

PARADIGMS OF URBANISATION

THE COMPARATIVE OUTLOOK

Christian Schmid
Monika Streule

In this book we have presented a comparative and empirically grounded analysis of the urbanisation processes that are shaping eight large metropolitan territories across the world.¹ We conclude by taking this analysis one step further and comparing these urban territories themselves. To undertake this kind of overarching comparison raises the question of what exactly to compare. An obvious answer would be to find similarities and differences between the extended urban regions analysed in the case studies. However, following the territorial approach introduced in Part I, we understand urbanisation to be an open process in time and space. We do not therefore aim to compare territories but to address the ensemble of the interrelated urbanisation processes shaping these territories in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of patterns and pathways of urbanisation. This territorial approach to urbanisation has four main epistemological and methodological consequences that we address in this book.

Firstly, we understand urbanisation as a trans-boundary process that transforms a territory in contradictory and uneven ways. Following the epistemology of planetary urbanisation, we do not conceive of these areas as bounded units and thus we do not examine urbanisation through the analytical lens of any kind of entity, such as an agglomeration, a metropolitan region or any other type of unit that we could have chosen or constructed

de nouveau. Instead, we conceptualise an urban territory as an ensemble of different urbanisation processes. As a consequence, we do not conduct detailed analyses of catchment areas, commuter zones, labour markets or regional economies. Rather, we analyse the extension of specific urbanisation processes on the terrain. We use the open and vague term 'extended urban territory' to characterise the perimeter of our analysis, because usually there is no clear spatial limit to a particular urbanisation process, as they often transition gradually to another type without clear boundaries in time or space. This is indicated in some of the configuration maps presented in Part II by the fading out of the colours used to mark individual urbanisation processes.

Secondly, we employ a postcolonial approach. Our comparison is based on an empirically grounded analysis of very different areas across the various divides that are often uncritically thought to shape the world. We therefore did not follow predetermined and pre-conceptualised divisions, such as North and South or developed and developing territories, because we were aiming to allow whatever differences that existed to emerge from all our case study areas. We therefore tried to avoid all sorts of preconceptions or generalising assumptions about the very nature of agglomeration processes or modalities of urban development. This open epistemological perspective also defined the methodological approach we applied to analyse concrete local and historical urban contexts (see Chapters 2 and 3). This meant that we had to engage empirically with the everyday knowledge of local people that is usually underrepresented in dominant urban theories as well to take into consideration concepts formulated beyond the anglophone canon.

A third important finding of our territorial approach is what we call the principle of specificity (see Chapter 1): every urban territory is necessarily specific, because there are so many determinations influencing urbanisation that it is impossible to identify or develop a clear-cut typology of urban forms. This applies to every scale of an urbanised territory. If we zoom out, we detect very different ways in which urbanisation occurs in the extended urban territory, such as large-scale urban corridors and megaregions, as well as vast territories of extended urbanisation. If we zoom in, we see a multiplicity of entangled urbanisation processes that are interacting within the territory. Even inside a specific urban configuration we were able to identify very diverse urban constellations and situations, as exemplified in Part II. Therefore, the principle of specificity applies to all possible urban outcomes; it provides a crucial analytical lens for all sorts of 'cut-outs' of an urban territory. Thus, every neighbourhood shows a specific set of urban constellations, being embedded in varying centre-periphery relationships and overlapping catchment areas. Whatever the scale of study, we are confronted with multiscale and multilayered realities that lead to

very different urban outcomes, even though certain overarching social, economic and political processes co-determine the overall development of an urban territory.

Finally, as Henri Lefebvre explained, urbanisation is always a 'trial by space': actors involved in the production of space are constantly developing new solutions to various emerging problematics or sets of interrelated questions (Lefebvre 1991 [1975]: 416–418). In this way, urbanisation can also be understood as a process of innovation. A good example of this is the crucial question of how to handle rapid population growth. As our case studies revealed, depending on concrete situations and constellations, very different strategies have been developed to address this issue and they have resulted in a variety of processes such as popular urbanisation, plotting urbanism, mass housing urbanisation or laminar urbanisation (see Part III).

The four consequences described above have guided our analyses of the eight urban territories presented in this book. These territories were not selected according to a systematic application of criteria such as economic structure, demographics, regional characteristics, historical development or territorial typology, such as global city, metropolitan region or megacity. Instead, we decided to include very large urban territories situated across the world, with very different economic, social and political characteristics, territorial regulations and forms of everyday life. By applying this open sampling criterion, we selected the eight cases according to two commonalities: population size and urban dynamics. Thus, all our eight urban territories are very large. The smallest, Paris, consists of about 12 million inhabitants, and the largest, the entire Pearl River Delta, has a population of about 60 million. Our sample represents about one-quarter of all urban territories in this range.

Urban dynamics, the second communality of the selected case studies, is directly related to population size. All eight case studies have experienced massive urban growth in the last six decades, with all the possibilities, troubles and challenges this includes, even if some regions, particularly Paris, Los Angeles and Tokyo, experienced considerably lower growth rates or even stagnation in the last two decades. With these selection criteria, all cases display similar urban dynamics and include marked processes of urban expansion as well as processes of urban intensification and the transformation and reconfiguration of already urbanised areas. At the same time, we also identified processes of peripheralisation, which result in uneven and contradictory urban development.

