the processes of social experience and articulation from (the essentializing tendencies of) more materialist-oriented approaches.

New cultural politics of difference (poststructuralist and postcolonialist) encompasses struggles against ethnic, religious domination and class exploitation, yet the central focal point is the struggles around identity formation and negotiation (issues of subjectivity). Local, bounded physical space of the neighborhood is not necessarily the spatial referent for new forms of identity and the multiplicity of identities. For transnational migrants, notions of home and community are inclusive of multiple and often contradictory spaces and are fused from an array of imagination, personal memory, and mediated representations.

James Donald has problematized the relationship between the physical and the imaginary -- between the vast arrays of structures of the city (from industrial to the present) and their articulation in the everyday lives of city dwellers. The focus here shifts toward the subjective experience of the city, and consciousness, memory, and processes of imagination rise to the fore of analysis. Consequently, these approaches eschew linear, causal connections between structure, experience, and action and embrace instead their contingent and opaque relations. The city, as James Donald writes, is understood as "a historically specific mode of seeing" (1999: 92), often narrated and described and represented. These imaginings and other experiential processes have consequences for the type of social, economic, and cultural practices and structures that occur within the city and vice versa. Novels, cinema and other mass media forms mediate these interrelationships between structure and experience.

Massey:

Space is implicated in questions of power and symbolism, that is the "power-geometry" of space.

Social space implies "a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces: cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another, or existing in relations of paradox or antagonism."

- Hall and Gilroy also work this area through their work on racialised urban space and the 'black Atlantic'. Their discussion of fundamentalism could link with Lubeck's abstract on Islamism and global Muslim urban struggles - Giddens and Albrow on disembedding, intimacy and trust and socioscapas

II. An assessment of fragmentation: theory-building.

A. Identify the clear advantages to fragmentation: the proliferation of new methodologies, new concepts, cross-disciplinary fertilization, theory building.

B. Identify some of the problems and how our volume is an effort to resolve them.

Divisions between European and American approaches (but that has lessened over the past few decades). The continued dominance of the Western-centered approach to the city. Lack of interdisciplinarity, theoretical divisions which undermine empirical-based efforts at hybrid analysis (e.g. epistemological divisions between political economy and poststructuralism).

Synthesis: Fragmentation and Interdisciplinarity are clearly evident in recent (re)conceptualizations of city as an object of analysis by Massey (1994) and Smith (2000).

Let us examine some points of possible convergence:

Structural influences upon identity processes, and vice versa

“Many critics of poststructuralism or postmodernist perspectives, including most Marxian writers, see the thoroughgoing deconstruction of the objectivity or the “real” as leading to the abandonment of structure for agency, in which identity, consciousness, and agency are “free floating,” “unconstrained” and so forth” (Taj 11)

“Despite the undertheorization of the nature of structure, especially in relation to political and economic institutions, it is best to read most variants of discourse theory as attempts to rethink the notion of structure and to deconstruct the identity/structure dyad in ways compatible with the critique of objectivism” (Taj 11)

Toward an Expansive Notion of Social Justice

What are the implications of these lines of inquiry for the study of the city? For one, they relate to the ongoing concerns about social justice but from a more broadly inclusive “politics of difference” in which presumptive categories of difference (based on class, race, etc) are dismissed, and the location of difference need to be specified locationally and temporally.

Badcock et al critique the cultural turn for its neglect of economic inequalities which underscore the conditions of the majority of city dwellers across the globe. Yet a more expansive definition -- one that is inclusive of other forms of social struggle beyond the economic-- is an obvious yet important site of collaboration and agreement.

III. Future synthesis: possible and preferable?

By synthesis we do not intend a master theoretical framework to be superimposed upon an otherwise seemingly unruly field of studies. As most post-positivists would concur, such frameworks would entail a rigidity of methods and hierarchies of concepts and issues so as to stymie theory building. This willingness is being influenced by non-western and global approaches which eschew the exclusionary disciplinary (methodological, evidential, analytical, and conceptual) boundaries inherent in western

positivism. Synthesis cannot be simply called for or hoped for; it is not purely prescriptive. It arises from the work of interdisciplinarity: reflexive critique, increased awareness of and openness to widely different approaches (e.g. the influence of postcoloniality).