FROM URBAN MODELS TO PARADIGMS OF URBANISATION

Analysing paradigms of urbanisation invokes some famous 'urban models' that have played important roles in the history of urban studies and urban design. Interestingly, most of the canonical urban models were greatly influenced by the writers' direct experience of certain cities at a specific time. Manchester, for instance, became the empirical basis for Friedrich Engels's analysis of capitalist urban development in the mid-19th century (1875 [1845]). Berlin was where Georg Simmel at the beginning of the 20th century developed his classic understanding of a Western metropolis marked by urban density and differentiation (Simmel 1950 [1903]; see Chapter 17). In the 1920s, Chicago served as an urban laboratory for applying the social ecology approach of the Chicago School of Sociology. The experience of the unique features of Paris shaped French-speaking urban scholarship for more than a century. The triad of Tokyo, London and New York formed the empirical ground for the development of Saskia Sassen's concept of the global city in the 1980s. And, as we explain in Chapter 11, the Los Angeles School declared that the polycentric metropolis was the paradigmatic urban model at the end of the 20th century. At the beginning of the 21st century, Mike Davis published *Planet of Slums* (2006), declaring 'slums' as a defining feature of contemporary urbanisation, and Rem Koolhaas presented Lagos as the urban model of the future (Koolhaas et al. 2000); while at the same time Shanghai, Singapore and Dubai became exemplars for the contemporary metropolitan mainstream.

All these models have influenced and defined the ways in which urban scholars have approached, analysed and conceptualised urbanisation processes. They were constructed from the examples of concrete urban territories and then generalised. In doing so certain aspects were usually overstated and sometimes even treated as general traits of urbanisation. Postcolonial urbanism has shown the distortions that this kind of generalising conceptualisations generated. As Jennifer Robinson's (2006) term 'ordinary cities' indicates, there are in fact many other pathways of urban development in the world which are neglected by these dominant Western narratives. Ananya Roy's (2003) study of Kolkata is particularly illustrative in showing what these other procedures and tactics of urban development can entail.

Our own comparison supports this post-colonial critique of misleading conceptualisations resulting from using such parochial models of urbanisation. It reveals not only the Western bias of many of these models, but also shows that

constructing a general model of urbanisation by identifying selected traits at a certain moment in time at a certain place may lead to misrepresentations and false assumptions. In fact, urban regions in the West also display unique features that cannot be captured in simplifying notions such as the 'North American metropolis' or the 'European city'. The same is true for concepts of 'Southern urbanism' or the 'Global East'.

A clear example of the limitations of such urban models is Ernest W. Burgess' well-known sketch of the concentric rings of the Chicago model based on a series of specific characteristics. This is a monocentric model, with a dominant central business district that is well connected by public transport to the wider urban region; wealthy people seek to live in large plots at the edge of the city where land prices are low, while the inner-city areas develop into the 'zone in transition', a kind of arrival city for immigrants coming from many parts of the world. This sketch was then formalised and declared to be a universal model. However, the Chicago School did not provide good reasons why this model was universally applicable, but rather showed a tendency to naturalise it based on its own theoretical approach of social ecology with its allusions to bioecology. Scholars studying Paris, however, described a radical different urban model showing that wealthy people may indeed be attracted to residing in central locations while it is the poor and working-class people who are pushed to the margins. In contrast to the Chicago model, the Parisian model thus highlights a strong centre-periphery relation in which the urban centre is conceived of as a desirable place that is endowed with cultural, social and economic value, and even sometimes seen as the core of civilisation. But as in the case of Chicago, the Parisian model should not be seen as universal, but as the result of a specific pathway of urbanisation. The deeply entrenched centre-periphery relation of Paris was in fact initiated by the massive intervention in the urban process by Baron Haussmann in the second half of the 19th century, during which the socioeconomically mixed central neighbourhoods of Paris were demolished and large parts of the city rebuilt as places for the bourgeoisie, thus initiating the process of embourgeoisement. This model is thus the result of massive state intervention into the urban process, which to this day influences the urban development of Paris (see Chapter 15). A comparison of the diverging consequences of the two models is revealing: in Chicago it led to poor and decaying inner-city neighbourhoods, and in Paris it led to the well-known crisis of the banlieue. This shows us that the idea of a universal wealth gradient is not tenable: the 'outer city' is not automatically wealthy (as in Chicago) or deprived (as in Paris). Rather, processes of peripheralisation may happen in both the outskirts and the core of urban regions. And wealthy people are not 'by nature' attracted to either

peripheral residential zones or central areas: in a capitalist society they can always choose according to the actual situation and their own preferences, and they have the means to impose their choice. It is thus not geographical location as such that determines social segregation and socioeconomic status, but a combination of factors that are often highly specific.

At the end of the 20th century, scholars postulated that a new model of urban development was emerging: the Los Angeles model, that in contrast to the monocentric urbanisation models of Paris and Chicago was polycentric, extended and car-dependent (Scott and Soja 1996). Two decades earlier, Reyner Banham (1971) had proposed his 'four ecologies' of Los Angeles—the freeways, the privileged foothills, the beaches and the plains with their endless middle-class suburbs. The Los Angeles School added to this list the polycentric and excentric geographical structure that resulted in an 'exopolis', a city at the edge that no longer resembles the familiar form of the city (Soja 1996a). Again, the generalisation of such a specific pattern of urban development proved to be misleading and did not help us to understand contemporary urban experiences. As shown in Chapter 11, the polycentric basic urban structure of Los Angeles was already prefigured in its pathway of urbanisation. In its initial phase, Los Angeles consisted of a series of villages and towns scattered over the plains and connected by inter-urban railway lines, which were then expanded, subsequently to coalesce and finally condense into a huge horizontal metropolis. This shows that, instead of presaging a new global model of urbanisation, the Los Angeles model provides evidence of the persistence of an urban pattern once it has become established. Indeed, our case studies illustrate the wide range of urban patterns and pathways that have been developing across the world in recent decades.