Urban theories which reduce the social world to patterns and processes in relation (or reaction) to structural conditions (see Smith 2001).

There is particular concern in these new approaches in examining the multiplicity of relations between the workings of power (especially their local articulations) and the construction and negotiation of subjectivities (see, among others, Fincher and Jacobs 1998 and Smith 2000). "The lens of difference does not ignore the way in which persistent power structures can unevenly shape urban lives. But it does highlight the ways in which such structures are, in turn, shaped by the contingent circumstances of specific people in specific settings. Emphasizing difference then does not simply mean charting new, more nuanced, uneven geographies of the city. It also means attending to the various ways that specificity -- both social and spatial -- can transform structures of power and privilege; the ways oppressed groups can, through a politics of identity and a politics of place, reclaim rights, resist, and subvert" (1998: 2).

Fincher and Jacobs (1998: 2) suggest that in the study of this interlinking of power and identity we not focus on difference alone (since it lends itself to a complete relativism) but to located politics of difference. The benefit is that spatial inequalities are then not ignored but integrated into analysis. "The political economy of the city showed me that some concept of structure of system is necessary to account for the aggregations of power in the state and the economy, while the shifting mosaic of the everyday worlds in the city equally required the notion of hybridity" (Taj: xiv). According to Fincher and Jacobs (1998) the tensions -- intellectual and epistemological -- between cultural analysis and political economic analysis are reduced. "Attending to a politics of difference," they write, "necessarily collapses the traditional divide between views of city life from cultural and political economy perspectives" (1998: 2-3). In the careful analysis of difference, Fincher and Jacobs see the potential for a "far more powerful cultural political economy of urban identities and places" (1998: 3). "...geographies of a located politics of difference compel these once "incompatible" perspectives [of culture and political economy] to come together in productive associations (1998: 4).

Organisation of this Volume

A familiar weakness of many edited volumes is their lack of coherence and cohesion. We intend to tackle this problem by not only explaining here the volume's organizational rationale but also linking the three sections through short sectional introductions. Inevitably, many readers will prefer to dip into the volume and focus on particular chapters or sections but for those who want to read the volume as a whole we will develop a linking commentary.

The volume is designed to provide a cutting edge, multi-disciplinary analysis of the ways in which the study of urban society is likely to develop during the 21st century. We invited both well-known and emerging writers on urban processes in various areas of the world to contribute to this ambitious project. They were encouraged to explain the ways in which they have engaged in those processes during the 1990s and, if they so

chose, to outline their view of the directions which urban research may or should take during the early 21st century. The contributors could also reflect on their personal involvement in the debates which they were discussing and the urban processes to which those debates referred. (Our interest in this reflexive work was shaped by our own research and collaborative writing concerning community issues in New York and London – see Eade and Mele 199).

To give more focus to these general aims we also suggested a number of questions which centered around our contention that a middle ground had emerged during the 1990s between political economy and cultural turn perspectives. If it could be justifiably claimed that such ground had indeed been created, how did this affect our understanding of social justice, for example? How could we relate these understandings to different urban contexts – the USA, Western Europe, the former socialist countries in Eastern Europe and the former USSR, the People’s Republic of China and Japan etc?

We have organized the chapters emerging in response to our invitation in the following way. The volume begins with four chapters by Ruth Fincher, Jane Jacobs, Kay Anderson, Sophie Watson, David Smith and Sophie Body-Gendrot. They link their general review of debates and developments with reflections on their local context and personal significance. We then move to a section where Michael Peter Smith, Peter Marcuse and Mark Gottdiener advance their vision of how urban processes should be approached through critiques (sometimes impassioned) of highly influential perspectives associated with particular individuals (e.g. Manuel Castells) and/or university ‘schools’ (Chicago and Los Angeles). In the third section we move away from these controversies through a consideration of the issues which have preoccupied urban researchers in other areas of the world, specifically former socialist societies in Eastern Europe and Russia, China and Japan. In the final section the debates highlighted in Sections One and Two sometimes reappear but where they do make an entry, the contributors concentrate on their usefulness for understanding what is happening in particular cities – Bangalore, Jerusalem, New York, Las Vegas and Los Angeles.

References

- Bhabha, Homi K. (ed.) 1990. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1990.
- Deutsche, Rosalyn. 1991. "Boys Town." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 9: 5-30.
- Eade and Mele. 199
- Massey, Doreen. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Section A: A Middle Ground? Difference, Social Justice and the City

In this opening section we bring together those who have mostly worked beyond the confines of American urban sociology. Kay Anderson, Jane Jacobs and David Smith work in Australian and British geography departments, Ruth Fincher is a member of an Australian urban planning department, Sophie Watson is now based in a British cultural studies department after a period in Australia and Sophie Body-Gendrot is based at a research center in Paris. Drawing on feminist perspectives Anderson, Fincher, Jacobs and Watson have made highly influential contributions to the development of cultural geography during the last twenty years. Issues of urban social justice in apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa have been a major theme of Smith's work, while Body-Gendrot has focussed on urban violence in both the US and Western Europe.

The opening chapter carefully explores the emergence of a middle ground between political economy and the cultural turn. The influence of the cultural turn is evident as Fincher, Jacobs and Anderson begin by discussing the ways in which the 'study of cities scripts of their coming into being, their logics and their inhabitants'. The rescripting of narratives about cities and the urban reveal the limitations of global city analyses, the ignoring of nature and the isolation of certain migrant groups. Yet their analysis of difference leads them towards, rather away from the concerns of political economy. Difference perspectives uncover the perpetuation of injustice and provide the political means to uncover varied discriminations. They help 'define new ways to be politically effective, as well as producing significant situated knowledges'.

In the second chapter Watson emphasizes the cultural turn's critique of early political economy approaches towards the public city. She examines the ways in which 'the "public" in all its various guises has been subject to a series of radical transformations during the last two decades'. The attempt by Orthodox Jews in north London to establish an *eruv* by Orthodox Jews is examined to support her argument that the 'new approaches have opened up, or in some cases excavated, different terrains which extend the boundaries of what it means to construct a more fully democratic public realm'. The case study reveals that 'how to live difference in the city, especially when it is awkward to address rather than easy to celebrate the exotic, has to be a central focus of urban research and action over the following decades'. Moreover, the power of symbolic space is revealed through a clash between the rational city of planning discourse and a symbolic city constructed through an ancient Jewish text. The cultural turn produces new understandings of the material inequalities and divisions highlighted by earlier political economy approaches. A more just city can be created through the new ways of thinking about the public city and public space

The issues involved in creating a more just city are also investigated by David Smith. Focussing on the city and urbanization in apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa, he reviews the debate about social justice and the city during the last thirty years. He draws on such influential figures as Harvey, Rawls, Walzer and Young to argue that 'the challenge ahead is...not so much social-scientific as ethical: to help devise a new theory of the good, incorporating inclusive material standards combined with an ethic of responsibility to the weak and vulnerable, persuasive enough to be a source of moral motivation as well as of social understanding.'

The theme of social justice is continued in the fourth chapter of this section. Sophie Body-Gendrot considers changing views concerning urban violence from the perspective of the criminal justice system. She shows 'how the definition of urban violence and of its potential causes has evolved in the last two decades' through a comparison between French and American cities. She tracks the movement towards the contemporary 'politicization of the crime issue' and the role played by 'politicians, the media and public opinion spokespersons to take advantage of a global feeling of insecurity to pursue their own strategies'. Such insecurity and the pressure from various interest groups leads to a new situation where elites are more willing to legitimate repressive policies rather than support social prevention. This process is not globally uniform since it is shaped by local conditions across the USA and Europe. France and many other European countries still 'support social prevention' and rhetorically reject notions, articulated initially in America, of 'zero tolerance, communitarianism, binary rhetorics'. Moreover, across Europe the symbolic unity of civic life is 'often more valued than the expression of differences' and urban violence is seen as avoidable. She ends on a more upbeat note than David Smith, calling for a 'new urban literature' which can tell us 'the good news' – presumably where our understanding of urban violence in America can draw on European traditions rather than the other way round.