Importantly, we can use our findings to question not only these Euro-American-centric models of urban development but also the idea that there is a distinct form of 'Southern' urbanism. Scholars often present megacities as typical urban forms of the Global South, and highlight urban informality and peripheral urbanisation as the defining features of Southern urbanism (see e.g. Roy 2005; Caldeira 2017). However, to generalise such tendencies is problematic, because in doing so we fail to distinguish between the effects of an urban majority composed of low-income groups, rapid urban growth and specific land regimes. In our comparative study, we identified very different forms and modalities of informality and illegality, which also occur in places like Naples or Belgrade and, more generally, have always been part of housing production and urbanisation all over the planet (Diener et al. 2016). While peripheral urban development is an important feature of Southern urban territories, it is also widely found in the

North. Finally, we have to take into consideration the dynamics of urbanisation that constantly create new urban outcomes. Many Southern metropolises are today marked by all sorts of megaprojects and new centralities, by skylines, commodified and gentrified inner-city areas and large condominium developments, similar to many regions in the North.

CONCEPTUALISING PARADIGMS OF URBANISATION

As our comparative project shows, the patterns and pathways of urbanisation vary much more than is usually assumed. To grasp this variability, we developed the concept of 'paradigms of urbanisation' (see Chapters 2 and 3). While an urban model assumes that the development of an urban territory follows some constants or invariants that are either typical of a certain city or of a certain time, using the perspective of paradigms of urbanisation allows us to draw a much more differentiated and nuanced picture by addressing the specificity of urbanisation in space and time.

For the reasons discussed in the preceding paragraphs, we abstained from developing a comparative typology of urban territories and their characteristics, but sought instead to compare the ways and modalities in which urban territories develop and transform. The basic idea guiding this comparison was to identify and analyse urbanisation processes in each territory and examine their dynamics and characteristics and their interrelations and interconnections. Thus, we focused on patterns of urbanisation through the lens of urbanisation processes. This also meant taking into consideration the specific (historical) pathways of urbanisation and establishing a periodisation, which resulted in the detailed analyses presented in Part II of this book.

Paradigms of urbanisation are always specific in space and time. On the temporal dimension, they can be understood as shorter or longer periods marked by a certain regularity and stability of urban development, which may be disrupted and changed at certain historical moments. Such ruptures are generated in many ways, including revolutions and political regime changes, shifts in the constellations of forces and power relations, and also economic crises that lead to major changes in the economic system. They can also be the result of long-term changes in the way that space is produced.

Turning to the spatial dimension, we may understand a paradigm of urbanisation as the ensemble of urbanisation processes that determine a given territory at a specific time. The combination of these processes is not random: it follows a certain logic, because the different urbanisation processes emerge in the same specific context and are thus related to each other. For instance, a specific type of land regime may exclude certain urbanisation processes—therefore, we do not find plotting urbanism in either strongly regulated or market-oriented territories. Likewise, laminar urbanisation does not develop in territories with weak or multiple territorial regulations and land regimes, because it presupposes fully commodified land

markets. Therefore, underlying material patterns, regulatory systems and political and socioeconomic structures can determine the long-term characteristics of urbanisation in a given territory (see Chapter 1).

MATERIAL STRUCTURES DETERMINING URBAN DEVELOPMENT

On the most basic level, we must remember that the 'space of nature' (Lefebvre 1991 [1975]), particularly geographical location, geomorphological characteristics and topography, may exert a strong influence on urbanisation. Thus, harbour cities have been nodes of networks of trade and information for a long time, as Tokyo and Canton in the Pearl River Delta illustrate. In the 19th century, Hong Kong's entrepôt economy depended entirely on its harbour at the entrance to the Pearl River Delta, and in the 20th century Los Angeles and Lagos took great advantage of their harbours, which increased their connectivity and functioned as hubs for logistics and industrial production. However, not only natural conditions but also the related 'second nature' produced by society plays a role as well. Thus, despite the fact that Los Angeles has no natural harbour, it became the main logistics hub along the North American west coast. This was the result of a local and regional growth coalition, which succeeded in building an artificial harbour at the beginning of the 20th century.

Natural formations like mountain ranges and foothills play various roles in the urbanisation process. The steep mountains that cover large parts of Hong Kong pose limits to large-scale urbanisation. These limits have been partly overcome by adding landfills and constructing the high-rises that are so characteristic of Hong Kong's cityscape. However, as the analysis in Chapter 6 shows, this particular urban design was not only imposed by the topography, but was also a result of the struggle of villagers against the expropriation of their land, which further limited the land that was available for housing construction. Mountains also sometimes have opposite effects as they may attract affluent people who are looking for spectacular views and secluded spaces that shield residents from the urban bustle. The hills in the western part of Mexico City and various foothills in Los Angeles are examples of this effect. However, a hilly topography may also result in reduced accessibility and thus constitute a peripheral location. Such land is often used for popular urbanisation, which is typically located on cheap land that is difficult to build on such as hills, flood-prone land and landslide zones like in Mexico City and Lagos.