Section B: Ways Forward: The Global and Local, Information Age and American Metropolitan Development

In the Second Section we bring together three American urbanists who advance a critique of highly influential contemporary perspectives in order to propose future directions for research. We begin with Peter Marcuse's critique of the work of one particular urban theorist – Manuel Castells. He argues that Castells has moved from a neo-Marxist stance of the late 1960s and 1970s to a more recent abandonment of Marxist considerations. Castells has been caught up in the contemporary enthusiasm for the study of globalization and the information age. Although Marcuse eagerly acknowledges Castells' vital contribution to urban studies over the last four decades, he regards his more recent publications on the information age as an implicit depoliticization where power and conflict disappear, classes play a subordinate role and capitalism is ambiguously conflated with globalization. Powerful 'groupings, actors' and agents, shaping contemporary globalization, are replaced by a highly generalized 'we' who can only hope to persuade 'those in power' to respond to their interests. Castells remains committed to changing society but in ways which suppress the political.

Marcuse's critique leaves us with a challenge – how to reformulate political economic perspectives in ways which embrace the ambiguous complexity of transnational linkages, global flows of capital, goods, information and people and local transformations where class solidarities decline in the face of fragmentary identity movements. Michael Peter Smith sets out an urban research agenda for the 21st century through a theorizing of the local and global. He challenges two approaches – (a) understanding locality as an embedded community where personal meanings, cultural values and 'traditional ways of life are enunciated and lived' and (b) where the global replaces the urban 'as a metaphor for the central outside threat to the primary social ties binding communities'. He questions both the structuralist 'grand narratives of macro-social development' advanced

by Harvey and Castells, for example, and the post-modern celebration of local ethnography, 'partial truths' and the postcolonial subject.

Through a reimagining of the politics of everyday life Smith moves towards 'a transnationalized mode of ethnographic practice', citing research in London on constructions of a transnational Islamic community (*umma*), Sayer's pioneering essay, Massey's critique of Harvey's important model of space-time compression, Gupta and Ferguson's approach towards transnationalism and Jackson's analysis of a local community's contested past. Setting out the deficiencies of all these perspectives, Smith argues for a careful analysis of 'the intricacy involved in sorting out the social interactions and processes at multiple spatial scales that constitute the complex politics of place-making under contemporary conditions of transnational interconnectivity.'

Smith wants to move beyond not only the structuralist formulations of such leading urbanists as Harvey and Castells but also the postmodern cultural studies and the study of the politics of everyday life. These approaches share a binary logic where global power confronts local cultures. To move beyond them Smith urges us towards the analysis of 'transnational urbanism' where the social is reintroduced. Here the focus is on 'power relations and meaning-making practices', which involve 'a multi-sited, trans-local mode of transnational ethnographic practice, inflected with the domination-accommodation-resistance motif, and combined with historicized approach to political-economic and social relations'.

The cultural turn during the 1990s has been deeply influenced by geographers working at the University of California's Los Angeles campus. Ed Soja's publications have made a major contribution to postmodern investigations of space, while Soja's colleague, Michael Dear's book, *The Postmodern ??*, also set out an agenda for cultural geography's study of postmodern urban society. There have been some moves towards a battle of the schools, with the Chicago 'school's approach towards the modern city being contrasted with its apparent successor – the LA school – and its study of Los Angeles as the archetypal, postmodern, 'edge' city.

Mark Gottdiener seeks to cut the LA school down to size. In an impassioned critique he criticises what he sees as the media hyping of particular LA academics. More generally, he questions the promotion of Los Angeles as 'the exemplary suburban auto era city' and the attempt to replace the Chicago school. Both moves fail to take into consideration the course of history. Suburbanization characterizes all American cities while the 'Chicago School paradigm has been dead and buried for decades'. The 'new urban sociology', developed across the United States since the late 1970s, has directed attention away from the 'bounded, centralized city that organizes its hinterland' towards multi-centered metropolitan regions where centralized cities are absorbed 'in a matrix of increasingly personal, political and business decisions'. Indeed, some areas of the country have no centralized cities at all. Orange County, for example, of areas which 'are neither suburbs nor cities, yet they are fully urbanized'. Las Vegas, rather than Los Angeles, exemplifies the multi-centered metropolitan region, as well as the decentered, postmodern cultural forces highlighted by Soja and Dear. Having said this, Gottdiener also claims that we must move beyond looking at particular cities as exemplary; rather, the research agenda during the 21st century should be upon processes structuring space.