The production of the urban fabric also has a long-lasting effect on further rounds of urbanisation. It forms a second nature that petrifies, layer by layer, and has a similar effect as the topography (see Chapter 1). This second nature guides and

sometimes also hinders urban development. Cities like Istanbul, Mexico City, Paris and Tokyo are all based on long-entrenched urban patterns that constitute a major cultural and social value and a unique heritage. Yet relatively young colonial cities like Kolkata, Lagos and Hong Kong also have historical cores that represent an important heritage. When the Hong Kong Government demolished the Queen's Pier and the Star Ferry Clock Tower in 2006, it immediately sparked off huge public protests. This shows that it is not only the material structure that influences further urbanisation but also the fact that the material structure itself incorporates historical values, memories and experiences.

Even invisible structures may exert marked inertia, as became apparent in Tokyo. The almost complete destruction of the urban area in the devastating fire of 1923 and again during the allied bombing campaign at the end of the Second World War did not significantly alter the pattern of urbanisation there. The parcelling of the land and the underlying pattern of railway lines constitute a persistent basic framework, which can be explained by the strong attachment of the people to the land, and particularly to reference points that carry meaning such as mountains, temples or the sites of rituals.

The persistence of the built-up structure also contributes to the lasting legacy of centre-periphery relations. In Mexico City and Paris, ring motorways called 'Anillo Periférico' and 'le périphérique' separate the urban core areas from the periphery or the banlieue. In Paris this ring motorway was built at the place of the last city wall, that was constructed in 1845, and which had inscribed the duality of the city of Paris and the working-class banlieue into the territory. Similarly, the Yamanote line, the central ring railway line that connects all major centralities, marks the boundary of the central zone of Tokyo.

On the other hand, the existing urban structures may also be weak, and thus open the field up for extensive urban development. This was the situation in Los Angeles with its endless zone of laminar urbanisation covering the plains and valleys. When the small towns scattered over the territory were connected by inter-urban railways, this set an extensive process of urbanisation in motion advancing into the open land. Later, when these railway lines were replaced by freeways, the specific Los Angeles pattern of a horizontal metropolis fully unfolded. In a similar way, the settlement areas of Shenzhen and Dongguan could be extended over the mostly flat and only sparsely settled agricultural landscape; however, the existing material pattern and territorial grid of towns and villages and the specific power relations and territorial regulations engendered a different urbanisation process, mainly based on plotting urbanism.

TERRITORIAL REGULATIONS

A second aspect of the paradigms of urbanisation are the territorial regulations, and thus the rules that guide the production of space and the use of the land. A decisive precondition for urbanisation is the availability of land for the construction of settlements and infrastructure, which is heavily determined by land use regulations and land ownership regimes.

In Mexico City, ejido land, a type of communal land that was created by the Mexican land reform in 1934, enabled the rapid spread of popular urbanisation. A further land reform in 1992 made ejido land tradeable and thus facilitated mass housing urbanisation in the periphery. Similarly, the existence of state-owned land in Istanbul was a precondition for tolerating the gecekondus and also allowed the emergence of plotting urbanism. In a later phase, the availability of this land also made mass housing urbanisation a feasible option for urban development. In Hong Kong, the land was designated crown land belonging to the colonial state, and thus could be used to generate income for the state and also for steering and controlling urban development. After the handover of the colony to China, this land remained in the hands of the Hong Kong government. In Paris, where most land is privately owned, state agencies have strong planning powers and even expropriation rights. This was particularly important for the French model of mass housing urbanisation and also for the development of the villes nouvelles.

Other regulations took the form of territorial compromises in situations where the simultaneous presence of contradicting land regimes dominated. In Lagos, a dual land regime was established by the conflict-ridden superimposition of customary rules via a formal private property system—which became the regulatory basis of plotting urbanism. In Shenzhen and Dongguan, the remnant of the socialist system of village collectives' rights on rural land has led to complex conflicts and negotiations on land use rights between villagers and town and city governments. The distinction between rural and urban land, regulated by different rules, constituted the legal basis of bypass urbanisation in Kolkata. Under Indian law, state governments have the right to forcibly acquire agricultural land for non-agricultural uses under certain conditions, but the exercise of this right has led to explosive land conflicts; not only in Kolkata, but also in many other parts of India. All these specific forms and modalities of territorial regulation can become very important determinants of urbanisation and may continue to be effective for many decades. They can thus be considered constants of paradigms of urban development.

A third important dimension of the paradigms of urbanisation is the set of entrenched political and socioeconomic structures and differences that may influence urbanisation in many ways. This is particularly evident in long-lasting centre-periphery relations and social segregation. As discussed above, the centre-periphery relations in Paris set in place by the urban transformation imposed by Haussmann in the second half of the 19th century are still effective today. In recent decades however, the west-east polarisation of wealth and income, which is also rooted in long-standing social differences, has been superimposed on them.

Mexico City displays a similar west-east polarisation, mainly generated by the topography, with the hills in the west and the unstable and flood-prone ground in the eastern part. In contrast, Istanbul and Kolkata have developed quite differentiated social patterns, with some rich and privileged areas but also a large number of mixed neighbourhoods. In Lagos the old colonial method of spatial segregation persists in the central areas, while the intrinsic mechanisms of plotting urbanism have contributed to quite mixed neighbourhoods. In recent times, bypass urbanism has introduced a new kind of segregation between the urban majority and the urban elites, which are looking for an exclusive, Western-oriented lifestyle.

THE QUESTION OF PERIODISATION

As has been shown in the previous section, features that relate to the specificity of a territory may have long-lasting imprints on urban development. However, a once-established urban pattern is not immutable, and the path dependency of a territory does not prevent radical transformations. It is therefore necessary to analyse paradigm changes in urban development, and thus to conduct a periodisation of the pathways of urbanisation to identify ruptures in the modalities of the production of space, and most importantly, to find answers to one of the key questions in urban studies: how to explain urban change?

Our comparison of the urbanisation pathways reveals the existence of a great variety of urban dynamics, as well as a wide range of possible ruptures and shifts. If we focus on the last hundred years, we see in all our study areas a clear paradigm shift at the end of the Second World War, with the beginning of decolonisation and the postwar economic boom. However, in the decades that followed the different urban areas displayed quite divergent pathways of urbanisation. In Los Angeles, Paris and Mexico City a clear rupture appears in the early 1970s with the economic crisis and the beginning of deindustrialisation. In other territories, however, such transitions happened only in the 1980s or even the 1990s and they are quite different in character. There is another wave of transitions in the 2000s, but in other territories a paradigm change becomes apparent only during the course of the 2010s.

These findings challenge to some degree one of the most commonly posed hypotheses in urban studies: that the pathways of urbanisation are mainly determined by long cycles of general social development. This hypothesis is based on two assumptions: (1) that urbanisation usually follows the same universal historical pathway and thus displays the same periodisation (see e.g. Abu Lughod 1999); and (2) that a model of accumulation always affects the production of space in the same way. The broad discussion on the transition from a Fordist or developmentalist model of development towards a neoliberal model exemplifies this (see e.g. Leborgne and Lipietz 1988; Brenner and Theodore 2002): Even if there are strong arguments for assuming that there was a fundamental worldwide urban transition during the long 1980s, this does not mean that general tendencies are 'translated' directly into urban space. The production of space is not the direct expression of wider socioeconomic processes but is determined by a multitude of processes, conflicts and forces.

Thus, quite different forms of Fordist urban development and various urban strategies of neoliberalisation exist. Even if we find indications for

a clear break or rupture of urbanisation patterns in many urban territories across the world in the mid-1970s and early 1980s, the question remains as to whether these ruptures are determined by changes in the accumulation regime and the respective mode of regulation, or whether other moments and factors became decisive at this point. It is therefore important not to assume that such changes need no explanation but to proceed with a detailed analysis of the processes of urbanisation and to clarify what really happens on the ground.

MODERNISATION AND DEVELOPMENTALISM

On a worldwide scale, the period after the Second World War between about 1945 and 1975 was characterised by decolonisation, the Cold War and the emergence and consolidation of three heterogeneous and contradictory political blocks: the West with market capitalism, the socialist Eastern Bloc, and what Frantz Fanon called the 'Third World'. This phase led to the consolidation of nation-states, some of which were newly established during the process of decolonisation. Modernisation and developmentalism were main strategies used by nation-states to promote growth, giving rise to the emergence of what Lefebvre calls a 'state space' (see Schmid 2022: 464–465). In this process, states became the agents that direct and monitor the production of space, control the national resources and the organisation and planning of the entire territory. The national space served as a kind of container for the deployment of Keynesianism in Western countries, and for state socialism and the strategies of import substitution in many postcolonial countries. This period led to an unprecedented economic boom and also unprecedented rates of urbanisation. It is known in Mexico as *milagro mexicano* (Mexican miracle) and in France as *trentes glorieuses*.

What was the influence of these regimes of accumulation on urbanisation? In our specific sample of urban territories, it resulted in a change towards expansive paradigms of urbanisation, pushed by waves of domestic and international immigration. In all our case studies, the dominant overall process during this time was thus massive and rapid urban growth. The forces behind this urban growth, however, differed considerably. In some of our studies large-scale industrialisation processes unfolded, either advanced by Fordist-Keynesian growth policies (in Paris, Los Angeles and Tokyo), or by strategies of import substitution (in Mexico City and Istanbul). In contrast, in both Hong Kong and Kolkata, huge waves of refugees stood at the beginning of post-war urban growth. The partition of India in 1947 brought hundreds of thousands of refugees to Kolkata and the Civil War and the rise of the Communist Party in China resulted in a

population increase of almost two million people in Hong Kong between 1945 and 1955. The colonial government of Hong Kong responded to the ensuing urban crisis using a strategy of mass housing urbanisation combined with export-oriented industrialisation. In this way, an industrial working class was formed that became the basis of the long-lasting economic boom of the colony.

A very different situation prevailed in Lagos, where industrialisation played a minor role, but oil production and state functions were determining economic sectors (until the relocation of the capital of Nigeria to Abuja in 1991). Other drivers of urbanisation were the harbours in Hong Kong and Lagos. Informal economies also played important roles in Lagos and Kolkata. As they are respectively the major metropolises of Nigeria and the state of West Bengal, both with low levels of urbanisation, they attracted many migrants from rural areas. Further drivers for urban growth were specific state strategies that promoted the concentration of state functions and the centralisation of power, particularly in Tokyo, Mexico City and Paris—which are all located in countries with centralised state structures.