Section C: Beyond the American Frontier: Urban Research in Particular Regions of the Globe

The contributors to the previous section indicate the immense influence exercised by American urbanists upon research around the globe. The Chicago school and its later rivals have made a deep impact upon debates concerning urban structures and processes in Europe, the Pacific Rim and the Middle East, for example. In this section we are able to follow these debates, as well as track research pursuing different directions, largely in response to particular historical, political and ideological conditions. We want especially to draw attention to socialist and postcolonial perspectives, which resist American preoccupations and developmental models based on the assumption that – put crudely – ‘what America does today the rest of the world will do tomorrow’.

Chris Pickvance’s contribution to the ‘new urban sociology’ has already been acknowledged by contributors to the previous sections. Here he reviews research undertaken in Central and Eastern Europe ‘as a context for theorizing about state socialism and post-socialism, and their associated urban patterns’. During the 1970s state socialism and urban development became a central theme of international urban sociological debates. Empirical issues concerning ‘the pattern of urban development, the allocation of housing and urban spatial patterns’ were related to theories of the state and state socialism.

International models of industrialization and modernization led to analyses of the degrees to which central and eastern European societies were under-urbanized. A generic pattern was identified which was ‘directly attributable to state socialism in its forced growth phase’ and which could be applied beyond the region to other state socialist societies and China in particular. Housing allocation was another major theme leading to a more general debate ‘about the character of state intervention and resource distribution in different types of society’. A third research question focussed on ‘whether there was a specifically socialist residential social pattern’. Again Chinese data was taken into consideration leading to the conclusion that residential patterns were to be explained not in terms of ‘the underlying political ideologies but the power structures which emerged as much in spite of these ideologies as because of them’.

Since 1989 the combination of political and economic changes in central and eastern Europe have ‘provided a unique natural experiment’. Rapid transformation challenged the explanatory capacities of social scientists. Pickvance contends that reliance on the ‘ubiquitous concept of “transition” has concealed the fact that social science as a whole did not have ready a set of theories capable of understanding the process of macroscopic change’ taking place across the region. Theories of transition have provided limited explanatory purchase and [p]erhaps the most interesting development is the emergence of a common theoretical discourse among scholars inside and outside the region’.

In the second chapter of this section we move to China. Dorothy Solinger and Kam Wing Chan claim that urban research here ‘has not been driven trends and fads in scholarship so much as it has been shaped by the nature of China itself as fashioned by the state (and later the market), and by the momentous shifts the nation has weathered because of political decisions’. The study of Chinese urban processes by Western social scientists has been patchy. Economic geographers and planners have been more in evidence than anthropologists, for example, while cultural issues have only recently been

examined. This situation is explained in terms of local exigencies - '[t]he point is that three decades of fairly idiosyncratic socialist ideology and practices in China have made a big difference.' The late arrival of cultural studies 'is, in part, a function of the homogeneous nature of Chinese life, at least up until the early 1980s'. Researchers did not simply pursue political economy approaches 'in deference (or in sympathy) with trends in urban studies elsewhere'. Urban life became more easily studied as secrecy and uniformity weakened. Consequently, urban studies has emerged as a substantial subject in China only during the 1980s and 1990s.

The trends reviewed by Solinger and Chan lead them to suggest two future directions for urban research in China. One locates the country along the same path trod by 'other industrializing, modernizing societies (such as Taiwan)' where 'the past conventions of the authoritarian rule appear ill-suited'. The other suggests a much more bumpy journey characterized by conflict and serious social problems. Researchers will need to 'develop theories that encompass and interrelate the new urban vitality, as citizens thrive on the new consumption, along with the various types of social breakdowns that accompany the evisceration of past and ruptured solidarities'.