The cumulative effect of all these factors was urban explosions in all analysed territories between 1950 and 1980. The population of the Tokyo Metropolitan Complex increased from 11.3 to 28.5 million; in Mexico City from 3.4 to 13.0 million; in Greater Los Angeles from 4.9 to 11.5 million; in the Paris Region from 7.3 to 10.1 million; in Hong Kong from 2.1 to 5.2 million; in Istanbul from 1.2 to 4.7 million and in Lagos from about 300,000 to 2.6 million.

THE TRANSITION PERIOD OF THE LONG 1980S

In all our case studies, a sea change in the pathway of urbanisation became apparent during the long 1980s, which was a transitional period of crisis-induced global restructuring that began with the deconstruction of Fordist-Keynesian and national-developmental regimes of accumulation in the early 1970s and continued until the collapse of state socialism and the subsequent intensification of global economic integration. However, this change does not constitute a general, clear-cut break in the pathways of urbanisation, as our case studies demonstrate. It could be regarded as an extended transitional period in which a range of significant transformations occurred, combining centralisation and peripheralisation, deindustrialisation and the development of global headquarter economies, and more generally uneven development and non-simultaneity of urban processes.

If we look at the periodisation of the production of space, we see that very different factors influenced the pathway of urbanisation of individual urban territories. The crisis of Fordism in the West

was accompanied by marked deindustrialisation, clearly visible in Paris and Los Angeles. This process started in Paris in the 1960s, driven by the deliberate state policy of industrial decentralisation, which was then aggravated by the economic crisis of the 1970s. In Los Angeles the crisis in the manufacturing sector unfolded in two waves; the first in the 1970s in the classical Fordist manufacturing industries and the second in the early 1990s, when the end of the Cold War and the ensuing reduction of warfare spending led to a crisis in the defence sector.

The crises in Paris and Los Angeles had a direct relationship with the simultaneous rapid growth of export-oriented manufacturing industries in East and South-East Asia, which brought about a 'new international division of labour' (Fröbel, Heinrichs and Kreye 1978). Tokyo and Hong Kong were at the forefront of this global transformation. In Tokyo the export-oriented growth regime continued until the Japanese economic crisis of the 1990s induced a long phase of stagnation. At the same time, Hong Kong became one of the four Asian Tigers or Little Dragons with strong industrial export sectors (together with Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan). In the 1980s its situation changed dramatically with the radical new economic policy introduced in the People's Republic of China under Deng Xiaoping, which was first implemented in the Pearl River Delta. This resulted in the rapid, state-driven industrialisation and urbanisation of Shenzhen and Dongguan, which together became the 'world factory' during the 1980s and 1990s. Over the course of this process, Hong Kong developed into the most important centre of the Pearl River Delta, while its industrial production was mainly relocated to Shenzhen and Dongguan.

Diverse forms of neoliberalisation employing various strategies of economic liberalisation, deregulation, marketisation and financialisation started in Istanbul and Mexico City in the 1980s and in Kolkata over the course of the 1990s, markedly shifting urbanisation processes towards urban intensification. In contrast, the pathway of urbanisation in Lagos was mainly linked to the question of political stability: after a catastrophic period of bust in the 1980s and 1990s, induced by the global oil crisis, a period of political stability started in 1999.

URBAN INTENSIFICATION AND METROPOLITAN MAINSTREAM

Over the course of the 2000s and 2010s, a new phase of urban development became apparent in our case study areas that we may subsume under the umbrella term 'urban intensification'. The process of globalisation led to the development of global economic control centres in many metropolitan areas as a result of the spread of global production networks. Thus, in tandem with deindustrialisation, headquarter economies developed in

Paris, Los Angeles, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Mexico City, Istanbul and also Shenzhen with corporate headquarters, producer services and research and development departments, often accompanied by the construction of technopoles (in Los Angeles, Paris, Tokyo, Shenzhen and Dongguan) and also IT centres (in Kolkata).

Such developments were partly conceptualised by the concepts of world city and global city (Friedmann 1986; Sassen 1991). But these concepts reduce the often complex and contradictory development of urban territories to their global functions, and at the same time neglect the fact that the formation of headquarter economies is also fundamentally transforming many urban territories across the world that do not fit into the categories of global or world city.

The production of privileged spaces to accommodate global elites and the concomitant process of the commodification of the urban affects often entire central areas and also transforms peripheral zones. Strategies of metropolisation, urban regeneration and urban renewal have contributed to establishing a new metropolitan mainstream that manifests itself in the construction of flagship projects, office and condominium towers, mega-projects and large-scale infrastructures, accompanied by policies of urban upgrading and normalisation causing displacements and dispossession (see Schmid 2012). In most of our case study areas we observed processes of the incorporation of differences, and in Lagos and Kolkata, where these processes were not very pronounced, we saw bypass urbanism, and thus the large-scale transformation of urban peripheries.

At the same time, urbanisation was stretching even further out, affecting more and more remote areas that are being transformed by various processes of extended urbanisation (for more details see Schmid and Topalović 2023). They are pushed forward by strategies of metropolisation designed to integrate huge urban areas into encompassing catchment areas, mainly by the construction of mega infrastructure projects. These strategies were deployed in Mexico City, Istanbul and particularly the Pearl River Delta.

DYNAMICS OF URBANISATION PROCESSES

What were the effects of these transformations on the production of space and how did they take shape on the ground? In our understanding, paradigms of urbanisation are not abstract categories: they are manifestations of concrete urban transformations and become visible through the emergence of new urbanisation processes. However, as discussed above, there is no direct relationship between accumulation regimes and the production of space. The materialisation of general political and socioeconomic tendencies is always mediated by material structures, trans-scalar power relations and territorial regulations, and socio-economic differentiations.

A comparison between Istanbul and Mexico City reveals this contradictory relationship. Both urban territories have large urban cores that represent an important historical legacy. Both metropolises experienced an economic boom and strong industrialisation resulting from import substitution strategies during the 1950s and 1960s, and in both territories popular urbanisation was utilised as an implicit strategy to cope with the problem of constructing housing for increasing numbers of immigrants. Nevertheless, we can observe certain differences in the concrete arrangements and procedures of popular urbanisation, based on different land regimes. These differences became visible in the way in which popular urbanisation played out. It resulted in a kind of consolidated popular urbanisation in Mexico City and plotting urbanism in Istanbul. And once again, in the 2000s, both metropolitan territories showed clear parallels with the process of mass housing urbanisation in the urban peripheries and the incorporation of urban differences in the urban core areas.

Another illustration of this relationship between general tendencies and the specificity of concrete urban territories is the contrast between urban developments in Paris and Los Angeles. Both are large industrial regions that have experienced marked immigration and massive urban growth, and both represent classic examples of Fordist urbanism. In both cases, urban growth was realised by the mass production of housing, but this was achieved by almost opposite urban strategies. While in Paris centralised state strategies were used to produce mass housing urbanisation and later state-planned *villes nouvelles* and rapid regional metro lines, the dominant process in Los Angeles was laminar urbanisation, which was based on the mass production of privately built single-family homes linked by freeways. However, starting in the 1970s, a certain alignment of urban development occurred. In both territories neoliberal policies were introduced and

both metropolises were afflicted by deindustrialisation and by socioeconomic and racialised peripheralisation; thus also developing similar processes of post-proletarian urbanisation, which ignited struggles and uprisings in the 1990s. In both Paris and Los Angeles headquarter economies arose and new and renewed centralities emerged in the former urban periphery, which resulted in multi-layered patchwork urbanisation. And both regions were confronted with processes of urban intensification and the incorporation of urban differences in the last two decades.

These developments give us a certain understanding of the relationship between paradigms of urbanisation and specificity. They shed light on the range of options that exist in a certain historical moment: there are often similar problematics, but very different ways of addressing them, corresponding to the different circumstances and underlying conditions leading to the specific pathways of urbanisation of each individual territory. To explore these urban dynamics, we introduce a broad classification of the processes of expansion, intensification and peripheralisation.

PROCESSES OF EXPANSION

The fundamental problematic of urban growth can be condensed in one simple but protracted question: how to house hundreds of thousands of people in a very short space of time? One possible option is to extend the urbanised area via market mechanisms, which leads to classic forms of suburbanisation. However, this happened in our case studies only in Los Angeles and Tokyo; namely, in the form of laminar urbanisation by means of an endless production of single-family homes over the territory. Due to the very large scale of this urbanisation process it determines the basic structure of both territories to this day.

Another possible solution to this problem is mass housing urbanisation, which usually involves the intervention of the state. This urban strategy was adopted in Hong Kong and Paris. In both cases the threat of protests and social unrest was an important motivation for the respective governments to find a quick solution to the housing problem, and in Hong Kong it also served the goal of exerting control over the working class. State and private actors in Istanbul and Mexico City had recourse to similar urban strategies in the 2000s, but under completely different conditions of financialisation and marketisation.

A very different answer to this question was popular urbanisation. In many urban territories mass housing urbanisation was not an option in the 1950s, because state resources at this scale were not available and the low-income population did not have the means to construct regular houses for themselves. An important precondition for

this urban strategy was the availability of collective ejido land as in Mexico City, or state-owned land as in Istanbul.

Another way of providing housing for many people is plotting urbanism. Usually based on dual or at least ambivalent land regimes, this plot-by-plot process can transform entire landscapes in a very short time because it mainly works without comprehensive planning and coordination and is based on the initiative of individual landlords; and proceeds by the repetition of generic architectural and urban layouts. One primary example of this process is Lagos, where it became the ordinary process of urbanisation. Interestingly, a similar process was established in Shenzhen in the 1980s by villagers who took advantage of grey zones and ambivalences in the land-use regulations. They managed to construct large urban settlements capable of housing a huge number of labour migrants, during a time in which housing was urgently needed but the process of state-driven urban development did not achieve the scale of new settlements needed. In a later phase, the plotted neighbourhoods were demolished and replaced by urban renewal developments. In retrospect, plotting urbanism can thus be understood as an intermediate phase in the rapid urbanisation of Shenzhen.

PROCESSES OF INTENSIFICATION

As we have seen in the section on periodisation, since the 1990s various processes of urban intensification have taken hold in all our case study areas. Urbanisation has shifted towards the production of urban spaces for the new urban elites and to accommodate headquarter economic functions, leading to simultaneous processes of recentralisation and decentralisation.

An important part of this process of intensification is the production of centralities, including the transformation and expansion of existing centres as well as the creation of new centralities with specific activities and functions. On the one hand, the extension and upgrading of central districts leads to the incorporation of urban differences, such as in Mexico City and in Istanbul. In Hong Kong the strategy of metropolisation resulted in the expansion of the central business district in Hong Kong Island, the construction of a new central district in West Kowloon and new business and entertainment centres in various other locations. An entire belt of new centralities was developed in Shenzhen, and new centralities were also built in Dongguan. And after many attempts, the combined efforts of private and state actors finally succeeded in developing a thriving Downtown in Los Angeles.