The contributors so far have written from the perspective of sociology, planning, criminology and geography. Jerry Eades (not related to John Eade!) introduces an anthropological approach in his survey of urban developments across east and southeast Asia. He moves quickly from such well-established themes as the contrast between rural and urban society, aging, labor, education and the family to more recent research, especially consumption, popular culture and the environment. Analyses of how the global becomes local through consumption, personal choice and the media have been complemented by research into the political economy of high-speed growth. The interweaving of consumption and the political economy can be seen most strikingly in the urban environment of eastern Asia.

The 'rich empirical diversity in urban life', especially in Japan, leads Eades to explore changing theoretical interpretations and Castells' contribution in particular. His discussion of Castells' recent publications concerning the information age lead towards Gottdiener's earlier argument about American cities - 'the more advanced, informational and globalized a society becomes, the more the divisions between town and country become blurred, and the more the concept of what constitutes the city begins to disappear. Just as the city disappears as a theoretical object, except for discussions of physically built-up areas or administrative boundaries, so the separation of "city life" from other types of social life and behavior also becomes increasingly distinct'.

Understanding this process has encouraged researchers to work across academic boundaries and to ground analyses of urban culture more firmly in political economy processes than many contributors to the cultural turn would like. This deconstruction ensures that there is no such thing as the 'Pacific Asian city', despite the similarities between what has been occurring in Japan and other cities across the region. These similarities can be detected in the relationship between high-speed growth and the developmental state, as well as an Asiatic mode of pollution. Looking to the future Eades suggests that globalization, however defined, has moved researchers towards new subjects and methodologies. The analysis of cultural processes, such as consumption, will go hand in hand with the exploration of the urban environment, leading towards a multi-faceted activism promoted through cyberspace and cybercultures.

Section D: Urban Processes and City Contexts

In this section we explore the ways in which the processes, outlined in the previous sections, operate within different urban contexts. We begin with Smriti Srinivas's chapter on the Indian city of Bangalore which lies at the heart of the country's 'Silicon Valley'. She wants to build on 'subaltern histories of the sociological discipline' so that she can go beyond political economy understandings of how 'cities are embedded within global structures of capital or labor, and cultural studies' emphasis on 'postcolonial, sexual, and other cultural identities, or their discursive formations'. Urban sociology within India has been seriously hampered by the disconnection between sociology and history. To redress this deficiency Srinivas attempts to 'critically engage with the complex realities of Bangalore, which was neither a sacred city nor a colonial city, and seemed to escape in some subtle ways the categories that emerged from demography or concerns about social justice'.

Her historical account leads to five models of the city and 'discourses of return, "quest" stories that tie institutional and personal biographies together'. The narratives are related to the 'creation of new metropolitan fringes' which occupy sites 'abundant with spatial and ritual memories'. Discourses of return use the languages of a 'sacred quest' – languages which 'do not separate the sacred from the civic, the political, or the affective, and, therefore, redefine the urban in their image'. The analysis of the sacred quest is developed through a case study of the Sai Baba cult and three religious sites on the fringes of Bangalore which evoke the models of the city outlined earlier. Through a mnemonics of space and an analysis of embodied memory Srinivas reveals 'a reorientation within the city, recovering spatially peripheral tracts, and older axes of the city from a zone of urban amnesia and also using contemporaneous axes and institutional sites in other patterns of meaning'. In doing so she seeks to reveal the lacunae in models of the city and stage 'other possibilities of the urban tied to the inner, affective, cultural and spiritual worlds of the subject of the metropolis'.

History is also the focus of Shlomo Hasson's investigation of urban morphology, culture and power. In the context of Jerusalem he examines the relationship between different cultures and landscapes, the relationship between cultures and the relationship between landscapes over time. Through a discussion of 'urban morphology and design, cultural landscapes, political relationships between landscapes, and the factors that shape these relationships', Hasson shows how the city's landscape embodies three main cultures shaped by (a) religion, (b) nationalism and modernity and (c) national conflict, consumerism and globalism.

A review of the relevant literature leads to a description of three periods in Jerusalem's history – pre-modern, early and late modern. These periods refer to specific morphologies of the city which are, in turn, related to religion, the nation-state and a more recent consumerist society. Roads, residential areas, land use patterns, public and private space, and the city's outskirts are shaped by these different forces, leading Hasson to ask how the three cities of Jerusalem relate to one another today. Responses to this question take two forms – a dominant, closed-hegemonic discourse and a subordinate, open-dialogical discourse. The dominance wielded by the closed-hegemonic discourse is explained in terms of three power systems (political, economic and cultural) but Hasson also explores

the resistance strategies adopted by Arab residents and the factional divisions among their Jewish neighbors.

In this struggle the religious pre-modern city and the nationalist early-modern city are dominated by the late-modern, outer city, whose rules are 'efficiency, rapid pace, dependency on private vehicles, and the move to suburbia, urban expansion and ignoring the landscape in favor of real-estate development'. This dominance offers 'the potential to reduce tensions and create a city that is less clannish, fanatical, less steeped in ceaseless conflict'. At the same time Hasson urges decision-makers to appreciate Jerusalem's other cities and their unity 'which lends the city its unique character and image'. Urban development depends, therefore, upon understanding and respecting each city's 'rules and resources, which crystallized during the course of history'.

In the final three chapters we focus on three American cities (New York, Las Vegas and Los Angeles), as well as South California's Silicon Valley. As the other chapters have shown, any discussion of a particular city has to account for both its unique characteristics and the commonalities it shares with other cities. Furthermore, transnational and global processes ensure that the issues investigated are not necessarily bounded by specific administrative and political structures of the city, region or nation-state.

Consequently, when Michael Indergaard comes to explore new media circuits of innovation, speculation and urban development in New York, the urban locality is the site for a cyberspatial transformation where the global interweaves with the local. He raises a question already examined more theoretically by the contributors to Section A, in particular: 'Can a just and coherent city emerge amidst a swirl of financial, cultural and technological forces?' Indergaard shares the view of others in this volume – a critical urban theory needs to answer this question by confronting 'the problem of reconciling material and cultural analyses'. New centers of power will be required to control and explain the relationship between real and virtual business spaces. We must rethink the assumption that 'financial flows are divorced from, and antagonistic to, culture and social relations' and explore the ways in which 'Silicon Alley has served as an institutional nexus for weaving together circuits and a matrix of power for making relationships, identities and spaces'.

Lower Manhattan illustrates how entrepreneurs have sought to eliminate boundaries between virtual and real worlds. They have broken New York's traditional role as a supplier of venture capital to other parts of the country by organizing district circuits through social networks. Rather than global capital flows shaping local fortunes, Silicon Alley actors were able to connect 'the dot-com segment to the bull market'. New media stock options and images formed a currency which 'fueled a boom in a revived Manhattan real estate market'. This expansion threatened to displace 'not just individual firms but entire sectors' in the older economy – a threat alleviated by the Spring 2000 crash. However, images of Silicon Alley are employed by real estate developers as the focus shifts to the Times Square area.

Indergaard advances an economic sociology of a locality in order to show how Silicon alley operated as 'an institutional nexus for building and conjoining "restricted circuits" (Zelizer 2000) of capital and culture'. Venture capitalists and real estate developers have 'mobilized power through their ability to create and link circuits, and convert "currencies"'. With regard to the question of social justice imagined cyberspace has

played a key role 'in transforming real space and in creating new forms of inequality'. City government has encouraged this process through supporting a 'development that is neither inclusive nor sustainable'. Its strategy encourages the 'hypergrowth of a new monoculture in the short term, but depletes the city's rich milieu'.

The relationship between cultural processes and political economy is also the principal theme of Alexander Reichl's study of sex, political economy and public space. He locates the cultural turn within 'a long tradition of drawing on the urban landscape as a blueprint to the circuitry of power (Benjamin 1999; Engels 1958 [1845]; Mumford 1938)'. The analyses of urban culture developed by David Harvey, Sharon Zukin, Michael Sorkin, Judd and Fainstein, for example, show that culture does not simply provide 'ideological support for the capitalist order' but plays a crucial role in producing economic wealth. However, more clarity is required concerning 'how new cultural forms of urban development might serve as an instrument of political power'. Recent political developments in the US makes it even more important to understand 'the impact of spatial practices on democratic political life'.