These processes of recentralisation were accompanied by state strategies of urban redevelopment and urban renewal, particularly in Istanbul and Hong Kong, but also in Mexico City with the

plan 'bando dos' that promoted the upgrading of residential and industrial districts close to the urban centre. The government of Shenzhen launched condominium developments in areas of plotting urbanism, and in Tokyo deindustrialised harbour areas were transformed by mansion urbanisation. Ever since the 1970s, large-scale processes of embourgeoisement have transformed the city of Paris into a huge exclusive zone for metropolitan elites and tourists; and in the 2000s and 2010s, more and more banlieues in the southwest of the Paris Region have also been affected by this process. Surprisingly, in the 2010s, even in Greater Los Angeles with its extensive urbanisation processes urban regeneration and gentrification have been evolving—particularly around Downtown LA, but also in places like Santa Monica and Santa Ana in Orange County.

On the other hand, the production of new centralities in former urban peripheries are reinforcing processes of polycentralisation. While the polycentric structure in Los Angeles has been strengthened and upgraded in the last three decades, new business zones have been created in the urban peripheries of many other metropolises, such as Santa Fe in Mexico City, La Défense in Paris and the new central business district along the Mecidiyeköy-Büyükdere-Maslak axis in Istanbul. New centralities were also built in Dongguan and in Shenzhen outside the Special Economic Zone, reinforcing tendencies of polycentralisation.

The extension of existing centralities and the production of new ones have led to the emergence of multilayered patchwork urbanisation in and around the areas of the villes nouvelles in Paris, in Hong Kong's New Territories and in Los Angeles's Orange County. In a different form, similar processes of the production of new centralities have contributed to the evolution of bypass urbanism in Kolkata, Lagos and Mexico City, restructuring the centre-periphery relationships in the entire regions.

Most recently, new encompassing metropolisation strategies have been deployed to enhance international competitiveness, such as the project for Grand Paris. On an even larger scale, the strategy of the 'Greater Bay Area' aims at the stronger integration of the entire Pearl River Delta, including Hong Kong, and at developing the region into an international innovation, science and technology hub.

PROCESSES OF PERIPHERALISATION

These processes of intensification, upgrading and commodification went hand in hand with processes of peripheralisation. In an urban society centrality is an important, even indispensable, resource for the entire urban region. According to Lefebvre, centrality constitutes the wealth of an urban society. Access to centrality and urban difference are therefore

crucial aspects of a more just and self-determined urban process. These reflections led Lefebvre to his famous calls for the 'right to the city', the 'right to centrality' and the 'right to difference' (Lefebvre 1996 [1968], 2003 [1970], 1991 [1975]). Interestingly, scientific and activist contributions to the right to the city have increased widely in the last decade in very different contexts. This greater awareness indicates that social exclusion has become more pressing in many places across the world. It is a sign that a contradictory process of urban upgrading continues hand in hand with processes of peripheralisation.

A closer look at this phenomenon may detect quite different processes of peripheralisation as part of various urbanisation processes. One is the dispossession and displacement of people from central to periurban and exurban areas as a result of the incorporation of differences, upgrading and commodification processes. Furthermore, our analysis of mass housing urbanisation in Hong Kong and Paris has shown that since the 1960s and 1970s, processes of logistical peripheralisation and the peripheralisation of the everyday have occurred. In both cases, this turned into socioeconomic peripheralisation in the 1980s. These tendencies are directly related to post-proletarian urbanisation in both Paris and Hong Kong, which have also unfolded in Los Angeles and Mexico City. Moreover, in Lagos and Kolkata bypass urbanism induced the large-scale reorganisation of centre-periphery relations and the peripheralisation of large urban areas in central locations.

URBANISATION AS AN OPEN PROCESS

As a general conclusion, two key aspects stand out. The first is the insight that urbanisation should be understood as a collective search process. Urbanisation generates constantly new situations and constellations which demand appropriate responses. As this comparison has shown, state and private actors in different contexts have developed a variety of urban strategies to cope with newly arising problematics, which have resulted in quite different outcomes. Sometimes these strategies followed entrenched patterns of urbanisation, and at other times, completely new strategies were developed that could be seen as real collective inventions. Thus, new urbanisation processes have evolved, from plotting urbanism to bypass urbanism and multilayered patchwork urbanisation.

According to Lefebvre, we should understand such often surprising urban transformations neither as accidental results nor as conscious and desired outcomes of political and economic changes. He therefore brought forward the idea of a 'trial by space'. With this formulation he meant that it is the transformation of space itself that puts society to the test (Lefebvre 1991 [1975]: 416–419). This raises the question about the nature of urbanisation as such. It is a process of exploration, shaped as much by urban strategies as by preexisting structures and by chance and sudden events. Urban space is in constant flux. And so, urbanisation is, by necessity, a process that implies constant innovation and inventiveness. Situations arise that call for new responses, sometimes resulting in completely different and unexpected outcomes. Errors and dead ends are as much part of this process as serendipitous breakthroughs and success stories.

This makes the urban an experimental field upon which the rich diversity of society can flourish. We must keep our minds open to new alternatives and routes of development. The urban is an open horizon where the unexpected is always present.

1 We present seven urban portraits in this book; however, our work was also informed by research on Kolkata, which we include in this concluding chapter (see also Chapter 14).

APPENDIX