Reichl pursues this argument through an empirical study of 'sex-related adult entertainment' in Las Vegas and New York. Sexual practices promise new insights into the relationship between culture and urban political economy because they are a contested terrain – economically, politically and culturally. A prominent feature of this contestation in both cities is the institutional 'desire to control public space'. This conflict is expressed through different political strategies in the two cities - 'Adult entertainment circulated differently into the symbolic representations of each city, reinforcing the seductive appeal of Las Vegas and the perceptions of disorder and decline in New York'.

Reichl concludes his chapter by linking his empirical analysis to theories concerning the political value of public space. He distinguishes between two perspectives shaped by Jane Jacobs and Michael Sorkin respectively. While Jacobs' view of the social benefits of public space has been more influential, Reichl draws attention to the way in which Sorkin's approach helps the study of how the politics of public space 'is implicated in material processes of capital accumulation through the realm of cultural representations'. Public space should be understood as a 'forum for open political expression' where sex-related businesses, for example, should be governed by standards concerning the use of that space. Reliance should be placed on local political action rather than zoning laws. Democratic, First Amendment public space 'presupposes nothing about who should be present or what they should be "saying;" but it does presuppose a limited degree of corporate or state control, such as that exercised by the casinos of Las Vegas or the public-private authorities in charge of Times Square. Above all, a valuable public space must be a place of possibility'.

Leonard Nevarez also wants to engage the poststructural (cultural) turn through his training as an urban political economist. He focuses on reassessing corporate elites in the light of two developments – (a) the challenge presented by sociospatial and poststructural perspectives to assumptions concerning urban elites, which has moved analysis away 'from efficacy in community power to the legitimacy that urban elites articulate in local politics' and (b) 'recent changes in corporate organization associated with the new economy' which have 'destabilized the traditional constitution of urban elites.'

Nevarez pursues his reassessment through a discussion of how the elite concept has been used since the 1960s. The recent collapse of cohesive urban elites with the

expansion of rootless capital and its management has led scholars to question 'whether urban agency, urban politics and, implicitly, urban elites matter anymore'. Yet although poststructuralist critiques appear to 'undermine the theoretical value of the urban elite concept as constructed by urban political economy, it also opens up a theoretical space to examine urban elites as objects, not subjects of representation.' This possibility is related to the changes taking place within the US economy, especially industrial reconstruction in the new economy, and the uncertainty this creates for growth coalitions. The role of new economy executives can still be analyzed through an analytical framework which 'infuses the urban political economy problematic of urban elites with the poststructural focus on local meaning'.

Empirically the chapter rests on a study of new economy executives, business leaders and political activists in Santa Monica, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo. The executives can be described as ambiguous and inarticulate urban elites 'because their local interests are illegible to themselves and to others.' A new structural mechanism has emerged - 'the capacities of labor markets to organize production and capital investment in new economy sectors' - which 'gives elite workers a political economic stake in the quality of life district different from the conventional corporate interest in "pro-business" social relations'. Because these workers are unaware of this mechanism, a crisis has emerged in the representation of their local interests to both themselves and others, ensuring that their political future is unclear.

We remain in California for the last chapter by Jan Lin. He investigates the relationship between mass culture, symbolic sites and urban redevelopment in Hollywood. Like others in this volume he draws on the 'new urban sociology', especially the critical cultural perspective shaped by Sharon Zukin and Mark Gottdiener, in particular, and its examination of 'how metropolitan fortunes under postindustrialism are increasingly derived from the fabrication of thematic sites and symbols.' Hollywood provides Lin with an analytical window through which he can 'augment our understanding of Los Angeles as a world city, while contributing to our theoretical and empirical understanding of the connections between globalization, consumption and urban sociology.'

An outline of the historical development of Hollywood as a machine of mass cultural production leads to a discussion of dream palaces, mass spectacle and urban iconography. Recent redevelopment schemes center around the proposal to build a \$388 million complex at the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard and Highland Avenue, which would greatly encourage tourism. The proposal was challenged by local residents and businesses on environmental grounds as well as by those who 'drew attention to the host of social problems besetting the low-income population of Hollywood.'